

Please find, following, the transcript discussed with Catherine Lappe on the interview that took place on The National last night. Thanks & have a nice day! PROGRAM: THE NATIONAL NETWORK: CBC-TV DATE: 2001.06.21 TIME: 22:00:00 ET END: 23:00:00 ET HOST: ALISON SMITH John Luik and Second-hand Smoke ALISON SMITH: It's a familiar sight outside government and office buildings across the country. Smokers standing in doorways, forced to leave if they want to light up. And the trend is spreading to shopping malls, restaurants and clubs. Now most people accept the scientific data showing that second-hand smoke can cause cancer. But not this man. John Luik is a professor with impressive credentials, but he's a skeptic when it comes to second-hand smoke and he's very vocal about his views. Our colleagues at the Fifth Estate have looked into John Luik. Here's what Anna Maria Tremonti found out about the consultant. ANNA MARIA TREMONTI: In the debate over tobacco in Canada, one man keeps showing up. UNIDENTIFIED WOMAN (1): John Luik is a public policy consultant and author... UNIDENTIFIED WOMAN (2): John Luik, how is it you come to believe that second hand smoke is a bogus menace? JOHN LUIK: I think the important question is that it's not either myself or my co-author... UNIDENTIFIED MAN (1): And in the CTV hot seat, Dr. John Luik, a public... UNIDENTIFIED MAN (2): We have Dr. Luik, Dr. John C. Luik. TREMONTI: He's been before senate committees in Ottawa seemingly so self-assured he corrects the parliamentarians who question him. LUIK: Let me perhaps tread on your hospitality by suggesting that perhaps the question before that you have put is not the correct one. TREMONTI: Dr. John Luik has been the forefront of an issue that tobacco industry considers one of its greatest liabilities -- second-hand smoke. Two years ago, Luik a doctor of Philosophy co-authored this book with Dr. Gio Gori, a former head of the U.S. National Cancer Institute. It argues that the link between second-hand smoke and lung cancer is unproven. And it takes aim at those scientists who would unequivocally link the two, specifically the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, the E.P.A. arguing that the E.P.A's own political agenda and corrupt science created the fears that led to smoking bans across North America. The subject of second-hand smoke became a hot button issue as town and cities across Canada considered banning smoking in public places. Business owners and workers in Toronto practically rioted when the city tried to ban smoking in restaurants. Luik's arguments were seemingly powerful ammunition for those opposed to smoking bans. UNIDENTIFIED WOMAN (3): The province's hotel industry brought in a heavy hitter today in its on-going war against anti-smoking legislation. John Luik is a policy analyst and... TREMONTI: He is a provocative speaker capable of sowing doubt. He argues over public policy suggesting democracy at risk and government and scientific manipulation. LUIK: This discussion paper is so fraudulent in its claims that it astonishes me that it would be produced by anyone in Canada. TREMONTI: In the scientific world, the overwhelming majority believe second-hand smoke is dangerous. But in 1998, Luik found a landmark U.S. court decision on his side. District court judge William Ostein ruled the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency in its zeal to restrict smoking had exaggerated the dangers of second-hand smoke. The judge accused it of manipulating the agency's standard scientific methodology. But the other side was also making gains in this fight. A year earlier, an ailing mom from the United States had stared down big tobacco and made it blink. Norma Broynne had lung cancer. She'd never smoked. But as a former flight attendant, she spent years on planes thick with smoke. This was before the smoking ban. She blames her cancer on what she said were those enormous quantities of second-hand smoke. She became the poster girl for the anti- tobacco lobby, taking the industry to court. NORMA BROYNE: The fact that I didn't have any of the normal risk factors but yet I was in such a significant amount of cigarette smoke, it just made sense to me that if cigarette smoke was harmful to a person who smokes, never thought about it before because I was told, you know, if I didn't smoke as a kid, you know, I wouldn't get those horrible diseases that smokers get. But the more I thought about it, the more the research that I read confirmed my belief that second-hand smoke truly caused the same diseases and illnesses that smokers got. UNIDENTIFIED MAN (3): In settling this landmark lawsuit on second-hand smoke... TREMONTI: A nervous tobacco industry avoided the jury and settled out of court big time. It agreed to give \$300 million to establish a medical foundation to research smoking related illnesses and it consented to lifting the statute of limitations so that flight attendants with related illnesses or their survivors, potentially many thousands, could sue. Bill Ferrone is a former tobacco insider who knows the

