



April 18, 2016

The Honorable Barack Obama
President of the United States
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Ave. NW
Washington, DC 20500

Re: Monsanto Shield Provision in H.R. 2576 - TSCA Reform Legislation

Dear Mr. President:

Waterkeeper Alliance is the largest and fastest growing nonprofit solely focused on clean water. We strengthen and grow a global network of grassroots leaders protecting everyone's right to clean water. Today, Waterkeeper Alliance is made up of over 280 Waterkeeper Organizations protecting rivers, lakes and coastal waterways on 6 continents. Our goal is swimmable, drinkable and fishable water everywhere.

We are writing to request that you oppose, and veto if necessary, an unconscionable attempt by Congressional Republicans to use Toxic Substances Control Act ("TSCA") reform to shield Monsanto from liability for billions of dollars in damages caused by toxic polychlorinated biphenyls ("PCBs"). At the last minute, Republican House Energy and Commerce Committee staff members surreptitiously inserted a potential liability shield provision into Section 7(c) of H.R. 2576. The provision, while purporting to maintain the status quo, creates an implication of pre-existing preemptive effect for TSCA Section 6(e) – the 1976 TSCA provision that led to a ban on Monsanto's manufacture of PCBs.

Monsanto was, in essence, the sole manufacturer of PCBs in the U.S., producing roughly 1.4 billion pounds of PCBs between 1930 until 1977. Monsanto continued production for roughly a decade after learning that these persistent, toxic chemicals were contaminating natural resources and harming people around the world. The 1976 TSCA PCB ban did not halt the spread of PCB pollution or prevent the damage caused by PCB exposure, which includes cancer, neurological damage, immunological damage, and other severe human health problems. Unborn children, infants and school age children are uniquely susceptible to injury as early-life exposure to PCBs causes neurodevelopmental effects, such as lowered intelligence and behavioral deficits, including inattention and impulsive behavior.

CLEAN WATER  STRONG COMMUNITIES

PCBs are in our bodies, homes, schools, and businesses; in the water and air; in our drinking water and food supplies; and in fish, wildlife and plants. In the United States alone, more than 80,000 miles of streams/ivers, 2.9 million acres of lakes/reservoirs, and 8,000 square miles of estuaries are contaminated with PCBs. Cities, governments, school districts, and individuals across the country have been forced to sue Monsanto to address PCB pollution and recoup potentially billions of dollars in associated damages. Monsanto and its corporate successors are already using Section 7(c) of H.R. 2576 to argue in a federal court case that TSCA has always shielded it from liability.

Waterkeeper Alliance shares your Administration's commitment to reforming and strengthening TSCA. However, as Congress attempts to reconcile H.R. 2567 with S. 697, we urge you to oppose this reprehensible attempt to shield Monsanto from liability for the massive damage it caused, and continues to cause, to people and natural resources. If this provision is included in the final TSCA reform bill, we urge you to exercise your veto power to ensure that our nation's health and environmental interests are not sacrificed to protect Monsanto's ill-gotten profits.

Respectfully yours,

Marc A. Yaggi, Executive Director
Waterkeeper Alliance, Inc.
New York, New York

John L. Wathen, Hurricane Creekkeeper
Friends of Hurricane Creek
Tuscaloosa, Alabama

Myra Crawford, PhD, MPH
Executive Director
Cahaba Riverkeeper
Birmingham, Alabama

Casi Callaway
Executive Director & Baykeeper
Mobile Baykeeper
Mobile, Alabama

Michael William Mullen, Riverkeeper
Choctawhatchee Riverkeeper
Banks, Alabama

Kate McLaughlin, Executive Director
Prince William Soundkeeper
Cordova, Alaska

Nelson Brooke, Riverkeeper
Black Warrior Riverkeeper
Birmingham, Alabama

Jennifer Kalt, Director
Humboldt Baykeeper
Arcata, California

Frank Chitwood, Riverkeeper
Coosa Riverkeeper
Birmingham, Alabama

Garry Brown, Executive Director
Orange County Coastkeeper
Costa Mesa, California

William Y. Shugart IV, Waterkeeper
Little River Waterkeeper
Mentone, Alabama

Don McEnhill, Executive Director
Russian Riverkeeper
Healdsburg, California

Garry Brown, Executive Director
Inland Empire Waterkeeper
Riverside, California

Matt O'Malley, Waterkeeper
Legal & Policy Director
San Diego Coastkeeper
San Diego, California

