Asbestos Disease in the United States 1918-1975

Irving J. Selikoff, M.D.
Mount Sinai School of Medicine of the
City University of New York

1046
(623)

Comparatively few studies were undertaken in the United States concerning asbestos-associated disease until the 1930's, despite the considerable use of asbestos. The first medical reference to disease among asbestos workers may be found in the rich monograph of Frederick L. Hoffman "Mortality from Respiratory Diseases in the Dusty Trades. Inorganic Dusts." published by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics in 1918.[1] He noted that insurance company records showed increased mortality among asbestos workers and commented that these companies were reluctant to insure such workers. In the same year, there was the finding by Pancoast, Miller and Landis of fine fibrosis in the chest x-rays of 15 asbestos workers.[2,3]

In retrospect, these early scientific reports should perhaps have attracted more attention. There are unpublished data indicating that both compensation awards and insurance claims reflected disability among asbestos workers,[4] for example. The first published case report of fatal asbestos disease in the United States appeared in 1930.[5]

The brilliant series of British reports[6-12] 1927-1929 concerning asbestosis attracted much attention in the United States and stimulated the initiation of important research studies. In 1929, the U.S. asbestos industry commissioned a survey of asbestos health hazards in the United States and Canada, which was conducted from October 1929 to January 1931.

Presented at the Conference on Asbestos Disease, Rouen, France, October 27, 1975.

The results were reported in 1935.[13] A serious situation had been found. Of 126 workers employed three years or more, selected at random, 105 had abnormal findings, with only 25 of 121 asymptomatic.

Meanwhile, independent surveys had been undertaken, and had shown significant prevalence of asbestosis in factories.[14-17] When an extensive investigation by the U.S. Public Health Service confirmed these findings, it became widely known and appreciated that asbestos exposure commonly resulted in a serious pneumoconiosis. Although industrial hygiene data were scant, the U.S. Public Health Service proposed a "tentative standard," to be revised when better information became available.[18] In 1935, Lynch and Smith suggested that lung cancer could also be associated with asbestos exposure.[19]

Thus, by 1935, the main directions of the problem were known. Chrysotile asbestos, virtually the only fiber then used, could produce widespread disease, this disease could be fatal and malignancy might be a result of exposure.

With this background, it is difficult to explain the curious quiet hiatus of the next 25 years.[20] Little was done, regulations were few and government inspections and supervision were infrequent. For example, in a clinical survey of 1,117 asbestos insulation workers conducted by us, each worker was asked about dust counts he had seen. Their employment covered the span 1910-1962.[21] In approximately 3,500,000 working days, seven dust counts had been observed; most, in relation to recent Workmen's Compensation claims.

Towards the end of this "silent era" some disquiet appeared concerning the question of asbestos-induced cancer, and was augmented by an observation reported by O'Donnell and Mann in 1957, from a hospital in a city in Pennsylvania with an asbestos factory, that of 27 cases of asbestosis seen by them, 13 had had lung cancer.[22]

It is worthy of note that during these years of inattention, years in which the use of asbestos grew approximately five-fold in a rapidly expanding industry making thousands of products, approximately one million United States men and women began work for shorter or longer periods, unwarned and largely unprotected, a fact for which our scientists can take little pride and little credit. This is especially true because many of the cases of asbestos disease now being seen in the United States had their origin in uncontrolled excessive exposures during this time.[23]

* * * * * * * * * * *

Fifteen years ago, asbestos disease in the United States began to attract much more attention. A number of studies appeared which identified three major problems, which we have not solved and with which we are now concerned.

First, although the frequent presence of pulmonary asbestosis among workers in the asbestos trades had been demonstrated 40 years ago, this knowledge has not resulted in an important reduction in its prevalence among such groups of workers nor in the prevention of its more serious consequences, cor pulmonale and respiratory insufficiency. In one study of asbestos insulation workers, for example, of 1,249 men who had been members of the insulation worker's union in the New York metropoliton

area at any time from January 1, 1943-December 31, 1962, 1,117 were x-rayed during 1963.[21] 542 had abnormal x-rays. Notable was the fact that of the 725 with less than 20 years from onset of exposure, only 203 were abnormal. On the other hand, of the 392 men with longer durations from onset of exposure, 339 had abnormal roentgenograms (Table 1).

Moreover, it was found that in many groups of workers from 5 to 7% of deaths were due to cor pulmonale and respiratory insufficiency.[24-26] Identification of the problem 1930-1935 had not been sufficient to prevent the occurrence of the disease.

* * * * * * * * * * *

Second, and perhaps more important, although the persistence of asbestosis as an important industrial hazard was rediscovered, it soon became evident that it was not the principal hazard of exposure to the fiber. The principal difficulty was clearly cancer. Two critical studies showed this to be true, both in the factory production of asbestos products[27] and among workers using these materials.[24]

In our experience, approximately 40% of deaths among asbestos insulation workers in recent years have been due to malignancy. In one study, we have followed a cohort of 632 asbestos insulation workers from January 1, 1943 to December 31, 1974; they continue under observation. Altogether, 305 deaths were expected. 451 occurred. The excess was largely due to cancer. Age, year and sex specific analysis indicated that 52 such deaths were to have been expected -- 200 occurred. Specifically, analysis of the cancer deaths by site indicated that 12 lung cancer deaths were likely to have occurred; 89 were found. Some

two or three times as many cancers of the esophagus, stomach, colon and rectum occurred as expected. There were also 35 deaths of mesothelioma, 10 pleural and 25 peritoneal. Of course, no deaths of this rare disease were expected (Table 2).

