

August 25, 1932

Dr. E. E. Evans
The Grasselli Chemical Company
East Chicago, Indiana

Dear Dr. Evans:

On my return home from several weeks vacation, I have come upon the correspondence which was taken care of in my absence by Dr. Machle. I am glad to send you herewith a report of our findings on your patient. Unfortunately, they do not permit of a very definite diagnosis. You will observe that the results in both urine and faeces are not noticeably higher than are findings in normal individuals. On the other hand unless I am mistaken, it has been some weeks since your patient had any exposure. It would appear from the record that illness developed on or about June 17th. Presumably the exposure was discontinued at about that time. The samples for analysis were collected in July. Thus it would not be expected that the results would be as high as they would at the time of discontinuance of employment. Nevertheless it would be expected that the urinary findings would remain high over a period of some weeks if the exposure had been of any considerable magnitude. Therefore, I am inclined to doubt whether your patient's illness is due to the absorption of lead. I can not say this with any assurance so that we are unfortunately giving you negative laboratory data which as you know in many instances may not be taken too seriously.

One of the physical findings which you mentioned in your letter of July 19th, namely the bronchial irritation, makes me wonder whether or not you may be dealing with a chronic arsenic intoxication. This brings me to question whether or not at that time there was any desiccation of the skin or whether there were any changes in the nails. It would appear to me in handling lead arsenate, arsenical poisoning would develop more rapidly than lead poisoning.

If there are any further developments in this case, I should be glad to hear about them.

Very truly yours,