



INTERNAL CORRESPONDENCE

PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT

UC-5021

MINING AND METALS DIVISION

270 PARK AVENUE, NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10017

To (Name)
Division
LocationDr. J. J. Welsh
4th Floor

Date

April 16, 1974

Originating Dept.

Answering letter date

Copy to

Messrs. W. J. Kovack
H. B. Rhodes

Subject

Toxicology

This is a follow up to our recent telephone conversation requesting the views of Union Carbide's Medical Department on the confidentiality of employee physical examinations as related to the OSHA asbestos regulations. Background information on this matter is attached. A statement of your opposition to such a move, together with substantiating reasons, would be most helpful to our activities in conjunction with the Asbestos Information Association in opposing such a change in the OSHA asbestos regulations.

W. C. Thurber

WCT:es
Attachment

03326

RECEIVED

APR 17 1974

MEDICAL DEPARTMENT

UCC 014396



INTERNAL CORRESPONDENCE

MINING AND METALS DIVISION

P. O. BOX 579, NIAGARA FALLS, NEW YORK 14302

To (Name) Mr. W. C. Thurber
 Division UCC Mining & Metals
 Location 38th Floor
 270 Park Avenue
 New York, NY 10017

Date March 4, 1974
 Originating Dept. "Calidria" Asbestos

Answering letter date

Copy to Mr. J. L. Myers
 File

Subject Toxicology

Dear Bill:

Here are three items relating to the above subject where your recommendations are requested.

1. Confidentiality of Physical Examinations

At our first Technical Advisory Committee meeting, Ed Fenner mentioned that a very strong push is expected from the Unions to make the results of employee physical examinations confidential. This means that the company does not have access to the results and only gets a statement from the examining physician that the man is able or unable to work. This position was also reported to have considerable support from OSHA.

A request was made that the Corporate Medical Directors of the various companies represented be asked to state their position on this matter and provide any supporting evidence or information re the position that they felt was appropriate. This would be used by the AIA/NA Medical Advisory Committee to evaluate if an industry position should be taken and if so what it should be. I assume that the final results will be subject to the same review by the Board of Directors as the Technical Committee recommendations but this was not explicitly stated.

It seems to me that this would be a good matter for you to discuss with Dr. Dernehl. If you agree, please proceed. If not, please advise.

2. Consumer Product Safety Commission

The attached article came to my attention today. I suspect that this Commission has no background in asbestos and "only know what they read in the papers." Some missionary work by Bob Mereness before the activist petitions to ban asbestos containing consumer goods start to come in may be very useful. It is suggested that this matter be brought up at the next Board of Directors' meeting.

RECEIVED

MAR 5 1974

UCC 014397

03327