May 4, 1939

Mr. D. W. Hone
Tide Water Associated Oil Company
79 New Montgomery Street
San Francisco, California

Dear Mr. Hone:-

This is to let you know that I received your letter of April 10th and the copy of your petition. I apologize for not having acknowledged the receipt of both but I was prompt in passing the petition on to the legal advisors of Ethyl Gasoline Corporation. I have the assurance of Mr. Loder that he will make such comments as seem pertinent, and useful.

Having been out of town I was unable sooner to make reply to your letter. I have examined the petition carefully and I regard it as a masterful presentation of the essential facts. I think your choice of directly quoted material was very good and, in my opinion, it was also quite fair. My only criticisms referred to several typographical errors and one or two inconsequential references to my professional connection which were not strictly true, and which may not be wholly calculated to be advantageous. I refer here particularly to the statement that I had had some advisory relationship to the United States Public Health Service. This is not strictly true and the Service would not take it altogether kindly if it were brought to their attention that I had made any such claim, which, in fact, I did not do. Such relationship as I have had to the Public Health Service has been in a purely cooperative relationship of one scientific worker and professional man to another engaged in the same type of work. This is obviously a matter of no consequence and I mention it only in case this matter should be brought into question.

It does not appear that there is anything which I can contribute further in this case,

but I am sure you will not hesitate to let me know if any occasion arises in which I can be of service.

Sincerely yours,

RAK:ls

Robert A. Kehoe, M.D.

P.S. Since writing this letter, I have received a notation from Mr. B. C. Loder of the New York office of Ethyl Gasoline Corporation, the essential portion of which I quote herewith.

"It seems to me that it covers very well the essential questions at issue and, after reading it, I am all the more at a loss to understand why the Industrial Commission decided in favor of the applicant."

RAK.