

I.T. Co., Canada.

Research - Development
Rev: - 4 APR 1966
Ack:
.....

abc

March 25, 1966

Dr. W. B. Fordyce
Westminster House,
7 Millbank
London, S.W. 1,
England.

HSH
back to VC
h - 30m
L/14/66

Dear Brian:

We were very pleased to receive your letter of March 18 with its proposal to get the project for standardization of smoking procedures off the ground. Although I have not had time to study carefully the details and implications of your suggestions I felt that you would appreciate it if I dropped you a line to say that I.T. Co. (Canada) Ltd., agrees, in principle, with the project.

Furthermore, we would be glad to provide the standard cigarettes required. In fact, we have recently manufactured 100,000 cigarettes which are serving as our own internal standard. These are 74 mm. plain cigarettes made with a regular blend of flue-cured grades of tobacco and contain normally used levels of PCL and CRS.

A quantity of these cigarettes could readily be made available for the standardization exercise at any time. I would recommend, however, that we keep them here until all details of the exercise have been finalized and the various laboratories have indicated that they are set up to perform the experiment. It would be a simple precaution to circumvent the possibility of the cigarettes being affected differently by storage for long periods in different locations.

As soon as I have had a chance to fully study your suggestions I shall reply to your letter in more detail. In the meantime, however, I would like to jot down a few off-the-cuff thoughts for your consideration.

Firstly, it seems to me that nicotine would be a better starter for our exercise than tar. It is a single, unequivocal smoke constituent which all laboratories analyse by a similar technique and are already completely set up to undertake. In addition, its determination should provide a much better assessment of any laboratory differences in smoking parameters than would that of tar. Once any inter-laboratory parameter discrepancies were cleared up, then, in my opinion, would be the right time to tackle the determination of tar.

Secondly, instead of a Karl Fischer water determination I would advocate the Near-Infrared technique. Admittedly we have had only a very brief experience with the Karl Fischer method but it was long enough for us to confirm that it can give rise to serious problems and errors, especially in

.... 2

100086734

the hands of those unfamiliar with it. The Near-Infrared method on the other hand, is much more specific and precise. I feel sure that it could be adopted by any laboratory in very short order and would prove to be much more trouble free and reliable than the Karl Fischer determination.

With kindest regards,

Sincerely,

J. E. de Souza

JEdS/cc

cc: Dr. D. G. Felton ✓
Mr. W. W. Reid
Dr. F. Seehofer
Mr. C. J. Rosene

100086735