Why did the QAMA researchers omit the information on crocidolite contamination of the ore bodies from all the published work? Had they published on the presence of crocidolite in the ore, it would have cast a pall over any argument that Canadian asbestos was "innocuous." Although the presence of crocidolite contamination would have supported the scientific argument that chrysotile did not cause mesothelioma, crocidolite could not be removed from the ore or final product and thus would have completely undermined the argument that the Canadian asbestos was "innocuous." While using crocidolite, as a scapegoat would have drawn attention away from chrysotile, the point was to maintain the illusion that Canadian asbestos was safe. If crocidolite periodically contaminated the mine ore, then the ore could not be considered safe.

Tremolite Contamination

Most recently, however, the QAMA researchers *have* blamed ore contamination for mesothelioma risk. The QAMA researchers argue that tremolite contamination of chrysotile, and not exposure to chrysotile per se is the cause of asbestos-related cancers in miners and millers. In 1985, Peto and Doll reviewed this argument and deemed it to be of academic interest only because tremolite was found to contaminate commercial chrysotile fibers, which could be found in the end product.(Doll and Peto 1995) In response the QAMA sponsored researchers fabricated two new conjectures. First, there are "high" and "low" concentrations of tremolite depending on the mine location, with current chrysotile coming from "low tremolite" mines.(McDonald and McDonald 1995) Second, current commercial chrysotile contains "minimal" concentrations of tremolite because the tremolite is mined from "tremolite-free" mines and any remaining tremolite is avoided in mining and removed through the milling processes. (2001a)