FILE NAME: MilChem (MC)

DATE: 1969 Sept 18

DOC#: MC001

DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION: Memo RE Flosal

PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT

DMA-1672

NOTEGRAM

September 18, 1969

In re: Flosal
Bar-132-69

TO: A. V. Williams

FROM: H. M. Barrett

On September 17 Billy Walkinshaw with Milchem called from Houston relating that the longshoremen at the London docks had refused to unload Flosal because it is an asbestos based material. The longshoremen in England will not unload any thing that they know is asbestos or chrysotile.

Walkinshaw referred Mr. Bill Suggs with Furness-Withy Steamship Line to me for clarification of the problem. Suggs informed me that they would not handle any material from the Gulf Coast to England that contains asbestos or chrysotile. This particular shipment is still on board a ship headed for another North Sea port where it will hopefully be unloaded and sent back to England. Dextrid is another material the British longshoremen will not handle.

Our export bag does not show Flosal to be asbestos or chrysotile asbestos at any place. This particular shipment, however, came from Milchem's domestic warehouse stock at Houston. Our domestic bags carry a caution on the bag and show that Flosal is chrysotile asbestos. Milchem made all shipping arrangements.

Mr. Suggs tells me that materials such as these can be shipped in containers 8' x 8' x 20' (approximately 1100 cu ft). Their minimum container charge is $550.00 each to London or Felixstow. Billy Walkinshaw tells me that such containers are prohibitive, however, because there is a steam cleaning charge at destination that may be almost as great as the ocean freight.

It appears that our best bet is to stay with export bags. We may, however, be too late because the tradename, Flosal, itself may be barred.

This is for your information.

cc: J. L. Howe
bcc: File
H. M. Barrett

DSC 14753

ASB 086379

CCO 20522