

December 6, 1926.

Dr. John A. Johnston,
Citizen's Trust Bldg.,
Cannonsburg, Pa.

My dear Doctor Johnston:

I wish to thank you very much for your letters of November 24th and December 2d. I should appreciate it very much if you are willing to do so if you would let me have a copy of Doctor Wright's report to you. I should like to have this in order to have my records complete on this case as it will be advisable to report it as fully as possible to Doctor Leake of the United States Public Health Service.

I wrote to Doctor Wright about the matter not knowing that he had been called in consultation by you. I am sorry for this but I was under the impression that he had seen him before you. Doctor Wright very courteously pointed out to me my mistake and referred me to you.

I am enclosing herewith a report of our findings on the analysis of the excreta of Mr. Donaldson. You will note that both the urine and faeces contain lead. A word of explanation is necessary about this, otherwise it might be taken as conclusive evidence of sufficient lead to produce symptoms.

During the course of an investigation of several hundred men, a part of which investigation is to appear soon in the Journal of the Medical Association, we have found lead in minute quantities in the urine and faeces of most men taken at random. In the case of men who have no immediate exposure the quantities are low, they are considerably higher in the case of men who are having exposure. The results in this case in both the urine and faeces fall within the limits of the lead excretion of supposedly normal individuals. They cannot be said therefore to be significant. This simply leaves us so far as the diagnosis of lead poisoning is concerned in exactly the same position as we were before, namely that of complete dependence upon clinical observations.

The results are as follows:-

Urine - 3720 cc. -- 0.41 mgs lead

Faeces -dry weight- 18.15 grams -- 0.25 mgs.lead

The latter figure calculated in terms of milligrams of lead per gram of ash is equivalent to 0.09 mgs.

N 6093

Dr. J.A. Johnston

December 6, 1926

I should say in explanation of the above that these results are obtained as the result of a very great increase in the sensitivity of our methods of determining lead. The reason that such results have not been found previously is that the methods for analysis for any organic material have but recently been developed to their present sensitivity.

If there is any further development in the case of Mr. [REDACTED] I should regard it as the greatest courtesy to me if you would let me know. I do not feel under the present circumstances that it will be fruitful or advisable for me to see him further.

Cordially yours,
