

Central Toxicology Laboratory
Alhambra Park
1600 Alhambra Circle
SK 10 071
Pasadena Alhambra Bldg 2711

Dr. B. D. Cronell
Standard Oil Company of California
576 Standard Avenue
RICHMOND, California 94802
U S A

CONTRACT NUMBER	375
DATE	7/15/75
NO.	
NAME	
ADDRESS	
CITY	
STATE	
ZIP	
PHONE	
FAX	
TELETYPE	
TELEFAX	
EMAIL	
INTERNET	
WWW	
FTP	
MAILING LIST	
ADVERTISING	
SALES	
MARKETING	
RESEARCH	
DEVELOPMENT	
MANUFACTURING	
OPERATIONS	
FINANCE	
LEGAL	
GENERAL	



Date 21 July 75

Dear Dick

My I reply to the points raised in your letter of 9 July.

1. Superoxidic diamines. The Bismarck are now pretty convinced that superoxidic diamines are not the cause of the problem. They have not published this (they never do) but I believe they intend to do so. Since there is some residual doubt in view of the paper by Moore, then it would be advisable to sponsor some work along the lines you suggest. It will be very happy to see this done in the USA. I would be interested to know whether you can be guaranteed on an 1850 basis, but I would leave the proposal to you. I enclose a copy of the Huntington experiment since I understand you did not receive a copy.

2. I think your best contact for experience with manufacturing problems would be the Medical Officer in charge of the plant here,

Dr. F. D. Brown
Imperial Chemical Industries Ltd
P.O. Box 110
Pittsburgh-Sullivan Group
WIDEN, Lancs.

3. Work on dogs using haemoperfusion for paraquat poisoning was done at Strathclyde University and Glasgow Royal Infirmary. The work has not been accepted for publication and will be available in a few months time. Until then no details can be released but it does show that haemoperfusion will reduce the blood concentration of paraquat.

4. I am sorry not to be more helpful with your legal problems. To my knowledge, no one has followed up a case of recovered paraquat poisoning for more than a few weeks. I have not heard of delays in the courts, rightly or wrongly, to paraquat. You possibly can recover damages on our part, very few people have however. I can offer you any sort of problem in the field and we have the support of the official side. Consequently, any allegation of illness due to spraying

11/11/75 - Meeting 20-21-22

To: Mr. J. V. [unclear]

From: [unclear]

Subject: [unclear]

Re: [unclear]

Enclosure: [unclear]

Date: 11/11/75

Dr. B. D. Cronell

21 July 75

never reached serious proportions and we have never had to defend this type of action. Also, since it is not believed that paraquat causes damage there has been no study of long-term effects. This would be very difficult in an uncontrolled population.

As you say, there are sporadic reports of CNS effects in paraquat poisoning although from brain oedema and haemorrhage in a few cases. My impression is that paraquat does not affect the CNS to any significant extent, except in very large doses. Certainly injection of even small quantities into the brain is lethal, but I know of no described lesion. The only remotely connected complaint I have met is that of a peripheral neuritis or neuropathy. This has been alleged three or four times and is, I believe, coincidental.

5. As I believe was explained, we do not intend to do any further studies here on in vivo assessment of absorbents. If you believe that various American materials should be tested, then I think it would be more appropriate for this to be done in the USA. My own feeling, as I explained in a previous note, was that anything was probably of some use but that the particular material used would depend on what was available rather than what was better.

I hope we can discuss these points more fully when you come. It is obvious that the American environment is giving you problems which we have not encountered here or elsewhere. I look forward to seeing you.

Yours sincerely

K. Fletcher

Enclosure