



Wynn Oil Company

1151 WEST FIFTH STREET
AZUSA, CALIFORNIA

DEPARTMENT OF
RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT

August 25, 1961

Robert A. Kehoe, M. D., Director
The Kettering Laboratory
University of Cincinnati
College of Medicine - Eden Avenue
Cincinnati 19, Ohio

Subject: New Report on your Toxicological Evaluation
conducted at our Plant last year.

Dear Dr. Kehoe:

It was a pleasure to talk with you on the telephone several months ago on the above subject. We had hoped to have this report in your hands for your study and perusal much earlier but the press of normal business and the absence of certain executives in our office did not permit the conclusion of this suggested format until this time.

We appreciate the position you and your University hold in this matter. We further wish to be as ethical as possible in dealing with the factual information which you developed. After due consideration and in deference to the request you made on the telephone, we have not included any part of any report from any other laboratory in the suggested revision which we are submitting to you. We felt that the worth of and the power of your report was founded in its overall encompassing features. To intermingle toxicological information from other sources with your carefully collected clinical and medical observations would, no doubt, only weaken the impact of the entire report. The fundamental reason for this is that your report embraces a study of our workers who have been exposed not only to our raw products and our various concentrates but also to all of our finished products. In this sense then your examination of these workers in a systematic scientific manner atests to the general level of health of all of these workers after the exposures referred to above. We are sure you appreciate and agree with us then that a report covering a single phase of one type of toxicity carried on on animals should not be included with or even connected with the type of observations which you made.

We have taken the liberty of re-arranging the information which was included in your letter which was sent to Dr. Gleason on June 10, 1960. We feel sure that you will want to make certain suggested changes and perhaps additions to what we envision as a suitable format or vehicle to convey the impact and meaning of all your tests as related to our products. We draw your attention to point 3 under "Results" in which we have deleted actual mention of the chemical element lead which you monitored in your study. Due consideration was given to the alteration which we submit as a commercial alternate to your fundamental report. We are