

RECEIVED

INTER-COMPANY CORRESPONDENCE

JUL 1 1964

INDUSTRIAL MEDICINE &
TOXICOLOGY DEPARTMENT

(ATTN) COMPANY Union Carbide Chemicals LOCATION Mellon Institute

To Dr. W. E. Ackart
LOCATION Union Carbide Plastics
Bound Brook, New Jersey

DATE June 29, 1964

ANSWERING LETTER DATE

ATTENTION

COPY TO Dr. C. U. Lerner - New York
Dr. A. W. Downes - New York
Dr. R. B. Haseleman - Bound Brook
Mr. A. P. Mazzuchelli - Bound Brook
Mr. N. H. Reinking - Bound Brook
Mr. G. T. Scriba - New York
Mr. R. L. Wechsler - Bound Brook

SUBJECT Tin Stabilized Rigid Vinyl
Bottles for Foods, Drugs,
and Cosmetics

This answers the question to me in your June 15 letter on the above subject to Mr. Wechsler.

Our pertinent experimental data refer to di(2-ethylhexyl) tin maleate, dibutyl tin laurate, and dioctyl tin dichloride. I consider them adequate basis for an opinion.

I believe that 0.1% (1000 ppm) of dioctyl tin laurate entering a shampoo from the container would cause no "severe" eye injury when the shampoo accidentally entered the eye. I believe 0.01% (100 ppm) would have no effect on the eyes nor any significant skin penetration.

If these opinions cramp your development efforts, it is possible that animal tests on shampoos to which the tin compound is added would yield higher figures. The eye injury tests would be reasonably cheap (about \$50 per concentration) and quick.

Henry F. Smyth, Jr.
Henry F. Smyth, Jr., Ph.D.

HFS:MG

UCC
063584