It was of interest to find that, among the mesothelioma deaths, there were more peritoneal mesotheliomas than pleural. This observation is consistent with that made by Enticknap and Smither[28] among workers in an asbestos factory in London, and is in contrast to the location among patients with mesothelioma derived from environmental contact with asbestos.[29] Perhaps differences in intensity and in nature of exposure are responsible for this variation. Direct occupational exposure, with its exposure to large numbers of fibers including, perhaps, ingestion as well as inhalation, may be more likely to increase the risk of peritoneal mesothelioma while the far fewer fibers in environmental circumstances, tend not to lead to such disease.

Similar findings have been obtained in other studies. In one, we have been following all members of the insulation workers' union in the United States and Canada (International Association of Heat and Frost Insulators and Asbestos Workers, AFL-CIO, CLC). On January 1, 1967 there were 17,800 such men. By the end of 1973, 1,577 deaths had occurred. Again, there were approximately three times as many cancers as expected (Table 3). And again, lung cancer, mesothelioma and gastrointestinal cancer were the principal categories of such excess neoplastic deaths. 67 deaths of lung cancer were anticipated; 321 occurred. There were 103 deaths of mesothelioma (again, with a preponderance of peritoneal sites of origin) and a [illegible] increase of

cancer of the esophagus, stomach, colon and rectum. It was of interest that cancers of other sites were also, in the aggregate, increased (103 expected, 165 observed). While increased risk of cancer of a number of other sites exists (larynx,[30] oro-pharynx,[31] and others) the infrequency of such neoplasms in general makes it advisable to seek further experience before a firm opinion is expressed concerning the extent of such increased risk.

We have considered the possibility that the complex environment in which these insulation workers are employed (industrial construction) might in some way influence their mortality risks. We therefore undertook to investigate the workforce of two factories making insulation materials, exposed to asbestos but not to many of the other materials found at construction worksites. The first was a plant which made amosite asbestos insulation materials (pipe covering, block, asbestos mattresses, etc.). Introduced in the late 1930's, their use increased during World War II. A factory making the products started production in an eastern U.S. city in 1941.

From June, 1941 to the end of 1945, 933 men began work at the plant. Some worked for as little as one day, others for one or more months and a number for somewhat over 13 years, until the plant ceased operations in November 1954. We have traced this group of workers to December 31, 1974. Table 4 includes their mortality experience, starting five years from onset of work. It will be noted that their experience was very much like that of the construction workers who used the products made in this factory. Again, there was three times increase of cancer of all sites (50 anticipated, 157 observed). Too,

lung cancer, gastrointestinal cancer and mesothelioma were the major categories with excess neoplastic deaths. These experiences confirm earlier observations of neoplastic risk associated with this work.[32]

In an investigation of workers in another asbestos factory (the largest in the United States) we had less opportunity of focusing on the production of insulation materials, since many other products were made. Nevertheless, the results are again of interest. On January 1, 1959, there were 689 production employees in this factory (including 611 males) who had begun work before January 1, 1939. We have studied the male mortality experience January 1, 1959-December 31, 1973. There was little difference from our findings in other cohorts. Again, cancer proved to be the major asbestos hazard (although asbestosis, as in the other cohorts, was an important cause of death). Of the cancer categories, bronchogenic carcinoma, mesothelioma and gastrointestinal cancer took pride of place (Table 5).

* * * * * * * * * * *

A third major difficulty now with us is derived from the appreciation that it may take much less asbestos to cause cancer than to result in asbestosis -- sometimes, very little indeed. We learned this first from the work of Wagner and his colleagues[29] and Newhouse.[33] So alerted, we have become concerned not only with asbestos workers, but with widespread dissemination of asbestos from the primary worksite, exposing both other workers nearby as well as individuals not associated with the work at all, but exposed to asbestos as a result of environmental pollution. Examples include household contamination by dust brought home by workers to their households and asbestos air pollution

from asbestos-using facilities, contaminating surrounding neighborhoods and, to a lesser extent, the general environment.

Such indirect exposure of workers has been particularly important in the United States in the construction industry and shipyards. In the former, since 1959, a particular hazard has resulted from the use of sprayed asbestos fireproofing.[34] This is now strictly controlled.[35]

Anderson and his colleagues[36] have also demonstrated that family contact asbestos disease, among wives and children of asbestos workers, is much more common than originally suspected. 326 household contacts of workers employed in the amosite asbestos factory for shorter or longer periods 1941-1954 were examined in 1974-1975. Approximately one-third had characteristic parenchymal and/or pleural x-ray abnormalities (Tables 6 and 7).

