



E. I. DU PONT DE NEMOURS & COMPANY
INCORPORATED

WILMINGTON 98, DELAWARE

October 17, 1945
CC: Dr. Robert Kehoe

MEDICAL DIRECTOR'S OFFICE

S. L. ABRAMS
LEGAL DEPARTMENT

ETRA ETHYL LEAD PLANT
BATON ROUGE, LA.

The above employees of our Baton Rouge Plant were accidentally exposed to TEL several months ago and, as a result, developed an acute intoxication. They have been hospitalized and taken care of medically ever since and neither have returned to duty. I am sending you attached a copy of a letter written by Dr. Kehoe relative to these two men and from it you will see that from a medical standpoint there is no evidence to indicate that there is anything wrong with them and they should return to work.

Under the present circumstances, I am not quite sure as to who takes the initiative in these two cases - whether it be du Pont or Ethyl Gasoline Corp. If it be a responsibility of the du Pont Co., then medically it is our opinion that all compensation should be discontinued at the present time. I presume what is most likely to happen then would be that these men will present their case to the Compensation Commission and demand compensation for a further period of time or possibly some permanent disability and then it will become necessary for our Legal Dept. to decide just how the cases will be handled.

I am passing this information on to you in order that you may in turn, if this is still a du Pont responsibility, issue the necessary legal instructions in order to terminate this situation.

MEDICAL DIVISION

G. H. Gehrmann, M. D.
Medical Director

CHG:MTF P.S. Dr. Kehoe:

I have sent through the above letter to our Legal Dept. feeling that they should make the first move in view of the fact that the situation is a little complicated and I personally am not familiar with the agreement between du Pont and Ethyl.

I assume from your letter that Roosevelt Jackson is to have anti-luetic treatment upon the recommendation of a Neuropsychiatrist from New Orleans. I should like to have a copy of his report for our files and I assume that we will have to pay for his anti-luetic treatment as the difficulty in establishing a differential diagnosis under lead psychosis and paresis I do not believe will stand up in the compensation courts in Louisiana. Is this your opinion also?