

Mr. Conahan

BALTIMORE CITY HEALTH DEPARTMENT

MEMORANDUM

April 1 1959

TO - Dr. Huntington Williams
FROM - George W. Schucker
SUBJECT - Lead Paint Labeling Meeting, March 26, 1959

Those present were:

Mr. Lawrence Kiefer	- National Paint, Varnish & Lacquer Assoc.
Mr. Richard J. Eckart	- Capelin Paints, Inc., N.Y. City
Col. L. A. Elliott	- National Paint, Varnish & Lacquer Assoc.
Mr. E. J. McDowell	- The Sherwin-Williams Co., Cleveland, Ohio
Mr. E. L. Hartman	- Inter-Coastal Paint Corp., Baltimore, Md.
Mr. E. A. Miller	- The O'Brien Corporation, Baltimore, Md.
Mr. Daniel G. King	- National Paint, Varnish & Lacquer Assoc.
Mr. Jerome Fricter	- New York City Department of Health
Dr. Huntington Williams	- Commissioner of Health, Baltimore City Health Dept.
Gen. Joseph F. Battley	- National Paint, Varnish & Lacquer Assoc.
Dr. A. J. Meyers	- Baltimore City Health Department
Mr. George W. Schucker	- " " " "
Mr. Charles W. Conahan	- " " " "

Dr. Williams opened the meeting by briefly outlining events leading up to the passage of the Baltimore City Lead Paint Labeling Ordinance and his agreement to contact Dr. Baumgartner concerning New York City accepting the Baltimore wording of the warning label. He pointed out that the paint industry was evidently opposing any action by the New York City Department of Health to accept the Baltimore wording unless Baltimore would accept the New York wording. He then introduced Mr. Fricter.

Mr. Fricter stated he believed the paint industry was interested in uniformity in labeling. He therefore urged the paint industry to adopt the Baltimore label as model labeling for a national law or for other local laws. He pointed out that everybody was following Dr. Williams' lead, who had developed any program for controlling lead poisoning in children. With Baltimore City's background in lead poisoning in children their lead paint labeling ordinance was naturally superior to other laws and regulations and should be supported by all agencies striving to control the hazard. He felt that the New York City Board of Health will be glad to change their regulations to conform to the Baltimore Ordinance.

General Battley pointed out since the adoption of the New York City Labeling in 1954 which was worked out with the cooperation of the National Paint, Varnish and Lacquer Association, the association has sponsored the New York labeling as a model law for other agencies to adopt. He said that 92% of the paint manufacturers are members of the association. Since this labeling has been adopted by a considerable number of states changing now to the Baltimore labeling would cause considerable difficulty and expense to all concerned while for Baltimore to be willing to accept the New York labeling would require only one city to act. He stated the Baltimore

0035BHD0000005

N 4429

April 1, 1959

wording was too long to fit into already crowded labels. He also stated that any money expended should be expended for education and not for label changes.

It was pointed out by Dr. Williams that the Baltimore City Health Department had given very careful consideration to the New York City regulations and found them lacking before drafting the Baltimore Ordinance. He stated the City Health Department would have to proceed to enforce the Baltimore wording and he would not request the City Council to change the wording and would have to oppose any move made to change the ordinance.

Mr. McDowell of the Sherwin-Williams Company and Mr. Miller of the O'Brien Corporation pointed out that their companies were now formulating their interior paints with less than 15 of lead as required by Section 84D of the Baltimore Ordinance. They pointed out that the entire paint industry was doing likewise and that the removal of lead from interior paints would do more to eliminate lead poisoning in children than any wording of a warning label which would only appear on exterior paints. Mr. Eckart of Japolin Paints, Incorporated agreed with Mr. McDowell and Mr. Miller requested that we consider accepting the New York label. He also emphasized that it was old paint and not modern paint which was causing the lead poisoning. Mr. Eckart also questioned the safety of removing removing lead paint by burning. After some discussion it was suggested that the paint industry study paint removal and possibly develop a more satisfactory method of removal.

It was pointed out to those present that the action to remove the lead from all interior paints by the paint industry came about only as the result of the Baltimore Ordinance.

Mr. Trichter proposed a program to acquaint the country of the problem of lead poisoning in children and what steps should be taken to attack the problem based on the experience of Baltimore. Mr. King stated he was 100% in agreement with Mr. Trichter and asked to briefly outline such a program. Mr. Trichter said that in his thinking at the moment the program should consist of:

- 1st - A listing of the objections of the program to control the problem by Dr. Williams.
- 2nd - Positive steps every agency including the paint industry should do to push the program.
- 3rd - The Baltimore City Health Department to offer publicly to offer consultation services to Health Departments desiring assistance in developing a child lead poisoning control program.

Mr. Williams present a paper at the American Public Health Association Meeting in Atlantic City on lead poisoning in children. It was agreed that Mr. Trichter's proposal had real merit and Dr. Williams agreed to confer with the Baltimore Health Department on the proposal. He emphasized, however, that the Baltimore requirement for a permanent label would be enforced after June 9, 1959.

Mr. Trichter's program would receive 100% cooperation and financial support of the paint industry.

George W. Schuck

GWS:bbk

0035BHD00000055