

FILE NAME: General Electric (GE)

DATE: 1933

DOC#: GE022

DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION: Transactions of the National Safety Council

1933

TRANSACTIONS

National Safety Council

Incorporated

TWENTY-SECOND ANNUAL
SAFETY CONGRESS



Chicago, Illinois

October 2 to October 6, 1933

The Stevens Hotel

Copyright, 1934, National Safety Council, Inc.

Plan of Publication

CONT

THE TRANSACTIONS of the Twenty-second Congress of the National Safety Council are published in two volumes. The first, containing the General, the General Subject, and the Industrial Section sessions, is supplemented by a smaller volume containing the sessions of the Street and Highway Traffic Section, the Child Education Section, and Home Safety.

THE LARGE GENERAL volume is being sent automatically to the Industrial members of the Council; the smaller volume is sent automatically to members who are believed to be chiefly interested in those sessions. It may also be secured on request by other Council members.

THE PLAN OF PUBLICATION is the same as that adopted for the sessions of the Twenty-first Congress and found to be very satisfactory. It is a condensed record. The papers of each session or division of the Congress have been assembled, edited with care and discernment to abbreviate or delete the less essential portions, and the concise results are presented for study and reference. Although not "complete" in the sense that every word is reproduced, it is a readable, interesting record which emphasizes the memorable parts of each paper and address. The original manuscripts are on file in the Council Library, available for additional reference as desired.

ALTHOUGH THE National Safety Council endeavors to eliminate from discussion at its conventions matters which are not pertinent to its purposes or which are contrary to its policies, the Council cannot accept responsibility for the views expressed either in the papers presented or the discussions thereon.

Council Officers and Directors.....	
Council Purposes and Policies.....	
Annual Meeting of Members.....	
Banquet and Dance.....	
Subject Sessions—	
Accident Records.....	
Dermatitis	
Dust Problem in Industry.....	
Falls of Persons.....	
Fire Prevention.....	
Handling Materials.....	
Hoisting Chains.....	
Maintaining Interest in Safety.....	
Practical Medical Program for Ind.....	
Industrial Nursing.....	
Safety Equipment.....	
Safety Organization and Program..	
Safe Use of Chemicals in Industry.	
Safe Use of Electricity in Industry.	
The Eye and Its Relation to Safety.	
Mental Training for Safety.....	
Accident Prevention Equipment Manufa	
Aeronautical Section.....	
A. S. S. E.—Engineering Section.....	
Automotive and Machine Shop Section.	
Cement Section.....	
Chemical Section.....	
Construction Section.....	
Delivery, Taxicab and Bus Section.....	
Electric Railway Section.....	
Food Section.....	
Marine Section.....	
Meat Packing, Tanning and Leather In	
Metals Section.....	
Mining Section.....	
Paper and Pulp Section.....	
Petroleum Section.....	
Power Press Section.....	
Public Utilities Section.....	
Quarry Section.....	
Refrigeration Section.....	
Rubber Section.....	
Safety Section, ARA—Steam Railroad S	
Textile Section.....	
Woodworking and Lumber Manufacturi	
Index	

National Safety Council

Incorporated

20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago

Honorary Members

ASSOCIATION OF IRON AND STEEL ELECTRICAL ENGINEERS

ROBERT W. CAMPBELL

ARTHUR WILLIAMS

OFFICERS (1933-1934)

JOHN E. LONG, President.
ROBERT I. CATLIN, Vice-President for Public Safety.
J. E. CULLINEY, Vice-President for Engineering.
G. T. HELLMUTH, Vice-President for Finance.
LEW R. PALMER, Vice-President for Safety Councils.
R. T. SOLENSTEN, Vice-President for Membership.
C. W. SMITH, Vice-President for Business Administration.
GEORGE H. WARFEL, Vice-President for Industrial Safety.
DR. C. H. WATSON, Vice-President for Health.
A. W. WHITNEY, Vice-President for Education.
W. E. WORTH, Treasurer.
W. H. CAMERON, Managing Director and Secretary.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE (1933-1934)

C. B. AUEL, Past President.
J. I. BANASH, Past President.
C. W. BERGQUIST, Past President.
EARL F. BLANK, Metals Section.
W. H. CAMERON, National Safety Council.
ROBERT W. CAMPBELL, Past President.
ROBERT I. CATLIN, Aetna Life Insurance Company.
J. E. CULLINEY, Bethlehem Steel Company.
CLIFFORD DAVIS, Memphis Safety Council.
LEWIS A. DEBLOIS, Past President.
MARCUS A. DOW, Past President.
D. D. FENNEL, Chicago Safety Council.
DONALD A. FINKBEINER, Toledo Safety Council.
HOWARD B. FONDA, Burroughs Wellcome & Co. (U.S.A.) Inc.
OTTO M. GRAVES, The General Crushed Stone Company.
HARRY GULBERG, The Pullman Company.
G. T. HELLMUTH, Chicago, North Shore & Milwaukee Railroad Company.
HAROLD G. HOFFMAN, Street & Highway Traffic Section.
W. D. JAMES, James Manufacturing Company.

