PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT UR-127

Hogansville, Georgia

February 17, 1965

Mr. R. C. Harrington
WINNSBORO

Subject: Meeting of Asbestos Textile Institute - February 10 - 12, 1965

The Asbestos Textile Institute met at Pinehurst, North Carolina, February 10 - 12, 1965, and was divided into meetings of the Air Hygiene & Mfg. Committee, Fiber Testing Committee, Technical Committee, and Sales Promotion Committee. Mr. Austin and I attended the Air Hygiene & Mfg. Committee meeting along with Dr. Jack Wolfsie of our Company. Dr. Cralley of the Health, Education, and Welfare Department who is now conducting a survey of a number of asbestos plants to determine any possible relationship between asbestos dust and lung cancer was present and gave an interim report.

He pointed out that what they are seeking is find out the safe level of dust concentration. This refers to all dust that is in the field of counting. As to questions regarding the level, the five million figure is still used, although everyone attempts to reduce it to the minimum. Dr. Cralley pointed out that there is a possibility of some damage caused by plant life which was left in the asbestos when it was formed, and when released has an adverse affect on people. This is benzopyrene and minute traces of it are evident in some forms of asbestos, particularly the blue type. There are other minute traces of nickel and other types that conceivably might have bad effects, and these are being investigated. He pointed out that bunker fuel used in some ships and some shore installations releases chemicals that could cause damage to the human being, and this raised the question in my mind as to any additives that we use as a dust-down which should be checked to be sure that they have no ill effect.

I raised this question in a meeting yesterday with Mr. Hilton and others on this Nopco additive which improves running conditions and produces less waste. They assured me that there was no element of this spray that could possibly harm the body.

Dr. Cralley pointed out the various experiences and the alarm caused by some labor unions, and some doctors and lawyers in presenting a "scarshead" headline for the general public to see. The problem is acute with the larger asbestos companies in that they have had a number of phone calls wanting to know if it is dangerous to use an ironing board cover. Propaganda has gotten so far that the question of release of asbestos particles from brake linings was considered by the opponents of the use of asbestos as dangerous. Mr. Lew Williams, Chairman of the Committee, presented two clippings from papers pointing out the danger of asbestos - one from the SCIENTIFIC AMERICAN of December, 1964, which pointed out that certain asbestos silicates contain traces of iron, nickel, and chromium and all three are know to be carcinogenically active. There was also presented an item headlined, "Cancer Experts Eye Asbestos in Alarm," from THE PLAIN DEALER, Cleveland, Ohio, January 12, which started

out: "Asbestos, used in more than 3,000 American products from textiles to insulation and flooring, has recently become a subject of international concern as a cause of cancer." This article quoted Drs. Selikoff, Jacob Churg, and E. Cuyler Hammond. Dr. Hammond is director of statistical research of the American Cancer Society.

While the government has not sampled dust in towns around asbestos plants, there was an indication that they might do so, particularly in view of the report at the New York Academy of Sciences held last year that asbestos dust was evident as far as forty kilometers away from one of the North European countries.

The H. K. Porter Company - Mr. A. P. Gouveia, Assistant Works Manager at Charlotte, Davidson, and Bennettsville - commented that their dust counts were less in the plants than on the streets of Charlotte. He invited anyone to come by and see the plant - that they had spent $2,500,000 with refrigeration and washed air to insure worker safety. I got the impression that no other plant was refrigerated.

The potential ill effects of asbestos dust in the air was recognized by everyone, and efforts taken to allay any fears were discussed. Mr. Austin and I pointed out that we had talked with each employee and that we had set up an elaborate system of tests and examinations to protect the employees. It was suggested that each employee have a pre-employment X-ray and physical, which we do, and that it might not be necessary to X-ray again for five years. I disagreed with this, giving an example of how something triggers off the rapid advent of asbestosis. While there was some disagreement as to how often X-rays should be made, Dr. Wolfsie agreed that our program of once a year was in effect satisfactory.

The meeting devoted primarily to air hygiene adjourned at twelve and started again at nine o'clock that night. The night meeting was devoted primarily to manufacturing with efforts to use vacuum cleaners for the removal of dust. Various types were suggested, but none were entirely satisfactory. Mr. Pete Gouveia stated that their Abington vacuum system for stripping was very satisfactory. Generally speaking, where vacuums could be used, they were recommended, but in other places where dust had to be blown down on the week-end, it was, of course, recommended that masks be used. A mopping action to remove dust was also recommended. Various phases of productivity were discussed, along with job layouts and pounds per manhour. *

At the General Meeting on Friday morning, reports from each committee were given, and a general discussion was had. It was announced that the asbestos miners had decided to set up a large sum of money for further exploration of dust control and dust hazards in the industry. This could supplement Dr. Cralley's study.

My impression is that we are far ahead of all other asbestos companies in our records and in our protection of employees. Perhaps H. K. Porter may be better in working conditions if Pete Gouveia is to be believed. He again invited us to visit at any time, and I told him that we could not reciprocate, and he stated that he was not interested in reciprocation primarily. He, of course, would be glad to visit us should an opportunity arise, but he would like for us to see their plants.

Dr. Cralley left Friday afternoon and is to visit Hogansville at some early date and at the same time visit Opelika and Conyers. He is to visit at a time convenient to him and Dr. Wells. I checked this with Dr. Wells and will advise when a definite date is set.

A. C. Link

mp