

ITA BUTTROSE INTERVIEW ON RADIO STATION 2UE, 1984 WITH JOHN DOLLISSON (TIA) AND SIMON CHAPMAN (HEALTH DEPARTMENT).

Transcribed by Simon Chapman

Interviewer How conclusive is the evidence that cigarette smoking is damaging to health?

SC I think the overwhelming body of medical opinion would think that there is very little in medicine that is known as much. I don't think there is any substantial body of medical evidence or medical body in the world which doubts the relationship. The tobacco industry claims that the relationship isn't very good. They have a number of scientists who dispute this. However these scientists are very much a minority and there is no doubt at all in serious circles e.g. WHO, Royal College of Physicians, AMA.

Interviewer What do you have to say John?

JD We certainly refute that. All that exists is a statistical association between smoking and ill health. There is no proof that tobacco causes these diseases. In fact the Royal College of physicians and The Surgeon General both state quite clearly, that despite further use of research they have been unable to identify the biological mechanism that cause these diseases. What's required is not a statistical association but proof about the mechanism of biologic pathways that you need induced in tobacco when it goes into someone and cause these diseases. Despite years and years of research they have never been able to show that. For instance I would like to show some examples that show quite clearly this and raises questions about the statistical association. For example, Australian non-smokers obtain these diseases. The majority of smokers don't get these diseases. Decreases in heart rate in heart disease in Australia but no change in smoking patterns. In Japan where there is highest incidence of smoking in the world and lowest incidence of lung cancer and smoking is said to cause lung cancer. I can go on and on. One of the most recent studies is when other factors are taken into consideration with these diseases is associated with internal/ external workplace pollution, nutrition, genetics and environment find smoking correlation completely disappears. I think that it is important to realise that there have been some major epidemiological surveys including MRFIT Study of \$150 million which tried to show that by removing tobacco from people's diets they would increase longevity. In case of heart disease it had no effect on mortality and in case of lung cancer it

increased mortality from removing this. So to say that, is quite mischievous For anyone to suggest that tobacco causes disease. It constitutes statistical mal-practice to jump from statistics to causation.

SC I think Mr Dollisson's one point is that you can't prove that any individual who smokes is going to suffer ill health consequences for it. All he is saying is really like the situation in Russian Roulette. When 6 people play a game 5 people will win and one will lose. You can't prove which one will win and lose, there are statistical relationships between winning and losing the same with smoking. We can't say as in the case of many people who will live into ripe old age and smoke all of their life that any particular individual is going to suffer death or illness due to their smoking. The fact is that for every 12 cancer patients in a cancer ward, 11 of them would have been heavy smokers and I think all Mr Dollisson talks about 1 or 2 studies and statistics and using that as a 'boo' word isn't going to be much conciliation for people who find themselves in that situation.

JD Perhaps, you should explain why after years and years of research trying to induce these diseases by smoke into rats /mice to the equivalent of 600 cig./day and in man they haven't been able to induce these disease in one place around the world

SC But we aren't talking about rats, we are talking about human beings smoking and human beings may go for years and years smoking. In the case of Doll & Hill study there was one occupational group, the British doctors, who smoked, the ones who gave up lived longer and the ones who didn't had significant increased death rates than the ones who did give up. So your point about pollution, genetics, occupation background is all controlled for when you looked at one occupational group like doctors and this was done over an immense number of doctors over immense number of years.

JD But refuted by leading statisticians in America and around the world in the 1960s??

SC Do you think then that there is some conspiracy by bodies like the WHO to get the tobacco industry. Why is it these studies that you are talking about never reached the conclusive stage in the major reports put together by individual researchers? The only conclusions you're talking about are published and promoted by people like yourself.

JD I think the reason for that lies perhaps in what I and you do. There is an anti smoking body out there that promotes the studies that supports their case. The press play out the provocative headlines. I'm sure they never read the media. I am sure that I have never read the full Surgeon General Report. I am sure there are complimentary statements in there. I am sure of the fact that despite 30 years of research they haven't been able to identify reasons for these diseases.

SC They don't know the reasons for a lot of diseases, they don't know why people get multiple-sclerosis, why they get all sorts of diseases.

JD Let me give you one example. It wasn't long ago that they gave a number in science for smoking causing tuberculosis. They found strong statistical association and jumped to the conclusion that smoking caused tuberculosis. Then suddenly they discovered the infectious nature of the disease and the whole hypothesis was dropped. I am sure that will happen with lung disease and heart disease.

