PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT

UC-1995

RECEIVED

Toxicology

Dear Peter:

Your suggestion that we consider including "UX paper industry" topics in our general sales meeting is well taken -- and I plan to review the notes with Mr. Sayers.

Apropos of your letter on toxicological studies relative to [illegible] we have received the two excerpts you sent us with Dr. Carl Dernehl. He counsels that the papers "do not by any means present [illegible] proof, nor do they present [illegible] that in United States experience there has been no increase in [illegible] lung cancer when the threshold limit has not been observed."

From past publications, we have also noted the references to organic contaminants, with the thought that proof of absence of polycyclic aromatics in Union Carbide asbestos might be useful. We are planning some extraction studies and analyses for 3,4-benzo(a)pyrene by techniques employed at South Charleston. We will let you know the results, probably in an appropriately written statement by Dr. Dernehl.

The matter of soft papers, facial and other tissues, has been a recurring subject with us. Primarily this is a question of skin sensitization. While the over-all statements by our Industrial Medicine and Toxicology people should suffice -- we have given thought to "patch tests," which, incidentally, cost appreciably to run. It would be meaningless to conduct such tests with paper containing UCC asbestos, since the other components of the furnish bear on the results. Hence we are considering patch tests using straight asbestos -- which, of course, would absolve only our product. The other components (including, as you know, a variety of organic compounds) of specific furnishes would have to be considered by the paper company involved. We shall let you know our plans.

Very truly yours,

A. E. Pefahlick

A.E.Pefahlick:ck

cc: [illegible]

Dernehl DEPO. EXH. 50
3/15/89
KIRBY A. KENNEDY
COURT REPORTER

PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT
PW60

A0315