At further remove from occupational sources of asbestos contamination, there has also been concern with asbestos pollution of general community air.[37] There are numerous sources for such asbestos air pollution in the United States.[38] In recent months an additional source has been identified: air within buildings fireproofed with asbestos.[39] Concomitant with such environmental contamination has been the frequent finding of chrysotile asbestos fibrils in the lungs of urban dwellers.

* * * * * * * * * *

Current United States Approaches to Control of Asbestos Disease

Perspectives which provide a background to approaches designed to control or eliminate asbestos disease in the United States are largely derived from experiences such as those above and are reflected in proposed regulations, either in occupational[41] or environmental[35] circumstances.

1. Asbestos-associated cancer of primary concern. Control measures are now based on the realization that it is necessary to prevent asbestos-associated cancer, as well as asbestosis.[41] In general, this implies that permissable asbestos concentrations need be significantly lower than those calculated to minimize the risk of asbestos alone.

2. Long period of clinical latency. In seeking to prevent cancer, it is appreciated that the long period of clinical latency of asbestos cancer must be taken into account. Our studies and those of others have demonstrated that cancers associated with asbestos exposure frequently do not become clinically evident for at least 20 years after onset of exposure. Often, the elapsed period is 30, 40 or more years. We have analyzed deaths of lung cancer in our cohort of 17,800 asbestos insulation workers in the United States and Canada, from January 1, 1967 to December 31, 1972. Table 8 demonstrates that there were no deaths of lung cancer among individuals with less than 10 years from onset of exposure. A small increased risk was found in the period 10-14 years from onset but the major impact of the increased lung cancer risk was observed 20-40 years from the beginning of work exposure.

It is likely that "duration from onset of exposure" is, in some instances at least, a composite effect and includes both the influence of total exposure and that of the passage of time from first exposure (or, more accurately, from the time sufficient exposure has occurred to result in increased cancer risk - "effective exposure").

3. Brief (excessive) exposure may produce later disease. Even brief exposures -- a day,[42] a week, a month -- if excessive, can later result in disease. The inhaled fibers remain in the lung. Thus, the men employed in the amosite asbestos products factory mentioned above 1941-1945, worked for varying periods of time. Approximately one-third worked for three months or less, one-third for a year or more. Even less than three months of work resulted, during the next 30 or so years, in significantly increased cancer risk (Table 9). Nevertheless, those with longer periods of work had even greater risk.

4. Multiple facter interaction -- cigarette smoking. In 1967, it was found that the risk of the most important occupational asbestos cancer, bronchogenic carcinoma, did not depend upon asbestos exposure alone. Rather, if there were absence of concordance of two agents, cigarette smoking and asbestos, there did not seem to be a significantly increased risk.[25]

In the first cohort study detailed above (Table 2), on January 1, 1963 there were 370 survivors of the group whose observation had begun in 1943. When these men were examined, each was asked of his smoking habits. 87 men had no history of cigarette smoking and 283 had such history. By April 30, 1967, it was anticipated that virtually no

deaths would have occurred among the non-smokers. Not one did occur despite their long years of asbestos work. On the other hand, 3 deaths of lung cancer had been anticipated among the 283 smokers. 24 were observed. It was calculated from these data that asbestos workers who smoke cigarettes have approximately 92 times the risk of dying of lung cancer, compared to men of equal age who neither smoke nor work with asbestos (Table 10).[25]

The cigarette smoking-asbestos interaction has been confirmed in a larger study.[43] Among 2,066 non-smoking asbestos workers 7.51 deaths of lung cancer were expected from January 1, 1967 through 1972 on the basis of rates derived from the general population of the United States. 2 deaths occurred. On the other hand, among 9,590 men with a recorded history of cigarette smoking, 31.10 deaths of lung cancer were expected, and 179 were observed (Table 11).

No clear association with risk of mesothelioma has been observed, nor of cancer of the stomach, colon or rectum. Asbestos workers who do not smoke may still die more frequently than expected of these diseases, or of asbestosis. Nevertheless, if they do smoke cigarettes, our data indicate that their risk of death of lung cancer is approximately eight times that of other smokers.

5. Dose response relationship. There is little doubt that a dose response relationship exists for the several asbestos-associated diseases. This is well demonstrated by the experience of the amosite asbestos factory workers referred to above (Tables 4 and 9). Here, workers were exposed to the same fiber, during the same period of time, making the same products, in the same city: they

varied. however, with regard to their total exposure. Such variations were reflected in differences in the risk of death of both asbestosis and asbestos-associated cancer.

It may be that risk also varies with other factors, such as intensity of exposure, peak exposure, type of fiber, individual susceptibility, etc. Insofar as fiber type is concerned, Wagner[44] has proposed that crocidolite has a greater potential to cause mesothelioma than do other fiber types. Our own studies provide little information concerning this hypothesis. Chrysotile has long been the principal fiber type used in the United States. Comparatively little crocidolite was imported into the United States until World War II,[31] and it has not been used in insulation materials utilized by the asbestos insulation workers investigated in our studies. Our data do not allow comparisons, therefore, between crocidolite and chrysotile risks. Amosite was also imported in the United States in scant quantities until the last part of the 1930's and the 1940's. While 1940 and 1950 deaths among insulation workers[24] are unlikely to have been influenced by amosite exposure, it would be difficult to separate the influence of amosite from chrysotile since that time, since exposure to both fiber types could have occurred and sufficiently long in the past to effect analysis of deaths 1960-1975.

