

COPY  
THE TRAVELERS



April 30, 1954

Armstrong Cork Co.  
Hancock Street  
So. Braintree, Mass.

Address all replies to:

Claim Department, The Travelers  
147-149 Milk St., Boston 9, Mass.

and refer to file

B-7131799  
Armstrong Cork Co.  
re: Richard Rothwell

Gentlemen:

Please find attached a photostat of the single member decision on the above captioned matter. This was requested by one of the associates some time ago.

You might be interested to know that on appeal of this decision we also prevailed. At this date we do not know if this appeal has been appealed to the Superior Court.

Very truly yours,

C. W. King, Jr.  
Adjuster

CWK:mr  
Enc.

COPY

100-443887-100

1. The first step is to identify the problem or question that needs to be answered. This involves understanding the context and the specific information required.

2025

[illegible]

This document contains information affecting the national defense of the United States within the meaning of the espionage laws, Title 18, U.S.C., Sec. 793 and 794, and the transmission or the revelation of its contents in any manner to an unauthorized person is prohibited by law.

1. The first step in the process is to identify the problem or issue that needs to be addressed. This involves gathering information and understanding the context of the problem.

100-442887-100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657, 658, 659, 660, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669, 670, 671, 672, 673, 674, 675, 676, 677, 678, 679, 680, 681, 682, 683, 684, 685, 686, 687, 688, 689, 690, 691, 692, 693, 694, 695, 696, 697, 698, 699, 700, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722, 723, 724, 725, 726, 727, 728, 729, 730, 731, 732, 733, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 744, 745, 746, 747, 748, 749, 750, 751, 752, 753, 754, 755, 756, 757, 758, 759, 760, 761, 762, 763, 764, 765, 766, 767, 768, 769, 770, 771, 772, 773, 774, 775, 776, 777, 778, 779, 780, 781, 782, 783, 784, 785, 786, 787, 788, 789, 790, 791, 792, 793, 794, 795, 796, 797, 798, 799, 800, 801, 802, 803, 804, 805, 806, 807, 808, 809, 810, 811, 812, 813, 814, 815, 816, 817, 818, 819, 820, 821, 822, 823, 824, 825, 826, 827, 828, 829, 830, 831, 832, 833, 834, 835, 836, 837, 838, 839, 840, 841, 842, 843, 844, 845, 846, 847, 848, 849, 850, 851, 852, 853, 854, 855, 856, 857, 858, 859, 860, 861, 862, 863, 864, 865, 866, 867, 868, 869, 870, 871, 872, 873, 874, 875, 876, 877, 878, 879, 880, 881, 882, 883, 884, 885, 886, 887, 888, 889, 890, 891, 892, 893, 894, 895, 896, 897, 898, 899, 900, 901, 902, 903, 904, 905, 906, 907, 908, 909, 910, 911, 912, 913, 914, 915, 916

1. The first step in the process is to identify the problem or issue that needs to be addressed. This involves gathering information and understanding the context of the problem.

[illegible]

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED  
DATE 08-01-2001 BY 60322

1. The first step in the process of the investigation is the identification of the problem. This is done by the investigator who is responsible for the study. The investigator must first identify the problem and then determine the scope of the study. The next step is to design the study. This involves determining the methods to be used and the data to be collected. The third step is to collect the data. This is done by the investigator who is responsible for the study. The fourth step is to analyze the data. This is done by the investigator who is responsible for the study. The fifth step is to interpret the results. This is done by the investigator who is responsible for the study. The sixth step is to write the report. This is done by the investigator who is responsible for the study. The seventh step is to present the results. This is done by the investigator who is responsible for the study. The eighth step is to discuss the results. This is done by the investigator who is responsible for the study. The ninth step is to conclude the study. This is done by the investigator who is responsible for the study. The tenth step is to publish the results. This is done by the investigator who is responsible for the study.

TESTIMONY ON PAGE:

Helen V. Rothwell

2,3,4,5,12

Dr. Harrison L. Hardy

5,6,7,8,9,10,11

John J. Hughes

12,13,14,15

Dr. James Stewart Roney

16,16,17

.....

Rothwell (dec'd)

REPORT OF EVIDENCE

All the material evidence is reported herewith:

The Utica Mutual Casualty Insurance Company is designated as the First Insurer and the Travelers Insurance Company is designated the Second Insurer.

HELEN V. ROTHWELL, the claimant, questioned by her attorney

testified she is now 40 years of age, and is the widow of Richard J. Rothwell, they were married December 25, 1919 at Star of the Sea Church, East Boston. There are five children of the marriage under the age of 18 at present. Joyce was born January 13, 1919 Edward was born May 31, 1939, James was born on August 6, 1941, Mary was born December 25, 1942 and Theresa was born July 6, 1948. Her husband's last employer was the Armstrong Cork Company. She has not got the date he worked for the Armstrong Cork Company. (IT WAS AGREED he worked there from March 20, 1952 to April 25, 1952.) Asked if at any time while working for this company her husband told her the nature of his work, witness replied, yes. He told her he was a pipe cutter and heat and frost insulator and asbestos worker - it was known under all those names. As to working for this employer he worked for A.W. Bancroft Company. She knows he worked there over a year. (IT WAS AGREED he worked for this concern from December 17, 1950 to March 19, 1952.) Asked, did your husband tell you at any time that he worked for the A. W. Bancroft Company was nature or title of his occupation was (objection noted by counsel for Utica, question allowed in, insurer's exception is saved) witness replied, yes. Asked, what was the nature of his occupation there according to what he told you, witness replied, just a pipe cutter, the same work he also had done that type of work before he worked for the A.W. Bancroft Company. Asked, for how many years before had he done it, witness replied, practically all the time we were married except during the depression; we were married 22 years; about 16 years. Asked, did he describe any of the details or conditions of his work during the time that he worked for the A. W. Bancroft Company (objection noted by Utica, exception saved) witness replied, yes. Asked, will you tell us what your husband told you about the nature of his work that he did while in the employ of the A. W. Bancroft Company (objection noted by Utica - counsel for Utica stated he is making a general objection to cover anything which the deceased witness as to his employment while employed by A.W. Bancroft Company - his exception is saved) witness replied, I know that sometimes the asbestos came around a cylinder form, they have to cut it, and sometimes came loose and they have to sort of make what he called mud and pack it in a boiler and cover it with canvas and do the pipes. Asked, did he tell you anything at all about the condition or conditions under which he worked, witness replied, sometimes had to climb heights and stairs, sometimes he worked under the ceilings, sometimes on the floor, sometimes he worked in what he called tight corners. Asked, when he cut the asbestos tubing did he ever tell you what it was like when he cut it, witness replied, he brought home some one time and I could see what it was like it was hard on the top, soft in the center and sort of powdery when you cut it. Witness always did the family wash. She did observe the condition of his work clothes when he came home from work. Asked to tell what she observed about the condition of his work clothes while working for the A. W. Bancroft Company, witness replied, the same as always. Asked to tell what that was, witness replied, I just had to take his overalls before washed them and had to take them outdoors and shake them hard and get all the stuff out of them in his pockets. She had to shake loose little feathery stuff, this was in the pockets and in the cuffs and just all over. The work shirts would be covered also, it clung to everything. Asked, what was the condition of your husband's face and hands when he came home from work, was it clean or what, witness replied, just clean. The first physical

