

CHICLE DEVELOPMENT CO., INC.

500 FIFTH AVENUE

NEW YORK

PLEASE ADDRESS ALL COMMUNICATIONS TO THE COMPANY

November 17th 1936

Messrs. Nelson L. Buck

J.C. Cox

W.C. Arkell

P.L. Becker

J.S. Ellithorp

C.W. Dunn

S.C. Prescott

R.A. Kehoe. ✓

Gentlemen:-

I enclose herewith copy of
a letter from Dr. George R. Cowgill, dated November 16th,
with reference to the method of removing X from maple products,
as provided by Mr. Wharton. In this same letter, Dr. Cowgill
comments on the proper procedure for the next steps in our
problem.

I shall be glad to have your
comments.

Yours very truly

CHICLE DEVELOPMENT COMPANY

S.S. Yates,

President

SSY-W

c: GRC

Encl.

KE 0006394

N 7579

CHICLE DEVELOPMENT COMPANY
500 FIFTH AVENUE
NEW YORK

November 16th 1936

Mr. S.S. Yates, Pres.
Chicle Development Co.
500 Fifth Avenue
New York City.

Dear Mr. Yates,

I have studied the description of a method for removing X from maple syrup, as provided by Mr. Wharton, and have the following reaction to report.

On purely theoretical grounds, it is highly questionable whether this method will also work when applied to chicle, but experimentation alone can give us a definite answer. Without being extremely technical in explaining why I think the method will fail to work with chicle, let me say that the method doubtless depends upon the presence of the metal in ionic form, and this requires that the product in question be in a solution; a syrup could doubtless meet these fundamental conditions. In the case of a product like chicle, this is most questionable. If it should be found to work with a molten chicle, I would almost be willing to venture the assertion that an unusually long time would be required for the reaction to take place. As stated above, however, only experimentation can give us the final answer. I suggest that a few pioneer experiments be performed sufficient to determine the feasibility of this method when applied to chicle, not merely in order to satisfy ourselves on this point, but to be able to show the government sooner or later (see no. 5 below) that their suggestion does not meet the situation, should this indeed prove to be the case.

Since the government refuses to send its technical men to inspect the centrifugation process developed by Dr. Kehoe and associates, some other procedure must be devised. It is my considered opinion that whatever procedure is decided upon, it must include a description of the technical work that has been done in attempting to "clean up" contaminated chicle. Such a statement should give essentially (a) the principle and the plan followed in the experimentation (b) representative experimental data, (c) the conclusions which they seem to warrant and (d) the method of plant control finally developed based thereon. In my opinion, the government is not going to be satisfied until it has been given such a report and had a chance to study it. Let us suppose that such a report has been received and studied by the government and has made a favorable impression. If, now, the interested companies should ask for the release of the chicle in question, under guarantee that it will be processed so as to reduce the X content to below the established tolerance, and only that which is so reduced allowed to enter as raw material in certain manufacturing processes, then the likelihood of favorable action on this request is very great. In the absence of the proposed scientific

KE 0006395

N 7570 01

page two.

report, however, I feel certain that the government will not release the chicle, because it would regard such action as not being in the public interest. I suggest, therefore, that the following plan of procedure in essence be followed:-

1. A scientific report of the research conducted by Drs. Kehoe, Thamann et al., be prepared in form sufficiently detailed to permit governmental chemists to understand clearly and to appreciate the significance of what has been done in a scientific way to develop a method for "cleaning up" contaminated chicle.
2. This scientific report should be made part of a more general report on what might be called the present status of our problem- PART II, - PART I having already been dealt with by Mr. Dunn in his report on the field investigation in Mexico and elsewhere.
3. The general report on PART II should include a request for release of the detained chicle following a study by the government of the scientific report here submitted; or, if such release cannot be granted, an invitation for suggestions from the government as to what they consider to be required in the circumstances.
4. The general report on PART II might well include a reminder that the units of the industry here involved consider they have solved the problem of contamination of chicle in the field, and therefore entertain a reasonable expectation that no more chicle to be imported by them will be detained by the government because of contamination with X. Even in the face of this expectation, and when using chicle passed by the government, the industrial units here involved have established plant control procedures. The attitude revealed to the government by a statement of this type would indicate unquestioned sincerity of purpose on the part of the industry, and voluntary action which goes even beyond the minimum that might be expected. This would help to secure favorable action on the request for release of detained chicle.
5. This report on PART II might well include a brief statement concerning trials with chicle of the method for removing X found effective with maple syrups in order to show that we have tried out even this suggestion. As indicated above, I feel reasonably certain that this method will be found experimentally to fail with chicle. In view of the uncertainty on this point, however, these experiments should be performed as soon as possible, because upon the results will depend in some measure the line of action to be taken next.

Very truly yours,

George R. Cowgill.

KE 0006396