

February 5, 1942.

Mr. Richard H. Porter,
United Safety Service,
180 N. Wacker Drive,
Chicago, Illinois.

Dear Mr. Porter:

This will acknowledge your letter of January 30.

The question of lead compounds in fumes from drying paint, is so important to us that I felt obligated to obtain authoritative opinion on the matter. You state that you referred the question to H. C. Lassen, a chemist. It is possible that Mr. Lassen is an outstanding chemist and is an authority on the subject. I have no inclination to be unfriendly or to criticize Mr. Lassen. In order to locate him, I did the natural thing in referring to the directory of the American Chemical Society. I did not find H. C. Lassen listed as a member of the American Chemical Society July, 1940. I believe this is the last directory published by the ACS. In our own organization at Dayton, we now have sixteen graduate chemists and chemical engineers. The number is now lower than it has been. The President of our Company is a chemist from Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Among our force we have two men with Ph. D. degrees. If you will consult the directory you will also find that the writer's name is listed.

The entire time of this chemical force is devoted to the study and production of paint and paint products. The most of us have had quite a number of years of experience. There has never been any evidence that we have discovered that indicates that fumes from drying paint contains volatile lead compounds. As a chemical group we invite Mr. Lassen to submit evidence that such is the case.

Not being satisfied with our own experience in the matter, I referred the question to Dr. Robert A. Kehoe, M.D., the directing head of Lettering Laboratory of Applied Physiology, University of Cincinnati, and an outstanding world authority on lead poisoning. I should prefer to submit to you a copy of his letter but I have not obtained his permission to do this. I am reasonably certain, however, he would have no objection to me taking the following quotations from that letter.

"It is not reasonable to suppose that anything happens to the lead whereby it becomes volatile, and I do not need to tell you it does not give rise to dust from the surface. I have an idea that the chemist who arrived at this startling

Mr. Richard H. Porter,
Page 2,
February 5, 1942.

conclusion obtained some samples of the urine of persons who had been subjected to this alleged lead exposure, and that he found lead in the urine. This would not be remarkable in view of the presence of lead in all normal urines. If he were somewhat more careful in his observations, and if he took samples both before and after the alleged exposure, he may have found differences in the lead concentration before and after. Variations in the urinary lead concentration occur and may be of considerable magnitude, and by chance alone, variations might have occurred in the direction of increased concentration."

"I would suggest that you put it up to Mr. Porter to submit the evidence on which his statement is based, for critical examination. I think he should have it pointed out to him that this is a serious matter and that the most carefully obtained evidence would be necessary to prove such an otherwise unreasonable statement."

"There is altogether too much loose talk in this field as it is."

Dr. Kehoe, as you may know, was placed at the head of the laboratory established by Mr. Kettering for the purpose of studying industrial health hazards. Mr. Kettering established this laboratory after a rather large number of lead cases developed from exposure to tetra ethyl lead in the production of ethyl gasoline.

I shall await your reply with interest.

Yours very truly,

THE LONE BROTHERS COMPANY

E. W. Fasig

ENF:CS