Bethwell (dec 4)

change she noted in her husband's condition was he got out of breath. She first noticed that around January 1952. Asked, and had you not change in his physical condition before January 1952 from the condition he was in when you first got married, witness replied, yes, definitely. She noticed that he started to lose weight. He started to lose weight before Christmas 1951. She had not noticed any change in his physical condition prior to that. Asked, nothing at all, witness replied, except in that morning he had to clear his throat, he had a dryness in his throat. Asked to tell when she first noticed this clearing of the throat or a dryness of the throat on awakening in the morning, witness replied, about a year or so. That was a year or so before December 1951. Her testimony is that the first physical change or symptom she noted in her husband was this clearing of his throat on awakening in the morning and the dryness in his throat, the second thing she noticed was the loss and the third thing was that he got short of breath and this was January 1952. She knows where her husband was working in January 1952 it was at Fort Kent, Maine. She was not with him at that time. He came home for Washington's Birthday which was in February. Prior to that was at Fort Kent and came home for Christmas. She saw him at Christmas then over Washington's Birthday weekend. Asked, at the time you saw him over Washington's Birthday did he tell you anything about the condition of his health between those two dates, witness replied, (objection is by Utica, exception is saved) yes. Her husband had called her up, I always called her -- he called her every week on Thursday. Asked, did he tell you anything about his health in these telephone conversations Christmas and Washington's Birthday of 1952 (general objection noted by Utica to the conversations, exception is saved) witness replied, he was not feeling well. Asked, did he tell you in what way he was feeling well, witness replied, not too much. Asked, when he came home and saw you over Washington's Birthday did he tell you anything about the condition of his health during those two weeks before Christmas noted by counsel for Utica and Travelers, their exceptions are saved witness replied, he was sick at Fort Kent, he had been very sick. Asked, when he told you he had been sick at Fort Kent, did he describe to you how he had felt and what he had felt when he was sick, witness replied, I can't remember clearly. Asked, do you know from what your husband told you the reason he left the Bancroft Company, (objection noted by Utica and Travelers, exceptions are saved for both) witness replied, he told me that there was about four inches of water where he supposed to be working, he said he told Mr. Bancroft that he was sick and just could not work there, so he just left. He then obtained the job with the Armstrong Cork Company. Asked, did your husband, while he was working for the Armstrong Cork Company, at sometime before any of this was brought in this case, did he tell you then what was the type of work he was doing in the employ of the Armstrong Cork Company, witness replied, yes. Asked, and what did he tell you, witness replied, he was an asbestos worker. Asked, and did he tell you anything about the circumstances or nature or details of that work for this particular company, witness replied, he did tell me he had a lot of stairs to climb on this job. Asked, did he tell you anything else, witness replied, it was a new housing project. This was located in Rosindale. Her husband was doing the insulating in this project. She does not know what the insulating was. Asked if he told her what insulating material he was working with witness replied, no, I don't know the material he was working with at that time. While working for the Armstrong Cork Company she also washed his work clothes and shirts and slacks. Asked, and did you have occasion while he worked for the Armstrong Cork Company to observe anything about the condition of these work clothes as to dust, witness replied, I don't remember. Her husband left the employ of Armstrong Cork Company on April 25, 1952. During the time he worked for the Armstrong Cork Company he lived at home. Asked, tell the condition of his health as you observed it during the period from March 20th to April 25th while he worked for the Armstrong Cork Company, witness replied, seemed to get weaker not better. Asked to tell what symptoms she observed about him during the period he worked for Armstrong Cork Company, witness replied, he was

Bethwell (dec'd)

starting to get irritable and he never was irritable, that was a change and he was tired and was not eating good, he just did not look good, that is all I can tell you (objection noted by Travelers to the statement 'he just did not look good', exception is saved). When he came from Fort Kent they were living in Wilmington and her husband went to Dr. Gerald Fagan of Clark Street, Wilmington. They were not living in Dorchester when he worked for the Armstrong Cork Company. Her husband : the doctor either on the 22nd of February or the day before, it was in that vicinity. Asked if Dr. Fagan continued to be her husband's doctor until the time he went to the Massachusetts General Hospital, witness replied, not in entirety, no. At some time he saw Dr. Edward Hogan of Lyndhurst Street, Dorchester. He saw him in May. Asked, had he been in the care of Dr. Fagan from February until May, witness replied, more or less, I mean the doctor came a couple of times to the house and he went the office a couple of times. Asked, do you know why your husband left employ of the Armstrong Cork Company (objection noted by Travelers, exception is saved) witness replied, yes. Asked, at some time before your husband stopped work at the Armstrong Cork Company did he have a consultation in your presence with some physician, witness replied, yes. I was with Dr. Hogan. Following that consultation with Dr. Hogan her husband stopped work at the Armstrong Cork Company. Then at some time he went under the care of the Massachusetts General Hospital. A friend, George Raylan, Jr., referred him to the Massachusetts General Hospital. She said he first went to the Massachusetts General Hospital on June 23, 1952.

Counsel for the claimant offered the record of Massachusetts General Hospital for this record. Counsel for the Travelers objected to its admission in its entirety, specifically objecting to the history and any diagnosis based on the history, his exception is saved; counsel for Union objected to the admission of this record, his exception is saved. The record of Massachusetts General Hospital - Unit #775285 - is made part of this record by reference and may be found in the same file. Counsel for Travelers requested his exception be saved to his request for some part of this record to be deleted.

TO COUNSEL FOR THE UNION: She did say her husband was up in Maine during December 1951, January and February 1952. Her husband came home Washington's Birthday and she is not sure whether he then returned to Fort Kent. Asked, you think he came home on Washington's Birthday and then did not return to Fort Kent, witness replied, I don't think so. Her husband did come home for Christmas and the next time after that was on or about Washington's Birthday, which was in February. Of her own knowledge she does not know what his condition was in January 1952. Ask and when you told us a little while ago that you noticed he got short of breath in January 1952 that was not as result of any personal observation which you had made, witness replied, I was not there in January. Asked, that is what you told us, witness replied, the only time I would have seen him was when he left after New Years. If she said previously that she first noticed he was getting out of breath in January 1952 that is not as she did not see him then. Asked, and your memory now is that you have no clear recollection as to when you first noticed him getting out of breath to speak, witness replied, that is correct. Her husband came home in December 1951 a few days before Christmas. She would not say he started losing weight in December 1951. She did testify that clearing of the throat started in December 1950. Asked if that seemed to get progressively worse as time went on or remained the same, witness replied, got worse. Before her husband worked for the A.W. Bancroft Company he worked for the New England Insulation Company. He was doing the same type of work there. That is the work she has described here. She thinks he worked at the New England Insulation Company quite a while. It must have been over two years. Her husband went to work for the A.W. Bancroft Company directly after his employment at New England Insulation Company. There was no layoff period or anything of that nature. He went to work for the Bancroft Company within a week after his leaving the New England Insulation Company. Ask can you recall for whom he worked before he worked for the New England

Retwall (cont'd)

Insulation Company, witness replied there was a whole list of them, I not give them in order, I don't know if I could give them all. Before worked for the New England Insulation Company he worked for the Insulation Company of New Jersey. There he did the same type of work that he did New England Insulation Company, A. W. Baneroff Company and Armstrong. He may have worked for the Insulation Company of New Jersey about a year. During her husband's lifetime he did the same type of work as she has described here this morning; that was his trade, in other words. He has been engaged steadily at that trade during their married life except during the depression. During the depression he was out of work six years. They were married December 25, 1930. Her husband was working at that time. Sometimes in the early thirties he was out of a job. In the late thirties he resumed working again at the type of work she has described. She is in the paper that the Mr. Baneroff for whom her husband worked had a small shop. Her recollection is that the day her husband stopped work for the A. W. Baneroff Company he then started to work for the Armstrong Company the next day. He did not have occasion to wash his clothes when he was up Fort Kent. Her husband did not seem then home, asked, and you don't know of your own knowledge under what conditions he worked while Fort Kent, witness replied, just what he told me. When she told this morning about the conditions under which her husband worked that was a thing her husband told her and she did not follow him around.

