“Pesticides are absorbed by plants and in some cases residues are found in the resulting food. There is a possibility that these residues may present a health risk to the consumer. People in West Germany genuinely believethat this risk is real and not theoretical. In the UK, on the other hand, little public concern is shown towards pesticide residues in food.

While there I s little, if any , evidence that consumers face a real hazard form pesicide residues in food it is entirely appropriate that measures should be taken to ensure that residues are kept to a inimum. In many respect the UK and west Germany use similare means to prevent excess resideues appearing in food in the first place”

WG – statutory system for reg/licencing of pesticides UK has Pesticides Saftey precautions Scheme.

Both objectives safeguard humans, livestock, domestic animals and wildlife against risks from pesticides. PSPS should be made statuary.

Both UK and WG restrict certain pesticides.

WG farmers are more likely to use pesticides properly if they know that their prducce is likely to be examined for residues when it reaches the market. But the vast bulk of home grown food is not sampled at all and that which is are all below the reporting limit. Openly stated that home grown food is not sampled because farmers are responsible and do not misue pesticides. This faith could be betrayed. Samples that are analysed are from imported foods known to have problems.

Usually by thte time that results from testing are in, the food stuff will already have been eaten/processed, never withheld.

EEC Commission proposals seem based on WG system. WG seems to be strict standards, intensive, the principle behind the legislation reflects consumer anxieties rather than representing an economic weapon to deter or reject imports which would compete with home production. UK would rather EEC layed out general guidelines, but let memer states decde for itself what safeguards should be adopted.

P11

Pesticides and the environment. Awareness of the possible undesirable effects of pesticides on wildlife and the environmentl generally grew during the 1950 and more generalised anxiety has continued more or less unabted since Rachel Carson published her book “Silent Spring” in 963 (**74**) . Deserves consideration if only because it has contributed significantly to the widespread emotional response eto pesticides in general.

No doubt mistakes were made causing unnecessary damage to wildlife. Ignorance. Select suitable pesticide carefully, use it under controlled conditions.

Still condierable concern about the persistence and use of organochlorine pestiies, esp DDT. However few of the suspected effect have been fully substantiated and there is no evidence whatsoever that the build up of DDT will lead to the “eath of the planet”.

Mellanby (75) it is clear that pesticides can be pollutants, that they may cause env damage and that they do cause widespread but apparently harmless contamination”/

p.16 Significance of residues in food. The amounts of pesticide residues in food are undoubtedl very small, yet there is some concern about the possible risk to consumers. The crux of the problem seems to be widespread misunderstanding about the significance of such minute amounts. These misunderstandings have perhaps been compounded by the various forms of legislation which have been laid down to control pesticide residues in food.

p.23 There can be no doubt that the majority of people in WG sincerely believe that maximum limits for pesticide residues are laid down in order to protect consumers. In fact they go further than this and genuinely believe themselves to be at risk from pesticide residues. This view is widespread and is certainly not confined to a fringe minority. It is held by the Consumers’ Association of Germany and by people working in local consumer offices… This office receives numerous queries from the public about PR and is convinced that it is an important subject of consumer safety. They found it difficult to believe that Consumers’ Association in London doe not receive similar enquiries from the public.

Why is this? – possibly the amended Food Law of 1958 – PR are foreign substances and probably whey the Food Law specifically mentioned them. At the same time as decisions were being make on best possible agricultural practice with respect to pesticides, SS and pesticides hit the headlines. “Some of the criticisms were undoubtedly justified because at that time pesticide use was not adequately controlled, but the book was written in a highly subjective and emotional style and did not present a balanced view of the risks and benefits of pesticides. SS undoubtedly influenced public opinion in WG to a considerable degree. Pesticides became a subject of great public debate and have remained so ever since. Industry became prime target and charge w irresponsible attitude but were actually trying to provide evidence on residues found in produce and the criticism may have contributed to industry efforts to provide evidence of extremely low residues. Basic misunderstanding had already arisen and these residues were equated with safety levels.

Plant protection act 1968 WG

P65

The UK must have been one of the first countries in the world to initiate discussions at govt level about pesticides and their residues in food. As long ago as 1949 the question of “toxic substances in consumer goods” was referred to the Advisory Council on Scientific Policy. Their report concluded that by and large there was a potential risk to consumers from PR in food , that there was no evidence of actual harm but that, given the upsurge in the use of such chemicals there was a need for some immediate action.

1949 also Gowers Committee report on Health Safety and Welfare in the nonindustrial employment. 🡪 MAF set up the working party on Precautionary measures against toxic Chemicals used in Agriculture. 1951, 1953 and 1955 reports laid foundation of UK’s basic approach to control of pesticides. 1954 the Advisory committee on poisonous substances used in agriculture and food storage was set up. 🡪 becoming Advisory Committee on Pesticides. Studies on retail food were carried out by the govt chemist, UK has continuously monitored food for residues since that time and has extended surveillance to include total diet studies and human fat studies.

Local authorities and public analysts – 1965 national programme of coordinated sampling and analysis of foods as available to the final consumer. NCC commissioned regular detailed studies to collect evidence of PR in water, soil plants and animals.

Royal Commission on Environmental Pollution set up in 1970 to advise on matters both national and international, concerning pollution of the environment; on the adequacy of research in this field and the future possibilities of danger to the environment.

P68 While uk does noet have legislation requiring statutory licensing and registration of pesticides or max permitted limits for PR, there is some legislation related to the sale of poisonous substances and to the protection of workers who use pesticides.

Poisons Act 1972 – replaced Pharmacy and Poisons Act 1933 certain listed substances (currently in the Poisons list 1978) have their sale and supply controlled by the Poisons Ruler 1978. Any pesticide so listed may be sod only by registered pharmacists or those listed by the local authority as authorised sellers of poisons an only to people employed in the trade or business of agriculture horticulture or forestry for use in that business and in a form designed for such use. Effect is to keep the more toxic pesticides out of the hands of amateur gardeners and other members of the public. A number of pesticides appear in the Poisons List – of the 196 substances in the current list of approved products for famers and growers, 31 are listed poisons and another two have been recommended for inclusion in the list.

Health and Safety (Ag) (Poisonous Subs) Regulations 1975 – made under the HSatWork Act 1974, replaced the Ag (Pois Subs) Regs 1966 and1969 which were made under the Ac(Pois Subs) Act 1952. Designed to protect operators from poisoning, describe ppe, self employed people included now.

Aerial spraying strictly controlled and limited types.

Food and Drugs act 1955 – far reaching powers = food sold ot the public is of good quality, free from adulteration and injurious ingredients and is fit for human consumption. PR could be said to = contamination, harmful ingredients or to make the food unfit for human consumption. Never been used to bring a case against excess pesticides though frequently and successfully to bring prosecutions against antibiotic residues in milk and they are equally appropriate for PR .

The Medicines (Prohibition iof non-medicinal antimicrobial substances) order 1977 under Medicines act 1968 – must refer pesticides which contain specified antimicrobial substances to the medicines commission joint subcommittee on antimicrobial substances before the can be put on the market.

1978 list of approved products includes some 190 pesticides and lists over 800 proprietary products.

Nothing abut the mechanics of uptake/ retention of PR, or why it might be different between lettuces root vege etc, or that anyone was trying to understand this. Also no detail of what the tests undertaken by the govt chemist in UK or Germany were – were these all done by hand? Guess it might be too early for these guys to have MassSpec technologies?

Assoc. of Publ.Analysts – surveyed pesticide residues in England and Wales
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Based on discussions with German workers, not actual documents or published research -