

Kelly Maria

From: Patrino Beth
Sent: Wednesday, March 20, 2013 9:21 AM
To: Kelly Maria
Subject: FW: House Bills 2532 & 2175

From: Arwen McGilvra [<mailto:the.tech.chef@gmail.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, March 19, 2013 4:44 PM
To: Patrino Beth
Subject: House Bills 2532 & 2175

I will not be able to attend Thursdays hearing on House Bills 2532 & 2175, but I would like to submit my testimony in opposition to both bills.

My family has been involved in agriculture for generations, currently the 4th generation is farming ground in Oregon.

I am opposed to a bill that would cost more for farmers, more for food processor and ultimately cost more for consumers. This same issue was brought to the voters of California last Nov and they rejected Prop 37 as being too confusing and too costly. Not only will it cost growers and consumers, I am also concerned about what labeling products will do for interstate commerce. Will Oregon grown products be at a disadvantage because of a label that implies that there is something different or wrong with what we grow? I am also concerned with the cost to the state for the oversight of these regulations. Who will do the testing? How do you tell if a finished product has GM ingredients? How much will the program cost to regulate?

In general I believe that the farmer should be able to choose what to grow on their own land based on knowledge of the land, their resources and the market. Labeling GM ingredients limits the farmers right to freely make those decisions.

There is a great blog called Applied Mythology that address the issue of GM labeling during the debate in California last year. In his post "GMO Foods: To Label Or Not To Label?" The author outlines seven reasons not to label GM foods. I hope you will take the time to read it and consider his logical approach to the discussion. <http://appliedmythology.blogspot.com/2012/08/gmo-foods-to-label-or-not-to-label.html>

Thank You,

--

Arwen McGilvra
Albany, OR 97322

