



**For Immediate Release: 17 October 2010**

## **Putting the GM Canola Genie back in its bottle**

MADGE (Mothers are Demystifying Genetic Engineering) has registered a complaint with the Ombudsman, claiming Administrative Deficiencies in the Food Standards Australia New Zealand approval of the Monsanto crop.

MADGE is seeking the remedy of the removal of the crop from the Table of approved GM crop lines.

MADGE Madeleine Love said "We've been researching the approval of the GM canola crop for more than two years, and we can't see we're getting value for our regulation dollar. The public is highly skeptical about the safety of GM crops, and we expect a little more Duty of Care, especially given the recent revelations of GM residues contaminating infant formula."

"There was a saying that once released into the environment, the GM canola genie couldn't be put back in its bottle. We think that it can."

FSANZ approved this crop on information given to it by Monsanto, the owner of the GM canola.

"The Monsanto material had been described as "scientific studies" by FSANZ. But Monsanto reported contaminated samples and altered and disregarded protocols. They failed to report essential data, and had study design that made meaningful results impossible. This isn't science as the public understands it."

"The FSANZ document was riddled with basic errors, confused essential facts about the crop, and was misleading to the public consultation."

"The final straw was when FSANZ said that it was a requirement that the company generate data according to Good Laboratory Practice (simple rules to limit potential for lab fraud) and submit to external auditing, adding "Studies that do not make the grade will not be accorded any weight in the safety assessment.""

"In fact Monsanto reported compliance with Good Laboratory Practice (GLP) in only three out of 30 studies. Monsanto reported compliance failure in 15 studies, said they didn't 'significantly deviate' from GLP in one study, didn't provide a statement of compliance in 10 studies and in one said they did not have to comply."

"Most of this information is found inside the front covers of the Monsanto reports, but it seems FSANZ failed to check before issuing its public statements."

“Despite the non-compliance to GLP<sup>i</sup>, and no record of external auditing, FSANZ cited all of these studies in their risk assessment document, without referring to any deficiencies. FSANZ did seem to accord them ‘weight’, against its reassurance that it wouldn’t.”

“We have presented this information to FSANZ, and have what is essentially a concession letter.”

The Monsanto GM canola material is available on the MADGE website for Australians who want to see it for themselves. If journalists can find one scientist that has read this material, MADGE would like to speak with them. The MADGE/FSANZ correspondence is also available.

**Contact: Madeleine Love 0447 762 284 (main MADGE researcher on this topic)**

**Fran Murrell 0401 407 944 (MADGE spokesperson)**

---

<sup>i</sup> One of the simplest rules of Good Laboratory Practice was that researchers had to write in pen, rather than pencil to prevent the temptation to erase the data and write in more favourable results. Yet for some of these studies, Monsanto’s own in-house quality assurance staff had on scheduled visits to the labs noted that data had been written in pencil! This is elementary. Where is the Duty of Care?