

What do we work with? What does it do to us? And they are driving us into the courts to get answers to these very simple questions. Not one single industry has agreed to give us the answers to the questions I have posed, including Johns-Manville.

Dr. WOLFE: I think one explanation for the lack of consciousness or reduced consciousness among some workers is that they have been blackmailed by industry. If you are a worker and you are given a choice of no job or cancer, that is not any kind of choice at all, and the worker may opt for having a job even though it exposes him to a carcinogen. Many industries have claimed, and it usually turns out to be an empty claim, that if they have to regulate, they will have to shut down. The more that is exposed, the better.

Dr. KOTIN: Just a quick comment. First of all, I hope Mr. Mazzocchi will recall that Johns-Manville was delighted to participate in the preparation of the Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers film.

But the thing—a classical example of something brief but really incendiary: benzene is a "potent carcinogen." It is not a potent carcinogen. It is a "leucemigen." I believe it can cause leukemia. But to classify that as a potent carcinogen almost denotes an approach to the problem that puts scientific dimensions well below those of proprietary or constituency dimensions.

Mr. SPIVAK: Dr. Selikoff, cancer experts tell us that among heavy smokers, those who smoke one or more packs a day, one person out of twenty gets lung cancer.

Dr. SELIKOFF: That is true.

Mr. SPIVAK: If it is true heavy smoking causes cancer, what is the explanation for the fact that the other nineteen heavy smokers do not get cancer?

Dr. SELIKOFF: I don't know. In fact, even among asbestos workers, one out of five dies of lung cancer, and four out of five don't, and I wish we knew why. Nature is trying to tell us something, and we certainly have not learned the answer.

Mr. SPIVAK: Would you be in favor of banning cigarettes by law as saccharin is banned?

Dr. SELIKOFF: In general, as you know, cigarettes are a voluntary act. Nobody puts a cigarette in your mouth. You can elect to do it or not, and my own inclination is that Americans should be allowed in such cases to do as they wish with individual freedom. Food additives are another problem. We generally don't know what is in our food.

Mr. BAZELL: Dr. Upton, you said a while ago that anybody who had thought at the beginning of the war on cancer that there was a search for a magic bullet would have been foolish, and nobody has said that. But, in fact, as part of the enacting legislation, there was even a resolution in Congress that cancer should be cured by 1976 to go along with the Bicentennial, and, in fact, at the time that that legislation was passed, there was very much that mood, and it is still reflected in your budget, isn't it, Doctor, that a massive amount is a search for a cure, and even in your proposed budget for next year only a tiny amount deals with environmental cancer. When is that going to change in a significant way?

Dr. UPTON: Two points: I am not aware that any responsible spokesman for the Cancer Institute ever predicted a cure by the time of the Bicentennial. I am aware that there were statements in the press, by others, but I am not aware that any responsible spokesman for the Institute or for the cancer research community made those kinds of promises.

As for budget, we do, in fact, devote substantial sums of money to the development of more effective treatment, and earlier in the program I stressed that I thought that these investments had paid off handsomely.

If you compare the amount we spend for the development of new drugs, on the

order of \$50 million a year, and the amount we spend on environmental causes, more like \$180 million a year, you can see that we spend a far larger amount of money on the search for causes than on the search for cures.

Dr. SELIKOFF: I don't think we ought to get caught in the trap of either/or. We shouldn't look just for prevention, finding out what is causing cancer, and ignoring cure.

Remember that there are many Americans now alive who in the last 15 years were, unfortunately, exposed to things that we now know cause cancer, and they will need treatment, and I think there is great urgency for the development of even better treatment and better cures for cancer. We have to do both.

Mr. MONROE: We have about a minute and half.

Miss YUNCKER: Dr. Kotin, the National Cancer Institute has been looking at chemicals. They have looked, with an animal screen, at 47, according to the last count I have seen.

Of that 47, 27 proved to cause cancer in animals. Even assuming they picked the most wicked-looking molecules they could find out of thousands of chemicals available to look at, that is a pretty scary statistic.

They are a three-quarters of a billion dollars agency. You are a hundred billion dollars industry. What is industry doing to prevent these chemicals from coming forth without our knowing whether they are cancer-causing or not?

Dr. KOTIN: I am sure there is a wide spectrum of industry postures. I can tell you what one company is doing, and that is, addressing potentially hazardous agents with the same scrupulousness, the same scientific rigidity as the federal government is, and where an agent is likely to be a potential carcinogen, it is an agent that is abandoned. One can clearly identify among the giants in the chemical industry specific materials that I know have had millions of dollars put into them in development which never saw the light of commercial day.

I don't know that I have the authority to name a company and the compounds or I would have gotten a release, but these are not figments of the imagination. When we are off the air, I will be glad to tell you the names of the companies.

Mr. MONROE: Thank you, gentlemen, for being with us today on MEET THE PRESS.