Office

WALTER G. KING, Past President.
FRANKLIN M. KREML, Evanston S
C. L. LAFONTAINE, Great North
JOHN E. LONG, The Delaware & F
M. J. MCCARTHY, Automotive & A
HENRY MINEUR, Elizabeth Safety
ARTHUR T. MOREY, Past President
B. W. NUTT, Accident Prevention
LEW R. PALMER, Equitable Life A
F. M. PEPPER, Public Utilities Sec
C. E. PETTIBONE, Past President.
ALBERT S. REGULA, Industrial Rela
LT. COL. HENRY A. REISINGER, Pa
JOHN RUSSELL, JR., Newark Safety
CHAS. E. RUTH, Delivery, Taxicab
GEORGE E. SANFORD, General Electr
HARRY A. SCHULTZ, United States
CHARLES B. SCOTT, Past President.
LESTER D. SEYMOUR, American Air
E. L. SIMONDS, New Haven Safety
C. W. SMITH, Standard Oil Comp
R. T. SOLENSTEN, Elliott Service C
ARTHUR M. TODD, Consulting Mari
C. P. TOLMAN, Past President.
GEORGE H. WARFEL, Union Pacific
DR. C. H. WATSON, American Tele
S. E. WHITING, ASSE-Engineering
A. W. WHITNEY, National Bureau
W. E. WORTH, International Harve
ARTHUR H. YOUNG, Past President

DIRECTORS

WILLIAM F. ARDERN, Safety Divisio
P. M. ARTHUR, Mining Section.
J. I. BANASH, Consulting Engineer.
E. A. BARNITZ, York Safety Counc
ERNEST W. BECK, United States R
H. W. BECKMAN, Berkeley Traffic
W. A. BENNETT, Worcester Safety
J. G. BENTLEY, Richmond Safety C
C. W. BERGQUIST, Western Electric
DAVID S. BEYER, Liberty Mutual In
R. W. BLACK, Petroleum Section.
EARL F. BLANK, Jones & Laughlin
WARREN S. BLANVELT, Troy Safety
NATHAN P. BLOOM, Louisville Safet
C. F. BORKENHAGEN, Kenosha Safe
COL. PHIL H. BROCKMAN, St. Loui

R. A. BRYANT, Safety Division, Syracuse Chamber of Commerce.
 W. H. CAMERON, National Safety Council.
 ROBERT J. CATLIN, Actna Life Insurance Company.
 FRANK H. COGAN, Marine Section.
 WILL COOPER, Marshall Field & Company.
 W. EZELL CRAIG, Safety Department, Nashville Chamber of Commerce.
 J. E. CULLINEY, Bethlehem Steel Company.
 EDWARD DANA, Boston Elevated Railway.
 F. A. DAVIDSON, Consulting Engineer.
 CLIFFORD DAVIS, Memphis Safety Council.
 RICHARD H. DAVIS, Blackstone Valley Safety Council.
 L. W. DAWLEY, Refrigeration Section.
 CHARLES D. DAWSON, Grand Rapids Safety Council.
 LEWIS A. DEBLOIS, Consulting Engineer.
 JAY E. DECKER, Mason City Safety Council.
 JAMES B. DOUGLAS, The Philadelphia Gas Works Company.
 DR. LOUIS I. DUBLIN, Metropolitan Life Insurance Company.
 CHARLES H. EAMES, Textile Section.
 HARRY W. EKINS, Meat Packing, Tanning & Leather Industries Section.
 D. D. FENNELL, Chicago Safety Council.
 RAY A. FINCH, Electric Railway Section.
 DONALD A. FINKBEINER, Toledo Safety Council.
 THOMAS FITZGERALD, Western Pennsylvania Safety Council.
 HOWARD B. FONDA, Burroughs Wellcome & Co. (U.S.A.) Inc.
 R. B. FORTUN, Lehigh Valley Safety Council.
 H. G. GILSON, Paper & Pulp Section.
 DR. THOMAS W. GOSLING, Child Education Section.
 OTTO M. GRAVES, The General Crushed Stone Company.
 HARRY GUILBERT, The Pullman Company.
 ISAIAH HALE, The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Company.
 D. T. HARRINGTON, United States Bureau of Mines.
 G. T. HELMUTH, Chicago, North Shore & Milwaukee Railroad Company.
 CHAS. E. HILL, New York Central Lines.
 HAROLD G. HOFFMAN, Street & Highway Traffic Section.
 CLAUDE J. HOLDING, Albany Safety Council.
 JULIUS W. HORRE, Hudson County Safety Council.
 HARRY D. IMMEL, Pennsylvania Department of Labor & Industry.
 W. D. JAMES, James Manufacturing Company.
 A. L. KAEMS, Power Press Section.
 K. T. KELLER, Detroit Industrial Safety Council.
 IRA V. KIENER, Pennsylvania Salt Manufacturing Company.
 LOUIS W. KERBERG, Woodworking & Lumber Manufacturing Section.
 FRANKLIN M. KREML, Evanston Safety Council.
 C. L. LAFONTAINE, Great Northern Railway Company.
 LEONARD C. LAMB, Knoxville Safety Council.
 FRANK J. LANAHAN, Fort Pitt Malleable Iron Company.
 M. G. LICKTEIG, Eastbay Safety Council.
 RALPH W. LITTLE, Employees' Publication Section.
 DR. R. M. LITTLE, New York Department of Education.