SC You mean you would hope it will happen with lung cancer?

JD I don't hope I would like to see sensible, objective dedicated research to find out what the real causes are. We are doing that unlike the anti smoking lobby.

Interviewer If you would like to ask any questions please phone through.....

Interviewer Do you smoke John?

JD Only socially, I enjoy a cigar in the same way I enjoy Port

Interviewer "Only socially" what does that mean?

JD Only 1 or 2 on an evening when I am entertaining?. Something I smoked when I was young, it was the done thing. I would go to the pub after football and have a beer and smoke. I decided at the age of 22 years that I didn't want to smoke. Some people do some people don't. I think the individual should be left to the individual.

SC Why didn't you want to smoke?

JD More to the point I think that the decision is made according to the individual

SC What was in your decision that made you stop?

JD I had no desire to smoke. Some people do some people don't. It's a custom some people enjoy. You enjoy drinking I enjoy drinking. But we don't enjoy smoking. Some people do some don't.

Interviewer Your saying that there should be freedom of choice?

JD I certainly do. It doesn't matter if its smoking or some other activity.

SC I think what we say to is that there should be freedom of choice but it should be informed freedom of choice. I think that's why with eg tobacco advertising so many people are against it because tobacco advertising doesn't inform people about cigarettes. The argument that it should be legal to advertise if it is legal to sell is all very fine if the advertising were informative. If they said we are advertising this product and here are all of the qualities you can expect from it. But Mr Dollisson couldn't name one advertisement that says anything about the product at all.

JD Just to contradict all cigarette advertisements tell people something about the product i.e. the number of cigarettes contained, the price, as this is one of the most important factors. Would you disagree with that?

SC Yes I would because the price of cigarettes in Australia ranges from 5 cents to 6.8 cents. I don't think many people these days are worried about a 1.8 cents difference.

JD I think you would be quite surprised what difference the price makes on cigarettes as it does on any product. You know full well that if the price on a commodity increases then demand falls off.

SC You know full well that the price of cigarettes is demand inelastic. We can argue back and forth for on this one for a long time.

Interviewer John how important is advertising for cigarette smoking? You can't advertise cigarettes on radio and television?

JD That's correct.

Interviewer There are lobby groups that are hoping to have cigarette ads of all kinds banned. What would that mean to the industry?

JD In the total consumption terms it will have no real effect. We advertise to sell cigarettes to sell brands not to sell smoking. In the

same way that soap manufacturers spend millions of dollars to advertise to sell soap not sell a wash. It's to sell a particular product. The aim of the manufacturers is to maximise their market share of a limited market. A market that has been stabilised for over the last 20 years with 4 million Australians consuming quantity of cigarettes. So the aim is to maximise market share we run under a self regulatory code which restricts our advertising to adults and changing brands that adults smoke. There is no objective evidence to suggest that our advertising encourages people to smoke. The most objective study ever done in this area was undertaken by NH&MRC in 1969 and 1979. Conclusive evidence that peer group pressure, parental smoking and where children spend time and other environmental factors are reasons to smoke. Your guest on Monday Roger Weller from Sydney Institute of Psychology will verify that people who watch a show sponsored by a tobacco company don't go out and smoke a cigarette. Advertising is not the culprit and it is naive for anyone to suggest that we sit here and say tobacco is saying for people to run out and have a cigarette. I think this is an insult to suggest that Australian people.??

- SC If I can just say I think the tobacco industry are almost unique in the world of being an industry that will say that they are only interested in advertising to those who smoke. The future of their whole industry depends on children taking up smoking. Children who are not smoking taking it up. His analogy just a minute ago about soap. Yes you just have to do better than that because everybody washes but everybody doesn't smoke and they know fully well that if they don't capture a cohort of young people to start smoking then their industry is doomed within a few years and one need only turn to countries around the world where they have tobacco monopolies so the brand share doesn't really come in here and they advertise the sky down. Countries like Austria, Kenya used to have a monopoly and many countries like that have imported cigarettes but are only less than 1% of the market. They still advertise they are after increasing the general good feeling in the community about smoking and it promotes and idea of brand smoking and switching.
- JD I think you are forgetting commercial values in the market ever in those countries where they have monopolies. (a) competition with importers and (b) competition within brands within the monopoly.
- SC Yes but it the money still goes back to the same producer. Why should they care less.
- JD They make 1/3 of sale of a nicotine brand consistent with health department requirements.??? Who knows the reasons?

