

**EXHIBIT 41**

**FILED UNDER SEAL**

Dr. A. A. B. Swan

Mr. W. Johnston, PPL

Mr. R. A. Hamilton  
c/o Mr. W. Johnston  
Plant Protection Limited  
Farnham  
Basingstoke, Surrey

AAB:ESU

11th May 1966

Chevron Chemical Company: Paraquat Petition

I thought it might be as well to put in writing what I have already said to you about the recent paraquat petition for tolerances on cotton and potatoes by the Chevron Chemical Company, before your visit there.

The main point is that, despite our previous agreement with Jim Kent in 1964, neither Plant Protection nor HRL were given an opportunity to see the latest petition before it was submitted to the U.S. authorities. The petition was sent to the F. & D. A. on the 10th March, and the copies sent out on the same date did not arrive at PPL or here until the 13th March. As you will know, there have been a number of points of detail in the petition on which PPL and HRL have commented, and with which I need not trouble you, but an account of what has happened in the presentation of the inhalation toxicity of paraquat - an aspect which could well have considerable bearing on the success of the petition - will illustrate how much room there is for improvement in our communications with Chevron.

In the petition for temporary tolerances presented in January 1965, reports of work on inhalation toxicity done by Industrial Bio-Test Laboratories of Chicago were included. Subsequently examination at HRL of a sample of the equipment used by Industrial Bio-Test in producing their aerosols of paraquat led us to think that this work had under-estimated the inhalation toxicity, and this was confirmed by the results of experimental work at HRL in 1965. Industrial Bio-Test were informed and agreed to do further work, in the light of which they issued revised reports in January 1966.

You will remember that I referred to the HRL work on inhalation toxicity, when suggesting a threshold limit value for continuous exposure to respirable aerosols, in a paper to the Second Overseas Development Conference at Farnham in December 1965, at which

continued . . . . .

From : Dr. A. A. B. Swan

- page 1 -

To : Mr. E. A. Hamilton

11th May 1966

representatives from Chevron were present. Since the work at IHRL was being extended to other species of animals, it was decided not to issue a report until we had this additional information and the results of this season's partial sampling programme in the field to set alongside the laboratory work. Chevron were told this when they asked in January 1966 for a report of the IHRL work referred to at the Development Conference, and they were advised to obtain in the meantime copies of the revised Industrial Bio-Test reports for inclusion in the present petition. In the event, the old, unrevised Bio-Test work has been submitted in the petition, together with the first half of the paper I presented at the Development Conference, as evidence for the proposed threshold limit value for respirable aerosol concentration. Thus the greatest apparent discrepancy in results has been presented, and this could so easily have been avoided.

I apologise for burdening you with this detail, but wish to provide one specific example of the difficulties that have been caused through lack in practice of the proper cooperation that has been agreed in principle between Chevron and ourselves.

A. A. B. Swan