Sejal Choksi-Chugh
Executive Director & Baykeeper
San Francisco Baykeeper
Oakland, California

Cindy Medina, Riverkeeper
Alamosa Riverkeeper
Capulin, Colorado

Jeff Kelble, President
Potomac Riverkeeper Network
Washington, DC

Dean Naujoks,
Potomac Riverkeeper
Washington, DC

Dan Tonsmeire, Riverkeeper
Apalachicola Riverkeeper
Apalachicola, Florida

Harrison Langley
Collier County Waterkeeper
Naples, Florida

John Capece,
Caloosahatchee Riverwatch,
A Waterkeeper Affiliate
LaBelle, Florida

Laurie Murphy, Coastkeeper
Emerald Coastkeeper
Pensacola, Florida

Neil A. Armingeon, Riverkeeper
Matanzas Riverkeeper
St. Augustine, Florida

Justin Bloom, Executive Director
Suncoast Waterkeeper
Sarasota, Florida

Buck Ryan, Waterkeeper
Snake River Waterkeeper
Boise, Idaho

Adrienne Cronebaugh, Executive Director
Kootenai Environmental Alliance
Lake Coeur D'Alene Waterkeeper
Coeur d'Alene, Idaho

Rae Schnapp, Ph.D., Riverkeeper
Banks of the Wabash, Inc.
Lafayette, Indiana

Art Norris, Waterkeeper
Quad Cities Waterkeeper
Davenport, Iowa

Dawn Buehler, Riverkeeper
Kansas Riverkeeper, Friends of the Kaw
Mission, Kansas

Paul Orr, Riverkeeper
Lower Mississippi Riverkeeper
Baton Rouge, Louisiana

Dean Wilson, Executive Director
Atchafalaya Basinkeeper
Plaquemine, Louisiana

Kathy Phillips, Assateague Coastkeeper
Executive Director of the Assateague
Coastal Trust
Berlin, Maryland

Fred Kelly, Riverkeeper
Severn Riverkeeper
Annapolis, Maryland

Elizabeth Nicholas, Executive Director
Waterkeepers Chesapeake
Takoma Park, Maryland

Brent Walls, Riverkeeper
Upper Potomac Riverkeeper
Williamsport, Maryland

Tim Gray, Riverkeeper
Housatonic Riverkeeper
Lenoxdale, Massachusetts

Jill Jedlicka, E.D. & Riverkeeper
Buffalo Niagara Riverkeeper
Buffalo, New York

Lee Willbanks
Upper St. Lawrence Riverkeeper
Executive Director, Save The River
Clayton, New York

Paul Gallay, Hudson Riverkeeper
Riverkeeper, Inc.
Ossining, New York

Joseph Campbell, President
Seneca Lake Guardian,
A Waterkeeper Affiliate
Watkins Glen, New York

Daniel J. Gulizio, Executive Director
Peconic Baykeeper
Quogue, New York

Hartwell Carson, Riverkeeper
French Broad Riverkeeper
Asheville, North Carolina

Larry Baldwin, Waterkeeper
Crystal Coast Waterkeeper
Morehead City, North Carolina

Brian Wegener, Riverkeeper
Tualatin Riverkeepers
Tualatin, Oregon

Carol Parenzan, Riverkeeper
Middle Susquehanna Riverkeeper
Lewisburg, Pennsylvania

Topher Hamblett, Director of Advocacy
Save the Bay, Narragansett Bay
Narragansett Baykeeper
South County Coastkeeper
Narragansett Bay Riverkeeper
Providence, Rhode Island

Emma Gerald Boyer, Riverkeeper
Waccamaw Riverkeeper
Conway, South Carolina

Mark Frondorf, Riverkeeper
Shenandoah Riverkeeper
Berryville, Virginia

Jeff Turner, Riverkeeper
Blackwater Nottoway Riverkeeper
Sedley, Virginia

Lee First, North Sound Baykeeper
RE Sources for Sustainable Communities
Bellingham, Washington

