

Syracuse, N.Y. August 27th, 1935

Mr. W. E. Thomas

We attach hereto complete file of correspondence covering the case of [REDACTED] former employee at Ogdensburg, New York, who died in the Heppburn Hospital, Ogdensburg, Friday morning, August 23rd. We were informed by Mr. Ward's brother-in-law that the family believed his death was caused indirectly by lead poisoning, a condition which was alleged to have been the cause of an illness which he had in December of 1933.

For your information, Mr. [REDACTED] was reported ill on Thursday morning, Mrs. [REDACTED] called the office stating that his stomach had bothered him during the previous evening and that morning and that he could not be able to work that day. There was no indication that Mr. [REDACTED] at that time was seriously ill - not until later in the afternoon.

Mr. [REDACTED] was removed to the Hospital early Friday morning, Aug. 23rd, and died a few hours after his admittance.

We were also informed by his brother-in-law that an autopsy was to be performed to determine, if possible, the exact cause of death. We are not in a position at the present time to advise you the results of the autopsy, but will do so as soon as we receive them.

In this connection, our general salesman, Mr. Scannell, attended the funeral Sunday afternoon and word was dropped by the Undertaker that the autopsy indicated that death was caused from lead poisoning.

We have not discussed the matter with members of the family, nor do we intend to in view of the fact that there is nothing definite until such time as the report is rendered covering the autopsy. This will be forwarded to you as soon as we are able to secure it either from the Doctor direct or from newspaper articles.

You will note from the enclosed correspondence that the report of Dr. H. E. Clark, Company Doctor at Ogdensburg, under date of Jan. 4th, 1934, states that the diagnosis is definite - chronic lead poisoning due to the constant inhalation of Ethyl gas fumes. This report, to the best of our knowledge, was never changed.

We would appreciate any comments which you may care to make in regard to this case in the event that we are approached by the family in connection with an adverse report from the autopsy.

R. H. GREEN