

Gentechvrij, A Media Release and a Summary of our complaint about the placing on the EU market of 2 kinds of GM spray carnations of Florigene Ltd. via The Netherlands, EU. *** NB, archive not all links are still working.**



30-10-2015 Press release

Re: Hearing about placing on the EU market of two GM spray carnations at the Dutch Ministry of Infrastructure and the Environment.

The European GMO-free Citizens, Foundation Ekopark, Lelystad, The Netherlands and MADGE Australia Inc. are making a complaint against plans of the Dutch Ministry of Infrastructure and the Environment to place on the EU market two GM spray carnations of Florigene Ltd. With a changed flower color. Mark *GGO C/NL/09/01 en GGO C/NL/09/02*

Hearing data:

Date: 17 th of November 2015, **Time :** 14.00 h, **Place :** Koningskade 4, The Hague, The Netherlands Den Haag Room B01.40, Tel.: (070) 456 00 00 From CS bus 18, 22, 69 or 79.

Names of the GM spray carnations: FLORIGENE ® Moonberry tm en FLORIGENE ® Moonvelvet tm.

The GM spray carnations.

They have been fully changed, not only the colors. In these cases changes have taken place in the whole plants, and we think they were unexpected changes: Florigene did know this before hand?

Other differences: *The primary difference between IFD-25958-3 and the recipient plant is in the colour of the flowers, because of the production of delphinidin in the GMHP . The transgenic line IFD-25958-3 produces flowers with more petals than the parental line it is derived from and a thicker stem at the 5th node. IFD-25958-3 also shows increased filaments which are significantly*

shorter than the parental line. Source: application. The second gm flower also has a change in appearance.

Not been tested in EU field trails

These two carnations C/NL/09/01 en GGO C/NL/09/02 have not been tested in EU field trails. That's why they cannot be placed on the EU market. See for evidence: *List of SNIFs circulated under Article 9 of Directive 90/220/EEC and Article 9 of Directive 2001/18/EC From 21 October 1991 to 26/04/201*

We read DIRECTIVE 2001/18/EC OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL of 12 March 2001 on the deliberate release into the environment of genetically modified organisms and repealing Council Directive 90/220/EEC

(25) No GMOs, as or in products, intended for deliberate release are to be considered for placing on the market without first having been subjected to satisfactory field testing at the research and development stage in ecosystems which could be affected by their use.. http://eur-lex.europa.eu/resource.html?uri=cellar:303dd4fa-07a8-4d20-86a8-0baaf0518d22.0004.02/DOC_1&format=PDF_2, page 150.

There is no real purpose and TIMENTIN has been used.

We don't see any purpose in changing a color of a carnation.

Furthermore during the production of the GM-flowers the **antibioticum TIMENTIN** has been used to kill *Agrobacterium* that is used to produce the GM flowers . " *To reduce the development of drug-resistant bacteria and maintain the effectiveness of TIMENTIN and other antibacterial drugs, TIMENTIN should be used only to treat or prevent infections that are proven or strongly suspected to be caused by susceptible bacteria. <http://www.rxlist.com/timentin-drug/indications-dosage.htm> Ticarcillin is a carboxypenicillin. It is almost invariably sold and used in combination with clavulanate as Timentin. Because it is a penicillin, it also falls within the larger class of beta-lactam antibiotics. Its main clinical use is as an injectable antibiotic for the treatment of Gram-negative bacteria, particularly Pseudomonas aeruginosa. It is also one of the few antibiotics capable of treating Stenotrophomonas maltophilia infections." <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ticarcillin>*

Dr. Mae Wan Ho:

*As I have written in many, many articles, there is good evidence that *Agrobacterium* is not killed by the antibiotics and can remain dormant and undetectable together with the binary vectors . Please read Chapter 3 of Ban GMOs Now. (Fragment.)*

The use of ***Agrobacterium* is very controvercial. The greatest danger while using GMO crops is according to Dr. Mae Wan Ho *horizontal gene transfer* . (HGT). And the possible connection with *Morgellons skin fibers**. Zie http://www.i-sis.org.uk/Ban_GMOs_Now.php en <http://www.morgellons-research.org/morgellons/morgellons-disease-factors.htm>**

