Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research, volume 605
2nd International Conference on Business Law and Local Wisdom in Tourism (ICBLT 2021)

Gene Pollution Due to Transgenic Organisms – Regulatory Measures

Siti Hafsyah Idris[1,*] Nurulhisham Shamsuddin[2]

[1,2] *University of Teknologi MARA*
Corresponding author. Email: sitihafsyah@uitm.edu

ABSTRACT
Cross-Pollination from Hereditarily Changed (GM) crops causes contamination, featuring the gigantic test of controlling GM crop innovations. While hereditary fertilization is unavoidable, lacking enactment now and again will not consider seed makers responsible for usual mischief instead of accusing ranchers who have become casualties of contamination. Organizations will make a typical move against ranchers who develop transgenic crops without corporate authorization. A rancher who survives hereditary control might be held obligated to the organization that created the GM crops, paying little mind to who submits the disregarding activities. Subsequently, the inadvertent presentation of GM crops on the property of non-GM ranchers, just as patent law infringement, raises a vast number of lawful concerns because even a blameless neighbor could be expected to take responsibility for patent encroachment. At the point when GM crops cross-fertilize with practical or customary yields in neighboring fields, the absence of a general set of laws might compel ranchers to battle in court. Ranchers who face send out market dismissal due to GM harvests might experience serious monetary misfortunes accordingly. Natural ranchers who have GM defilement might lose their natural certificate and harvest premium. At the point when shopper interest for non-GM crops rises, ranchers search for new business sectors for non-GM crops that address more significant expenses. In any case, the disappointment of businesses to satisfactorily isolate GM crops from conventional assortments represents a test to these makers. Administrative measures should be embraced and executed to shield ranchers from GM crop responsibility issues, principally to shield ranchers who develop customary yields from GM crop pollution. Subsequently, severe contamination guideline is essential to shield non-GM ranchers from biotechnology enterprises that build up and keep up with protected innovation rights in contamination causing GM seeds.

Keywords: *Gene Pollution, Farmers' Rights, GM Crops, Legal Protection, Regulatory Measures.*

1. INTRODUCTION

The International Journal of Food Contamination reports that somewhere in the range of 1997 and 2014, around 400 GM seed pollution cases happened in 63 nations, with the majority happening in China.1 This marvel of "genetic drift" (the development of hereditarily changed seeds or dust through natural or conventional harvest fields) features the colossal test of controlling the spread of hereditarily adjusted yields. Tragically, notwithstanding how hereditary float is unavoidable, inadequate enactment often neglects to consider seed organizations responsible for any possible misfortunes and instead faults ranchers who have become survivors of pollution.

It is widely believed that these GMOs can spread across nature and interbreed with natural creatures, damaging the ecosystem and future generations. Some conservation biologists and conservationists believe that this technique is undesirable because it may result in hybridization with native species and genetic pollution.3 They also stated that the introduction of GMOs into complex ecosystems might result in uncontrollable adverse effects. The term "gene pollution" is a new and contentious one. It is associated with gene flow from GMOs to native or non- GMO organisms. Transgenic organisms, or GMOs, can interact with other life forms and transfer or mutate their characteristics through reproduction, causing severe ecological harm.

2. METHOD

This research employs a doctrinal legal research approach to examine the existing legal frameworks relevant to the subject matter. Content analysis is carried out to answer the main question because, in a broader methodological technique, doctrinal research is preferred to explore two main issues: the effects of cross-pollination of gm crops on farmers' rights and the comprehensiveness of existing biosafety legal frameworks in malaysia, particularly the law of tort in

dealing with the cross-pollination of gm crops. a thorough examination of these legal issues can assist in clarifying the current and evolving regulatory structures, laws, and social significance of the matters under consideration. It also provides an opportunity to assess the effectiveness of the law as a tool for identifying gaps.

3. RESUTLT AND DISCUSSION

The tort claims of trespass to land, nuisance, negligence, and strict liability may be asserted against farmers and seed companies responsible for genetically contaminating neighboring fields with their seeds. 18 There must always be a remedy in law, according to the Latin legal maxim "Ubi jus ibi remedium" (in the presence of a right, there must be a remedy). It follows that wherever a right exists, there is also a remedy available to protect that right. Typically, the case of Ashby v. White is cited as an example of the maxim, in which the court observed, "When the law clothes a man with a right, he must have means to vindicate and maintain it, as well as a remedy if he is injured in the exercise and enjoyment of that right, and it is a vain thing to imagine a right without a remedy because lack of remedy is reciprocal."19 Farmers may be able to receive financial compensation for losses or damages incurred due to GM contamination of their crops through the use of these remedies.