Chris Wilke, Soundkeeper
Puget Soundkeeper Alliance
Seattle, Washington

Jerry White, Jr., Spokane Riverkeeper
Center for Justice
Spokane, Washington

Angie Rosser, Waterkeeper
West Virginia Headwaters Waterkeeper
Charleston, West Virginia

Cheryl Nenn, Riverkeeper
Milwaukee Riverkeeper
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

cc: Gina McCarthy, EPA Administrator

ATTACHMENTS



TOXIC LEGACY: Monsanto and PCB Contamination

“But, the most important thing about PCB's ... is that we have identified a mad dog—a known bad actor in the case of PCB. There is no doubt about its toxicity and danger in the environment. It has caused millions of dollars worth of damage in the United States; the time has arrived to get rid of it.” - Statement of Congressman Gude, Legislative History of TSCA (1976).

Monsanto was, in essence, the sole manufacturer of PCBs in the United States from 1930 until 1977. PCBs are an extremely toxic, persistent chemical that can cause cancer, neurological damage, immunological damage, and other severe human health problems. Monsanto contaminated the entire planet with PCBs through its manufacture, distribution and aggressive marketing of roughly 1.4 billion pounds of PCBs during this period.

Due to the toxicity of PCBs and widespread PCB contamination of air, water and soils in the U.S., Congress singled out these toxic chemicals and explicitly banned the manufacture processing and distribution of PCBs for non-enclosed uses under TSCA in 1976. EPA banned all manufacturing, processing and distribution of PCBs under TSCA by 1979.

MONSANTO - PROFITS OVER PEOPLE

Monsanto knew that PCBs were toxic to humans and other living things, and that these toxic chemicals were being released into the environment, but the company did

not stop producing them and did not properly warn the public about the danger. Monsanto was aware of PCB toxicity in 1930s. Even after the mid-1960s, when it became fully recognized by others that PCBs were dangerous and that large amounts were escaping into the environment, Monsanto continued to produce, distribute and market PCBs until 1977.

Instead of taking action to protect the public, in 1969, Monsanto created a PCB Committee to develop a strategic action plan that: (1) Protected continue sales of PCBs; (2) Permitted continued development of new uses and sales of PCBs and (3) Protected Monsanto's public image.

“[T]here is little probability that any action that can be taken will prevent the growing incrimination of specific [PCBs] as nearly global environmental contaminants leading to contamination of human food . . . There are, however, a number of actions which must be undertaken in order to prolong the manufacture, sale and use of these particular [PCBs] . . .” - Monsanto PCB Committee (1969).

“The truth is that PCBs are everywhere. They are in meat, they are in everyone in the courtroom, they are everywhere and they have been for a long time . . .” - Monsanto Attorney Opening Statement, Owens v. Monsanto (N.D. Alabama April 4, 2001).

By the time Monsanto ceased production in 1977, it was estimated that 150 million pounds were already free in the environment, 290 million pounds were in dumps or landfills that constitute continuing sources of release, and at least 10 million pounds of PCBs were released each year through vaporization, leaks and spills. EPA also reported in 1977 that PCBs were present in significant concentrations in waterways around the world and in the milk of nursing mothers throughout the country.

Today this toxic pollution persists all over the world in our bodies, in our homes and schools, in the water, in the air, in our food supplies, in our drinking water, and in fish, wildlife and plants. Monsanto’s toxic PCBs continue to be transmitted through the placenta or mother’s milk to unborn children and infants.

- **U.S. SCHOOLS:** Thousands of American schools built between 1950 and 1979 contain hazardous concentrations of PCBs in their window caulking and lighting fixtures, endangering millions of children with mitigation running from approximately \$1 million to \$3 million per building
- **SUPERFUND SITES:** According to the EPA CERCLIS Superfund program database, PCBs have been identified as a contaminant at more than 300 NPL or non-NPL sites, including major cleanup sites like the Hudson River, Hanford, Anniston, and Fox River.
- **TOXIC RELEASES:** In 2014, according to EPA’s Toxic Release Inventory, 3.8 million additional pounds of PCBs were released into the environment at 87 different locations in the United States.

