

SUBJECT:

Handwritten: HAD
FEB 13 1892
AV 1
12 29 91
AM

100 Canal Street, CLEVELAND,

Report of latter and final test on Dahl Lead.

As the continuation of the previous experiment of this Lead I made further experiments as follows:

No. 1 liquid paint, same consistency as S.W.P. using Dahl Lead straight. No. 2 liquid paint same consistency as S.W.P. using one part white zinc to two parts Dahl Lead. No. 3 two parts white zinc one part Dahl Lead. This costs as follows, regular 101.04, No. 1 101.04 No. 2 98.98, No. 3 97.75. The consistency of the three samples are all about the same as our regular. When painted with, we find No. 1 to have little or no body. No. 2 to be some what better. No. 3 being about the same as regular S.W.P., No. 3 weight 13 lbs. 1 oz. against 15 1-4 lbs. for regular. This test seems to show that the Dahl Lead does not have with the same consistency as ordinary lead near as much body. In fact it seems to have even less body than zinc. No. 3 formula however would substitute very fairly for our regular goods. Whether it would commend itself so thoroughly to the consumer under the various conditions of use, is however a question.

It would be subject to the same objection advanced by Mr. Hogarth with reference to other changes we have considered. Namely its great decrease in weight. Whether the saving of about 2 1-4 cents a gallon be sufficient to make it pay to fight this difficulty and run the risk also in finding other difficulties with the consumer is a question. It looks to me as though the process would be of questionable value. To say that Dahl Lead is equal in every way to the old lead process is undoubtedly a mistake.

Yours truly,

FEB 12 1892

*Mr. John H. Hogg
Exp't. of Lead
March 26 p. 91.*

*Must Lead
14 lbs @ 6 1/4 87 2
oil 5-10 23 2 4 1/2 33 3/4*

*Dahl
7 lbs @ 6 1/4 43 3/4
6" 403 oil 87 1/2
2 1/4*

*1 g.c must wt. 19 # 1003
127 1/4*

*1 g.c Dahl 13 lbs 4 3/4 81 1/4
40*

*J.B. Lewis
71 Broadway N.Y.*

0007-SWP-043398

SUBJECT:

Handwritten: FEB 13 1892
APR 1 12 30 PM '92

100 Canal Street, CLEVELAND,

Report of latter and final test on Dahl Lead.

As the continuation of the previous experiment of this Lead I made further experiments as follows:

No. 1 liquid paint, same consistency as S.W.P. using Dahl Lead straight. No. 2 liquid paint same consistency as S.W.P. using one part white zinc to two parts Dahl Lead. No. 3 two parts white zinc one part Dahl Lead. This costs as follows, regular 101.04, No. 1 101.04 No. 2 98.98, No. 3 97.75. The consistency of the three samples are all about the same as our regular. When painted with, we find No. 1 to have little or no body. No. 2 to be some what better, No. 3 being about the same as regular S.W.P., No. 3 weight 13 lbs. 1 oz. against 15 1-4 lbs. for regular. This test seems to show that the Dahl Lead does not have with the same consistency as ordinary lead near as much body. In fact it seems to have even less body than zinc. No. 3 formula however would substitute very fairly for our regular goods. Whether it would commend itself so thoroughly to the consumer under the various conditions of use, is however a question.

It would be subject to the same objection advanced by Mr. Hogarth with reference to other changes we have considered. Namely its great decrease in weight. Whether the saving of about 2 1-4 cents a gallon be sufficient to make it pay to fight this difficulty and run the risk also in finding other difficulties with the consumer is a question. It looks to me as though the process would be of questionable value. To say that Dahl Lead is equal in every way to the old lead process is undoubtedly a mistake.

Yours truly,

FEB 12 1892

*Mr. John T. Hoggan
Exp. of Lead
March Sept. 91.*

*Test Lead
14 lbs @ 6 1/4 oz
oil 5-10 oz 8 1/4 @ 7 3/4*

*Dahl
7 lbs @ 6 1/4 4 3/4
6" 403 oil 8 1/2*

*1 gal rust wt. 19 #1003
127 1/4*

*1 gal Dahl 13 lbs 4 3/4 @ 1/4
40*

*J. B. Lewis
71 Broadway N.Y.*

0007-SWP-043398

N23213

0007-SWP-00012674