

JRD O'BRIAN
W. ELLISON
AS AUSTERN
C. WESTWOOD
S. A. HORSKY
RLOW
MISS
COVINGTON
BY ROPER, JR.
MCLOTHLIN
W. JENNES
L. TEMRO
C. MCKAY
DOUGLAS
N. CAROTHERS
ACKERMAN
J. SAILER
SCHAFFER
H. MOSES
MOYNE ELLICOTT
RD DUNKELBERGER, JR.

DEAN G. ACHESON
JOHN G. LAYLIN
FONTAINE C. BRADLEY
EDWARD BURLING, JR.
GERHARD A. GEBELL
HUGH B. COX
W. GRAHAM CLAYTON, JR.
JOHN T. SAPIENZA
NESTOR S. POLEY
DANIEL M. GRIBSON
HARRY L. SHNIDERMAN
DON V. HARRIS, JR.
WILLIAM STANLEY, JR.
WEAVER W. DUNNAN
J. RANDOLPH WILSON
ROBERTS B. OWEN
EDGAR F. CIARRA, JR.
WILLIAM H. ALLEN
DAVID S. ISBELL
JOHN B. JONES, JR.
PHILIP R. STANSBURY

COVINGTON & BURLING

UNION TRUST BUILDING

WASHINGTON, D. C. 20005

REPUBLIC 7-5900

June 24, 1967

H. Henry Ramm, Esquire
Vice President and General Counsel
R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Company
Winston-Salem, North Carolina

Frederick B. Haas, Esquire
General Counsel
Liggett & Myers Tobacco Company
630 Fifth Avenue
New York, New York

Re: Questionnaire on Cognizance
of Warning Statement

Dear Henry and Fred:

Yesterday I received from Mr. Kraft the enclosed materials which I am forwarding to you, as members of the Subcommittee of the Committee of Counsel, with the following comments:

1. In the telephone talk this morning, I told Mr. Kraft that it would be necessary for me to secure your formal approval before he went ahead next week with the interviewing on a national scale.

In that connection, I suggested that you, as the supervising subcommittee, might want to know what the trial runs on the questionnaire had shown. Mr. Kraft told me that these trial runs were being continued over this weekend and that he might have the results late Monday or Tuesday. I asked him to telephone what they were, and if I get them, I will have them telephoned to each of you.

2. In my discussion with Mr. Kraft today, I asked a number of questions about his Questionnaire.

LG 2022097

LIG- 38437

H. Henry Ramm, Esquire
Frederick B. Haas, Esquire
June 24, 1967
Page Two

First, and possibly the most important one, was why he wanted to get the level of smoking as contained in his questions 2a, 2b, and 2c. He told me that while this had little bearing on the level of cognizance of the Warning Statement and was not essential to the main inquiry, it would give him some basis for determining the frequency of smoking. As near as he can tell, he might want a basis for eliminating a respondent who only occasionally smoked one or two cigarettes at a social gathering.

I am somewhat troubled about the inclusion of these questions on the degree of smoking, and particularly asking people who smoke beyond 2-1/2 packs per day. If either of you share my dubiety, I believe that Mr. Kraft is prepared to change these questions. If the results turn out that the heaviest smokers were the least cognizant of the warning statement, I think we might have some difficulty. In addition, this type of detail permits a government agency to cross-tabulate questionnaires in a variety of ways and come up with their own inferences. My own recommendation, which I have not as yet communicated to Mr. Kraft, would be to eliminate all of question 2 unless he thinks this information essential.

I also had some difficulty in what the correlation between those who did not ever smoke and those who did quit smoking would be to knowledge of what is on the package since January 1, 1966. Logically, if someone quit smoking in 1964, I wonder whether he would know what was on a package today. Certainly, if he quit five years ago, it would be doubtful whether he would be interested in what was contained on a label today. Mr. Kraft reported that he thought this was a sort of warm-up question, and that in some of the preliminary interviewing they had found that people who did not smoke still knew about the warning statement.

I also saw no point in asking about the demographic data relating to members of the household under 6 years, between 6 and 18, and over 65. Mr. Kraft said that he thought this Classification question was

H. Henry Ramm, Esquire
Frederick B. Haas, Esquire
June 24, 1967
Page Three

somewhat irrelevant and agreed to eliminate it. I think it is covered in the questions under age.

Just how far you want to go in making suggestions about the questionnaire, I do not know. Senator Clements has very considerable confidence in Mr. Kraft, and I suppose we ought rely upon him to devise a questionnaire which will produce the answers and which he will defend. He did tell me that using a series of three probing Recalls usually produced some recalls of the Caution statement in at least the second recall. You will observe that in question 4, they plan to probe into the cognizance of the whole area of smoking and health. Mr. Kraft told me that in many instances they got a recall of the Caution statement long before they got to question 4.

Necessarily, once the questionnaire is cleared, Mr. Kraft is extremely anxious to begin with the national interviewing. If either of you want to see the results of the trial runs, I doubt that the few days' delay will make any difference. Indeed, I have the impression that his stating that he wants to begin interviewing even before July 5th represents his desire to get the job started rather than a real belief that taking some additional time to clear the questionnaire will preclude his meeting the deadline.

3. In his letter, you will find a description of his sample. Frankly, I think it is characterization rather than a description, and adds up more or less to say that he has a decent sample. He tells me that the sample was constructed by his sampling consultant, Dr. Valinsky, who is connected with CCNY and is a sampling consultant to a number of survey groups. They still plan to use 3,000 interviews. (I think the phrase "interpreting samples of matched attributes" must be read as "interpenetrating samples of matched attributes" otherwise I can make no sense out of it.)

VINGTON & BURLING

H. Henry Ramm, Esquire
Frederick B. Haas, Esquire
June 24, 1967
Page Four

I renewed in my talk today with Mr. Kraft the point that he must have enough of a sample for the 16-18 and 18-21 groups. He told me that they may over-sample, if necessary, in order to get a large enough sub-sample. The present guess is that they will get about 300 in each of these groups, but how they arrive at that conclusion has not been stated.

It seems to me that I do not know enough about the sample design to pass upon it, but that this must remain a matter for Mr. Kraft to defend at the hearing. He was forthright enough to tell me that he did not know precisely what this description covered, but would be prepared at the hearing, and if it became necessary to defend the design against criticism, he could also have Dr. Valinsky testify.

In view of the deadlines on time, my own feeling is that we must more or less accept his sample design and concentrate on getting your reactions to the Questionnaire.

I would very much appreciate your telephoning me on Monday in order that I may have your comments. I would also appreciate your letting me know whether you are willing to approve this Questionnaire without getting any tabulation of the results on the trial runs.

With best regards.

Very truly yours,

dgd
Enclosure

cc: Hon. Earle Clements

P.S.: I do not recall whether there was ever sent to you the memorandum of our original conference with Mr. Kraft or of the points covered in a subsequent telephone conversation. I am enclosing photocopies of these as background.