TO COUNSEL FOR THE TRAVELERS: Her husband brought his overall every two weeks for her to wash. She is positive of that. He used to bring the overalls in his tool kit when he did not bring them home. Asked, what you testified this morning as to the condition of his overalls, witness only saw these overalls once every two weeks, more or less, witness said yes. After her husband saw the doctor on February 21st or 22nd he went to work for the Baneroff Company. He continued to work for this company until March 19, 1952. The next day he went to work for the Armstrong Company. From the time he saw the doctor in February 1952 up until he saw the doctor in April 1952 when he stopped working, she observed that he was different, he was irritable, at times he was not eating good, he was not sleeping good. Asked, anything else, witness replied, just was not feeling good, he was not himself. Asked, was he complaining to you about anything during the period from February 21 or 22, 1952, witness replied, he was of his chest. Asked, what did he complain about in his chest, witness replied, one morning he got up and went to the bathroom and came back in his chest tightly, he said 'I can't breathe, can't breathe'. Asked, you testified he started to get out of breath in January 1952, witness replied I meant he found it harder to breathe. Asked, what did you observe about him during that period from February 21 to April 25th, anything else, witness replied, I don't know. Asked, but that is the condition you observed him to be in from February 1952 until April 25, 1952, witness replied, yes. Prior to that she had not seen him for substantially two months. Asked, you're sure this was the condition he was in from February 22nd to April witness replied, yes. Asked, no question about it at all, witness replied

DR. HANVINE L. HANVY, called and questioned by counsel for claimant, testified her professional address is Massachusetts General Hospital, Medical Department of M.I.T. in Cambridge and is a physician and licensed to practice medicine in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Asked if she has a particular speciality in the field of medicine, witness replied she makes a special study of occupational and asked if she holds any position with regard to that speciality, witness replied, yes, I have charge of the occupational medical clinic and at M.I.T. I am assistant medical director in charge of the occupational medical service. Asked if in that field her work is primarily one of treating patients or primarily one of research, witness replied, it's a combination of both features. In connection with her speciality she deals with diseases of the chest. The decedent in this case was a patient of hers at Massachusetts General Hospital. She first saw him on June 23, 1952 at her office. At that time she received a history from him. Asked to tell the history she received, witness replied, he gave her a history of gradual onset of coughing in the morning causing him to vomit in January 1952 without other symptoms. In answer to counsel for Travelers witness stated this history is one in her

Rothwell (see'd)

personal records), he kept working for three weeks in spite of this cough. He was told to stay home by his family physician who said he had the gripe, then began to have severe pain in the left shoulder blade worse in the morning, better when he moved around, much worse at night there was increase in cough and about this time he began to be aware of increasing shortness of breath. He dated that as about March 1, 1952. He was troubled that he had to do something about it, about April 1, he went to his physician in Dorchester, Dr. Edward Hogan, and she has with him. She got her history from the patient. She got the history: then did the physical and then talked with Dr. Hogan. The patient gave her the history of Dr. Hogan telling him after his x-rays that his lung collapsed (counsel for Travelers objected to this being admitted, his exception is noted - counsel for Utman also objected to this being admitted and his exception is noted.) Her history continues that from this period of time in April 1952 the patient had been taking penicillin and iron and sulphur drugs, he had some constipation and a burning sensation in the left armpit, he reported a weight loss of 16 pounds since January, a shortness of breath that he noted beginning in March was getting worse than even before, his appetite was fair, the medical history that he gave insofar as it was important was that he had bronchitis 8 years ago, he had had slight sinus infection with some coughing but nothing severe enough to keep him out of his work, he had x-rays taken time to time in community surveys and he was never told there was anything wrong, his father was thought to have tuberculosis, that diagnosis was not clear, the patient gave it to witness and she put down a question mark after it, the man smoked both pipe and cigarettes, averaging one pack a day until his present illness, his occupational history was that he began working in a store as a clerk while still at school and he did errands at Boston Floating Hospital for two years while still at school and during the summers he was a shipper at Pilgrim Press Company, he is that about 29 years ago, when he was about 17, he worked off and on, sometimes with his grandfather and with a number of companies, he was called a hant and from time to time he worked at the company where that he received asbestos boards, the source depending on the company with which he was working in answer to counsel for Travelers' question as to what period of development she is now talking about without she is talking about the history he gave her covering 29 years. He gave a description of any specific boards, asbestos boards, he gave a description of his trade of hant and from time to time. His particular job was to cut and saw the asbestos boards to fit pipes and boilers and needed for insulation. Witness did a physical examination at the time if she followed him while he was in the hospital during his various admissions, witness replied, with the exception of his admission in June when I was away on my holiday, she followed him in June and her husband kept in touch with her. When he returned to the hospital after that she followed him. After his death an autopsy was performed. She had a chance to run autopsy protocol and the different autopsy material. Having in mind her contact with this case, she presently has an opinion as to what the diagnosis of this man's illness was. She did testify that she followed this man throughout his entire period of hospitalization, that she read the autopsy protocol and saw some of the pathological material in connection with the autopsy. In addition she is familiar with the hospital record itself.

TO THE COMMISSIONER: She did examine this man. Her first examination was on June 23, 1952 when she discovered the man had a complete collapse of his left lower lung, he obviously had lost weight, following he had chest x-rays which she viewed with the roentgenologist and discovered that he not only had the collapse of his left lower lung but he had evidence of density by x-rays in the right lung. On the basis of these findings she recommended his hospitalization for diagnostic studies. He was hospitalized. These were made by her colleagues in the hospital at her suggestion, she was not there. Asked if she participated in some of them, witness replied, only to the extent of suggesting them. Her holiday came during this period and when she came back they went over material together. Asked if she supervised or controlled these studies:

Rothwell (dow'd)

were they just merely a suggestion on her part, witness replied I supervised them to the extent of being the senior officer who is of the recommending, there were other doctors around. The results of studies were made available to her. Based on the history she received the physical examination she conducted, the diagnostic material which was made available to her, she arrived at a diagnosis in this case. Her diagnosis was carcinoma of the lung and asbestosis.

TO COUNSEL FOR THE CLAIMANT: Asked after she reached the nosis she has just testified to, did she have any further contact with the man during his period of hospitalization, witness replied, I did. This further contact was that she went to see him very often while he was in the hospital, consulted with other physicians about the course of treatment once the diagnosis was made and followed him case to the time of his death, she was not a witness at the autopsy but followed out very carefully what those findings were. She has personally viewed some of the autopsy material. She personally viewed a slide of the lung. In the course of her medical training she has had occasion to receive training in the field of pathology. Asked to tell what that training was, witness replied, she had the usual amount of pathology as an undergraduate, meaning she took lectures and so on, then when she was house officer at Philadelphia General Hospital she had intensive training in pathology which involved doing a great amount of autopsies, then she went on to do some in the department of pathology in Cornell University making an intensive study of certain pathological problems, since that time it's been her privilege to associate with Dr. Tracy Mallory in pathological studies of occupational diseases. Asked, do you feel that you are qualified to view these pathological slides of Mr. Rothwell's lung tissue (objection noted by counsel for Travelers and Utica, their exception is noted) witness replied, yes. Asked to tell what the slides revealed (objection noted and exception saved for counsel for Travelers and Utica), witness replied, showed what is known as pulmonary fibrosis, meaning scar tissue and reaction around the bronchial tree. Large conglomerate masses are usually associated with the presence of foreign material, I saw what are known as asbestos bodies and I saw cells of malignancy (counsel for Travelers objected to the testimony about the asbestos bodies and his exception is saved). Asked to describe the asbestos bodies for the purpose of the record, witness replied, the asbestos bodies as seen in this man's lungs are club-shaped bodies that take an iron stain which means they look yellow under the microscope, they vary in length and contour and are unique with the inclusion of a central whorl of which asbestos is one (counsel for Travelers objected to this testimony being admitted, his exception is saved) these asbestos bodies are bits of asbestos fiber surrounded with blood pigment which have clung to the asbestos body during their long presence in the small bronchioles which is the part of the bronchial tree, their shape varies, depending on the length of the asbestos fibers and the length of time it's been in the bronchial tree. Asked, do you now have an opinion, based upon the contact you had with this case as you have testified, as to what the diagnosis is in the case, witness replied, yes (objection noted for counsel for Travelers and Utica and their exception is saved). Her present opinion is that this man died of bronchogenic carcinoma, secondary to asbestosis. Asked, have you an opinion as to the relationship of the asbestosis and his work as pipe coverer (objection noted by counsel for Utica and Travelers, question allowed, their exception is saved) witness replied, I said 'yes' I had an opinion, my answer is based on the length of time that this patient worked in the industry involving exposure to fine asbestos fibers during the putting and sawing of asbestos boards, the length of time I would like to explain and the discovery of asbestos bodies in the lungs definitely prove the relationship between exposure and the diseased process, it's my opinion these two things fall in together - his work as pipe coverer and the disease that resulted in his death. Asked, did this man give you at any time during the period that you saw him any specific info

