IZONE
INTERNATIONAL LTD.
SUITE 1027-470 GRANVILLE ST.,
VANCOUVER, B.C. V6C 1W3

TELEPHONE (604) 681-6510
FAX (604) 681-9507

September 20, 1990

Honourable Bill Clinton
Governor of the State of Arkansas
Little Rock, Ark.

Dear Sir:

"ABC Prime Time Live" was in Vancouver, B.C., Canada recently to interview Izone International Ltd. As we explicity told you during our meeting in early August, we are just a small company that has developed a unique technology that has applications in many different areas. So I'm sure you can imagine our surprise when Chris Wallace from ABC's " Prime Time Live," produced a letter from your office that we were unaware of and that deeply disturbs us. This letter contained disparaging remarks that were seemingly intended to discredit us behind our backs. We must comment on this as well as on some other attacks that have recently come to light.

The letter we refer to, was signed by your right-hand man Ken Smith. The entire contents of the letter are not known to us because we have never received a copy of it. Needless to say, it was disconcerting to hear that according to Ken Smith, you had nothing good to say about Izone International or anyone associated with the company.

We have never spoken of you in any terms other than in a positive manner and find these comments unjust and unsettling. We have only stated that we have felt that you were not getting the correct technical advice on which to base your decisions. It certainly would have been more professional and courteous had you sent us an advance copy of this letter as we have courteously done with all of our correspondence to you. We hope that this will be the case in the future.

Just this past week, Randal Mathis of the Arkansas State Pollution Control and Ecology Office issued a formal statement to the press and environmental groups. The nature and contents of this statement can only be perceived as an attempted discreditation of Izone International and all the concerned environmental groups who are against the proposed burn in Jacksonville. We would like to clear up a few misconceptions in the statement as well as correct some grevious errors on the part of Mr. Mathis and his speech writer.

...2

We at Izone International steadfastly maintain that there is no scientific proof pertaining to thermal incineration as a viable method for destroying toxic wastes and chemicals. We also maintain that incineration is a process that is unsafe and is based on scientific oversights and generalities that defy the logic of applied physics and complex chemistry. In other words - representative claims regarding incineration successes border on myth.

There is nothing "irrational" or "inaccurate" about Mr. Kirbys' statements regarding the Jacksonville incinerator producing "...landfills in the sky during operation and that there will be dioxins spewing from the stack." Substantial amounts of up to date scientific literature abounds that supports these claims. For someone to even suggest that the incineration of pure chlorinated organic hydrocarbons will not cause the formation of dioxins and furans only shows a complete lack of fundamental and complex chemistry. Barry Commoner, Director of the Center for the Biology of Natural Systems in New York has repeatedly stated that incinerators are "...dioxin factories." The credentials of Barry Commoner are above reproach and every statement he makes is based on years of comprehensive analysis by the Center for the Biology of Natural Systems at Queens College.

George Baggett, of the Air and Waste Management Division of the Environmental Science Division, has a degree in applied mathematics and has studied complex chemistry extensively. It is widely accepted that Baggett is one of the top incineration experts in North America and he has worked in waste management for close to 24 years. He has clearly stated that "the burning of chlorinated hydrocarbons produces dioxins, furans and many other extremely toxic chemicals." Baggett has also stated that, " if you try to incinerate these matterials at any temperature, you are dealing in a speculative area with zero proof or basis to make any claims whatsoever."

Further to the statement that Izone International and the National Environmental Groups have only managed to foster an atmosphere of " fear...and have...insulted the intelligence of the good people of Jacksonville," is a far-fetched observation at best. Izone International attended a meeting in August that was packed with over six hundred scared and angry citizens Mr. Mathis - it is quite obvious that this fear you allude to was already in existence well before we became involved in the Jacksonville debate. Secondly, to suggest we have insulted the intelligence of the citizens of Jacksonville is in itself an insult to those very people. We have merely supplied information as requested and have given everyone the opportunity to discuss our claims with the experts we have consulted in order that they may make up their own minds. We must mention, that it seems ironic to state that we are merely stirring things up when just after we sent a letter regarding our concerns about the equipment to be used at the site, a crack was discovered in the rotary kiln. Also, the burn has not proceeded due to undisclosed problems that have come to light since.

