

FILE NAME: Armco (ARM)

DATE: 1940 Apr

DOC#: ARM011

DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION: Proceedings of All Ohio Safety Congress

PROCEEDINGS
of
All Ohio Safety Congress

Held Under the Auspices of
THE INDUSTRIAL COMMISSION OF OHIO
and the direct management of
THE DIVISION OF SAFETY AND HYGIENE
Published under the authority

of
The Industrial Commission of Ohio

Deshler-Wallick Hotel
Columbus, Ohio
April 16-17-18
1940

DANNER PRESS, Inc.
Akron, Ohio
1940

Program

Chairman: Carl L. Smith, Managing Director, Cleveland Safety Council.

Exhibits

Chairman: Buell W. Nutt, President, Safety Equipment Service Company, Cleveland, Ohio.

Entertainment

Chairman: H. G. Ehret, Safety Director, Division of Factory and Building Inspection, Department of Industrial Relations of Ohio.

Publicity

Chairman: Harry M. Paul, Supervisor of Printing and Publications, Division of Safety and Hygiene, Industrial Commission of Ohio.

Reception

Chairman: Harry L. Sain, Assistant Superintendent, Division of Safety and Hygiene, Industrial Commission of Ohio.

Registration

Chairman: C. C. Beasor, Statistician, Division of Safety and Hygiene, Industrial Commission of Ohio.

BUREAU OF INFORMATION ON SAFETY, COMPENSATION AND CLAIMS

SAFETY

Chairman: George P. Meehan, Mechanical Engineer.

Staff of the Division of Safety and Hygiene of the
Industrial Commission of Ohio

C. G. Barth	Safety Engineer
H. P. Heyne	Safety Engineer
T. E. Fennessy	Safety Engineer
Mackin Kelly	Safety Engineer
P. B. Martens	Safety Engineer
Sidney Smith	Safety Engineer
James P. Scanlon	Safety Engineer
L. M. Merritt	Safety Engineer
W. M. Morrow	Safety Engineer
George P. Meehan	Structural Engineer
Lewis C. Lewis	Mechanical Engineer
D. M. Ryan	Mining Engineer
A. D. Caddell	Mining Engineer
W. E. Obetz	Special Representative
Geo. Calhoun	Medical Director
R. C. Jones	Special Investigator
James Flaker	Special Investigator
Ben T. Godfrey	Special Investigator
Arnold Bill	Special Investigator
A. R. Taubman	Special Investigator

COMPENSATION

Robt. W. Nott, Supervisor of Information, Industrial Commission of Ohio

LIST OF HONORARY VICE PRESIDENTS

Geo. A. Strain, Director, Department of Industrial Relations, State of Ohio.
 Frank A. Livingston, President, Columbus Chamber of Commerce, Columbus, Ohio.
 Don K. Martin, Secretary, Ohio Manufacturers' Association, Columbus, Ohio.
 Thos. J. Donnelly, Secretary, Ohio Federation of Labor, Columbus, Ohio.
 Thos. J. Duffy, former Chairman, Industrial Commission of Ohio, Columbus, Ohio.
 Judge Lee E. Skeel, President, Cleveland Safety Council, Cleveland, Ohio.
 Frank A. Purnell, President, The Youngstown Sheet and Tube Company, Youngstown, Ohio.
 Charles R. Hook, President, The American Rolling Mill Company, Middletown, Ohio.
 E. E. Grover, President, Columbus Safety Council, Columbus, Ohio.
 Ben W. Marr, President and General Manager, Columbus & Southern Ohio Electric Company, Columbus, Ohio.
 S. P. Bush, Columbus, Ohio.
 C. C. Slusser, Vice President, Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company, Akron, Ohio.
 Lewis M. Crosley, Vice President and General Manager, Crosley Radio Corporation, Cincinnati, Ohio.
 H. C. Blackwell, Union Gas and Electric Company, Cincinnati, Ohio.
 Charles L. Keller, Vice President, The Gardner-Richardson Company, Lockland, Ohio.
 J. A. Voss, Vice President in Charge of Personnel, Republic Steel Corporation, Cleveland, Ohio.
 Peter E. Rentschler, President, Hamilton Foundry and Machine Company, Hamilton, Ohio.
 L. W. Robinson, President, Zanesville Industrial Safety Council, Zanesville, Ohio.
 George W. Smith, Jr., Vice President, White Motor Company, Cleveland, Ohio.
 C. E. Torrey, General Manager, Ohio Power Company, Canton, Ohio.
 H. A. Timken, Jr., Vice President, Timken Roller Bearing Company, Canton, Ohio.
 Dr. O. P. Geier, Director of Employee Relations, The Cincinnati Milling Machine Company, Cincinnati, Ohio.
 James R. Byrum, President, Middletown Safety Council, Middletown, Ohio.
 C. R. Steiner, President, Lancaster Safety Council, Lancaster, Ohio.
 D. S. Lutz, President, Scrap Iron and Steel Institute, Canton, Ohio.
 John H. Hoffman, President, Newark Safety Council, Newark, Ohio.
 E. Neld, The Ohio Ceramic Industries Association, Columbus, Ohio.
 M. Tharp, Vice President and General Manager, Ohio Fuel Gas Company, Columbus, Ohio.

Chairman:
 trial C
 P. A. Alber
 Campbell A
 John C. Asi
 Ernest Aug
 C. F. Bates
 Claude Haw
 Fred G. Ber
 Edgar M. B
 John Bower
 John Breide
 Ohio.
 A. Clark, Sa
 A. C. Cook, S
 town, O.
 O. R. Cornel
 H. E. Crain.
 William J. C
 J. R. Cuthber
 Robert O. Da
 Thos. J. Don
 Kenneth L. E
 H. G. Ehret,
 Relations
 E. A. Ellis, Di
 I. M. Emery,
 Larry L. Evert
 John A. Ey, Jr
 C. A. Felker,
 G. R. Fenner,
 R. H. Ferguson
 D. K. Finley, S
 Ohio.
 H. D. Fishbang
 A. C. Germain,
 E. E. Grant, Pr
 E. E. Grover, C
 H. H. Henry, S
 H. L. Hershey,
 Don C. Hunter,
 Ohio.
 Ralph J. Huston
 John W. Jockel,
 Ohio.
 J. Harrison Kell
 Victor L. Keys, (

TS

e of Ohio.

Columbus, Ohio.

mbus, Ohio.

s, Ohio.

Columbus, Ohio.

and, Ohio.

Company, Youngs

, Middletown, Ohio.

Ohio.

thern Ohio Electric

any, Akron, Ohio.

Radio Corporation,

O

any, Lockland,

el Corporation, Cleve-

Company, Hamilton,

oil, Zanesville, Ohio.

, Cleveland, Ohio.

on, Ohio.

pany, Canton, Ohio.

nnati Milling Machine

ddletown, Ohio.

r, Ohio.

n, Ohio.

k, Ohio.

ibus, Ohio.

l Gas Company, Colum-

COMMITTEES

Arrangements

Chairman: Thos. P. Kearns, Superintendent, Division of Safety and Hygiene, Industrial Commission of Ohio, Columbus, Ohio.

P. A. Alberty, Secretary, Ohio Fuel Gas Co., Columbus, Ohio.

Campbell Allen, American Rolling Mill Co., Middletown, Ohio.

John C. Askam, Ohio Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.

Ernest Augustus, Safety Director, Mead Corp., Chillicothe, Ohio.

C. F. Bateman, West High School, Columbus, Ohio.

Claude Bawden, Underwriters Laboratories, Youngstown, Ohio.

Fred G. Bennett, Safety Director, Buckeye Steel Castings Co., Columbus, Ohio.

Edgar M. Bland, Zanesville Rapid Transit Co., Zanesville, Ohio.

John Bowen, Jr., American Vitriified Products Co., Uhrichsville, Ohio.

John Breidenbach, Third Vice President, Ohio State Federation of Labor, Dayton, Ohio.

A. Clark, Safety Clothing Co., Cleveland, Ohio.

A. C. Cook, Superintendent, Safety, Welfare and Claims, Carnegie Steel Co., Youngstown, Ohio.

O. R. Cornelius, Southwestern Portland Cement Co., Osborn, Ohio.

H. E. Crain, Safety Director, Ohio Power Co., Canton, Ohio.

William J. Curn, Jr., Wheeling Steel Corp., Steubenville, Ohio.

J. R. Cuthbert, Standard Oil Co., Lima, Ohio.

Robert O. Dale, President, Ohio State Conference, B.M. & P.I.U., Euclid, Ohio.

Thos. J. Donnelly, Secretary, Ohio Federation of Labor, Columbus, Ohio.

Kenneth L. Ede, Ohio Public Service Co., Cleveland, Ohio.

H. G. Ehret, Division of Factory & Building Inspection, Department of Industrial Relations, Columbus, Ohio.

E. A. Ellis, Director of Welfare, Wheeling Steel Corp., Wheeling, W. Va.

I. M. Emery, Massillon Steel Casting Co., Massillon, Ohio.

Larry L. Evert, Ohio Bell Telephone Co., Cleveland, Ohio.

John A. Ey, Jr., Columbus & Southern Ohio Electric Co., Columbus, Ohio.

C. A. Felker, Marion Steam Shovel Co., Marion, Ohio.

G. R. Fenner, Pure Oil Co., Toledo, Ohio.

R. H. Ferguson, Manager of Safety, Republic Steel Corp., Cleveland, Ohio.

D. K. Finley, Secretary, Columbus Safety Council, Chamber of Commerce, Columbus, Ohio.

H. D. Flahbaugh, Fairfield Paper Co., Baltimore, Ohio.

A. C. Germain, American Steel & Wire Co., Cleveland, Ohio.

E. E. Grant, President, Crystal Tissue Co., Middletown, Ohio.

~~E. E. Grever, Columbus & Southern Ohio Electric Co., Columbus, Ohio.~~

~~H. H. Henry, Safety Director, OHs Steel Co., Cleveland, Ohio.~~

~~H. L. Hershey, East Ohio Gas Co., Cleveland, Ohio.~~

~~Don C. Hunter, Personnel Department, Oxford Miami Paper Co., West Carrollton, Ohio.~~

~~Ralph I. Huston, Central Ohio Light & Power Co., Findlay, Ohio.~~

~~John W. Jockel, Ohio Conference of Bricklayers, Masons & P. I. U., East Cleveland, Ohio.~~

~~J. Harrison Keller, Limoges China Co., Sebring, Ohio.~~

~~Victor L. Keys, Ohio State Assn. of Dyers & Cleaners, Columbus, Ohio.~~

J. T. Kidney, Manager, Employees Service Division, Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Akron, Ohio.

R. H. Krone, Safety Director, Cincinnati Gas & Electric Co., Cincinnati, Ohio.

George Lerch, Cincinnati & Suburban Bell Telephone Co., Cincinnati, Ohio.

J. D. Lyle, Personnel Director, Fisher Body Cleveland Division, Cleveland, Ohio.

Geo. H. McConahy, American Steel Foundries, Alliance, Ohio.

Don E. Martin, Secretary, Ohio Manufacturers Association, Columbus, Ohio.

Howard Massman, Parker High School, Dayton, Ohio.

Ray S. Metzger, Director of Claims & Safety, Toledo Edison Co., Toledo, Ohio.

Urban L. Moler, Inland Manufacturing Co., Dayton, Ohio.

