

not recall ever hearing any one suggest that that should be the case, in any discussions I have had on the Delaney clause.

There exist a number of safety standards which apply to food under the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act. Some of these standards overlap—that is, more than one standard may apply to a food or food ingredient or constituent, depending on the particular circumstances.

First, there is the general adulteration standard under section 402(a)(1) of the FD&C Act. This section, which applies to food generally, says that a food is deemed to be adulterated (that is, unsafe) if:

It bears or contains any poisonous or deleterious substance which may render it [the food] injurious to health; but in case the substance is not an added substance such food shall not be considered adulterated under this clause if the quantity of such substance does not ordinarily render it injurious to health.

This safety standard has two parts. For poisonous or deleterious substances added to food, the food is adulterated if the substances may render the food injurious to health. For substances which are not added, that is, they are inherent or not the result of human activity, the adulteration standard is ordinarily injurious to health.

These two principal adulteration standards have been bulwarks in the legislative and regulatory scheme to ensure the safety of food for decades. Indeed, numerous courts have had occasion to interpret these provisions, for example, in *U.S. v. Boston Farm Center, Inc.* (590 F.2d 149 (4th Cir. 1979) and *United States vs. Anderson Seafoods, Inc.*, 622 F.2d 157, (5th Cir. 1980).

These standards remain unamended in S. 343 and would continue to guarantee the safety of our food supply.

Second, it is important to note that the adulteration standards found in section 402(a)(1) are independent of the requirement that such food ingredients as food or color additives be shown to be safe. Or put more simply, any legislative change to section 409 dealing with food additives, for example, would not affect the adulteration standards in section 402(a)(1).

In fact, FDA has used the 402(a)(1) standard to permit quantities of substances, including recognized carcinogens such as aflatoxin—a naturally occurring toxicant from mold which particularly affects peanuts—to be in food. In such a case, FDA has typically employed risk assessment to determine the level of the carcinogenic poisonous or deleterious substance that presents only an insignificant risk.

Third, numerous other safety standards are set forth in section 402 of the FD&C act. One of the principal additional standards provides that a food is adulterated if it contains a poisonous or deleterious substance which is unsafe within the meaning of section 346.

Section 346 provides that a food containing a poisonous or deleterious sub-

stance is unsafe for purposes of section 402, and thus is adulterated unless the substance is required in the production of the food or cannot be avoided by good manufacturing practice.

It is under the principals of section 346 that FDA has regulated environmental contaminants, including such substances as PCBs, a particularly toxic group of chemicals once widely used in industrial production, and PBBs, a flame retardant that was mistakenly applied to food in Michigan.

FDA has implemented this section through the use of action levels and tolerances, which are announced levels of the toxic substance that will be permitted in food.

As Professor Richard Merrill observed in "Regulating Carcinogens in Food: A Legislator's Guide to the Food Safety Provisions of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act," (77 Mich L.Rev. 171 (1978)), "Most notably section 406 . . . does not unequivocally preclude the marketing of food that contains an added carcinogenic substance." Professor Merrill adds that "FDA has taken the position that it may establish a tolerance for a contaminant shown to be carcinogenic—and thus 'approve' its presence in food in quantities below the tolerance."

As is the case with respect to section 402(a)(1), the legislative language contained in S. 343 has no effect on the important safety standard found in the interplay between sections 402(a)(2)(A) and section 406.

Fourth, section 402 contains numerous other standards related to the safety of food, including those that pertain to food that contains filthy, putrid or decomposed substance, that has been prepared under unsanitary conditions, that contains unlawful pesticide residues, or if the package of the food contains a poisonous or deleterious substance that may render the food injurious to health, (the same standard as set for in section 402(a)).

The second point on which I would like to comment is the contention that not defining insignificant or negligible risk in legislation language is a bad idea.

I take vigorous exception to the idea that the Congress should define these terms in law. Imposition of the zero risk standard by legislative fiat is what led to the Delaney dilemma in the first place.

When Congress first enacted a Delaney amendment in 1958, scientists were not able to detect potentially carcinogenic substances at the parts per million, or parts per billion, levels as they are today. Does this mean that we should lock into the law a one in a million lifetime risk of cancer standard? I think not. What our bill does is allow the agencies to make these definitions. This will allow the law to grow with the science.

In closing, Mr. President, let me reiterate my continued commitment to Delaney reform which both protects the public health and is consistent

with sound scientific and regulatory principles. This is long overdue.

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is now closed.

#### BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA SELF-DEFENSE ACT OF 1995

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of S. 21, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 21) to terminate the United States arms embargo applicable to the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Madam President, I rise to speak in favor of the proposal which I am privileged to cosponsor with the distinguished majority leader and many others of both parties, which would finally lift the arms embargo and do some justice in the former Yugoslavia, by replacing a policy of inaction or half actions that has failed to stem the conflict, has failed to stop aggression, and has failed to protect the victims of that aggression, whose pain we see each night on our television sets.

Madam President, this is a genuinely bipartisan or nonpartisan effort, as it should be, as American foreign policy has traditionally been at its best—above party consideration.

Senator DOLE and I began this effort in 1992 when the incumbent in the White House happened to be a Republican, President Bush. We have continued in 1993, 1994, and 1995, with President Clinton in the White House.

Sadly, each time that we have raised this question of lifting the arms embargo and using allied air power selectively, we have been met with different excuses. A defense, not even really so much a defense of the existing policy, but criticisms, complications, unintended results, that might occur if the arms embargo was lifted.

In that, I think, and I will get to that in a moment or two, we have failed not only to see what was happening on the ground, but to listen to the victims of the aggression. The Bosnians have said repeatedly, over and over again, "We don't want American soldiers on Bosnian soil. We don't need American soldiers on Bosnian soil. We have troops on Bosnian soil, they are Bosnians—in excess of 100,000. They are motivated, understandably, to fight to defend their country, their communities, their families, themselves. Just give us the weapons with which to defend ourselves."

Madam President, we rise again, a bipartisan group. Several tries at lifting the arms embargo having failed, this time we act with some sense of hope that we will be able to achieve, perhaps