

DATE	4 NOV 1983
SEEN BY	MJH
FILE	
DATE TO	
	→ LCFB ALH

JIAL

File  
Canada



Imperial Tobacco Limited/Limitée

3810, rue St-Antoine Street  
 Montréal, P.Q. H4C 1B5  
 (514) 932-6161  
 P.O. Box 6500 C.P.  
 Montréal, P.Q. H3C 3L6  
 Cable/Câble 'Telimp'  
 Telex/Télex 055-00673

October 31, 1983

Dr. M.J. Hardwick  
 British-American Tobacco Co. Ltd.  
 GR & DC  
 38 Regent's Park Road  
 Millbrook, Southampton SO9 1PE  
 England.

Ref.: MJH/K.P.N./46B-10

Dear Mike,

Pat has asked me to reply to your letter of September 19th regarding John's amplification of Work Area 13. Vacations and the disruption caused by the partial reconstruction of our building have contributed to the delay in responding to your request.

John has done a very creditable job of outlining what will obviously prove to be a very difficult area. His proposal to review some of the work that has been done in the past in the light of present conditions is I believe a correct approach. It also serves to illustrate the difficulty in coming up with something that is really new and will hopefully result in a climate where new ideas will emerge. ✓

His intention of limiting a machine development to simple test rigs that can be used to prove principles and provide sufficient products for small scale subjective and objective testing is good. We have too often, in the past, attempted the development of sophisticated machinery before ascertaining if there was a genuine product need. ✓

From our point of view we would tend to give higher priority to products where the consumer can perceive a genuine plus. Our second priority is in the area of product changes which would counter anti-smoking efforts followed by cost saving activities

109974679

As a result we will follow with interest the development of techniques whereby different structures can be tested along with variable density, variable composition and multiple section cigarettes. With respect to annular cigarettes we worked on this sometime ago but became somewhat discouraged at the difficulties associated with surrounding a 5.6 mm diameter core with a 1 mm annulus for a 50:50 cigarette or even the problems of controlling an approximate 2 mm annulus around a 4 mm diameter core for a 75:25 cigarette. Perhaps with John's test rigs the products can be sufficiently controlled to determine if they will satisfy a consumer need and then the production problems can be worked out.

With respect to the suggestions for increasing the % void fraction either with structured sheets or non tobacco fillers we have not nearly exhausted the weight savings that can be obtained through process modifications, and our current policy is to shy away from additives. We would put a low priority on these activities.

THIS IS  
R G H  
WOLK  
+  
R W H  
WOLK

Turning now to the programme on filter technology, although our present workload precludes any active development in this area we will follow with interest studies on the value of modifying smoke puff profiles and the smoke pattern entering the smoker's mouth. These could be of potential value.

Controlling the delivery of specific smoke components, and I assume this refers to some of the "nasties" is not an active issue here. We are having some problems with Carbon Monoxide but I believe they can be solved without resorting to the CSF1 filter at this time. Similarly the heat embossing of tipplings has not stirred up much interest. Low cost filters as typified by the polypropylene developments appear to have greater application in countries such as Brazil than in Canada.

Summing up I would reiterate our order of priorities:

- 1) Efforts to find a product plus ✓
- 2) Programme which would improve the health image of cigarettes ✓
- 3) Economics. ✓

I hope this will be of some help to you in walking the narrow line between fostering a climate where novel product technology can emerge and keeping an eye on practicality without stifling creativity. Good luck.

With kind regards,

Yours sincerely,

S.M. Candlish

109874680