November 11, 1968

CALL REPORT

Eternit Germany

Attached is a copy of the minutes of my recent meeting in Berlin as forwarded to me by Eternit. I should like to make the following additional comments:

Berlin wishes to test the regular 4T30. They request that we ship to them 5 tons to Hamburg as soon as possible by any vessel we like, but preferably by FEDNAV. They wish to be advised when this is done, so that they may intercept it before it gets mixed-up with any other fibre.

They may be interested in using Group 6 from Advocate, but they wish to test it first before reaching a decision. This is only in case if we decide to produce such a grade. In general, they claim that A-25 is better for production than S4T30, but the latter is more uniform in quality.

These are some of their results in tests of shipping samples of 6D-24 as compared to CJM figures:

JM	- 34 ;	Eternit	- 31	---	JM	- 35 ;	Eternit - 29
"	- 33 ;	"	- 29		"	- 35 ;	" - 28
"	- 34 ;	"	- 29		"	- 35 ;	" - 26
"	- 36 ;	"	- 29		"	-	

They admit that their production tests give higher results - above the guaranteed minimum of 30 PV.

On S4T30, they give the following comparison:

1967	JM - 76	;	Eternit - 80
	" - 77		" - 75
	" - 75		" - 72

(continued)

...../2

Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
asbestosclaims.law/library/24454/1

1968	JM - 74	;	Eternit - 74
	" - 76		" - 72
	" - 73		" - 75
	" - 73		" - 73
	" - 72		" - 70
	" - 73		" - 71

They point out the drop in values since early 1968, and although they accepted that these figures are within the guaranteed minimum, they fear we are not leaving a sufficient margin of safety, and they are worried we might drop the quality some more. I reassured them that it is not our intention to violate our contract with them!!

The same old story came up with Advocate. They say all shipping samples always show 72 PV. They do not believe that this is possible, and they have given me the following figures on their tests on these samples:

Average in 1967	:	80 PV
1968	:	80, 72, 79, 74, 73, 74, 74.

You will note their comments on the shipment made on the EL KANEMI. They have sent a sample of this fibre to Asbestos for re-testing.

They ask that we again send to them about 100 lbs. of small ore samples that they could distribute to customers, various organizations, etc. They also ask that we send them a large, rough rock with good vein occurrences that they could proudly display in the main entrance to their offices in Berlin. They would like it to be 200/300 lbs., and they are prepared to pay for all transportation costs.

They are categorically opposed to any "Caution" labels on fibre bags. They see no legal obligation for us to put such a label, as they consider it strictly their internal problem about which they, and others, are perfectly aware. They would be interested to learn from us about any health data we have to disclose on asbestos and its effect on health, but they feel it is unnecessary to advertise its possible danger to labor unions or to dockworkers who only handle bags of asbestos, but do not work with it. The same feeling, but even stronger, is being expressed in England. As one man at Cape said to me:

...../3

"If J-M goes ahead with this label, we shall also put a label on our Amosit going to America, saying: This is Amosite; it is not Johns-Manville chrysotile."

They are very bitter about it, and say that such a step should never be taken unilaterally by one producer, no matter how big. If it is absolutely necessary to put such labels on fibre bags, they argue that it should be done by the whole industry with the full knowledge of all its members.

pc D. Poutiatine
cc: D. T. Colton - attachment
N. W. Hendry - attachment

Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
asbestosclaims.law/library/24454/3