SC Yes that is where another irony exists isn't it? If smoking is not bad for you why is the tobacco industry concerned to market and advertising low tar brands?

JD The tobacco industry reacts to demand and there has been demand for that type of cigarette so they produce that type of cigarette.

Interviewer Gentlemen, if we forward for a commercial

Interviewer We have Peter on the line. Hi Peter

Peter I just wanted to ask John a question. If smoking is not bad for you why on every packet is there warning on the packages saying that smoking is a health hazard?

John The answer to that is quite simple. The government asked to put that on and legislation was passed by the Victorian Parliament in 1971. The Federal government then passed uniform packaging laws and it has been imposed on the industry.

Peter Would the government say it was right . Why would the government tell you to say something unless it was right?

JD I think the government has many examples of government asking us to do things. One would question if they are right or wrong. Perhaps Quit for Life campaign is classical example?

Peter Why don't you sue them for false advertising if they are saying the wrong thing?

JD I don't think we're in the game to sue the government. I think our role is to provide a product to 4 million Australian consumers. A product they enjoy and we're about servicing that demand.

Interviewer I don't think Peter's convinced, John.

SC I just want to say that the tobacco industry must be a little relieved that they have been obliged to put the labels on because if people started suing the tobacco industry for selling a product that could kill them they could say "we warned you so you bought the product its your "

JD Interestingly enough there have been over 100 major litigation cases in the U.S.A against the tobacco industry for that reason. Not

one of them has been lost by the tobacco industry despite medical evidence, despite everything. Its been very interesting because when you hear a doctor in court asked "does smoking cause disease" he has to say no. He can say its multi-factorial, many other factors need to be taken into consideration. Where smoking the is the symptom not the cause? It isn't known. What's required is more sensible research to? identify what the real reasons are.

SC I'd say that tame doctors that the tobacco industry supines that might say that it doesn't cause disease. But the great majority would not.

JD How come the great majority didn't have their way in 157 law cases.

SC Because as I was trying to say in my original point is that the statement on the pack is like buyer beware.

JD That was certainly not the reason. The weight of evidence is quite in the area that no-one can say that smoking tobacco causes disease and therefore can't provide compensation for it.

Interviewer It is a bit far fetched to have us believe that cigarettes by tobacco industry and the Surgeons General has determined to put warning that smoking is a health hazard and they carry them because the government told them to and doesn't matter if they're right or wrong.

JD Why do manufacturers bump off other products with labelling?

SC Because they are true.

JD Imposed by regulation in South Australia and Cairns don't have much option.

Interviewer So its nothing to do with health - the regulation?

JD There are other laws eg why do we all wear seatbelts.

Interviewer To save our lives. It is dangerous to drive without them. You may kill yourself.

JD That's correct. But perhaps it should be a personal choice. The fact of the matter is that it was imposed on us by the government. There are as we have already acknowledged statistical associations between smoking and aspects of ill health. There are major

questions about that statistical association. That was the government's justification for providing health warnings. We are not against sensible public education campaigns. Maybe there is a role for government to sit down and say the Surgeon General has said this but there's no proof to provide an honest objective assessment of what the world health community are really saying.

Interviewer Lets see what the listeners are saying. Good morning Kiera.

Kiera Good morning. I'd just like to have my little say about smoking. I have been smoking since I was 13 and I am now 73. So it hasn't done me any harm. I can still do what I used to but I'm only speaking for myself.

SC I think that is a classical example of what John and myself have been talking about. The statistical risk of getting something from smoking ie lung cancer or heart disease. You sound like you are one of the fortunate ones who in fact are in the majority of smokers who don't get anything. But there is a big minority. In Australia 16000 deaths a year who do suffer the ill health consequences. It s risk it is not a certainty. That's what it's about.

JD First I would like to dispute Simon's 16000 deaths

Interviewer Kiera do you want to say anything- just interrupt

JD Firstly Kiera I'd like to congratulate you on enjoying a habit for so long and you are reflective. Of the vast majority of smokers. The Commonwealth Dept. of Health supposedly suggests 16000 deaths . It is interesting to note that the age of death of all of them is higher than average death of every Australian.

Kiera If I'd kicked it tomorrow I would have got something else. I have had a pretty good inning

JD Unfortunately the anti- smoking lobby will classify you as premature death even at 73.

