

September 4, 1935

Mr. A. E. Mittnacht
Ethyl Gasoline Corporation
Chrysler Building
New York City
New York

Dear Mr. Mittnacht:

I have given consideration to the matter of the gas masks as manufactured by the Bureau d'Etudes Techniques pour la Defense contre l'Incendie, and described in the enclosures in your letter of August 20th.

I have no doubt that the mask as described is useful for a great many purposes. However, in as much as it makes use of an oxygen tank for supplying fresh air under pressure to the face-piece, it operates under a totally different principle from the masks which we have recommended for protection against the vapors of tetraethyl lead, and it, therefore, has no relationship to the specifications which we have laid down in our regulations. It is obviously in the interests of safety to maintain uniform specifications as to the masks, and to have uniform methods in this respect. For this reason alone the type of mask described must be regarded as unsatisfactory for our purposes. It has in addition several disadvantages over the canister type of mask in that it is heavier and in that there is greater opportunity for technical and mechanical defects. I do not think, therefore, we can regard this mask as suitable for use in connection with mixing plants. However, if the manufacturer of this mask were to make a type of mask which complies with our specifications, I should be glad to give it the same consideration that is given to corresponding masks manufactured by others.

Very truly yours,

RAK:is

Robert A. Kehoe, M.D.

KE 0000485