An unresolved question related to the problem of "dose-disease response" relationships is whether or not a "safe" exposure level exists, whether there is, for asbestos, as for any carcinogen, a threshold level. In animal experiments, Wagner[45] failed to find evidence for a threshold dose of asbestos for mesothelioma.

From a practical point of view, one might consider the observations of a continuous reduction in identifiable cancer risk with decrease in levels of exposure suggest that it may be feasible to reach levels at which it will not be possible to statistically define increased risk of cancer of those sites known to be associated with a neoplastic effect of asbestos.

6. Industry efforts to control exposures. In the last several years, there has been sharp increase in the scope and intensity of industry efforts to control factory exposures, and the importance of avoidance of cigarette smoking is also now being stressed.

7. End product use major unresolved problem. Still unresolved is the control of exposures encountered in the use of asbestos products. This is not only true in the construction industry, shipyards and power plants, but in such uses as brake repair and brake maintenance, as well as in the end product use of some asbestos materials by the general public. Attention has recently been called to one such use, the home utilization of taping and spackle compounds needed for home repairs and rebuilding. Analytical studies showed that many contained asbestos, without warning labels or instructions for the use of special protective precautions.[46]

8. Demolition, waste disposal, maintenance and repair. Waste disposal, demolition of asbestos-containing structures and the necessity for repair of facilities containing asbestos materials are thorny problems. So far, little research has been devoted to this question,

although some notable efforts have recently been made,[47] and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency is seeking to establish regulations aimed at minimizing environmental pollution from these sources.[35]

9. Environmental exposure; conjugal, neighborhood and general community disease. Although family contact and neighborhood residence have been clearly demonstrated to carry a risk of asbestos disease, the magnitude of this risk has not been established quantitatively. Indeed, although it is known that mesothelioma may result in such circumstances, there is no information whether other asbestos-associated cancers might also occur in excess among people so exposed. It is unlikely that extensive asbestosis, sufficient to result in death of cor-pulmonale, will often occur although I have seen cases of moderately extensive pulmonary fibrosis (2/2 in the ILO-U/C classification) among wives of asbestos workers. Studies are currently underway in our Laboratory to provide information on the extent of asbestos-associated disease other than mesothelioma, among family contacts and neighborhood residents. There is no evidence at present that asbestos exposure of the community at large ("general asbestos air pollution") has been associated with disease risk, although attention has been called to the fact that mesotheliomas not known to be associated with asbestos exposure (approximately 15% in the series of Greenberg and Lloyd Davies[42] and Webster[48]) have also been increasing incidence.

10. Asbestos contamination of public water supplies. Asbestos may be found in some food and beverages, presumably as the result of the filtration of these products through asbestos filters or as the

result of use of water contaminated by asbestos.[49] Water may naturally contain fibers as the result of ground waters coursing through geological formations containing asbestos minerals.[38] In other instances, there is the possibility that water being transported through asbestos cement pipe could, in some circumstances, be contaminated by the asbestos cement material.[50,51] There are, at present, few data that would allow appropriate evaluation of a potential hazard, especially since the question of asbestos disease resulting from ingestion of the fiber is still unresolved.[52]

It has also been found that wide contamination of public water supplies may result from disposal of asbestos-containing waste, as in the contamination of Lake Superior by mining operations.[53,54]

11. Ineffective therapy. To the present, little has been achieved in terms of improved survival of asbestos workers suffering from asbestos-induced cancer. (Insofar as asbestosis is concerned, much can be done to lengthen life by appropriate medical surveillance.) In our studies of asbestos insulation workers in the New York metropolitan area, we observed 1,249 men from January 1, 1963. 370 men had long experience, having been members of the insulation workers' union in 1943. By December 31, 1974, 7 pleural mesotheliomas, 21 peritoneal mesotheliomas and 49 lung cancers were observed. All 28 men with mesothelioma are dead and 48 of the 49 individuals with lung cancer. Among the 879 men who were admitted to the union between 1943 and 1962, 2 pleural mesotheliomas occurred, and 1 peritoneal. All 3 men are dead. Similarly, 10 instances of lung cancer were seen by December 31, 1974; 9 of the 10 are dead.

Epilogue:

It is sobering to consider that the asbestos disease and asbestos-associated deaths that have recently been seen in the United States are largely related to the inadequately controlled use of asbestos 1930-1940, when some 200,000-300,000 tons per year were used in the United States. At present, approximately 650,000 tons per annum are used (Table 12). To the extent that this use is inadequately controlled, we will see deaths of asbestosis and cancer in the year 2000, and later.[55]

Table 1

X-ray Changes in Asbestos Insulation Workers[21]

Onset of exposure (yrs.)	No.	% Normal	% Abnormal	Asbestosis (grade) 1	2	3
40+	121	5.8	94.2	35	51	28
30-39	194	12.9	87.1	102	49	18
20-29	77	27.2	72.8	35	17	4
10-19	379	55.9	44.1	156	9	0
0-9	346	89.6	10.4	36	0	0
	1,117	51.5	48.5	366	126	50

