

Johnson & Johnson Issues Statement on December 15 the *New York Times* Article

December 15, 2018

Regulators, independent labs, and leading academics have tested J&J's talc for decades and found that our talc does not contain asbestos. Far from a new theory or insight, plaintiffs' lawyers have resurrected a disproven argument about asbestos in our talc that dates back to the 1970s.

The information the *New York Times* relied upon has been publicly available for years, and juries, judges, and appellate courts have considered it carefully through the judicial process. It is unfortunate that while we reviewed many of these detailed facts with *The New York Times*, they elected not to report that the FDA tested our product and sourcing sites for over four years in the 1970s, continually monitored cosmetic talc products over time, and again tested our products and talc sources in 2008-09 – and each time found no asbestos.

Their story also ignores independent, peer-reviewed studies of tens of thousands of women and more than 1,000 men by the nation's foremost research institutions found that our talc does not cause cancer or asbestos-related disease, while instead pointing to studies “conducted in the past few years by plaintiffs' lawyers” to support their premise.

The decades-long record overwhelmingly shows that our talc is safe, and J&J has engaged with great transparency in open discussions on the safety of its talc with scientists and regulators, and we will continue to defend our position.

More than 5,000 documents that have been admitted into evidence in these cases are available at <http://www.factsabouttalc.com>.

###