...3

We would also like to clear up a few points regarding our informal meeting with yourself and members of the State Pollution Control and Ecology Department. First of all, our company is officially titled Izone International Ltd., not the Izone Corporation as alluded by the official statement. The subjective use of the word 'corporation' implies a large organization - we are a small emerging company just reaching commercial viability and we have never stated otherwise. Secondly, Edward Kirby was represented as being a marketer and salesman - never did Mr. Kirby allude to himself in this manner as he stated to all present at the meeting as well as to the press, that he was the fiscal agent and a shareholder. At no time did Mr. Kirby solicit any funding from residents of Jacksonville or Arkansas for that matter. It should also be noted, that there is no mention of Izone being a public-trading company in any of the literature handed out in Jacksonville or Little Rock.

As an in-house researcher and writer, Scott McDonnell is indeed a rarity in the business world. With the emergence of environmental divisions in companies this rarity will soon be commonplace. Through his self-interest and continued research into the hazards of incineration, Mr. McDonnell has become a valued member of the small Izone family. As with our unique technology, we are breaking new ground in the area of public education as well. To be fully environmentally-aware sir, a company has to be current on the issues and concerns of the public as a whole - not just as is reported by the media or by politically-motivated representatives.

It is very interesting that Mr. Mathis would state that his still un-named scientist has claimed that our chemical equation for the breakdown of PCB's and Dioxins is incorrect. These formulas have been distributed to various chemical engineers all over North America and not a single scientist has questioned the validity of the information. I would hazard a guess that this same un-named scientist is one of the consultants that has misled so many people in the Jacksonville area on the safety of incineration.

Another puzzling point regarding the statement is the fact that it was not issued on PC&E letterhead. One can only assume that this is not an official statement from the State Office. Therefore, it must be a personal rebuttal and attempt at discrediting Izone which is curious as we have never once said anything about Mr. Mathis on a personal level. As with you sir, we have only suggested that Mr. Mathis has been receiving some technical information that is incorrect and therefore an attack like this is unwarranted and unprofessional.

...4

We do indeed question the merits of incineration and further to that statement - we are committed to the re-education of our politicians and the public about the misconceptions and oversights of this deadly industry. For your information, the economic and business interests behind the incineration industry are in large the engineering firms and their associates that left us the ongoing economic and environmental legacy of the nuclear powerplant fiasco of the 70's and early 80's. This information in itself should be enough to warrant public concern over industry claims of "state of the art" equipment and safety.

Mr. Kirby did indeed state that the detection equipment in use at the Vertac incinerator stack will not detect dioxin and furan emissions. According to a letter from C. C. Efferson dated June 11, 1990, the verification process regarding the combustion efficiency of the incinerator will seemingly be determined using a Beckman NDIR 865 analyzer. There are some very pertinent points that need to be addresssed at this time.

First of all, it seems somewhat odd that the operators of the incinerator seem to be self-regulating (see attached letter). Would it not be prudent for the state regulatory officials to determine what is required? It seems to go against any logical thinking that the very persons who will be operating the incinerator are the same individuals that are responsible for it's emissions and therefore its' economic and environmental viability. For the contractors to state that they are following Federal EPA Regulations is incorrect as there are no such regulations - what there are is a series of guidelines that are open to a series of interpretations. For the sake of economic security - I do not think the contractors would divulge any problems to the public. While these previous comments may be somewhat hypothetical, we do indeed have hard facts that point to the monitoring of the process that brings new light to stated claims.

We spoke at great length with applications engineer Bill Hooven of Beckman Industries who designed the monitor that is being used at the Vertac site. Hooven stated that the model in use is more suited for monitoring automobile emission and he was puzzled as to why anyone would use it on a toxic waste incinerator. He also stated that the monitor <u>will not</u> detect dioxins, furans or any other complex chlorinated hydrocarbons and he added that the model is now considered somewhat obsolete by the manufactuer. Hooven said that there is nothing available on the market that will detect dioxins and furans with the exception of the EPA Modified Method #5 Sampling Train as indexed in the U.S. Code of Federal Regulations. Further to our intent of providing correct and proper information to you and the citizens of Arkansas, we verified this with another expert in Canada.

...5

Doctor Brian Fowler is the Chief Chemist at Seakem Laboratories in Victoria, British Columbia. Seakem is responsible for stack gas evaluations and the complex testing of samples provided from industry from all over B.C. When asked about a monitoring device to detect dioxins and furans, Fowler stated that the only method available in Canada is based after the EPA method #5 which he claimed is the only method in the U.S. that is capable. He also stated that the method involves a series of expensive lab equipment and that it only has a 90% efficiency rating. A number of scientists contacted after these discusions have given this procedure a rating from 20% effective to 95% effective so we contacted the man who developed the method for the EPA.