Table 2

Expected and observed deaths among 632 N.Y.-N.J. asbestos insulation workers, January 1, 1943-December 31, 1974

	Expected*	Observed
Total deaths, all causes	305.20	451
Total cancer - all sites	52.02	200
-Lung cancer	12.20	89
Pleural mesothelioma	**	10
Peritoneal mesothelioma	**	25
Cancer of stomach, esophagus	6.46	20
Cancer of colon	7.64	23
Asbestosis	**	37
All other causes	253.18	214

*632 members were on the union's rolls on January 1, 1943. 9 died before reaching 20 years from first employment. All others entered these calculations upon reaching the 20-year from onset of first exposure point. Expected deaths are based upon white male age-specific death rate data of the U.S. National Office of Vital Statistics from 1947-73. Rates were extrapolated 1943-48 from rates for 1949-55, and for 1974 from rates for 1969-73.

**U.S. death rates not available, but these are rare causes of death in the general population.

Table 3

Expected and observed deaths among 17,800 asbestos insulation workers in the U.S. and Canada, January 1, 1967-December 31, 1973

	Expected deaths*	Observed deaths	Ratio
Total deaths	1131.11	1577	1.39
Total cancer - all sites	709.27	658	3.14
Lung cancer	66.99	321	4.79
Pleural mesothelioma	**	36	--
Peritoneal mesothelioma	**	67	--
Cancer of stomach	9.82	16	1.63
Cancer of colon, rectum	24.55	39	1.59
Cancer of esophagus	4.60	14	3.04
All other cancer	103.31	165	1.60
Asbestosis	**	119	
All other causes	921.84	800	0.87

*Expected deaths are based upon age-specific white male death rate data of the U.S. National Office of Vital Statistics from 1963-1973. Rates were extrapolated for 1973 from rates for 1968-1972.

**U.S. death rates not available, but these are rare causes of death in the general population.

Table 4

Deaths among 933* workers employed in an amosite asbestos factory, starting five years from onset of work 1941-1945 to December 31, 1974

Cause of death	Deaths 1946-1974 Expected**	Observed	Ratio
All causes	285,62	483	1.69
Cancer - all sites	50,10	157	3.13
Lung cancer	12,45	63	6.67
G.I. cancer	12,05	24	1.99
Pleural mesothelioma	***	5	....
Peritoneal mesothelioma	***	5	....
"Asbestos" cancer	24,50	117	4.78
Other cancer	25,60	40	1.56
Asbestosis	***	28	....
All other causes	235,52	298	1,27

* 128 workers were omitted from these calculations: 33 had prior asbestos exposure; 38 died in the first five years after onset of employment. 49 were not completely traced; and eight had other asbestos employment after the five year from onset point.

** Expected deaths are based upon white male age-specific death rate data of the U.S. National Office of Vital Statistics, 1949-1973. Rates were extrapolated for 1946-1948 from rates for 1949-1955 and for 1974 from rates for 1969-1973.

*** U.S. death rates not available but these are rare causes of death in the general population.

Table 5

Expected* and observed number of deaths among 611 New Jersey asbestos factory employees 1 January 1959 - 31 December 1973 twenty or more years after onset of first exposure to asbestos

	1959-1963			1964-1968			1969-1973			Total 1959-1973		
Number of men	611			562			480			611		
Person-years of observation	2955			2646			2195			7795		
	Exp.	Obs.	Ratio	Exp.	Obs.	Ratio	Exp.	Obs.	Ratio	Exp.	Obs.	Ratio
Total deaths - all causes	39.87	49	1.32	52.06	82	1.58	59.60	82	1.38	151.53	213	1.41
Cancer - all sites	7.60	19	2.50	10.52	24	2.28	12.75	34	2.67	30.87	77	2.49
Lung cancer	2.31	6	2.60	3.48	10	2.87	4.37	14	3.20	10.16	30	2.95
Pleural mesothelioma	n.a.	1	..	n.a.	3	..	n.a.	6	..	n.a.	10	..
Peritoneal mesothelioma	n.a.	1	..	n.a.	3	..	n.a.	4	..	n.a.	8	..
Stomach, esophagus	0.72	3	4.17	0.87	--	--	0.90	--	--	2.49	3	1.20
Colon, rectum	0.92	4	4.35	1.28	2	1.56	1.56	2	1.28	3.76	8	2.13
Other cancer	3.65	4	1.10	4.89	6	1.23	5.92	8	1.35	14.46	18	1.24
All respiratory disease	2.32	9	3.88	3.34	10	2.99	4.17	10	2.40	9.83	29	2.95
Asbestosis	n.a.	8	..	n.a.	7	..	n.a.	8	..	n.a.	23	..
All other causes	29.95	21	0.70	38.20	48	1.26	42.68	38	0.89	110.83	107	0.97

* Expected deaths are based upon white male age-specific death rate data of the U.S. National Office of Vital Statistics, 1959-1973.

n.a. Specific rates for these causes of death are not available. They are, however, extremely rare in the general population.