Ralph Z. Moore, Sorg Paper Co., Middletown, Ohio.

H. E. Nold, Ohio Ceramic Industries Assn., Columbus, Ohio.

Buell W. Nutt, Safety Equipment Service Co., Cleveland, Ohio.

Ray O'Connell, Safety Director, Ohio Steel Foundry Co., Lima, Ohio.

D. A. O'Neill, Owens-Corning Fibreglass Corp., Newark, Ohio.

John Owens, President, District No. 6, United Mine Workers of America, Columbus, Ohio.

Clarence Palmer, Robt. H. Evans Co., Columbus, Ohio.

Thos. Price, United Mine Workers of America, Midvale, Ohio.

C. M. Rankin, Ohio Bell Telephone Co., Columbus, Ohio.

L. E. Reinwald, Crowell Publishing Co., Springfield, Ohio.

Kathryn B. Reynolds, American Education Press, Columbus, Ohio.

John Richards, Hanna Coal Co., St. Clairsville, Ohio.

H. N. Rider, Automatic Sprinkler Corp. of America, Youngstown, Ohio.

W. L. Schneider, Safety Engineer, B. F. Goodrich Co., Akron, Ohio.

J. D. Shanman, Capitol-Barg Dry Cleaning Co., Cincinnati, Ohio.

J. L. Sivard, Safety Director, Wheeling Steel Corp., Steubenville, Ohio.

Carl L. Smith, Managing Director, Cleveland Safety Council, Cleveland, Ohio.

Frank G. Smith, Asst. General Supt., Sunday Creek Coal Co., Nelsonville, Ohio.

Dr. Robert E. Smith, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

Irvin R. Snyder, Globe Laundry Co., Dayton, Ohio.

William Spanton, American Hard Rubber Co., Akron, Ohio.

Russell D. Squibb, Y & O Coal Co., Martins Ferry, Ohio.

J. P. Sutton, Manager of Industrial Relations, Ohio Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.

B. H. Taylor, Personnel Director, Diamond Alkali Co., Painesville, Ohio.

W. S. Taylor, Franklin-American Laundry & Zoric Dry Cleaning Co., Columbus, Ohio.

Fred Toy, Cincinnati Gas & Electric Co., Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. J. Tuccinardi, Ohio Boxboard Co., Rittman, Ohio.

C. W. Ufford, Ohio Rubber Co., Willoughby, Ohio.

R. Reid Vance, Secretary, Graphic Arts Federation, Columbus, Ohio.

J. A. Voss, Vice President in Charge of Industrial Relations, Republic Steel Corp., Cleveland, Ohio.

F. W. Weber, Standard Lime & Stone Co., Woodville, Ohio.

Homer J. Weeks, Manager, Safety, Sanitation & Welfare, American Steel & Wire Co., Cleveland, Ohio.

R. M. Weimer, Dayton Rubber Manufacturing Co., Dayton, Ohio.

Roy L. Wesler, Ohio Bell Telephone Co., Columbus, Ohio.

O. W. Wiswell, Executive Secretary, Ohio Coal Conference, Inc., Columbus, Ohio.

Joseph H. Zucker, Cleveland Plain Dealer, Cleveland, Ohio.

Chairman

Chairman
Ohio

Chairman
Dep

Chairman
and

Chairman
Indu

Chairman
Comm

C. G. Bart
H. P. Heyr
T. E. Fenn
Mackin Ke
P. B. Mart
Sidney Smi
James P. S
L. M. Merr
W. M. Mor
George P.
Lewis G. Le
D. M. Ryan
A. -D. Car
W. E. Obet
Geo. Calhou
R. C. Jones
James Fluke
Ben T. Godf
Arnold Bill
A. R. Taubm

Robt. W

LIST OF EXHIBITORS

- Acme Safety Products Co., Akron Ohio
 American-LaFrance-Foamite Corp., Chicago, Ill.
 American Optical Co., Cleveland, Ohio
 A. M. Best Co., New York, N. Y.
 Boyer-Campbell Co., Detroit, Mich.
 Brown Shoe Co., St. Louis, Mo.
 E. D. Bullard Co., Chicago, Ill.
 Burroughs Wellcome & Co. (U. S. A.) Inc., New York, N. Y.
 Carob Products Co., Columbus, Ohio
 H. Childs & Co., Inc., Pittsburgh, Pa.
 ClerSite Co., New York, N. Y.
 M. E. Cunningham Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.
 Davis Emergency Equipment, New York N. Y.
 C. H. Dockson Co., Detroit, Mich.
 The Ericson Mfg. Co., Cleveland, Ohio
 Flohr Mfg. Co., Buffalo, N. Y.
 The Fyr-Fyter Co., Dayton, Ohio
 Goshen Mfg. Co., Goshen, Ind.
 Huntington Laboratories, Inc., Huntington, Ind.
 Industrial Boots & Shoes Co., Lima, Ohio
 Industrial Commission of Ohio, Columbus, Ohio
 Industrial Gloves Co., Danville, Ill.
 Insto-Gas Corp., Detroit, Mich.
 International Shoe Co., St. Louis, Mo.
 Junkin Safety Appliance Co., Inc., Louisville, Ky.
 Keystone View Co., Meadville, Pa.
 Kimball-Safety Products Co., Cleveland, Ohio
 Lehigh Safety Shoe Co., Allentown, Pa.
 Lima Cord Sole & Heel Co., Lima, Ohio
 Martindale Electric Co., Cleveland, Ohio
 Thom McAn Shoe Co., New York, N. Y.
 Melflex Products Co., Akron, Ohio
 Milburn Co., Detroit, Mich.
 Mine Safety Appliances Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.
 M. F. Murdock Co., Akron, Ohio
 National Bronze & Aluminum Co., Cleveland, Ohio
 National Production Co., Detroit, Mich.
 G. H. Packwood Mfg. Co., St. Louis, Mo.
 Panther-Panco Rubber Co., Chelsea, Mass.
 H. W. Peters Co., Columbus, Ohio
 Portable Lamp & Equipment Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.
 Positive Safety Mfg. Co., Cleveland, Ohio
 Proportioneers, Inc., Providence, R. I.
 Pyrene Mfg. Co., Chicago, Ill.
 Safe-T-Grip Device Co., Cincinnati, Ohio
 Safety Clothing Co., Cleveland, Ohio
 Safety Equipment Service Co., Cleveland, Ohio
 Safety First Shoe Co., Holliston, Mass.
 Safety First Supply Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.
 Safway Steel Scaffold of Ohio, Fostoria, Ohio
 Shepherd Safety Shoe Corp., Chicago, Ill.
 A. Smith & Son, Inc., Philadelphia, Pa.
 Standard Safety Equipment Co., Cleveland, Ohio
 Sugar Beet Products Co., Saginaw, Mich.
 Surty Mfg. Co., Chicago, Ill.
 Universal Shoe Mfg. Co., Lynchburg, Va.
 Wiseman Mfg. Co., Dayton, Ohio
 Geo. L. Williams Co., Cleveland, Ohio
 Williams & Co., Inc., Pittsburgh, Pa.
 Williams Jewelry & Mfg. Co., Chicago, Ill.
 Willson Products, Inc., Reading, Pa.
 Wolverine Shoe & Tanning Corp., Rockford, Mich.

OCCUPATIONAL DISEASE HAZARDS — THEIR CAUSE AND CONTROL

Wednesday Afternoon Session

April 17, 1940

This Section of the All Ohio Safety Congress devoted to Occupational Disease Hazards—Their Cause and Control was called to order at 2 o'clock by Dr. Sidney McCurdy, Director, Medical Division, Industrial Commission of Ohio, Columbus, Ohio, Chairman.

Chairman McCurdy: Our meeting will now come to order. We have to discuss a subject that is really momentous. In the state of Ohio recently we have entered a new phase of taking care of people. We have placed the burden upon industry for practically all diseases that are peculiar to the industry in which a man works and which he customarily would not meet and would not be subjected to elsewhere. The history of our occupational disease law up to this point has been that we have carefully selected specific diseases easily capable of proof and named them, and no others were applicable to compensation. I think that was in 1921. In 1928 or 1929 we added six or seven in the same manner, by making them specific, and we went on rather slowly, and somewhat discouragedly, until 1937, when we took our place with others who had been ahead of us in recognizing, specifically, silicosis. Apparently with some fear and trembling we did that, because we stuck around that law some safeguards to limit what might be classed as a previous accrued liability. In any event, we took on silicosis with those safeguards that seemed to protect fairness and merit and in some instances, I fear, we were a bit unfair to the claimant. But there had to be a starting point and we made it in 1937. In 1939 we threw all discretion to the winds, burned our bridges behind us, and took on all diseases not classified hithertofore by name, and which, of course, in this modern day and age is a step in advance. It also introduces the Industrial Commission very definitely in Ohio into the business of preventing diseases as well as accidents. We have done something that is a little bit peculiar in our section. Perhaps it might be classed a trifle experimental. When we took on silicosis, we set up a Board of Medical Referees. Those referees were to be men especially versed upon the subject of silicosis and with special knowledge of it, two of whom could be most any specialist that we desired to choose, but one of whom had to be a roentgenologist. Their opinion was not final, but the cases had to be submitted to them; before the Commission could allow or disallow the claim. As a matter of fact, that silicotic board is made up, I believe, of three as good men as we could get in Ohio, and who have been so recognized in the communities in which they practice. I believe from working with them, that they are dealing with the cases fairly and honestly, but upon a scientific basis. That Board has been obliged, of course, to turn down some, but it has been, I believe fairly liberal in passing those cases that had merit. Remember that Board was not final. But when we took the additional number of twenty-three other diseases, we set up again a new principle in Ohio and, I think, a new principle everywhere,

in that each c
upon medical
fact, and upo
They were fin
had occasion
basis—special
field that we
Toledo or Da
disease contro
made it nece
forty-four. I
wrote to the
telling them
could pay the
the list of the
most of them
in behalf of
so labelled he
public health
their terminol
arise out of.
now have, I
word "occupa
going to discu
the word "occ

Our first
he has been v
head of their
moment, but I
is through, I
stand upon his
if he represe
He must do t
cares to discu
is up, because
limited. I will
very soon. W
first speaker.

national Dises

(Applause)

THE OC

Dr. Smith
medical aspec
asked me to
It was their
certain topics
seldom seen
present statu

in that each claimant who was dissatisfied with the ruling of the Commission, upon medical facts, had a right to appeal to a medical Board, upon a medical fact, and upon the judgment of that Board, the case would be decided. They were final, on medical fact. That is as it stands today. Now we haven't had occasion to use that new Board. I have attempted to set it up on this basis—specialists in each of the larger cities, covering practically every field that we can expect to meet, so that if in Cleveland or Cincinnati or Toledo or Dayton or Columbus, we want to pick a special Board for a skin disease controversy, we can do it without going out of those cities. That made it necessary to select a great many men. I believe the number is forty-four. I think one of the proudest moments in our lives was when I wrote to these men, requesting that they serve upon this new Board, telling them frankly that I couldn't tell them at that time how much we could pay them, but telling them what I wanted them to do and giving them the list of those that I was asking, and not one man turned us down, and most of them wrote, thanking us for the opportunity to render their service in behalf of this new principle. We speak of this whole problem, and it is so labelled here, as "Occupational Disease Hazards." When you get into public health matters, it is spoken of as industrial diseases. I think perhaps their terminology is better than ours, because after all, these cases must arise out of, or in the course of employment. With the liberality that we now have, I think the word "industrial" could well take the place of the word "occupational." At the beginning of this symposium today, we are going to discuss first occupational diseases occurring in Ohio. Let us change the word "occupational" to "industrial" diseases occurring in Ohio.

