Sayers

A. Yes.
Q. And it's from an associate medical director, and that was Dr. Carl Dernehl again.
A. Yes.
Q. We've talked about that; right?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. On the second page of this letter by Dr. Dernehl he says, "It is probable that the 5 million particles per cubic foot will not be acceptable for the prevention of mesothelioma."
Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. Do you remember that that statement was being made by Dr. Dernehl back in 1967?
A. I have cited this letter, so the answer must be yes.
Q. You recognized at that time that 5 million particles per cubic foot was the current dust air regulation in England for asbestos dust?
A. Yes.
Q. Then Dr. Dernehl continues: "I have no idea what concentration might be effective in preventing this disease and I wonder if even a limit of 1 million particles per cubic foot would

Sayers

be effective in this regard."
Do you see that?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Do you remember that information being conveyed to you?
A. I do.
Q. Do you remember if at any time you ever told anybody at any of the paper mill customers in England that there was concern by the Union Carbide medical department that the current dust level under the regulations in England might not be sufficient to prevent mesothelioma?
A. I can't recall in detail.
Q. Do you remember telling any of your papermaking mill customers in England at any time that there was concern by the medical department at Union Carbide in New York that even a cut of five times from 5 million particles down to 1 million particles per cubic foot in the dust air level might be insufficient to prevent mesothelioma?
A. No, I don't recall saying things like that.
Q. Do you recall giving your customers any information about the threshold limit value for

Sayers

asbestos dust in the air other than that contained in the asbestos toxicology report also written by Dr. Dernehl?
A. That was the one we used.
Q. And that one, as you recall, it didn't talk about 1 million particles per cubic foot; all it talked about was the regulation of 5 million; right?
A. That is correct.
Q. So put another way, Dr. Dernehl's concern that we see in his letter to Dr. Hall of June 7th, 1967, that even 1 million particles dust level might be insufficient to prevent mesothelioma was not something that he ever set forth specifically in the asbestos toxicology reports?
A. It emerged later on in the second toxicology report, but I had already left the industry by that time.
Q. Right. That one was not written by Dr. Dernehl until sometime in 1969; right?
A. So I believe.
Q. Well, that's what you told us earlier in morning. You can look at it if you want.
A. Yes, 8th of May.

Sayers

Q. Just so we're clear, Dr. Dernehl's revision of the asbestos toxicology report, which was the piece you used to show to customers, was written on the 8th of May in 1969?
A. I didn't show it to customers because I had left.
Q. Your successor, then, would have used that to show to customers?
A. There wasn't a successor, because the marketing rights had been given to Degussa by that time.
Q. You at least recognized the document. You recognized that revision of the toxicology report?
A. I have only seen that recently.
Q. Let me ask you a different question. Back at the time you were actually working for Union Carbide in England, calling on customers in the papermaking industry, you did not have a copy of Dr. Dernehl's newest toxicology report?
A. That is right.
Q. Because that hadn't come out yet?
A. Right.
(Sayers Exhibit 16, letter dated 8/1/67