Table 6

Distribution of 326 household contacts of amosite asbestos workers by relationship to worker

	Relationship	Number		Percent
	Wives	83		25%
Children	Daughters	115	188	58%
	Sons	70		
Sibs	Sisters	20	32	10%
	Brothers	12		
Others	Mother	7	23	7%
	Father	3		
	Cousins, etc.	13		

Table 7

X-ray abnormalities among 326 household members of amosite asbestos workers

X-ray findings	Number of household members
Pleural thickening the only abnormality	42 (13%)
Pleural calcification the only abnormality	7 (2%)
Pleural thickening and pleural calcification	3 (1%)
Irregular opacities the only abnormality	35 (11%)
Irregular opacities, pleural thickening and/or pleural calcification	27 (8%)
Total	114 (35%)

Table 8

Deaths from lung cancer among 17,800 asbestos insulation workers in the U.S. and Canada January 1, 1967-December 31, 1972; relation to elapsed period from onset of work exposure

	Lung cancer		
Years from onset	Expected deaths	Observed deaths	Ratio
< 10	0.56	0	--
10-14	1.97	5	2.5
15-19	5.87	23	3.9
20-24	9.55	34	3.6
25-29	10.70	56	5.2
30-34	8.20	60	7.3
35-39	4.68	29	6.2
40-44	4.84	27	5.6
45-49	4.51	19	4.2
50+	4.97	22	4.4
Total	55.87	275	4.9

Expected deaths are based upon age-specific white male death rate data of the U.S. National Office of Vital Statistics. Rates for 1972 were extrapolated from data for 1967-1971.

Table 9

Expected and observed deaths subsequent to first year after onset of employment among 870 amosite asbestos factory workers first employed 1941-45 and observed to December 31, 1973. Distribution by duration of employment.

	3 months work or less			3-11 months work			1 year + work		
	Expected	Observed	Ratio	Expected	Observed	Ratio	Expected	Observed	Ratio
Total deaths, all causes	99.75	112	1.12	94.34	170	1.80	110.55	216	1.95
Cancer - all sites	16.92	28	1.65	16.29	46	2.82	18.99	81	4.27
Lung cancer	4.13	16	3.87	4.00	16	4.00	4.64	49	10.56
Pleural mesothelioma	n.a.*	0	---	n.a.	2	---	n.a.	2	---
Peritoneal mesothelioma	n.a.	0	---	n.a.	1	---	n.a.	4	---
Cancer stomach	1.46	1	0.68	1.47	3	2.04	1.73	5	2.89
Cancer colon, rectum	2.38	4	1.68	2.27	7	3.08	2.67	5	1.87
Asbestosis	n.a.	1	---	n.a.	2	---	n.a.	23	---
All other causes	82.83	83	1.00	78.05	122	1.56	91.56	112	1.22
Number of workers		249			294			327	
Person-years of observation		5,747			6,305			7,061	

This table excluded 63 men. Ten died during first year of employment, 34 could not be traced after the first year and 19 had prior occupational exposure to asbestos. Of the 870 men, 18 were partially traced and 16 had subsequent asbestos work. These remained in the calculations until lost to observation or until onset of subsequent asbestos work. Expected deaths are based upon white male age-specific death rate data of the U.S. National Office of Vital Statistics, 1949-71. Rates were extrapolated for 1941-48 from rates for 1949-55 and for 1972-73 from rates for 1967-71.

*U.S. death rates not available but these are rare causes of death in general population.

Table 10

Lung cancer among 370 NY-NJ asbestos insulation workers, January 1, 1963-April 30, 1967

	No history of cigarette smoking	History of cigarette smoking
Number of men	87	283
Expected lung cancer*	0.15	2.98
Observed lung cancer	0	24

*Hammond, E.C. Smoking in relation to death rates of 1,000,000 men and women. In: NCI Monograph #19, 1966, p. 127-204.

Table 11

Expected and observed deaths of lung cancer among 17,800 U.S. and Canada asbestos insulation workers, January 1, 1967-December 31, 1972; Relation of cigarette smoking

		Deaths from lung cancer		
	No. of persons	Expected*	Observed	Ratio
Smoking habits not known	6,144	16.76	94	5.6
History of cigarette smoking	9,590	31.60	179	5.7
No history of cigarette smoking	2,066	7.51	2	0.3
Never smoked	1,457	4.40	1	0.2
History of pipe and/or cigar only	609	3.11	1	0.3

* Expected deaths based upon age-specific U.S. mortality rates for white males disregarding smoking. Lung cancer estimates based upon U.S. rates for cancer of lung, pleural, bronchus and trachea, categories 162 and 163 of the International Classification of Diseases and Causes of Deaths, 7th Revision.

Table 12

U.S. Consumption of Asbestos

	Tons
1930	120,000
1940	262,000
1950	727,000
1960	710,000
1973	862,000*

*Chrysotile 839,200 tons, amosite 4,273 tons, crocidolite 17,966 tons and anthophyllite 1,162 tons. (Source U.S. Bureau of Mines.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Hoffman, F.L. Mortality from respiratory diseases in dusty trades. Inorganic dusts. Bull. of the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics No. 231. (Industrial Accidents and Hygiene Series: No.17) pp.458. Washington, D.C. June 1918.