Rockwell (dub'd)

sion as to his work for the A. W. Baneroff Company between December 17, 1951 and March 19, 1952, witness replied, he described to me his work with the Baneroff Company as we worked backwards into his early life history and told me that his work at the Baneroff Company was precisely the same type as I have earlier described to you. Asked, did he give you any information with regard to dust conditions in his work for the Baneroff Company, witness replied, nothing above the grinding and sawing which I have stated previously. He did not produce any asbestos material to show how he conducted his work. Asked if she got any information from him as to whether or not the cutting and sawing of asbestos pipe covering produced any dust, witness replied, yes. He told witness that when he was cutting and sawing material that he had fit on the pipe he often did it dry and had to use a grinding wheel of one sort or another or mechanical type of saw that he pumped with his feet and had some electrical equipment if it was a bigger company and at that time there was a good deal of dust flying around about the air, that was kind of history she was trying to draw out of him because for Travelers objected, stating the question was asked with regard to his work at Baneroff Company and if the answer is not confined to it then he would like it taken out. Asked if she got any specific information with regard to the work at the Baneroff Company, witness replied, he talked about this at great length because except for this very brief employment at the Armstrong Company that was his most recent job, and in the discussion of the operation it was obviously the Baneroff Company he was talking about, we talked about the character of the job and he told about the times that he did not do wet, sometimes this job was done wet. He did describe to her the operation of mixing the asbestos powder into a mud. Asked, did he describe that operation as having been performed while working between December 17, 1951 and March 19, 1952, witness replied, I have no such note. Asked, did he tell you about his work for the Armstrong Cork Company between March 20, 1952 and April 25, 1952, did he give you any specific information with regard to the character of that work, witness replied, the only note I have is that the most recent work was similar to his earlier work and I don't have the previous description of his work at the Armstrong Company being different from that of the Baneroff Company. Asked, do you have an opinion as to whether or not this employee's disease and death were causally related to his employment with the Baneroff Company between December 17, 1951 and March 19, 1952, witness replied, yes. Asked, do you have an opinion as to whether it was related to his exposure to the same type of work that you have mentioned in your answer to the previous question while in the employ of the Armstrong Company between March 20, 1952 and April 25, 1952, witness replied, you're making it tough for me, yes. Asked, in your previous answer you told us that you felt that his disease and death were related to the length of time that he was exposed in his work as pipe covering, witness replied, yes. Asked, do you have an opinion as to whether or not he received any additional injury to his lungs while performing his work at the Baneroff Company between December 17, 1951 and March 19, 1952 see as to information that you received and to which you have testified to have an opinion. Asked, do you have an opinion as to whether he received any additional injury to his lungs while working for the Armstrong Cork Company doing his work as you have testified to between March 20, 1952 and April 25, 1952, witness replied, yes, I have an opinion. Asked to give her opinion in regard to this additional injury to his lungs while working for the Baneroff Company, witness replied (objection noted by counsel for the Union, stating there was no specific information as to what he did for this company, counsel's exception is saved) the history from way back up until and including the Baneroff Company gives substantial evidence of exposure to fine asbestos dust because of the nature of the operations and the preparation of the asbestos board for use as insulating material (objection noted by counsel for Utica and Travelers and their exception is saved), the study of case very clearly indicates a long-standing process, depending on the presence of asbestos fibers of varying sizes in the small bronchioles with resultant reaction around these bronchioles and what amounts to little patches of pneumonia, when these little patches of pneumonia take place bits of the lung become incompetent, they are no longer of any use, now during the exposure at the Baneroff Company he inhaled more asbestos dust of a fine enough caliber to reach the small bronchioles, he plugged the small bronchioles.

Rothwell (dew'd)

which resulted in reaction (counsel for Utica objected to the description of 'small caliber of asbestos' while working for his company, question answer admitted as same.) Asked, in answer to the previous question about this man's exposure while in the employ of the Bamroft Company, is to say for his employer between December 17, 1950 and March 19, 1951 you did not tell us anything as to the size or caliber of the particular asbestos fibers to which he was exposed, did you obtain any information from him as to that, witness replied, no. Asked, what do you base your statement to your previous answer with reference to the caliber and size of the asbestos bodies to which he was exposed while in the employ of the Bamroft Company, witness replied, the answer is very simple - because of the findings of the asbestos in the lung, it had to be small enough to get there, there could be any number of them arriving at one exact moment but because of the quantity of them and the character of them which I have described to you earlier as evidence of the asbestos bodies it seems reasonable, and certainly an extra number of fibers remaining that lung set up a reaction during the period I have just been describing to me, meaning 3 years prior to his death (counsel for Utica objected to the question and answer and they are admitted as same.) A: did you receive enough information from this man to form an opinion as to whether or not he had sustained any additional injury to his lungs during the period from March 20, 1952 to April 25, 1952, witness replied, no, I have no such thing, she does not have enough information on that. Asked, in a previous answer you testified that the bronchogenic carcinoma secondary to asbestosis, will you give us your reasons for that statement, witness replied, my reasons are based on experience and study experience of other cases of individuals who have asbestosis and have died of bronchogenic carcinoma, precisely with the same clinical and pathological study as Mr. Rothwell and when I speak of study I refer to my knowledge of literature plus travelling in Europe and attending being at Saranac symposium in October 1952 at which time the whole subject of asbestosis and cancer of the lung was reviewed. She has had experience with individual cases of asbestosis and bronchogenic carcinoma other than that of Mr. Rothwell. Asked to tell what her experience has been in these other cases, witness replied, precisely the same - a long history of exposure to asbestos. Asked, do you have an opinion on the mechanism whereby the asbestosis is causally related to the bronchogenic carcinoma, witness replied, yes, in her opinion the asbestos fiber which is small enough to reach the bronchioles is not big enough to really pierce and what happens is that during inspiration and expiration the asbestos fiber swings back and forth and acts as a mechanical irritant and we know other mechanical irritants that have produced malignancy, that is the basis for the opinion that the asbestosis caused the bronchogenic carcinoma.

TO COUNSEL FOR THE UTICA: Asked, you don't want to tell us you know what causes cancer, witness replied, in some instances I would be glad to, we have a pretty clear evidence in regard to pipe smokers, Asked, people seem to think there may be a greater incidence of cancer among pipe smokers but that is just one of the factors which you have found in your studies, witness replied, yes, but if he did not smoke the pipe he would not get the cancer, that is all. Asked, is it true that you all find cancer of the lung among people who don't smoke at all, witness replied, yes. Asked, it's also true you find cancer of the lung among people for whom you did not discover in the history of their occupation or background or anything else that the lung had been irritated in any way whatsoever, witness replied, because we can't find it does not mean does not exist. They have found cancer of the lung in such cases. It is true that her theory that irritants produce malignancy does not follow through in all cases. At the time of this man's first admission to the hospital she did not form the opinion that he had asbestosis. She was on vacation during July of that year. On June 23rd he was in her office as an outpatient, he was not confined to bed then. At that time she received the history she has stated. Mr. Rothwell was still in the hospital when she returned from her vacation in July. Asked if she made an examination of him or assisted or supervised the making of an examination of him at that time, witness replied, yes. On that particular admission he was dis-

