

April 1, 1939

Mr. C. V. Porter
Taylor, Porter and Brooks
Louisiana National Bank Bldg.,
Baton Rouge, La.

Dear Mr. Porter:-

In accordance with Dr. Gehrman's request in his letter of March 28th, I am sending to you herewith copies of the two papers which were offered as examples in the Sanders case by Judge Tyner.

I am at some loss to know why these papers were presented in refutation of my testimony since it is rather clear that there is nothing of consequence in them which is in opposition to statements which I made on the witness stand. Perhaps it may be just as well to make a few remarks concerning them.

The paper on "Recognition and Prevention of Lead Poisoning" represents a brief and rather precise statement of the general principles which I recommend in the maintenance of hygienic conditions in lead plants. If an example of this type of hygienic supervision were required, I should cite the Baton Rouge plant and the regime under which it operates as an entirely satisfactory illustration of the practical application of the methods which I advise.

The other paper was written at a time when I did not have as much information on the subject of lead poisoning as I now have. Moreover it was written before the development of the present methods of analysis which are in use in this laboratory. Also statements made with reference to the significance of lead in the blood are quite inadequate. Obviously since information on the blood lead was not available, and since none of the data which were available had been obtained by methods which were sufficiently precise to provide the correct results, it was not possible to make much in the way of interpretation of the results of lead analysis. Since that time, much information has been provided, and on the basis of such information new and much more precise interpretation can be made. It must

not be forgotten that most of the information which has been obtained by myself and by my colleagues has become available since 1930 for we have done very much more in the past nine years than we did in the period of five or six years preceding. Other experimental workers too have added considerably to the available information since 1930. Despite these remarks the general conclusions presented in this paper are sound in my opinion, and coincide with my present opinions. There are certain definite points of exception. These, however, are not very significant. The chief effect of the work and the experience of the last eight or nine years has been to answer questions which were left open at the time this paper was written. I do not believe, therefore, that Judge Tyceer has improved his case any by the submission of this paper.

I should be very much interested in having any further information which may be available on the progress and outcome of this case.

With kindest personal regards,

I am

Cordially yours,

RAK:ls

Robert A. Kehoe, M.D.