

010985

Final -- Media Briefing -- H. Kornegay

We appreciate your coming here this morning to obtain some background information on a controversy that is important to your readers, viewers or listeners.

About two-fifths of the adult population today are cigarette smokers. During the past 20 years the health implications of this custom have attracted increasing attention in the medical and scientific community. During the past 17 years the tobacco industry has become the leading source of financial support for scientific research relating to smoking and health questions. During the past nine years, this question has been the subject of public policy decisions by governments at every level from the city councils to the Presidents of the United States. Here and there we've seen elements of emotionalism, prohibitionism, even fanaticism that have given us more clouding than enlightenment of the scientific and medical issues.

T503173

TIMN 0119282

I'd like to come back to this line of thought in a few minutes. First, let me note a thing or two about this briefing.

Whatever we have to say today, is on the record. We want any of you to interrupt at any point with a question or any remark you want to make.

The formal part of this briefing will not go beyond 60 minutes, and a drink and some lunch will be waiting for us.

Before going further, I want to introduce to you the medical director of The Tobacco Institute, Dr. Gilbert Huebner.

He has been in his present position less than a year, but before he joined the Institute, as a surgeon, he saw a great deal of the problems of health from the inside out, so to speak. Dr. Huebner left the Caylor-Nickel Clinic in Indiana, where he was staff surgeon, to come to us in Washington. He's a Harvard graduate, and took his doctorate at Cornell University Medical College. He is a veteran of very distinguished Army medical service, including posts as chief of

010987

surgery and commanding officer of a station hospital in France.

He was resident in general surgery at Letterman General Hospital in San Francisco for four years. Dr. Huebner is a diplomate of the American Board of Surgery and a fellow of the American College of Surgeons.

He will give you some of the highlights of the medical and scientific basis for our view that we do not yet have the answers in this controversy about smoking and health. Dr. Huebner?

\* \* \*

Thank you, Doctor. You've given in a few minutes some of the high spots in the medical and scientific area which demonstrate that we simply are not dealing with a closed case. This is by no means a situation in which the tobacco people are clutching at slim reeds, either. Far from it.

We've given you a document which explicitly shows the lack of acceptance by some of the foremost scientists and physicians

T503181  
TIMN 0119284

of the theory that tobacco causes disease in this country and elsewhere. Every one of those statements is in the public domain and each of them is a very carefully considered expression of scientific views.

There is another document in your background material which gives you a timetable of the various kinds of federal action in this controversy starting back in 1962. There isn't any point in my reciting them in detail to you, but there are some interesting patterns worth noting.

When you look at it, you will see that the first major event was the report of the Advisory Committee on Smoking and Health to the Surgeon General back in '64. Right there we began to see the conflicting reaction within the government that continues right down to this day.

HEW published the report and endorsed it.

T503183

TIMN 0119285

FTC within a week accepted it without qualification and used it as the basis to propose a required health warning in cigarette advertising. The Trade Commission has continued to press for this warning ever since. Parenthetically, I would say it remains to be seen whether the industry's recent decision to show the package warning in its advertising will suit the Commission.

In any event, Congress did not take that report--or any of the subsequent HEW reports--at face value. Instead, they held hearings on the health questions in 1964, '65, and '69. Congress currently requires the Surgeon General's opinion--which I can assure you we do not agree with--to appear on every cigarette package. But it is still the position of the Congress as expressed in law that smoking "may be"--not is, but may be--a health hazard. In other words, they have paid attention to what some of these distinguished scientists and researchers have said.

By 1967 the Federal Communications Commission intervened--first, it declared that any station that ran cigarette commercials would have to carry anti-smoking commercials too. In 1969 it said cigarette commercials ought to be prohibited. Last year it said that

T503183

TIMN 0119286

the stations should keep running the anti-smoking commercials as a public service--without the cigarette commercials--but that they did not have to give any time for the broadcasting of contrasting views. That, ladies and gentlemen, is editorship. ~~As you see from the notes we've given you, we're contesting that decision in the Federal Courts.~~

It seems to us that HEW and the regulatory agencies ~~have tailored~~ have made the science of the cigarette question ~~fit the predeter-~~ <sup>to their</sup> mined policies, ~~which they think are going to have the best popular~~ ~~reaction.~~ <sup>also</sup> It's obvious to us that the Congress has dealt far more even-handedly with the issue in making its policies fit the science. Where you have one branch of the government being more or less reasonable, and another being totally arbitrary, I ~~don't know who~~ can be an effective policeman, <sup>only</sup> ~~except~~ the pressure of public opinion. That's why we so earnestly want you to understand our view of this <sup>with</sup> public issue, situation.