cigarette companies have been concerned about second-hand smoke for a long time. Ferrone was Director of Applied Research at Philip Morris for eight years until they fired him. He says the tobacco company knew very well how dangerous second-hand smoke could be. BILL FERRONE: At the time I was at Philip Morris, we knew that second-hand smoke is dangerous because it contains many of the same chemicals, virtually all the same chemicals as mainstream smoke which we know causes cancer and a variety of other diseases. TREMONTI: Ferrone says that back in the 80's, Philip Morris itself discovered an alarming fact about second-hand smoke and the deadliest of its chemicals, N.N.K. FERRONE: Research was done in Switzerland, with the laboratories in Switzerland that showed that for up to six hours after you extinguish a cigarette in an ashtray, that that chemical continues to build up in the room. This is all documented in Philip Morris files. TREMONTI: The disagreement is not over which chemicals are in cigarette smoke but rather the chances of those chemicals actually causing disease in people other than smokers. An impressive array of scientific bodies argues second-hand smoke is damaging. Among them Health Canada, the Canadian Cancer Society, the Canadian Mental Association, the Canadian Lung Association, the U.S. National Cancer Institute, the U.S. Surgeon General. But in their book, Luik and Dr. Gio Gori argue the scientific community can't prove how much smoke it takes to be hazardous. They argue that the statistics are weak and those who use them to dictate public policy are not viewing the evidence objectively and are therefore practicing corrupt science. There are other scientists who agree with them but few appear as strident. Former insider Ferrone says they've got it backwards. FERRONE: I think the burden of proof is on the other side of the issue to show that the levels are in fact safe. And to my knowledge, neither the industry or the authors of the book you have shown me have done any experiments that show a safe level, for example, of N.N.K., nicotine, nitrosamine, keytone which is one of the deadliest carcinogens. TREMONTI: The Canadian Cancer Society's senior policy analyst has written his own book critical of the tobacco industry. Rob Cunningham says the more doubt big tobacco can raise, the more cigarettes it sells. ROB CUNNINGHAM: A lot of people quit or cut back because of concern of second-hand smoke on their children or on their spouse. The industry does not want that to happen. And when there's restrictions on smoking in work places and public places, it becomes a hassle in many cases, and a great motivator for people to quit. BROYNE: The tobacco companies in the past have won because they said people chose to use our product. The non-smokers did not choose to use their products. They made a conscious decision not to use their product but yet they're being injured by the tobacco product. TREMONTI: The cigarette companies saw this coming back in 1978 when their polling identified second-hand smoke as the most dangerous development to the viability of the tobacco industry. And so big tobacco's response was to help create a debate to create doubt. LISA BARROW: A lot of the debate has come from articles that have been generated by the tobacco industry or other opponents of regulation of passive smoke. Now another case we're doing today is environmental tobacco smoke case. TREMONTI: Lisa Barrow is a scientist at the University of California and she is no friend of the tobacco industry. When she studied review articles that summarize scientific literature on second-hand smoke, she came to this conclusion. BARROW: About 40 percent of the articles, a little less said that passive smoking wasn't harmful. And almost all of those were funded by the tobacco industry or from tobacco industry affiliated authors. CUNNINGHAM: Because of decades of lying and deception, the public just doesn't believe the tobacco industry. The industry needs others to fight industry battles. FERRONE: At Philip Morris, we had one person who would go out and try and find people who took positions that would cast doubt on commonly, common pieces of evidence that were used against the industry. TREMONTI: There are scientists who share the views of Luik who's called himself a sometime tobacco consultant. Here's an example of his involvement. UNIDENTIFIED WOMAN (4): So the federal government is lying to us when they say cigarettes are addictive. LUIK: The federal government is being extremely untruthful about that. I don't deny that they have a right to hold that opinion. For instance, I'd asked them where did they get the conclusion that cigarettes are addictive? Well they had a group of people from the Royal Society of Canada that met over one summer, looked at a few research papers and then came up with that. UNIDENTIFIED WOMAN (4): Come on, John. LUIK: It's in the record. It's entirely what they did. No new evidence. They simply looked at research papers. They made a recommendation to Health Canada. You make the

people put this on the cigarette packages. UNIDENTIFIED WOMAN (4): So they decided to lie to us. You're telling the truth and they're lying. LUIK: They decided to, they decided... UNIDENTIFIED WOMAN (4): The statement that says cigarettes are addictive is a lie. LUIK: Exactly. They decided that in the interest of public health, it's better to exaggerate. TREMONTI: Luik wasn't just on TV. He was published. This article written by Luik shows up in an obscure university alumni magazine. It characterizes as corrupt science the research used to link second-hand smoke to lung cancer. It's a seemingly independent rebuttal to the argument in favor of anti-smoking legislation. One that could be quoted by mainstream media outlets looking for balance in the smoking debate. In the article, Luik is described only as a non-smoker and a management consultant. But industry documents show tobacco executives actually worked with Luik to write the article. CUNNINGHAM: People are entitled to their own opinion. But there should also be an openness as to the links with the tobacco industry so that the public that is analyzing or assessing these statements is fully aware of that relationship with the industry. TREMONTI: Luik and Gori's book makes reference to their past work with tobacco companies but the Fifth Estate has learned that the publisher, the Fraser Institute