Drifting genetic traits from one crop to another can cause damage to the neighbor's crop, resulting in trespass claims. 21 To commit an intentional trespass, the defendant need not intend to harm the plaintiff's property interest to have the required intent. Unintentional trespass causes no harm to the plaintiff, so nominal damages are awarded. Is pollen drift from GM crops an intentional tort?23 Owners of adjacent non-GM fields seem to be the answer. 24 To be clear, a court may require that the defendant's act directly impacts the plaintiff's property without the involvement of other factors, such as natural and inevitable forces like wind. Seed companies and growers alike recognize the pollen-drift potential of GM crops. However, the legal system has yet to address whether mere knowledge is sufficient to establish intentional trespass. Pollen spread by wind drift or insect pollination, on the other hand, would be unlikely to constitute trespass because it would not include a direct interference with the plant's growth. Because of this, patent holders for genetically modified crops and those involved in GM crop agriculture will only be held liable for trespass if the trespass is done with the intent, recklessness, or negligence of the parties involved.

A GM farmer who fails to act reasonably in the circumstances may be liable to a non-GM farmer for negligence. 27 For a neighbor to prove GM crop contamination was due to negligence, the neighbor should show a sensibly predictable probability of injury because of the GM crop rancher's absence of care in keeping away from injury or mischief to the neighbor's harvests. Expanded weeds, cross-fertilization, or the presence of volunteer plants could be proof.28 Unintentional contamination of neighboring fields may result in liability for the GM crop farmer. 29 A failure to properly select seeds, adhere to buffer zones, or follow growing and harvesting procedures may be a duty breach.

In this regard, it would be significant if biosafety regulatory measures established an acceptable standard of behavior for farmers growing genetically modified crops and identified the duty owed to neighbors growing non-GMO crops as part of their implementation. This should increase the certainty in determining whether crop contamination occurred due to negligence in a specific case. In addition, establish a compensation fund to compensate farmers for losses resulting from genetic contamination of non-GMO and organic crops by genetically modified (GM) crops.

A nuisance claim could also be made against GM crops. This type of claim is frequently brought of some "activity on the defendant's land that unreasonably interferes" with the plaintiff's use of his neighboring land, as defined by the court. 32 The activities of genetically modified (GM) farmers must be controlled within the boundaries of their land. They must ensure that such actions do not adversely affect the owners or occupiers of another land.33 If a genetically modified farmer interferes with a neighbor's quiet enjoyment of their property, for instance, by radiating dust onto the non-GM rancher's territories and obliterating crops; or by making smells, sounds, contamination, or whatever another risk that reaches out past the limits of the property, the influenced party might have the option to bring an irritation guarantee against the hereditarily changed rancher. The far and wide planting of GM crops is a considerable factor restricting the viability of an irritation claim.34 Deciding if the planting and collecting of GM seeds and harvests comprise an irrational horticultural practice might be troublesome without embracing a zero-resistance standard for cross-fertilization from a court of law.

The strict liability rule established in the English case of Rylands v. Fletcher may provide a solution to GM crop contamination.36 A person is held strictly liable under this rule if they bring or accumulate something dangerous on their land that is likely to cause harm if it escapes, and damage occurs as a natural result of the escape. A court must first determine whether making, selling, or handling genetically modified crops constitutes an abnormally dangerous activity before it can apply the theory of strict liability in the case of GM crops contamination.37 On the one hand, farmers who plant the GM seed with the knowledge that the resulting crop is likely to cross-pollinate a neighbor's conventional crop, could be held strictly liable for damages on the other.38 Therefore, an equitable outcome would appear to require that responsibility for the unintended spread of the technology is placed on the company responsible for introducing the technology and that the company bear the burden of controlling the spread of the technology in question. Parties bringing a strict liability claim may have

difficulty establishing the existence and likelihood of each of the first two factors listed above.

Despite what might be expected, customary law cures are inadequate to manage the potential mischief brought about by GM yields, and ranchers are encountering expanding challenges in acquiring pay for their misfortunes. As a matter of first importance, it is easily proven wrong how much misdeed law cures might be pertinent on GM food tainting. The misdeed law cures were created during the nineteenth century, before the improvement of GMOs.39 It is easily proven wrong whether misdeed law cures are fitting considering the uniqueness of twenty-first-century hereditary designing innovation. Second, to be viewed as careless, the recognized direct probably brought about a sensibly predictable danger of injury to be considered improper. It is hazy what chances GM crops present for sure sort of harm they may cause. It is additionally challenging to decide if the danger presented by hereditarily changed life forms is sensibly foreseeable

4. CONCLUSION

Because of the absence of hereditary contamination shields, nations are helpless against administrative escape clauses. Current biosafety enactment should incorporate administrative measures to manage hereditary defilement hazards. It is reasonable to have biosafety administrative principles that permit common cases for hurt, ecological or human, coming about because of hereditary tainting. As indicated by Article 4 of the Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur Advantageous Biosafety Convention on Risk and Change, a causal connection between the harm and the LMOs being referred to should be set up. Along these lines, the individual Contracting Gatherings should build an association between the injury and the LMO. Concerning responsibility for harm brought about by the transboundary development of GMOs, Article 4 of the Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur Beneficial Biosafety Convention on Risk and Change gives Contracting Gatherings complete circumspection. If risk and change strategy/enactment has not been finished, existing common law will settle any issues. Then again, if the LMOs break and cause harm to the encompassing region where the GMOs are kept, the individual would need to turn to misdeed law to recuperate damages

REFERENCES

[1] Healy, D.L, Trounson, A.O and Andersen A.N (1994). Female infertility: causes and treatment. Lancet 343, 1539–1544.