L. A. LOHMAN, Madison County
 JOHN E. LONG, The Delaware &
 H. W. LOW, Rubber Section.
 W. R. LLOYD, Safety Division, B
 H. T. MARTIN, Fisk Rubber Com
 F. W. MATSON, Minnesota Safety
 PAXTON MENDELSSOHN, Detroit.
 HENRY MINEUR, Elizabeth Safety
 W. S. MOELLERING, Ft. Wayne Sa
 R. B. MORLEY, Industrial Accident
 M. J. MCCARTHY, Automotive &
 MILLER MCCLINTOCK, Harvard U
 T. H. MCKENNEY, Illinois Steel C
 B. W. NUTT, Accident Prevention
 JOHN A. OARTEL, Carnegie Steel C
 GEORGE C. A. OPP, Detroit Edison
 LEW R. PALMER, Equitable Life A
 JOHN C. PARKER, Brooklyn Safet
 F. M. PEPPER, Public Utilities Se
 C. E. PETTIBONE, American Mu
 J. B. POWELL, Seattle Traffic & Sa
 ALBERT S. REGULA, Industrial Rel
 LT. COL. HENRY A. RENINGER, Le
 MARINUS RITER, Paterson Safety
 JOHN ROACH, Chemical Section.
 CHARLES H. ROLOSON, JR., Baltim
 THOMAS ROTH, Rochester Safety C
 JOHN RUSSELL, JR., Newark Safet
 CHAS. H. RUTH, Delivery, Tanica
 G. E. SANFORD, General Electric C
 HENRY G. SCHAFFNER, Erie Safety
 T. A. SCHENDEL, Food Section.
 OTTO SCHENK, Wheeling Safety C
 HARRY A. SCHULTZ, United States
 CHARLES B. SCOTT, Bureau of Saf
 LESTER D. SEYMOUR, American A
 EARL S. SHARTZER, Utica Safety
 GEN. JOHN H. SHERBURNE, Massa
 DR. L. A. SHOUDY, Bethlehem Ste
 E. L. SIMONDS, Southern New En
 GEORGE P. SINGER, Reading-Berks
 LEE E. SKEEL, Cleveland Safety C
 C. W. SMITH, Standard Oil Comp
 W. D. SMITH, Delaware Safety C
 R. T. SOLENSTEN, Elliott Service C
 W. D. SPEIGHT, Peoria Safety Cou
 E. C. SPRING, Lansdale, Pa.
 GEORGE R. STEPHENS, The Safety
 LUCIUS S. STORRS, United Railway

ALFRED H. SWAYNE, General Motors Corporation.
ARTHUR M. TODE, Consulting Marine Engineer.
W. W. TRENCH, Schenectady Safety Council.
W. D. TURBEVILLE, San Antonio Safety Council.
WILLIAM F. VEECH, Railway Safety Council.
VINCENT WAKEFIELD, Kansas City Safety Council.
GEORGE H. WARFEL, Union Pacific Railroad Company.
DR. C. H. WATSON, American Telephone & Telegraph Company.
HARRY M. WEBBER, Illinois Bell Telephone Company.
S. E. WHITING, Liberty Mutual Insurance Company.
A. W. WHITNEY, National Bureau of Casualty & Surety Underwriters.
W. H. WINANS, Union Carbide & Carbon Corporation.
DR. C.-E. A. WINSLOW, Yale Medical School.
HARRY WISE, SR., Chattanooga Safety Council.
J. M. WOLTZ, Youngstown Sheet & Tube Company.
W. E. WORTH, International Harvester Company.
E. J. ZACFT, Safety Bureau, Duluth Chamber of Commerce.
J. B. ZOOK, Cement Section.

