

cer when ingested by man or animal." On the face of it this sounds reasonable enough, and certainly no responsible scientist, industrialist, food processor or farmer advocates the increase in cancer under any circumstances. The problem arises from the blanket coverage and lack of definition in the Delaney Clause. No indication is given as to how a compound is to be identified as a carcinogen—or cancer inducer—and this is a very debatable point even among cancer specialists. No indication is made as to what dosage level can be allowed or how the resulting residue tolerance can be determined, and as a zero residue is obviously an impossible value to measure, a suspect compound cannot legally be used at all, even under a zero residue registration. For, as analytical procedures are refined, what is a zero residue today may be a detectable or even appreciable level tomorrow. Finally the Delaney Clause implies the compound must be proven to be non-cancer inducing in humans as well as in animals. This is a manifest impossibility to achieve even if such experimentation was feasible, for one may be able to prove a compound *is* a carcinogen, but one cannot prove it is not, anymore than one can prove one is not married. By strict interpretation then, the Delaney Clause virtually precludes all new compounds from the agricultural and food market.

SUPERSTITION GAINS ASCENDENCY

As with all such matters of general concern and vast complexity, ample opportunity is provided for misunderstanding, illogical conclusion and unfounded fear to arise. In such an atmosphere, decisions of policy affecting the welfare and livelihood of millions of people may be based not on knowledge but on a lack of it, and prejudice and superstition gain ascendancy over scientific truth. In recent months, while hesitancy reigned in administrative quarters, a noisome and prevaricative publicity has been made of these new laws, of their relationship to the use of agricultural chemicals in the production, processing and distribution of our foodstuffs and of the alleged hazards these substances may have upon the health of the people. A wave of fear and alarm has been deliberately fomented among the consumers of our country, a wave calculated to sweep away the trust, assurance and honest thinking in the business of agriculture and food production that it has taken our agricultural colleges, experiment stations and industry nearly one hundred years, and uncounted effort, to establish.

This criticism, essentially destructive in tenor and intent, is based on half truths, scraps of irrelevant and unrelated evidence, much of it taken out of context and out of time, and largely founded upon superstition and outright falsehood. Books have been published under sensational and misleading titles by authors with neither training nor experience in the fields they purport to discuss; articles have appeared in obscure journals whose goal has been circulation rather than veracity; and the net effect has been