Because the firm wanted an immediate opinion, Dr. Nantz wrote a letter to the firm explaining his off hand opinion, and this is apparently his letter of November 10, 1961, addressed to Dr. Van Maanen. Dr. Nantz could not remember the exact date of his visit or the letter, but knew that it was in November or December. The dates supplied here were the dates provided from Mr. Brandenburg in his phone conversation with Supervisory Inspector Rice of 6/19/62.

Dr. Nantz verbally told the firm apparently Dr. Van Maanen, that he did not believe there was any relationship between the cataracts in the dogs and the patients because of the very high levels of Mer 29 in the dog study opposed to the lower levels being taken by the human patients. In his letter, he recalls that he did believe the cataracts were the result of the Mer 29 because of the high levels in dogs. but he believes that he finally mentioned in this letter that he could not say whether or not there was any relationship between the cataracts in the patients and those found in the dogs.

Subsequent to his first trip and letter, Dr. Nantz made additional trips to the firm to examine the dogs' eyes. He does not recall exactly how many trips were made or when they were made, but he did make in the neighborhood of six trips extending over a four month period. The last time Dr. Nantz has been out to the firm looking at the dogs' eyes was approximately one month ago.

As far as Dr. Nantz knows, these dogs have not been sacrificed as yet, because the firm promised to call him when the dogs were sacrificed so that he could observe histological technics and examine sections of the lenses.

When Dr. Nantz was out at the firm, he was shown slides of eye tissue sections of dogs which were fed Mer 29 and sacrificed prior to his visit. Dr. Nantz had never examined the eyes of these dogs while the dogs were alive from which the sections were taken.

Dr. Nantz knew that the dogs he had examined and who were apparently still alive now had been on a large dose of Mer 29 for approximately six months. He said that these dogs apparently developed the cataracts rather rapidly after the six months' period, and that the formation of the cataracts was quite variable from dog to dog. He said that in some cases, the abnormalities of the lenses tended to recede even while the dog was on the drug, and then after being retained on the drug, the opacity would continue to progress and develop.

Dr. Nantz also stated that there were skin disorders or rashes which developed on the dogs who developed cataracts. He stated that the rash developed prior to the cataracts as far as he could recall.

Dr. Nantz recalled that there were other dogs on another drug which may have been related to Mer 29. He did not know how many months the dogs were on the other drug, and at this time he is not certain as to whether cataracts were observed in these dogs on this other drug.

Dr. Nantz recalls that a second letter was written to the firm about February 20, 1962. The reason for this letter was that he had been asked by Dr. Bundie to come out to the firm to meet a well-known opthomologist from Des Moines, Iowa, who had made a special trip to Merrell to examine the eyes of the dogs on Mer 29. Dr. Nantz was about ready to depart for a professional meeting and vacation in New Orleans, and since this request came the day before he was to leave, he was unable to go out to the firm and meet this doctor, but he did write an informal letter to Dr. Bundie explaining what he had already seen, and this letter enumerated specific points he had observed in technical terms for the use of this doctor. This letter was much more detailed than the letter he had written in November to the firm.

Dr. Nantz and his secretary searched his files to see if they could find copies of these letters or any other correspondence, but they were unsuccessful.

Dr. Nantz promised to continue to search for any correspondence and to look at home, and if he was able to locate any correspondence with the firm in this connection, he would advise us, so that we could secure such correspondence.

At this time, Dr. Nantz recalled that he wrote only the two letters to the firm.

Although Dr. Nantz has not seen any cataracts in his own practice on Mer 29 patients, he inferred he changed his mind since his original letter, or original opinion that there was no connection between Mer 29 and cataracts in humans.

THOMAS M. RICE.
JAMES A. MEYRING.