

7th March, 1958.

Dr. L. C. Laporte.

it was unlikely there was just one potent carcinogenic agent in smoke whose presence made it dangerous and whose removal would render smoke innocuous. I incline far more to the view that any connection that smoke might have was of a more general nature, represented by the summation of a long series of slight irritations which were only important when happening to a particularly susceptible person. There is a great difference in outlook that follows from these two attitudes of mind which would have a direct bearing on the type of research we should sponsor. If there were a remote chance of a single potent agent then meticulous and detailed chemical analysis of the smoke would be required, coupled with the study of various pre-treatment methods to remove the precursor. On the other view, the problem is far more of reducing the tar while preserving the physiological effects and the taste, and hoping that the solution to our immediate problem will come from advance in our knowledge of cancer as a whole. This would carry as a corollary that this industry's support should be quite considerably to fundamental matters connected with the cell and what leads it to behave abnormally. I should be most grateful to have any of your ideas on this subject and, to put me in the picture, how you feel thought over on your side is developing.

With kindest regards,

Yours,

(Sgd.) Charles.

Copy to:-  
Mr. H. D. Anderson.

100171668

PRIVATE & CONFIDENTIAL.

From :- Sir Charles Ellis, F.R.S.

7th March, 1958.

Dr. L. C. Laporte,  
Imperial Tobacco Company of Canada, Ltd.,  
P.O. Box 6500,  
3810, St. Antoine Street,  
MONTREAL 30,  
Canada.

Dear Leo,

It seems a long time since I wrote to you and I am taking the opportunity to do so now because of a remark that Hugh Anderson made to me the other day. He said that you had been looking at the results of pre-treatment of tobacco by hexane or cyclo-hexane and studying the effect it had on the taste. I was surprised to hear that, while you found the taste altered it was not disagreeable. I was surprised because, if my memory is right, the original accounts emanating from Wynder stated the taste was objectionable, but Hugh Anderson's comments on this were that this was due to dirty vessels or failure to remove some impurity on the part of the people who did the extraction work for him.

I am very intrigued by this and would be most grateful if you would give me such information as you are able about the progress of your investigations in this field, and where you think it may take you. Do you yourself believe that there is a definite relation between the carcinogenic action of the condensed tar as measured by mouse reaction and the presence or absence of the hexane extract?

Whether I have any foundation for it or not I have, up to the moment, held the view that

100171669