

COMMENTS ON REPORT NO. T.51 (B.T.C., AUSTRALIA)

SUMMARY

This is more or less a reproduction of the R.I.S. on Monsanto filters. I find the sentence concerning manufacture to an accurate specification a little over-emphatic. The final paragraph is a repetition of my suggestion to Tasman Wilson when he was here. I presume we await a firm order before contacting Monsanto?

INTRODUCTION

Australia say these filters are cheaper to purchase - presumably this means they are cheaper than cellulose acetate filters purchased from Australian Manufacturers.

RESULTS

The WOODROSE results are most interesting and encouraging.

PHYSICAL ANALYSIS

There are no figures to support the conclusion on batch-to-batch variation. Filter hardness is not mentioned.

SMOKE ANALYSIS

The general comments are in agreement with our views.

CONCLUSIONS

The remark on nitromethane fraction is rather bold. On the whole these are very fair and encouraging.

This report does not cover filter attachment to cigarettes.

*All the evidence on filters is for, if any effect, an increase in activity. Why should this be different? RT 11/17F written sep 11/72 even.*

*H S G.*

H.G. Horsewell

11th September, 1972.

107470022