TWENTY-SECOND ANNUAL SAFETY CONGRESS
NATIONAL SAFETY COUNCIL



Dust Problem in Industry

FRIDAY MORNING SESSION

October 6, 1933

The special session devoted to a discussion of the dust problem in industry was called to order by J. R. Allan, assistant manager, Industrial Engineering and Construction Department, International Harvester Company, Chicago, who presided. He briefly outlined the purposes of the session and then presented the first speaker.

The Mechanical Control of Dust

By E. O. JONES

Consultant, National Founders Association, Chicago

The speaker said in part: During the last few years, much has been written about the pathological effects of dust. From this material there seems to be some lack of agreement among scientists as to the pathological effects of these types of dust, their dangerous dimensions, the length of time one must be exposed to their inhalation, the density of concentration which is dangerous, and the extent to which they are directly causative or contributory to disease.

It is unfortunate that in the twilight zone between ethics and non-ethics, there are certain members of the legal and medical profession who are willing to take advantage of these uncertainties and capitalize on them largely for their own benefit.

When the foundry industry was confronted with the accusation that it harbored a potential health hazard, its leaders immediately took steps to study the problem, with the object of eliciting all the facts and determining upon a course of procedure to eliminate the causation. This study has been under way in some localities for some time, but its procedure presents many difficult problems.

The mechanical control of dust is not our only problem, nor does the accomplishment of such control depend upon large expenditures of money. We know from experience that gradually human ingenuity will provide ways and means to this part of the problem.

But let us digress from the subject to consider the amount of dust we as individuals create. Take the molder, for instance, who goes to his bench at the start of his day's work. He reaches for his air hose, and starts the day by removing, with its force everything he can from his equipment. In close proximity to his bench,

or on the window sill in front of him, you will usually find a varied collection of relics. He will usually wet down his sand pile, but seldom his floor or gangway. When he is through with his shift he usually grabs the air hose and proceeds to take a compressed air bath.

And we have the foundry laborer; he has many menial tasks to perform. When he sweeps or uses a shovel he seems to be of the opinion that his efforts are judged by the atmosphere he creates. If he does sprinkle the floor it is usually done very sparingly.

Shake-out men and crane men seemingly give little attention to the results of their thoughtlessness. Grab buckets are usually lifted to the limit of their lift and then dumped. Many companies have furnished equipment, such as positive pressure helmets and respirators, to employees who work in extremely dusty atmospheres. But it is surprising to note the apparent lack of interest on the part of the employee for whose protection this equipment is furnished.

From these remarks some may say "Why shift the responsibility?" Not a bit. We have merely cited these few facts as an indication that possibly we can improve the supervision. If we make every man responsible for the cleanliness in the vicinity in which he works, and every foreman responsible for his department, and then in turn make the superintendent answer for the cleanliness of his shop, we will not have to worry about the increase in labor cost. After dust gets into the atmosphere, it is, of course, very difficult and expensive to remove. Keeping the foundry floor off the ceiling is a man-size job.

Ventilation is a problem everywhere. A diligent survey of our existing equipment may develop the fact that by small expenditures we can improve conditions. Inspect your dust-arresting equipment. See that the rapping device is in order, that the screens are in good condition, we suggest that they are rapped and the hoppers emptied regularly. Repair any leaks in pipes. See that the valves close properly. Chutes should be kept in good repair and when emptying arrestors, respirators should be worn by the men whose duty it is to perform this work. If refuse from the arrestors is not removed at once, keep it in containers or wet down until it is removed. Above all, watch your air velocities and make sure you are removing at the source as much of the dust as the equipment was originally designed to do. You pay for the current the motor consumes to operate your suction equipment, therefore get the proper return for that expenditure.

Do not store or allow sand to accumulate around your blasting equipment. Make sure you are receiving the proper air changes in your sandblast rooms. Inspect your masks to the amount of air purging through. The wearer is prone many times to just crack or partially open the valve, and when this is done he is not getting the full protection for which the helmet was designed. We suggest that the helmet be removed from the sandblast room and stored at the end of the day in a dust-tight cabinet, instructing the wearer to clean before re-using.

In your cleaning rooms where tumbling barrels are used, we deal again with air velocities. Piping should be diligently inspected and kept in good repair. Make sure traps are performing the service they were designed for. It might be well to keep floors in this department wet down. Remove the day's accumulation of refuse at the end of the day's run. When cyclones are used, make sure you are not exhausting at the level of windows which may be opened in other parts of your plant.

