PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT

AB-263

November 12, 1948

Mr. W. T. Kelly, Jr.,
Executive Vice-President,
American BrakeBlok Division
of American Brake Shoe Company,
230 Park Avenue,
New York 17, N.Y.

Asbestos Dust Experiments

Dear Mr. Kelly:

The meeting to consider the Saranac report was held yesterday as scheduled, with all the interested companies represented except The Russell Manufacturing Co. I read to the meeting Dr. Kaslin's memorandum of November 3rd and it was the consensus that his judgment was correct concerning the references to pneumonia among the experimental animals. Accordingly, we will not request that this be deleted but merely that it be modified somewhat with the view of placing more emphasis on the factors which made it doubtful whether the disease developed as a result of dust exposure.

It was the unanimous opinion, however, that the reference to cancer and tumors should be deleted and this is a point we will insist upon for the following reasons:

1. The experiments were not directed towards determining the incidence, if any, of cancer as a result of asbestos dust exposure.

2. Dr. Gardner indicated prior to his death that he believed this aspect should be made the subject of a separate study, which would take from two to three years.

3. Dr. Gardner also indicated that he believed the question of cancer susceptibility should be omitted from the report. This statement is contained in his letter to me of February 24, 1943 with which he enclosed his outline of a proposed monograph on asbestosis.

4. It also appears from Dr. Gardner's outline that certain strains of white mice develop tumors without apparent cause and that "such a strain of white mice was unintentionally used in three inhalation experiments with asbestos".

A considerable number of other changes in the report will be suggested to Seranne, but they relate to form and to emphasis rather than to substance, and I believe there is no necessity of detailing them in this report to you.

We have retrieved all of the copies of this tentative and confidential report except the one we sent you, which I note Dr. Emslie would like to keep. I wish, however, you would prevail upon him to return it to us. Everyone felt it would be most unwise to have any copies of the draft report outstanding if the final report is to be different in any substantial respect. The feeling of the representatives of the various companies was very emphatic on this point.

I am enclosing an extra copy of this letter in case you wish to send it to Dr. Emslie.

Sincerely,

Vandiver Brown,
Secretary

VBw

Encl.

cc J.P.Woodard