RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 67:

Not applicable. See Abex's response to Interrogatory No. 63, above.

INTERROGATORY NO. 68:

Prior to the date on which Defendant first directed that a warning accompany any product identified in response to Interrogatory Nos. 19 and 42, did any person, firm, organization or other entity, within of without your employ, suggest, recommend, counsel, advise, or otherwise indicate in any manner, that a warning should accompany any or all such products or asbestos-containing products generally?

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 68:

See General Objections. Abex further objects to this request on the grounds that it is compound, vague, ambiguous, overly broad as to time and scope, unduly burdensome, irrelevant to any issue in this action and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

Abex further objects that this request may call for information subject to the attorney-client privilege, protected by the attorney work-product doctrine, the rule protecting materials prepared in anticipation of and/or in connection with litigation, or any other applicable privilege.

Without waiver of these objections, Abex responds that it has been unable to determine the exact circumstances surrounding its decision to place warnings on its asbestos containing products and has been unable to identify any individuals who were involved in this process. Investigation continues.

INTERROGATORY NO. 69:

If you answer to Interrogatory No. 68 is "Yes," with respect to each such suggestion, recommendation, counseling, advice or other indication:

(9) Identify the person(s) and/or entity(ies) giving the same;