

COPY

December 2, 1935.

Mr. Charles Wesley Dunn,
608 Fifth Avenue,
New York City.

Dear Mr. Dunn:

Dr. Horwitt and I wish to make the following report of analyses made of chicle, government sample N.Y. 20113. This is the sample we received from government officials pursuant to your request for the same.

Two 50 gram samples were ashed by a technique recommended by the government chemist, Mr. Laughrey. The solution was diluted to 200 cc. Fifty cc. were analysed by our dithizone method and the remaining 150 c.c. by the government's electrolytic method. The results are as follows:

	Dithizone method	Electrolytic method
1.	(a) 5.90 parts per million	(b) 5.5 parts per million
2.	(a) 6.06 " " "	(b) 5.8 " " "

As predicted, the electrolytic method is consistently lower because of the quantitative difficulties associated with the handling of the lead sulphide precipitate. Electrolytic sample 1b was treated with sodium polysulphide to remove any tin that might be present. Electrolytic sample 2b was not treated for removal of tin. On the basis of the above results it is probable that the step calling for removal of tin, a procedure which is time-consuming and of questionable merit, may be omitted when analysing chicle for lead by the electrolytic method.

It should be emphasized that the above results are for the part of the samples which we analysed, and, because of the nature of the material, might reasonably be quite different from the results obtained with another part of the same general sample.

We are continuing to make analyses of other samples now available. In order to assist in your development of control work you should perhaps know that Merida, 8th shipment, on analysis is giving higher results, some samples of this particular shipment showing more than 10 parts per million. As fast as we are able, we shall report on these additional analyses.

Very truly yours,

George R. Cowgill.

KE 0006374

N 7569