Our first speaker has had a tremendous amount of experience in that he has been with the State Board of Health for a number of years, at the head of their Occupational Disease Division. I will introduce him in a moment, but I want to state first the rules of the game. After each speaker is through, I will throw it open to discussion. I wish each discussant would stand upon his feet and announce his name and where he comes from and if he represents anybody, I wish he would introduce who he represents. He must do that as many times as he speaks. I shall allow anyone who cares to discuss, five minutes, and I shall be rough when the five minutes is up, because others may want to talk too, and our time is more or less limited. I will rap upon the table or indicate by a sign, he must sign off very soon. With those preliminary remarks, I wish to present to you our first speaker, Dr. Kenneth D. Smith, formerly director of Division of Occupational Diseases, State Department of Health, Columbus, Ohio. Dr. Smith.

(Applause).

THE OCCURRENCE OF OCCUPATIONAL DISEASES IN OHIO

By Kenneth D. Smith, M. D.

Dr Smith: When Mr. Kearns and Dr. Obetz asked me to speak on the medical aspects of Occupational Diseases at this Safety Congress, they asked me to give an informal discussion rather than read a formal paper. It was their opinion, with which I heartily agreed, that I should review certain topics which color the picture of these diseases but which are seldom seen in print and which we quite often neglect. In appraising the present status of these diseases. Therefore, this discussion will be more or

THEIR

Occupational
2 o'clock
Commission

have to
recently
faced the
to the
not meet
Occupational
selected
ers
or
ic,
1937,
gnizing,
id that,
t might
silicosis
rit and
ut there
rew all
on all
in this
dustrial
diseases
peculiar
hen we
referees
special
desired
on was
mission
e board
io, and
ctice. I
s fairly
ged, of
passing
t when

less a hodge-podge of miscellaneous information. I shall not burden you with many statistics. If there are any of these data that you desire in actual figures they can readily be obtained from either the Industrial Commission or the Ohio Department of Health.

Whenever it has fallen to my lot to discuss a subject I have usually consulted the dictionaries for two reasons: I wanted to be sure that I knew what my subject meant to me after I had read the definition given by those who were experts and qualified to tell me; but more important has been my desire not to give an entire discussion which would be erroneous because I had erred in my understanding of the words. I made no exception when the title of this paper was given to me. However, when I read the many definitions of "occurrence" I found among them this: "The act of occurring." Obviously this definition, although correct, takes us to the word "occur" where we find first "to befall, to happen, to take place." Again a correct definition but inadequate here because we do not know the exact number of workers who suffer from occupational diseases because of faulty diagnoses and the wide-spread lack of reliable statistics. The next definition was more to my liking for it stated, "To exist as to being able to be found or seen; to be found; to come under observation;" Here was something to sink my teeth in for we can discuss only those things which are found or come under our observation.

Definitions which adequately and accurately tell us just what occupational diseases are have been the cause of more headaches to the industrial hygienists than the diseases themselves, and I have finally come to the conclusion that these headaches are the most prevalent of occupational diseases.

If we consider occupational diseases from a medical standpoint, a definition would appear to be obvious. Unfortunately, however, except for those specifically occupational illnesses such as certain poisonings, the pneumoconioses, and some infections (such as anthrax), we encounter erroneous reasoning based on a priori reasoning. Diseases now classified as "partly occupational," "industrial illnesses," and other such terms must be clarified.

Weyl insists on the inclusion as occupational diseases not only those illnesses generally caused by the personal activity of the worker, but any frequent manifestation of symptoms affecting a given occupational class. This definition follows closely that of Van den Borgh who believes that "occupational diseases are the consequences of long continued exposures to harmful effects in the exercise of a calling, and that they arise exclusively or with particular frequency amongst the workers in a given industry." Gilbert believes that "those diseases which appear in any given calling with an incidence exceeding the normal, as well as those obviously due to occupational risk," should be considered occupational. Certainly these definitions are open to criticism. The inclusion of the statement that the exposure must of necessity be over a long period of time renders those definitions fallacious when one considers wool-sorter's disease. We must remember that time is relative and whether we call afflictions which follow short exposures accidents or acute specific occupational diseases, the pathology is none the less dangerous and the occupational etiology remains unchanged.

I can't agree with those previously mentioned definitions for two reasons: One is that I saw a case of lead poisoning in a dairyman and a case of silicosis in a hog sorter. Each of these were proved to be correct diagnoses. The dairyman had been soldering milk cans, holding his face

over the cans worked in a were covered an extremely years. Obvious But, of course Mr. Bloomfield silicosis when

Mr. Bloom

Dr. Smith breathing the he danced. I routine entrance

Because which insist manifestation a particular more correct necessarily

Dr. Hay affliction was and I read definition that is true

Certain It is universal natural for defective or violence, with tion of the forest for disease that have occurred in no and all included

It may what diseases good for appreciate and well as

The cause occurs the difficult relation between would arise workers and how the question

We know a half million whom were

burden you with
desire in actual
rial Commission

I have usually
are that I knew
given by those
nt has been my
neous because I
option when the
ne many defini-
of occurring."
word "occur"
Again a correct
xact number of
aulty diagnoses
definition was
le to be found
ere was some-
ings which are

what occupa-
the industrial
come to the
of occupational

a defini-
or those
the pneumo-
inter erroneous
ied as "partly
st be clarified.
not only those
orker, but any
national class.
believes that
I exposures to
ise exclusively
ven industry."
n calling with
tue to occupa-
se definitions
the exposure
se definitions
ust remember
follow short
the pathology
ns unchanged.
ions for two
iryman and a
to be correct
ding his face

over the cans, and had been at this work for quite some time. The hog sorter worked in a stock yard situated on the lake front. The ground and floors were covered with sand and the constant milling of the stock had created an extremely dusty atmosphere. This worker had been employed for many years. Obviously the man incurred his silicosis as the result of his job. But, of course, hog sorters usually don't develop silicosis. Am I correct, Mr. Bloomfield, that we were shown a case of a tap dancer who developed silicosis when we were in Washington in 1936?

Mr. Bloomfield: Perhaps so. I don't recall, Doctor.

Dr Smith: If I recall correctly, this chap had incurred his silicosis by breathing the dust from the sand that was sprinkled on the stage when he danced. He had been a dancer for several years and the exertion of his routine entailed deep breathing.

Because of these facts, I again repeat that I cannot accept definitions which insist that an occupational disease must be one which is a frequent manifestation of a certain calling or that it must arise exclusively, or with a particular frequency within a certain industry. "Wool sorters' disease," or more correctly, Pulmonary Anthrax, proves that the exposure need not necessarily be of long duration.

Dr Hayhurst has long since stated that "an occupational disease is any affliction which is the result of exposure to an industrial health hazard," and I read a paper which had been given by an attorney stating that this definition was too loose. From the standpoint of the legal mind perhaps that is true. I don't know. As a medical man it is not too loose to me.

Certainly we have no quarrels over the definition of the word "disease." It is universally accepted to mean any state of the living body in which the natural functions of the organs are interrupted or disturbed, either by defective or preternatural action, without a disruption of the parts by violence, which is called a wound. I often wonder if we are not in the position of those, if I must use a hackneyed expression, who cannot see the forest for the trees. I believe that an occupational disease, after all, is a disease that can be proved, after the exclusion of any reasonable doubts, to have occurred as a result of hazardous exposures which the worker encountered in no other place but his place of employment. To me that is adequate and all inclusive.

It may seem that I have taken an undue amount of time to discuss what diseases we can blame on the working environment alone, but it is good for us to take the time occasionally for such thought in order to appreciate the problems that confront our compensation boards and courts, and well as the worker and his employer.

~~The next question, obviously, would be: What are the hazards which cause occupational diseases? I shall skip that until later in order to discuss the difficulties which face us when we attempt to determine the exact relation between cause and effect, and pass on to the next questions that would arise. Without exception we all want to know two facts. How many workers are exposed to hazards that might produce occupational diseases and how many cases of occupational diseases occur? No less important is the question: What, specifically, are these diseases.~~

We know from the last census that there were approximately two and a half million gainfully employed people in this state, almost a million of whom were employed in the manufacturing, and mechanical industries and

in extraction of minerals. These three groups are usually known as the heavy industries and health hazards are known to exist in them.

It would seem that if the state required that these diseases be reported in the same manner that contagious diseases are handled our problem of occurrence would obviously be solved. Theory and fact are often not the same. The reporting of any disease believed due to occupation to the State Health Department has been a requirement by law in Ohio for 26 years; compensation has been paid for industrial accidents since 1912, and compensation for certain scheduled occupational diseases has been in effect since 1921. Wherever compensation is paid for occupational diseases, more cases are reported. In Ohio 2,575 cases were reported from the date of the first report (May 15, 1913) to the date when compensation began (August 4, 1921), or an average of 322 cases a year. From the date that compensation began to January 1, 1939 (17.4 years), 23,409 cases have been reported, or an average of 1,245 cases a year. The increase in the number of cases reported when compensation is paid is further shown by the cases of silicosis reported immediately prior to and following the advent of compensation for that disease in Ohio. The law which placed silicosis in the list of compensable diseases became effective July 31, 1937. In 1936, nineteen reports of silicosis were received; in 1937, forty cases, and in 1938, one hundred and forty-one cases.

If we analyze these figures several facts are impressive. Apparently all cases are not reported because of incorrect diagnoses, lack of knowledge concerning reporting, and other reasons, or there must be an extremely small number of actual health hazards in proportion to the great number of workers in this state. It cannot be denied that the influence of compensation on the number of cases reported decreases the value of statistics based on them. Actual field studies have shown that but a small portion of cases are reported. In spite of these disadvantages, reporting is of the utmost importance and should be continued. The field studies, just mentioned, prove that many cases exist unrecognized although work done in large companies proves that the actual incidence is not as great as we would expect. On the other hand, many illnesses are reported as occupational diseases which, on investigation, can be easily proved to have no relation to the work place. When compensation for silicosis was paid, many cases of pulmonary pathology were reported as silicosis and I have received reports wherein the causative agent was given as marble dust, limestone dust, grain, and almost every other substance that is capable of existing in the form of dust.

It is an oddity that such a small amount of consideration has been given to occupational diseases in medical schools, meetings, and public health work. Especially so, since they are not of recent discovery. A discussion of the history of occupational diseases, although interesting, is not of importance here today except to mention that Hippocrates, the father of scientific medicine, called attention to them almost five hundred years B. C., and many other physicians have described, from time to time, some of these afflictions which result from the work processes. Although silicosis is generally considered to be of recent discovery, it was discussed by George Agricola as early as 1556 and a severe outbreak of the acute type occurred in this country in the early part of this century. Extremely noteworthy is the fact that Ramazzini published detailed and amazingly accurate descriptions of the diseases found in more than a hundred occupa-

tions. This but almost

What tional facilities inadequate diseases due to exposure to be denied. gather, the the Silicosis in the press, and consequence rule, unfort

The pi entirely by environmen an individu wise to exp organs if t disorders. race, nation certain sub

The im the most in if the work must of nec welfare eit about the o about eight great haza engages in extra-curr in our com might enco worker spe a moderate

job where not unusua acute mani person's w the pattern

Other tional dises deep breat usually plac to occupati importance a job whe knew that an increase

tions. This momentous report appeared, not within the past few decades, but almost two and half centuries ago!