U.S. Waterways Contaminated by Monsanto’s PCBs

- **80,000 Miles of Streams and Rivers**
- **2.9 Million Acres of Lakes and Reservoirs**
- **39,000 Square Miles of the Great Lakes**
- **8,000 Square Miles of Estuaries**

BUSINESS DAY

Chemical Safety Bill Could Help Protect Monsanto Against Legal Claims

By ERIC LIPTON FEB. 29, 2016

WASHINGTON — Facing hundreds of millions of dollars in lawsuits, the giant biotechnology company Monsanto last year received a legislative gift from the House of Representatives, a one-paragraph addition to a sweeping chemical safety bill that could help shield it from legal liability for a toxic chemical only it made.

Monsanto insists it did not ask for the addition. House aides deny it is a gift at all. But the provision would benefit the only manufacturer in the United States of now-banned polychlorinated biphenyls, chemicals known as PCBs, a mainstay of Monsanto sales for decades. The PCB provision is one of several sticking points that negotiators must finesse before Congress can pass a law to revamp the way thousands of chemicals are regulated in the United States.

“Call me a dreamer, but I wish for a Congress that would help cities with their homeless crises instead of protecting multinational corporations that poison our environment,” said Pete Holmes, the city attorney for Seattle, one of six cities suing Monsanto to help cover the costs of reducing PCB discharge from their sewers.

The House and the Senate last year both passed versions of legislation to replace the 40-year-old Toxic Substances Control Act, a law that the Environmental Protection Agency acknowledged had become so unworkable that as many as 1,000 hazardous chemicals still on sale today needed to be evaluated to see if they should be banned or restricted.

Democrats and Republicans — along with the chemical industry and even some environmentalists — agree that the pending legislation would be a major improvement over existing law. But from legal liability shields to state-based regulatory authority, the House and Senate versions have major differences to resolve. The remaining disputes revolve around the basics of pre-emption: Who gets to sue? And who gets to regulate the chemical industry?

A Monsanto spokeswoman said the company had received no special treatment from the House or the Senate.

“Monsanto does not consider either version of the bill, with respect to the effect on preemption, to be a ‘gift,’ ” the spokeswoman, Charla Lord, said.

Already, attorneys general and top environmental regulators from 15 states have written to leaders in Congress demanding changes.

“Our future work depends on striking the right balance to strengthen the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s abilities and funding, without limiting state powers in creating and enforcing needed protections,” said a letter, obtained by The New York Times, sent by the top environmental regulators in California, Connecticut, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New York, Oregon, Washington and West Virginia.

Some of the most vociferous objections relate to the so-called Monsanto Clause. The provision does not mention the company by name, but between the early 1930s and 1977, Monsanto manufactured almost all of the 1.25 billion pounds of PCBs sold in the United States.

The chemicals were initially admired for their ability to prevent fires and explosions in electrical transformers and other equipment. But as the use of PCBs skyrocketed nationwide in products as varied as paints, pesticides and even carbonless copy paper, evidence mounted that they were contaminating the environment and potentially causing health problems including cancer and immune-system complications. The E.P.A. banned their production in 1979.

PCB litigation has surged in the last year as cities and school systems struggle to

comply with directives from federal and state regulators to reduce PCB levels in sewer discharge and in caulk once used to construct schools. Separately, a group of individuals who received diagnoses of a form of cancer known as non-Hodgkin's lymphoma sued Monsanto last year, claiming the company should pay damages.

The Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, in a June report accompanying its version of the legislation, asserted that neither existing toxic chemical law nor any revisions pending in Congress should be seen as a way to "pre-empt, displace or supplant" the right to sue for damages in lawsuits like the ones filed against Monsanto.

The House also voted to preserve the right to sue if individuals or local governments believe they have been harmed by a chemical, regardless of future federal regulations of the substance. But a critical paragraph added to the House bill in late May made sure past regulatory requirements by the E.P.A. would continue to disqualify legal claims, and it specifically referred to the section of the 1976 toxic chemical law governing PCBs, giving Monsanto clearer authority in the future to ask judges to dismiss lawsuits filed against it.

Congressional aides involved in the drafting said the language was inserted at the request of Republican staff members at the House Energy and Commerce Committee. One Republican committee aide disputed any suggestion that this was a gift to Monsanto, but he said he was not allowed to discuss the issue on the record.