We will have to look for further co-operation from the foundry equipment manufacturers who serve our industry. Equipment will have to be sold to us net to

varied collection of
his floor or gangway.
hose and proceeds to

to perform. When
his efforts are judged
is usually done very

to the results of their
their lift and then
as positive pressure
dusty atmospheres.
part of the employee

ability?" Not a bit.
ably we can improve
liness in the vicinity
rtment, and then in
shop, we will not
into the atmosphere,
the foundry floor

existing equipment
conditions. Inspect
in order, that the
and the hoppers
lives close properly.
respirators should
If refuse from the
own until it is re-
are removing at
signed to do. You
equipment, therefore

equipment Make
ams. Inspect your
one many times to
is not getting the
that the helmet be
day in a dust-tight

al again with air
repair. Make sure
at be well to keep
ation of refuse at
are not exhausting
or plant.

equipment manu-
sold to us net to

meet existing codes, but as dust-tight as human ingenuity can design them. After the equipment is installed, it will be the purchaser's responsibility to see that it is regularly inspected and maintained to perform the service for which it was originally designed.

And we refer again to the employee's responsibility. When he elects to work in a foundry, he should be willing to co-operate and wear the safety devices which are provided by his employer, and it will be the purchaser's responsibility to see that the equipment is well cared for and properly maintained.

Our industry is a basic one and we hope that it will long continue to be essential. For this reason we want to assure those who are sitting on the side lines that it is our determination and hope that, with the help of those in the medical profession who have given so generously of their time in scientific study, we can soon determine the actual extent of the hazard.

In the meantime, while many diverse opinions are being brought into agreement, it is imperative that we give more than passive assent to suggested measures of precaution or improvement. The accomplishment of worth while results depends upon the diligent and active co-operation of everyone concerned and the utilization of all known means of prevention and control. Only through united effort can we hope to accomplish an effective program which will give maximum of advantage to employers and employees alike, and to such an end we are confident the foundry industry will continue to dedicate its earnest and conscientious efforts.

How to Determine the Dust Content of the Atmosphere in Dusty Industries

By DR. E. G. MEITER

Director, Industrial Hygiene Laboratory, Employers Mutual Liability Insurance Co., Milwaukee, Wis.

The importance of atmospheric dust as an agent in the causation of respiratory disease has long been known. However, it is only within the last few years that this subject has achieved medical and legal importance in dusty industries. Because of the extension of compensation laws to include occupational diseases, and through an ever-increasing number of legal suits against industrial concerns by employees claiming disability due to dust inhalation, there is need for a severe attack on the problem of eliminating or otherwise combating the dust hazard. In order to intelligently control the dustiness of the air, the amount of dust present must be determined. With a given dust, two factors are usually considered; (1) the number of dust particles in a given quantity of air, which is usually expressed in millions of particles per cubic foot of air; (2) particle-size, usually expressed in a size frequency distribution curve, that is the percentage less than stated size is plotted against the size of particles.

Instruments Used for Determining Atmospheric Dusts

Many instruments have been devised for determining the dust concentration in air and it may be well to give a brief historical review of this subject. The South African investigators began using the sugar tube method for the sampling of atmospheric dust in 1911; the same method was used by the U. S. Bureau of Mines as early as 1914. By this method a measured volume of the dust air is passed through

a tube containing granulated sugar, which filters out the suspended dust. At the laboratory, the sugar is dissolved in water and the number of dust particles are determined by counting those in a small volume of the sugar solution under a microscope. This method of dust sampling had certain disadvantages, the chief of which was the fact that the purest commercial sugar contained a certain quantity of dust, which introduced considerable errors, especially in those samples containing a low dust concentration. To overcome the limitations of the sugar tube method various other devices were developed, one of which was the Palmer apparatus. This apparatus consisted essentially of a pear-shaped glass bulb, the lower end of which terminated in a U-tube or trap. Suction was applied to the glass bulb by means of an electric exhaust fan and the volume of air measured by means of a Petot tube. Dust-free distilled water was put into the U-tube. The air drawn through the water in the trap broke it up into a spray within the larger portion of the sampling bulb, which washed out and retained the dust. The dust so obtained was analyzed by the usual methods. The Palmer apparatus also had certain disadvantages, the chief of which was that its efficiency as a dust catcher was low. In the search for a more portable type of instrument, which at the same time would yield rapid results, the South African investigators introduced in 1916 a new instrument known as the Kotzé konimeter. The konimeter samples dust by impinging a small volume of air against the surface of a vaseline-coated glass plate, the vaseline serving to catch the dust particles. The dust retained on the glass plate was then counted under the microscope at a suitable magnification. The chief disadvantages of the konimeter are that in atmospheres containing a high concentration of dust, the spots are too dense to allow counting the individual particles and the method can, therefore, not be used in such cases, also many samples had to be taken to secure a correct average determination in places where the dust concentration was variable.

