PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT TN 1902

CONFIDENTIAL

45/522/151-5

RSy/CMP

Dr. S. Holmes

28 JAN 1977

To: RAW(2)
Copies: KHD/HR(2)
SHs/SHt/WTo/AA

27th January, 1977.

TUC SUBMISSION TO THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ASBESTOS

Report of Meetings held on Tuesday 18th and Monday, 24th January, 1977.

Present:

Mr. W. Towler	-	Chairman
Mr. S. Hazlehurst	-	(First meeting only)
Dr. S. Holmes	-	(First meeting only)
Mr. R. Sykes		
Mr. A. Austin		
Mr. S. Brown	-	G.M.W.U.
Mr. R. Ivey	-	(Second meeting only)

TBA representatives of NJIC Unions, MATSA and APEX.

1. It was clear at the start of the first meeting that wide differences of opinion existed on the validity of the T.U.C. submission. The Management representatives reported that a close scrutiny of the document had revealed the presence of several erroneous and controversial statements and emphasised that the extreme measures called for (e.g. a Maximum Allowable Concentration of 0.2 f/ml) would result, if accepted by the ACA, in the closure of most, if not all sections of the industry including TBA.

The APEX representative present reported that his branch members were also concerned with the findings of the submission and were taking action to inform the TUC of their concern.

However, Mr. Woolfenden said that as far as his NJIC Union members were concerned the TUC submission was valid and would be endorsed. He then asked one of his colleagues to read out a potential press statement which had been formulated as a response to the TUC report by the members of the NJIC Unions present at the meeting (chosen to represent the interests of the TBA work force). This statement called on the Company to undertake certain measures (detailed in Appendix 1). It was pointed out strongly to Mr. Woolfenden that the points made in the statement were purely domestic issues, had little or no direct relevance to the TUC document and could be dealt with through the usual internal channels of communication.

Cont'd...

2. The TUC submission was then discussed point by point. Several of the comments made in the TUC report were related by Union members to their own experience within TBA and/or their views of Company policy and the following points were noted in particular.

(a) Use of Substitute Fibrous Materials at TBA

The Unions demanded (and were given assurances) that close attention be given to the potential health risk of all new or "substitute" materials. It was felt by some that insufficient attention had been given to the hazards associated with the manufacture and handling of glass textiles. The Management representatives stressed the relevant differences between asbestos and glass with regard to health risks and Mr. F. Williams (Senior Shop Steward, Hindley Green) said that as far as he was concerned the TUC document had not shown up anything new.

(b) Union Involvement in Health & Safety Issues

The NJIC Unions asked for an early implementation by the Company of the "Safety Representative Regulations" that had been formulated by the Government but temporarily shelved. It was pointed out that TBA was continuing with the "Safety Representatives' Training Courses" and would be issuing a statement on implementation in due course.

(c) Information on Asbestos and Health

Although the Union members accepted that they had ready access to the ARC and AIC publications, it was considered that a wider dissemination of literature on Asbestos and Health was required. The need for a transcript of some of the medical articles on the subject was also felt to be desirable. (On a point of detail, Mr. Sykes agreed to let Mr. Woolfenden have a copy of the report of the Advisory Committee on Asbestos Cancers - Lyon 1972)

(d) Early diagnosis of Asbestos Related Diseases

It was felt that the Company, and in particular the PMR might not be keeping completely up to date with its methods of diagnosis. Through the Management representatives present, the TBA Medical Officer was asked to comment on the value of an "EMI whole body scanner" that had received recent publicity in the Readers Digest and New Scientist. The incidence of laryngeal cancer at TBA was also queried in view of its mention in the TUC document. (Mr. Sykes agreed to take these points up with Dr. Morris).

3. At the end of the meeting Mr. Woolfenden said that he would report back to the Shop Stewards on the discussions that had taken place. They could then decide their course of action. The meeting was made aware of the decision by TAC and Cape Industries' representatives to send a deputation to the TUC to voice their concern on the statements made in the Submission.

Cont'd...

Mr. S. Brown said that he would seek more information on the way the G.M.W.U. had dealt with their contribution to the TUC submission. He reported that Mr. Bradley, the man originally responsible for dealing with the subject of Asbestos and Health had died and he thought that the TUC issue had been handled by another (and possible more biased) person.

Mr. Brown asked if it would be possible for Mr. Sykes to provide him with a summary* of his critique of the TUC submission and this was agreed to.

R. Sykes.

* Note. This will be submitted to you for approval.

APPENDIX I

1) That shop steward(s) be trained in the monitoring of dust levels within the factory. (It was explained that this recommendation was made following a recent dispute within the factory on the validity of Royco readings)

2) That medical and x-ray examinations be carried out at 3 monthly intervals (this point was strongly criticised by the Management in view of the proved risk to health by over-exposure to x-rays).

3) That the Company should no longer have multi-shift working systems.

4) That the Company should no longer mislead shop floor personnel into believing that asbestos related diseases were dose related and that there were 'safe' levels of exposure.

5) That any new plant should be "dust proof".

6) That a second opinion be obtained on the design of the new plant.

7) That the Company and Trade Unions should work together towards the establishment of a shorter working day and working life.