What factors have been responsible for the apparent neglect of educational facilities and informative material, lack of interest, and our relatively inadequate amount of statistics? It has often been stated that occupational diseases did not touch public appeal because of the fact that, in the majority of cases, they usually manifested themselves only after a long period of exposure to the hazards. Accidents possess a dramatic quality that cannot be denied. The suddenness of occurrence, the excitement, the crowds that gather, the immediate and obvious damage are all impressive. However, the Silicosis Disaster that occurred at Gauley Bridge and the radium poisonings in New Jersey, because of widespread publicity given them by the press, awoke public consciousness that occupational diseases of tragic consequences occurred. Misconceptions are rampant and misconceptions the rule, unfortunately, concerning all phases of these diseases.

The physical and mental health of every man is influenced almost entirely by those two important factors, his innate characteristics and his environment. Inheritance can play an important part in the resistance of an individual against occupational diseases. For example, it is probably not wise to expose a worker to substance which may damage his blood forming organs if there is a family history showing an excessive occurrence of blood disorders. Other innate factors which enter the individual's resistance are race, national extraction, complexion, sex, and individual idiosyncrasies to certain substances.

The importance of environment can certainly not be denied as probably the most important factor which controls everyone's health. Certainly then, if the worker spends a third of each day in his work place, this environment must of necessity exert a most important influence on his physical and mental welfare either for better or for worse. The question naturally arises what about the other two-thirds of the day? As a general rule most workers sleep about eight hours and it is generally considered that sleep presents no great hazards. That leaves us with eight hours during which the worker engages in all kinds of extra-curricular pursuits. The importance of these extra-curricular activities has not been given the prominence that it deserves in our consideration of an individual's resistance to a hazard that he might encounter at work. As a concrete example I might state that if this worker spends much of his time in the corner beer parlor and does even a moderate amount of elbow bending he has no business working on a job where he may be exposed to many substances used in industry. It is not unusual for as small amount as one glass of beer to precipitate an acute mania among nitro-glycerin addicts. It is evident, therefore, that a person's working environment and his spare time have combined to weave the pattern of his health.

Other factors which play important roles in the development of occupational diseases are age, long hours of fatiguing work, hard work entailing deep breathing, uncomfortable postures, and all those factors which we usually place in our safety considerations but which one seldom hears applies to occupational diseases. The previous medical history of a worker is of importance also, for instance we would not want to place an employee in a job where he would have the slightest amount of lead exposure if we knew that he has recurrent gastric ulcers. The individual's susceptibility, or an increased sensitiveness to even small amounts of a certain substance

has been responsible on occasions for poisonings and particularly for dermatitis among workers.

I realize that many of you possibly expected me to devote a great deal of this discussion to various specific occupational diseases with a detailed account of their symptoms and the occupations and industries wherein they occurred. I know that a few of you have expected me to interrelate the specific occupational diseases with the so-called "partly occupational diseases," quote industrial complaints and conditions and the relation of certain industries and occupations to increased incidents of certain diseases not ordinarily considered as of occupational origin. However, because of the limitations of time and the title of my paper, it is impossible for me to discuss anything but specific occupational diseases. If we were to diverge into the subject of the entire field of industrial health, we could hold as many sessions and have as many meetings as the program of this Safety Congress contains, and then we would have merely scratched the surface.

We have previously stated that the requirement of reporting of occupational diseases is of great assistance in solving the problem of their prevention, even though these reports are inadequate and the diagnoses often questionable. It is natural to ask why we do not study these industries and the workmen therein, thus giving us a complete picture of not only specific hazards, but also their effects upon the employees. This is probably the dream of every person interested in industrial health. However, the magnitude of such a procedure renders it impossible for such a study to give authentic results unless we had the services of hundreds of scientists. It would be necessary to take specific and detailed scientific analyses of the work places for all the hazards that might possibly exist there. It would be necessary for the physician to examine each individual worker, to take a complete medical history, and to do the necessary laboratory and X-ray examination. In addition, when we realize that these examinations of both the worker and his work place must be checked not once but many times at specified intervals to determine an average, we begin to see the impossibility of such a procedure. These repeated checks are necessary in the face of the fact that both the working environment and the resistance of the wage earner varies from hour to hour, day to day, week to week, and season to season.

However, we can measure the potentialities of our health hazards by taking a cross section of industry and by what one might call observations learn the processes where one might expect the possibility of hazardous exposure. This procedure must be done by a scientific sampling process to secure a proper balance of plants which had good environments to counteract the opinions formed from those establishments which did not have healthful environments. It was my privilege to participate in such a survey when the Ohio Department of Health made a study which covered more than 3,000 establishments in the heavy industries and analyzed the working environment of 300,000 jobs for potential health hazards. This study also included the recording of control measure when present, welfare facilities such as full time or part time physicians, plant hospital, nursing service, safety directors, shop committees, insurance service and others.

The advantages of such a survey are that we are able to evaluate the potential hazards by listing them as exposures, and to know where dangerous exposures may occur. The greatest value is in the fact that one who has been warned concerning a danger is much more apt to be on guard.

Please keep in mind the encounter trouble in a

The disadvantage of often forget that no assure to any material only that the worker is are used or created. C cise medical engineering the worker can one ever worker.

Thus far I have discussed of occupational diseases amount of actual hazard of the inadequacy of of information obtained eases occur from day reported each year, and by five or ten times. epidemiological standards half million workers in

Although these because of comparative severe or fatal nature great importance of an opening for better disaster and the New the same manner poor health of workers. axiomatic that health that a healthy work profits, there is less ways great in an expense entailed in workmen have spent paid for themselves programs that we occupational diseases and favorable influences

Because I have discussing the factors occupational diseases, almost nothing concerning there is much to be that we must have we discuss these diseases which sometimes clear of the difficulties the the true relationship

In discussing the and effect it is not which are responsible an acceptable definition

Please keep in mind the word "potential" for without that word we could encounter trouble in a great number of ways.

The disadvantage of such a study, should it be published, is that readers often forget that no attempt was made to evaluate the extent of the exposure to any material listed, and the potential hazards or exposures indicate only that the worker is employed in an environment in which such substances are used or created. One should keep in mind at all times that only by precise medical engineering and chemical examinations of the workplace and the worker can one evaluate the extent of the exposure or its effect upon the worker.

Thus far I have discussed only the factors which bear on the appearance of occupational diseases and methods of approaching an evaluation of the amount of actual hazard that might be present in Ohio industries. Because of the inadequacy of occupational disease reports received and the paucity of information obtainable no one knows how many specific occupational diseases occur from day to day. However, if we take the number that is reported each year, and never more than 2000 a year is reported, and multiply by five or ten times, it is at once obvious that their importance from an epidemiological standpoint is not great in comparison to the two and one-half million workers in the state.

Although these specific occupational diseases may not be important, because of comparative rarity, we must not forget that every case of a severe or fatal nature is a tragedy to that worker and his dependents. The great importance of occupational disease is that it is a wedge that makes an opening for better industrial health programs. It took the Gauley Bridge disaster and the New Jersey radium poisonings to awake the public. In the same manner poisoning is often followed by programs to improve the health of workers. The benefits of such programs are manifold. It is axiomatic that healthy workmen do more and better work. We also know that a healthy worker is less accident-prone, the employer makes better profits, there is less chance of litigation and claims. Labor turnover is always great in an unhealthy environment. Certainly industry realizes the expense entailed in training new men, particularly in trades where expert workmen have spent years in training. Better health programs have always paid for themselves both in money and happiness and it is only through such programs that we can hope to increase our knowledge of the partly occupational diseases and of those adverse environmental conditions which exert unfavorable influences on health.

Because I have taken such a great portion of the time allotted to me in discussing the factors which are important in the occurrence of specific occupational diseases, I hope I have not given you the opinion that we know almost nothing concerning them. This field is no exception, however, for there is much to be learned in all the medical sciences. It is certainly logical that we must have a clear understanding of the difficulties facing us before we discuss these diseases. Another reason for my dwelling on the difficulties which sometimes cloud the picture is that we are all agreed on the enormity of the difficulties that face the compensation boards and courts in evaluating the true relationship between cause and effect.

In discussing the specific occupational diseases from a standpoint of cause and effect it is natural that one should properly classify various hazards which are responsible. An acceptable classification is in the same class with an acceptable definition of the term "occupational diseases". Without excep-

tion the classifications have in general followed the physical characteristics which make up the hazard.

In this classification that I am presenting the first item includes any health hazard which can be classed as a material substance. In other words, it consists of matter. We can subdivide this classification into two main subdivisions, the first of which we might call the non-living substances. Here we find the poisons, irritants, and asphyxiants, such as gases, fumes, mists, vapors, dusts, liquids, and solids. Some of these may act as true poisons when they have been absorbed into the body. Various types of gases are good examples of the difference in actions. For instance, one gas, such as hydrogen sulfide, is a distinct tissue poison, another, carbon monoxide is a chemical asphyxiant in that it displaces the oxygen ordinarily carried by the red blood cells. A third, methane, would be classed as a simple mechanical asphyxiant if it replaced the oxygen in the air to the point where the oxygen supply was not high enough to sustain life. Material substances can also cause occupational diseases because of pressure and friction, causing in the case of pressure, prepatellar bursitis, or "housemaid's knee". The poisons encountered which may cause occupational diseases belong to a group of material substances and exist in one of the forms mentioned above. It is probably timely to mention that there are two very important considerations that we should discuss at this time. Industrial poisonings occur chiefly as the result of entrance of the toxic substance responsible into the body through the respiratory system. Poisoning resulting from absorption through the skin is probably next frequent and those poisonings resulting from ingestions of toxic compounds are least frequently encountered. The other consideration is the fact that the clinical symptoms displayed in most cases of industrial poisoning are usually almost entirely unlike those symptoms seen in acute poisonings where large doses have been swallowed or breathed, for example with suicide intent. A good example of this can be seen by comparing the symptoms which follow the ingestion of a large amount of a mercury compound such as bichloride of mercury. Our patient here presents almost immediately the picture of profound shock with a fast and thready pulse, cold and clammy skin which is pale. The patient is usually in collapse with dull and apathetic mental reactions. In "Hatters' Shakes" a chronic form of mercury poisoning seen in the manufacture of felt, we see an entirely different symptom complex. Symptoms do not usually appear until within five years of exposure and are characterized by psychic or emotional changes, muscular tremors, and inflammation of the mouth.

I believe it pertinent to mention at this time that silicosis which as we all know is the result of long exposure to free silica in the form of a fine dust may be classed as the result of exposure to a hazard belonging in this group. We may further state that all evidence seems to show that the cellular response to silica is probably due to a chemical reaction rather than because of the sharp edges of the dust particles. Evidence of this can be seen by the fact that diamond dust and the dust of the harder artificial abrasives do not cause the formation of pathology such as seen in silicosis.

Other harmful exposures that are classed as living material substances are the bacteria, fungi, and parasites.

The next agent in our classification of potential causes of occupational diseases is thermal in character. Here we find extremes in temperature, extreme temperature change, and possibly, temperature and humidity.

Another large to radiant energy, infra-red rays, X-might also include.

Abnormal atmospheric workers, and related encountered by various diseases.