2. Pancoast, H.K., Miller, T.G. and Landis, H.R.M. A roentgenologic study of the effects of dust inhalation upon the lungs. Amer. J. Roent. 5: 129-138, 1918.

3. Pancoast, H.K. and Pendergrass, E.P. A review of our present knowledge of pneumoconiosis, based upon roentgenologic studies, with notes on the pathology of the condition. Amer. J. Roent. 14(5):381-423, November 1925.

4. Lanza, A.J. Asbestosis. J. Amer. Med. Assoc. 106:368-369, February 1, 1936.

5. Mills, R.G. Pulmonary Asbestosis. Report of a case. Minnesota Med. 13(7):495-499, July 1930.

6. Cooke, W.E. Pulmonary asbestosis. Brit. Med. J. 2:1024-1025, December 3, 1927.

7.. Oliver, T. Clinical aspects of pulmonary asbestosis. Brit. Med. J. 2:1026-1027, December 3, 1927.

8. Seiler, H.E. A case of pneumoconiosis. Result of the inhalation of asbestos dust. Brit. Med. J. 2:982, December 1, 1928.

9. Bridge, J.C. Remarks on occupational dust. Brit. Med. J. 2:1143-1147, December 21, 1929.

10. Haddow, A.C. Clinical aspects of pulmonary asbestosis. Brit. Med. J. 2:580-581, September 28, 1929.

11. Wood, W.B. Pulmonary asbestosis. Radiographic appearances in skiagrams of the chest of workers in asbestos. Tubercle 10:353-363, April 1929.

12. Merewether, E.R.A. and Price, C.V. Report on effects of asbestos dust on the lungs and dust suppression in the asbestos industry. Part I. Occurrence of pulmonary fibrosis and other pulmonary affections in asbestos workers. Part II. Processes giving rise to dust and methods for its suppression. H.M.S.O., 1930.

13. Lanza, A.J., McConnell, W.J. and Fehnel, J.W. Effects of the inhalation of asbestos dust on the lungs of asbestos workers. Pub. Health Rep. 50(1): 1-12, January 4, 1935.

14. Donnelly, J. Pulmonary asbestosis. Am. J. Public Health 23:1275-1281, December 1933.

15. Fulton, W.B., Dooley, A., Matthews, J.L. and Houtz, R.L. Asbestosis. Part II. The nature and amount of dust encountered in asbestos fabricating plants. Part III. The effects of expsoure to dust encountered in asbestos fabricating plants on the health of a group of workers. Department of Labor and Industry, Bureau of Industrial Standards, Commonwealth of Penn., Harrisburg, Pa. Spec. Bull. No. 42, September 20, 1935.

16. S[illegible]ll, J.P. Asbestosis. A roentgenologic review of 71 cases. [illegible] 27(3):[illegible]-29[illegible], September 19[illegible].

17. McPheeters, S.B. A survey of a group of employees exposed to asbestos dust. J. Indust. Hyg. & Toxicol. 18(4):229-239, April 1936.

18. Dreessen, W.C., Dallavalle, J.M., Edwards, T.I., Miller, J.W. and Sayers, R.R. with Easom, H.F. and Trice, M.F. A study of asbestosis in the asbestos textile industry. Pub. Health. Bull. #241, August 1938, Washington D.C.

19. Lynch, K.M. and Smith, W.A. Pulmonary asbestosis III: Carcinoma of the lung in asbestos-silicosis. Amer. J. Cancer 24(1):56-64 May 1935.

20. Trasko, V.M. Some facts on the prevalence of silicosis in the U.S. A.M.A. Arch. Indust. Hlth. 14:379-386, October 1956.

21. Selikoff, I.J., Churg, J. and Hammond, E.C. The occurrence of asbestosis among insulation workers in the United States. Ann. N.Y. Acad. Sci. 132:139-155, 1965.

22. O'Donnell, W.M. and Mann, R.H. Asbestos: an extrinsic factor in the pathogenesis of bronchogenic carcinoma. [Abstract] Amer. J. Path. 33(3): 610 May-June 1957. Cancer 1[illegible]:1[illegible]-1[illegible], August 19[illegible].

23. Selikoff, I.J., Bader, R.A., Bader, M.E., Churg, J. and Hammond, E.C. Editorial: Asbestosis and neoplasia. Amer. J. Med. 42(4):487-496, 1967.

24. Selikoff, I.J., Churg, J. and Hammond, E.C. Asbestos exposure and neoplasia. J. Amer. Med. Assoc. 188:22-26, 1964.

25. Selikoff, I.J., Hammond, E.C. and Churg, J. Asbestos exposure, smoking and neoplasia. J. Amer. Med. Assoc. 204(2):106-112, April 1968.

26. Selikoff, I.J., Hammond, E.C. and Seidman, H. Cancer risk of insulation workers in the United States. In: Biological Effects of Asbestos, Ed. P. Bogovski et al. IARC Sc. Pub. No. 8, Lyon, France, 1973. pp. 209-216.

27. Mancuso, T.F. and Coulter, E.J. Methodology in industrial health studies. The cohort approach, with special reference to an asbestos company. Arch. Envir. Hlth. 6(2):210-226, February 1963.

