

Other Volumes in this Series

Users of this volume will find much value in its companion volumes. Here is the list:

TITLE	VOLUME No.
General Sessions and Detailed Index to all Volumes.....	1
Aeronautical Industries.....	2
Air Transport Industry.....	3
Automotive and Machine Shop Industries.....	4
Cement and Quarry Industries.....	5
Chemical Industries.....	6
Coal Mining Industry.....	7
Construction Industry.....	8
Electrical Equipment Industry.....	9
Farm Safety.....	10
Food Industry.....	11
Glass and Ceramics Industry.....	12
Home Safety.....	13
Industrial Nursing.....	14
Industrial Subject Sessions (Sponsored by ASSE).....	15
Maritime Industries (Marine Section).....	16
Meat Packing, Tanning and Leather Industries.....	17
Metals Industry.....	18
Mining Industry.....	19
Motor Transportation Industry (Commercial Vehicle Section).....	20
Petroleum Industry.....	21
Power Press and Forging Operations.....	22
Printing and Publishing Industry.....	23
Public Employment (Public Employees Safety Committee).....	24
Public Utilities Industries.....	25
Pulp and Paper Industry.....	26
Railroad Industry.....	27
Rubber Industry.....	28
School and College Safety.....	29
Textile Industry.....	30
Traffic Safety.....	31
Transit Industry.....	32
Wood Products Industries.....	33
Speaking With People (Early Morning Sessions).....	34

PRICES OF EXTRA COPIES OF INDIVIDUAL VOLUMES TO MEMBERS

VOLUME SIZE	1 to 9 copies Each	10 to 99 copies Each	100 to 999 copies Each	1000 or more Each
Less than 24 pages—	\$0.25	\$0.20	\$0.15	\$0.15
24 to 48 pages—	.30	.25	.20	.20
49 to 96 pages—	.40	.35	.30	.30
Over 96 pages—	.60	.55	.50	.50

Complete set of Transactions (34 volumes)—\$6.00

NON-MEMBER prices are double member prices, except volumes 10, 13, 29 and 31.

NATIONAL SAFETY COUNCIL • 425 NORTH MICHIGAN AVE. • CHICAGO 11, ILL.

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

24

1000-151-WHP

Current Safety Topics in the

METALS INDUSTRY

As presented in the
Sessions of the Metals Section
at the 1950 National Safety Congress

Management Interest in Accident Prevention.....	5
Safe Practices and Use of Protective Equipment in Galvanizing Operations.....	12
Safe Coating Operations in the Steel Plant.....	15
Safety and Health Problems in the Aluminum Industry.....	17
Safety and Health Problems in the Non-Ferrous Metals Industry.....	20
Safe Practices in Foundry Operations.....	22
Safety Equipment for Foundry Workers.....	23
The Problem of Industrial Hygiene in the Foundry.....	25
Presentation of Awards.....	27
Possible Clue for Further Accident Reduction.....	28
Dry Cleaning with Corn Cob Grits.....	30
Sling Chain Characteristics and Applications.....	32
Some Features of Sling Chains.....	34
Introduction to Job Safety Analysis.....	40
Job Safety Analysis.....	41

Volume 18
Transactions
1950 National Safety Congress

NATIONAL SAFETY COUNCIL
425 No. Michigan Avenue • Chicago 11, Ill.



SCF-ALL-F-01178

come a definite attitude or habit, and we know of no better way to accomplish this than by an adequate program of education and training. The employee must be taught that there is a right and safe way to do every job, and that this right and safe way is the only way the job should be done. I am sure that every company has some sort of training procedure for its employees. There has been no end of suggestions for training methods, and the subject has certainly been widely discussed. The training

program which is most likely to succeed is the one that fits the particular type of industry and the caliber of its personnel. In our St. Joe operations, we are seeking the type of educational program which will do a more efficient job of teaching the employee to think, to remember and to acquire a process to convert that knowledge into effective action. We are also trying to find some sort of a check-up method by which we will be apprised of the results, if any, that are being attained.

Safe Practices in Foundry Operations

By F. W. SHIPLEY

Foundry Manager, Caterpillar Tractor Co., Peoria, Ill.

We have always considered a progressive safety program just as essential in the operation of our foundry as the making of quality castings. Most of you are familiar with the rather unsatisfactory reputation foundries have had in the past relative to production methods, working conditions and safety measures. These conditions were more or less accepted as a part of the industry's environment.

Up until the early twenties foundry production was of a wide variety of castings and small quantities, however, when the popularity of the automobile began to grow the problem of production became apparent and new foundries were built and old ones expanded. These foundries were specifically designed to latest engineering principles of planning and operational procedures, embodying efficient handling and production methods with proper consideration to working conditions and safety.

