

New York Times reverses position, now supports mandatory labeling

The GLP aggregated and excerpted this blog/article to reflect the diversity of news, opinion and analysis.

In approving genetically engineered salmon as safe to eat and safe for the environment, the Food and Drug Administration rejected [petitions](#) from environmental and food safety groups asking that companies selling this salmon be required to [label it as genetically engineered](#). Congress should overturn that decision. Consumers deserve to know what they are eating.

The F.D.A. said there is no reason to mandate labeling because there is no material difference between engineered and natural fish on qualities like nutritional content. But the value of that information should be [left to consumers](#) to decide.

Vermont enacted a law last year that will [require labeling](#) of genetically engineered foods starting next July unless a suit filed in June 2014 by four industry trade groups derails it. Other states with strong consumer movements may try to follow.

The House [passed a bill](#) on July 23, 2015, that would pre-empt states from requiring such labeling, and industry groups are pressing the Senate to attach similar language as a rider to an omnibus spending bill. The Senate should rebuff that tactic and allow states to adopt mandatory labeling laws if they wish.

Read full, original post: [Tell Consumers What They Are Eating](#)