
LEAD INDUSTRIES ASSOCIATION
420 LEXINGTON AVENUE
NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

To: Dr. Kehoe
From: Manfred Bowditch

Further on the Chinese baby.

C O P Y

THE CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL RESEARCH FOUNDATION

Cincinnati 29, Ohio

Elland Ave. and Bethesda

June 1, 1955

Mr. Manfred Bowditch
Lead Industries Association
420 Lexington Avenue
New York 17, N. Y.

Dear Mr. Bowditch:

I was most interested to receive your letter and enclosures concerning the Chinese baby that Dr. Byers and Dr. Maloof studied. From the data as given I do not find sufficient evidence to be absolutely sure of the diagnosis of lead poisoning. However, this does not prevent one from searching for possible sources of lead. The two main sources, of course, would be assimilation of lead either through the respiratory tract or the intestinal tract. It is hard for me to believe that the baby could get sufficient lead from the mother's milk without the mother having marked evidence of lead absorption. Therefore I feel that one ought to look more towards a common source of exposure, in particular a respiratory exposure. However, the data as given do not give me any clue and I am sure that Dr. Maloof has made an extensive search in this direction. Therefore I am afraid that I cannot really help out in this case.

Sincerely,

/s/ Hugo Dunlap Smith

Hugo Dunlap Smith, M. D.

HHS/bp

VE 03585

Lead Industries Association

420 LEXINGTON AVENUE

NEW YORK 17, N.Y.

J. B. HOFFNER, PRESIDENT
J. M. BOWLEY, VICE PRESIDENT
K. C. BROWNELL, VICE PRESIDENT
J. A. MARTINO, VICE PRESIDENT
ROBERT LINDLEY ZIEGFELD,
SECRETARY-TREASURER

MANFRED BOWDITCH
DIRECTOR OF HEALTH AND SAFETY

May 31, 1955

Robert A. Kehoe, M. D., Director
Kettering Laboratory of Applied Physiology
University of Cincinnati
College of Medicine
Eden Avenue
Cincinnati 19, Ohio

Dear Bob:


These are just a few lines to express my gratitude for your thoughtful and very helpful letter of May 24th. Just before receiving it on Friday, I had dictated a letter to Randy Byers in which a number of seemingly pertinent questions were posed, and I think I will await his replies to these before deciding just how to pass on the additional commentary you have provided.

My association with Randy has covered quite a few years and I have on more than one occasion had evidence that he is rather more touchy than some of us. Hence, I have thought better of my initial impulse, which was to have your letter copied verbatim and send it along to him.

I hope you can find the time before long to give me in a couple of paragraphs your thoughts on that extraordinary Australian proposal referred to in my letter of May 16th. It may interest you to note from the enclosed what Drs. Cranch, Johnstone and Mayers had to say about it.

I'll be looking for you in Atlantic City, where I'll be parked at the Ritz-Carlton. I am sure Elfriede would welcome your charming spouse as a beach companion.

Sincerely,



MB:MM



16 03586 0017

May 24, 1955

Mr. Manfred Bowditch
Director of Health and Safety
Lead Industries Association
420 Lexington Avenue
New York City 17

Dear Manfred:

I have examined the information supplied with your letter of May 19 concerning the Chinese infant, and although I have several comments to make, none of which would seem to be helpful.

I dislike very much to appear to be hypercritical, but I find no information of the one type that I consider to be absolutely required to confirm the significance of the absorption of lead in so unusual a case - namely, the results of an analysis (or analyses) of the blood of this child. There is no doubt, now, that one may be misled by the results of the analysis of the urine, and this is especially true in the case of the female infant. Moreover, there can be no serious doubt that the clinical diagnosis of lead encephalopathy may be made in error or that it may be missed, unless characteristic or unusual symptomatology can be linked to specific etiology through analytical proof that an hygienically significant quantity of lead has been absorbed. We have seen the diagnosis missed too many times by careful and experienced people to doubt the utility and necessity of the application of the criterion of the concentration of lead in the blood for purposes of differential diagnosis.

The analytical information in this situation is not very convincing to me. It is said that the mother's blood contains a "high normal" concentration of lead. Just what the level is is not stated, and just what is inferred from this is not evident. If it is normal, it has only negative clinical significance, since "high normal" in my book signifies that the value found is within the normal range, somewhere above the mean normal value. As such, it is a normal (physiologic) phenomenon, and it does not signify risk or danger of borderline import.

It is also said that the mother's milk contained no lead, and (sic) by spectrographic analysis. It is hardly possible to make a spectrogram of human milk that does not contain certain of the more sensitive lead lines, if one uses a satisfactory method of preparing and examining such a sample. I am forced to conclude, therefore, that someone lacking in information or experience carried

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
LE 03587

Mr. Manfred Bowditch - (2) - May 24, 1955

out this examination.

It is also said, without stating the range of lead concentration in initial samples of the urine of the child, that Versene has induced an increase in the concentration of lead in the urine, repeatedly. I can only ask why not, since this is the normal response to Versene.

