DI-12

Eng 241

801849

June 1, 1950

Mr. W. G. Hazard
Industrial Relations Division
Owens-Illinois Glass Company
Toledo 1, Ohio

Dear Bill:

The Trudeau School currently in session prevented a more prompt answer to your letter of May 18. It finished today and I am now ready to attack the accumulated correspondence.

In reviewing your letter the first order of business is to urge you and Doctor Shook to visit Saranac Lake. My calendar is full up to the middle of June. Select any time after that date which is most convenient for both of you.

The second point which you raise relates to the X-Ray Department and the service by the Foundation for the reading and interpretation of chest roentgenograms of your employees. In commenting upon this matter as requested in your letter of April 3, there is certainly no objection on our part should you prefer that the matter be formalized on a contract basis. In many respects, some formal agreement would ease our administrative duties. I rather expect also that it would satisfy your purchasing department.

The agreement of last year was based on a flat rate of $4.00 per chest case. In explanation, per chest case refers to the roentgenograms of each man at a given date. Thus, the case might consist of only a single film, or it might include a stereo pair, a lateral, and an oblique. The fee of $4.00 would cover the entire lot. If on the other hand two dates were involved, we would consider that as two cases.

We see no reason to change that fee, unless there is some objection on the part of the company. It is indeed a relatively low figure and we keep it there only because of our continued interest in problems relating to the inhalation of dust. The opportunity to study clinical material of this sort is of tremendous help in our research program.

EXHIBIT P-241

m-241

CRMC-Motley1000-Subj-001394

Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
asbestosclaims.law/library/12901/1

801850

The third point concerns the experimental investigations with Kaylo which are about completed. Only a few more animals remain. These will be sacrificed next month. Then we will be ready to prepare the final report. For your information, at this time, I believe the findings permit the following:

Kaylo dust on inhalation by experimental animals does not produce silicosis irrespective of the small amount of quartz present. It does produce the asbestotic type of reaction in the lungs and, therefore, we believe every precaution should be taken to minimize exposure of industrial employees.

Kaylo dust on inhalation by experimental animals infected with tubercle bacilli (H) produces only a very mild stimulation of the tuberculous infection, much less than that caused by the inhalation of pure quartz. This evidence leads us to believe that in industrial practice the minimal allowable concentration of Kaylo could be far in excess than that accepted for quartz before Kaylo would have an adverse stimulating effect upon a tuberculous infection in exposed employees.

This evidence would support the view that inhalation of Kaylo dust would not be hazardous from the standpoint of tuberculosis, especially provided that the dust hazard is controlled as cited above.

We are looking forward to having you and Doctor Shook with us the latter part of June.

Sincerely yours,

Arthur J. Vorwald, M.D.
Director

AJV:bv

cc: Dr. Shook
Kaylo exp. file

CRMC-Motley1000-Subj-001395

Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
asbestosclaims.law/library/12901/2