The mandate behind the threshold — and the politics

*Requested 2026-06-11: (a) the verbatim **legislative mandate** that created the demand Mount & Stephan's method (→ SSD) was built to fill, and (b) whether the **politicians** behind the de minimis (food) threshold and the environmental (water/SSD) threshold **overlap.** Primary: the statute PDF in `sources/`. Secondary (sponsors/committees): cited web sources. Companion: `SSD_VALIDATION.md` (Mount & Stephan's motivation), `SSD_GENEALOGY.md`.*

---

1. The mandate, verbatim — the Water Quality Act of 1965 (P.L. 89-234, 79 Stat. 903)

Mount & Stephan (1967) named this Act as the trigger: it "suggests that some type of 'standards' will be forthcoming." Here is what it actually required (local primary: `sources/PL89-234_Water_Quality_Act_1965_79Stat903.pdf`). **[P]**

Its stated object, in the long title: *"to require establishment of **water quality criteria**, and for other purposes."* The operative command, the new subsection (c) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act:

> "(c)(1) If the Governor of a State or a State water pollution control agency files … a letter of intent that such State, after public hearings, will **before June 30, 1967, adopt (A) water quality criteria** applicable to interstate waters … and (B) a **plan for the implementation and enforcement** of the water quality criteria adopted … such State criteria and plan shall thereafter be the **water quality standards** applicable to such interstate waters."

And the substance the standards had to satisfy:

> "(3) **Standards of quality** established pursuant to this subsection **shall be such as to protect the public health or welfare, enhance the quality of water** and serve the purposes of this Act. In establishing such standards the Secretary, the Hearing Board, or the appropriate State authority shall **take into consideration their use and value for public water supplies, propagation of fish and wildlife, recreational purposes, and agricultural, industrial, and other legitimate uses**."

That last clause *is* the demand the SSD answers. The statute requires a number that **balances "propagation of fish and wildlife" against "agricultural, industrial, and other legitimate uses"** — i.e., a threshold of acceptable harm.

The 95%-protection HC5 is one way to put a figure on exactly that trade-off. The law created the question; the toxicologists supplied the round number. **[synthesis]**

*(For comparison, the food side: the de minimis idea was the industry's answer to the **Food Additives Amendment of 1958** (P.L. 85-929), which required premarket safety testing for additives not "generally recognized as safe" — and to the **Delaney Clause** within it banning any additive shown to cause cancer. Same era, same threshold-of-acceptable-harm logic, opposite chamber and committee — see below.)*

2. The politicians — do they overlap?

Short answer: **the immediate sponsors are different people in different chambers, but the regulatory framework has a real overlap node — John Dingell and the House Commerce committee — and a deeper structural link through NEPA. [2]/[synthesis]**

The two mandates came from different places:

- **Water (1965 Water Quality Act): Sen. Edmund S. Muskie** (D-ME), chair of the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution of the **Senate Public Works Committee**, introduced S.4 with 25 co-sponsors; the Senate passed it 68–8. The water-quality-standards regime is **Muskie's, in the Senate.**
- **Food (1958 Food Additives Amendment / Delaney Clause):** grew out of the **House** "Delaney Committee" (Rep. **James J. Delaney**, D-NY); food-additive jurisdiction sits with the **House Interstate & Foreign Commerce Committee** (later **Energy & Commerce**).

So no shared sponsor: Muskie (Senate, water) vs Delaney (House, food).

But the overlap is real where it counts:

- **John D. Dingell** is the connecting figure. He sat on (and long chaired) the **House Energy & Commerce Committee**, whose jurisdiction covers **both** the FDA/food-additives **and** environmental law. In our own record, **Dingell is the congressman whose House Small Business subcommittee pressed the FDA on indirect food additives in 1967** — the pressure that forced the February 1968 conference where Frawley argued de minimis (see `08_VINYL_CHLORIDE_CAMPAIGN.md`). The *same* Dingell **wrote the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)** and was a principal architect of the **Clean Water Act of 1972.** One man stands at the food-additive *and* the water/environmental thresholds.
- **NEPA links the two regimes literally.** Because of NEPA (Dingell's law), the **FDA must assess the environmental impact of its food-additive approvals.** The food-additive decision and the environmental regime are not just analogous — they are statutorily wired together.
- The **House Energy & Commerce Committee** is the institutional node: it oversees the FDA (the de minimis arena) and a large share of environmental law (the SSD arena).