- 2) GM carnations will be thrown out or composted once they die. The GM DNA is likely to be taken up by soil and other bacteria with unknown consequences for the environment. Degraded sequences of DNA as short as 20 base pairs could be taken up and incorporated into the bacterial genome. Even DNA from dead and extinct plants and animals has been found to be able to be incorporated http://www.i-sis.org.uk/Horizontal_Transfer_of_GM_DNA_Widespread.php
- 3) GM DNA is already contaminating the environment with unknown consequences:
 - A study in China in 2012 found GM plasmids containing an antibiotic resistance gene in all six of China's rivers. (Chen J, Jin M, Qiu ZG, Guo C, Chen ZL, Shen ZQ, Wang XW, Li JW. A Survey of Drug Resistance bla Genes Originating from Synthetic Plasmid Vectors in Six Chinese Rivers. *Environmental Science & Technology* 2012, 46, 13448-54.)
 - Streams in the US are contaminated with debris from GM bt corn plants. Laboratory tests show the GM plants reduced growth and increased death rates for stream insects. <http://www.pnas.org/content/104/41/16204.abstract>
 - There is the likelihood of similar contamination and poisoning by GM DNA from discarded GM carnations with unknown consequences for the environment.
- 4) There is no ability to recall GM genes that spread and harm the ecosystem. S

Fragments objections of MADGE Australia Inc. President Fran Murell.

What will happen if consumers nevertheless eat the GM petals?

They insert the cauliflower mosaic virus in these GM carnations.

"Probably the greatest threat from genetically altered crops is the insertion of modified virus and insect virus genes into crops. It has been shown in the laboratory that genetic recombination will create highly virulent new viruses from such constructions. Certainly the widely used cauliflower mosaic virus is a potentially dangerous gene. It is a pararetrovirus meaning that it multiplies by making DNA from RNA messages. It is very similar to the Hepatitis B virus and related to HIV."
 Dr. Joseph Cummins, professor emeritus in genetics from the university of West-Ontario The use of Cauliflower Mosaic Virus, Joseph Cummins.

And we support the undermentioned quote:

Richard Strohman is an eminent scientist and former Chair of the Department of Molecular and Cell Biology at Berkeley who stated the problem this way: *When you insert a single gene into a plant or an animal, the technology will work you'll get the desired characteristic. But you will also have produced changes in the cell or the organism as a whole that are unpredictable. Genes exist in networks, interactive networks which have a logic of their own and the fact that the industry folks don't deal with these networks is what makes their science incomplete and dangerous. We are in a crisis position where we know the weakness of the genetic concept, but we don't know how to incorporate it into a new, more complete understanding.* Source: http://www.davidsuzuki.org/david/downloads/David_Suzuki_Biotech_essay.pdf

END

You can also find this media release at: <http://www.gentechvrij.nl/a15eng.html>

The European GMO-free Citizens: <http://www.gentechvrij.nl/thegmofreecitizens.html>

Foundation Ekopark, Lelystad: The Netherlands: <http://www.stichtingekopark.nl>

MADGE Australia Inc: <http://www.madge.org.au/>

Info: [info\(a\)gentechvrij.nl](mailto:info(a)gentechvrij.nl) and [info\(a\)stichtingekopark.nl](mailto:info(a)stichtingekopark.nl)



A Summary of our complaint.

Registered

Staatssecretaris van IenM, mevrouw W. J. Mansveld
T.a.v. de Hoofddirectie Bestuurlijke en Juridische Zaken
Afdeling Algemeen Bestuurlijk-Juridische Zaken
Postbus 20901
2500 EX Den Haag.

Lelystad, 17th of August 2015.

Dear Mrs. Mansveld,

Complaint and Open Letter.

We are making a complaint against your plans to place on the EU market two GM spray carnations of Florigene Ltd.

Op 9 juli 2015 zijn door het Ministerie van Infrastructuur en Milieu (hierna: IenM), vergunningen verleend, met kenmerk GGO C/NL/09/01 en GGO C/NL/09/02 , voor het in de handel brengen van genetisch gemodificeerde organismen krachtens artikel 23 van het Besluit genetisch gemodificeerde organismen milieubeheer, geldend ten tijde van de ontvangst van de aanvraag (hierna: Besluit ggo) aan Florigene Ltd., gevestigd in Melbourne, in Australië. De beschikkingen zijn op 20 juli 2015 aan Florigene Ltd. verzonden . Op 12 maart 2009 had Florigene Ltd. daartoe strekkende aanvragen ingediend. De genetisch gemodificeerde organismen die als product in de handel worden gebracht ten behoeve van import zijn snijbloemen van anjer (Dianthus caryophyllus L.) met een gewijzigde bloemkleur, gemodificeerd met Agrobacterium tumefaciens stam AGL0, met behulp van de vector pCGP3366 respectievelijk pCGP2355, wat lijn 25958 (C/NL/09/01) en lijn 26407 (C/NL/09/02) heeft opgeleverd. Quote Advert Volkskrant 20-07-2015 .