And Ms. Lord, the Monsanto spokeswoman, said the company did not ask for the change.

But by November, Monsanto was clearly aware of the provision. Arguing before a federal court in Texas, a lawyer representing Monsanto cited the House language to say that certain of the legal claims against the company's past PCB business should be dismissed.

"The House bill specifically exempts PCBs," ensuring that protection from lawsuits would continue "after the passage of the new law," the lawyer argued, even though the provision remained locked in negotiation.

The House provision is now drawing protests from local officials suing Monsanto to try to recover costs associated with PCB cleanups, and from lawyers who are trying to collect damages for individuals with health problems linked to PCB exposure, including non-Hodgkin's lymphoma.

"Taxpayers and public entities would be left holding the bag to pay hundreds of millions of dollars if not billions of dollars cleaning up Monsanto's PCBs," said John Fiske, one of the lawyers representing the six cities suing to collect money from the company to help cover cleanup costs. Monsanto has not yet argued that the cities are barred from suing, but Mr. Fiske says he is certain that if the legislation passes, the company will make that argument.

Ms. Lord says Monsanto bears no responsibility for cleanup costs in cities like Seattle, San Jose and San Diego.

"PCBs served an important fire-protection and safety purpose," she said in a written statement. "If these products were improperly disposed of, Monsanto is not responsible."

And A. Elizabeth Blackwell, the lawyer representing Monsanto who cited the House language in the Texas lawsuit, says the provision would merely preserve the protection the company believes it already has against claims brought under state law.

"The claims are currently pre-empted," she said. "It can't make them any more pre-empted. So how can it be helpful?"

Monsanto registered to lobby on the chemical safety legislation last July, just after the House passed its version.

The Democratic state attorneys general from California, Hawaii, Iowa, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, Oregon, Rhode Island, Vermont and Washington are mainly concerned with the power that states will retain to regulate chemicals once the revised law passes.

They argue that the Senate version would block states from taking action on potentially hazardous chemicals for as long as four years while the E.P.A. reviewed

them for possible regulation. That, the attorneys general say, could create roadblocks for state reviews already underway on products such as flame retardants in furniture cushions and methylene chloride, a chemical used in paint strippers.

“It could really slow down the pace of progress in the states,” said Ken Zarker, a manager at the Washington State Department of Ecology, which has its own chemical testing and regulation program.

The House bill presents a different issue: It would prevent a state from regulating a chemical if the health risk the state agency was targeting was different from the risk the E.P.A. had already acted on, the attorneys general say. For example, an E.P.A. regulation targeting a cancer threat from a cleaning product could block state officials from regulating the same product to protect consumers from respiratory illnesses.

Despite such concerns, Democrats and Republicans — as well as environmentalists and state officials — want legislation passed this year to replace the current law, which was rendered all but unenforceable by a 1991 court ruling.

That ruling left chemical regulation a patchwork of inconsistent state rules and national efforts by retailers like Target and Walmart to curb the sale of some products under pressure from environmental groups.

That hodgepodge has left few satisfied with the status quo.

Representative Diana DeGette, Democrat of Colorado and one of the lead House negotiators on the legislation, said: “We need to give security to consumers, so they know that dangerous chemicals will be regulated, and certainty to the industry, so it knows how chemicals it sells will be treated.”

Follow The New York Times’s politics and Washington coverage on Facebook and Twitter, and sign up for the First Draft politics newsletter.

A version of this article appears in print on March 1, 2016, on page B1 of the New York edition with the headline: A Shield for Monsanto.



HEALTH NS GHTS WATER

'Monsanto Rider' Would Shield Chemical Giant From Liability for Injuries Caused by PCBs in Public Schools

Robert F Kennedy Jr March 15 2016 10:05 am Comments

416 SHARES



Don't miss out. Stay Informed. Get EcoWatch's Top News of the Day.

ENTER YOUR EMAIL

SIGN UP



The New York Times [reported](#) last month that Congressional Republicans have clandestinely inserted a provision into the [Toxic Substances Control Act \(TSCA\)](#) reauthorization bill that will give Monsanto permanent immunity from liability for injuries caused by its toxic polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs). The long awaited and grievously needed bill is now in the Conference Committee for reconciliation with a companion Senate bill. The so-called "Monsanto Rider" would shield the chemical colossus from [thousands of lawsuits by cities](#), towns, school districts and individuals, who have been injured by exposure to PCBs.



