

May 18, 1970

SUBJECT: BULLETIN NO. 5 - LEAD IN GASOLINE

TO: ALL MEMBERS OF THE LEAD INDUSTRIES ASSOCIATION, INC.

Bulletin No. 4 was issued on April 20. Bulletin No. 5, herewith, is perhaps the most important to date and we directly request your careful attention to it.

- A) On April 28 I wrote our primary contact in your company asking that he forward a LIA position statement to Federal Congressmen from the districts of your various plants with a personalized letter. Along with that request was included 10 copies of the LIA's position statement. I asked for copies of correspondence from your company as might be concerned.

It is somewhat disturbing that in nearly 3 weeks I have had indications from only 3 of 62 member companies that they have done anything with this. If you have not taken action, please do so very promptly. If you have, I would still appreciate copies to indicate what action you chose to take.

My letter of April 28 went only to ~~Mr.~~ Mr. [redacted] in your company. If you have not heard from him you may ask what he wants you to do. An added copy of LIA's Position Statement, as for Congressmen, is attached.

- B) You will be interested to know that under date of April 29, written testimony by LIA was submitted to the appropriate committees in the Federal Congress, both House and Senate. It is not pleasant to report that this testimony has been acknowledged by fewer than 5 senators and representatives - again adding evidence to the need for individuals actions as constituents.
- C) Also enclosed is a folder containing evidence of the publicity achieved by LIA's activities on this subject during the period February 24 - April 30.

Sincerely,

J. L. Kimberley
J.L. Kimberley
Executive Vice President

JLK/gt
Encls.

N10183

PNYC00001268

LIA POSITION STATEMENT — CONTINUED

elements used in combination with lead for gasoline additives.

7. The lead industry would lose 20 percent of its total market. A replacement market cannot be found overnight. The problem is complicated by the fact that many lead producers have already made major capital outlays for recent plant expansions.

All these dislocations and difficulties might be justified if there had been demonstrated, beyond question, the availability of devices to deal with emissions from unleaded gasoline that would materially reduce air pollution. However, this has yet to be proven. In fact, a Department of the Interior study hints that greater air pollution might result from the use of unleaded gasoline, and there are others who are seriously concerned about the unknown health effects of replacements for lead additives. Such considerations have to be weighed against the fact that there is no existing or threatened health hazard to the public from lead additives.

The Lead Industries Association believes that it is poor public policy to compel the abandonment of an existing proved source of efficient automotive power until there has been a clear, accepted demonstration that the alternative represents an improvement.

April 27, 1970

LEAD INDUSTRIES ASSOCIATION, INC., 292 Madison Avenue, New York, New York 10017

PNYC00001269

N10183.01

THE LEAD INDUSTRIES ASSOCIATION'S STATEMENT OF POSITION
ON
REMOVAL OF LEAD ADDITIVES FROM GASOLINE

Before Congress is legislation (HR-15848 and S-3466) that would empower the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to regulate fuels and fuel additives --(including lead antiknocks).

Much of the testimony presented to Congressional Subcommittees has misrepresentations and inaccuracies about lead in gasoline in an attempt to force action.

"Get the lead out" of gasoline has become a slogan in recent months. Like most slogans it attempts to reduce a complex problem to simple terms. Unfortunately complex problems, such as those of automotive emissions, cannot be solved simply.

Automobile manufacturers have said that with unleaded gasoline, various devices to control emissions "could become technically feasible."

Nowhere have we seen a statement that in the immediate future such devices will be installed on new car models -- not in 1971, not in 1972.

But we do know that systems have been demonstrated that will meet 1975 Federal goals for emissions using leaded gasolines and present autos.

Neither have we seen any evidence that lead emissions from automobiles constitute a present threat to health or a contribution to smog problems.

Why should the public have to use an inferior gasoline which will give an unsatisfactory performance until the alleged devices which can operate on unleaded gasoline have been proved and have actually been installed on new cars?

One major oil producer is already marketing unleaded regular gasoline in California. Its price is 6¢ per gallon more than leaded regular and 2¢ more than leaded premium. Thus, the public is now paying a 6¢ per gallon penalty for an inferior product.

The April 8 issue of The Wall Street Journal listed other ramifications and consequences of a quick switch to unleaded gasoline:

1. *The oil industry will have to make a major investment in new refining facilities, variously estimated from \$8 billion to \$10 billion, as well as an additional 6 to 8 percent draw down in petroleum reserves.*
2. *Small petroleum refineries may have to shut down because they do not have the capital resources to make the new investment.*
3. *Asphalt, the backbone of road building, would be curtailed since this product is made largely by the small refiners.*
4. *The hundreds of thousands of retail outlets for gasoline would have to install new gasoline pumps and gasoline storage tanks. The availability of pumps is strictly limited; the labor required to install them and the tanks will add to the inflation of construction costs.*
5. *Without lead in gasoline, oil companies would have to make greater use of benzene, toluene and xylene, thereby diminishing the supply of these materials to the petro-chemical industry, with sharp inflationary consequences.*
6. *Sellers of bromine and sodium would lose a major market since these are the*