

Exhibit 53

Message

From: Hext Paul PM [/O=ZENECA/OU=ALDERLEY/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=PAUL.HEXT]
Sent: 5/19/1999 7:19:28 AM
To: Kilgour Joanne JD [/O=ZENECA/OU=ALDERLEY/cn=Recipients/cn=Joanne.Kilgour]; Chester Graham G [/O=ZENECA/OU=AGUK/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=Graham.Chester]; Berry Dave DJ [/O=ZENECA/OU=ALDERLEY/cn=Recipients/cn=Dave.Berry]
CC: Hartley Margaret M [/O=ZENECA/OU=ALDERLEY/cn=Recipients/cn=Margaret.Hartley]; Ellis Sonia S [/O=ZENECA/OU=AGUK/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=Sonia.Ellis]; Wheals Ian IBW [/O=ZENECA/OU=AGUK/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=Ian.Wheals]
Subject: RE: PARAQUAT: USE OF AGRAL

Dave,

Aren't we mimicking this in any case by doing the study.

Paul

From: Berry Dave DJ
Sent: 18 May 1999 15:47
To: Kilgour Joanne JD; Hext Paul PM; Chester Graham G
Cc: Hartley Margaret M; Ellis Sonia S; Wheals Ian IBW
Subject: RE: PARAQUAT: USE OF AGRAL

Thanks Graham; if it could be argued (by regulators) that the Agral **might** reduce the droplet size at the pressures encountered under normal ag practice, my recommendation would be to mimic this as worst case. Any dissenters?

From: Chester Graham G
Sent: 17 May 1999 17:51
To: Berry Dave DJ; Kilgour Joanne JD; Hext Paul PM
Cc: Hartley Margaret M
Subject: RE: PARAQUAT: USE OF AGRAL

Dave,

I have a report to hand of work done by Silsoe Research Institute commissioned by Formulation and Analytical Sciences, Yalding which investigated, among other things, the effect of Agral on Reglone particle size distribution. The conclusion was that at low pressures, Agral slightly reduced droplet size, presumably owing to a reduction in surface tension. Size was slightly increased at higher pressures. The study was, however, not concerned with small droplet sizes per se, only VMDs, %<100um and <200um as general categories. At the 3 bar pressure you'll be operating at, I would therefore expect, at most, a slight reduction in size of droplets <100um (drift cut-off point).

Graham.

-----Original Message-----

From: Berry Dave DJ
Sent: 17 May 1999 08:35
To: Kilgour Joanne JD; Hext Paul PM; Chester Graham G
Cc: Hartley Margaret M
Subject: FW: PARAQUAT: USE OF AGRAL

Jo/Paul,

More issues! A view of the possibility of differences in aerodynamic properties of the spray with/without Agral appreciated: as it is included as a wetter, might we get more sticking to mucosal membranes?.... what might it do to spray droplet size?

Graham,

Do you have any comments?

Thanks

From: Ellis Sonia S
Sent: 14 May 1999 23:02
To: Wheals Ian IBW; Berry Dave DJ
Cc: Kowalczyk Bob B
Subject: FW: PARAQUAT: USE OF AGRAL

Dear Ian and Dave,

I refer to your discussion whether Agral should be included in the PQ inhalation studies. Please see the attached.

Dave, generally would Agral be expected to make any impact on inhalation toxicity. I suggest that we add the Agral if there is any potential for weakening our case to the Authorities.

Regards
Sonia

From: Kowalczyk Bob B
Sent: 14 May 1999 16:18
To: Ellis Sonia S
Subject: RE: PARAQUAT: USE OF AGRAL

UK: 0.05% AGRAL ADDED TO 2.0 L/HA AND BELOW

FR: The label says add 0.5 l/ha Agral for best effect (= 0.25% at lowest volume rate), and specifically recommended for rates up to 4 l/ha (of 100/50 PQ/DQ). I think the **registered** rate is without Agral - this is the French distinction between what is registered and what is on the label.

It is clear we **recommend** Agral in a major market. Does this suggest it should be in the test?

Regards

Bob

From: Ellis Sonia S
Sent: 12 May 1999 10:56
To: Kowalczyk Bob B
Subject: PARAQUAT: USE OF AGRAL

Dear Bob,

We are carrying out inhalation studies using spray strength to try to challenge the future inhalation classification for PQ and DQ. For the DQ studies we have added Agral, but my view was that Agral was only added to PQ if very low rates were used and therefore I intended to carry out the study without Agral. Do you agree?

Regards
Sonia