

FILE NAME: RT Vanderbilt (RTV)

DATE: 1975 Jan 7

DOC#: RTV220

DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION: J-M Memo RE Memo on Jan 2, 1975 to P. Kotin -
"Talc & Asbestos"



Johns-Manville

Internal Correspondence

To: H. R. Keefe - 2W

Date: January 7, 1975

From: R. S. Lamar

Copies: See end of correspondence

Subject: YOUR MEMO OF JANUARY 2, 1975 TO
P. KOTIN, " TALC AND ASBESTOS "

I cannot help but feel that some additional input from Research is needed here. Several points:

1. The National Paint and Coating Association is simply a trade organization. It carries no legal weight. We are still bound by the law as described in OSHA documents. It seems to me that Stender, in his letter of October 9, 1974, destroys his own organization. Until this confusion within OSHA is resolved, we have no choice but to comply with the law as written.
2. As I read the NP&CA Bulletin No. 20, I get two strong impressions:
 - a. Rather than clarifying the matter, as stated, they only add to my confusion.
 - b. Asbestos is not really asbestos, but it can be anything you want to call it, e.g., "commercial talc."
3. I am greatly concerned with the point raised by A. Finkbiner at our last meeting. This has to do specifically with the fact that we are "sitting" on information which shows quite conclusively that R. T. Vanderbilt's talc products contain not only tremolite, but significant amounts of chrysotile and anthophyllite as well. What might be J-M's legal responsibility by withholding such information?
Refer to:

January 7, 1975

Memo October 9, 1974 V. E. Wolkodoff to R. S. Lamar
Report No. 414-T-33, October 4, 1974
Memo October 10, 1974 K. L. Jaunaraajs to R. S. Lamar
Memo October 23, 1974 V. E. Wolkodoff to R. S. Lamar
Memo October 11, 1974 R. S. Lamar to V. E. Wolkodoff

Do we still intend to provide OSHA with this information on Vanderbilt's talc products? I also feel that we should provide this information to R. T. Vanderbilt.

4. Finally, the real question is medical in nature. From information I have from Kotin and Fenner, there is more than ample reason why we should label regardless of what the law might say. And, this could in time have a great deal to do with J-M's legal as well as its moral obligations.

I guess what I am really trying to say, Harry, is that the decision to label was right and should not be subject for reconsideration. We have to learn to live with it in a business sense regardless of how difficult this appears.



R. S. Lamar

kjm
attachment

cc:
P. Kotin - 4N
F. J. Solon - 4N
E. M. Fenner - 4N
A. C. Finkbiner - 5W
P. A. Martinson - 2W
H. Kranich - 2W
W. C. Streib
File: 259-6.1

De/cw
Not
Sens. Inc