

Edward A. Greenhalgh
265-7 Regina St. N.,
Waterloo, Ontario
N2J 3B9 Canada.

Mary C. Spearing
Chief: Fraud Section
U. S. Dept. of Justice
Fraud Section
Rm. 1400
New York Ave. NW
20530

John Dockery
Office of Investigation
Health & Human Services
Office of the Inspector General
Rm. 5554 Cohen Bldg.
330 Independence Ave. S. W.
Washington, D. C. 20201

(519)-884-3318

Dear Ms. M. C. Spearing, and Mr. J. Dockery:

Thank you for your kind attention, but please be aware that this letter requires a written response from your respective departments concerning a status report of your investigations and the receipt of my documentation and allegations of misconduct and resultant fraudulent actions by the University of Waterloo for federal funds. I have over the week of November 1st to 6th telephoned each department requesting written confirmation, and each office has replied that my case is being investigated. Had I not been mistreated by various officials in the past, then these statements could be accepted at face value. However, history has taught me the importance of written confirmations; especially if a cover-up is in progress.

I must express personal concerns, feeling that certain individuals may see the whole affair as a contest between themselves and me. If this is true, then it is very childish and irresponsible. "The Old Boys Network" has been mentioned in the media lately, especially concerning intelligence bungling at the CIA (perhaps costing lives). Perhaps, certain civil servants have taken the attitude of, "who the hell does E. A. Greenhalgh think he is?" Quite frankly, E.A.G. sees himself as a little mouse who told the truth and was caught up in a trap made from others' vanities.

I spoke with a very kind correspondence lady at the Justice Dept. and expressed the opinion that the issue really wasn't money: the American government views the Riley scholarship as a mere drop in a very large bucket. The REAL issue is public health and safety, and the Justice Dept. and Health and Human Services (HHS) were willing to accept a new generation of scientists who have no qualms about lying, and indeed, accepts it as part of modern science. I said that such an attitude should be totally unacceptable. Wouldn't it have been better if the DOW Corning scientists hadn't (allegedly) buried their contrary reports. The lady quickly replied, "of course!"

Ladies and Gentlemen, if you think that this is some stupid contest of "you vs. Greenhalgh", please think again. Greenhalgh, compared to the American government is a very tiny mouse, but can't we share a concern for good science? The public, American and Canadian (perhaps the world) depends upon You! On your high standards. And only through the stringent enforcement of your regulations and ethics is the public protected. Please remember that President Clinton is now calling for the highest of expectations in biological and medical research.

Please recall my 10th June 94 outline concerning a "new" abortion treatment and Dr. R. U. Hausknecht's cancer drug/prostaglandin procedure. Note the concerns that my theory raised about the possible damage to women's ovaries and how experiments were proposed to examine the possibility. HHS didn't help me in 1994, but you now must recognize the VALIDITY of my work/concepts. Instead of fighting this little mouse, LOOK AT THE SCIENCE! The potential good! Review the Hoechst-Celanese research proposal. My research concepts build on simple models to examine ovarian cancer, AIDS and the immune system. Simple experiments that can glean new data that others are overlooking. BUT I can't do this work if you are involved in covering up unethical scientific misconduct.

The CIA is an example, being given intelligence and misusing it (accepting double agents reports because they were in the "club"). Bureaucracy protected bad people, while good people were harmed. The new CIA director has stated the matter is cleaned up.

Ladies and gentlemen, good scientists want to help society, and not be involved in court cases. I have documented to your offices how I tried to leave the continent on the advice of a respected American scientist (Fr. Nicholson) to avoid the fight. The fight followed me! People (allegedly) with political ties acted meanly. They cared less about science and benefiting society, but more about themselves and selfish personal interests. And I allege they weren't above exploiting the American government. Perhaps, instead of putting your anger against the Greenhalgh mouse, you'd be better off asking if someone has played the American government for a "sap"? I know that I would be upset if someone used my goodwill for selfish personal interests.

The American government being used for petty personal gain: The University of Waterloo has given signed assurances to HHS for American monies. The mouse, Greenhalgh, almost achieved private funding for scientific purposes. Think about it! UW I allege, gave false assurances to gain American money. What had Greenhalgh GAINED in this fight that he tried to walk away from? I would suggest that a civil court would see a clear conspiracy and consider huge punitive damages more than justified.

Which leads to the point of the letter. If a cover up exists, then all the documentation in the world is useless, and the allegation becomes that Yale was a full conspirator and clearly liable since the misconduct served to protect both funding and reputation: a clear cause and effect. And counsel must be sought; and public and media attention too!