A first observation:

The first two of our letters did not reach the Ministry because a wrong postbox number, wrongly named in the advertisement of the Ministry. We complained about it. So people therefore from other EU countries could not support our complaint. Those letters will be refused, like 2 of ourselves. Cannot you do something about it?

The gm spray carnations.

They have been fully changed, not only the colors. Is this intentionally? We don't think so.

They are symbols of several countries.

The European GMO-free Citizens believe that these introductions on the EU market of these GM-carnations with changed flower color must not take place. This introduction is for economic reasons only. We don't want GM flowers and we don't want them from a company who has used embryo cells and mice to test the toxicity of their first GM-flowers. **They are symbols of several countries like Holland, Poland, Russia, Portugal.** Furthermore they insert the cauliflower mosaic virus in these GM carnations.

They insert the cauliflower mosaic virus in these GM carnations.

"Probably the greatest threat from genetically altered crops is the insertion of modified virus and insect virus genes into crops. It has been shown in the laboratory that genetic recombination will create highly virulent new viruses from such constructions. Certainly the widely used cauliflower mosaic virus is a potentially dangerous gene. It is a pararetrovirus meaning that it multiplies by making DNA from RNA messages. It is very similar to the Hepatitis B virus and related to HIV."

Dr. Joseph Cummins, professor emeritus in genetics from the university of West-Ontario The use of Cauliflower Mosaic Virus, Joseph Cummins.

And we support the undermentioned quote:

Richard Strohman is an eminent scientist and former Chair of the Department of Molecular and Cell Biology at Berkeley who stated the problem this way: *When you insert a single gene into a plant or an animal, the technology will work you'll get the desired characteristic. But you will also have produced changes in the cell or the organism as a whole that are unpredictable. Genes exist in networks, interactive networks which have a logic of their own and the fact that the industry folks don't deal with these networks is what makes their science incomplete and dangerous. We are in a crisis position where we know the weakness of the genetic concept, but we don't know how to incorporate it into a new, more complete understanding.* Source: http://www.davidsuzuki.org/david/downloads/David_Suzuki_Biotech_essay.pdf

Data of Florigene and the Cogem.

Did the Cogem cheque and investigate the data of Florigene or just copied them in 2009?

The Ministry should always use the latest data not those of 6 years ago.

Bill Nye, says on the 3rd of March 2015:

So scientists assess GMOs' safety based not on whether they're GMO, but on what their new genes actually do and the resulting changes in the plants.

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2015/03/03/proof-hes-the-science-guy-bill-nye-is-changing-his-mind-about-gmos/?postshare=8181439400161618>

In these cases changes have taken place in the whole plants, and we think they were unexpected changes: Florigene did know this before hand?

Other differences: *The primary difference between IFD-25958-3 and the recipient plant is in the colour of the flowers, because of the production of delphinidin in the GMHP . The transgenic line IFD-25958-3 produces flowers with more petals than the parental line it is derived from and a thicker stem at the 5th node. IFD-25958-3 also shows increased filaments which are significantly shorter than the parental line. Source: application.*

We read DIRECTIVE 2001/18/EC OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL of 12 March 2001 on the deliberate release into the environment of genetically modified organisms and repealing Council Directive 90/220/EEC

(25) No GMOs, as or in products, intended for deliberate release are to be considered for placing on the market without first having been subjected to satisfactory field testing at the research and development stage in ecosystems which could be affected by their use.. http://eur-lex.europa.eu/resource.html?uri=cellar:303dd4fa-07a8-4d20-86a8-0baaf0518d22.0004.02/DOC_1&format=PDF

These two carnations C/NL/09/01 en GGO C/NL/09/02 have not been tested in EU field trails. That's why they cannot be placed on the EU market. See for evidence: *List of SNIFs circulated under Article 9 of Directive 90/220/EEC and Article 9 of Directive 2001/18/EC From 21 October 1991 to 26/04/2012, [page 150.](#)*

Our complaint exists in two parts.

Part one **mark GGO C/NL/09/01** .

Part two **mark GGO C/NL/09/02** .

