

FILE MEMORANDUM

May 4, 1970

STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL

REPORT ON SUCHER CONTROL MEETING HELD AT TILLSBURG APRIL 30, 1970.

The following persons were in attendance at what was actually a continuation of the April 7 meeting on Sucher Control Chemicals -

L.S. Vickery	- Research Station, Delhi, Chairman
C. Heath	- Ontario Flue Cured Tobacco Growers Marketing Board (O.F.C.T.G.M.B.) Secretary.
G. Demeyere	- O.F.C.T.G.M.B.
R. Miggins	- O.F.C.T.G.M.B.
S. Smith	- O.F.C.T.G.M.B.
M. Watson	- Field Extension Staff, ODAF, Delhi Research Station.
N. Shukla	- Field Extension Staff, ODAF, Delhi Research Station.
A. Stanton	- Department of Industry Trade and Commerce, Ottawa.
R. Wight	- Plant Products Division, Toronto.
D.E. Kearney	- Imperial Tobacco Products, Montreal.
G.W. Boswell	- Imperial Tobacco Products, Montreal.
W. Smith	- Benson and Hedges, Montreal.
L. Lapointe	- Benson and Hedges, Montreal.
J. Campbell	- Imperial Tobacco Group, Wilson, N.C.
E. Meizer	- Rothmans, Toronto.

For short periods of time the following people attended to describe their product and answer questions.

Dr. Walter Abramitis - Armour Chemicals.

Mr. John Iglar and his group representing Proctor and Gamble and Atlas.

.../2

110317333

Mr. Vickery stated reviewed the previous meeting and pointed out that because of bioassay test results on Penar, there was much concern in the U.S. concerning its continued use on Canadian tobacco. The use of MH-30 would be acceptable to the T.A.C. but in so doing it chose the lesser of two evils in that smoke condensates of MH-treated tobacco were found acceptable by bioassay although the quality of MH tobacco is inferior. The fatty alcohols give effective sucker control and produce acceptable tobacco but no bioassay tests have been conducted, a requirement that T.A.C. feels is necessary before it gives approval for use on tobacco. The sucker oils are not acceptable to some domestic buyers because of oil spots on the paper of cigarettes. Mr. Vickery hoped that this meeting might provide some further information on Penar, MH-30 and the fatty alcohols. At the present time the status of these chemicals in the U.S. was also being reviewed.

The stand which members had taken at the April 7th meeting was again emphasized. Mr. Campbell said that it was strictly on health grounds that MH-30 was considered an alternative to Penar. Dr. Boswall stressed that the domestic buyers were opposed to the use of either Penar or MH-30, but that the fatty alcohols, which had given good control of suckers in Mr. Vickery's tests for three years, should be accepted for use in 1970. Although bioassay tests have not been conducted on the fatty alcohol treated tobacco, the possibility of a health situation arising from the use of fatty alcohols appears minimal. Mr. Demevere said that the Board found itself in a real dilemma because it appeared to be impossible to please both factions of buyers. Both Mr. Miggins and Mr. S. Smith indicated their desire to see MH-30 used from the point of view of the grower with regard to ease of application and the oft-quoted benefits that could result from its use to combat weather fleck in the lake area. However they would accept a continued ban of MH-30 if the committee considered it in the best interests of the tobacco producers. Mr. W. Smith said that MH-30 was not as innocuous a material as some people would like us to think it is. He said alcohols had been bioassayed but in a different manner than TAC tested Penar and although he had no data to present, he felt that by the acceptance of the fatty alcohols we are not buying a pig in a poke. Mr. Meinzer and Mr. Kearney said that MH-30 definitely was not wanted by their companies. Mr. Kearney pointed out that the decreased filling power of MH-30 treated tobacco would necessitate the use of more tobacco per cigarette - thus contributing to higher tar yields which would be most undesirable at a time when the Department of Health could be legislating for cigarettes of lower tar producing potentials. T-148 therefore looks like a natural replacement for Penar.

