

FILE NAME: General Electric (GE)

DATE: 1932 Feb 9

DOC#: GE123

DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION: Letter to Dr. Greenburg from L.W. Olson Objecting to Sandblast Research Committee's Findings & Recommendations

THE OHIO BRASS COMPANY

February 9, 1932

Mr. Leonard Greenburg
310 Cedar Street
New Haven, Connecticut

My dear Doctor Greenburg:

I was indeed sorry not to have been able to attend the meeting of the Sandblast Research Committee held in New York City on January 11th. As I will also be away and unable to attend the meeting scheduled for February 23rd, I am writing you to give my reactions to the report. I was appointed to this committee as a representative of the American Foundrymen's Association and perhaps also because the company I represent, as well as myself, have had a good many years of contact with sandblasting operations. We have had three cases of silicosis develop in this plant during the course of the last 27 years. We were among the first founders to use sandblasting for cleaning castings and naturally did not realize the occupational hazard involved in the earlier operations. We have now for a number of years followed a plan of limiting employment in sandblast operations for any one individual to a period of one year. We give the individual a very thorough physical examination before he is put on this work, and follow this up with monthly examinations during his period of employment, and this plan seems to quite effectively remove any health hazard that there may be with our apparatus. We have during the course of time improved the ventilating conditions in our sandblast operations, but we have not even now gone as far as your report would indicate to be necessary.

The report from a practical standpoint seems to demand more than should be necessary, nor is it necessary that conditions should be so arranged that constant and continuous performance over a lifetime need be arranged for. The committee would probably find in industry many occupations that are made intermittent in order to relieve the severity of the influence surrounding the work.

I object to the basing of this committee's findings upon the data that has been secured from foreign sources and without making a more detailed study on its own account under conditions existing in our own country. I object to the recommendation implying that metallic abrasives should be used to the exclusion, if possible, of silica. My company has repeatedly tried to use metallic abrasives exclusively but many considerations enter which make it inexpedient to do so. At a meeting held in Chicago nearly a year ago I indicated that it would be a pleasure to have one of your investigators visit the plant of The Ohio Brass Company and talk over some of these matters with me and perhaps even make some tests here. This has not been done and while perhaps it is not necessary for the committee's investigators to visit each establishment that might extend an invitation, yet I certainly expected to get some acknowledgement of my suggestion. It strikes me that probably not much additional research work has been done since the Chicago meeting.

I think sufficient time should be given to permit more people contacting with the practical side of this problem to give their views and experience.

Yours very truly,

L. W. Olson

LWO-C
cc-S. C. Vessy, C. E. Hoyt