

November 26, 1962

Mr. Wm. R. Perdue, Jr.  
Ethyl Corporation  
100 Park Avenue  
New York 17, New York

Dear Bill:

I am sending to you (and also to George Kirby) a copy of the final report of the California TML investigation. Four copies have gone to the Detroit Laboratory (via Dan Guy) and one has gone to Len Huxtable. Frank Princi, of course, has a copy. The remainder of the 250 copies scheduled for appearance will be assembled and bound (all have been multilithed) shortly, and I shall then be glad to supply all who should have them. Meanwhile, I am gathering a list of recipients, and I'll be glad to have your suggestions as to persons within the Corporation and elsewhere.

I shall not check our correspondence at this time to determine the number of copies of the initial draft which I sent to you (I think it was only one), but I wish to get these copies entirely out of circulation, and I'll be pleased if you will have them (or it) destroyed.

Having received a copy of Dr. Anderson's (USPHS) reply to George Kirby's inquiry as to the views of his associates, I consider that our purpose has been achieved. There is one point, however, which should be known to you. Dr. Prindle suggested to me, informally, that it would be a good thing to check the clinical observations (which, as you will remember, were not done to my satisfaction) some time in the not too distant future, and perhaps to extend them. The latter, I think, is unnecessary, but I believe it would be wise to make further clinical observations while the same people are available (i.e., if they are available), and also to check the analytical findings. I have raised the question of the feasibility (and desirability) of doing this with Dr. Curtis, just as a precautionary step. It is my belief that the findings of this investigation will be questioned, not as to their validity, but as to their applicability in relation to a much longer period of occupational exposure than that involved thus far in the investigation. As a matter of economy, as well as of practical advantage, I would choose to postpone this for two years or thereabouts, for I doubt very much that there will be much question in anyone's mind after such a lapse of time. One must reckon with the fact that California is a hot spot in matters of this sort. The industry will be wise, therefore, to spend a modest sum of money on this at the proper time, so as to secure itself against having to carry out elaborate

KE 0004059

activities in self-defense on short notice.

Frankly, I do not like to do unnecessary experimental work for purely defensive purposes. It is a waste of time and talent that are badly needed for other purposes. That is why I'd like to see this postponed, and yet not forgotten. The only joker is the matter of the turnover of the employees, especially in the service stations in Los Angeles and San Francisco. If there is a good chance of finding a fair proportion of the same persons in the same jobs after the lapse of two or more years, it would be best to wait.

Incidentally, I think it unlikely that any criticism of our work was made (or any suggestion for further work) by Dr. Prindle to anyone but me. It would have been most unfortunate if there had been any reference to this matter in Dr. Anderson's statement of the case. I do not believe there could have been any sound justification for any reservation of judgment in this matter because of the "shortcomings" of the clinical work. The physiologic information was too conclusive to permit of any real doubt on that score. Nevertheless, there are people who are "sticky" about such matters, and Dr. Prindle (or more likely some of his lay associates) seems to be in that category. It behooves us, therefore, to be on the alert to forestall any difficulties in this matter in California.

Sincerely yours,

Robert A. Kehoe, M.D.

RAK:ss

Encl: 1 copy of Final Report of the TML California Investigation

cc: G.F. Kirby, M.D.

KE 0004260