However, if Yale is separate JCM Riley and the University of Waterloo, then the Justice Dept./HHS have a separate case to chare UW with misconduct and the giving of false assurance to gain federal funding (like Dr. Poisson, whom the American government is now suing the institution where he worked). HHS/Justice Dept. should be progressing in this direction, and be able to confirm my request for hard copy documentation.

But if Yale is involved, and a cover up is ongoing, hard copy documentation will never be given. And such a lack of reply/action will confirm that lying and misconduct to gain funds, scholarships and position are acceptable practices in academia. And this should be made public knowledge.

Therefore, under these parameters so set out, the documentation already supplied to the Justice Dept./HHS may also be supplied to any legal counsel, including that representing the accused Yale student. If such documentation also becomes public knowledge can only be viewed as a direct consequence of the failure of the proper investigative procedures to go forward; and may serve to cause a public enquiry for the public good. In the above context (re. Silicon implant reports being buried) the public may find such a direct benefit to the public health and safety.

Again, I re-iterate, my interests have been scientific, and how my work will benefit society. I feel that I am a victim to someone's vanity and corruption. I believe that a foolish contest between myself and the Old Boys Network has occurred. A contest that I did not initiate, nor foresee, but was a direct result of the slander that my work and myself have suffered. I have gone to the Justice Dept./HHS for the good of society and for help to continue the work. If the Justice Dept. and HHS was yto review their own regulations and ethics, and ask if the signed assurances for federal funding concerning JCM Riley and UW were met at the most stringent levels that the public safety now demands (re. Pres. Clinton's call for high ethical standards), or not? The "Not", I allege has interfered with work of value to society.

I must, however, respectfully, place a deadline on your reply. If you can not provide hard copy documentation of an ongoing investigation by the 17th of Nov. 1995, then I am forced to conclude that a cover up may indeed be under way. Then I am free to turn over copies of documentation to any legal counsel, or other so to bring this matter into the public domain. Free as expressed above implies to any extent that I have complied with all expectations of confidentiality that your investigations require, but your actions, or lack of action, has conveyed a lack of propriety on your agencies' part. This lack of action then frees me of any constraint or obligation so that counsel, or public domain may be openly approached without any consequence.

I firmly hope that you are interested in the public health and safety, and good science. That is all that I am interested in, believing that my concepts will help society. However, I can not continue the work without your very real help. I do hope that you are committed to good science, the public good, and ethics. Please accept this letter for what it is: a formal notice.

I urgently await your reply.

Thank you.

Very truly,

E. A. Greenhalgh

Edward A. Greenhalgh
265-7 Regina St. N.,
Waterloo, Ontario
N2J 3B9 Canada.

20 November 1995

Mary C. Spearing
Chief: Fraud Section
U. S. Dept. of Justice
Fraud Section
Rm. 1400
New York Ave. NW
20530

John Dockery
Office of Investigation
Health & Human Services
Office of the Inspector General
Rm. 5554 Cohen Bldg.
330 Independence Ave. S. W.
Washington, D. C. 20201

(519)-884-3318

Dear Ms. M. C. Spearing, and Mr. J. Dockery:

I have not received a hard copy reply to the 17th Nov. deadline as requested, but when your offices were telephoned the “budget furlough” was cited as the reason. I must accept your comments at face value and give latitude as latitude may also be asked of an American civil court in the future. All clauses and content of the 10th Nov. 95 letter remain though, plus additional material in the new request. Given that you already have the 10th Nov. 95 letter, I must respectfully request hard copy documentation by the 28th Nov. 95; plus the answers to the pertinent questions in the new letter. The theme of this final formal notice is public health & safety, and Pres. Clinton’s call for higher ethical standards in biomedical research; and how the public depends upon you for protection.

Protecting society. The Office of the Inspector General has recently investigate the CIA, and found the Old Boys Network to be central to the problem. Please apply the same thoroughness to the present problem which will be illustrated by the Dianne Sawyer (Prime Time Live, 15 Nov. 95) tv report of a researcher (U. of Calif. At Irvine) who is alleged to have violated ethics and the law regarding the use of human embryos. Some of the embryos went to other universities for experimentation without the parents’ consent or knowledge. Please note:

1. He must have given some Signed Assurances to obey laws and guidelines.
2. The people, his clients-part of the public-gave him their trust.

Did the universities receiving the embryos also have to give ethical signed assurances? The question becomes: when are signed assurances to be taken seriously? Maybe HHS is held in contempt, and NO one expects their signed assurances to carry any consequences.