I have no doubt of the experience and astuteness of the clinical work done for this child, but I still ask for the proof of the diagnosis, before I get all hot and bothered about some mysterious source of lead absorption, and I should be glad to offer our services and equipment for obtaining and analysing duplicate samples of the blood of the child, and for that matter, of the mother and father as well. May I say here, that there is no reason whatever for believing, and some evidence to support skepticism, that the milk of a mother with frank lead poisoning, can induce lead poisoning in an infant. The concentration of lead in the milk, while always demonstrable, is more than likely to be low under all circumstances. This, therefore, is an unlikely source, and in a mother with a "high normal" blood level, a preposterous source, of significant lead absorption.

Now, on the other side of the coin, lead is so nearly ubiquitous in the normal environment, and so subject to increase in the artificial environment, that one need not be utterly frustrated at not finding its precise source in all instances. I have had several baffling experiences of this type. At least two that come to mind rather dramatically, have involved adults one of whom was a housewife. The sources of the poisoning of several children have eluded us completely, despite the rather considerable efforts made to unearth them. The case of a nursing infant is a bit more difficult to understand, but even so, this is not always possible. I confess to a certain sense of frustration when we fail to find the source, principally because of the threat that remains undisclosed and thus uncontrolled, to the child that has become ill and to others in the same environment. However, this is not something so remarkable as to be a marvel, in view of the ubiquity of lead. Certainly this is not a unique situation, and especially should I be cautious in dramatizing it until and unless I had the proof of the diagnosis, which, so far as I am concerned, has not been furnished.

May I suggest to you, and if you can do so without offense to Dr. Byers, since I mean only to be helpful and would shrink from giving offense, that it is of importance that the analytical methods and the diagnostic criteria, which we and others have employed over a period of years, should be used generally in the study of cases of this type. I fail to see how our colleagues in Boston can bring themselves to deal with their diagnostic and therapeutic problems without the benefit of the entirely reliable (within completely predictable limits of precision) means of determining the concentration of lead in the blood of patients, and without the physiological background that would enable them to interpret such results with an almost absolute degree of certainty. It is a source of considerable sadness to me to find that there are comments and implied questions in this correspondence, which ought not to be uttered in view

KE 03528

00170

Mr. Manfred Bowditch - (2) - May 24, 1955

out this examination.

It is also said, without stating the range of lead concentration in initial samples of the urine of the child, that Versene has induced an increase in the concentration of lead in the urine, repeatedly. I can only ask "why not," since this is the normal response to Versene.

I have no doubt of the experience and astuteness involved in the clinical work done for this child, but I still ask for the proof of the diagnosis, before I get all hot and bothered about some mysterious source of lead absorption, and I should be glad to offer our services and equipment for obtaining and analysing duplicate samples of the blood of the child, and for that matter, of the mother and father as well. May I say here, that there is no reason whatever for believing, and some evidence to support skepticism, that the milk of a mother with frank lead poisoning can induce lead poisoning in an infant. The concentration of lead in the milk, while always demonstrable, is more than likely to be low under all circumstances. This, therefore, is an unlikely source, and in a mother with a "high normal" blood level, a preposterous source, of significant lead absorption.

Now, on the other side of the coin, lead is so nearly ubiquitous in the normal environment, and so subject to increase in the artificial environment, that one need not be utterly frustrated at not finding its precise source in all instances. I have had several baffling experiences of this type. At least two, that come to mind rather dramatically, have involved adults one of whom was a housewife. The sources of the poisoning of several children have eluded us completely, despite the rather considerable efforts made to unearth them. The case of a nursing infant is a bit more difficult to understand, but even so, this is not always possible. I confess to a certain sense of frustration when we fail to find the source, principally because of the threat that remains undisclosed and thus uncontrolled, to the child that has become ill and to others in the same environment. However, this is not something so remarkable as to be a marvel, in view of the ubiquity of lead. Certainly this is not a unique situation, and especially should I be cautious in dramatizing it until and unless I had the proof of the diagnosis, which, so far as I am concerned, has not been furnished.

May I suggest to you, and if you can do so without offense, to Dr. Byers - since I mean only to be helpful and would shrink from giving offense - that it is of importance that the analytical methods and the diagnostic criteria which we and others have employed over a period of years should be used generally in the study of cases of this type. I fail to see how our colleagues in Boston can bring themselves to deal with their diagnostic and therapeutic problems without the benefit of the entirely reliable (within completely predictable limits of precision) means of determining the concentration of lead in the blood of patients, and without the physiological background that would enable them to interpret such results with an almost absolute degree of certainty. It is a source of considerable sadness to me to find that there are comments and implied questions in this correspondence, which ought not to be uttered, in view

Mr. Manfred Bowditch - (3) - May 24, 1955

of the state of our present knowledge.

Sincerely yours,

Robert A. Kehoe, M. D.

RAK ef

P. S. I was unable to be at the A. S. A. meeting, and thus far I have not contributed to the activities of the Sub-Committee on the lead standards. I shall do my best to respond to your subsequent calls on me for help. Is any needed now, and if so, what?

R. A. K.

KE 03590

66101