Dr. Larry Johnston is the National EPA Expert for Systems and Analysis of Organic Materials for Compounds from Industrial and other Stationary Sources. Dr. Johnston was the primary force behind the development of a proceedure to detect dioxins and furans in incinerator emissions. According to Johnston, "...we felt it was necessary because of the many examples of shady operations that were emitting these materials into the air and also with the realization that all incinerators produce these materials in varying degrees." The protocol for this method is very complicated and needs highly qualified chemical engineers to make sure the proceedure is properly executed.

Dr. Johnston went on to say that, "...in general, the method is quite effective yet the room for error that will greatly influence the findings is large. Under ideal laboratory conditions, we can essentially determine close to full determination but when you go on site you enter the problems of complex reactions and more grey areas." Johnston also stated that the detailed analysis of the sampling train tests could only be properly undertaken at a small number of laboratories in the U.S.

When asked if he was aware of any continuous monitoring equipment that was currently available that would give any indication of the presence of dioxins or furans in the stack gases other than the modified Method #5, used only during the test burn, he plainly stated that, "...there is no monitoring equipment whatsoever that has that capability." When we asked him about the ability of ambient air monitoring equipment approved as "state of the art" by the EPA, he said, "...ambient air monitors do not stand a chance."

Dr. Brian Fowler was also asked these questions and his responses echoed the expert opinion of Dr. Johnston. "Even the most advanced testing equipment used today can only detect in the parts per billion ranges and therefore they will miss the dioxins and furans that are in the stack gases. These are present because even the most stringent pollution control devices do not impede all the dioxins from entering the stack. The dioxins and furans will further escape detection due to the relatively high concentration of other molecules in the stack gases that effectively mask these materials.

...6

Infra-red monitors operate by monitoring specific waves or bands and due to the complexity of dioxins and furans and the fact that they exist on many different bands, they cannot be detected by this method. Claiming that the monitoring of specific elemental gases such as methane and hydrogen will help verify the combustion of chlorinated hydrocarbons is nothing short of a falsehood.

Another large supplier of continuous monitoring equipment in the U.S. other than Beckman, states in their literature that they have not yet discovered the means to detect PCB's and Dioxins from stack gases. It is this information that allows Mr. Kirby to make such statements - statements based on facts not conjecture or myth.

We would also like to point out the findings of the EPA Project Summary entitled the **Pilot-Scale Incineration Test Burn** of **TCDD-Contaminated Trichlorophenol Production Waste** carried out on representative samples from the Vertac site. These series of burns were carried out in the Combustion Research Facility under ideal conditions and according to the conclusions; "Accurate determination of the particulate emissions at the virtual stack and system stack was not achieved. Further research is needed to obtain data on the amount, nature and source of particulate emissions from these sources." So, by their own admission, the EPA could not determine the make-up of the emissions while burning the Vertac Waste under **IDEAL LABORATORY CONDITIONS.**

Secondly, Mr. Mathis questions Mr Kirby's statements regarding dioxins re-forming outside the stack and beyond the monitoring equipment (that will not detect the dioxins anyway). Well sir, this comment is based on research by the Center for the Biology of Natural Systems and the personal in-depth chemical-reactive studies by George Baggett. George Baggett would be more than pleased to inform you of the basis for this statement and will explain how the interaction of chlorine gas emitted from incinerators will react with simple hydrocarbons already present in great numbers in the existing urban air pollution to reform into complex chlorinated hydrocarbons such as dioxins and furans. Research into this area of concern is continuing in the realm of complex chemical engineering. So once again sir, Mr. Kirby's comments are based on factual information and research and are not based on conjecture or inadequate understanding of the technology as you so wrongly imply.

In regard to the comment that Mr. Kirby would not release any trade secrets to the representatives of PC&E - Mr. Mathis left out an important segment of the discusion. Mr. Kirby <u>also</u> stated that he would be dealing with Federal officials of the EPA and any other needed regulatory officials once the first commercial unit was ready for verification, testing and approval. It should seem obvious why some trade secrets would not be released. There are many individuals out there that have a vested interest in the existing technologies and it now seems obvious that they would stop at nothing to block the emergence of this process.