SC All smoking deaths are premature because if people didn't smoke they wouldn't die at the age that they do. The whole life expectancy thing is unnecessary and weighed down by unnecessary deaths. People are killed in car accidents, bitten by sharks, smoking all drag down the life expectancy down. Smokers are one of the groups that bring it down.

Kiera All my daughter?

Interviewer Thank you Kiera. We'll take another call. Hi Pat.

Pat Hi gentlemen. Be nice to one another

Interviewer Alright I'll fling myself between them ..

SC We were having a pleasant chat outside. Its only when we get on the mike that we do our job.

Pat I'd just like to give my opinion. I've been a smoker for many years and I have lung cancer. I gave this a lot of thought when I found out that I had the tumour. I thought it is the smoking or is it not. In our days we weren't educated to know about cigarettes and all the smoking and nicotine and whatever. I have given it a lot of thought and I'm a highly nervous person and with my smoking if I was to stop now I might even die sooner. I have the cancer and I really and truly believe that I got it from stress and stress will give you cancer. If you have and air conditioner open it up and see the dust and dirt in the filter. Its not smoke its what we breathe in the air.

Interviewer What does your doctor say?

Pat Ironically enough only one comment from one doctor. They haven't go to the bottom of it. I think it depends on the individual. I like my cigarettes and I enjoy it and if I was to stop now it would kill me sooner.

SC It's very true that it depends on the individual and it would be terrific if we could at birth which people were going to susceptible to a whole range of disease, lung cancer included. But the fact is that we can't do that and we have to identify these agents that promote the risk and those agents the poisons and viruses as smoking we then say that you should avoid it and I think that's the point Health Departments are making for smokers . Disease like lung cancer occur far far more in smokers than they do in non smokers. Its not the only thing that causes lung cancer. Asbestos, all sorts of other agents cause cancers in the body and so can smoking.

Pat Yes I suppose you could say that but I still believe that its stress and if I was to give up smoking I'd be taking more nerve tablets than what I'm taking now and I think that whats in the air and what we're breathing is only when I wash out my air conditioner it astounds me the filters. I enjoy my cigarettes and that's the way it will be until the end of time.

JD Let me say firstly that I'm sorry to hear that you have lung cancer. Its good to see that you've taken an objective assessment as to why you have lung cancer. Its interesting to note that factors like stress, genetics, hereditary, indoor/outdoor pollution are taken into consideration. The so called statistical association is virtually removed, that Simon talks about. Its good to see that you've taken an objective assessment of that and not believed the rhetoric that is being put around today.

Interviewer We now have Sue on the line. Hi Sue??

Sue I'd like to ask John that since the tobacco industry are so adamant that they don't advertise to children if they don't believe smoking is harmless, why don't they push it on children?

JD Well the industry has always maintained that smoking is an adult custom. Like driving a car, drinking and voting. As you all know and as the debate today has shown there is quite a scientific controversy about smoking and health. I don't believe the industry doesn't believe that children are mature enough to assess those arguments and therefore we believe that smoking is an adult custom and should practices as an adult custom. I think that the important thing that we need to point out here is that only this State government has a piece of legislation that restricts sales to children with a measly fine of \$6. I think access to the restrictions lies clearly in government hands for them to do something about it rather than accusations that come back to the tobacco industry all the time.

SC I know that the tobacco industry lobbied very strongly to prevent that fine from being put up. I think you can take John's comments with a 'pinch of salt'.

JD I think that you are jumping to conclusions. In WA there was a bill to ban advertising about last year and was defeated. We encouraged the opposition to increase fines of sales to children. More importantly we put up our money where our mouth is and we printed signs to put up at every retail outlet and on every vending machine in WA warning people that it was illegal to sell cigarettes to minors. That's consistent with our view that smoking is an adult custom. We don't believe and we don't encourage children to smoke.

Sue But its not logical. You'd want to make a million more dollars.

John We see it as an adult custom. We don't have any desire to want children to smoke.

Interviewer We'll take another call. Good morning Lyn.

Lyn I'd like to speak to Simon

SC Yes speaking

Lyn I'd like to know how you decided that smoking was bad for unborn children when the mother is pregnant?

Simon There have been a considerable number of studies which have looked at low birth weight, length of child that sort of thing. The functioning of the child in the first few days of life after it is born. Many of these studies have concluded that the risk of the baby being born up to 200 gms lighter is increased quite considerably by people who smoke. See the drugs and chemicals in tobacco cross the placental barrier as many things do and so the advice is that women who are pregnant or in fact all women and people shouldn't smoke. But if you are a smoker and pregnant and you smoke it's a very good time to give up not only when you are pregnant but when you are thinking about getting pregnant. The first few months of the foetus's life is very crucial.

