

SPECIAL MEETING

GRAND BAHAMA HOTEL AND COUNTRY CLUB, G.B.

FRIDAY, MARCH 29, 1968

Dr. Wright attended the meeting as Chairman of the Scientific Committee of the Institute of Occupational and Environmental Health.

INSTITUTE OF OCCUPATIONAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH

At the invitation of the President of the Association, the Chairman of the Committee reviewed briefly the activities of the Institute since the last special meeting. First, a progress report on the epidemiological study of asbestos mine workers was submitted by Dr. McDonald in February. This report indicates that the work is somewhat ahead of schedule with the result that some funds may have to be advanced ahead of budget.

As regards the Antigua Conference, there were 37 doctors and 7 Q.A.M.A. people in attendance. Total expenditures to date \$65,000.00 as against a budget of \$85,000.00. The charges for the printing of the proceedings of the Conference are still to come.

Johns-Manville has prepared a position paper on Asbestos and Human Health, copies of which have been distributed to every company.

The Chairman then asked Counsel to report on his activities, especially on his efforts concerning Bills HR-14816 and S-2864 which are before the House and Senate Committee on Labour and Public Welfare of the United States. The meeting was informed that Dr. Selikoff appeared before this committee and used rather strong language concerning the health of workers in the asbestos industry, statements which may well be misleading and inviting misinterpretation if not considerable exaggeration.

Counsel was happy to point out that he had been visiting with Dr. Selikoff on several occasions and felt that the latter had however a genuine desire to get to the core of the problem and in that connection to work more closely with us. Dr. Selikoff has quite a front to cope with. He feels he sometimes is the center of attacks from industry. As a result of his work with insulation workers (18,000), he is in demand in many circles, and such circles demand more action on his part. J.M. research people meet regularly with Dr. Selikoff's team.

Following a phone call from Dr. Selikoff, Counsel accompanied him when the latter (Dr. Selikoff) appeared before the House Committee on Labour, on Bill HR-14816 tabled by secretary Wirtz. This visit to Washington was supposed to be an "impromptu" affair, but Dr. Selikoff had however a well prepared statement. Several questions were asked and some damaging comments resulted.

In view of this, Counsel had found the situation to be pressing and that something should be done in Washington. He had contacted Mr. O'Hara, Chairman of the Committee, and explained his position with

3.

the asbestos industry, suggesting that the industry had a wealth of information which should be considered by the Committee. It was therefore agreed that, time permitting, Counsel would be heard, and if not, that he should present a written submission.

As a matter of fact, time was not available. Counsel's presentation was nevertheless made to the Congress Committee. The text of the presentation will be distributed at the next meeting.

In turn, the Chairman of the Scientific Committee was invited to address the meeting.

Dr. Wright reported on the progress of the Scientific Committee which held its 6th meeting in February. At this meeting the progress of Dr. McDonald's project was reviewed and discussed. It is considered that the work accomplished is highly commendable and deserves full support. It should be pointed out that this study may provide early information on the people living in the asbestos mining environment.

X-Ray film reading sessions were held to establish a unified classification and recording of asbestosis on an international basis. The work was conducted by an international committee of doctors who attempted to define and agree on their interpretation of the radiological appearance of a group of chest films of asbestos employees. A final meeting is to be held in London, England, just

before the Dresden Conference in April. A report on the methodology will then be released; this is an accomplishment to be sure. Dr. McDonald will also report on his epidemiological survey at the Dresden Meeting. His study of Primary Malignant Tumours of the Pleura or Peritonium is already in progress.

Dr. Wright explained that it is sometimes cheaper to have certain research projects carried out by competent people in other countries, because of certain specific conditions and facilities. In this regard, the Association is supporting projects of Dr. Vigliani and Dr. Pernis; the Committee also proposes to recommend support of a study on a group of shipyard workers in Halifax, Nova Scotia and a study of Dr. Dumont of the University of Montreal.

In the U.S.A. there is a committee of industrial hygienists whose main function is to determine standards controlling noxious agents. This service determines maximum allowable concentrations. The Committee has potent legal standing in theory, but not in practice. It was emphasized that adequate information is not always available to this Committee; for instance, standards for the asbestos industry are not up-to-date.

As a result of the evidence as to crocidolite being a cause of mesothelioma, strong pressure has been exerted, specially in Great Britain (Dr. Roach), to replace crocidolite in the manufacture of products wherever possible. Crocidolite, however, should not be singled out. The three types of asbestos are in the same boat. The situation in the case of crocidolite comes from the experience in South Africa and Great Britain. In the U.S.A. Dr. Selikoff has reported a high incidence of mesothelioma among insulation workers, using in their trade both amosite and chrysotile. This could mean

that the exclusion of amosite and chrysotile might be asked at some future date. One cannot ignore that with proper circumstances the same fibrogenesis and malignancy apply to amosite and chrysotile. These findings have been reported by Dr. John Knox in Textile Plants in Great Britain. Dr. McDonald's study will show the actual situation in the asbestos operations in Quebec.

In view of these findings, what are the possible options?

- a) No fibre could be used.
- b) Customers may decide to use something else.
- c) Alter the fibre to a point where it is still saleable, but not injurious.
- d) Like in the beryllium industry, to contain the material; this is possible but highly improbable, due to the large utilisation of fibre.
- e) To learn the maximum allowable concentration which is safe for the working man and the public. In Great Britain, this has been set at 2 particles (fibres) per cubic centimeter.

