

March 27, 1935

Dr. Bradford C. Scudder,
The Grasselli Chemical Company,
Cleveland, Ohio.

Dear Dr. Scudder:

I have your letter of March 25.

I am not quite certain what to say to your inquiry with regard to infection. It is true that, theoretically at least, a case of silicosis may be complicated by infection other than tubercle. In Fisher we did see cases that were infected with the Vincent's organism in symbiosis with others.

I am not clear how infection is to be determined. I imagine that what will happen is that in every case of silicosis, they will present a sputum analysis showing that bacteria are present in the sputum and, therefore, the case is infected. Then you have the resulting battle with the lawyers and the quacks. Infection with the tubercle bacillus is a definite entity that can be demonstrated. "Infection", without qualification, is an indefinite term which can be construed by any lawyer to suit his ends. My feeling is that if you change the proposed Act to read merely "infection", you are going to pay disability on every case that is diagnosed as silicosis regardless of the patient's actual clinical condition.

I do not understand a claim for asbestosis arising from soapstone in the rubber industry. This is, of course, absurd but no more so than many of the other claims on which payments are made. I am not quite sure what you mean by the "last straw theory."

It will be some considerable time before our official report on asbestosis is out as we have not finished our survey yet and the working up of the data is a slow process.

It was a great pleasure to hear from you.

With best regards,

Sincerely yours,

A. J. Lanza, M.D.
Assistant Medical Director

cc - Dr. McConnell & Mr. Cummings