Rothwell (dec'd)

charged on July 18, 1952. She did not prepare a discharge diagnosis at time. Asked, was there one prepared and as part of the hospital record witness replied, there must be. Asked, weren't you in charge of his case witness replied, do you want to understand the administrative mechanism that would be helpful, I am in charge of the occupational medical all I recommend these cases for admission for diagnostic study and treatment but they go on the ward as a regular patient and I don't 'boss' them; I go around and help work the case out but it's not my ultimate responsibility about what is written on the chart and what is done to the patient, is just the mechanism of the hospital. She saw the man in her office June 23. He was later admitted to the hospital. He was admitted to the hospital with a tentative diagnosis, that is the way it is done, she on the record that it states 'asbestosis' with a question mark. She is the original of the hospital record. Asked, and do you find in the original record this notation under July 2nd which reads 'first Mass General Hospital record of this 46-year old white male who enters with diagnosis of "possible carcinoma of lung", witness replied, yes. The question mark stands for possible, questionable. Asked, at the time of his admission to the hospital, is there any reference in the hospital record of any asbestosis that you can see, witness replied, on July 3, it says history is compatible with a diagnosis of asbestosis - these are not my notes. Asked, what I'm trying to get is this, was would put the first questionable diagnosis that was inserted there upon admission, was that be something that would come from your record as result of your examining and studying him on June 23rd, witness replied, no, I just explained to you, the administration has nothing to do with me, that is important, there are technicians, researchers and x-ray men, I don't dictate opinions to them. Asked, so if I understand you you're not responsible for any of the opinions expressed in the record itself, witness replied, I certainly am not. She studied the record carefully. Asked if there is any part of the record she disagreed with, witness replied it would be actually questionable if there were not but I don't have the entire into my opinion. She has reviewed the record. There is no treatment for the disease of asbestosis. It is a progressive disease without any treatment known to man. Asked, what would be the effect of numerous x-rays on an individual's chest with reference to this condition of asbestosis, would it aggravate it, witness replied, you're talking a the diagnosis or therapeutic radiation. The therapeutic radiation was given in this case for the treatment of cancer. The record shows this man did receive therapeutic radiation. He received quite a number of it. She thinks he began to have this on his second admission - he had a lot x-rays taken at the outpatient department. Asked, it's a fact, is it not, that therapeutic x-ray treatment would be detrimental to him insofar as the asbestosis condition is concerned, witness replied, no, I don't think one can draw any such conclusion. She doesn't believe that, in fact counsel gave her an idea in that shrinking of the tissue might do some. The therapeutic xraying was done to 'knock' out the cancer cells, shrink the tissue and make the man more comfortable but no one has the slightest of treating with the idea of curing him, it was simply a case of putting off his day of death. Asked, so if the record itself indicates that the hospital was treating this man for cancer from the day of his first admission that is so, witness replied, as soon as the diagnosis was made. Asked, it was made on the first admission, witness replied, I think that was made about July 10th. Asked, wouldn't therapeutic x-rays cause an increased fibrosis of the lung, witness replied, that would depend on how much of the lung was exposed to the radiation, usually this is fairly localized treatment, care being taken not to give general radiation, I could talk over with the radiation man if you want me to. She does know if one gets enough radiation on the lung as a whole you can get pulmonary fibrosis. She doesn't feel qualified to express an opinion in this regard in this case. Asked if in the treatment of asbestosis where the bronchial tubes are reduced in size in order to alleviate that condition do they not administer a dilating drug for this, witness replied, we use it but have not been able to produce any good results with asbestosis. They did not do it in this case because there was too much carcinoma. Asked, and that was apparent to you from the outset on the first day you examined him with the collapse of the lung, witness replied, there was no question but that is what this was

Rothwell (dwd)

Asked, you have notes with you with reference to the history that you received from him as to the employment over the years, witness replied, don't think these are satisfactory;; they are my handwritten notes. She has no dates in that, she was trying to get a description of his work as heat and frost insulator. Asked if she wrote down all she got witness replied, one does not do all that, there are a good many things that a man like this tells me that are not written down, precisely I did not get down here the exact days when he worked for this company, the company. Asked, when you first examined this man you were not interested in fixing liability on a particular individual inasmuch as you were in a diagnosis, witness replied, yes. Asked, and it would be important in making a diagnosis to determine how long the individual had been doing this particular job, witness replied, it does not seem relevant when a history that is so long in time of exposure. She has noted that he is a store after school in his early youth. Then while still in school worked for two years for the Boston Floating Hospital. He worked at P. Press as shipper also. He worked there about a year. Her next notation that he worked at Waverly Heating for one year. Following that he did mason work, he worked off and on with his grandfather in this cement. He then started at what he called heat and frost insulating and did it and on for about 30 years, he cut and sawed asbestos board to fit pip boilers, etc. She was interested in this 30 years' employment in this particular trade. Asked insofar as what he did while working for a year or 15 months for one employer or two years for another employer at the particular time when you received this history you were not too interested in finding out the details of that, witness replied, that's right. Asked and nowhere in the record does it indicate how much asbestos he came in contact with while in the employ of the Bancroft Company and nowhere in the record does it indicate the caliber of the asbestos while working for Bancroft Company, witness replied, yes. Working with asbestos requires one to have proper ventilation or the wearing of a mask and then it is done, etc. Insofar as her records are concerned she doesn't know what while working for the Bancroft Company he was out in the open or in a lined space, what the situation was with reference to ventilation. She saw this patient during his last admission to the hospital - the last part of November and first part of December. She was not the so-called attending physician at that time; the man was on the ward. She had nothing to do with the preparation of the death certificate; that was done by the house officer. She had nothing to do with the preparation of the final diagnosis. The diagnosis of asbestosis throughout the hospital record was questionable but that antedated the postmortem. That is true insofar as the hospital record is concerned.

TO COUNSEL FOR TRAVELERS: On looking at the slides following autopsy she observed some club-shaped, brown-colored bits of fibers and because of their length and contour and duration in the bronchial tree lung she concluded they were asbestos fibers. Asked if she had an opinion as to whether they had been there a year or ten years, witness replied, Asked, they had certainly had been there longer than a year in your opinion, witness replied, I don't think I give you an opinion on time. Asked, the fibers that caused the cancer which produced the death had been there a longer than a year, that is a fair statement, witness replied, that seems certainly more than likely. Asked if in her opinion that is true, witness replied, I wish I could be awfully flat-footed but I'm certainly willing to go along with you on that.

TO COUNSEL FOR THE CLAIMANT: Asked, the diagnosis of asbestosis which was placed on the hospital record on at least several occasions as being a possible diagnosis, was that confirmed by the postmortem, witness replied, yes.

TO COUNSEL FOR THE UTICA: Asked, is it a fair statement to say that you have no opinion as to how long the asbestos fibers which you saw on the slides had been in his system, witness replied, yes. Asked, and of course those would be the fibers which produced the cancer which caused death, in your opinion, witness replied, no, you can't bring that into what I have said because the asbestos fibers move around. Asked, while they move around they will not leave the system, witness replied, yes, they will. Some of them might leave the system; they might leave at any time. She has no opinion as to how long the fibers which she saw under the slide were in the system.

Brownell (dec'd)

Counsel for Utica renewed his request that the questions and answers admitted de bene be stricken from the record and Commission they be allowed in until the entire record had been submitted.

\*\*\*\*\*

At the continued hearing held in this case in Boston on July 31, 1953, the following evidence was reported:

APPEARANCES: L. Locke, Esquire, for Claimant.  
A.J. McLaughlin, Esquire, for Utica's Insurance Company.  
R. Plunkett, Esquire, for Travelers Insurance Company

\*\*\*\*\*

HELEN V. BROWNELL, the claimant, questioned by her counsel, testified she recognizes the memorandum book which counsel has in his hand. She found that in the pocket of the coat her husband wore to work. Asked to look at the handwriting in that book and tell if she recognizes it, witness replied, yes. It is her husband's.

Counsel for claimant offered this Memorandum Book for this record as an Exhibit, stating it is a work record kept by the deceased Monday, October 28, 1951 through February 19, 1952, that in it the employee listed from day to day the work that he did, that it is upon this man had some sort of supervisory capacity on this job; counsel for Utica objected to the admission of this Memorandum Book; Commissioner ruled the Memorandum Book was to be admitted as an Exhibit and was not to be saved for counsel for Utica.