T503181

TIMN 0119287

It's one thing to have to live under federal policies  
that have the force of law when they are not based on scientific  
facts. We could throw up our hands and file that under "injustice."  
But there's more to it.

But the greatest damage can be done to science itself, and  
ultimately to the American public.

For if a scientific question can be decided by political  
edict it becomes unprofitable to search for actual, rather than  
"official," facts. If you can find a scapegoat, you can stop  
looking for the real culprit. Or to put it another way, if you go  
down the wrong fork in the road, you are diverted from following the  
right fork.

It is a diversion that is costly in terms of human lives.  
And it has happened before. Such a trip down the wrong fork may  
have been made in 1953 in the fight against polio. One fork led  
towards a vaccine using "killed" polio virus.

T503185

TIMN 0119288

The other led toward a vaccine with live virus that could no longer cause polio.

We have it on the authority of no less an expert than Dr. James A. Shannon, the former director of the National Institutes of Health, that the wrong turn was taken - and for non-scientific reasons. According to Dr. Shannon, the National Polio Foundation, a voluntary health organization, secretly decided to throw its resources behind the killed virus vaccine, which three weeks after it came into general use was discovered to be produced and tested with unsafe and inadequate methods.

As you may know, the live virus vaccine is now the preferred treatment by at least a ten-to-one margin. And as we have learned it was delayed three years, because of an unfortunate decision of the Polio Foundation to intervene. Dr. Shannon declared that this intervention "markedly increased the difficulties and greatly

T503186

TIMN 0119289

protracted the time required to develop the generally accepted polio vaccine we have today."

The same mistake--a non-scientific, political decision--may be diverting research from the underlying cause of cancer and the many other environmental factors that influence the disease.

It is a possibility worth pondering especially in view of a curious coincidence. In 1953, the same year the Polio Foundation took the wrong fork in the road, the American Cancer Society too seemed to be standing at a crossroads. Confronted by a rise in lung cancer, the Cancer Society was encouraging research into both cigarette smoking and air pollution. For as the ACS said, "Some evidence places cigarette smoking on the scene of the crime. But the evidence is not strong enough to convict it. Other data link air pollution and lung cancer."

But that was 17 years ago. The American Cancer Society has long since made its choice...Perhaps the wrong one. And one may

also ponder whether the vast Federal research effort likewise was diverted by this well-publicized and heavily promoted crusade.

One outstanding government cancer researcher, for instance, feels that the continuing effort to prove that cigarettes are guilty is less fruitful than a major research program aimed at discovering what it is that really causes cancer.

As he sees it, only one out of 1400 cigarette smokers gets cancer in any year. To him, that means that the 1399 smokers who don't get cancer have something different in their genetic structure than the one smoker who does get cancer.

We think government policy must foster scientific understanding of the causes of human disease. It shouldn't replace open, objective research with closed, official dogma. To do so it must move to fill the gaps in our knowledge and not to slam doors in the face of them.

T503183

TIMN 0119291

Two years ago, after hearing and studying the statements of nearly 80 scientists and physicians, who spoke for government agencies, fund-raising organizations, the cigarette industry, or individually, the House Commerce Committee declared in an official report that "nothing new has been determined with respect to the relationship between cigarette smoking and human health since 1964 and 1965."

At the initiative of our industry, dating back to conversations between the President of The Tobacco Institute and the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare as long as five years ago, industry and HEW officials, and scientists, have been holding discussions in an effort to identify and fill gaps in knowledge in smoking and health. The Congress is aware of this effort and has encouraged it.

The "big-three" sources of funds for such research are the Council for Tobacco Research, the AMA's Education and Research

T503189

TIMN 0119292

Foundation, both supported by the tobacco industry, and of course the government itself. The industry's commitment to date through the two organizations exceeds \$35 million. Contrary to what you might expect, the voluntary health associations' role in smoking-health scientific research has been minimal.

We, of the tobacco industry, pledge to keep doing all we can in this direction, because we believe the cigarette controversy raises a fundamental question for the future of American society.

I think there are two questions here as far as the government is concerned. Should it provide information to the public about smoking and health? We think it should--if it sticks to the facts.

The second question is whether it should attempt to control the individual smoking behavior or the citizens. We think it should not--but that's where we clearly part company from some of the government people.