Fatigue, part many cases of te operators is alleged.

It is only natural might be responsible we have actually use a summary of Department of Health trial Commission compensable diseases reports of compensated to be due most outstanding comprises about we have reached frequency of a departmental Commission that there has been the other hand, to be incurable a expense. Lead poisoning cases and in turn mately the same.

Chromosomal ulcers with the small that during that or radium poisoning compensable diseases in Ohio due to of this disease, the reports that ported in Ohio, for period. Not one from 68 cases all down to 2 cases that for many when two cases in numbers, most that these report list of diseases in face of our new

Since we have want me to say

Another large group of exposures is that one which includes exposure to radiant energy. In this we can include visible spectrum, ultra-violet rays, infra-red rays, X-rays, radium, and radio-active substances, and possibly one might also include noise.

Abnormal atmospheric pressure such as encountered by divers and caisson workers, and relatively frequent changes in atmospheric pressure such as encountered by aviators may be responsible also for specific occupational diseases.

Fatigue, particularly from rapidly repetitive motions is responsible for many cases of tenosynovitis. A disease affecting the elbows of air hammer operators is alleged to be due to vibration.

It is only natural that it would follow our discussion of exposures which might be responsible for specific occupational diseases with what diseases we have actually had reported in Ohio. As a basis for the frequency I shall use a summary of reports received during the decade 1928 to 1937 by the Ohio Department of Health. These were chosen rather than data from the Industrial Commission in view of the fact that both the compensable and non-compensable diseases are included. This group is comprised of almost 13,000 reports of compensable diseases together with several hundred diseases alleged to be due to occupation although not compensable at that time. The most outstanding feature in our review of these cases is that dermatitis comprises about two-thirds of all cases reported. I believe that at this point we have reached the best time to call attention to the difference between the frequency of a disease and the severity of it. I am informed by the Industrial Commission that nearly all cases of dermatitis reported to it indicate that there has been no time lost by nearly all of the workers afflicted. On the other hand, a patient suffering from manganese poisoning is conceded to be incurable and may remain an invalid for many years incurring much expense. Lead poisoning was next in frequency with almost fifteen hundred cases and in turn was followed by tenosynovitis of the wrist with approximately the same number of cases.

Chromo ulcerations headed the remaining compensable diseases reported with the small total of less than 400 or about three percent. It is pertinent that during that period no cases of glanders, manganese dioxide poisoning, or radium poisoning were reported although they were on the list of compensable diseases. No evaluation can be made of the occurrence of silicosis in Ohio due to the enormous increase in reports following compensability of this disease, as well as, the erroneous agents blamed for this disease in the reports that were received. Of the remaining occupational diseases reported in Ohio, poisonings comprise a total of less than 900 for the ten year period. Not one of these agents caused one hundred cases. They ranged from 68 cases alleged to be due to benzol or its amino- or nitro- derivatives down to 2 cases alleged to be due to phosphorus. It is interesting to note that for many years no reports were received on anthrax until recently when two cases were reported. Among the infections tularemia is increasing in numbers, most of the cases being found in butchers. Please bear in mind that these reports were received during the period when Ohio had a scheduled list of diseases which were compensable. What the future will bring, in the face of our new all-inclusive Act is not known.

Since we have a little time left, Dr. McCurdy, I am wondering if you want me to say anything about silicosis. I think a great many of the men

al characteristics

em includes any

In other words,

to two main sub-

stances. Here

es, fumes, mists,

as true poisons

es of gases are

ne gas, such as

n monoxide is a

y carried by the

mple mechanical

here the oxygen

stances can also

causing in the

" The poisons

to a group of

ned above. It is

nt considerations

ur chiefly as the

se body through

on through the

from ingestions

ne sideration

industrial

seen in acute

ed, for example

v comparing the

a mercury com-

ents almost im-

eady pulse, cold

llapse with dull

chronic form of

entirely different

within five years

anges, muscular

sis which as we

form of a ne

belonging in this

x that the cellu-

ion rather than

this can be seen

tificial abrasives

ecosis.

terial substances

of occupational

temperature, ex-

umidity.

here are vitally interested in this and there are a great number of misconceptions concerning this disease.

Chairman McCurdy: I think all the men would be interested in it, if you will speak up good and loud.

Doctor Smith: I believe that we should mention first that various types of reactions are produced by the different kinds of dusts. Toxic systemic diseases may follow the inhalation of poisonous dusts such as lead, cadmium, and arsenic. Allergic symptoms may follow the inhalation of certain dusts. A good example of this reaction may be found in the occurrence of asthma in workers who inhale cotton dust. Although some writers include metal fume fever, or "founders' shakes" as the result of the inhalation of zinc fumes and class fumes as a dust, I have never liked fumes being classed as dust. Technically, perhaps, that is true. To me the dusts, as we think of them in industry, are generated mechanically and fumes are the result of subjecting the metals to heat. Any dust, if the concentration in the air becomes great enough may cause irritation of the upper respiratory system and bronchitis. We are not concerned with any of these dusts, however, and shall not mention them except here. They are of no importance in a discussion on silicosis except to call attention to them in passing.

The first and foremost thing that we should remember about silicosis is that it can only be produced by free silica. Silica, or silicon dioxide, has the chemical formula, SiO_2 , or in other words two atoms of oxygen have united with one atom of silicon. When we speak of silicosis we usually refer to the chronic form that follows many years of exposure to the dust. In foundry workers, for example, the disease does not usually manifest itself until the worker has been exposed to a harmful concentration fifteen, twenty, or thirty years.

The words, "Pneumoconiosis" and "Silicosis", have often been used interchangeably, although incorrectly. Pneumoconiosis means a dusted lung or a disease of the lungs caused by breathing dust. Therefore, it includes silicosis as one of the pneumoconioses. Asbestos is also a pneumoconiosis.

You are all familiar with the definition of silicosis that is given in our law: "Silicosis shall mean a disease of the lungs caused by breathing silica dust (silicon dioxide) producing fibrous nodules and distributed through the lungs and demonstrated by x-ray examinations or by autopsy."

Obviously, only dust from material composed in whole or in part of free silica can cause the disease. Quartz is almost synonymous with silica. Sand is almost one hundred percent silica. Sandstone and granite contain varying amounts. I should mention, too, that the silica in granite is present as free silica mixed with the other constituents and not joined chemically. When free silicon dioxide, or silica, joins and forms a chemical compound by uniting with sodium, potassium, aluminum, and the other bases, we know these compounds and combinations as silicates. At the present time only one silicate is known to cause a disabling fibrosis of the lungs. This silicate is asbestos and the disease resulting is called asbestosis. It is interesting to note that silica enters into the composition of many rocks and that about sixty percent of the crust of the earth is composed of these.

I believe that it is certainly of importance to name a few substances which we have had reported to us on occupational disease report forms and which have never been known to cause the disease. Among these are marble, limestone, carborundum and other artificial abrasives, rock wool, glass wool, gypsum, cement, coke, and soapstone. Coal, either anthracite or bituminous,

will not cause silica.

The size of particles of less than (1/1000 inch) are of interest. Those of less than 1/1000 inch are, the concentration of million particles the upper safe limit. A part of the composition of silica is decreased by the composition of the dust which enters the action of the

Let us take the nature has given assistance. Both may act as traps. The pipe responds to those microscopic up so that it is enters the nose

If the part tack upon it through the wa pendent motion foreign body. way through the lymphatic system dust cell process of such system body. One system the lungs. The of the lung, or the bronchial tu enter the lung. killed by the action that point. This area result markings since reaction can be and occurs where tissue, or scar however. The which under the an onion has cells die in the the flow is blocking the lymphatic the fibrous nodules due to their over

will not cause silicosis without an admixture of hard rock which contains silica.

The size of the dust particles is of great importance. Only those particles of less than ten microns (a micron equals approximately 1/25,000th inch) are of importance and it has been stated recently that probably only those of less than three microns are of importance. The smaller these particles are, the greater is the hazard increased. Of equal importance is the concentration of these particles in the air. It is generally conceded that five million particles of a diameter not to exceed 10 microns per cubic foot is the upper safe limit in the case of pure silica. However, if the silica is but a part of the composition of the dust, this limit is increased as the percentage of silica is decreased as a general rule. We do not yet know what effect that the composition of the non siliceous dust, or rather I should say that portion of the dust which is not free silica, has in the acceleration or inhibition of the action of the free silica.

Let us take a look at just what happens when dust is breathed. First, nature has given us other protective devices in addition to our natural resistance. Both the shape of the nose and the mucous in the nose and throat may act as traps. In addition, the ciliated mucous membrane of the windpipe responds automatically when the smallest foreign body touches it and those microscopic finger-like cilia contract rhythmically to force the particle up so that it is coughed up. It is believed that only about half the dust that enters the nose reaches the lung.

If the particle is small enough to enter the air sac it stimulates the attack upon it by the "dust cells" or "wandering cells" which pass from or through the wall of the air sac. These phagocytic cells are capable of independent motion and their function is to ingest or surround any microscopic foreign body. After the cell has ingested the silica particle it makes its way through the wall of the air sac and enters the lymph channel. The lymphatic system has been called the sewage system of the body and the dust cell proceeds along with the flow of the lymph. The lung possesses two of such systems which are often called the third circulatory system of the body. One system drains to the pleural surface, this membrane which covers the lungs. The other system, following the blood vessels drains to the hilum of the lung, or that structure near the heart in the center of the chest where the bronchial tube divides into smaller tubes and where the large blood vessels enter the lung. After the dust cell has proceeded along this channel it is killed by the action of the silica and the formation of scar tissue begins at that point. The irritation which has been set up causes a tissue increase in this area resulting in what is known as an exaggeration of the peribronchial markings since the lymphatics surround these tube and blood vessels. This reaction can be seen in the X-ray but is not limited to the silicotic process and occurs whenever there is an irritation or infection in tissue. The fibrous tissue, or scar tissue, which forms where the dust cell dies is characteristic, however. The scar tissue cells form in a circular nodule, the appearance of which under the microscope is not unlike the layer formation one sees when an onion has been cut through. As more dust is breathed and more dust cells die in the lymph channels the flow of the lymph is disturbed until when the flow is blocked no more dust cells can enter the channel. Instead of entering the lymphatic channels the dust cells die on the walls of the air sacs and the fibrous nodule forms there. All these nodules tend to grow and in time, due to their overlapping or fusing, we find massive areas of scar tissue. Due

er of miscon-

ested in it, if

various types
toxic systemic
lead, cadmium,
certain dusts,
ence of asthma
include metal
lation of zinc
ng classed as
s we think of
the result of
in the air be-
ratory system
however, and
e in a discus-

out silicosis is
n dioxide, has
oxygen have
usually refer
the dust. In
manifest itself
if twenty,

ed inter-
ed lung or a
includes sili-
noconiosis.

s given in our
reathing silica
d through the

n part of free
n silica. Sand
contain vary.
is present as
nically. When
ound by unit-
ve know these
only one sili-
This silicate is
interesting to
nd that about

few substances
ort forms and
se are marble,
ol, glass wool,
or bituminous.

to the encroachment of this scar tissue on the tubes which lead to the air sacs, we find a condition called emphysema which is due to the otherwise normal air sacs between the scar tissue expanding in size. All this process takes many years to reach the stage where we find the large conglomerate areas of scar tissue. Death is usually due to an intercurrent infection in the lungs such as tuberculosis or pneumonia. In fact death from uncomplicated silicosis is so rare that it is considered an oddity and some investigators declare that it does not occur. Other investigators have claimed that the large masses do not form unless there is infection, although general observation does not show this to be the case.

