Page 249

agree with Union Carbide?
A. Not entirely, no. It depends on the particular dispute you're thinking about.
Q. This particular dispute.
A. I think that they had reason to fear a predictable tightening up of OSHA. I think they had reason to fear that it would happen quickly enough that it would make it very difficult for them to continue in business in asbestos. That they had a picture of the world where it was going to be possible for a long period of time to produce asbestos relatively safely, but the concern about the downside, partly on the basis of other people's behavior, was going to make it impossible for them, so they were very unhappy with the prospects of what they took to be the course of regulatory tightening up.
Q. Let's take this battle over OSHA. In your life long study of these type battles, do you take a position on one side or the other? What side are you on in an issue like this?
MS. ROSENBERG: Objection as to form. Position as to what?

Page 250

Q. Do you understand my question?
A. No.
Q. As to the competing interest of protecting -- the advocacy groups for protection of the worker and use your word, firms whose, I think you used the term, prime motivation is economic --
A. Economic survival.
MS. ROSENBERG: Do you understand the question?
A. I understand it now. My answer is straightforward.
I'm not at all surprised that firms are concerned about surviving. I'm not at all surprised that advocates of workers safety are concerned about improving safety levels and I think you see that in the balancing act that took place about threshold value levels. That is, a tightening up but a postponement of it for two years, that is the sort of thing that I would have expected.
I thought there was a balancing act between the interest at hand and both those interests are important. Economic continuation is important to labor too.

Page 251

Q. Let me ask you a different question. When did this debate over OSHA go on?
A. It went on from 1964/5 beginning, all the way through 1969 in one phase and then heated up again in 1970 with the legislation and then heated up again as they started setting the rules for OSHA, the exposure levels and the standard -- immediate standard and long term standard. I was talking about the longer term standard, one of threshold value levels.
Q. At that time you were aware of these issues? Thinking back, this is nothing you discovered in your research. You knew what was going on at the time being a student of political science.
A. Yes, I was in Washington in 1996 as well as working HEW as an assistant to the cabinet secretary and this would have come up as an issue. Not that he was involved in every aspect of it, but because, Medicare, which is what I was working on, was so involved in this labor management dispute, I heard the same things about this dispute.
Q. At that time, not looking back in

Page 252

retrospect as a political scientist, but at that time, what was your position?
A. I was sympathetic to the concerns about worker safety, but not sure that the means that were put forward -- I didn't have an independent view about what would be tolerable and appropriate means, but that there was a problem I was sure.
Q. Being a student of public policy and being in Washington at the time when the regulations were enacted, did you feel at the time that they were reasonable regulations?
A. Yes. I think they represented a somewhat better outcome for organized labor than it did for the industry, but there were concessions on the side of the industry too and I thought that balancing act was important so as not to have a turnaround against OSHA shortly thereafter with a change in government.
Q. You brought up, I think you called it a trade organization, and we agreed that we were talking about the Asbestos Information Association?
A. Right.
Q. The AIA?