T503130

TIMN 0119293

Item. In 1965, the Public Health Service set up a so-called National Clearinghouse for Smoking and Health to disseminate "health information." This year, its mission is frankly behavior change. They say "we must reduce the number of persons smoking...and work toward a general reduction in smoking...the task is the determination and utilization of other factors which influence smoking cessation."

Item. The American Cancer Society has also frankly abandoned its interest in providing facts. Quite the opposite. In his keynote address last year Jonathan Rhoads, president of the Society, laid down a hard line reminiscent of Carrie Nation: "Our efforts will continue," he said, "to eliminate cigarette smoking entirely."

(Ironically, part of the Cancer Society's indictment of cigarettes rests on experiments with mice. But regarding the same animal experiments with carcinogens in smog, or oil, gasoline and

diesel fumes, Dr. Rhoads was cautious. "It is quite a jump," he said, "from infant...incompetent mice to human beings." Which is, after all, what the cigarette industry has been saying all along.)

Another Item. The Surgeon General frankly wants to ban smoking in public. Not because it would be effective - as he must know it would not be - but because it will help discredit the social acceptability of smoking.

As the trend is now developing, the federal agencies have decided that Americans who do not choose to conform to official information lack either the understanding or the will. The inevitable consequence will be more and more "education" and "tinkering", and "protection" until people "freely" conform to the behavior that the bureaucrats consider is really best. (I must say the late George Orwell wrote an imaginative book, but I wonder if he didn't have the 1984 date wrong!)

TIMN 0119295

T503192

010999

-15-

The application of this doctrine to cigarettes is too much a commonplace. Will it be as easily accepted in other areas of American life? More importantly, should it be entertained at all as government policy?

What can the media do to advance scientific progress and protect citizens? Primarily, they can tell people that there is another side to the cigarette controversy. But first they must be willing to listen to the other side.

TIMN 0119296

You are doing that today very admirably. We are trying to outline the facts which convince us not that our product is above scientific suspicion, not that it has been scientifically exonerated--but simply that it is in every sense still on trial. The cigarette industry has two commitments in light of that fact--to foster research as we cited earlier, as the only way to resolve this controversy--and to attempt to make our position clear to the public. This gathering today is an example of the latter, and we deeply appreciate your attention to our story.

T503193

011000

-16-

None of it, as I have suggested it in my remarks, would make much sense without a glimpse of the medical and scientific considerations on which we rest our case. It's by no means as simple as the neat summaries out of the front of the Surgeon General's reports that came over the wire services or the networks from Washington, D. C.

We find it very difficult to capture public attention long enough to provide the details and the technical points that can counteract the headlines made by the adversaries of cigarettes. I'd like to wind up the formal part of this briefing by showing you a case history of one of these anti-cigarette headline stunts that turned out eventually to be meaningless. The example I'm going to discuss in the famous "smoking dog" experiment that was announced a year ago February by the American Cancer Society.

What they did was to try to create an illusion which reality gradually shattered. A good deal of the reality was unearthed by newspaper and television reporters.

TIMN 0119297 T503194

1. Left:  
February 5, 1970  
Waldorf Astoria...

2. Right:  
Swords

3. Right:  
"Scientists have produced..."

The story began on February fifth  
last year at the Waldorf-Astoria  
Hotel in New York, where the  
American Cancer Society staged a  
news conference for two of its  
researchers, Doctors Hammond and  
Auerbach. The Society announced  
what it claimed was the major link  
between cigarette smoking and lung  
cancer. In their publicity release--  
and this is an exact quote--the  
Cancer Society said:

For the first time, scientists have  
produced lung cancer in a  
significantly large experimental  
animal as a result of heavy cigarette  
smoking. End quote. They went on to  
say that lung cancer was found--  
quote--in 12 of the heavy smoker  
dogs. End quote.

TIMN 0119298

T503195

4. Left: February 6, 1970  
San Francisco Chronicle  
Right: Smoking Dogs Show...

It was a pretty sensational story.

The next day the newspapers across  
the country really played it up.

The San Francisco Chronicle ran  
this headline:

(Pause) Ⓢ

5. Left: February 6, 1970  
Chicago Tribune  
Right: Dogs Inhale...

The Chicago Tribune played it this  
way:

(Pause) Ⓢ

6. Left: The Washington Post  
Right: Cigarettes Produce...

Here was the Washington Post story:

(Pause) Ⓢ

7. Left: Reader's Digest  
Right: Last Gasp...

The Reader's Digest ran this head-  
line:

(Pause) Ⓢ

8. Left: Time Story & Cover  
Right: Newsweek Story  
and Cover

And it was a major story for the  
news weeklies, too.

