

Mr. ROXBURGH: Yes. For example, there have been experiments carried out in this connection in southern and northern Carolina in respect of the tobacco situation and in regard to tobacco and smoke causing cancer, and it has been proven that the lead in the tobacco has been one of the causes. For example, down there they have 42 to 50 parts per million of lead in the tobacco that is used in cigarettes in that part of the country and yet the tobacco in Canada is one part per million. I think our government regulation is five parts per million. What I am getting at is this: would not lead as compared with D.D.T. not only through tobacco but the vegetables that are used, play a fairly large part in the cause of cancer through the use of food that has had lead arsenic applications—and I am thinking of cabbage or anything else that this preparation is used on.

Mr. COON: I was not aware of this implication in respect of lead producing cancer.

Mr. ROXBURGH: Well, it has been written up fairly well in the press.

Mr. COON: According to my information, arsenic has a worse reputation as a potential carcinogen than lead. However, there may have been some recent developments of which I am not aware. If that is true what you suggest as a possibility may very well be.

Mr. ROXBURGH: There was quite a write-up in the press about arsenate of lead. Tests were conducted and straight facts were given. It was a proven test; it was not a matter of guessing. It pointed out that was one of the causes. I do recall this appearing in the paper yesterday or the day before but, as I say, there have been many small articles on soil micro-organisms and lead arsenic in the soil which are eventually taken up in the plant, causing cancer or a number of other things.

Mr. COON: I saw a recent report that lead acetate ingested into rats and mice produced malignant changes.

The CHAIRMAN: Have you a question, Mr. Mitchell?

Mr. MITCHELL: I would like to ask Mr. Coon two or three questions. In your statement to us I think you suggested that there was no harm caused by the use of D.D.T. in humans through ingestion of pesticide residues, including D.D.T. You also included some other insecticides and said, as far as you knew, the amount taken in by the human system has not been harmful to date.

Mr. COON: I would include all pesticides in this category; that is, none of them yet have proved to be injurious to human beings through the ingestion of residues on foods. Perhaps I should not make this such an outright bald statement because, in reading over the proceedings of these meetings previously, I recall the girl who went on a reducing diet and had nothing but apples which had been sprayed with arsenic, and she came down with a good case of arsenic poisoning. Of course, that was a pesticide residue, and she was injured by that residue. But, as we said before, there should be no harm if the tolerance levels are not being exceeded to any significant extent, and even if they are exceeded quite substantially they are so low in the first place that pesticide residues from that standpoint are not causing injury to the human population.

Mr. MITCHELL: Well, you have just answered what I was going to ask next. Have you any proof, say, through autopsies or otherwise, that the human system is building up a tolerance to pesticides? Have you any proof that that is the case?

Mr. COON: No, we cannot yet make the statement that there is any evidence of an adaptation or a tolerance being built up in human beings to pesticides.