

April 4, 1960

Mr. Wm. R. Perdue, Jr.  
Mr. J. R. MacGregor  
Mr. J. R. Sabina

Gentlemen:

I forward herewith to each of you a reproduced copy of a letter received from Dr. Price of the U.S. Public Health Service in response to certain questions and suggestions of mine stated in order to clarify certain details of procedure in connection with the marketing of gasoline containing tetramethyl lead. My tentative suggestions were put in the form of what might be regarded as desirable, and I think I should comment on the paragraphs numbered 1, 2, and 3, in the reply, for these are to be regarded, I believe, as the evidence that any reasonable suggestions made at this time would be found acceptable as being within the province of the industries to follow.

1. With respect to the maximum limit of the concentration of TML, it might, perhaps, have been desirable to set this limit at the equivalent of 4 rather than 3 ml. of TEL, so as to have this behind us if it becomes desirable to go to this level of TML. I do not believe this would be wise at this time, and I do not think this should even be considered by the industry until experience in the use of TML shall have proved that the substitution of TML for TEL up to 3.06 ml. per American Gallon of gasoline is wholly lacking in risk. I believe firmly in a step-wise procedure, and I am pleased by the corresponding attitude of the Public Health Service. This is sufficient reason for holding the line at the level of 2.06 ml. of TML. I do not anticipate that there will be any difficulty, but the industries concerned here, because of their status in American commercial life, should make their moves on evidence and not faith and hope.

2. The willingness on the part of the Service to accept "lead alkyl" on the signs arises from my suggestion, which I believed to be true at the time, that this was what technical representatives of the industries desired. I saw no objection to it and so indicated in my letter, pointing out, however, that since the present signs correspond to written and published specifications of the U.S.P.H.S., it was felt that they should not be changed in any respect, without, in effect, consulting the Service, or at least informing them.

The acquiescence to our suggestion indicates to me that the words recently agreed upon by the industries "Antiknock Compounds" will meet with no objection. I believe the latter to be superior to the former, since it will be more widely understood by the public (if the public pays any attention to either). At least, one of the persons involved in this matter in the Service agrees informally that this is true, and I

RF 0002750

Mr. Wm. R. Perdue, Jr.  
Mr. J. R. MacGregor  
Mr. J. R. Sabina

- 2 -

April 4, 1960

anticipate no difficulty here. Before writing further to Dr. Price, however, and either asking for advice, or merely stating the case for his information, I wish to be advised in writing as to the final form of the sign that is desired by the industries. There is a question as to the precise point and manner of the use of "antiknock compounds," in relation to the other wording of the sign. I would like to have this straight before I take any further action, if, as I believe, some further action is to be taken.

3. Paragraph 3 is entirely satisfactory, I believe, and is entirely logical in view of Paragraph 1. It needs no further comment from me.

I shall await further instructions before making any other move.

Sincerely yours,

Robert A. Kehoe, M. D.

RAK:ss

Enclosure

KE 0002753