

May 12, 1959

To the Members of the A.S.A. Z66.1 Subcommittee:

Dr. M. R. Mayers
Dr. H. M. Cann
Mr. R. J. Eckart

Dr. J. H. Foulger
Mr. Stuart Hoover
Mr. H. G. Lamb

Dr. A. G. Langmann
Dr. T. W. Nale
Mr. H. J. Whitson

Herewith is a copy of a letter, dated May 1, 1959, received from Chairman Mayers.

Because (1) the proposal put forward verbally by Dr. Foulger on March 31 and herein discussed has not yet been confirmed by him in writing, and (2) as Mr. Eckart has informed me that a request relative to revision of American Standard Z66.1-1955 is to be expected from the National Paint, Varnish and Lacquer Association, this expression of Dr. Mayers' views is submitted without present comment.

Copies go to Dr. Kehoe, Dr. Radtke and Mr. Ziegfeld as of possible interest in connection with a forthcoming conference on lead toxicity research.

Manfred Bowditch

Manfred Bowditch
Secretary

MB:N

cc: Dr. R. A. Kehoe
Dr. S. F. Radtke
Mr. R. L. Ziegfeld
Dr. G. M. Wheatley

KE 0014951

(COPY)

May R. Mayers, M. D.
214 East 18th Street
New York 3, N. Y.

May 1, 1959

Mr. Manfred Bowditch
Lead Industries Association
60 East 42nd Street
New York 17, New York

Dear Manfred:

We have just returned from our island-hopping trip - which was very delightful, by the way - and I find in the great stack of mail awaiting me here, several communications from you; one with reference to Dr. Foulger's suggestion that safety limits be set for the substances which are now prohibited in our A.S.A. Z66 standard. I note that Mr. Eckart and Mr. Whitson believe that an effort should be made in this direction.

While, on general principles, I always prefer safety standards to prohibitions, I am inclined to disagree in this case for several reasons:

1) We know so little about safe dosage for ingestion of these substances by young children - particularly dosages in combination with lead and with one another - that our standards would inevitably be weak if not actually unsound. The toxicological research which would be necessary to provide reliable data would be time-consuming and expensive.

2) I question that there would be any great hardship to paint manufacturers if the paints to which they wish to add these substances were not used on cribs etc. for children. Surely, quantitatively speaking, the amounts cannot be significantly great.

3) By trying to add these other potentially toxic agents, we open the door to considerable controversy and criticism of the original standard. You will remember that the U. S. Public Health Service was not very enthusiastic about our standard for lead. Moreover, general suspicion of our standard - such as was voiced to me by that representative of Consumers' Research, which I told you about - would be greatly increased. You will remember, that he seemed greatly reassured when I told him that no additional toxic substances were going to be added to paints used for children. I am sure we would be put to it to prove that the new safety limits are, in fact, sound.

In short, I believe that the present standard is a good one, and that we would be looking for trouble if we begin trying to introduce standards for substances other than lead.

Sincerely yours,

/s/ May

KE 0014952

N18579.01