There are no characteristic complaints or findings on physical examination that are not found in many other diseases. The patient must show an exposure to silica for several years and an X-ray examination is considered to be the most important factor in establishing a diagnosis. Post mortem examination of the lungs clinches the diagnosis, of course.

If one understands the underlying changes that take place, he can readily understand the changes seen in X-rays taken at various intervals of time. In the X-ray film we note the hilum, which I previously mentioned, in the central part of the chest near the upper part of the shadow cast by the heart. We can understand the changes that occur as the disease begins and progresses if we compare the appearance of the films to the changes which occur in bushes or trees when spring comes. In the healthy chest we see the hilum giving the appearance of the trunk of the tree where the large branches appear. These branches, in turn divide as they pass outward into the lung tissue until they fade entirely before they reach the pleural portion of the lung. In early, or first stage silicosis, we find an increase in the trunk and a generalized irregular exaggeration of the linear markings of the smaller branches together with the appearance of tiny discrete nodules of uniform size and evenly distributed throughout the central portions of the lungs. These nodules are not unlike the appearance of tiny buds on the tree. In the typical cases the extreme top, or apex of the lung; the outer areas; and the lower portion, or base, characteristically show few nodules. As the disease progresses the nodules increase in size and the linear markings are intensified by contrast. When the nodules exceed 6 millimeters in size and when conglomerate masses are seen, we have advanced, or third stage silicosis with some loss in the appearance of the lateral markings. In our tree we can say that the buds have burst forth into leaves and the clusters of the leaves have obscured the branches in some areas. I might state, too, ~~that the conglomerate areas can assume almost any shape and appear in almost any area of the lung. They can extend outwards from the hilum, or be wedge shaped and extend in from the pleura, or they can appear as tumor-like masses deep in the lung tissue. All these changes described can occur in uninfected, or properly called simple, silicosis.~~ Infection can occur during any stage and I shall not attempt to discuss it for the experts are quite often misled by the many forms and patterns that can occur. Neither shall I discuss differential diagnosis except to say that many diseases such as miliary tuberculosis, certain fungus infections, cancer, multiple calcified nodules of healed tuberculosis, and others may simulate the appearance. Simple, or uninfected silicosis, does not produce fever, however.

We have been speaking of the chronic silicosis which we designate silicosis unless specified otherwise. In the Gayley Bridge tunneling cases we had what is usually called acute silicosis although we prefer to call it rapidly

developing silicosis seen in pneumoconiosis than many years of tuberculosis.

Most autopsies of silicosis are convincing and are appraised carefully. Silicosis in the same person as silicosis occurs is free of silicosis.

There has been in the susceptibility to pneumonia is independent of the lymphatic system of the disease, with the result of the expanded

To estimate the natural resistance of the lung to repeated exposure to dust. What protection is afforded by the functioning of the lungs, dust collection, physical examination, the X-ray examination.

In conclusion, to the victim of the disease, the cause of most of the

Chairman, we should keep control of the situation will clear up

I wish to see of arranging was present the occupation of Donnelly, Se

Mr. Donnelly participated in floor from 1910 proper silicosis compensation

Now of beginning with forcing the

developing silicosis. Here the appearance of the lungs was more like that seen in pneumonias and these cases developed in the period of months rather than many years. Some men have expressed the opinion that they were all tuberculosis. How correct they were, I do not know.

Most authorities state that the silicotic is more susceptible to tuberculous infection and that most deaths in silicotics are due to it. Not all of us are convinced of this, however, when all the evidence is brought out and appraised carefully. I might mention that there are two terms often misused. Silicotuberculosis means that the tuberculosis and silicosis are present in the same portion of tissue: Silicosis with tuberculosis is that state where silicosis occurs in the lungs with the tuberculosis affecting lung tissue that is free of silicosis, and the silicotic tissue is free of infection.

There has been much argument concerning the role that silicosis plays in the susceptibility to pneumonia. Our greatest factor in resistance to pneumonia is considered usually to be the antibody content of the blood which is independent of silicosis or lung tissue. However, whether the blockage of the lymphatic channels, which are so important in the resistance to infection of any tissue, plays any great part, I cannot say. Also, whether the outcome of the disease is influenced by the scar tissue replacing normal lung tissue with the resultant loss of that lung tissue and the compensation because of the expanded air sacs that remain, is a moot question.

To estimate the disability one should know several things. What has been the nature and extent of the exposure? What has been the individual resistance of the particular worker to that exposure as shown by repeated examinations, and particularly when these examinations have been compared to repeated examinations of other workers who have had the same exposure? What protective devices were used and were these maintained properly and functioning efficiently? The answer to these questions entail precise histories, dust counts, and much other study. In addition there must be a careful physical examination and an X-ray or several X-rays. The technique of the X-ray exposure must be flawless or misleading factors enter.

In conclusion, we can say with assurance that silicosis is of importance to the victim, and I do not care how far it has advanced, only when it is the cause of change in his ordinary way of living. I believe that covers most of the important medical aspects. Is the picture clear?

Chairman McCurdy: I think in discussing this, if there is any discussion, we should keep away from discussing at this time anything to do with the control of the occupational disease hazard because Dr. Bloomfield probably will clear up those points that are troubling you.

~~I wish to open this discussion with a man who sired this whole business of arranging for an occupational disease law. He not only sired it, but he was present at its birth. I would like to hear first upon the evolution of the occupational disease law as it stands today. My good friend, Mr. Tom Donnelly, Secretary of the Ohio Federation of Labor.~~

Mr. Donnelly: I didn't expect to participate in a discussion, because I participated for so many years before the General Assembly. I was on the floor from 1921 until 1939, before we finally got what we thought was the proper silicosis and occupational disease law in connection with workmen's compensation.

Now of course we have had a great many battles about silicosis. At the beginning we were told that if we compensated for silicosis, we would be forcing the employer into compensating for diseases that really had no rela-

tion to the silicosis, because we would be compensating for consumption and pneumonia and a number of other things. Fortunately about the time the Act reached its greatest strength, I believe, the medical profession discovered there was a manner in which they could take X-rays of lungs and from the X-rays they could show whether the person was suffering from silicosis causing the disability or from something else. Now of course I presume in the old hand tool days, with the small objects and everything and before we had gone into different chemical industries and we used so many different kinds of metals in industry, that there was very little occupational disease such as we know it today. Of course as a representative of the Ohio State Federation of Labor, it has been my duty to endeavor to have the compensation laws in Ohio changed from time to time to meet new situations which we thought required the application of workmen's compensation principles to disabilities and deaths. I am rather at a loss what more to say, except that I have had a great passion over a number of years to bring the representatives of industry and labor together here upon the question of legislation.

There is really no excuse for the occupational disease law we got in 1921, when industry and the representatives of labor could just as well have agreed upon a real occupational disease compensation bill. Now if you have observed the history of this country, as well as the history of this state, you certainly must have observed the progressive side of this proposition, speaking generally from the side of Labor. It has been upon the side of Labor, because it was the laboring people that were getting hurt and getting killed by industrial accidents and by industrial diseases. Naturally the man who is not working in those places and does not contract those things, can't be as progressive, you might say, in trying to present to the General Assembly of Ohio laws that will compensate, nor will he be quite so arduous, in many cases, to see that these hazards are removed by engineering methods.

Now, silicosis has got everybody pretty well scared about this time all over the United States and there has been a great deal of it registered since we had compensation for it. I served on a committee, governmental committee, some few years ago, in which we made a report to show that much of these dust diseases, like many other diseases of industry, can be to a large extent controlled and to some extent eliminated, so that industry will not have to bear the cost of compensating for a lot of diseases that are caused by dust.

Of course there are many dusts beside silica dust. As I said before, I hope to live long enough—I am getting pretty well to the end of the road—I hope to live long enough that when these laws are put on the statute books, some situations as have come up in relation to occupational disease, workmen's compensation, perhaps unemployment insurance, perhaps something else, that the persons who are affected vitally by it, industry and labor, will have common sense enough to sit down around a table and work it out, rather than put it into the Legislature of the state where there is not one man, perhaps, in ten, who understands the problem you are trying to solve.

Chairman McCurdy: Thank you very much, Mr. Donnelly. Now the opening talk is opened for discussion by anybody. I am going to call upon one more man and one man only, to start the scientific discussion, if you care to call it that, although it must not be limited to that. You should ask the questions you want to know. Dr. Hayhurst, who was so many years with our Board of Health, perhaps will open the discussion.

Dr. Hayhurst: prepare anything that Dr. Smith of his points, is cated. The speci partly occupation and through, whe workers, for insta that there are fro develop it. As p apt to get it, so t years of age begi allowed us to say without mentioni that we must have we can control the ease problem, but

Mr. Benedict: whether exposure t any effect upon the

Chairman McC

Dr. Smith: The dust, whether it is dust up to a hundr upper respiratory entered the field in of chest of electri Ensler reported tha they fooled the exp a deposit of pigment of these cases. The an accident or an i

Does that answ

Mr. Benedict:)

Chairman McCu:

to learn, and ask the

H. H. Henry, O

a deposit or the effe

a similar nodulation

more susceptible to

deposit? I probably

Chairman McCu:

the last article upon

upon the lungs which

other words it did no

seem to quicken the

Dr. Bloomfield?

Dr. Bloomfield:)

as aluminum oxide e:

have been made whic

the lungs associated

consumption and about the time the profession discovered lungs and from silicosis. I presume in 1921, we got in 1921, well have agreed if you have observed this state, you can't be in many methods. I said before, I don't of the road—statute books, disease, work—perhaps something industry and labor, and work it out, there is not one trying to solve. nelly. Now the ing to call upon discussion, if you You should ask so many years

Dr. Hayhurst: Dr. McCurdy, and those present: I haven't had time to prepare anything or see the thing through, from the very large coverage that Dr. Smith gave to his subject. My general experience, if I got one of his points, is that occupational diseases are not as frequent as he indicated. The specific occupational diseases are rather rare. Those that are partly occupational are pretty extensive. I doubt, taking it all through and through, whether more than twenty-five or twenty-eight per cent of all workers, for instance, exposed to silica, will develop silicosis, which means that there are from 70 to 75 per cent of those equally exposed who will not develop it. As persons get older, particularly with silica, they are more apt to get it, so that we find as many as half of those who are over forty years of age beginning to work with silica who develop it. I wish you had allowed us to say a word about the controlling feature. I can't sit down, without mentioning something which I think is very essential, and that is that we must have pre-employment and periodic health examinations, before we can control the health problem in industry, not only the occupational disease problem, but the health problem.

Mr. Benedict, the Aluminum Company of America: I just wondered whether exposure to large volumes of dust, as for instance iron oxide, have any effect upon the respiratory system.

Chairman McCurdy: Dr. Smith, can you answer that at this time?

Dr. Smith: There have been various limits set for any dust as a nuisance dust, whether it is health hazardous or not. When we get in the nuisance dust up to a hundred million particles per cubic foot, we run the danger of upper respiratory irritation, and of bronchitis. However, iron oxide has entered the field in another way. There have been pictures, X-ray pictures of chest of electric welders, electric welders using bare electrodes. Dr. Ensler reported that the pictures were perfect pictures of silicosis; in fact, they fooled the experts. The nodules are not due to scar tissue, but due to a deposit of pigmentation of the iron. No disablement has ever followed any of these cases. The case I am thinking of was autopsied because of, I think, an accident or an intercurrent disease of some kind.

