

~~1. [unclear]~~
2. Files

November 3, 1923. BCL-HBM

Superintendent,
U.S. Bureau of Mines,
Pittsburg, Pa.

SUBJECT: Physiological Effects
of Ethyl Gas

Dear Mr. Fieldman:

In the Minutes of your Problem Conference of the Chemical Division, October 27, I note under B:169, the above title, and I believe that I recall that Midgley told me his Company had decided to adopt the trade name "ethyl gas." Of course, their objects in doing so are fairly clear, and among other things they are not particularly desirous of having the name "lead" appear in this case. That is alright from the standpoint of the General Motors Company, but it is quite a question in my mind as to whether the Bureau of Mines would be justified in adopting this name so early in the game before it has had the support of popular usage.

The reasons for my objection are as follows: (1) it will lead to confusion, especially if the name ever becomes widely used, as there are many other ethyl gases besides ^{that containing} tetraethyl lead; (2) since the real object of our investigation is to determine whether or not lead is deleterious in the combustion products, it seems to me that we would be wise in our investigations to refer to its chemical name "tetraethyl lead", or one of the other ones possible. This is merely my personal feeling, and I am open to conviction. If you do not share it, I would like to hear from you further.

Very truly yours,

B.C. Lind
Chief Chemist

cc to Mr. Lyon