The Scientific Committee plans to make an analysis of the last option in a systematic way. The Committee has undertaken a survey of areas where research should be done in the field of asbestos and health and the estimates of funds needed in each area. There are 4 major areas:

- 1) Studies dealing with the maximum allowable dust concentration in the environment of man.
- 2) Studies dealing with the determinants and mechanisms in the biological action of asbestos fibres, in order to interrupt the process.

- 3) Studies dealing with the reducing of the concentration and numbers of inhaled asbestos fibres.
- 4) Studies dealing with the development and evaluation of methods used in the preceding considerations.

The engineering problems (area No.3) should be handled by industry itself. The danger however is that the job will be given to people having already other assignments.

The second area would be partly supported by scientists. The cost of an intelligent program could amount to some \$500,000.00 a year for an unknown number of years.

The first area may last ten to fifteen years. Presently, there are studies being conducted by Dr. McDonald, Dr. Vigliani and Dr. Pernis. In order to cover manufacturing operations in Quebec, the budget should be set at \$110,000.00 instead of \$80,000.00 over the next two years.

There is very little information to talk of in the manufacturing of asbestos products. It seems that the industry will have to go ahead and conduct studies on textile, asbestos-cement, tile, roofing, etc., product manufacturing. To this end, one needs a population with 20 to 25 years of exposure and some competent scientists nearby. In the New Orleans area, the cost of such a study would run at \$100,000.00 to \$110,000.00 for two years, and a little less for the next year. At Manville, New Jersey, the cost would be \$125,000.00 per year. The cost of studies in the first area would, therefore, amount of \$800,000.00 per year.

The survey of desired information compiled by the Institute of Occupational and Environmental Health proposes a systematic program for studying the problem in such a way as to provide the necessary data for the purposes set forth above. It is obvious that the areas are inter-related and that there is some overlapping and reduplication. There is nothing that has not been expressed before, but it seems that a useful purpose might be served if the areas for study are recorded so that memories can be constantly refreshed and none of the important factors overlooked. Just how this material will be used is not entirely clear at the moment. It can act as a scaffolding upon which enlisted research can be structured. It may assist in minimizing overlap and reduplication. It is hoped that it may assist those who are designing pertinent studies to include the necessary components. It may also help to indicate the areas of study which would be the most productive in terms of a speedy development of safeguards. It should give an understanding of the size of the problem and hence avoid the staging of inadequate attacks. The outline proposed may assist in developing an orderly approach and reduce the chance that efforts will be dissipated by popular interests. It is apparent, too, from such an outline that the several major avenues can be worked upon simultaneously and each component will benefit by integration of effort.

One may wonder why there has been a delay in the development of safe practices for using asbestos since its potential for fibrogenesis has been known for fifty years and the suspicion that it might play a role in neoplasia dates back to 1935. A paucity of knowledge has been and continues to be the major deterrent for the development of reliable and adequate safeguards. This in turn can be traced to several factors to which attention must be directed if the goal of safe utilization of the fiber is to be achieved.

The lack of study methods possessing sufficient reliability to convince all concerned has been a major deterrent to which considerable but still inadequate attention currently is being directed. A paucity of adequately trained persons willing to devote their energies to the problem is a second major deterrent. Equally at fault is the lack of opportunity for study and insufficient funds for that purpose characteristic of past years. There is no reason to expect that these problems will disappear and adequate information be obtained spontaneously without directed effort. The industries involved, the workers with their organizations and the government regulating agencies either directly or indirectly might be expected to provide the opportunities for study and the funds for this purpose. Past experience with government agencies gives little reason to hope that they will mount a sustained effort and it is doubtful that the workers and their organizations can do so on a broad enough scale. This places the burden of developing the necessary information and putting into operation the required safeguards directly in the hands of the industries involved. The time appears to have come for a concerted approach and a vigorous pursuit of the problem.

Following Dr. Wright's presentation, it was pointed out by the President that in discussions with people who defended the tobacco industry, he had been told that it had been found advisable not to be carried away by the medical profession. Why not speed up Dr. McDonald's study? Our Association knows of mesothelioma and this study should tell us of the degree of incidence, the President added.

To prevent snowballing of research expenditures, it had originally been foreseen that the cost could be split up three ways:

\$250,000. to Q.A.M.A.  
\$250,000. to Manufacturers.  
\$250,000. to Government.

It was agreed that we need a definite program to obtain support of manufacturers and government, and the Q.A.M.A. is the best group to lead the industry in this field. Dr. Wright to submit copy of framework to all companies, so that a recommendation can be made by their advisers. This will also help obtaining support of manufacturers.

The discussions indicated that there was a lack of communication with Directors about the problem, especially as to the escalation of costs (\$1,500,000.00). Possibly the Executive Committee of the Institute could be enlarged so that all Directors could be better advised. Suggestions were made also as to the sharing of expenditures by mining and manufacturing companies.

The Chairman of the Executive Committee explained that several research projects had been submitted recently, a certain number of which had been recommended by the Scientific Committee but not ratified by the Executive Committee. To do so would require an amount of \$50,000.00 over an above current budget of the Institute. Accordingly, it was proposed by the Chairman to increase present budget of Institute from \$249,642.00 to \$300,000.00 (for 1968). This will allow the Executive Committee to study and accept some of the projects submitted.

Adopted.

Dresden Meeting - Due to recent regulations of the U.S. Government, the industry will finance the trip to Dresden of Drs. Mancuso, Enterline, Naylor, McDonald, W. Smith, and Clark Cooper, for a total cost of \$4,280.00. These six doctors are presenting papers at the Conference.

ADJOURNMENT

Their being no further business, the meeting was terminated.

Paul-A. Filteau,  
General Manager  
&  
Secretary.