[2] Leone, A, (2003). Relationship between cigarette smoking and other coronary risk factors in atherosclerosis: risk of cardiovascular disease and preventive measures. Curr. Pharm. Des 9, 2417–2423.

[3] Haslam, D.W and James W.P. (2005). Obesity. Lancet 366, 1197–1209.

[4] Augood, C, Duckitt, K and Templeton, A.A (1998). Smoking and female infertility: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Hum. Reprod. 13, 1532–1539.

[5] Cameron A.J, Wellborn, T.A, Zimmet, P.Z, Dunstan D.W, Owen N, Salmon J, Dalton M, Jolley, D and Shaw J.E (2003). Overweight and obesity in Australia: the 1999-2000 Australian Diabetes, Obesity and Lifestyle Study (AusDiab). Med .J. Aust. 178,427–432.

[6] Pal, L and Santoro, N. (2003). Age-related decline in fertility. Endocrinol. Metab .Clin. North Am 32,669–688.

[7] Kaplan, B, Nahum R, Yairi Y, Hirsch M, Pardo J, Yogev Y and Orvieto. R. (2005). Use of various contraceptive methods and time of conception in a community-based population. Eur. J. Obstet. Gynecol. Reprod Biol, 123, 72–76.

[8] Baird DT, Collins J, Egozcue J, Evers LH, Gianaroli L, Leridon H, Sunde A,Templeton A, Van Steirteghem A and Cohen J et al. (2005) Fertility and ageing. Hum Reprod Update 11,261–276.

[9] Nasseri A and Grifo J.A (1998). Genetics, age, and infertility. Maturitas 30,189–192.

[10] Chuang C.C, Chen, C.D, Chao, K.H, Chen, S.U, Ho H.N and Yang, Y.S (2003). Age is a better predictor of pregnancy potential than basal follicle-stimulating hormone levels in women undergoing in vitro fertilization. Fertil. Steril, 79, 63–68.

[11] Roth, L.K and Taylor, H.S. (2001). Risks of smoking to reproductive health: assessment of women's knowledge. Am. J. Obstet. Gynecol, 184,934–939.

[12] Kunzle, R, Mueller, M.D, Hanggi, W, Birkhauser M.H, Drescher, H and Bersinger, N.A. (2003) Semen quality of male smokers and nonsmokers in infertile couples. Fertil. Steril, 79,287–291.

[13] Younglai, E.V, Holloway A.C and Foster W.G (2005). Environmental and occupational factors affecting fertility and IVF success. Hum Reprod, Update 11, 43–57.

[14] Baron J.A, La Vecchia, C and Levi F (1990). The antiestrogenic effect of cigarette smoking in women. Am .J. Obstet. Gynecol, 162,502–514.

[15] Shiloh H, Lahav-Baratz S, Koifman M, Ishai D, Bidder D, Weiner-Meganzi Z and Dirnfeld M (2004) The impact of cigarette smoking on zona pellucid thickness of oocytes and embryos prior to transfer into the uterine cavity. Hum Reprod, 19,157–159.

[16] Hull, M.G, North K, Taylor H, Farrow A and Ford W.C (2000). Delayed conception and active and passive smoking. The Avon Longitudinal Study of

Pregnancy and Childhood Study Team. Fertil. Steril, 74,725–733.

[17] Bolumar F, Olsen J and Boldsen, J (1996). Smoking reduces fecundity: a European multicenter study on infertility and sub fecundity. The European Study Group on Infertility and Sub fecundity. Am. J. Epidemiol, 143,578–587.

[18] Edward Edi, Wallach E.E, Kempers, R.D. Modern Trends in Infertility and conception control Volume 4. 1988. 487-498.

[19] Hassan MA and Killick, S.R (2004). Negative lifestyle is associated with a significant reduction in fecundity. Fertil. Steril, 81,384–392.

[20] Bolumar, F, Olsen J, Rebagliato, M, Saez-Lloret, I and Bisanti, L. (2000). Body mass index and delayed conception: a European Multicenter Study on Infertility and Sub fecundity. Am. J. Epidemiol, 151, 1072–1079.