

January 28, 1930

Dr. Emery R. Hayhurst,
Department of Public Health,
Ohio State University,
Columbus, Ohio.

Dear Dr. Hayhurst:

The outline of organization of work of the Committee for the current years seems to me to be entirely satisfactory. In looking over the allocation of work I quite naturally find myself most interested in the items involved in item 1, and especially with the laboratory technique in determining the existence of lead poisoning, post mortem findings, and the prognosis and disability period. I shall be pleased to contribute what I can to any one or all of these items.

As to the report which was gotten out during the past year, I have a distinct feeling that the interest which has been manifested concerning it is not entirely justified. There are many loose ends in it, and there are many points at which it could be more specific. It is perhaps a good beginning, but I do not think it should be regarded as a finished piece of work by any means. However, it is certainly advisable to continue the work if it has any possibility of bearing fruit, for the practices in the prevention of lead poisoning as well as the methods of caring for cases of poisoning, especially from the industrial compensation point of view, operate at the present time with a technique which suggests the middle ages.

Very sincerely yours,

RAK:EJ