PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT AB-68
PENGAD-Bayonne,N.J.

PERSONAL & CONFIDENTIAL

July 2, 1981

Mr. Stephen S. Conway, Jr.
President
New York Office

Dear Steve,

What I am now doing is strictly forbidden, at least I have been totally regimented into believing this, and it could cost me my job. If so, then Mr. Given would have believed that this possibility is as it should be.

I am assuming that you have read Mr. Given's pamphlet, which impressed me immeasurably. I have been told that it is your desire to return to his philosophy of management and this letter or presentation is based on this premise and my desire to aid you from the standpoint of the Medical Department. However, I am sorely in need of direction from you.

In my relatively brief association with Abex, the Medical Department has always been told what it could and could not do. An acceptable excuse for not following suggested programs has been, "we can't spend that kind of money."

Many cases and examples exist to document this statement and I will enumerate some of them. There is a plant which has an unacceptable exposure to a toxic substance of which they are aware. Repeated industrial hygiene surveys have shown no improvement in this exposure in spite of some measures taken to correct this. Facilities Engineering has proposed changes to correct the situation, but the answer has been "no way will top management approve this expenditure." I have been able to prevent intoxication of the employees, but by quasi devious "administrative" means.

Recommendations for wearing equipment to protect the worker has been answered with "O.K., but we will have to phase it in gradually -- we can't afford to buy the equipment." I believe all equipment for the protection of employees should be supplied by Abex. California already has a law to this effect and why should Abex bring up the rear and wait until all states pass such a law?