PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT AIA8
Blumberg No. 6113

AIA 8th EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
7 JULY 1978
AGENDA ITEM 6

808210

EXTRACT FROM MINUTES OF 3rd MEETING OF EEC ADVISORY COUNCIL
ON 20th MAY 1978

7. Labelling.

7.1. Considerable time was spent on discussing the pro's and contra's of labelling.
Opinions on the desirability of starting at this moment; a voluntary labelling scheme differed widely from one country to the other, but there was general agreement on the necessity to prepare a label in order not to be taken by surprise later on.

7.2. As for the type of label and its wording, AIA/London would circulate a questionnaire among EAC members asking them to give their countries views on the following points :

1. Should the label refer to the fact that the product contains asbestos ?
2. Should it contain the words "CAUTION" or "WARNING" ?
3. Should the label refer to the nature of the danger ? (creation of dust - inhaling dust).
4. Should the label contain an advise to observe safety instruction
5. Should there be a mention of "HEALTH HAZARDS" ?
6. Should the label contain a logo and if so, which one ?

7.3. It was felt that the EAC should agree on and propose a "minimum statement" for the label, to which individual countries could add further information according to national requirements.

7.4. Various members reported on the present situation or future action in their country as regards labelling.
Most participants were in favour of an action in various stages, the switching over from one stage to a further less favourable one, depending on outside pressure :

1st stage : health and safety recommendations included in a leaflet together with recommendations for handling.

WHM 19729

Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
asbestosclaims.law/library/20918/1

stacking etc... of the product) similar to the Eternit leaflet).

2nd stage : label according to the French or U.K. model, but without the logo.

3rd stage : idem, with logo.

7.5. Many of the participants were of the opinion that it was advisable to adopt the U.K. label as such if the use of a label was unavoidable. Rediscussing its wording could bring along the risk of having to include the word "cancer" in it. The fact that this label had been found satisfactory to the U.K. authorities was also seen as a good argument for avoiding the EEC to press for a less favourable one (such as the skull and cross-bones used for "toxic" substances). It was also believed that, in order to stand a chance for the EEC to accept the logo put forward by the industry, the whole asbestos industry within the EEC should agree on and start using one and the same logo.

7.6. The EAC secretary was asked to keep contact with Mr. KRUGER of UNICE on the matter.

7.7. In those countries where it was felt it was still too early to start voluntary labelling, in fear of a possible negative influence on sales steps should be taken in order to prepare commercial people for the idea, making clear that in the absence of an industry's initiativ we could run the risk of being imposed the "skull and cross-bones" symbol for our products. It should also be pointed out to them that the fact to agree on a kind of label did not imply the agreement of starting to use it right now.

7.8. Mr. van der REST asked U.K. members to do their utmost to obtain that U.K. asbestos containing goods exported to the continent should not yet be labelled, as this would put the continental industr in a difficult position.

IHM 19730

OCT 16 '90 10:39AM BALDWIN P.5/20