Dr. Walter Abramitis, Armour Chemicals, spoke to the meeting on Penar as a sucker control chemical. He stressed the low levels of Penar in the which are found in cured tobacco and pointed

.../3

110317334

out that 80-90 percent of the Penar on green leaf is lost during flue curing. He cited one particular experiment where a green leaf on analysis contained 10 ppm Penar - the equivalent of 147 ppm on a cured weight basis - contained only 2 ppm when cured. The highest possible theoretical concentration of Penar in tobacco when applied at recommended levels would be 110 ppm, but with the losses associated with rain, weathering and flue curing only 1 ppm or less of the Penar active moiety is found on the cured leaf. In Penar spiked tobacco samples at 10, 15, 100 and 300 ppm, no residues of Penar were detected in smoke condensates below 10 ppm but they did find residues in smoke from tobacco containing the higher levels of Penar. Mr. Campbell suggested that although the residue levels in leaf are low, it does not necessarily follow that the biological activity of the residue is low. Dr. Abramitis indicated that members of regulatory bodies in both Washington and Ottawa were really not satisfied with evidence obtained from mouse skin painting, but that the NCI after many months of delay only recently outlined protocol for the testing of chemicals for tobacco. He stated that a quantity of Canadian grown Penar treated tobacco, now at Philip Morris in the U.S., has a residue of 0.2 ppm which could be used for bioassay tests.

Mr. John Iglar and a group of people representing Proctor and Gamble and Atlas briefed the meeting on the use and characteristics of T-148, the fatty alcohol to be marketed as Delapray T-148. Mr. Iglar outlined the time and method of application, the type of equipment to use, and stressed the ease of application, the wide latitude of safe time of application, the effectiveness (as good as 100-30 on average) and the absence of residues in tobacco and smoke condensate. The emulsifier is of USP pharmaceutical quality and approved as a direct food additive. On questioning, a P.G. spokesman said that no bioassay work had been undertaken because their data indicated no residues of the chemical in the leaf. It was a decision made on purely technical grounds because no C<sub>8</sub> - C<sub>10</sub> residues were found by their analytical method which is accurate to 1 ppm and sensitive to 0.1 ppm C<sub>8</sub> - C<sub>10</sub>. Proctor and Gamble were prepared to provide sufficient Delapray T-148 for 12% of the Canadian tobacco production, but if a committee decision was made in the next few days to accept fatty alcohols for the 1970 crop, P. & G. could still alter plans and probably fill the market requirements.

During the meeting Mr. Wight had a telephone conversation with Mr. Jefferson, Plant Products Division, Ottawa, who had been in touch with Dr. H.W. Hays, Pesticides Regulations Division, Washington.

.../4

110317335

Dr. Hays indicated that no action will be taken against Penar at present and therefore it will not be banned for the current crop year. The USDA has asked Armour for more information on the levels of Penar in smoke because it feels that the TAC levels were unrealistic. He also stated that MH-30 was suspect by USDA because of recent work by Epstein at Harvard, and further information concerning the levels of MH-30 in smoke was also requested. However it appears that all types of sucker control chemicals will be available for use in the U.S. in 1970. In reply to Mr. Wight's question as to the likely status of Penar and MH-30 in Canada in 1971 if registration of chemicals is mandatory, Mr. Jefferson said that with the information now available he feels it would not be in the public interest to register these two chemicals.

In view of the importance of the Smoking and Health factors in Canada, it was generally agreed that only chemicals with good health connotations should be considered for use. Therefore the meeting agreed to prepare a press release which would conditionally accept the fatty alcohol suckerling agents in 1970. Penar, Engard and Offshoot-T are considered unacceptable while MH-30 remains banned and is not mentioned. The draft of the press release is attached and this will be presented to the Marketing Board for approval on Monday, May 4. If approved the members of the Board will do their utmost to reduce the use of Penar, without mentioning the health aspect but by stressing that the use of fatty alcohols will likely provide the good quality tobacco that the buyers want.

Because of the difficulty in controlling the use of sucker control chemicals, the meeting approved a suggestion by Mr. Campbell that a resolution be sent to the Plant Products Division CDA as follows: "In view of the difficulty involved in assessing the value of growth regulators on tobacco, the regulations governing the application of the Federal Pesticide Act 1969 should be prepared as soon as possible."

GWB/ja

cc: Mr. R.S. Wade  
Mr. D.E. Yearney  
Mr. C. Warren  
Mr. L.E. Fieard  
Mr. L.C. Laporte  
Dr. S.J. Green  
Dr. D.G. Tolson

110317336