However, IF Signed Assurances are serious, the my points are:

1. Dr. J. C. Carlson (circa 1987, see earlier letter for copy) wrote on my constructive criticisms that “NO oxidation damage” occurred in the JCM Riley membrane preparation and he had checked it out.
2. My legal counsel warned the University of Waterloo that Dr. Carlson and other students intended to repeat my suppressed work at a later date. My 1986-7 suppressed work clearly explained to Drs. Carlson & Riley how oxidation damage occurred.
3. Circa 1990, at Yale, Drs. Riley & Behrman published work where oxidation damage is essential to their explanation. So does Dr. Carlson.

4. Work suppressed circa 1986 – Cell Death Signal Theory-essentially explains Dr. R. U. Hausknecht's 1995 abortion treatment, and note the FDA's 1994 reply. There are ramifications to cancer research.
5. Dr. Carlson also wrote on my thesis, regarding constructive criticism, "how can anyone trust you?" Isn't science supposed to report data truthfully?

From the above, particularly pt. #1., the allegation is that JCM Riley either lied, was incompetent, or both. If we accept that advancing scientific knowledge as essential, and the reason for NIH funding, weren't the actions of the University of Waterloo in suppressing my research unethical misconduct? Hasn't the University of Waterloo deliberately lied (gave false assurances) to the American government concerning JCM Riley?

Lets put this another way. Are ORI (and Justice Dept., HHS) personnel willing to put their jobs and pensions on the line that JCM Riley told the truth, and that NO oxidation damage occurs in his membrane preparation? If not, then ORI admits that JCM Riley lied (deliberately or via incompetence), and that they are prepared to charge the University of Waterloo with unethical misconduct, and giving false assurances. They have a choice! The women who received the silicon implants via the (alleged) buried reports did not. They depended on truthful and competent scientists. Did oxidation damage occur? Yes or no? Please answer the question. The answer constitutes a big part of your investigation.

The next point questions your agencies' commitment to your society as a whole. America has affirmative action programs. I, myself, believe in equal opportunity tempered by fairness and honesty. I am more than aware of the sacrifice required by the underprivileged to achieve a good education. Certain people believe minorities should be given "head start" programs, while others argue elite standards so not to "dilute" academia. Sometimes the elite are only "elite" on paper like JCM Riley was pointed out to you previously, and review the 23rd Sept. 95 letter to OHRC (enclosed) as it outlines special considerations given to JCM Riley over a minority person who broke other rules. As already noted, JCM Riley had a C- avg. Gen. BSc. in physics, and even though his Ph. D. was flawed, he was able to gain entry to Yale. The question is: wouldn't American society have benefited more if a minority student with a B+ avg. in biology had received help rather than all your government's help going to protect JCM Riley? Please ask ORI to answer this question also.

Please realize that Drs. J. C. Carlson & H. R. Behrman are American citizens, and like Yale subject to American laws and expectations. Yale accepted responsibility for JCM Riley through the auspices of Carlson & Behrman. Two people are the minimum required for a conspiracy (technically). Further, reviewing the enclosed OHRC letter, part of the problem, and in response to NIH regulations for a mechanism to resolve disputes, the University of Waterloo continuously proposed Dr. J. R. Behrman as an independent researcher. Please answer the question: if Behrman was Riley's supervisor, is he truly independent? Yes or no? And if no is the answer, then this constitutes proof of unethical misconduct by the University of Waterloo, Then, didn't the University of Waterloo give false assurances? Yes or no?

Here is the crux of the problem: was H. R. Behrman a full and willing conspirator: or duped by malicious slander? Could ORI interview Dr. H. R. Behrman and form an opinion? I am asking Ms. Spearing and Mr. Dockery to supply a status report as the answers to my questions are critical to future actions.

This case is about the safety and truthfulness of science. If scientists are allowed to lie, how can the public trust new drugs and treatments to be safe? The case is also about whether it is acceptable that the American government can be lied to for personal interests and gain? And worst, that American agencies are quite willing to accept these lies rather than enforce laws and regulations that protect the public.

Thank you for reading my material. I realize that my case is very difficult, but your help is needed as I believe that I am being punished for being a truthful scientist. However, if you can not, or refuse to answer my enclosed questions, and supply hard copy documentation by the 28th Nov. 1995 means that you have consciously decided not to reply and I am forced to conclude a cover up is under way. Therefore, I shall be free to approach any

legal counsel or media personnel as outlined previously. I do hope that does not happen as society depends upon your agencies to protect them. Your refusal to act and enforce your own regulations can only be seen as an admission that new drugs and treatments may be greater risks than anyone had feared before. I sincerely hope that this is not the case.

I urgently await your reply as this is a final formal notice.

Thank you for your kind attention.

Very truly,

Edward A. Greenhalgh.