(Pause) Ⓢ

9. Left: February 6, 1970,  
New York Times  
Right: 12 Dogs Develop...

It was Page One in the New York  
Times, and the gist of all the  
stories was that Doctors Hammond and  
Auerbach found that twelve of their  
experimental dogs had developed lung  
cancer. This was after they inhaled

cigarette smoke for more than two years through holes cut in their windpipes. Scientists had been trying for decades to produce lung cancer in animals with inhaled smoke, and never had been able to do it.

So that was the story everybody read, and it was repeated in various media over the next several months. On April 30, for example, Doctor Auerbach again gave the gist of the findings on a television news broadcast:

(Film)

10. Left: April 30, 1970  
11. Right: Film on  
Left: For many years...

(Auerbach: For many years we've been working on the effects of cigarette smoke on the bronchial tubes of human beings. We have observed over this period of time changes which lead to lung cancer. Now we have done the same thing to dogs that human beings have done to

12. Left: We have observed....

13. Left: Now we have...

14. Left: Namely, put...

themselves. Namely, put cigarette smoke down into their bronchial tubes, and we have observed a series of changes leading to lung cancer.

15. Left: These dogs...

These dogs have developed lung cancer exactly like those of human beings.)

(Film Off)

16. Left: 12 Dogs

So the two main points in this story were--first--that there were

17. Left: 12 Dogs Developed Lung Cancer

12 dogs, and--second--that they developed lung cancer--quote--as a result of heavy cigarette smoking. End quote.

Now, as we'll see in a moment, some questions were raised about this, and when the press began to dig into it more deeply, both these assertions began to be denied.

18. Left: June 23, 1970  
AMA Convention

For example, on June 23 Doctors Hammond and Auerbach delivered their report once again--this time in Chicago at the annual convention of

the American Medical Association. Doctor Hammond held another news conference there, in a pretty noisy press room. When the reporters pinned him down on this study, here's what Doctor Hammond said.

(Film)

19. Left: In this experiment...

(Hammond: In this experiment, the heavy-smoking dogs of non-filter-tip cigarettes, two of them, also developed very small invasive

20. Left: Just two of them...

bronchial carcinomas. Just two of them. The filter-tip smokers and

21. Left: They also developed...

the lighter smokers did not. They also developed bronchiolo-alveolar

22. Left: To these, we...

tumors, 12 of which were invasive.

To these we have not applied the word cancer because there's a difference of opinion as to whether this sort of tumor should or should not be

23. Left: Different pathologists...

called cancer. Different pathologists have different impressions of it, so we are simply publishing what we found, describing it

without applying that term.)

(Film Off)

24. Left: 12, (rolls to 2)

So what had happened was that the original 12 cancers had mysteriously shrunk to two. And the impact of the 12 dogs begins to fade. But what about that sensational handout in February? Does the Cancer

25. Right: Research Report Revised...

Society, which created the myth, put out a news story like this?

Research Report Revised--

Two Dogs, Not Twelve,

Develop Lung Cancer.

Unfortunately it does not. Now bear in mind that one of these researchers--Doctor Hammond--is a salaried vice president of the American Cancer Society. He, and the other Researcher--Doctor Auerbach--have had their dog experiment supported to the extent of more than three-quarters of a million dollars in grants from the Society and the government.

TIMN 0119303

26. Right: New York Times Story

T503200

We can wonder why these men lent themselves to this exaggeration by the Cancer Society, or whether it was just a careless accident. But I think we need some more information before making a judgment about that.

27. Left: February 6, 1970  
Waldorf Astoria  
Right: Swords

Let's go back to the bombshell announcement at the Waldorf. As you can imagine, the tobacco industry was greatly troubled about it.

28. Right: "Their findings..."

Besides announcing findings that the researchers themselves later in effect denied, the American Cancer Society advised the cigarette companies that day to review their advertising policies in light of these new findings. The tobacco companies certainly were and are ready to do so, but they thought they ought to get an independent evaluation of this experiment first.

29. Left: February 27, 1970  
A letter...  
Right: Cullman letter

T503201

TIMN 0119304

So, starting late that month, there were several exchanges of letters between Joseph Cullman of Philip Morris, the chairman of our Tobacco Institute executive committee, and his opposite number at the Cancer Society, William Lewis, who is chairman of the board.

