

**Beyond the Headlines:
Quotes from around the world on the safety of Bisphenol A (BPA)**

German Federal Institute for Risk Assessment (BfR) in an updated Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) document posted to its website on October 2, 2009, regarding the safety of polycarbonate baby bottles containing BPA:

“Following careful examination of all studies, in particular the studies in the low dose range of bisphenol A, BfR comes to the conclusion in its scientific assessment that the normal use of polycarbonate bottles does not lead to a health risk from bisphenol A for infants and small children.”

Source: BfR website; Selected questions and answers on bisphenol A in feeding bottles and dummies for babies (Updated FAQ of 2 October 2009); <http://www.bfr.bund.de/cd/7294>

California Developmental and Reproductive Toxicant Identification Committee (DARTIC) regarding its decision not to add bisphenol A to the Proposition 65 chemicals list:

“Following the staff presentation, comments from the public and committee discussion, the DARTIC determined that, based upon current scientific information, bisphenol A has not been clearly shown to cause reproductive toxicity; and therefore the Committee declined to add it to the Proposition 65 chemical list.”

Source: July 15, 2009, Meeting Synopsis; Website of the California EPA Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment; http://oehha.ca.gov/Prop65/public_meetings/dart071509synop.html

Roselyne Bachelot-Narquin, the French Health Minister, quoted in the National Assembly regarding a ban on BPA:

“...recent in-depth studies by the AFSSA¹ and the EFSA² concluded that BPA-based baby bottles are harmless. Any residual levels of BPA are significantly below the maximum limits fixed by health authorities. The precautionary principle becomes applicable when there are no reliable studies. Here (for BPA) these reliable studies are available, and on the basis of the scientific studies confirm no risk [for baby bottles produced with this substance]....”



Beyond the Headlines:

Quotes from around the world on the safety of Bisphenol A (BPA)

October 2009

Page 2

“Canadian authorities banned Bisphenol A under public pressure and without any serious scientific study,” the minister added. “The precautionary principle is a principle of reason, and under no circumstances a principle of emotion,” she concluded...”

Source: *Agence France Press, March 31, 2009*

Health Canada’s Bureau of Chemical Safety, Food Directorate Health Products and Food Branch:

“Health Canada’s Food Directorate has concluded that: The current dietary exposure to BPA through food packaging is not expected to pose a health risk to the general population, including infants and young children. The nutritional benefits of baby food products far outweigh any possible risk.”

“The results of this survey clearly indicate that exposure to BPA through the consumption of jarred baby food products would be extremely low. The low levels of BPA found in jarred baby food products available for sale in Canada confirms Health Canada’s previous assessment conclusion that the current dietary exposure to BPA through food packaging uses is not expected to pose a health risk to the consumer.”

Source: **Survey of Bisphenol A in Baby Food Products Prepackaged in Glass Jars with Metal Lids, Bureau of Chemical Safety Food Directorate Health Products and Food Branch, Health Canada, July 2009**

Senator Cheryl Pflug (R-5th Legislative District, Washington State):

“The Senate should have compelling evidence to justify an action that contradicts FDA findings, eliminates jobs, and increases costs to the public. Good intentions are assumed, and are a valid reason to introduce a bill, but they do not constitute adequate justification to enact the proposal if the science doesn’t materialize. Hearsay and opinion do not constitute scientific evidence. I agree that this could be an important issue. It definitely merits attention to future scientific findings, particularly in regard to neural effects on pregnant women and fetuses. At present, such findings do not exist. As a ban will do clear harm without visible benefit, it seems inadvisable.”

Source: **Letter from Senator Pflug to her legislative colleagues considering a bill to ban BPA during the 2009 session**



Beyond the Headlines:

Quotes from around the world on the safety of Bisphenol A (BPA)

October 2009

Page 3

Swiss Federal Office of Public Health (FOPH) (Bundesamt für Gesundheit BAG) in rejecting a ban on BPA:

“A ban on BPA would inevitably cause manufactures of packaging and consumer products (food contact materials) to have to switch to other substances, the toxicity of which is less well known. This would mean a well characterized risk would be replaced with a conspicuously unpredictable risk.”

Source: “**Science Suppressed: How America became obsessed with BPA.**” Trevor Butterworth, Statistical Assessment Service (STATS), 2009

Survey of 1000 Society of Toxicology Members regarding the precautionary principle and the politicization of science:

“Media coverage and public and political debate have featured strong criticism of the risk assessment approach taken by government agencies charged with regulating chemicals. But toxicologists give the system a vote of confidence. Fewer than one out of four believe that regulation should be guided by the precautionary principle, which mandates that a substance suspected to cause harm should be banned even in the absence of scientific consensus. Similarly, only one out of four believe that the US regulatory system is inferior to that of Europe, where the precautionary principle has the force of law.”

“But toxicologists do express concern over the politicization of science. Two out of three believe the peer review process is becoming too politicized, three out of four say scientists should restrict public statements to areas of their own expertise, and nine out of ten believe research findings should be peer-reviewed before being released to the press. Finally, majorities fault both the media and regulators for not doing a balanced job of explaining chemical risk to the general public.”

Source: **Report on Findings of 2009 SOT Survey conducted by Harris Interactive for Statistical Assessment Service (STATS) and Center for Health and Risk Communication at George Mason University**

¹ Agence française de sécurité sanitaire des aliments (AFSSA).

² European Food Safety Authority (EFSA).