

WERE YOU MISLED?

TODAY, READ ANOTHER SIDE OF THE STORY ABOUT SECONDHAND SMOKE.

Ever since the EPA issued its report about the "dangers" of secondhand smoke in 1993, serious questions have been raised about the report's validity.

Here are some of those questions:

- If there were doubts about the report, why weren't they widely publicized?
- Of 11 U.S. studies used by the EPA, not a single one concluded that there is a statistically significant overall association between secondhand smoke and lung cancer. What did the EPA do to find a link, using the very same studies?
- Why did an article in a major scientific magazine call the EPA's report "fancy statistical footwork"?
- Why, in its assessment of secondhand smoke, did the EPA suddenly disregard generally accepted standards of statistical analysis?
- A large U.S. study, published in *The American Journal of Public Health*, found no overall statistically significant link between secondhand smoke and lung cancer. Why did the EPA not include this study?
- Is it possible the EPA decided that secondhand smoke was harmful years before their assessment was done?

Today, on the next two pages, Philip Morris brings you the answers to these questions in an article from *Forbes MediaCritic* entitled **Passive Reporting on Passive Smoke**, by Jacob Sullum, Managing Editor of *Reason* magazine. This is one of the most comprehensive articles ever written about the EPA's risk assessment of secondhand smoke.

We believe that both smokers and non-smokers should consider these facts and draw their own conclusions about the issue of secondhand smoke.



PHILIP MORRIS U.S.A.

IN ANY CONTROVERSY, FACTS MUST MATTER.