Lyn I had 2 pregnancies and I'm on my third. I smoked for 10 years and with both my children, both over 8 pounds, both never had much chest cold, both talk ahead of their age.

SC But again it's a risk. If I walk down Pitt Street tomorrow with a blind fold on there is a very good chance that nothing will happen to me but its not something that I would recommend people should do. It's the same as the risk for smoking. Many people in fact the majority won't have anything happen to them but public health advice just as the majority of people exposed to poly-myelitis or flue or anything like that won't catch it either. But when these are around, health officials really try advise people to avoid them and advise people to . It's the same with cigarettes.

Interviewer Do you have something to add John?

JD I'd just like to point out, Simon mentioned that different studies about low birth weight etc . Again there are many other factors that are going to determine what effects it will have on yourself and your child. That would probably best be taken up with medical experts rather than Simon or myself. In relation to weight of unborn children it was interesting to note that these women who had children and then took up smoking after that had underweight children. So

perhaps there are other factors, genetics factors, nutritional factors that contribute to this. Much more research is needed as we have been saying for quite some time.

SC I think that the best way to resolve this is to consider the relative position that John and I come from. John is paid to represent the interests of the tobacco industry. I work for a health department. John is hardly likely going to be sitting putting anything which will put the tobacco industry into disrepute. Whereas what I'm doing is representing a body of the medical health opinion right around the world. People who haven't got a connection with the tobacco industry who are not making profit out of the conclusions that they say. I think the only conclusion one can draw is that these people don't have a vested interest in the conclusions that they reach. Whereas the statement that John 's making are very suspect because if he says anything else when he goes back he'll get a rap over the knuckles from his boss.

JD I think its silly to say that Simon.

Interviewer You're going to get a rap over the knuckles Simon.

JD If anyone would like substantiation in anything I'm only to pleased to provide. Please feel free to write to the TIA in Goldfields House. We have details with medical witnesses all around the world which provided substantial support for everything I have said. I stand by everything I've said and I believe that it is justified in numerous medical reports around the world.

SC I think John you said it better than I could ever say that. If you really wanted evidence about the harmful effects of tobacco why on earth would you go to the tobacco industry to get it. You'd go to the health department.

JD We've already seen the health department's approach in Quit for Life Campaign, in running misleading advertisements which have been removed from and being suggested that we are untruthful and misleading. If anyone is misleading the public quite firmly it is the Quit for Life Campaign.

Interviewer We'll take another friendly caller. Hi Faye.

Faye I wanted to ask Simon why there are so many cases of smoking leading to lung cancer when there are other factors involved such as pollution.

- SC Well let's take the eleven twelve patients that are smoking in a cancer ward. All of them have probably come from an urban environment, all of them have lived during the same period of history, many of them have different genetic factors. But one factor common to them is their smoking and that's why people say the relationship exists. We all breathe air.
- Faye Yes that's right Simon but I am a nurse. I am a drug nurse and I have nursed a lot of patients that have never smoked and who have lung cancer.
- SC I bet you've nursed a lot more who have had lung cancer who do smoke. Is that right?
- Faye Well their lifestyle , do you not think, certainly has some bearing? Also they undergo shock due to cancer.
- SC With lung cancer
- Faye Well yes cancer. Have been diagnosed and have attributed that they have had a dreadful shock due to cancer.
- SC I think you'll find with lung cancer and sites where smoking related cancers manifest themselves are a little different. Cancer is not one disease it's a whole range of diseases and when we are talking about smoking related cancers we are only talking about one in several sites??? Lung cancer being the principal one. The evidence is that one of the clearest things in medicine and the relationship between smoking and lung cancer is very strong.
- JD It certainly appears clear to you Simon but I think that the evidence from the course of the morning is just not clear. In America where studies have been done to try and identify other factors such as genetics, pollution, hereditary have been taken into consideration to account for the association between smoking and lung cancer. I think more research is needed if no-one has ever been able to show any component of cigarette smoke is dangerous to health.
- SC Cancer producing agents, John. Has that ever been shown?
- JD If anyone approached the industry and proved it was carcinogenic it would be removed. The industry offered in 1977 any dangerous substances in a cigarette it would be removed.
- SC I mean tar is full of carcinogenic elements, pesticide residues.

