

the disease in New Jersey "Radium Necrosis." Dr. Hoffman claims credit for having discovered this so-called disease, and we believe the published literature bears out his contention. . . .

Confronted with law suits, and with a paper purporting to have discovered a brand new disease among our former employees, also propaganda from the Consumer's League of New Jersey, we took further advice from competent medical authorities on what should be done. It was suggested that the Industrial Hygiene section of the College of Physicians and Surgeons, Columbia University, might undertake scientific investigations to ascertain if there really was danger existing in the industry. Dr. Frederick B. Flinn became interested in March 1925, and began a scientific study of the question. . . .

Based on the scientific data acquired, which was undoubtedly the most thorough study of the subject, Dr. Flinn reached the conclusion that there was no industrial hazard in the industry. However, soon after this article appeared there was brought to his attention a case of a former applicator who contained a certain amount of radioactivity. While there were other implications involved, after a period of 6 or 8 months observation and treatment, and a final autopsy, Dr. Flinn reached the conclusion that undoubtedly radioactivity contributed to the condition of the girl. . . .

Perhaps it would not be amiss to discuss briefly the recent suits against this corporation, which have received so much unwarranted and untrue publicity. . . .

Through a, no doubt, cleverly designed campaign of publicity, the public was appealed to and the appeal met a responsive chord. . . .

The spectacle of five women filled with radium, doomed to a speedy and terrible death, according to experts, presented a gruesome picture indeed. . . .

The fact that we settled these suits in no way is indicative of the merits of the complainants [*sic*] contentions, or that we admit responsibility or liability. From a legal aspect there is very little question but that we had a perfect defense, both from the standpoint of the Statute of Limitations and from the fact that there was no negligence on our part. . . .

---