...7

Izone International has spent close to two million dollars on research, development and operations over the past seven years and are committed to the cleanup of our environment. As with any business, we do wish to start making money but we intend to do it in a responsible manner.

Izone International came to Jacksonville for two reasons. We were invited by the local environmental group P.A.C.C.E. and Greenpeace International to discuss the emergence of new technologies. These groups have never endorsed our technology nor have we asked for any endorsement. They merely wanted the citizens of Jacksonville to know that new "environmentally-friendly" technologies were being developed and that they had a choice contrary to what they were being told. Secondly, we came to Jacksonville because we are committed environmentalists and we do not agree with the situation there.

Izone is a company that is environmental in philosophy and because we have a technology that is also environmental in design we are unique and can offer an alternative. Therefore, it is somewhat comical for Mr. Mathis to imply that we were in Jacksonville for the expressed purpose of promoting our technology. This merely points to someone who has a simplified understanding of the big picture.

While in Jacksonville, we aquired a copy of the Instrumentation and Controls for the incinerator at the Vertac site. We have voiced our concerns with this for the following reason; if the contractor was not intending to feed 4000 lbs of material into the rotary kiln then why have a meter that registers to this level. This would be the same as putting a Corvette speedometer in a Chevette. No automobile company would do such a thing if they did not intend to someday travel at such a speed in the smaller car. This may or may not be the case at the Vertac site although if the previous economic track record for incineration is any example, there is a good possibilty that due to upset conditions they will need to operate at this level someday.

We did indeed discuss the Instrumentation and Controls with a Mr. Marc Hooper of the EPA in Seattle, Washington. Mr. Hooper is a specialized Chemical Engineer in the Air Management Section of the EPA as pertaining to toxic materials and incineration. We have formally apologized to Mr. Hooper regarding our slight error in his official title but at least we did not refer to him as a simple "industrial process engineer," as did Gary Martin. The two comments we attribute to Mr. Hooper are general and were never stated as being based on hard evidence. In our fax to you sir, we stated our concerns regarding the instrumentation and controls and included the comments from both Mr. Hooper and one of our consulting scientists. It is ironic that just days after we voiced our concerns - a six-foot crack was discovered in the kiln.

...8

Randal Mathis' statement dramatically points out that no one from PC&E contacted either Richard Pirolla, Lou Chamberlain or Christopher Rappe from Sweden - all experts in their fields and whom collectively stated that the burning of chlorinated hydrocarbons produces dioxins and furans. Mr. Rappe was referred to as a "physical scientist" as if to suggest that his comments have no validity in this debate. For clarification; Christopher Rappe is a Professor and Chairman of Organic Chemistry at the University of Umea, Sweden. Rappe also sits on the consulting division of the World Health Organization and the International Agency for Research on Cancer. He is a recognized authority on chlorinated dioxins and dibenzofurans. He has authored more than 150 papers on these subjects and has extensively studied this area for over sixteen years. Rappe's stated concerns about the Jacksonville situation therefore must be addressed and it is incredulous to dismiss him simply as a physical scientist.

As far as referring to the effectivness of any incinerator in regards to the DRE or 99.9999 efficiency rating, perhaps the best analysis of this system of verification is offered by George Baggett who says: "When using materials with high combustion levels such as most chlorinated hydrocarbons with dioxins being a prime example, the result is quite concievable that a high volume of toxins will bypass any pollution control devices currently in operation and be sprayed all over the surrounding community. The concept that incinerator advocates hide behind what is called the DRE or six nines is a mechanism used to confuse and deceive not only the public but the operators and regulators as well.

One only need spend a brief period of time examining the Project Summary alluded to earlier that was done by the EPA on the evaluation of the incinerability of the Vertac wastes to see the faults in the six nine concept. To establish a correct percentage according to the EPA's own convoluted formula - we must know the exact percentages of the stack emissions. Once again for your information; "Accurate determination of particulate emissions at the virtual stack and system stack was not achieved. Further research is needed to obtain data on the amount, nature and source of particulate emissions from these sources." Yet, the EPA suggests that the incineration of these wastes should be considered to be a viable disposal method? This is a blatant hypocritical recommendation as they can not truthfully state that they came close to achieving the six nines needed for verification. If they cannot determine the particulate emissions, how can anyone accurately determine anything else?

