040587

SEP 27 1961

Mr. L. P. Bloomer, Upper Darby Engineering 9/26/61

W.E.Shoemaker/lb Upper Darby Eng.

cc: Mr. Kley,
Atlantic Division Operations

Keasbey & Mattison Company
Ambler, Pa.
Call 9/18/61

Asbestosis - Cancer "Investigation" - Proposal By United States Public Health Service

This will be a short report to file for information of others serving this risk. Mr. Porter, President, phoned Mr. Kley giving him a very complicated story over the phone and asking for some kind of help from Amlico. As I had run down some facts in the past on this subject for Mr. Porter, Mr. Kley asked me to go and see him.

The beginning of this year in the Cleveland Chest Clinic some Ohio doctors were looking over social security records on an asbestos products producer's plant. It is alleged that they thought they found higher than normal incidents of cancer among the workers, who must have been retired.

Dr. Kenneth Smith of Johns-Manville, being the only full time medical director in the industry, was asked to review their findings. It is believed that Mr. M. C. Shaw, executive secretary of the Asbestos Textile Institute was brought in on this review. Somewhere or somehow, someone contacted Dr. Magnuson, Chief, Environmental Health Section, U.S.P.H.S. who allegedly became unusually interested.

Following this, and this is the first information Mr. Porter had of these proceedings; (1) On May 19, 1961, the executive secretary of the Asbestos Textile Institute wrote to the member associations on the subject: "Role of Asbestos

EXHIBIT
P-875

M-875

CRMC-Motley1000-Subj-004593

Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
asbestosclaims.law/library/13196/1

as an Industrial Hazard For Asbestos Workers". This letter spoke of attacks on the industry which they were unable to refute. Also, advised the membership that Dr. Magnuson was interested in their problems. (2) The next notice came to Mr. Porter's attention on June 8, 1961 at the annual meeting of the Asbestos Textile Institute. Dr. Kenneth Smith is head of the Air Hygiene and Manufacturing Committee. Smith's committe had recommended adoption of the following proposals for submission to the Board of Governors of A.T.I. that the Board of Governors contact their membership to (a) Give authorization to ask the U.S.P.H.S. to conduct the discussed survey concerning asbestos and cancer (b) Board of Governors to create a sub-committee of company doctors to meet at least once a year.

On investigation, Porter was told that the U.S.P.H.S. claimed they have $2,000,000 available for such a study. Later investigation showed that this was not the truth, that they felt if they were "Invited" and the study was called "Investigation" which is of course a very popular congressional word, that the U.S.P.H.S. could get that amount of money. Mr. Porter was very afraid of publicity, felt that Smith and others were trying to make a name for themselves and had not thought through what they were doing. At the time of my call, the matter had reached the stage where a model letter had been drawn up by the executive secretary of the A.T.I. in order to get the membership's approval an "Investigation". Mr. Porter wanted the insurance industry to take action.

In consultation with Mr. Hickey and Mr. Kley and after discussion with Mr. Skinner, we found that the Engineering Department had no personal acquaintances or avenues to approach Dr. Magnuson informally. It was thought that action through Insurance Trade Associations could be very cumbersome, drawn out and probably not effective in this particular area. The following suggestions were made to Mr. Kley for proposed referral to Mr. Porter.

(1) We certainly agree that such a survey including cancer investigation could increase claim costs and industry costs greatly. There has not only been a lot of controversy on the subject of cancer and asbestos, but defense against phony cancer claims is very expensive.

W. E. Shoemaker of American Mutual on Keasbey & Mattison and the Public Health Service Cancer Survey (1961) Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 13196 · Page 2 of 4 asbestosclaims.law/library/13196/2

(2) We are in favor of a factual environmental survey by U.S.P.H.S., not including cancer. A helpful study by the U.S.P.H.S. is "Health of Ferros Foundrymen in Illinois", 1950. Apparently the Federal Government has made no study in the asbestos industry since 1937.
(3) On the positive side, the asbestos industry would do well to handle suspected cancer problem themselves as an internal project. The British already are doing research on the health problem of asbestos, although whether on cancer or not we are unable to find out. Canadians have already completed a survey of this problem. Of more importance in regard to this suggestion is that responsible U.S. industries have run the following cancer research programs to my knowledge. Handling this problem as an internal one has not developed runaway claims situations:

COMPANY	SITE OF CANCER	AGENT
DuPont	Bladder	Picric Acid
S. O., N.J.	Scrotum	Crude Paraffin
Monsanto	Bladder	4 Aminobiphenyl

(4) The best thing would be for the risk to ignore dealing with or expressing themselves on this subject to the U.S.P.H.S. There is nothing that compels K & M to cooperate with the rest of their industry if the U.S.P.H.S. do make a study.

Mr. Porter felt that he was in the role of Paul Revere in trying to get his industry heads to give this matter serious consideration, rather than allowing it to be pushed through by staff representative of the Johns-Manville Company. He tried to get Mr. Rohrbach, President of Asbestos-Manhattan, to take over the initiative since they are the biggest producers in the asbestos textile field. He also contacted the Presidents of Flintkote, H. K. Porter and Ruberoid. However, the latter are only using a small amount of asbestos in relation to their overall company product.

Dr. Magnuson is speaking at a meeting here in Philadelphia this week. Mr. Porter believes that Mr. Rohrbach and others in the industry will not attend a conference on this subject, which U.S.P.H.S. tried to call.

W. E. Shoemaker of American Mutual on Keasbey & Mattison and the Public Health Service Cancer Survey (1961) Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 13196 · Page 3 of 4 asbestosclaims.law/library/13196/3

040590

Mr. Bloomer, Upper Darby Engineering 9/26/61

Mr. Porter did not approach the Johns-Manville president, because he says it is a too large company with too many heads. He has had experience before in A.S.A. committee work along these lines. He has found that some of their staff men will run the ball on something, cause a great deal of trouble and then when the matter is brought to the attention of some of the heads of their company, they don't even know what the staff man is getting them into.

I am sorry that we do not have something more dramatic to offer Mr. Porter but believe it is fairly obvious that if the plant dust conditions are kept within, what are known to be safe levels, K & M and their industry would have less concern with this matter.

Assistant Engineering Manager

cc: Mr. Ballentine, Phila. Eng.
HOE
Mr. Don, Phila. Sales

CRMC-Motley1000-Subj-004596

Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
asbestosclaims.law/library/13196/4