

XVII. MEDICO-LEGAL ASPECTS

The first request for governmental regulations protecting workers employed in the dye stuff industry was made by Leichtenstern in 1898, three years after the discovery of the aniline tumors by Rehn. It was not, however, until 1925 that the German government passed a law (§ 1552 R.V.O. and § 8 I.V.O.) by which the tumors of the bladder, resulting from an occupational exposure to aromatic amines, were included among the occupational diseases requiring compensation. At the same time notification of their occurrence to the governmental health authorities was made obligatory. Switzerland recognized aniline tumors as an occupational disease in 1920; England followed in 1932, and similar laws were put in force in recent years in Russia, Italy, Czechoslovakia, Belgium, France, Canada, Australia and several of the states of the United States of America (Minnesota, New Jersey, Ohio, California, Connecticut, North Dakota, Illinois, Wisconsin, New York, Massachusetts, Missouri, etc. (International Labour Conference)).

In an appreciable number of states (of the United States) compensation laws do not exist, while in others, until recently, the regulations are worded in such a way that they provide insufficient protection to the worker, since they do not take into proper account the long latency period of these tumors (New Jersey, Minnesota, Porto Rico, etc.) (*Industrial Medicine*, 1933).

It is quite obvious that a law restricting eligibility to compensation to a maximum period of five or six months after the cessation of occupational exposure is wholly inadequate to cover the existing situation. The same objection must be raised against the laws which limit compensability to certain chemicals and their derivatives.

The preceding presentation has made it clear that a variety of chemicals of aromatic character may cause the development of benign and malignant neoplasms in the urogenous tract. As the rapid development of the chemical industry and the continuous production of new chemicals makes it impossible to devise on the basis of individual chemicals a compensation law not only adequate for existing conditions, but flexible enough to include future situations, the best solution of this perplexing problem is offered by the blanket laws passed in several states (Wisconsin, New York, California, Connecticut, North Dakota, Illinois, Massachusetts, Missouri). Such a law includes automatically not only the dye intermediates (benzol and naphthalene derivatives), but also certain azo-dyes (sudan III, etc.), among the substances for which adequate evidence of their carcinogenic effect upon the urogenous organs is available (Hibbs).

As an illustration of the legal complications which may arise from compensation laws naming certain chemicals as recognized causes of aniline tumors, the laws of Switzerland and New Jersey may be cited (International Labour Conference). The laws of both states recognize only amino-derivatives of benzol as causative agents of bladder tumors. Through this inadequate word-