The honest caveat — who actually "pushed" de minimis: the de minimis threshold was **pushed by industry** (Frawley/Hercules, the SPI/MCA campaign, Keller & Heckman), *not* by politicians. The politicians named here — Dingell, Delaney, Muskie — were on the **oversight/regulatory** side; Dingell was *pressing* the FDA, not lobbying for the exemption. So there is no shared political cabal driving both thresholds. What overlaps is the **regulatory architecture**: the same era (1958–1972), the same threshold-of-acceptable-harm logic, and the same House committee (Energy & Commerce) and figure (Dingell) sitting astride both the food and the environmental thresholds — while the *deregulatory* threshold-pushing came, on the food side, from industry, and on the water side from the regulators' own search for defensible numbers (RIVM, EPA; see `SSD_ORIGINS_AND_AFFILIATIONS.md`).

2a. John Dingell — a summary, his words, and the recurring motifs

Summary. John D. Dingell Jr. (D-MI, 1926–2019) was the **longest-serving member of Congress in U.S. history** — 59 years (Dec. 1955 – Jan. 2015, 30 terms), representing the Detroit/Dearborn area; "the Dean of the House." For decades he ran the **House Energy & Commerce Committee** and its **Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations** (chair 1981–95, 2007–09) — the committee whose jurisdiction spans **both the FDA and a large share of environmental law.** An Army veteran and former **National Park Ranger**, a lifelong **hunter and angler.** He authored **NEPA (1970)**, the **Clean Water Act (1972)**, the **Endangered Species Act (1973)**, and the **Marine Mammal Protection Act (1972)** — while remaining Detroit's foremost defender of the **auto industry**, fighting to balance emissions rules against manufacturing jobs. **[2]**

What he said — food / FDA. His food-and-drug record is the **watchdog's**. He ran the generic-drug investigation of the late 1980s that found FDA officials taking bribes (70 convictions, 22 companies, $50M in fines) and wrote the 1991 Generic Drug Enforcement Act; in our own record he is the congressman who **pressed FDA Commissioner Goddard on indirect food additives in 1967** — the pressure that forced the February 1968 conference. His instrument was the inquiry, not the statute: *"Oversight isn't necessarily a hearing. Sometimes it's a letter. We find our letters have a special effect on a lot of people."* **[2]**

What he said — environment. NEPA, his landmark, is a **procedural** law: it bans nothing; it **forces federal agencies to consider and disclose** the environmental consequences of their actions (the "Magna Carta of environmental law"). His conservation was the **sportsman's** — protect the "fishing and hunting grounds," inspire the next generation, "especially in cities." Yet he balanced clean-air rules against Detroit jobs — the living embodiment of **protection-versus-use. [2]**

The recurring motifs (the framing is consistent across both domains — and it is the *threshold* world's framing, not the absolutist's): **[synthesis]**

1. **Procedure over substance.** His signature line: *"I'll let you write the substance … you let me write the procedure, and I'll screw you every time."*

NEPA is procedure; oversight is procedure; the lever was never the ban or the number but the **process that forces an accountable agency to act.** This is the *opposite* of Delaney's absolute substantive prohibition.

2. **Accountability — make the agency answer.** Food (the bribery inquiry; the 1967 additives pressure) and environment (NEPA's duty to account) were both framed as **holding the executive to its job**; the threshold mattered less than the enforceable duty.
3. **Protect the public, balanced against legitimate use.** Consumer protector *and* auto champion; protector of waters *and* of Detroit jobs. That is precisely the balance the 1965 mandate writes down — "propagation of fish and wildlife" against "agricultural, industrial, and other legitimate uses" — and precisely what de minimis (food) and the HC5 (water) put a number on.
4. **Conservation through use.** The hunter-angler ethic — protect the resource *for* sustainable use, not preserve it absolutely. A threshold philosophy, not a zero.

The connection. Dingell is **not** the man who pushed de minimis — that was industry. He is the man whose **whole regulatory philosophy *is* the threshold-of-acceptable-harm, balance-and-procedure logic** that both de minimis and the SSD operationalize. Where Delaney wrote an absolute ("no additive that induces cancer"), Dingell wrote **process and balance.** The de minimis and SSD thresholds live in Dingell's world, not Delaney's: a number an accountable agency draws between protection and legitimate use. The apparent irony — that he *pressed* the FDA to act, yet what emerged was a threshold, not a ban — dissolves once you see that the threshold *is* his framing: balance, not prohibition; an agency held to account, not a line in the statute.

2b. James Delaney — a summary, his clause, and the opposite motif

Summary. James Joseph Delaney (D-NY, 1901–1987), of **Queens, New York** — about 30 years in the House (1945–47, 1949–78). He chaired the **House Select Committee to Investigate the Use of Chemicals in Foods and Cosmetics** (1950–52) — the "**Delaney Committee**," a two-year inquiry that filled four volumes (fertilizers, cosmetics, food, fluoridation) and laid the groundwork for the Pesticide (1954), Food Additives (1958), and Color Additive (1960) amendments. He later **chaired** the powerful **House Rules Committee** (from 1977) — a procedural insider whose lasting mark was a single *substantive* sentence. **[2]** *(The often-repeated claim that his wife had cancer is not corroborated by the authoritative histories of the amendment; omitted as unverified.)* Note also: the clause was **expected to be narrow** — only a handful of chemicals were then known animal carcinogens — and became the most absolute command in American food law only as analytical chemistry learned to detect carcinogenicity at ever-lower traces (the "Delaney paradox").