JOHN J. HUGHES, called and questioned by counsel for claimant testified he presently lives on Barry Street Dorchester. His occupation is that of asbestos worker. He is a member the Heat and Frost Insulation Workers' Union. He has worked as an asbestos worker about 35 years. (Counsel for claimant stated he was offering this man as an expert witness on the trade of a heat and frost insulator. During this 35 years he has worked as insulator on boilers, pipes, stacks and stacks. In doing this work he only had to mix up the asbestos with water - that was the only mixing he did. He has done that work himself. In that trade he had occasion to cut cylinders of prepared insulating materials. He has done that work himself. He has blocked boilers, flues among stacks himself. (Counsel for claimant again stated he offers this man as an expert witness on the trade of asbestos worker and heat and frost insulation man.) Blocking a flue was part of the insulating job. The material was not always used to block a flue. There are a certain line number of materials used for blocking a flue. Asked, what are the materials used for blocking a flue, witness replied, 85 per cent Magnesia would be one; air cell board would be another - this is just an asbestos paper; and application of magnesia cement alone without blocking. Asked, in any of these three insulating materials that you have just mentioned is any used, witness replied, yes. It is used in the magnesia. Each of the materials was used specifically in insulating, for heat saving. They all used an asbestos cement. Asked if a particular type of flue required a particular one of those four insulating materials, witness replied, yes. Asked, what would be the circumstances under which you would use the asbestos cement, witness replied, in 90 per cent of the cases you used asbestos cement for finishing. Asked, how is that asbestos cement prepared, witness replied, it comes right from the mines. They get it in bags and drop it into a mixing box and apply water. Asked, is it the custom of the

Rothwell (cont'd)

trade of a heat and frost insulating man and asbestos worker, is it of that trade that the man on the job mix this asbestos cement as the it (objection by counsel for Utica as being immaterial, question allowed witness replied, yes. He has done that himself.

TO THE COMMISSIONER: Asked to tell what he actually observe when this cement was mixed, witness replied, the dust naturally raise when the cement strikes the box.

TO COUNSEL FOR THE CLAIMANT: Blocking a boiler just means applying the insulation. That is done in the same manner as blocking. When blocking a boiler you generally used the insulation directly in with the boiler because no air space was called for but in a flue they used an air space lath to give air space when blocking it. The army use the air space. Asked, you said in answer to a previous question that 5 per cent of the time the material used in blocking a flue was this asbestos cement, would that same figure apply in blocking a boiler or would it different proportion, witness replied, no, it's the same thing. He would say that 90 per cent of the time they used this asbestos cement to fix in other cases they used the asbestos cement to stick the blocking to boiler but that was not a general practice with every person. Asked to how he would go about covering a steam pipe, witness replied, a steam pipe up to ten inches is generally stuck on with paste. The insulating material is generally magnesia. Asked, is it loose material or does it come in form of a cylinder, witness replied, no, it's a molded material. Asked to tell what he means by that, witness replied, it comes in a molded form, approximately ten inches and then molded in segments from seven to ten inches on. He means it comes pre-cut. They do have to cut it to fit. Asked, on the material that you used is there any label or other tag so that the material is composed of objection noted by counsel for Utica, question allowed and exception is moved; witness replied, yes. He only knows of four companies who manufacture this material - they are Alston & Materson, Johns-Manville, Phillip Carey, Stevens Asbestos. Asked, is your memory sufficiently strong today so you could tell us today what appears the labels of the molded pipe-covering produced by any of these four manufacturers (objection noted by counsel for Utica, question allowed) witness replied, 85 per cent magnesia and that is all. Asked, does it anything there about what the other 15 per cent is there, witness replied never stated to my knowledge. Asked, what does the phrase 'cementing a boiler' refer to, witness replied, that is simply finishing up the work. Asked, what is the substance that is used in that operation, witness replied, asbestos cement. Asked, what is the phrase 'finishing fittings' mean, witness replied, putting on the asbestos cement and sanding.

TO COUNSEL FOR TRAVELERS: He didn't know Mr. Rothwell very well. He was on the same job with him but never worked directly with him. He never worked directly with him so he never saw what work he had been doing. Asked, there are a lot of the duties on this job that are not dusty, witness replied, I would not say a lot, it's really a dusty job. Asked, you mean mixing is dusty, witness replied, even the application is dusty. Asked, after you have mixed the water with the material that is in this bag, then when you apply it it's wet and there is no dust, is that right, witness replied, no, there is dust when you apply it. Asked, when you wet it, witness replied, you're not apply this wet stuff to the boiler or flue, when you apply it to the magnesia block it's dusty. They put this bag material in a pail or tub and pour water on it. Then it's wet. The mixing can be done in a few minutes. Then the men who are going to use that take some a mortar board or pail. They use a trowel. These men take some in a bucket and then apply it with a trowel. One man can mix enough for 100 men. On an average job there would be ten men. One man, in one hour, could mix enough cement for all the men for the day. So the other nine men could go to the tub and get a pail or bucket full of this material and take it to where they were working and apply it with a trowel. That is the usual way it is done.

TO COUNSEL FOR UTICA: He was not working up in Fort Kent, Main with Mr. Rothwell; he was not on that job. He worked with him at the Lyx Housing. That may have been two years ago. It was sometime in 1931.

Rothwell (dec'd)

There are different means of applying insulation to a boiler. There are different types of insulation used. Asked, and whether or not in any period of time Mr. Rothwell was using asbestos to your knowledge you do know, witness replied, no.

TO COUNSEL FOR THE CLAIMANT: When one is applying this wet cement you're going against the dry surface and when you apply wet stuff on a dry surface you bring back the dirt. He did state the asbestos cement used as the finishing coat. As a general rule it was used as a finishing coat on top of something else. Asked, what is the usual material that is put on before the asbestos cement, witness replied, that is 85 per cent magnesia. Asked, is that in the form of a pre-molded segment or section is it also in the form of a wet mass, witness replied, 90 per cent of it is in molded form. Besides the mixing of the cement which is dusty, the cutting of the material is dusty, when you're sawing it, it's dusty. And would it make any difference where you were installing these molded segments as to the extent of the dust that would get on you, would some places be more dusty than others, witness replied, yes, on open construction there would be more wind. That would make it more dusty. Asked, how about installing insulation on pipes that are in the ceiling, between one ceiling and the floor above, objection noted by counsel for Utica, question admitted as bona fide, witness replied, I don't think that question is put correctly as far as we are concerned because between a ceiling is not as you're not between a ceiling when you're applying that, you're open although it's between the ceiling when the job is completed, you're in an open area you apply it. The floor above is in place. Asked, you're working above against a floor, witness replied, yes. Asked, is that work more dusty than other work or less dusty, witness replied, I think the answer would be just about the same.

TO COUNSEL FOR THE UTICA: That depends on the conditions on a job.

TO COUNSEL FOR THE CLAIMANT: Asked, so if I understand your answers, there are three parts of the work that are dusty, one of it is mixing of the asbestos cement, the second is when you place the asbestos cement against the magnesia block and the third is when you cut the molded segments to put on pipes, is there any other part of the work that is dusty, witness replied, as far as dusty, now as I understand that question to be is the work dusty, yes, it's dusty but I can't say it's dusty for all materials.

TO THE COMMISSIONERS: The work was dusty when he used their material in mixing or cutting or applying.

TO COUNSEL FOR TRAVELERS: Asked, on these jobs where you were applying or this material that you were cutting, there was a considerable dust that was not as result of your materials, is that true, witness replied, that is true, I said yes. Asked, in other words on boilers that you might be working on there may be a thick coat of ordinary house or building dust so-called, is that right, witness replied, yes. Asked, and on pipes that you were covering or repairing there might likewise be thick coating of house or building dust, witness replied, yes. Asked, and when you say the job was dusty you mean in your operations you disturbed and knocked loose a lot of this dust in around there, witness replied, no, in my statement... Asked, I say is that the procedure when you apply material either to a boiler or to these pipes you might disturb the dust that was on these pipes, witness replied, the answer would be 'yes'. That would fly around. Asked, when you explained that the job was dusty you meant that dust as well as other, witness replied, no, I did not in the question which was asked. As he was working there this other dust was flying around. He did say 90 per cent of the material is molded. Some of the molded material comes with cloth wrapped around the outside of it. All of it does not come that way. Asked, but all your pipe material comes that way, with cloth on the outside, witness replied, no, up to approximately ten inches, yes. Asked, would you say 90 per cent of your work involved the use of material up to ten inches or was percentage would you say, witness replied, I would have to withhold from the percentages, I would not know that answer. Asked, would you say a big

Rothwell (dec'd)

majority involved material up to ten inches, witness replied, on the I followed it has been without cloth, most of the work I have seen & has been larger work. He wouldn't know whether Mr. Rothwell worked with the larger work or with work up to ten inches. Asked, but if he did with material up to ten inches it would be covered with cloth, witness replied, it would be. This wet cement was applied to a boiler or other object with a trowel. When that was done, it was applied only a second at a time. That answer does not apply when it is applied to the insulation on the boiler. They apply the insulation on the boiler first and then finish with the cement. Asked, on the stuff you apply direct to the boiler you put that on directly with a trowel and that is wet, witness replied, no. Asked, you put that on with blocks, witness replied, yes. After he puts the blocks on, then he puts on the wet cement. The wet cement is handled in a trowel. Then they put on one part at a time. Asked, so the only part of the boiler that you touch when you put on wet cement with the trowel is that part which becomes wet, you don't touch any other part, witness replied, the wet cement hits one part of the boiler and invariably disturbs the dust that is on there. They cut these molded forms with a saw. Asked, and when you cut them with a saw do you usually put them down on something and saw down on them, witness replied, I would say 'no' to that question. That is usually done by laying it down on a flat surface and cutting across it. It is done like on a table and cut across. It cuts easily. Asked, and the material that you cut is usually covered with cloth, up to ten inches, witness replied, yes. Asked, you don't know whether Mr. Rothwell used any material over ten inches or not, witness replied, not definitely.

