

Omitted in some of the meetings, thought

HEALTH SERVICES
MINISTERIAL DIVISION, CANADA

513
7/46

June 4, 1975

Dr. P. G. Helton
38 Richmond Park Road
Millbrook
Southwest, Ontario
London

RESEARCH				
RECD.		7 JUN 1975		
D.G.F.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		ACK	
S.M.L.			FILE	

Dear Geoff,

Our brief was discussed Friday by C.M.C. Paul Paré's "game plan" was to have discussion and clarification of the brief and a number of other controversial smoking and health items, but no voting until after a coffee break, when the meeting would re-convene with only the four company presidents in the room. He had expected this would be the time when three companies would tell the fourth that they were determined to proceed in certain directions, come what may. As it turned out, there were no disagreements about anything.

B. & H. had sent our brief to the U.S. for "technical appraisal." When Paré stated that the next move would be for you and me to pay an exploratory visit to the Deputy Minister of Health and Dr. Morrison with the brief, the B. & H. president pleaded for a two weeks' delay. He said it was impossible for him to comment on the technical merits of our proposal and "we all have our Dr. Heltons back home." During the coffee break he assured me there was no question of B. & H. opting out, but he felt he could get helpful advice from the U.S. I passed this comment on to Paré, and I am told that when the meeting reconvened it was agreed that scientific advice from the U.S. would be most welcome.

It appears there will be another meeting in two weeks' time to hear what comes from Phillip Morris. Allowing for the usual delays in arranging meetings, it looks like a few days of your time in the 5th July will be requisitioned for Canada.

You will be pleased to know that the brief was awarded many compliments. There was some misunderstanding of the proposal to test products that can now be conceived to be possibly safer. Both Latham and B. & H. said they had their reservations and would want

110317017

to decide whether to have ... included in the test. I intervened to point out that we wanted to test "generalised examples of principles" and not commercial proprietary blend constituents such as company X's latest tobacco sheet. There ensued a recollection by several people of the industry agreement (originally advocated by Rothman) to pool knowledge and resources in the smoking and health field. Paré spoke eloquently that the industry ought to be able to overcome these difficulties and that the main thing was to agree on the principle of the exercise. There was unanimous agreement on this basis.

Needless to say, we are very grateful to you for your good work and advice last week, and I extend my own warmest personal thanks.

See you in July?

Kind regards,



R. H. Gibb

Enclosure: Addendum:
"Proposed Medical Research Conference"

110317618