His words — in the statute. Delaney's signature is not rhetoric but a **prohibition**, inserted as a last-minute amendment into §409 of the Food Additives Amendment of 1958 (and the 1960 color amendments):

> no additive may be approved that is "**found to induce cancer in man, or, after tests, … to induce cancer in animals.**"

Zero. No safe level, no agency discretion, no de minimis. **[P]** (statutory text)

His framing / the motif. The rationale his side pressed: **medical science can establish no safe dose for a carcinogen** — so any amount that induces cancer must be barred. Cancer is treated as a special, latent, irreversible harm (the same latency **Summerson** invoked in 1968), for which a calculated "acceptable level" is a contradiction in terms. The **public gets the benefit of the doubt; the expert's judgment is distrusted; the line lives in the statute, not in an agency's discretion. [2]**

The pole — Delaney vs. Dingell:

	Delaney	**Dingell**
Where the line lives	**absolute, in the statute**	a **threshold**, drawn by the agency
Logic	**no safe level** → prohibition	**balance** protection vs. use
Posture toward experts	**distrust** their discretion	**hold the agency accountable** to act
Lever	**substance**	**procedure**

The irony that closes the series. Delaney's "rigid, anti-science" clause is grounded in the science our essay *vindicates*: for a genotoxic carcinogen there **is no threshold** (the category error of §9). Delaney (1958) and Summerson (1968) honored that fact; **Frawley's "reasoned approach" and the SSD's HC5 substituted a round number for it.** The entire de minimis lineage is, end to end, the long campaign to get *around* Delaney — Frawley's carcinogen carve-out, then ***Public Citizen v. Young*** and ***Les v. Reilly*** (holding the clause admits **no** de minimis exception), and finally the **Food Quality Protection Act of 1996**, which repealed Delaney for pesticides and replaced it with a **risk-based threshold** ("reasonable certainty of no harm"). **When Delaney's absolute fell, the threshold logic — Dingell's world — won.** And it won precisely where the science said it should not: at the carcinogen, the one substance that has no safe dose to put a number on. **[synthesis]**

3. The take

The mandates rhyme more than the politicians do. Both the 1958 food-additives law and the 1965 water-quality law command an agency to draw a line between protection and "legitimate" industrial/agricultural use — a threshold of acceptable harm. De minimis (food) and the SSD/HC5 (water) are the two professions' answers to that same statutory demand. The politics differ (House/Senate, Delaney/Muskie), the sponsors don't overlap, and the de minimis *push* was industry's, not a legislator's. The one genuine personal bridge is **Dingell** — food-additive overseer, NEPA author, Clean Water architect — and the one genuine structural bridge is **NEPA's subjection of FDA food-additive decisions to environmental review.**

Sources

- **P.L. 89-234, Water Quality Act of 1965** (79 Stat. 903) — local `sources/PL89-234_Water_Quality_Act_1965_79Stat903.pdf` (govinfo). **[P]**
- **Water Quality Act sponsorship** (Muskie, S.4, Senate Public Works) — congress.gov S.4 (89th); ACSC/UDel exhibit. **[2]**
- **1958 Food Additives Amendment / Delaney Committee** (Rep. Delaney; House) — NCBI *Regulating Pesticides in Food*, legislative history. **[2]**
- **John Dingell — NEPA author, Clean Water architect, Energy & Commerce / FDA jurisdiction** — Wikipedia; Legal Planet (2019 obituary). **[2]**
- **NEPA applies to FDA food-additive approvals** — FDA, "Environmental Decisions" (fda.gov). **[2]**
- **Dingell's 1967 FDA pressure (indirect additives)** — our `08_VINYL_CHLORIDE_CAMPAIGN.md`. **[P/2]**

Open / next

- **[open]** Pull the *food-side* mandate verbatim too — the **1958 Food Additives Amendment (P.L. 85-929, 72 Stat. 1784)** and the **Delaney Clause** text — to set the two statutes side by side (the parent dossier cites them but holds no statute PDF). A clean diptych of the two mandates' "balancing" language would be the payoff.
- **[open]** Maltby et al. (2005) still unretrieved (`papers/_WISHLIST.md`); the Posthuma–Suter–Traas 2002 book appeared in the index but the service returned "no fast_download url" — retry the `/book` path.