Any attempt to calm concerns about the safety shut-off equipment used on the incinerator due to the "state of the art" design should be taken with a grain of salt. The space shuttle "Challenger" and the multi-million dollar "Hubble Space Telescope" were also considered "state of the art." With this in mind, we must be wary of the term and its' many interpretations.

...9

The Jacksonville test is being closely watched by all of North America and if deemed "successful", it will open the doors for toxic incineration at this level at a potential 400 sites across the United States alone. This is an unacceptable evolution of this industry and a growing group of individuals and environmental organizations are committed to stopping this potential "strangulation" of our environment that is already approaching expiration. The potential effects and affects of such action have been downplayed of late and we would like to clear up some misconceptions about the potential health hazards involved.

The claims of incinerator representatives that the chemicals entering the incinerator will be "destroyed" goes against one of the basic laws of science that states: **All matter can neither be created nor destroyed, it can only be transformed.** According to George Baggett and many other independent scientists, it would be naive to suggest that the combustion of chlorinated organics does not yield dioxins, furans and a host of deadly and complex toxic metals. As previously mentioned, Barry Commoner states in his book **Making Peace with the Planet**, that incinerators are indeed "dioxin factories".

The primary combustion unit at the Vertac site is a rotary kiln that is the most versatile type of incinerator in existence today. These units are capable of burning almost anything including; barrels, liquids, any form of canister, solids and various gases. The downfall of this particular unit however, is it's inability to properly combust liquid organic sludges such as what is found at the Vertac site. The organic sludge becomes very thick and sticky depending on its' chemical make-up and will foul the lining percipitating constant cleaning. We suggest that this is the reason that the Vertac contractors propose to feed this liquid matter directly into the secondary combustion unit.

The problem with feeding the waste into the secondary combustion unit, is that this will defeat the use of the chamber as originally intended by the protocol used by the manufacturer. This chamber is designed to combust the gases that are fed to it from the rotary kiln not to deal with directly-fed liquid matter. The immediate concern with this tactic, is that the residence time of the liquid will be effected by the gases from the rotary kiln that will be entering at the same time. This equation equals potential disaster.

The ability of this particular incinerator to produce dioxins and furans is very high based on design alone - when we take into consideration the material to be burned, the potential becomes alarming. The response to this alarm has always been that the pollution control devices are able to remove all the dioxins and furans from the system. According to the researchers at the Center for Biology of Natural Systems (CNBS), "...there are no proven pollution control devices to eliminate emissions of

...10

chlorinated dioxins and furans" (Shapiro, 1985). There have been too many documented studies and on-site findings for any literate person to refute this statement and this has led the proponents of incineration to try another area of attack - stack monitoring to prove their claims. We need go no further in this area as we have already discredited these statements earlier. This now leaves us with the final hurdle - dioxin toxicity.

There can be no doubt about the toxicity of dioxins and their entire group of chlorinated cousins. The most toxic is 2 3 7 8 TCDD that is found at the Vertac site as well in the area surrounding all municipal and toxic incinerator sites. This dioxin is 2000 times more toxic than strychnine and 150,000 times more toxic than cyanide according to an advisory issued by the Missouri Division of Health. According to a report issued by the much ignored EPA Scientific Committee, "dioxin is the most potent cancer-inducing synthetic chemical known to man." This report was issued in 1985 and has prompted a great deal of research into just how dioxin reacts with humans.

It is now widely accepted that dioxin is neither a carcinogen nor a cancer inducer. Dioxins can be referred to as a cancer "inviter" for lack of a better phrase. Dioxin reacts with the body the same way that steroids do - they bond with the many receptor molecules in our cells and in turn attach to our DNA. The dioxin has now effectively replaced one of our bodies natural hormones and begins to turn our genetic signals off and on in an inappropriate way leading to a host of serious problems.

By attacking us genetically, the dioxin alters the function of our DNA. The DNA is our own individual "personal computer" that essentially runs all of our body systems as well as controlling our growth rate and immune system. It is this ability that explains how dioxins promote cancer and other diseases of the central nervous system.

The debate on the effects of dioxin will continue for as long as there are scientists who are industry-supported rather than acting on an independant level. There are prime examples that are already documented that prove that this man-made chemical should not be allowed to exist at all.