DR. JAMES STEWART BOOKET, called and questioned by counsel for plaintiff (testified (Qualifications admitted as pathologist) he has had the opportunity to review the record of Massachusetts General Hospital and the autopsy record of the Massachusetts General Hospital, pathology department. He has formed an opinion as to the cause of death in this case. In his opinion this man's death was caused by adenocarcinoma of the lungs - that was the immediate cause of death - with extension to the heart, pleura, diaphragm, retroperitoneal tissue on the left, adrenals, kidneys and the lymph nodes. Asked, was there any other pathological condition this man had which was contributing factor in his death (objection noted by counsel for Utica, his exception is saved) witness replied, there were other contributing factors. Asked, what were they in order of importance, witness replied, this man had asbestosis with pulmonary fibrosis, congestion of the liver, inflammation of the external surface of his heart, inflammation of his right lung, externally, and he had approximately a quarter of fluid in his right chest. Asked to tell what there is in the hospital record which leads him to the opinion this man had asbestosis, witness replied, in the microscopic examination of his lung tissue the characteristic nodular shaped bodies one sees in asbestosis were present, these are diagnostic of asbestosis. Asked if he has an opinion as to whether or not there is any causal relationship between the asbestosis and the cancer from which this man died, witness replied he has. His opinion is that due to the longstanding chronic irritation, as result of the inhalation of asbestos fibers, that it is an adequate cause for the development of his cancer which led to his death. Asked, did the asbestosis itself, apart from its effect in producing the cancer, did the asbestosis itself play any part in his death at the time that he died, witness replied, I don't think so, no. Asked, I want you to assume that this employee worked for A. W. Bancroft Company between December 17, 1950 and March 19, 1952, that during that time he performed the regular duties of a heat and frost insulation worker or asbestos worker as it is ordinarily described, that this work, and specifically during the period from October 28, 1952 and February 19, 1952 included days in which he covered steam pipes with insulation material, in which he blocked flues, days in which he blocked boilers, days in which he covered pipes, days in which he finished fittings, that in these operations he used insulating materials, included among which would be asbestos cement, he used molded insulation material and molded segments, that in connection of covering of pipes he had to cut and saw the asbestos board, that he had to cut it to fit around pipes and fittings that came with the pipes that he was covering

Rothwell (dec'd)

that this work was dusty, that the dust included dust from the insulating materials as well as building dust which was present in a construction job, that the widow testified as fact that he coughed, that the clot she washed contained dust particles and I want you to assume further in January 1952 he developed the onset of a harsh, hacking cough which worse in the morning and productive of a small amount of brownish sputum that shortly thereafter he noticed that on exertion he was short of breath and had a sharp boring pain below the angle of his left shoulder blade that he was out of work from February 21 to February 29, 1952 and returned home from the job which he was doing away from home and was treated for the doctor told him was gripe, that he then returned to work for a few weeks and finally ceased work for the Bancroft Company on March 19, 1952 and went to work for the Armstrong Company from March 20, 1952 to April 1952, that he continued to do the work of a heat and frost insulation for the Armstrong Company, that he finally stopped work in April 1952 following consultation with a physician because of these symptoms described before, namely, shortness of breath on exertion, pain below his left shoulder and cough, now, assuming those facts to be true as to his work history and the history of the onset of his symptoms, do you have an opinion as to whether or not the work this man was doing while in the employ of A. W. Bancroft Company, that would be December 17, 1950 to March 19, 1952 was an aggravating factor in producing the asbestosis and bronchogenic carcinoma which he died, witness replied, I counsel for Utica objected, and admitted de bene, his exceptions are saved, I do. It is his opinion that sometime during 1951 this man developed a malignancy of his lung as secondary to his asbestosis, the asbestosis was a factor in causing the malignancy to start, that is as far as he can go. Asked, do you have an opinion as to whether the inhalation of dust from insulating materials his work during 1951 was a factor, aggravating or precipitating factor, in the asbestosis and thereby of the cancer, objection noted by counsel for Utica, his exception is saved, witness replied, if he inhaled dust containing asbestos during the period of time it would aggravate his condition. Asked, do you have an opinion as to whether or not his work from March 20, 1952 up to April 25, 1952, for the Armstrong Cement Company, assuming that he inhaled dust from insulating materials at his work, including asbestos, was a factor in the asbestosis and cancer from which he died, witness replied, I have an opinion. It is his opinion that it did not play any role. Asked to give his reason for that opinion, witness replied, because he had carcinoma prior to the time and carcinoma was the cause of the death. Asked, didn't the further inhalation of the asbestos dust the last six weeks play any part in the aggravating or worsening his condition, witness replied, no, I don't think so. Asked, did it play any part in producing the death at the time that he died, witness replied, I don't think

TO COUNSEL FOR THE UTICA: Asked, you say that there was a long standing chronic irritation due to the inhaling of fibers which you say was an adequate cause for the cancer, witness replied, that is correct. Asked, when you say longstanding chronic irritation, can you tell us how long, witness replied, I don't think anybody can tell you that; we do know that one of the causative factors in the production of malignancy is a chronic irritating process, when that begins I don't think anybody can narrow it down as to a week or a month, we know that cancer takes a certain length of time to develop, once it starts it depends on the location it depends on whether it can be removed or not, this man's cancer was too advanced to remove, they took him to the Massachusetts General and attempted to remove it and found they could not because of the advanced stage, when his cancer began I can't tell you because the line of demarcation between normal and abnormal no one ever sees, I don't think anyone can tell. Asked, so you can't say whether or not the cancer had its inception prior to March 20, 1952 or subsequent to that date, witness replied, it had its inception prior to 1952 because it was far advanced when they opened him up at the General. He cannot give a definite date on the inception of cancer in 1952. He cannot give a definite date on that for 1951. He thinks it began subsequent to 1950. Asked, so that you say that sometime in 1950 or, witness replied, either that - I would say probably 1951 from the description of the cancer. It could have been 1950. He has seen the autopsy report. Asked, this man, according to that report, had a history of having worked years in the asbestosis business, have you an opinion as to when the asbestos first commenced, witness replied, I would say the asbestosis had been present for many years. That is so because of the appearance of the lungs. Asked,

Rothwell (dec'd)

assume that this man worked at the same job subsequent to March 20, 1952 to April 25, 1952, doing the same sort of thing that he had done between period of December 1950 to March 20, 1952, do you have an opinion as to whether or not the work subsequent to March 20, 1952 would be detrimental to him? Having in mind the facts that it was your opinion at that time he had, first, asbestosis and, second, cancer (counsel for Travelers stated that the doctor has already answered the question) witness replied, here's a man who by 1952 was doomed to death from his malignancy, his malignancy was then advanced, I doubt the inhalation of anything further accelerated the growth of his malignancy. Asked, do you have an opinion as to whether or not during that period of time was detrimental to him (objection noted by counsel for Travelers, doctor allowed to answer the question) witness replied, there are certain patients with malignancy that you advise continuing their job and working until the day they die, there are other patients who completely collapse once you tell them they have malignancy and not return to work, I don't think the work factor plays much of a role in the advancement of malignant disease. Asked, the malignant disease was aggravated by the inhalation of asbestos after the malignant disease had started in his system, was it aggravated by the asbestos dust, in your opinion, witness replied, I think that once his malignancy began, that for a period of possibly four or five or six months following the beginning of his malignancy he might have accelerated the growth a little bit by inhaling more of the factor that was one of the causative agents in his malignant condition, the malignancy once it started was not aggravated much by the further inhalation of asbestos, that is in and of itself, I think it's not known to cause death per se. Asked, asbestosis, witness replied, yes. Asked, but your answer was that it was not aggravated very much, witness replied, I don't think it was aggravated very much by his work after his malignancy started. Asked, but it might have been aggravated somewhat, witness replied, slightly.