Does that answer your question?

Mr. Benedict: Yes.

Chairman McCurdy: Come forth with any questions of things you want to learn, and ask them.

H. H. Henry, Otis Steel Co., Cleveland: Does the nodulation caused by a deposit or the effect on the lung—I understand, as you stated, it results in a similar nodulation to the silica condition—does that throw the one affected more susceptible to a subsequent infection, as I understand it, from a silica deposit? I probably worded that a little clumsy.

Chairman McCurdy: I think I can say, if everybody agrees with me, the last article upon the subject seemed to indicate this arc welder's dust upon the lungs which appeared like silicosis did not behave like silicosis. In other words it did not seem to be a cause of death or incapacity and did not seem to quicken the action of other sicknesses. Will you agree with that, Dr. Bloomfield?

Dr. Bloomfield: I don't know so much about the arc welders, but as far as aluminum oxide exposure, which the gentleman also asked about, studies have been made which indicate there is apparently no disabling fibrosis of the lungs associated with aluminum oxide exposure.

Chairman McCurdy: Recently in talking with the Medical Director of Ontario, I discovered that they are experimenting with aluminum in an endeavor to diminish the activity of silica dioxide. That might be all right, but in the present state of our knowledge, it probably will be wiser to pursue the course that Dr. Gardner recommends, get rid of the dust and then you won't have to give something to overcome the possible ill effects of the dust. Have we other questions on this general subject?

Dr. Smith: Dr. McCurdy, isn't it quite an explosive hazard in the way they use that dust as a protective feature, or not?

Chairman McCurdy: That I can't tell you.

Chairman McCurdy: Will you give us your name please?

Philip Carey: I was just wondering if you had any experience of pneumonia from a sudden dust condition such as an explosion, where you might have dust for a minute or two, possibly hot dust?

Dr. Smith: I believe there is such a thing as dust pneumonia. As I mentioned, the acute silicosis cases are probably that. I don't recall, except cadmium salt, but we know that many irritating fumes and gases cause pneumonia. We know, for instance, that a person who had been overcome by carbon monoxide which was a part of smoke, quite often developed pneumonia afterwards during his recovery. Does that answer your question?

Mr. Carey: Yes, sir.

Mr. Gordon Richardson: Can cases of silicosis be permanently stopped if the patient is taken from the dust-laden atmosphere?

Dr. Smith: I don't know that you could say. In general they usually tend to progress, probably, from the start. Dr. Hayhurst could probably answer that question.

Dr. Hayhurst: Yes, for two years.

Mr. Shaffer of Dayton: The thing that is given the greatest attention is the occupational dermatitis. I think if Dr. Smith would just give us an idea of what he would classify as an occupational dermatitis, and how we can differentiate that from other skin ailments we come in contact with, it would be a big help. A few years ago we put great faith in the patch test. Now I am told by the skin specialists it isn't worth the trouble of going through it. What are you going to believe? You have something diagnosed as eczema. There is no such thing as eczema. In industry it is all occupational dermatitis. I am at a loss, being in this work, to know how you are going to come to the conclusion of what is a skin occupational disease as such.

Dr. Smith: I imagine the first procedure would be to remove the person from that job to see if the thing disappears and then put him back on it to see if it recurs again. That would suggest itself first to me. I am reminded of a series of cases, I believe McCord reported, in which a whole group of employees of one company developed a dermatitis. They looked everywhere and couldn't find any cause for it in the plant. It developed these men had started a community garden and they were getting it from materials used in the garden. It is easy to be misled, I will grant you. Dermatitis is a headache all right.

Chairman McCurdy: Are there some other questions?

Mr. Donnelly: I would like to ask one question in relation to dermatitis. It is well known but it might be well to bring it out. Isn't it true machine

shops and other places, dermatitis, through

Chairman McCurdy: I think there are which use oils over in trying to study it appeared at that time oil to start with, but particularly in those in those industries where machinery were kept but what we all fear from cutting oils.

Dr. Smith: As years dermatitis, as I know, the greatest cutting compounds. where they had an pounds, and men cut piece of waste or the oil has been sterilized the oil. If you sterilize don't spit in the oil Mr. Gongiver:

Chairman McCurdy: because you have to silica present in a contaminating subject. connection with the handling of spice, in

Dr. Smith: Now if anyone here has have seen a couple case I remember in this chap had prominent tuberculosis. We never have any fever and from the symptoms. time if he had any as he injected it in he would appreciate it. This first man in car, if it was from Sodium silicate, according

Chairman McCurdy: to introduce to you his topic "Control of J. J. Bloomfield vice, Washington, D

shops and other places are the prime causes of this dermatitis, industrial dermatitis, through the use of cutting oils?

Chairman McCurdy: I don't know whether I should answer that or not. I think there are incidents in which it is true, particularly those plants which use oils over and over. I remember some years ago, I ran into that in trying to study the thing out and get my mind straight upon it. It appeared at that time most of the firms were giving you a practically sterile oil to start with, but whether it remained sterile or not was another thing, particularly in those industries which used it more than once and particularly in those industries where, perhaps, in the use of it, neither workmen nor the machinery were kept in a good, clean manner. I think there is no question but what we all feel that there are industrial dermatoses which do come from cutting oils. There is no question about it.

Dr. Smith: As a matter of fact I know in the year 1937 and some other years dermatitis, as I said before, led all occupational diseases. As we know, the greatest cause of dermatitis, far above the others, was oils and cutting compounds. I have quite often been amused going into factories where they had an outbreak of dermatitis from cutting oils, cutting compounds, and men chewing and spitting in the oil and they had a common piece of waste or towel. I have seen several of these clear up, after this oil has been sterilized. We know unquestionably that there is bacteria in the oil. If you sterilize the oil, you stop the outbreak, providing the men don't spit in the oil and don't use common waste.

Mr. Gongiver: I wonder if there is any record of a case of silicosis resulting from dust spice.

Chairman McCurdy: I think I can answer that. There should not be, because you have to have silica present. There certainly should not be any silica present in a pure spice unless it has been in contact with some contaminating subject. I can't rule out contamination. It might happen in connection with the spice, if you have a foreman along the line, in the handling of spice, introduce silicon dioxide.

Dr. Smith: Now it is my turn to ask a question. I would like to know if anyone here has had much experience in the use of sodium silicate? I have seen a couple of cases of pulmonary disease blamed on it. The first case I remember in particular. I believe Dr. Kistler saw it with me, but this chap had prominent lesions that were almost typical of a very advanced tuberculosis. We made the remark at the time it was unusual he didn't have any fever and that it wasn't a picture of advanced tuberculosis, also from the symptoms. I saw another one later. I asked Dr. Gardner at the time if he had any experience with sodium silicate and he said yes, as soon as he injected it in any of his animals, it knocked them off right away and he would appreciate any information anyone has here who has been using it. This first man incurred his lesions by chipping sodium silicate in a tank car, if it was from sodium silicate. We have no proof to think it was Sodium silicate, according to Dr. Gardner, is certainly extremely toxic.

Chairman McCurdy: It gives me great pleasure to have the opportunity to introduce to you another authority upon this subject, who has selected as his topic "Control of Occupational Disease Hazards."

J. J. Bloomfield, Sanitary Engineer, United States Public Health Service, Washington, D. C.

actual cash benefits that industry gained through a program of this sort. I am reminded of the excellent striking examples that Mr. Fletcher gave at the Air Hygiene Foundation meeting last fall where he showed hundreds of thousands of dollars his company saved in a program of industrial health prevention. They have decreased their labor turnover from hundreds of percent down to three or four percent. They have saved all kinds of money. If you want figures of that sort, I will be glad to give them to you.

(Applause.)

Chairman McCurdy: I am sure we are grateful to Mr. Bloomfield for his presentation of a subject that is vital to us all. You may now ask him questions or discuss it with him.

Mr. Lisch: You spoke about infection from cutting compounds and nothing was said about the means of eliminating that. Will you speak on that just a minute?

Mr. Bloomfield: Well of course, in a way, that is a medical question that I would like to have one of my medical colleagues answer. In spite of the fact that I have had an honorary degree conferred upon me this afternoon by your esteemed Dr. McCurdy, I am an engineer and not a doctor. There are various solutions. One of course is to use cutting compounds or oils that don't have some of these acids in them. For sensitive individuals, you can use protective clothing, gloves, protective ointment and so on. I would prefer however, that someone like Dr. Hayhurst or Dr. Smith or Dr. McCurdy, any one of these gentlemen, answer that question.

Dr. Hayhurst: I could say that in 1916 or 1917 Dr. R. P. Albol, who is the medical director of the Fuller Corporations and interests in Cleveland, while he was then with the State Health Department, made a report, a very considerable study on the subject of these oils and cutting compounds and came to the conclusion the best way to control the external environment was to heat those oils, so that idea is nothing new at all. The trouble is that the infections get started in the workmen through cross-connections, if you want to call it that, contact with rags, towels and whatnot from one to another. About ten years ago Dr. Sietz, of the White Motors in Cleveland, discovered he could control a large part of that sort of spread by the use of towels, giving every man an individual towel, a small towel slightly larger than a napkin, whenever he wanted to use it. There are some, particularly those containing sulphur, that have a high percentage of preventative elements. In those controls, all said and done, I think there is not one of us that have entered into them, and that an epidemic which is present should be under medical supervision.

Mr. Lisch: Several disinfectant companies attempt to sell you liquids which you put in your tank in very small quantities, which are supposed to eliminate any disease transferred. Is such a thing possible in a small quantity?

Chairman McCurdy: I can't answer that question.

Dr. Hayhurst: We found that practically all of the substances that are added, if they are effective, are too strong and will produce dermatitis, whether they produce infection or not.

Mr. Bloomfield: I hope the next question is an engineering question.

Mr. Henry: Would you give the upper safe limits of concentration of dust in foundries and the silicosis content?

Mr. Bloomfield: There have been several studies made in foundries. There is a New York study which was shaped entirely on X-ray interpretation, no

clinical study in the number studied the hand sand blasting silica. Most particles per tolerate some foundry dust. exceed a cert the same all c ten million p soon as you to say ten or would sugges report, which report, which them by writ to get them.

Mr. Henry:

Mr. Bloomfield:

They have seen now they are

Mr. Henry:

Mr. Bloomfield:

foundries. Is they only ma clinical side

Mr. Henry:

there any fig

Mr. Bloomfield:

you an exact gentlemen of

write the Un studies made

them. For and we get

then we get in the past

very thorough and Lomb.

two is enorm On various

have vast al although I t

teen years. situation in

Mr. Henry:

Mr. Bloomfield:

samples from which, there settled dust separate th

of this sort. I
 teacher gave at
 d hundreds of
 dustrial health
 ndreds of per-
 nds of money.
 o you.