Part one

GGO C/NL/09/01

We read in **ASSESSMENT REPORT OF THE DUTCH COMPETENT AUTHORITY IN ACCORDANCE WITH DIRECTIVE 2001/18/EC**

NOTIFICATION C/NL/09/01 about our questions we asked in 2009 to the EC and the answers, which we only now have received.

*2. A member of the public asks what would happen if bees are attracted to the genetically modified carnation flowers and would carry away modified pollen. It is known that a German beekeeper could not sell its biological honey because of the presence of genetically engineered ingredients in the honey. **Answer:** The scope of the notification is for import of cut flowers for ornamental use, and excludes cultivation. Therefore bees will not come in contact with the flowers. Even if they would come in contact, potential spread of pollen will be negligible since domesticated carnations produce only a few anthers and little pollen.*

We don't agree. The carnations can be put on a grave or been put out site in a garden on a table in a vase where bees and butterflies can come in contact with them.

A member of the public protests against this market approval on ethical grounds. This person requests to take into account ethical considerations of the European consumers. Respect for

ethical principles recognized in a Member State is particularly important. According to this person, Member States may take into consideration ethical aspects when GMOs are deliberately released or placed on the market as or in products **Answer:** *According to Annex VI of Directive 2001/18/EC a notification has to be assessed on potential risks for human health and the environment only. Therefore comments not related to the environmental safety of the product are not taken into account in the assessment of this notification on genetically modified carnation.*

We meant: 2001/18/EC

(9) Respect for ethical principles recognised in a Member

State is particularly important. Member States may take into

consideration ethical aspects when GMOs are deliberately

released or placed on the market as or in products.

The ethical aspects are not considered in the Dutch GMO regulations. The Actio Popularis doesn't exist anymore, so citizens cannot have their say anymore against decisions of the Dutch government, only when in this case a foundation like Stichting Ekopark, makes a complaint on behalf of them.

Flowers will ultimately be sold to the general public. SNIF

And we, the general public can only act by telling the government that they will not buy these GM spray carnations!

We asked also:

*7. A member of the public asks if Florigene also used human embryonic intestinal cells, just like the genetically engineered carnation C/NL/04/02, to determine the toxicity of the flower for humans. **Answer:** No, an Ames/ Salmonella test was performed. The results of this test and all other assays performed with similar carnation lines are sufficient to conclude on the safety of cut flowers of this carnation line for human health and the environment.*

Those tests are no longer needed, now Florigene already has the data. We wouldn't want to get those carnations for Mothers day !

We are continuing reading:

Line IFD-25958-3 also contains the herbicide tolerance gene SuRB (also known as ALS) used to facilitate selection in vitro . Expression of this gene confers tolerance to sulfonylurea herbicides.

We don't like those herbicides although the flowers will not be sprayed with it. They can always end in the soil.

Labels.

How many people read labels? We have read in the application:

e. The words 'This product is a genetically modified organism' or 'This product is a genetically modified carnation', and the words 'not for human or animal consumption nor for cultivation' shall appear either on a label or in a document accompanying the product.

The proposed labelling, on a label or in an accompanying document, should include wording to inform operators and final users that the cut flowers of Dianthus caryophyllus L., line 25958 cannot be used for human or animal consumption nor for cultivation.

The importers must see to it that its proper labeled on websites also where the flowers are being offered (EG Nr. 1830/2003) 6. For products consisting of or containing GMOs, operators shall ensure that:

(a) for pre-packaged products consisting of, or containing GMOs, the words 'This product contains genetically modified organisms' or 'This product contains genetically modified [name of organism(s)]' appear on a label;

(b) for non-pre-packaged products offered to the final consumer the words 'This product contains genetically modified organisms' or 'This product contains genetically modified [name of organism(s)]' shall appear on, or in connection with, the display of the product. <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32003R1830&from=NL>

Not everyone has agreed to place these GM flowers on the EU market:

(6) The assessment report was submitted to the Commission and the competent authorities of the other Member States, some of which raised and maintained objections to the placing on the market of the product .

COMMISSION IMPLEMENTING DECISION (EU) 2015/692 of 24 April 2015 concerning the placing on the market, in accordance with Directive 2001/18/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council, of a carnation (*Dianthus caryophyllus* L., line 25958) genetically modified for flower colour. <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32015D0692&from=EN> .

Part 2

Mark GGO C/NL/09/02 .

We read: **ASSESSMENT REPORT OF THE DUTCH COMPETENT AUTHORITY IN ACCORDANCE WITH DIRECTIVE 2001/18/EC**

NOTIFICATION C/NL/09/02 is also about our questions (the same as C/NL/09/01) to the EC and their answers, these we read for the first time now.