28. Enticknap, J.B. and Smither, W.J. Peritoneal tumours in asbestosis. Brit. J. Indust. Med. 21:20-31, 1964.

29. Wagner, J.C., Sleggs, C.A. and Marchand, P. Diffuse pleural mesothelioma and asbestos exposure in the North Western Cape Province, Brit. J. Indust. Med. 17:260-271, 1960.

30. Stell, P.M. and McGill, T. Asbestos and laryngeal carcinoma. Lancet 2:416-417, August 25, 1973.

31. Selikoff, I.J., Hammond, E.C. and Churg, J. [illegible] asbestos insulation workers. In: [illegible] Proc. Int'l. Conf. [illegible] 1969. [illegible]

1970, [illegible]

ST0065957

36. Selikoff, I.J., Hammond, E.C. and Churg, J. Carcinogenicity of amosite asbestos. Arch. Envir. Hlth. 25:183-186, September 1972.

33. Newhouse, M.L. and Thompson, H. Mesothelioma of pleura and peritoneum following exposure to asbestos in the London area. Brit. J. Indust. Med. 22:261-269, October 1965.

34. Peizer, E.B., Nicholson, W.J., Waldron, D.A. and Selikoff, I.J. Application of sprayed asbestos fiber containing asbestos - occupational health hazard. Amer. Indust. Hyg. Assoc. J. 33:178-191, 1972.

35. Hazardous Air Pollutants. Federal Register 40(199):48291-48311, October 14, 1975.

36. Anderson, H., Lilis, R., Daum, S.M., Fischbein, A.S., and Selikoff, I.J. Household contact asbestos neoplastic risk. Ann. N.Y. Acad. Sci. (in press)

37. Selikoff, I.J., Nicholson, W.J. and Langer, A.M. Asbestos air pollution. Arch. Envir. Hlth. 25:1-13, July 1972.

* 38. Airborne Asbestos. A report prepared by the Committee on Biologic Effects of Atmospheric Pollutants, Division of Medical Sciences, National Research Council, Natl. Acad. Sci. Washington, D.C. 1971.

* 39. Nicholson, W.J., Rohl, A.N. and Weisman, I. Asbestos contamination of building air supply systems. In: Trans. Inst. Electrical Electronic Engineers (in press)

40. Langer, A.M., Selikoff, I.J. and Sidman, A. Chrysotile asbestos in the lungs of persons in New York City. Arch. Environ. Hlth. 22:348-361, March 1971.

41. Occupational Exposure to Asbestos. Federal Register 40(197):47651-47665, October 9, 1975.

42. Greenberg, M. and Lloyd Davies, T.A. Mesothelioma Register 1967-68. Brit. J. Indust. Med. 31:91-104, 1974.

43. Hammond, E.C. and Selikoff, I.J. Relation of cigarette smoking to risk of death of asbestos-associated disease among insulation workers in the United States. In: Biological Effects of Asbestos, Ed. P. Bogovski et al. IARC Sc. Pub. No. 8, Lyon, France, 1973. pp.312-317.

44. Wagner, J.C. Asbestos Cancer. J. Nat. Can. Inst. 46:v-ix, 1971.

45. Wagner, J.C., Berry, G., Skidmore, J.W. and Timbrell, V. The effects of the inhalation of asbestos in rats. Brit. J. Cancer 29:252-269, 1974.

46. Rohl, A.N., Langer, A.M., Selikoff, I.J. and Nicholson, W.J. Exposure to asbestos in the use of consumer spackling, patching and taping compounds. Science 189(4203):501-503 (August 15) 1975.

47. Sawyer, R. Vale air and architecture building, asbestos contamination: past, present and future. In: Trans. Inst. Electronic Electronic Engineers (in press)

48. Webster, I. Asbestos and malignancy. S. Afr. Med. J. 47(5):165-171, February 3, 1973.

49. Pontefract, R.D. and Cunningham, H.M. Penetration of asbestos through the digestive tract of rats. Nature 243:352-353, June 8, 1973.

* 50. Kay, G.H. Asbestos in drinking water. J. Amer. Water Works Assoc. 66(9):513-514, 1974.

* 51. Elvenum, C.H.J. Jr., Meyer, P.B., Stumphius, J. A preliminary investigation into the occurrence of asbestos in Dutch drinking water. H2O 7(19):405-[illegible], 1974.

52. Environ. Hlth. Persp. 9:1-182, December 1974.

53. Cook, P.M., Glass, G.E. and Tucker, J.H. Asbestiform amphibole minerals: detection and measurement of high concentrations in municipal water supplies. Science 185:853-855, September 6, 1974.

* 54. Cook, P.M., Noble, I.P., Maggiore, C.J. and Nicholson, W.J. X-ray diffraction and electron beam analysis of asbestiform minerals in Lake Superior waters. In: Trans. Inst. Electrical Electronic Engineers (in press).

* 55. Selikoff, I.J. and Hammond, E.C. Environmental cancer in the year 2000. 7th National Cancer Conf. Proc. Los Angeles, 1973. pp.647-656.