Australian Hotels Association, representing licensed premises and some restaurants. Information from Healthy Buildings International, an organisation with strong ties to the tobacco industry, was much in evidence. When the ACT Government proposed its legislation, it did so in the belief that it was only a matter of time before other jurisdictions would adopt a legislative basis for smoke-free public places. Whether, when, and how this happens will depend on the success of the Australian public health community in presenting the issues in a way that is informative and persuasive to the media, the public, and elected representatives.

MARGO GOODIN
Department of Health and Community
Australian Capital Territory
Canberra ACT 2601
Australia

Adolescent use of cigarette vending machines

To the Editor – Public health officials have shown increased focus on the nature and extent of youth exposure to tobacco products in the United States.1 Studies have clearly shown that minors can purchase cigarettes unchaperoned.2 While legislation calls for comprehensive measures to thwart youth access to tobacco,3 many communities have initially focused on regulating cigarette vending machines.

Tobacco control advocates, as well as the tobacco industry and retailers, recognise that a small percentage of youth tobacco sales is through vending machines. However, vending machines should be cause for concern because of their ubiquitous nature. In a highly publicised mail intercept survey commissioned by the National Automatic Merchandising Association (NAMA) found that teenagers (13–17 years old) generally used over-the-counter sources for purchasing cigarettes.4 However, among NAMA results, one sees that the younger the youth, the more likely will they be to use a cigarette vending machine. The survey showed that 13 year old smokers were 11 times more likely to use a vending machine than 17 year olds.

In the spring of 1993, more than 60000 students in grades seven, nine, and 12 (12–18 years old) participated in the Pennsylvania tobacco survey for students, which was conducted for the Pennsylvania Department of Health.5 Using a 121 item self-completed questionnaire, administered in a classroom setting, this research aimed to collect baseline data about youth behaviour patterns and attitudes about cigarettes and smokeless tobacco. These students came from a stratified random sample of 371 public and non-public schools. Care was given to the proportional representation of the geographic, ethnic, gender, economic, and grade composition of the state. A total of 60778 students was surveyed, including a random sample of 55563 students and an over-sampling of 5215 students in various target areas. After excluding the oversampled respondents and unusable questionnaires, the population on which our results are based is 54741 students.

With one degree of freedom found each of these comparisons to be highly significant (p < 0.001).

While the overall volume of cigarette sales to minors under supervision in the store was not smaller than from over-the-counter sales, the younger, experimental smoker is at greater risk of purchasing from a cigarette vending machine. Tobacco control groups should be aware of this risk to such a vulnerable target audience and should adjust their educational programmes and policies accordingly.

STEPHEN F GAMBESCIA
American Heart Association
Southeastern Pennsylvania Affiliate
Conshohocken, PA 19428-1190, USA

Son of Premier

To the Editor – In 1988, the RJ Reynolds Tobacco Company (RJ) introduced a unique cigarette product called Premier.1 This product was unique because, unlike conventional cigarettes, Premier heated rather than burned tobacco, thereby significantly reducing tar yields. In October 1988, RJ began test marketing Premier in two American cities (Phoenix, Arizona, and St Louis, Missouri). However, it did not sell well in these cities and was removed from the market in February 1989.

The concept of a smokeless tobacco product, however, did not die with Premier. On 27 November 1994, a New York Times article revealed that RJR was testing a second generation of "smokeless cigarettes" called Eclipse.2 Like Premier, Eclipse heats rather than burns tobacco, but is designed somewhat differently.3 RJR has been conducting consumer tests of Eclipse in eight different American cities, including Buffalo, New York.4

One week after the New York Times story on Eclipse, we undertook an informal mall-intercept survey to determine consumer awareness of and interest in the "smokeless cigarette". We were curious to see how smokers perceived this product, and were interested to see if non-smokers might be induced to try smoking Eclipse. Respondents were recruited by asking individuals at three shopping malls in Buffalo to participate in a 5 minute interview on cigarette smoking. Overall, interviews were completed with a sample of 94 persons, including 26 smokers, 28 former smokers, and 40 individuals who had never smoked. Only two individuals who were approached were refused participation in the survey. We were not sure to what extent persons would know about the Eclipse cigarette, interviewers were given a diagram of Eclipse to show to respondents. To help respondents understand the difference between Eclipse and a conventional cigarette, the diagram also listed several claims made about the product in the New York Times article (that is, reduce tar levels by 90%, eliminate 95% of secondhand smoke production less aromatics than much nicotine as a regular cigarette).5

Sixty percent of respondents stated that they had heard about the Eclipse cigarette. However, after showing respondents the diagram of Eclipse, it was apparent that most people were unfamiliar with the unique features of the product and how it differed from a conventional cigarette.

None of the current smokers and former smokers we interviewed expressed interest in trying Eclipse. However, 85% of the smokers stated that they would be interested in trying the product. Respondents who expressed interest smokewere less likely to describe benefits they believed to be associated with the product. The most frequently mentioned benefits were less side-stream smoke and tar. All respondents were asked to describe potential problems associated with the Eclipse cigarette. The most often mentioned problems were addiction and disposal of the device.

The vast majority of respondents answered affirmatively to a question asking whether Eclipse should be subjected to government testing for safety. However, when asked whether Eclipse should be sold alongside regular cigarettes only 70% said the product should be available like cigarettes. Anecdotal comments received from respondents to our survey give us the impression that both smokers and non-smokers are sceptical about claims being made about the safety of Eclipse in relation to conventional cigarettes.

A recent study showed that about 70% of adult smokers in the United States want to stop smoking do so out of concern for their health.