As a result of the different methods of dust determination being used by the different governmental bureaus and others, it was soon found that the various dust-sampling methods did not yield absolute results, consequently some confusion arose in interpreting the various dust studies. In order to arrive at some basis of comparison the U. S. Bureau of Mines conducted a laboratory study of dust-sampling instruments. The results of this study were published in Public Health Bulletin No. 144 entitled "Comparative Tests of Instruments for Determining Atmospheric Dusts." (1925) During the course of this study two of the investigators, Dr. L. Greenburg and G. W. Smith, devised a new apparatus called the impinger. In the comparative study the dust collecting efficiency of the impinger was found to be high, and in addition the method offered several advantages over previous methods. After several modifications to meet special requirements, this instrument was adopted by the Federal Public Health Service and Bureau of Mines as the standard technique for the sampling of dust in air. The instrument has been used in the study of a number of dust trades, and is the commonly accepted method in use today.

Size of Dust Particles Taken into the Lungs

It has been observed from a study of silicotic lungs that most of the dust particles that have penetrated into the air sacs are less than 10 microns in longest dimension (1 micron is 1/1000th of a millimeter, or 1/2500th of an inch). It is generally agreed, therefore, that we need not bother with particles larger than 10 microns in measuring the concentration of a dangerous dust.

So that you may visualize the size of these small particles consider a 280 mesh

ended dust. At the particles are determined under a microscope. One of which was the quantity of dust, which obtaining a low dust method various other means. This apparatus of which terminated means of an electric tube. Dust-free distilled water in the trap bulb, which washed the usual methods, which was that its portable type of instrument. South African instrument. The dust the surface of a particles. The dust at a suitable magnification spheres containing the individual also many samples places where the dust

used by the different dust-sampling methods arose in order of comparison the following instruments. No. 144 entitled "Dusts." (1925) Greenburg and comparative study and in addition the several modifications the Federal Public the sampling of the dust trades,

the dust particles longest dimension generally agreed, reasons in measuring consider a 280 mesh

screen in which the screen openings are 50 microns. In the absence of a beam of light, an atmosphere containing these tiny particles will appear clear to the naked eye, and therefore is extremely deceptive. Only a powerful microscope can make such particles directly visible.

It is necessary, therefore, to make a microscopical examination of the atmosphere to learn how badly polluted it may be. Larger particles such as are visible to the naked eye are essentially harmless in the causation of silicosis, as these are caught by the membranes provided by nature in the nasal and other respiratory passages and are eventually coughed up or eliminated before any damage is done.

When small dust particles are dispersed in air, they are carried about like smoke and settle out very slowly. How long such particles will remain suspended in quiet air can be roughly determined from Stoke's law. Assuming a round particle to be one micron in diameter, it can be calculated by means of this law that such a particle will fall only 20.3 feet in 24 hours. It can be seen, therefore, that any fine dust dispersed into the air is not only a momentary hazard but remains in the air for an indefinite period. This fact is often overlooked by workmen, as it is usually assumed that as soon as the dust cloud is no longer visible all dust has settled out.

The term "dusty working place" is only a relative one. Most air, both inside and outside of factories, contains some dust. It is, therefore, necessary to adopt a standard content for the dividing line between slightly dusty and dusty working places. The Wisconsin dust code prescribes a "tentative figure of 15 million countable dust particles under 10 microns in longest dimension with free silica content of 35 per cent in a cubic foot of air as determined by Public Health Service technique. Variations in free silica content will make proportional inverse changes in this standard." In accordance with this standard the permissible count for practically pure silica would be 5,250,000 particles.

How Dust Samples are Collected

As mentioned previously, the instrument used in collecting the dust samples is that known as the "Impinger." With this instrument the air to be sampled is drawn through a glass tube and impinged at a high velocity on a glass plate which is immersed beneath a suitable liquid contained in the collecting flask.

The impinger, therefore, combines the principle of collecting dust by impingement with a water-washing or bubbling method and so possesses the advantages of both principles. The dust is thus trapped and remains in the collecting liquid. Suction is applied to the impinger by means of a steam ejector operated by compressed air. Where compressed air is not available, a small electrically-operated vacuum pump may be used. The rate of air flow is measured either by means of a small vacuum gage or an orifice-type flow meter.