30. Right: Letter blown up

Mr. Cullman asked Mr. Lewis to make the experimental data available to a panel of independent experts.

31. Left: A letter...  
Right: Lewis's letter

But Mr. Lewis wrote bluntly to

32. Right: Letter blown up

Mr. Cullman that the Cancer Society did not intend--quote--to ask that these two eminent men submit their findings to any selected committee chosen by The Tobacco Institute, or any other group. End quote.

33. Left: New York Times  
Right: Eye, Ear, Nose...

At that stage The Tobacco Institute made the letters public. Then the New York Times ran an editorial in which it called the Cancer Society's position a--quote--error of

judgment--unquote. And a prestigious medical journal said their decision was--quote--difficult to understand.

34. Left: March 12, 1970  
A letter...  
Right: The letter

One of Mr. Lewis's letters in March said that the Hammond-Auerbach findings were going to be published shortly in a medical journal, and then they would show--quote--the meticulous work that went into this latest scientific experiment.

35. Right: Letter blown up

Well, that was last spring, and we waited for this prompt publication of the findings. April went by.

36. Left: April  
(Roll to November)

May;

June;

July;

August;

September;

October;

November...

T503203

TIMN 0119306

37. Left: July 8, 1970  
The Wall Street Journal
- Why all the delay? As yet we don't have the full story, but the press, particularly the Wall Street Journal and Science Magazine, did some investigating and came up with some explanations.
38. Right: AMA Journal decides... First, they learned that the Journal of the American Medical Association got manuscripts from Hammond and Auerbach, and appointed eighteen independent authorities to review them--apparently an unprecedented number. These authorities obviously decided the study simply didn't measure up to JAMA's professional standards.
39. Right: JAMA Cover
40. Right: JAMA cover smaller  
Not acceptable...
- The editor of the AMA Journal, Doctor Hugh Hussey, was quoted as saying that the articles--quote--are not acceptable in their present form, and that they'd been returned to the authors--quote--for extensive revision. End quote.

So it looked as though what the Cancer Society called meticulous work needed quite a few repairs.

41. Right: New Eng. Journal cover  
 We also found out from the press that the manuscripts were submitted to the New England Journal of Medicine, and that that publication also turned them down.
42. Right: New Eng. Journal cover smaller  
 Not acceptable...

These events and all the delays prompted Mr. Cullman to notify

43. Left: A letter...  
 Right: Salutation of letter
- Mr. Lewis that--as he put it--there is now good reason to suspect that this report was far from accurate and that it is likely that none of the dogs developed lung cancer.

Well, the scientific articles finally appeared, last December, ten months after the press conference, in the Archives of Environmental Health, which is a specialty journal of pretty limited circulation.

44. Right: December...  
 Left: Archives Cover

T503205

TIMN 0119308

45. Right: The articles

Now, let's take a look at the published report, and compare it with that premature announcement the previous February. Incidentally, that first announcement coincided with the American Cancer Society's annual fund raising drive. And Congress at that time was still considering the new cigarette act-- the one that prohibits cigarette advertising on tv and radio. It was signed into law just two months later.

As we shall see, the findings of the published report are modified dramatically from the original Cancer Society announcement. Some of the circumstances surrounding the publication raised several new questions about the background of the whole study.

T503206

TIMN 0119309

46. Right: Archives 9 days...

One of the most eye-catching facts was that Archives took only nine days to review and accept a study which JAMA studied for four months before rejecting.

47. Right: Chief editor...

Also, the editor of Archives, who's well-known for her anti-cigarette views, published the study in December, the same month her retirement became effective.

48. Right: Oscar Auerbach...

Another interesting fact is that Doctor Auerbach himself is on the editorial board of this journal. We wonder frankly if that isn't the reason he tried several other journals first.

49. Right: The articles

Well, the variations between the published report and the Cancer Society's February press conference version are so abundant I hardly know where to begin.

T503207

TIMN 0119310

50. Right: Tumors found...

The authors had one group of their dogs not exposed to any cigarette smoke at all, and they expressed surprise at finding tumors in 25 percent of the non-smoking dogs. This group is no longer referred to as control dogs, as they were in the Cancer Society's publicity release.

51. Right: "Squamous cell..."

And the only reference to cancer is--quote--Squamous cell bronchial carcinomas of microscopic size

were found in two dogs that smoked many non-filter cigarettes a day and were killed after 875 days of

52. Right: "Such cancers..."

smoking. Such cancers were not found in any of the other dogs.

Close quote.