Monsanto marketed PCB-based caulking to schools and other municipal buildings throughout the U.S beginning in 1950, touting the chemical's ability to contract and expand with changing temperatures. Studies suggest that any school built or renovated between 1950 and 1977 may contain PCBs. Photo credit: [pcbinschools.org](#)

PCBs are known human carcinogens and potent endocrine disruptors, which can interfere with physical, intellectual and sexual

development in children. PCBs persist in the environment and bio accumulate in animals and humans. According to U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), children exposed to PCBs can suffer damage to their immune, reproductive, nervous and endocrine systems. Two recent publications from U.S. EPA and the National Institute Environmental Health Science Children's Center at UC Davis report that PCBs can disrupt early brain development, by hijacking the signals that promote normal neuron branching which increase the risk of brain damage, including autism. Between 1935 and 1977, Monsanto was the exclusive manufacturer of PCBs in the U.S. Congress banned the manufacturing of PCBs in 1979 over concerns about its potential to cause severe health and environmental injury.

I've been sparring over PCBs since the start of my 32-year career as an environmental lawyer. For more than three decades I have been litigating and campaigning against General Electric (GE) to force the clean-up of the Hudson River. PCBs manufactured by Monsanto and dumped by GE have contaminated 200 miles of the Hudson, which is the country's largest superfund site. GE's long awaited Hudson River clean-up is now ongoing, but the Hudson is not America's only PCB contaminated waterway.

Monsanto's PCBs have poisoned 80,000 river miles elsewhere in our nation from Washington state's Duwamish River to Connecticut's Housatonic. Seattle and six other cities are currently in litigation with Monsanto to force the company to clean up local rivers and bays. The GOP's TSCA's shield provision would dismiss all those lawsuits. Congress would have the public, not the polluters pay to clean up Monsanto's monumental mess.

Of even greater concern is the burgeoning issue of PCBs in our public schools.

Monsanto marketed PCB-based caulking to schools and other municipal buildings throughout the U.S beginning in 1950, touting the chemical's ability to contract and expand with changing temperatures. Studies suggest that any school built or renovated between 1950 and 1977 may contain PCBs. As the scientific evidence about PCB hazards to human health accumulated in the early 1970's, and regulatory agencies and Congress began moving toward a ban, Monsanto amplified its aggressive marketing of plasticizer PCBs for use in caulk that was applied throughout America's public schools. Despite Monsanto's own internal conclusion in 1969 that PCBs were becoming "global environmental contaminants," Monsanto increased its production of PCBs which peaked in 1970 at 85 million pounds.

The National Center for Education Statistics estimates that 45 percent of all schools in the U.S. (approximately 45,000) were built during this era. About 27 to 54 percent of all these schools—12,000 to 25,000 nationwide—may contain PCBs with little variation among U.S. regions. The costs of mitigation and remediation ranges from \$750,000 to \$3.1 million per building. The total costs to school districts across the nation could be upwards of \$80 billion. As the exclusive manufacturer of PCBs in the U.S., Monsanto is responsible for these damages. I am representing school districts across the country who are suing Monsanto to pay the costs of removing contaminated caulking and PCB laden light bulb ballasts.

TSCA section 15 U.S.C. 2605(e), which was enacted in 1977, requires that every school district with PCBs in caulking and lighting ballasts greater than 50 parts per million, immediately remove these contaminants to safeguard school children's health. However, in 2009, the EPA implemented an informal policy allowing school districts to delay remediation until such time as there were major renovations or demolition of the contaminated structure. The EPA told the school districts that it would not enforce that law if the school district chose to wait.

While this unpromulgated and illegal EPA policy seemed like a concession to financially pressed school districts, it was actually a monumental gift to Monsanto. Most schools, low on cash flow, chose to delay the expensive and logistically challenging remediation projects indefinitely, despite the danger to children. When delays stretch past the five year statute of limitations (which begins running when the school district becomes aware—or should have been aware—of the contamination), Monsanto is off the hook. Those \$80 billion in Monsanto's costs are then transferred to local school districts. As predicted, school districts given the option to delay, mostly did just that despite the awful consequences to future taxpayers.

