

King also spoke of another monkey which he gave as number 35 which had been on compound 5066 which he said was an analogue of Mer 29. He was under the impression that Control Monkey 35 Male had actually been on this drug prior to being used as a control animal.

In explaining why all autopsies were not made the same day, King said that this was because they were freezing tissue at the same time, and it would thus be impossible to prepare and freeze the tissue for all of the monkeys on any one day.

He mentioned that it was obvious the firm was looking for a scapegoat. He said that he couldn't care less, because he could always get a job.

One interesting sidelight was that he told us he had copies of all the pages of the notebooks for us the afternoon that Dr. Nestor, Dr. Goldenthal and Inspector Rice were at the firm (April 9), but he was told not to turn them over to us.

King admitted that he personally prepared all the microscopic sections of the tissues and examined them himself at the end of the study, and he personally had autopsied the drug monkeys 49, 34, and 51. He could not explain why there was no raw data on the autopsy of monkey 34 in the notebooks, but felt that the records he had of the weights, the fact that they actually had the tissues in paraffin blocks, etc. proved that the money was in fact autopsied on 2/26/59.

King stated that the second edition of the brochure sent out with Mer 29 made no mention of his findings on female monkey 49 which he had reported. He said that he had observed morphological changes in the ovaries and had so reported these on his autopsy reports. He said that it was Dr. Van Maanen's decision to leave out this information so that investigators supervising clinical studies on Mer 29 wouldn't know about it.

King mentioned that Mr. Holthaus, who he has as his assistant, was not in this department at the time these Mer 29 studies submitted with the NDA were going on. He said that he was, however, in the endocrinology department and had transferred to his department later. He identified him as the individual he asked to get the raw data when it was asked for at the time of our visits on April 9 and 10.

King stated that he had searched for the original records of weights and observations made out by the technicians. He admitted that these were kept in loose-leaf fashion on a clip board and these were the original sheets on which the weights were recorded. He said that these weights would have been transcribed into the bound notebooks by the technicians. He identified these technicians as Umberger and Jordan. It appears significant that this corroborates Mrs. Jordan's statement that the original observations and weights were recorded on a loose-leaf type sheet on clip boards. It would appear that any information regarding illnesses observed, any substitutions, etc. would have been on these original sheets which according to King cannot now be located.

Incidentally, King admitted to us that he had been severely reprimanded by Mr. Beckwith and Mr. Lamb for turning over the weight charts to us at the time of our visit on April 9th, and also for letting us examine the bound notebooks.

One other point in respect to Monkey F49, according to King was that there was a weight loss of 1.1 kilograms on this monkey while it was on the drug. He said this weight loss was shown on the chart submitted with the NDA to Food and Drug Administration, but the serious loss of weight after the drug was withdrawn was not shown. He tried to play down the significance of the weight loss by telling us that it was common for monkeys to lose a great amount of weight just as children do when they become dehydrated.

King refused to have us look at or copy any records in his possession at this time. He said the company would have a "fit" if they knew he had them. He said he had to remain "loyal" to the firm within the bounds of "intellectual honesty", and until he knew definitely what his status was with the company, he would not sign anything or allow us to make copies of anything in his possession.

At the termination of the interview, he said he was getting in touch with the firm tomorrow to find out where he stood. We told him we were giving him an opportunity to cooperate fully with the government to supply us with the real facts as he knows them. We told him that we would be getting in touch with him again in the next day or two. He professed that he wanted to cooperate, but wants to know his true status with the company first. We then left his residence.

On April 25, 1962, while Mr. Rice was at Merrell on an assignment concerning Kevadon, Mr. Lamb made a remark indicating that he knew about our visit to