Bloomfield for
 now ask him

mpounds and
 you speak on

medical question
 r. In spite of
 me this after-
 not a doctor.
 compounds or
 ve individuals,
 and so on. I
 Dr. Smith or
 ion.

l, who is
 eveland,
 a very
 mpounds and
 vironment was
 trouble is that
 actions, if you
 om one to an-
 in Cleveland,
 ad by the use
 towel slightly
 are some, par-
 e of preventa-
 ere is not one
 ich is present

all you liquids
 re supposed to
 a small quan-

ances that are
 ice dermatitis.

ng question.
 ncentration of

undries. There
 rpretation, no

clinical study. There is a North Carolina study which is rather limited in the number of people covered. The public health service itself hasn't studied the health of foundry workers, foundry conditions with reference to sand blasting and so on. Those standards vary of course with the amount of silica. Most of them I think have a low limit of around ten or fifteen million particles per cubic foot for certain operations. In other operations they tolerate some higher amount. It depends on the actual composition of that foundry dust. It is difficult to say in all foundry operations, some won't exceed a certain limit and some will. For instance, granite is pretty much the same all over. We know, from our clinical studies and engineering studies ten million particles is as much as anyone should inhale per cubic foot. As soon as you get over that, you are going to get in trouble. It is difficult to say ten or fifteen or twenty million particles, because conditions vary. I would suggest that you consult the New York report and the North Carolina report, which are the only ones I know of and possibly the Massachusetts report, which have attempted to set standards of that type. You can get them by writing to the Industrial Hygiene Division. If you like, I will try to get them for you. Does that answer the question?

Mr. Henry: I understood certain standards were set up in those states.

Mr. Bloomfield: Yes, New York State attempted to set up standards. They have set them up for rock drilling and certain other excavations but now they are doing one on foundries.

Mr. Henry: Are you familiar with the standards in steel foundries?

Mr. Bloomfield: No, but they study steel and brass and all types of foundries. It is a rather comprehensive report. As I said, a moment ago, they only made Roentgen Ray studies, X-ray studies, and didn't go into the clinical side at all.

Mr. Benedict: These dust conditions you have been talking about, are there any figures available concerning them?

Mr. Bloomfield: Yes, there are figures available. I can't offhand give you an exact reference. In Ohio you might ask Dr. Kistler or some of the gentlemen of the Industrial Commission for that information, or you can write the United States Public Health Service. There have been comparative studies made, but I can tell you right now there is no consistency about them. For instance, we have made a comparative study of the konimeter, and we get consistent results until we get into very high concentration and then we get inconsistent results. From other comparisons we have made in the past—we have gone into a comparative dust and sand business very, very thoroughly—but we can't seem to get consistent results with Bausch and Lomb. ~~If you get into very small-sized particles the ratio between the two is enormous.~~ If you get down to coarser particles, the ratio drops. On various types of dust we haven't been using Bausch and Lomb. We have vast amounts of findings on Greenburg Smith. It may be awkward, although I think it isn't awkward at all. ~~I used it myself for some seven-~~ teen years. It has proved to be a valuable index of the hazards of the situation in respect to dust.

Mr. Henry: How do you determine your amount of silica?

Mr. Bloomfield: We determine it in this way. We first get several samples from a vacuum cleaner which is for hours in an atmosphere in which there is as much dust as we can get in the air. We also take settle dust on rafters and beams and bring it into the laboratory and we separate the various sized fractions of dust of air flotation. We get a

fraction, say, from zero up to an amount you can't measure, up to five, ten and fifteen microns. Now we take and examine each fraction chemically and petrographically, such as a minerologist will use to examine each fraction chemically and minerologically for the amount of quartz, amount of other minerals, calcite, opal, or whatever it appears to be. That is the way we do it. It is a job that takes a very highly skilled person. It isn't something that you can learn overnight, and we only allow specialists to fool with it.

Mr. Henry: You feel injurious particles are under ten microns?

Mr. Bloomfield: It seems to point in that direction. In the air they settle because of gravity. You will recall, Mr. Henry, I think, when I spoke on silicosis a few years ago, I showed a slide in Cleveland, Ohio, for various specific gravities of dust. You might recall, or maybe you don't, that a particle of about ten microns settles out very rapidly. I think the specific gravity of silica is 2.65 or thereabouts. It will settle at the rate of, I think, a foot a minute, or something like that, so those particles don't exist in the air. In our studies somewhere in the neighborhood of up to three or four microns, the bulk of them are one, one and a half, or thereabouts. That is probably the reason you don't find these particles in autopsy.

Mr. Henry: You do find them at the point of origin?

Mr. Bloomfield: Yes, but not in the terminal passages.

Mr. Henry: I am bringing these points out more or less from questions that have been asked me.

Dr. Smith: I would like to know what your opinion is of the electrostatic precipitator.

Mr. Bloomfield: For what purpose?

Dr. Smith: For collection of dust samples.

Mr. Bloomfield: We use the electrostatic precipitator only for the collection of fumes, because the apparatus is not very efficient for very fine matter, such as lead fumes, magnesium fumes, or arsenic fumes, where we analyze samples chemically. In collecting the dust, we have to run comparative dust tests by the impinger apparatus. It is a pretty good instrument to use. If you are fortunate enough to be able to get up to Detroit this fall, you will hear a paper by Mr. Case on that very subject.

Dr. Shaffer: I would like to ask Mr. Bloomfield one question that has been a little troublesome to me. We all agree, especially those in the medical profession, that examinations of every one is the ideal thing. I was wondering whether or not he had come in contact, in his various surveys in all the various states, with many employers who have instituted the general health examination without first being obliged to find out what it was worth to them, from this small, little, insignificant occupational investigation. After you can point that out to them, you can re-check on periodic examinations. They just say, "Oh yes, we will not examine everybody unless there is some reason for it," and that reason usually is this little insignificant occupational disease thing that starts the ball rolling.

Mr. Bloomfield: Dr. Shaffer, you brought out several interesting things. To begin with, we have established industrial hygiene practices like I showed you, in 29 or 30 states. I have recently completed an analysis of surveys of that type on 17,000 plants in 15 states covering one million and a half workers. One of the things we found out was that the information on what industries are now doing in the practice of industrial hygiene prevention is something like this: Only about 15 per cent of the employees have full-time

medical services. One third have full-time plant is the one which industrial hygiene that service and

Now you are talking about occupational disease, talk this afternoon, control, not at all.

them later on the line. You are quite right. You have something and the average

Mr. Phillip: I find it advantageous to have working hours, it would tend to be

Mr. Bloomfield: the time, but the One is in connection

a storage battery telling you, it is dollars per case cases per hundred to twenty thousand. They put in an and outside the in 1929 to four case because of

Now then, told you about. cite you these firm employed 2

In other words, a year. The cost of this cost would be it cost a great

costs more to the program of employment cent and today improved were improved housing factory itself. periodic were in

In addition possible where extent, even if official agencies them come in in a while some today where an munized every

up to five, ten
tion chemically
nine each frac-
rtz, amount of
That is the
erson. It isn't
specialists to

microns?
the air they
when I spoke
io, for various
don't, that a
nk the specific
te of, I think,
't exist in the
three or four
outs. That is

rom questions
tostatic

for the collec-
y fine matter,
e we analyze
parative dust
nt to use. If
fall, you will

tion that has
n the medical
was wonder-
ys in all the
eneral health
was worth to
ation. After
examinations.
here is some
occupational

sting things.
like I showed
of surveys of
a half work-
on what in-
vention is
ave full-time

medical services, only 29 per cent have full-time safety practices, only about one third have full-time nursing services, and so on down the list. The little plant is the one that can't have them. That is why we are trying to establish industrial hygiene services in official agencies to impartially give them that service and help them control these conditions.

Now you are quite right in saying that the opening wedge is through occupational disease control. For goodness' sakes, don't get the idea, in my talk this afternoon, that I was trying to minimize occupational disease control, not at all. We use that as a means of getting into a plant and selling them later on this whole program of adult hygiene, which is so important. You are quite right there, that the only way you can get in is when they have something wrong, such as silicosis, because the average industrialist and the average worker still thinks industrial hygiene means accidents alone.

Mr. Phillip Carey: Can you tell me whether any of these companies also find it advantageous to try to carry out some constructive program in after working hours, to keep these people, say, out in the open, or something that would tend to help the conditions?

Mr. Bloomfield: Let me give you some figures. I didn't want to take the time, but these are just two examples that might answer your question. One is in connection with a company that had a lead poisoning accident in a storage battery plant. These figures haven't been proved because, as I was telling you, it is all new. They used to pay three hundred to a thousand dollars per case compensation for lead poisoning. In 1920 they had twenty cases per hundred in their plant. In other words, it cost them six thousand to twenty thousand dollars at that time for compensation for lead poisoning. They put in an industrial hygiene program, a complete program, both inside and outside the home, outside the work place, and their rate dropped down in 1929 to four cases per hundred. From 1934 on they haven't had a single case because of good engineering and medical control programs.

Now then, here is this example that was reported by Mr. Fletcher, I told you about. You will find it described in Occupational Hazards. I will cite you these figures, because it answers your question specifically. The firm employed 2500 people and had a labor turnover of 250 per cent a year. In other words, in order to maintain that 2500, they had to hire 6,250 men a year. The cost for such replacement was estimated at \$250,000. Today this cost would be five times as great. At that time, even as far back as 1920, it cost a great deal. Today it would be about four or five times as high. It costs more to train a man today than it did in those days. By a good program of employee health, the labor turnover was reduced in 1926 to 40 per cent and today it stands at 3.6 per cent. Among the conditions that were improved were the construction of a good water supply, better schools and improved housing, including a control of the working environment in the factory itself. Later physical examinations, both pre-employment and periodic were instituted, thus correcting any physical defects.

In addition proper milk sanitation was also initiated. Of course that is possible where you have a one-industry town. It is also possible to a certain extent, even if it isn't a one-industry town. That is one of the things your official agencies can help you on, for example, your health department. Let them come in there and give you a program of immunization. Every once in a while smallpox will break out in a plant. I was citing a case at lunch today where an epidemic of smallpox broke out in a shoe factory. They immunized every worker there. Or let them give you something in connection

with the degenerative diseases, nephritis, heart, pneumonia, syphilis. Of course syphilis is not an occupational disease, except for certain types of occupations, that I don't need to go into. You would be surprised how many doctors and nurses report syphilis as a result of occupation. You see, I wasn't thinking of the same thing you were. After all, it is very important both to industry and labor. As to the syphilis rating in industry, it runs, from our studies, between three and four per cent. Because that man is more accident-prone, more prone to all kinds of conditions, your health department is in a position to give you a good program of syphilis control in industry. Principles have been enunciated whereby a man should not be discharged, unless he is a menace to his fellow-worker. Under a physician's care, he can be made non-infective, after a certain number of treatments. If you have a very constructive policy on that point, you can do something about syphilis among your workers. By improving the home environment, furnishing swimming pools, recreation, all those things will help to decrease your loss of time and improve the health of the worker in industry. Do those things, because it is darn good business to do them. Let us not kid ourselves about that.

Chairman McCurdy: I certainly think we have enjoyed our afternoon, and you have gotten a great deal of good knowledge from these two talks. The Industrial Commission is very grateful to Dr. Smith and Mr. Bloomfield for their illuminating discussions, and I am sure we are grateful to them for coming. I think it is time now that we adjourn.

The Occupational Disease Hazards Section of the Eleventh All Ohio Safety Congress then adjourned.

The Wednesday Aid teams represented by the State and the American Red

The contest was won by the Association, Columbus Bradley, assisted by Engineer D. M. Ryan of the American

Six teams were entered. The mine teams were from the Ohio and Dock Co., and teams were from Columbus and the Ohio S

A tie existed at the end of the contest, the contest winners, and the State successfully defended the way boys.