

June 5, 1947

Mr. E. O. Jones,  
Ethyl Corporation,  
Chrysler Building,  
New York City 17.

Dear Ellie:

Your letter of May 23, relating to a sample of TEL supplied to Dr. G. Goldfinger of the University of Buffalo by the Manufacturing Department at Baton Rouge, calls attention to what is, I believe, the first instance of this type. So far as I know, Baton Rouge has never supplied any TEL for experimental purposes previously. Indeed if they have been, we should establish the facts.

In my opinion this situation should be handled in precisely the same manner as we have handled other incidents of this type. In my opinion either you or I should take this matter up with the Manufacturing Department and should arrange a mechanism whereby the authority for such a procedure is vested in a specific individual in the Manufacturing Department, who will unfailingly report the circumstances to you and to me. As I pointed out previously, it is necessary for medico-legal reasons that I know and have a record of all such incidents. I see no reason why Dr. Kurt and his associates should not exercise the same right as that of Dr. Calingaert, to supply small quantities of TEL for bona fide experimental purposes to capable and responsible scientific colleagues. On the other hand, they should not supply ETHYL brand of antiknock compound, or for that matter, TEL, except under conditions that are fully understood and are covered by Company policy. Where experimental work leading to industrial processes are involved, actual or potential, the facts should be known and passed upon. In my opinion it is highly important, in view of the competitive aspects of this business in the near future that we should keep a tight line on all of our activities in this regard. It is particularly important that all of us who are responsible for policies and procedures with respect to safety, should be entirely aware of all of the developments along this line.

Very truly yours,

---

Robert A. Kehoe, M. D.

RAK ef