

Inaccuracies in 2,4,5-T Article

There are two brief articles about 2,4,5-T in your March, 1970, issue which contain inaccurate statements. I am writing in the hope you will correct them. On page 52, one finds an article entitled "Incriminating 2,4,5-T Test Is Invalid." A reading of this article reveals the headline is much too definite, and that further tests are needed to decide whether the toxic effects on laboratory animals are due to the 2,4,5-T or to an impurity of the dioxin type. A more correct headline would thus read "Incriminating 2,4,5-T test requires reevaluation."

The editor's note at the bottom of this article is also faulty. It states that DSMO (you really mean DMSO, standing for dimethylsulfoxide), also was used in the Bionetics test. That is only half true, for 2,4,5-T was supplied to the animals in two ways: in the diet in honey (no DMSO used) and by subcutaneous injection in DMSO as a spreading agent. Since the dietary administration method without DMSO yielded as much teratogenicity as the injection method, DMSO cannot be a factor.

An accurate account of the Bionetics Laboratory Report can be found in "Report of the Secretary's Commission on Pesticides and Their Relationship to Environmental Health, Parts I and II," published by the U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare in December, 1969. The final chapter (Chapter 8) deals with teratogenicity of pesticides and includes some of the Bionetics data. These are also included in a government pamphlet entitled "Chemical-Biological Warfare, U. S. Policy and International Effects," prepared by the Committee on Foreign Affairs

of the House of Representatives, dated 1970. Your readers should be referred to these sources for accurate and complete estimates of the present status of alleged 2,4,5-T toxicity.

On page 54, in another column under the title "Trimnings," there is also a discussion of 2,4,5-T in which it is said that "2,4,5-T is under fire because a laboratory test indicated the herbicide caused cancer in mice." This again is inaccurate. There was no indication of cancer formation, but rather of teratogenicity, i.e., malformation of developing embryos *in utero*.

In my view the use of 2,4,5-T ought to be greatly restricted or even halted until it is absolutely certain that it is not harmful. Whether the effect is due to the acid itself or to the dioxin impurity, the material as sold and sprayed constitutes a potential public health hazard. We need to know whether the dioxin can be eliminated completely, whether it may be formed in the field after 2,4,5-T application, and whether the dioxin's persistence is such as to make it a long time hazard.

Neither the science of chemical agriculture nor the Weeds Trees and Turf readership will be benefited by misrepresenting the issue, and by taking an anti-public health stand. In any event, I think it important that your readers get the accurate facts, and that you correct the statements that you have published.—**ARTHUR W. GALSTON**, professor of biology, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

Appreciates Aquatic Coverage

I was most pleased to hear you had selected two slides to use in your June special on Aquatic Weed Control. We are most en-

thusiastic about the coverage your magazine has given this relatively new field, and to some degree its development can be attributed to your efforts.—**JASON M. CORTELL**, consultant biologist, Allied Biological Control Corp., Wellesley Hills, Mass.

Pesticide Articles Commended

Thank you for another excellent article on the pesticide controversy in your April issue. I do wish such articles were more available to the general public. I can't help but wonder why newspapers and popular home magazines don't present this type of factual report.—**KATHLEEN H. GUSTAFSON**, Northland-Midwest Spraying & Pest Control, Inc., Burnsville, Minn.

You are to be commended for the excellent April issue. The special, "Pesticide Laws — As They Stand, What Changes Could Mean," is an outstanding example of the type of documented information that the pesticide industry needs so urgently.—**W. D. BROOKS**, marketing manager, agrichemicals marketing, Elanco Products Co., Indianapolis, Ind.

Irrigation Cover Impressive

We have received your current magazine, and are absolutely ecstatic with the exposure you have given us; the photos graphically illustrate sprinklers in operation on the front cover, plus the article is a real plus factor for the irrigation industry. We have received several telephone calls from various readers, and they were much impressed. They wanted some assistance in the design and layout of irrigation equipment.—**A. BROWN**, vice-president, sales, Turf Irrigation Corp., Commack, N. Y.

meeting dates

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
		1	2	3	4	5
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30	31		

22nd Annual Nurserymen's Refresher Course, sponsored by the California Association of Nurserymen at Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, June 9-11.

Purdue-Michigan State Weed Day at Agronomy Farm, Lafayette, Ind., June 18.

Penn State Field Day, formally dedicating the Joseph Valentine Turfgrass Research Center, June 24 and 25.

Ohio Chapter, International Shade Tree Conference, at the USDA Shade Tree and Ornamental Plants Laboratory at Delaware, Ohio, July 8.

Hyacinth Control Society at the Sheraton Motor Inn, Huntsville, Ala., July 12-15.

American Sod Producers Association 4th annual conference and field day, Ramada Dorchester Inn, Dolton, Ill., and the H & E Sod Farm, Momence, Ill., July 28-30.

Indiana Association of Nurserymen summer meeting, Executive Inn, Evansville, Ind., Aug. 9-11.

46th International Shade Tree Conference, Hotel Flagship-Rochester, N.Y., Aug. 9-14.