

17300

Industrial BIO-TEST Laboratories, Inc.
1610 FRONTAGE ROAD
NORTHBROOK, ILLINOIS 60062

088

TOXICOLOGY
ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES
CHEMISTRY
PLANT SCIENCES
MEDICAL SCIENCES

AREA CODE 312
TELEPHONE 378-8880

2	PLAINTIFFS DEPOSITION EXHIBIT
1	312
1	10-15864

624 N. Abrego Drive
Green Valley, Ariz. 85614
Jan. 14, 1972

Dear How:

I am returning the documents on egg quality criteria. These have not been very helpful in drafting the Proctor paper. This is not because the references are inappropriate but because they tend to confirm my notion that much of the data are either fudged or collected with carelessness or incompetence, particularly the data for the supplementary study with 1242.

1. The sp. g. for 7300 are generally lower than the cited normal values (by Ruelke and by Ridlen). I suggest that you get copies of the papers checked at the end of the Ruelke article. Baker and Curtis presumably relate physical characteristics to strain of chickens. I can probably get this paper at U. of Ariz. library. Check sp. g. of your brine solutions with a hyprometer just before each day of measurements.

2. Sp. g. is supposed to decrease with a decrease in eggshell thickness but in 18746 the sp. g. is higher and shell thickness is lower and remarkably constant.

3. It is difficult not to conclude that chick body weights at Day 1 are adversely

004394

EX.12

PLAINTIFFS
EXHIBIT
1432

EXHIBIT
Levinskas 15

MON 005

affected for leane. treatment groups and 089
30-day survival is generally lower for chicks
from treated groups. In future studies
do everything possible to maximize chick
survival.

4. Absence of gross pathology for chicks in
8746 suggests to me that they were not
examined.

My advice for future studies is the
same as it would be for any study.

- a. Do all things defined in the protocol
- b. Do these carefully and report the data
completely and honestly.
- c. Use healthy chicks

I would not alter the protocol defined
for J7300 but you might add observation
for porphyria which has been described as
an effect of PCB's in chickens, quail and
rats by Voe et al., *Tex. appl. Pharmacol.* 17, 652
(1970) and *ibid.* 22, 232 (1971).

I am ashamed to publish the work
done in these studies. One must report
the data but interpretation without
conviction of reality. This is perhaps the
most significant of the Archer studies and
some of my conclusions are not in
agreement with those of the reports (which
I signed without detailed analysis) or
with statements which have been made
by Kip and by Monsanto in discussions
with FDA and environmental groups.
There's nothing like writing for publication
to disclose defects.

Sincerely, 004395
Ofis

MON 005