TO COUNSEL FOR TRAVELERS: Asked, did I understand you to say in your opinion the man's work from March 20th until the date he finally died, such as asbestos as he might have inhaled, if any, played no part in either the aggravation or acceleration of the disease nor did it bring a his death sooner than it otherwise would have occurred, is that a correct statement, witness replied, that is correct.

Counsel for Travelers made a motion the claim against them be dismissed. The motion was taken under advisement.

Counsel for claimant requested the Autopsy Report of December 1952 - Unit Number 778205 - be made part of this record. This is done by reference and may be found in the Board file. The anatomic diagnoses reported thereon are: Bronchogenic adenocarcinoma, left lower lobe with extension into left upper lobe, heart, pleura, diaphragm, and retroperitoneal tissue on left and metastases to right lung, adrenals, kidneys, and hilar, mediastinal, left supraclavicular and para-aortic lymph nodes; Asbestosis with moderate pulmonary fibrosis; Hepatic congestion, moderate; Pericarditis, fibrinous; Pleuritis, right; Pleura effusion, right (800 cc.); (Pulmonary osteoarthropathy, mild).

Motherswell (dec'd)

Medical Opinion

This hearing was held to determine whether the employee suffered a personal injury arising out of and in the course of his employment and, if so, whether his death was caused or related to said injury.

The claim was brought by the estate of the employee - Union Mutual Casualty Company which covered the A. W. Motherswell Company and Travelers Insurance Company which covered the Armstrong Cork Company.

The employee worked for the A. W. Motherswell Company from December 17, 1950 to March 19, 1952 and he worked for the Armstrong Cork Company from March 20, 1952 to April 25, 1952.

There is evidence in this record upon which I find that this 46-year old decedent, with a 25-year work history as an asbestos worker, was last employed as a pipe fitter and heat and frost insulator for the two aforementioned companies. His work with the two insured firms entailed the handling and installation of asbestos in the covering of pipes and also as an insulator against heat and frost in various forms and under various conditions.

There is evidence upon which I find that the decedent's work exposed him to the inhalation of asbestos dust particles. I find he did inhale these particles.

It is also a fair and reasonable inference--and I so infer--that asbestosis is a disease contracted only by people who are exposed to the inhalation of asbestos fibers in their work. It is common knowledge that persons who are not so exposed do not suffer from this progressive disease for which there is no known cure.

~~Additional~~ Additional evidence that the employee died on December 3, 1952, ~~and that the cause of death was asbestosis~~ evidence upon which I find that death was due to ~~asbestosis~~ pneumonia, secondary to asbestosis.

I accept and adopt the opinion of Dr. Harriet L. Hardy, under whose supervision the decedent was treated during his entire period of hospitalization and who had an opportunity to review the entire autopsy protocol and who saw some of the pathological material in connection with the autopsy. Dr. Hardy testified--and I so find--the work the decedent

Rothwell (acc 4)

performed as a pipe cutter and he got frost embolism and the disease that resulted in his death "fell in together".

I accept and adopt the opinion of Dr. James Stewart Rooney, a pathologist, who testified "that sometime during 1951 (when he was working for A. W. Bancroft Company) this man developed a malignancy of his lung as secondary to his non-malignant disease, and a factor in causing the malignancy to start."

I find, therefore, that the asbestos dust which the employee inhaled at his work resulted in asbestosis. This, I find, constitutes a personal injury arising out of and in the course of his employment. I find further that the asbestosis caused a lung malignancy which resulted in his death on December 3, 1954.

The fibers that caused the cancer which produced the death of the employee had been in the employee's lungs much longer than a year in the opinion of Dr. Hardy. "That is a fair statement," Dr. Hardy testified, adding, "that seems certainly more than likely" and I so find.

This considered medical opinion would certainly relieve the last insurer of any responsibility for the payment of compensation since it was in the year of his death that the employee commenced work for the second insured.

This opinion, too, is shared by Dr. Rooney. He testified, and I so find, that "the man's work from March 23 until the date he finally stopped work, such asbestos as he might have inhaled, if any, played no part in either the aggravation or acceleration of the disease nor did it bring about his death sooner than it otherwise would have occurred."

Dr. Rooney, who is prominent in the field of pathology and whose qualifications were admitted here, testified it is his opinion the cancer started "subsequent to 1950. . . . I would say probably 1951 from the description of the cancer." I accept and adopt Dr. Rooney's opinion and so find. The decedent was in the employ of the A. W. Bancroft Company, the first insured, throughout all 1951.

I find, therefore, that the industrial injury which resulted in a lung cancer and caused the employee's death is causally related to his



Bethwell (dec'd)

employment with the John Hancock Company, covered by the Utica Mutual Casualty Company.

There is evidence in the record that the employee's last working day was April 25, 1952. Between the termination of his employment and his death he was three times confined in a hospital and in addition to these three confinements received other hospitalizations there.

There is no evidence to the contrary and so I infer and find that the employee was totally incapacitated for work between April 26, 1952 and December 2, 1952 due to the aforementioned compensable industrial injury, namely lung cancer. The Utica Mutual Casualty Company is directed to pay total incapacity compensation for the above-mentioned period, at the rate of \$30.00 a week, plus \$15.00 a week for dependency, in the total sum of \$1425.71. (See Atkinson's Case, 265 Mass. 51)

The Utica Mutual Casualty Company is further directed to pay the claimant widow the sum of \$20.00 weekly dependency compensation, from December 3, 1952 to date and continuing, subject to the provisions of the Act. The sum of \$905.71 is due to the filing date of this decision.

The Utica Mutual Casualty Company is also directed to pay the claimant widow the sum of \$25.00 weekly dependency compensation, for the care and support of five minor children in accordance with the provisions of the Act. The sum of \$1132.14 is due in weekly compensation benefits for the children to the filing date of this decision.

The total sum due the claimant widow under this decision to the filing date, October 16, 1953, is \$3458.56 which the Utica Mutual Casualty Company is directed to pay forthwith.

The Utica Mutual Casualty Company is also directed to pay the claimant widow the additional sum of \$500.00 under Section 33 of the Act.

The Utica Mutual Casualty Company is ordered to make the payment of \$500.00 to the State Treasury in accordance with Section 65N of the Act.

I find equity and justice required the testimony of Doctors Hardy and Rooney and they are each entitled to \$50.00 under the provisions of Section 9A of the Act.



Rothwell (dec'd)

The claim against the Travelers Insurance Company is hereby  
denied and dismissed.

JOHN S. JAMES

INDUSTRIAL ACCIDENT BOARD

FILED

*Friday October 16*  
*9am*  
*George H. James*  
SECRETARY



(Parham Foundation Co.)  
(Michigan Mutual Liability Co.)

\$ 177.71

(Hiley Steiner)  
(Michigan Mutual Liability Co.)

157.10

(Johns-McCoyville Roofing)  
(Travelers Insurance Co.)

177.34

(Parham Co.)  
(American Automobile Ins. Co.)

31.04

(Evert Asbestos Insulating Co.)  
(Continental Casualty Co.)

62.87

(J. W. Kallman Co.)  
(State Accident Fund)

25.68

(Central Asbestos)  
(Account by Travelers)

127.34

The formula used herein is the same as set forth in our Award of 1/18/57.  
In the event that plaintiff is now entitled to continued medical care, the  
Petitioner herein will bill the above "prior" employers for their proportionate  
share on a yearly basis.

James W. Nolan.