

PLAINTIFF'S
EXHIBIT

TN-490

JW/PC
To: HCL

Dr. H. C. Lewinsohn

CONFIDENTIAL

7th August, 1967

In your Annual Report, which was read with interest and discussed at the Board Meeting on Friday, a query was raised about your phrase near the end that you are not entirely satisfied that mesothelioma can be caused by chrysotile. Do you really consider that the case against chrysotile is almost proved? Surely not, in view of the enormous numbers of people exposed in Rochdale during the last 30 years and the negligible incidence of mesothelioma?

John Waddell.

To J.W.

Heads please. Annual Report.

Silboff et al have described mesothelioma of the pleura and peritoneum in laggers ~~who they said had probably~~ and intimated that their exposure had been mainly chrysotile. As crocidolite was used in the U.S.A and incorporated in steam pressure pipes, etc, it is likely that a mixed exposure occurred. Both these types of ~~exposures~~ ^{were} ~~are~~ difficult to ascertain with accuracy and it is for this reason that I concluded by stating that I was not "entirely satisfied that there exists enough evidence to incriminate chrysotile as a cause of mesothelioma." I cannot rule out the possibility that chrysotile does ~~not~~ cause mesothelioma but go on to say "concerning this that the risk is considerably smaller than that attributed to crocidolite." In fact the risk is probably negligible... I do however know of at least 4

Cases of mesothelioma at Rochdale where it ^{is} said that molten
chrysotile has been used in the past 30 years. In ~~the~~ view
of the fact that approximately 15,000 - 17,000 people have
worked here in the years 1947-1967 and that since
1932 only 134 cases of asbestosis have been diagnosed, you
are probably correct in regarding only 4 cases as negligible.
I would prefer to wait and see!