

COPY

INDUSTRIAL COMMISSION OF OHIO
COLUMBUS

October 29, 1935

Members of the Industrial Commission
Columbus, Ohio

Gentlemen: In re- Claim L.D. 5050 - [REDACTED]

Since the hearing of this claim October 22 and the discussion of the evidence on file with Dr. Hayhurst and the Referee additional proof which has been filed has been reviewed to determine whether or not any new facts have been presented which have not been considered by the Commission.

In looking over the reports the paragraph is found in which the laboratory findings at the Ford Hospital are quoted. After describing the negative Wasserman and Kahn test a normal blood count is given. The last sentence reads as follows:

"Also urine routine analysis negative throughout;
several stool specimens were positive for lead."

If this is a correct statement of the laboratory work which was done at the Ford Hospital it does not show lead in the urine nor does it show the presence of stippled cells in the blood which seems to have been reported to the Mayo Clinic and used by them as proof that the claimant at one time had suffered from lead poisoning. The other paragraph to which I wish to call attention is the one in which it is shown that the beginning of those symptoms of nerve circulatory involvement of the feet began before there was any known exposure to lead.

Referring to the report of my investigation and examination which was made December 11, 1928, I again wish to emphasize the entire absence of any symptoms either subjective or objective of lead poisoning at the time of my examination of the claimant. Furthermore the only contact with lead upon which the claim is based was the use of a very small can of a mixture of lead and oil used as a lubricant on the lathe which the claimant operated. The contents of this small can holding, perhaps, less than a half pound had furnished the entire supply which had been used in ten months and still contained enough for several months use. It is evident, therefore, that the amount of lead to which this man was exposed could have been only very minute. At the time of my examination there was some complaint of peculiar symptoms of the left leg and possibly a beginning similar condition in the right, but these symptoms were not considered to be in any way the result of or associated with lead poisoning. It was for these reasons, namely, the absence of symptoms of lead poisoning and the very slight

N1947

is my opinion that the progressive course which the disease from which this man is suffering has taken in spite of treatment is further proof that it is due to some condition other than an occupational disease. The fact that a definite cause for this peculiar disease cannot be found does not justify the conclusion that it was caused or influenced by lead poisoning, especially when there is inadequate proof that a lead poisoning ever existed. It is my opinion that the claimant's disability is not the result of a compensable occupational disease.

Respectfully submitted,

(Signed) W. E. OBETZ

Medical Investigator

KE 0016696