

CHICLE DEVELOPMENT COMPANY
500 FIFTH AVENUE
NEW YORK

July 14th 1953

Mr. F.L. Becker
c/o American Chicle Company
Thompson Ave., Manly St.,
Long Island City, N.Y.

Dear Phil:

Thank you very much for your
letter of July 14th in which you state the rev ons and eliminations
tentative report on I submitted to

After e report has been amended
again be submitted to the companies for comment before it
forwarded to Washington in final form.

Yours very truly

CHICLE COMPANY

S.S. Yates,

President

SSY-W

cc: WCA JSE JSC HLB
CHD SCP GRC RAK

KE 0006476

CHICLE DEVELOPMENT COMPANY
500 FIFTH AVENUE
NEW YORK

July 14th 1936

Mr. Charles Wesley Dunn
608 Fifth Avenue
New York, N.Y.

Dear Mr. Dunn,

I am attaching hereto copy of
Mr. Becker's letter of July 14th in which he comments on the tentative
report on X which I sent to you. Now that we have received this
report from the American Chicle Company, I would like to make
an appointment to go over all possible revisions with you, so that
the enclosed form, may as be sent out to the companies
for it is finally submitted to Washington.

Yours very truly

EVMI

S.S. Yates,
President

SSY-n

Encl.

cc: WCA HLB JCC
FLB SCP GRC RAK

KE 0066477

N 7600 01

Part II, page 12, paragraph 4.

The evidence given in this paragraph of the particulate nature of the lead is based on the tie-up of the X-ray pictures and the chemical analyses of samples. A person reading the report for the first time might question how we know for certain the particles shown on the photographs were actually lead and not some other metal. While this information is given on page 16, Part III, it is suggested that some reference be made at this point to the fact that a microscopic examination of the residue of Chicle showing a high lead content extracted with solvents disclosed "droplets" of solder of varying size.

Part III, page 16, paragraph 2.

This refers to the essentially satisfactory character of Chicle from certain sources. General Rank leads Chicle is included, but it seems advisable to eliminate this since the Government ordered normal diligences from this source detailed.

Part III, page 17.

The opening sentence of the one paragraph on this page reads:--

"By means of routine analyses of chicle going into production, combined with care in the selection of lots presumably low in lead (on the basis of sources or X-ray examination), the use of raw material containing lead in excess of the tolerance has been avoided".

This is not a correct statement and the paragraph should be rewritten to eliminate it. I feel sure that all of us have used on occasions lots of chicle which analyzed over 2.5 p.p.m. of lead because we knew after they

KE 0006478

July 14, 1936.

Mr. S. S. Yates, President,
Chicla Development Company,
500 Fifth Avenue,
New York City.

Dear Sheldon:-

Our comments regarding Parts I, II and III, of the proposed report of the investigation and solution of the search for land contamination in Chicla, which were attached to your letter of June 29th are listed below. We have received copies of Mr. Pickett's letter of July 8th and Mr. Nelson Buck's letter of the same date and share our attitude toward an item in the same we have avoided comment on it.

July 14, 1936.

Part III, page 17 (continued)

were blended with chicle with a low lead content and chicle substitute and filtered, that our finished products made from the mixture would be well within the limit. This question was discussed at the meeting in Mr. Clark Arkell's office in May.

The next to the last sentence of the paragraph reads:

"The available data of the plant laboratories are shown in Table 2, while the results of a smaller number of analyses carried out in this laboratory are given in Table 3".

It should be made clear what is meant by "this laboratory", which presumably is the Kettering Laboratory, College of Medicine, University of Cincinnati.

Appendix "B"

The American Chicle Company method of control procedure is given in a very much abbreviated form. While it is correct and gives the essentials, a person not familiar with our procedure might gain the impression that our control was superficial and less effective than that of either Beech-Nut or Wrigley. It seems only fair either to give the complete procedure, or include a statement that it consists only of the essential features of a detailed method, or to eliminate the names of the companies or the procedures themselves as Mr. Buck suggests.

We do not agree with one change recommended by Mr. Buck which reads as follows:-

"Page 17, Paragraph 1, end of second sentence - eliminate the wording 'served to remove some of the' and substitute therefor - 'served to remove the major part of the'".

It has been our experience and I believe that of the Beech Nut Packing Company that filtering does not serve to remove a major part of the lead. The statement as it appears in the proposed report should be allowed to stand.

Very truly yours,

F. L. Becker
Vice President.

HAG/AG

KE 0006479