It is common to read of the much reported incident at Seveso, Italy. This chemical accident resulted in the release of close to six pounds of TCDD into the surrounding population. Over one thousand domestic animals died within days but there did not seem to be any effect on the humans exposed. A study often quoted reveals that there were quite a number of chlorachne cases reported and a small elevation in abortions but nothing else came to light. In part, whoever quotes this study is correct to a degree; there was no elevated rates of cancers or other diseases because the study was completed a short period of time after the accident but, the latency rates for most cancers fall in the 7 - 40 year range.

...11

There is a new study rarely alluded to that monitored the period between 1976 - 1986 that has a different view on the toxicity of TCDD. Even this study was completed just more than ten years after the incident and it too barely enters the known latency rate formula.

The results of this study recently released by the American Journal of Epidemiology found that women in the area were suffering from elevated cancers of the vagina, rectum, liver and gall bladder. There was also an alarming increase in soft tissue sarcomas - an extremely rare form of skin cancer that was reported to be 57 times the level that should have occurred. The men in the area were suffering from circulatory disorders, chronic rheumatic heart disease and a high incident rate of stroke. Both the men and women were afflicted with other forms of serious skin cancers, leukemia and brain tumors. The conclusion of the decade-long study was that it is definitely misleading and untrue for anyone to state that there is no evidence of cancer or other serious disease among humans exposed to dioxins.

In Seveso, they were subjected to a one-time exposure - what is going to happen to people exposed every day, every hour and every minute? Inarguably, there are varying levels of toxicity in the various groups of dioxins but as George Baggett says, "...the difference is like comparing being run over by an eighteen-wheeler or a dump truck. The results are similar."

The research continues as more of us become aware of the toxic nightmare that is upon us. Currently there are three studies underway in various countries including Canada, that are investigating the potential relationship between dioxin contamination and AIDS. We know that dioxin contamination causes thymic atrophy or a wasting away of the immune system - the possible parallels seem plausible. This correlation is based in part on a correlation between the production of chlorinated hydrocarbons and the thermal destruction of these chemicals. Once the latency period is factored in, the "best case" scenario for the emergence of an immune system disease on a large scale such as Aids closely corresponds to the outbreak of the disease. Dioxins are fat-soluble and therefore store in the fatty regions of the body. As a person diets or if a person does not lead a healthy and nutritional lifestyle, the body begins to re-absorb the fat it needs for energy. It is believed that the dioxins re-enter our bloodstream and attack on a large scale at this point which causes a rapid wasting away of the immune system as is the case in AIDS patients. Once the immune system is destroyed, the body has lost it's ability to fight disease and is vulnerable to a host of cancers and other disorders.

...12

An excellent analogy regarding the toxicity of dioxin has been made by Dr. Peter Montague. One aspirin tablet weighs 5 grains or 325 million femtograms. To show the expressed "safe" lifetime dose of TCDD, you must take this aspirin tablet and divide it into over 32 million pieces and each miniscule piece remaining represents one "safe" lifetime dose according to the EPA.

We all realize the need to handle our hazardous wastes and can respect the immense pressure on key individuals to handle this problem in a proper and more importantly humane way. There is no easy solution to our problem as many would have us believe as the variables concerned are numerous and complicated. In regards to incineration however, there are quite simply too many validated studies and concerns to allow this process to continue at its' present pace.

Forget about Izone International and our technology as the validity of our claims has nothing to do with our concerns - they are two seperate situations entirely. The "proof will be in the pudding" so to speak regarding our technology as soon as we come on line. Forget about politics as well as this area too has no real bearing on this problem. No, these items are not the issue here at all. Any attempt to discredit this company or any politicians will not make this serious threat go away.

Scott McDonnell

E.J. Kirby

cc:

Sharon Golgan,
Citizens Against The Burn.

Ruby Brown,
People Against a Chemically Contaminated Environment.

Dr. George Baggett - Chairman,
Air and Waste Management, Environmental Science Division.

Dr. Barry Commoner,
Center for the Biology of Natural Systems.

Pat Costner,
Greenpeace International.

John O'Connor,
National Toxics Campaign.

Dr. Peter Montague,
Rachel's Hazardous Waste News.

Ralph Nader,
Washington, D.C.

James Deacon,
Macleans Magazine.

Andrea Dorfman,
Time Magazine.

Barbara Piles,
C.N.N. News.

Stephanie Arbarbanel,
Family Circle Magazine.

Sam Donaldson,
Prime Time Live - ABC Television.

Susan Oakie,
Washington Post - National Desk.

Martin Middlestaet,
Toronto Globe and Mail.

Micheal DeCourcy Hinds,
New York Times.