Also differences like part 1.

Other differences: The primary difference between IFD-26407-2 and the recipient plant is in the colour of the flowers, because of the production of delphinidin in the GMHP. The transgenic line IFD-26407-2 has on average a thinner stem at the 5th node, a shorter leaf at the 3rd node, longer styles, less viable anthers, more filaments and shorter filaments. These differences in characteristics could not lead to a survival advantage over the parent. Source: application.

Critics

Donella Meadows:

How it happened that we don't regulate biotech . Next time you hear a scientist asserting that gene splicing is safe, remind yourself that there is no scientific evidence for that

statement. We are profoundly ignorant about what we are doing to the code that generates all life. And unfortunately some scientists, including those entrusted with public safety, are willing to lie". <http://www.psrast.org/biotechist.htm> .

Dr. S. Druker:

The biotechnology industry-as irresponsible as they have been by and large-the main guilt lays at the feet of the mainstream molecular biology establishment; the scientists who were doing the research, getting the grants, and wanting to develop this technology. Most of them had altruistic goals. They thought this was going to be used to cure so many ills in the field of medicine... I think they eventually developed an 'end justifies the means' psychology. <http://articles.mercola.com/sites/articles/archive/2015/03/08/altered-genes-twisted-truth-gmo.aspx>

Famous Canadian dr. David Suzuki says:

"There is absolutely no reason to suppose that biologists know enough to anticipate the ecological and health ramifications of a revolutionary technology such as genetic engineering. Governments must resist the economic pressures and show leadership and concern for the long-term health of people and nature. And scientists involved in this exciting area should learn from history and welcome free and open discussion about ecological, health and social implications of their work." [http://www.davidsuzuki.org/david/downloads/David Suzuki Biotech essay.pdf](http://www.davidsuzuki.org/david/downloads/David_Suzuki_Biotech_essay.pdf)

Prof. Lucas Reijnders of Stichting Natuur en Milieu says:

"There are indications that genes that cause a change of flower color also can cause shedding of the roots, that is poisonous for the living creatures in the soil." _

Other advantages of the introduction of our products have been to illustrate to the general public that there are non-food applications of GM technology. Genetic modification of flowers has been well received, and this is an important benefit for Europe, which is still the home of most of the world's flower breeders. Page 40 application **GGO C/NL/09/02 .*

We do not want them and will not buy them!

See also our other complaints from 2009: <http://www.gentechvrij.nl/moonaquabezwaar.html>

<http://www.gentechvrij.nl/bedenkinggmoanjermoonlite.html>

<http://www.gentechvrij.nl/moonaquapleitnotapiet.html>

<http://www.gentechvrij.nl/plaatjesgen/moonaquarvsvomigenUitspraken.pdf>

"Any politician or scientist who tells you these (GMO) products are safe is either very stupid or lying." David Suzuki . <http://www.davidsuzuki.org/>

Yours sincerely,

Miep Bos, spokeswoman of the European GMO-free Citizens, by order of MADGE Australia Inc. and Fran Murrell, co-founder of MADGE* Australia. Stichting Ekopark, Lelystad, Mrs. Wieteke Moody - van Dort and all other GM-free Citizens. Stichting Natuurwetmoeders, Almere supporting us.

Lelystad
The Netherlands
www.gentechvrij.nl

You can also read this complaint via <https://www.gentechvrij.nl/gentech-anjers-met-veranderde-bloemkleur/>

** Jessica Harrison, Glenda Lindsay and Fran Murrell co-founded MADGE in 2007 because the Victorian Government's ban on growing GM canola was to expire in 2008. What does MADGE stand for? "Mothers Are Demystifying Genetic Engineering" but also "Mothers Advocating Deliciously Good Eating" as food should be nourishing and delightful .*

by order of : *MADGE Australia Inc.
PO box 10
287 Brunswick St
Fitzroy, 3065, Australia

<http://www.madge.org.au/>

CC Media, politicians.

Signature list. (English).

Print it out, sign it and send it to the ministry (address is on the list). Or scan it and send your scanned lists to [info\(a\)gentechvrij.nl](mailto:info(a)gentechvrij.nl) An email of the Ministry tells me that the Postbox number 20906 no longer exists and must be Postbus 20901, please forward widely! Real deadline to send it to me is 25th of August 2015.

Back and Dutch text. <https://www.gentechvrij.nl/gentech-anjers-met-veranderde-bloemkleur/>