Monsanto

SPEEDY MEMO

CC: K.A. Garcia - Akron
D.A. Hall - St. Louis

JUL 10 1970

SUBJECT: Etiwanda Steel (Fred Murdock)

REFERENCE: Phone conversation 7/8/70

DATE 7/8/70

TO: Dr. Emmet Kelly
St. Louis General Offices

Thank you very much for your help in trying to get Etiwanda squared around on the question of the toxicity of Pydraul 312. I would not have called you from the customer's plant were it not for the fact that they wanted to talk with you after reading your statement "Pydraul 312 - Toxcity and Safe Handling".

As we discussed, the problem here is not environmental considerations or irritability but toxicity in the truest sense. The personnel manager, Byron Kelsey, simply wants a memo stating that Pydraul 312 does not represent more of a health hazard than Houghtosafe 1120 (a 100% phosphate ester fluid). In other words, if an operator gets drenched with Pydraul, is there any more chance of permanent damage (on the skin or due to vapor inhallation) than with Houghtosafe? From the Kettering Studies, the answer is no but Murdock and Kelsey would like to have this confirmed in "laymen's language".

DSW 586422

This situation was brought about by a competitors misuse and Etiwanda's misinterpretation of our warning label. It is only through your help that we can get logic rather than emotion back into the picture. Again, my thanks for your cooperation. Hopefully, we will soon have a new customer.

Best Regards

Jerry Lawler
Los Angeles

G-1608 REV.2/70

STLCOPCB4091756