53. Left: "The dogs smoked..."

The ACS also said originally that the dogs smoked in much the same way that humans do. But the

54. Left: "The dogs did not..."

published study says the dogs did not

T503208

TIMN 0119311

smoke cigarettes in identically the same way as cigarettes are smoked by men.

55. Left: "The findings...

The original announcement by the Society said that the findings of Doctors Auerbach and Hammond effectively refute contentions by cigarette manufacturing interests that there was no cigarette-cancer link, and any claims to the contrary were only statistical.

56. Left: "Findings should have...

The Cancer Society's press release also suggested that the findings should have a significant impact on the smoking of cigarettes in this country, and will probably lead to a reassessment of advertising claims and policies of the cigarette industry.

57. Left: "To ascertain...

Now, that February report also said specifically that a purpose of the experiment was to ascertain whether

58. Left: "Male beagle dogs...

59. Right: Roll to picture of many beagles

60. Left: Swords

61. Left: 10 months delay

62. Left: Unpublished...

63. Left: Accepted in 9 days...

smoking cigarettes for two years or longer will produce lung cancer in dogs. The published report makes no claim of having accomplished this purpose. It doesn't even include it as a stated purpose. The absolute final conclusion of this highly publicized study now states instead that male beagle dogs...are satisfactory for testing the relative potency of various types of cigarettes in respect to the production of squamous cell bronchial carcinomas, provided that a large number of animals is employed and the dogs smoke for several years. Unquote.

In our own minds we put together all these inconsistencies, the long delay in publication, the obvious reserve with which the data have been received by pathologists and other reviewers, the strange, almost suspicious

64. Left: Refuse Independent  
Review

circumstances under which it was finally published, and the fact that the Cancer Society still refuses to permit the data to be looked at by independent scientists. And The Tobacco Institute contends the whole report is very far from accurate and that it is likely that none--repeat none of the dogs developed lung cancer.

65. Left: Swords

Yet this is what was hailed by the American Cancer Society as a scientific breakthrough--the only alleged breakthrough evidence against cigarettes, by the way, in many years. It's being relied upon as significant evidence in prestigious reports both in the U. S. and in England.

And the Surgeon General of the United States, who never examined

66. All black

the experiment itself as far as I know, warmly endorsed the original press release version.

Many people still believe that Doctors Hammond and Auerbach are reputable scientists. They've spent a lot of time and money doing this experiment, and it's extremely difficult to suggest that their whole project was a waste.

67. Left: "When you receive..."

My own feeling is that the doctors did contribute to a publicity stunt, and then became the unhappy victims of it. The editor of Archives herself commented that when you receive grants and when research money is tight, you have to go along a little bit with your sponsors. She went on to say that she was sure that the hubbub in the lay press was not the wish of the investigators.

68. Left: Lots of beagles  
Right: Swords

Now, we've taken a substantial amount of your time to provide what we consider a broad perspective on this issue of health and smoking. We've tried to show how many different elements are involved, and why a simplistic answer is not logical or justified. Yet the Cancer Society and many others are trying to take this simple approach in this controversy. I guess the moral is that when any institution makes sensational assertions they have to be looked at very carefully.

69. All black

In this particular case, the press and tv reporters did a superb job of digging away at the publicity story until they found the reality underneath it.

For that we're appreciative. We're hopeful the press will continue this probing role in this controversy.

011020

-36-

And now, Doctor Huebner and I will try to answer any questions. I know this has been a heavy dose this morning, and there are probably a lot of things you might want to talk about that we haven't gotten into, so feel free to speak up.

\*\*\*

TIMN 0119317

T503214

If there aren't any more questions right now, we'll go ahead and have a drink and some lunch, and there'll be no more speech-making. I hope that we close this session with your having a bit more comprehensive understanding of this controversy--maybe a little better impression of the corporate responsibility of the fine companies which we represent. I am no expert on corporate responsibility, but I am certainly proud of the industry's research effort; of the fact that it seeks open dialogue with the public on the smoking-health question; that it recognized, way back in the 60's, its obligation not to promote its products among young people and ceased doing so; that it extended this policy by volunteering two years ago to discontinue its broadcast advertising which was reaching so many youngsters, to the annoyance of their parents; that it volunteered to put the "tar"-nicotine scores in its advertising which you now see every day, and that soon you will be seeing the Surgeon General's opinion in every ad as a further industry step.

TIMN 0119318

T503215

011022

26  
-33-

Well, we thank you for coming. Now let's see about some

lunch.

TIMN 0119319

T503216