warehousing operations to receive attention from the Food and Drug Inspectors. You may also expect increasing visits from State authorities."

The FDA-er emphasized that his agency will spend more effort in the future in checking out industry quality control systems (See FOOD CHEMICAL NEWS, Nov. 8, Page 23), saying:

> " . . . You will probably see during the next year the beginning of a shift in approach in the FDA. This reflects the fact that . . . the responsibility for the safety and the quality of the food supply does not rest on the FDA except in the sense of establishing the rules of the game. The executive responsibility lies with the food purveyor. The person whose name is on the label has the responsibility for its quality including its safety. Accordingly, the FDA will in the future be paying more attention to the ways in which the purveyor satisfies himself that he is meeting his obligations. We should like to arrange our efforts so that the purveyor who has adequate quality control measures qualifies for a minimum of our attention so that we can then concentrate our efforts on those whose quality control is less effective."

Wodicka noted the possibility of legislation reorganizing FDA into a new agency, and said: "You may be sure . . . that whatever agency has the responsibilities that the FDA now has will continue along more or less the same lines even though there may be a year or two lost in transition. The pressures of the times will push in the same direction, and it appears certain that this pendulum will swing much further in this direction before it begins to swing back."

●

HAZLETON STUDY FINDS EFFECTIVE BARRIERS TO PCB MIGRATION

A recently-completed Hazleton Laboratories study concludes that PCB migration from food packaging materials to food can be controlled by materials of low gas permeability.

The study, done for American Paper Institute, found that PVDC coated paper prevented migration of Aroclor 1242 into foods and waxed glassine paper was the second most effective barrier, while polyethylene films were relatively ineffective at long storage intervals. The study did not investigate the effectiveness of foil laminates, copolymer films and paper laminates.

The Hazleton study found that in the absence of an effective barrier Aroclor 1242 migrated from paperboard to food in measurable amounts when the food was packaged in paperboard containing a significant amount of the PCB.

API included the report in its comments on the Food and Drug Administration's proposal to establish a temporary tolerance of 5 p.p.m. for polychlorinated biphenyls in food packaging paper and paperboard (See FOOD CHEMICAL NEWS, July 3, Page 26).

Saying that API is in full accord with the objective of reducing the level of PCBs in the food supply, the Institute suggested that this could be accomplished by confining tolerances to food. The Institute added:

> "Tolerances on food alone will protect against any risk of potential harm from PCBs in food. They will require the paper/paperboard industry and food processors to take full advantage of the known deterrents to PCB migration from packaging materials, such as effective barriers and proper package weight to food weight ratio. These steps will assure safe levels in food."

A tolerance of 0.265 mcg/sq cm "in that portion of the package from which migration to food can be expected" was suggested by the Packaging Institute. This suggestion was translated into .0017 mg/sq inch by the National Flexible Packaging Association, which endorsed the comments of PI, as did Bemis Company, Anaconda Aluminum, and Reynolds Aluminum.

Postponement of the regulations for food packaging materials until adequate information and analytical procedures are developed was asked by Bemis, Anaconda, Reynolds and Monsanto. The National Association of Secondary Material Industries asked suspension of the effective date of the regulations "at least until the enactment of the Administration's Toxic Substance Act," adding this "apparently will eliminate the PCB problem at the source, where it must be solved."

Monsanto commented that its "current program on the sale of PCBs should in time virtually eliminate the contamination of foods (assuming no other commercial sources are available)" and endorsed the establishment of temporary tolerances for the proposed limited groups of foods in the meantime. Maintenance of the current 5 p.p.m. tolerances for PCBs in milk on a fat basis and 5 p.p.m. on edible portions of poultry was asked rather than establishment of the proposed tolerances of 2.5 p.p.m. for milk and 5 p.p.m. on a fat basis for poultry.

Noting that residual PCBs are present in converted heat transfer systems, Monsanto asked that FDA conduct "extensive studies . . . to determine the realistic acceptable level which can be achieved," adding that the present requirements will create "unnecessary hardships." The company also suggested permitting the use of transformers and capacitors utilizing PCBs "installed in a manner which would prevent direct contact with the food or animal feed being processed."

Opportunity for Oral Argument Asked by SPI

Reiterating its earlier comments concerning the problems of the plastics industry in regard to the PCB regulation (See FOOD CHEMICAL NEWS, May 15, Page 42),

the Society of the Plastics Industry requested "an opportunity for a legislative or appellate type oral argument before the Commissioner, or other appropriate FDA officials prior to final action on the proposal."

"In view of the tremendous impact this rulemaking could have on the plastics industry as well as other packaging interests; and its precedental implications for the future," SPI asked the opportunity for oral argument, emphasizing:

> "It should be understood that this is not a request for a time consuming evidentiary hearing. All that is desired is an opportunity for oral presentation of our position, and those of other interested parties, so that a worthwhile record can be made before the appropriate decision-making officials."

SPI pointed out that other agencies, such as the Federal Trade Commission and the Federal Communications Commission, routinely handle such arguments, and that " . . . the Administrative Procedure Act specifically provides for such treatment, within the discretion of an Agency." The Institute recently requested an opportunity for oral argument on regulation of indirect additives (See FOOD CHEMICAL NEWS, June 5, Page 3).

●

TOLERANCES SET FOR 2 HERBICIDES; INSECTICIDE GETS EXEMPTION

The Environmental Protection Agency on July 18 established a tolerance for combined negligible residues of 2-(sec-butylamino)-4-ethylamino-6-methoxy-s-triazine and its metabolites of 0.25 p.p.m. in or on sugarcane.

This first tolerance set for residues of the herbicide came on a petition filed by Ciba-Geigy (See FOOD CHEMICAL NEWS, May 10, 1971, Page 30). The petition had proposed tolerances of 0.25 p.p.m. in or on sugarcane and sugarcane fodder and forage for residues of 2-(sec-butylamino)-4-ethylamino-6-methoxy-s-triazine.

However, the petition was amended by withdrawing the requests for sugarcane fodder and forage, and proposing the negligible residue tolerance in or on sugarcane for the combined residues of the herbicide and the metabolites 2-amino-4-(sec-butylamino)-6-methoxy-s-triazine, 2-amino-4-(3-hydroxy-sec-butylamino)-6-methoxy-s-triazine, 2-amino-4-ethylamino-6-methoxy-s-triazine, and 2,4-diamino-6-methoxy-s-triazine.

On July 19, EPA established a tolerance for negligible residues of phenmedipham of 0.2 p.p.m. in or on beets. Nor-Am had petitioned for a negligible residue tolerance of 0.3 p.p.m. (See FOOD CHEMICAL NEWS, June 28, 1971, Page 36), but had amended the petition to reduce the level to 0.2 p.m. The herbicide is methyl m-hydroxycarbanilate m-methylcarbanilate.