JD The question is the quantities. The equivalent carbon monoxide emitted into the air from a smoker his whole life is equivalent to carbon monoxide from motor vehicle driven 12.5 miles. Why aren't we worried about motor vehicles.

SC We are worried about motor vehicles.

JD Some of the so called carcinogenic stuff that you suggest are in all sorts of products.

SC But they are very concentrated. The average person smokes who on average smokes 25 cig/day takes in something like 800 doses a day and 30000 a year of the chemicals your talking about being low in quantities.

JD The health department. statistics? They ? the average Australian??????/

Interviewer We'll be back in just a moment.
Good morning Sylvia what would you like to say?

Sylvia I don't think cigarette advertisements should be banned. We've got so many alcoholic advertisements on we could become very boring and I don't think that cigarettes do any harm. You might say that people shouldn't go to the beach and are burned from lying there on the account of skin cancer.??????????/

Interviewer Do you smoke Sylvia?

Sylvia Yes I'm 68 and I've been smoking a long time.

JD I think that's good to hear Sylvia. You're like me a great believer in free enterprise and people having their say. I don't believe that the government or anybody has the right to decide what we as individuals will or won't do. I think its personal decision if we smoke, drink whether we play sport. There are even question about sex and sports. Who knows what's best??

Interviewer Good heavens not sex that just too hard that's too much. We'll take one final call. Good morning to you Arthur.

Arthur I'd like to say without criticising you, I think that it is extraordinary this debate could occur. It's like debating if the earth's flat or not John. I am a doctor and I think the weight of evidence is vast and against cigarettes whether we want to accept it or not makes no difference. If he was to say the earth is not flat saying the evidence

is not strong it doesn't makes it not strong. I think he just does not want to face the reality because of self interest. I think doctors wouldn't attack the tobacco industry anymore than they would attack the chipping industry. They don't get anything. I mean doctors don't get anything out of attacking the industry there's no money in it for them. I think that they have a genuine interest in people's health and I think that the tobacco industry is doing a lot of harm from not letting the message getting through.

JD All we want the medical profession to be honest about it and see both sides of the coin and one of the main reason for the institute existing is to give a balanced view to this debate. Your analogy with the earth being flat is quite incorrect because Christopher Columbus proved it was round. **No one has been able to prove that tobacco is harmful to health.** All we want is a balanced opinion. It is the role of the health department to say that there is statistical association here and some of the facts and figures but to go on and say that no-one has been able to induce cancer, induce heart disease and be honest about what they're saying and get into area of more research. The millions of dollars going into Quit for life Campaigns would perhaps be much better if put in sensible medical research and if you believe that you have a genuine case to put then get involved in that scientific research get out of being a body mechanic and get into being a research and try and show people that smoking does cause these diseases. You would be the first on the history of this earth to do that.

Arthur I think you have to accept that the scientific method involves statistical association

JD That's part of it

Arthur and properly construct a trial. Something over 30000 have been done and a vast majority of them apart from those by a medical doctor Mr Whitby have said that smoking is harmful.

JD In terms of statistics and only in terms of statistics. None of them have been able to show causation.

SC But John there is a statistical relationship between drinking and driving. By your argument we shouldn't be saying that either because it is only statistics.

JD Statistical association between the height of women's skirts and lifts up and down the stock exchange?

- SC Come on lets not get frivolous. The relationship between you drinking excess alcohol and having a road accident is as strong if not as stronger as smoking and disease.
- JD There are numerous other studies where this doesn't exist. Particularly when these other factors are taken into consideration. On the one hand you have a fairly substantial body of statistics that proves conclusively perhaps that there is correlation between drinking and driving that's not the case with smoking. There are numerous?
- SC Why is it then that the major world reports and ,you can't deny this the Surgeon General, WHO all say that smoking is the main preventable cause of premature death in the industrialised world after looking at your evidence and looking at my evidence why do they conclude what I've just said?
- JD You need to look perhaps at the Royal College of Physicians report and some of the people writing it. The Royal College of Physicians was set up as London's biggest anti smoking group. Much of the information in that report reflects their attitude I must point out that the Royal College of Physicians quite clearly said that despite 30 years of research we haven't been able to identify the biological mechanism that cause this disease.
- Interviewer We are going to have to end the debate that I think both of you are never going to agree on. I have found it interesting the different points of view expressed this morning.