

Viewpoint: It's a bad idea to 'recognize anti-science reasoning' by imposing overly stringent regulations on Canadian gene-edited crops

If a new and novel trait is added to a genetic line, the Canadian Food Inspection Agency, as a part of Health Canada, examines that result and decides whether it poses a threat to the nation — both genetically and on a market basis.

The process is rooted in sound science. Much of the world has come to agree with it. Regulate the outcomes, not the path. The European Union, with its mixed bag of regulatory procedures that lean heavily toward satisfying urban voters and urban myths around agriculture and food science, remains an outlier.

But now the progress of Canadian rules for gene edited crops, which appeared so promising after recent rulings, seems to have moved from the public policy fast lane to the mud-ridden European-like side roads of Health Canada and Agriculture Canada.

It's possibly because 15 groups recently signed a letter to the federal agriculture minister, lobbying her to block the rules recommended by Canadian bureaucrats that would stick to a science-based system of evaluating genetics regulation based on outcomes.

These groups argue that some international markets might not accept crops produced using technologies such as gene editing. And, if gene editing is used to create crops with improved genetics but not novel traits, these farmers might inadvertently grow them, spoiling their market access.

Follow the latest news and policy debates on sustainable agriculture, biomedicine, and other 'disruptive' innovations. Subscribe to our newsletter.

[SIGN UP](#)

Asking government to recognize anti-science reasoning so that one part of the sector can live without protecting its seed sources, or so that groups with other agendas can meet their donation goals by spreading myths about affordability and carbon efficiency, is ridiculous.

[**This is an excerpt. Read the original post here**](#)