It's important to understand that if a single school district in a state files a class action lawsuit against Monsanto to recover remediation costs, the statute of limitations is tolled for every district in that state. In most states, no district has filed a class action lawsuit. However, one courageous, pioneering district in Massachusetts chose to file, and that suit had the effect of tolling the statute for every school in that state—creating a deep pool of potential liability for Monsanto. GOP's new shield provision is designed to abolish Monsanto's liability as a favor to the company, which has donated \$39 million to politicians over 30 years.

Documents uncovered during our litigation have confirmed Monsanto's sickeningly corrupt corporate culture. Instead of being a good corporate citizen, Monsanto's decision making matrix puts greed before public health and welfare.

As early as the 1930's and 1940's, Monsanto was aware that prolonged occupational exposure to PCBs might cause liver damage in humans. A Monsanto memorandum dated Sept. 20, 1955, stated:

"We know Aroclors [PCBs] are toxic but the actual limit has not been precisely defined."

In late 1968, Monsanto learned that Japanese citizens were becoming ill from eating rice oil contaminated with Japanese manufactured PCBs. The company responded with a draft Oct. 2, 1969 directive stressing a preeminent focus on its bottom line:

"The objective of the [PCB] committee was to recommend action that will: 1. Protect continued sales and profits of Aroclors; 2. Permit continued development of new uses and sales, and; 3. Protect the image of the Organic Division and the Corporation as members of the business community ..."

An internal draft document dated Oct. 2, 1969, illustrates the moral bankruptcy of the company:

"The committee believes there is little probability that any action that can be taken [that] will prevent the growing incrimination of specific [PCBs] (the higher chlorinated—e.g. Aroclors 1254 and 1260) as nearly global environmental contaminants leading to contamination of human food (particularly fish), the killing of some marine species (shrimp), and the possible extinction of several species of fish-eating birds. There are, however, a number of actions which must be undertaken in order to prolong the manufacture, sale and use of these particular Aroclors as well as to protect the continued use of other members of the Aroclor series."

A document dated Jan. 26, 1970, *The PCB-Pollution Problem*, describes a Jan. 21 and 22, 1970 meeting between representatives of GE and Monsanto. This document appears to make a commitment by Monsanto science and safety division to fraudulently massage scientific data to make their dangerous product appear safe. The document states (emphasis added):

"In essence, results reported by Mr. Wheeler on chronic animal toxicity tests and animal reproducibility studies underway are not as favorable as we had hoped or anticipated. Particularly alarming is evidence of effect on hatchability and production of thin egg shells regards white leghorn chickens. The studies involved Aroclor 1242, 1254 and 1260. Some of the studies will be repeated to arrive at better conclusions."

The GOP is currently working to rewrite TSCA to assure that no jury will ever see these or the many other [damning documents in our possession](#).

If Monsanto gets its way, the American people will pay a high price for corporate greed and political corruption.

YOU MIGHT ALSO LIKE

[Seattle Sues Monsanto Over PCB Contamination, Becomes 6th City to Do So](#)

[California Widow Sues Monsanto Alleging Roundup Caused Her Husband's Cancer](#)

[Why Is Glyphosate Sprayed on Crops Right Before Harvest?](#)

[France, Sweden, Italy and the Netherlands Rebel Against Relicensing of Monsanto's Glyphosate](#)

POWERED BY ZERGNET

How much money can a solar roof save you in Oklahoma?

INSIGHTS



Ken Roseboro

Organic Food Not Just for Hippies Anymore: How the U S s Dealing With Growing Demand



Mark Ruffalo

Mark Ruffalo: TPP Would Fuel Climate Chaos and Empower Corporate Polluters



Dr. David Suzuki

David Suzuki: Tapping Earth s Abundant Geothermal Energy

Don't miss out. Stay Informed.

Get EcoWatch's op News of the Day

SIGN UP

HOME | ABOUT | ADVERT S NG | PR VACY POL CY | TERMS OF USE | CONTACT



© 2016 EcoWatch All Rights Reserved