FILE NAME: Johnson & Johnson (JAJ)

DATE: 1973 Apr 19

DOC#: JAJ066

DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION: Memo RE Dispersion-Staining Examination of Retained Samples of Johnson's Baby Powder

cc: Mr. W. H. Ashton to Mr. R. S. Russell
Dr. R. A. Fuller
Dr. E. R. L. Gaughra[illegible]
Dr. A. J. Goudie
Dr. G. Hildick-Smith
Dr. W. Nashed
Dr. T. H. Shelley
Dr. D. R. Petterson
Dr. [illegible] H. Goodman

Johnson & Johnson

New Brunswick, N.J.
April 19, 1973

Subject: DISPERSION-STAINING EXAMINATION OF RETAINED SAMPLES OF JOHNSON'S* BABY POWDER - PROJECT NO. 503

Dr. ~~F. R. Rolle~~ FR[2]

Twenty-five samples of JOHNSON'S* Baby Powder representing retained samples from both ESDP and Chicago facilities were examined microscopically by the Dispersion-Staining technique for the presence of tremolite. Four of these samples[a] are suspected of containing tremolite based on the finding of one or two "fibers" per sample which satisfy the color/morphology criteria.

This determination of the presence of tremolite is subject to the limitations described in my letter to you dated January 19, 1973 and in a letter from W. C. McCrone to A. J. Goudie dated January 30, 1973.

Many of the samples contain calcite which under the conditions of the study gives dispersion colors identical to tremolite. The morphology of a suspect particle was therefore the final factor influencing its identification. It is quite probable that a thin, lath-like, calcite fragment would be wrongly identified by this technique.

The Dispersion-Staining method is by no means infallible - McCrone describes it as "an indefinite method for chrysotile or tremolite" - and these results should be considered as a preliminary screening rather than as a definitive analysis. A careful and detailed petrographic study may clarify the situation.

David H. Hamer

ab

*A Trademark of JOHNSON & JOHNSON.

[a]ESDP 285S 10/11/72 2nd shift
ESDP 307R 11/2/72 1st shift
ESDP 068Z 3/9/73 3rd shift
ESDP 086Z 3/27/73 3rd shift

EXHIBIT
number 59

Protected Document–Subject to Protective Order