also received money from the industry for a project which included the creation of the book. The crux of the book is that laws restricting smoking are based on corrupt and politically motivated scientific research. It argues in part that because a blue ribbon panel criticized some work of the E.P.A., the E.P.A.'s work on second-hand smoke is also suspect. We wanted to talk to Luik and Gori but each refused us an interview. We tried the publisher, the Fraser Institute but again we were refused an interview. So we went to a member of the blue ribbon panel at the University of Pittsburgh. The dean here at the school of public health as on that panel. Dr. Bernard Goldstein actually praises the E.P.A.'s on second-hand smoke. DR. BERNARD GOLDSTEIN: The blue ribbon panel did not criticize the E.P.A.'s view of second-hand smoke. As I say, if we would've considered it, we would have considered what E.P.A. should be doing at all times. TREMONTI: The book in question says the link between lung cancer and second-tobacco smoke is simply politically motivated science. GOLDSTEIN: I would have to wonder about the purposes of the people who would relate what our document said to environmental tobacco smoke. TREMONTI: We decided to look at the credentials of the man accusing others of corrupt science. John Luik is an author, a some time tobacco industry consultant and a public policy analyst. He didn't start that way. John Luik was a Rhodes scholar at Britain's Hallowed Oxford University and he chose to become a professor of philosophy. He came to Canada and what was then Nazarene College in Winnipeg. On the surface, Luik seemed to have all the right stuff and a fellow professor, Martin Gerwin remembers his early successes. MARTIN GERWIN: Well that he was a lively and well-educated and competent philosophy, philosopher. TREMONTI: It was only when Luik applied for a full-time position at the more prestigious University of Manitoba that his academic credentials came under scrutiny. GERWIN: Some inquiries were made and it came to light that, although he'd been going around saying for several years that he'd completed his degree at Oxford, in fact he hadn't finished it. TREMONTI: So he didn't have a doctorate. GERWIN: Not at that time. TREMONTI: Do you remember talking to him about it? GERWIN: Well yes, I said, when this came to light, I said John, this is a serious matter. It's not like getting a parking ticket or having a book overdue at the library. People are going to take this very seriously. And he seemed to regard it as sort of an administrative matter. And I can only conclude he had a moral blind spot about that. TREMONTI: Fired from Nazarene College, Luik returned to the academic splendor of Oxford finishing that Ph.D. he'd claimed to have had years earlier. When Luik again sought work, Martin Gerwin was sympathetic. GERWIN: Many people thought that one incident should be just career ending. I personally didn't think so. I felt that he should have the chance to clean up his act and when I wrote a letter of recommendation for him, which I did, I commended his teaching, his scholarly competence and then said my recommendation is subject to one grave reservation and related how he had claimed to have a degree before he really had it. TREMONTI: John Luik ended up at Brock University in Ontario. Among his courses was one in business ethics. Again he appeared the model academic, prolific with a growing list of publications to his credit. And again all was not as it seemed. At the time in the late 80's Cecil Abrahams was the dean of humanities at Brock. In other words, John Luik's boss. Abrahams is now back home in south Africa where he's vice-chancellor of West Cape University. He remembers the problems that arose

when John Luik came up for academic review. CECIL ABRAHAMS: John Luik always presented a very long list of papers including books that he said he was just about to submit to various publishers and he would name these publishers. TREMONTI: That made Abrahams suspicious. He began to examine Luik closely. He phoned around to publishers and editors. ABRAHAMS: They said John Luik would write them letters and suggest they might think about a book with this title along these lines. They wouldn't hear any more from him. And then he would put it down in his curriculum vitae that he had either accepted the book or that he's finishing the book. TREMONTI: Abrahams dug further. There were visiting professorships that didn't exist, books and articles that simply didn't exist. ABRAHAMS: I certainly would not trust anything John Luik says because I, he must be the worst case of fraud that I have come across and I've been an administrator at universities for a long period of time on, both in North America and in Africa, and I think he's by far the worst case of fraudulent behaviour. TREMONTI: The Fifth Estate has also obtained this Brock University memo dated 1990. It's language is strong citing a pattern of misrepresentations, a breach of professional ethics and suggesting Luik would be considered unfit to continue teaching business ethics. His career at Brock was over. John Luik did contact us with a three page fax declining an interview, stating he stood by his science. So we are left only with a videotape record of his declarations on disinformation and misrepresentation. LUIK: Lying about science and attempting to create public policy decisions based on deceitful information or non-existent information is never in anyone's interest. TREMONTI: For The National, I'm Anna Maria Tremonti. SMITH: Still ahead on The National, this story. GEORGINA ZACHARIAS: They breed like rabbits. SMITH: And because they're elk, they eat like horses. Now they're taking over B.C. Sechelt Peninsula. (COMMERCIAL BREAK)