The entire apparatus is calibrated before use against a standard gas meter, so that a known volume of air may be sampled. The rate of sampling is approximately one cubic foot of air per minute. The dust-collecting device is placed in close proximity to the breathing level of the workmen involved while performing their respective duties, so that air samples representing actual working conditions may be obtained. After a sufficient volume of dust-laden air has been sampled, the collecting liquid is placed in a suitable container and removed to the laboratory for the necessary analysis.

When the dust sample reaches the laboratory, the entire sample is filtered into a clean graduated flask through a 280-mesh screen so that only particles smaller than 50 microns are permitted to pass; particles larger than 50 microns are not considered

injuriously and are, therefore, removed from the sample. After proper dilution, the contents of the graduated flask are thoroughly shaken so that a uniform suspension is obtained, and two portions of about one cubic centimeter are removed with a pipette to just fill two Sedgwick-Rafter counting cells. The cells are allowed to stand at least 20 minutes and the dust particles are then counted by means of a microscope.

The microscope with an Abbe condenser is provided with an eyepiece micrometer, a 16-millimeter objective and a 7X eyepiece. The eyepiece micrometer has a large square engraved on it, and this square is divided into 100 squares, one of which is further divided into 25 smaller squares. The proper tube length of the microscope is determined by calibration with a stage micrometer, so that a side of the large square of the eyepiece covers 1 millimeter (1,000 microns).

The large square of the eyepiece micrometer, therefore, encloses the dust in an area of one square millimeter, and since the counting cell is one millimeter deep, all the dust suspended in one cubic millimeter of the sample is under the ruled field. All particles visually less than 10 microns in longest diameter in one quarter of the field are counted at five points on the cell, namely, near the four corners and the center.

Two cells of each dust sample are counted and the average of 10 counts is obtained. Control counts are subtracted from the average sample counts, giving finally, average net counts of the number of particles which are then calculated in terms of particles per cubic foot of air sampled.

Having determined the concentration of dust particles less than 10 microns in diameter in a given atmosphere, it is also necessary to obtain information regarding the mineral composition of the dust before any evaluation of the health hazard can be made.

In general it may be said that the harmfulness of a quartz containing dust is usually in direct proportion to its free-silica (SiO_2) content. It is, therefore, necessary to distinguish between "free silica", that is the silica that occurs as quartz, and "combined silica", or the silica that is combined with other elements in the various silicate minerals. It should be borne in mind, therefore, that the total silica reported in the customary chemical analysis is no measure of the amount of free silica.

The quartz content of fine dusts is usually determined by a combination of petrographic and chemical methods. Each dust presents individual problems and no individual technique applies to all dusts regardless of their composition. Those interested in this problem should consult Reprint No. 1560 of the Public Health Reports, February 24, 1933, entitled "The Quantitative Determination of Quartz (free silica) in Dusts" by Adolph Knapp, Professor of Physical Geology, Yale University, and Consultant, United States Public Health Service.

Discussion of Dust Problems

By DR. LEONARD GREENBURG

Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

*Orig. paper
12/1/33*

The speaker said in part: On the technical side of this problem you have been presented with two excellent papers by Mr. Jones and Dr. Meiter. There is little that I should add from this point of view. Perhaps the most valuable contribution that I can make is to present to you my own personal view of the broader administrative aspects of this problem gained as a result of many years of close contact. In order to do this, let us analyze the problem in its simplest terms.

proper dilution, the
a uniform suspension
are removed with a
cells are allowed to
unted by means of a

eyepiece micrometer,
erometer has a large
one of which is fur-
of the microscope is
e of the large square

closes the dust in an
millimeter deep, all
r the ruled field. All
e quarter of the field
ers and the center.

10 counts is obtained.
iving finally, average
in terms of particles

10 microns in diam-
nation regarding the
ealth hazard can be

containing dust is
is, therefore, neces-
sary as quartz, and
ments in the various
total silica reported
of free silica.

a combination of
eal problems and no
composition. Those
Public Health Re-
son of Quartz (free
y, Yale University,

blem you have been
ter. There is little
valuable contribution
the broader adminis-
ers of close contact.
terms.

We may begin by agreeing that pulmonary fibrosis results from the inhalation of certain dusts in known concentration over a sufficient period of time. This fact has been demonstrated repeatedly by means of industrial, laboratory and pathological studies. On this simple fact, I take it, there is complete agreement.

Such legitimate cases of disabling pulmonary fibrosis are held in many states to be the responsibility of the employer. Further, a perusal of the compensation laws makes it evident that there exists a decided trend in the direction of broadening the compensation acts throughout the Union for we find from time to time that additional states are being added to the list of those holding silicosis to be a compensable disease. We would certainly be blinding ourselves to the facts were we not to admit the existence of this trend in social legislation. It should be pointed out here that this is a very wholesome and desirable state of affairs. The insurance principle has justified its existence in spreading the burden of ill fortune over a long period of freedom from catastrophe and surely in the case of industrial accidents it has freed us from the deplorable state of affairs in existence prior to 1912. In the case of the occupational diseases we may hope for equally satisfactory results.

