

R027PRA

*The documents in R027PRA are **Bates # 2500118008 (19900622) and # 2022198692(19900622)**. They are an external press briefing and an internal review that forms the basis for the press release.*

Authors: Steve Parrish, an attorney, and Vice President of Corporate Scientific Affairs for Philip Morris (when these documents were written) and Thomas Borelli, a Ph. D. in biochemistry who reported to Parrish as manager of the department. Steven Parrish has held a number of executive positions for Philip Morris, and continues to work for the organization. **Addressee:** None noted.

On June 22, 1990 Steven Parrish and Thomas Borelli, Philip Morris executives, held a press briefing regarding EPA's imminent release (on June 25th) of "...a preliminary assessment of the effects of environmental tobacco smoke (ETS) on the lung, including an estimate of lung cancer deaths from ETS."

The internal review document is structured such that a claim made in the EPA's draft report is rebutted with a response from PM. For example, where EPA finds that increased lung cancer occurrence is not a chance event, but occurs more often among nonsmoking women exposed to ETS than to those not exposed, the review author(s) counter with a lengthy design and methods critique. This then becomes the basis for assertions that PM thinks "...the EPA consultant's draft is more social engineering than science..." Parrish and Borelli begin by stating that the "alleged" scientific evidence against ETS has not been reviewed by EPA's Science Advisory Board, and have not undergone either peer or administrative review. They want the public to understand how preliminary the report is.

They attack the report on every issue it raises, suggesting that "...the EPA's consultant is putting a butcher's thumb on the scale of science..." claiming he ignores studies that do not support his conclusion of a correlation between increased risk of lung cancer and ETS. Parrish and Borelli conclude the press briefing by asserting their belief that when the scientists at EPA look at the documents they will also conclude that the research is faulty, and that "claims of lung cancer deaths are not supported by the evidence quoted..."