

2 tive individual by some sort of screening test? For dermatitis, for example, why not a patch test before he is put into contact with the suspected material on his job?

Generally speaking, we do not recommend this procedure. I believe one of the biggest scale attempts at this sort of thing was the testing of volunteers with mustard gas at the beginning of World War II. A great many were tested in an effort to determine individual variations in sensitivity. One consequence of this program was that some of the men were sensitized to mustard gas and therefore reacted abnormally whenever they came in contact with small concentrations. So, it is not a practical procedure to weed out the hypersensitive by a preliminary testing program if we are dealing with a sensitizer.

The other comment is that we can anticipate certain types of difficulty. For example, suppose we are dealing with a chemical that produces kidney injury. It would not be wise to expose a man who has only one kidney; he might very well be abnormally sensitive. And that brings up the importance of an adequate, preplacement medical examination and a classification of a man as fit or unfit for a certain type of exposure.

DR. McGEE: May I add one thing which I think is important? It is the absolute necessity of a critical attitude in tying down the diagnosis. I know of a few areas where it is more important to cross-examine a diagnosis and prove it to the extent that it is possible to prove it than in occupational disease. The very act of having a high index of suspicion when supervising an operation with a potential hazard sometimes leads to false diagnoses that can be troublesome.

I am reminded of the incident of the plant physician who was aware that a chemical could be a sensitizer of the skin and lead to a dermatitis. He showed me a case of a very stubborn dermatitis, stubborn because the man had been removed from the exposure for six months and still had the skin lesions. I was visiting the plant at the time. I had a hunch of a different diagnosis when I saw the man's lesions, partly because I was not expecting contact dermatitis, as was the plant physician who lives with the problem every day. I asked the patient if there were members of his family who had similar skin trouble. There were two members who had similar complaints. The diagnosis proved to be scabies for all three of the patients.

MODERATOR AHEARN: Thank you very much. We will go on to the next question. "Does the usual Products Liability Policy cover any and all liability that may be imposed upon a manufacturer for damages resulting from the use of his product?"

MR. BAILE: I think the answer to that question is obviously no.

First of all, it provided in t might be imp itself. That l product liabi basis." They damages arisi dent is used i point of time effects which : amount of sp larly when y liability resul mind that a p a satisfactory be certain th to call "occur

I thing i basis is imp coverage of tl pretty difficu more apparei road contract method is a li ing propertie The other me avoid that. V pensive meth

MR. T. do not insura beyond the c

MR. BA out with the be very happ would be ver that, of cours pany individ premium. Th have been ex necessarily w

So it is common to i