Nevertheless, compensation insurance is not the complete solution of the problem at hand.

The only adequate means of avoiding the burden of silicosis is by the prevention of this disease. All other methods do not touch the crux of the problem and they carry in their wake a vast amount of litigation, illness, and a large financial burden on industry. If what we have agreed upon to this point is true it is obvious that industry must prevent the dissemination of dust in the workroom air by such adequate engineering techniques as are available; or in certain cases where this is not possible industry must provide, and force the worker to use, such means of personal protection as will adequately safeguard him against the inhalation of dust. It is only by these means that we can guarantee a future free of disabling pulmonary disease due to dust inhalation.

In spite of the very best efforts of industry to solve this problem there will undoubtedly be a certain number of cases brought to the courts and presented as legitimate cases of silicosis. While some of these are true cases of silicosis others, I have been informed, are not, but are designed merely as a means of obtaining funds from industry. A consideration of such cases brings us logically to the second part of the present discussion. What is the ideal method of handling compensation cases with reference to occupational disease and more particularly silicosis?

If we examine the development of the compensation acts we find that a technique designed primarily to adjudicate cases of industrial accidents has by degrees been given jurisdiction over occupational diseases. In fact, in some states diseases are regarded as injuries so that they may be brought within the scope of the original compensation acts. But on close examination it becomes apparent that diseases are far more difficult to adjudicate than are the ordinary injuries arising in industry. They present many technical facets and often require a detailed knowledge of this particular branch of medicine with which the average commissioner is very often unfamiliar. As a result we find in practice that the Court is presented with highly technical evidence by experts for the plaintiff and for the defendant which is very difficult if not impossible to satisfactorily evaluate. Often the commissioner is caught between the conflicting views of such witnesses and is not provided with his own experts to aid him in arriving at the real scientific background of the problem at hand.

What we really need is a strengthening of the technical side of the compensation acts to keep pace with the increased factual understanding regarding the occupational diseases. This does not merely refer to the Courts themselves but should begin with the promulgation of accurately worded compensation acts which clearly define the diseases for which compensation is to be paid. Compensation commissioners should be assisted by boards of technical experts composed of engineers appointed by the deans of the various engineering schools and of physicians appointed by the deans of the recognized medical schools. The engineers selected should have a very complete knowledge of factory conditions and the field of ventilation, and the physicians should be experts in the field of industrial hygiene and occupational disease. It is only with the aid of such highly specialized boards, or their equivalents, that the compensation commissioners may be able to do complete justice to both sides in these highly technical cases. It is the belief of the speaker that employers and employees alike would benefit greatly from the establishment and use of such boards. In order to hasten the establishment of this system employers are justified in appealing to their legislatures with this end in view; certainly such a legitimate demand should receive the hearty support of all concerned.

Frequently one is asked, what should be done with those claims which are based on little or no real evidence of injury to the worker but which are merely reared by some very enterprising attorney? Such claims are, I have been told, becoming very common of late and constitute a real problem to industry. It is obvious that the compensation advisory boards suggested earlier will, as soon as they are formed, serve the future as a healthy bulwark against this type of baseless claim and I venture to predict that few such cases would be favorably acted upon by a board of real experts in this field. At the present time factory officials should employ the very best legal talent available and should reinforce such legal talent with technical and medical experts thoroughly versed in the field of silicosis. Many cases have been lost by a failure to bring to bear the requisite technical aid required to prove the non-existence of a hazard. Here is an excellent example of a case in which money may be saved in the end by increased expenditures.

We now arrive at the final steps in the control of this problem, the physical and X-ray examination of the worker. Every factory should have pre-employment and routine post-examinations. It seems obvious that the burden of the health of the worker should not be placed on the plant without the privilege of the pre-employment examination. How can industry be legitimately expected to hire a worker "in the blind" as to his or her physical condition and then a day later be expected to shoulder the burden of the worker's health? By repeated physical examinations it is possible to discern the faint early deviations from normal health if any take place. In this manner the employer would be forewarned very early if any workmen showed lung changes suggestive of early silicosis. The routine industrial health examination on a broad scale throughout the major portion of American industry would constitute a public health procedure of major significance. By its means a very large proportion of the population would be aided in the prevention of the degenerative diseases of middle life which today constitutes such a real menace.

ADJOURNMENT