We at Caterpillar were confronted with these same problems and a new foundry was built and started operation in 1930 and at that time the very latest design of mechanical equipment for producing and handling castings was installed together with latest methods of ventilation. These have been further improved through the years to keep pace with developments. Realizing that a progressive safety program was an essential in the operation of our foundry, safety equipment manufacturers were consulted to

design equipment which would give maximum protection to workers in all phases of operations. Employees were trained in safe practices as an important part of their jobs.

The results of this progressive program were indeed gratifying. Increased efficiency of production, lowering of operation costs, reduced labor turnover and improved employee morale were the benefits derived from this program.

For the last ten years we have been pouring 450 tons of gray iron and alloyed casting per day on a five day basis. Very frequently, in order to meet production requirements, we have worked six days per week.

Quoting from the National Safety Council injury rates for 1948, the national average for gray iron foundries is listed as: frequency—13.87 and severity—1.43. Caterpillar foundry's safety record for this period was: frequency—8.4 and severity .095. From the same source, the three year average for foundries for the years 1947-49 lists: frequency—17.21 and severity—1.49. Caterpillar foundry's figures for this period read: frequency—7.78 and severity—.071. Naturally, we are very proud of these comparisons, but we have no illusions that we have arrived at the point where improvement can no longer be accomplished. To the contrary, we will continue to stress safety in the operation of our foundry.

Safety Equipment for Foundry Workers

By PHIL OLSON

Safety Supervisor, Waukesha Works, International Harvester Co., Waukesha, Wis.

Let's talk about some of the safety equipment used to protect our foundry workers. First on my list is goggles. Goggles of all types should be provided. It is important to get the right type of goggles for the job. I believe one of the most important things is first to sell the employee on the idea of wearing eye protection rather than to emphasize the compulsory wearing of goggles. If you do have the proper goggles for the job the employee is doing, then and only then can you expect your employees to cooperate with you, rather than think of a million and one excuses why they cannot wear them.

Goggles must also be fitted, always feel comfortable, and be kept in good repair. Fitted and scratched lenses should be replaced, so that they do not interfere with the employee's vision. Speaking of goggles fitting properly, I personally know of plants where goggles are provided, and where, in ordering frames, they overlook such important items as ordering different size bridges. Unless you have these different size bridges you surely cannot get a proper fit, because you must have frame sizes to fit various face sizes.

More and more employers are providing corrected lenses or prescription goggles for employees with defective vision. This in itself is a great help to the safety supervisor, as you seldom have trouble with employees, who cannot see properly without glasses due to defective vision, when corrected lenses are provided. One of the biggest objections I have encountered is to sell the employee on wearing goggles with side shields. Many excuses are made. The most common being the excuse that they retard ventilation and cause the lenses to fog. Secondly, side shields create a blind area on either side of their vision, and they cannot see such things as cranes, trucks, and other moving hazards approaching from the side. I think they may have something there, but I haven't found a substitute for side shields to prevent an object from entering from the side of the face and probably causing an eye injury. The greatest salesman for goggles

is a few so called "eye saved" cases, and we have had plenty of those.

With the wide variety of goggles offered by the safety equipment companies today, I don't believe it is much of a problem to get the right type of goggles for any job, but regardless of this, you still have a selling job to do on your employees. Incidentally our company like many others furnishes corrected lense goggles to employees at no cost if they are required. If the employee leaves our company he has the privilege of paying one-half the cost price of the goggles and retaining them for his own use. By doing this you help the employee safeguard his eyesight no matter where he finds employment. We require the use of goggles by all employees in the plant except our molders, and we are arranging for coverage in that department now. We have not required our molders to wear goggles as they do no pouring or shifting, since we have a highly mechanized foundry. Our molders only make molds, and place them on conveyors next to their benches from where they are then conveyed to a pouring area. However, we know an eye injury hazard still exists, and we hope to have our employees completely equipped with goggles soon.

Our next important piece of safety equipment is leggings. We require that all employees such as shifters, who are working near the molds being poured, and of course the pouring crew, tappers, etc., wear knee type leather leggings at all times. We have tried several kinds of leggings and have found the knee type most serviceable in our foundry. Some of the reasons we finally decided on the knee-type, chrome-leather legging is that you can quickly jerk it off in an emergency. We did use a hip-type chrome-leather legging, but our experience has been that when carrying hand ladles, they are carried and raised in pouring a little above the knee, causing the leather to harden and shrink between the knee and the hip. We have been unable to bring back the original texture of the leather from its shrunken condition, and it does

not afford the protection desired to the upper part of the leg when this occurs. However, in wearing knee type leggings, it is important that the trousers be buttoned over the top of the leggings, so that molten metal cannot enter through the top and run down inside between the pants and the leggings.

Before I continue discussing personal safety equipment, let's see if, in your estimation, this wearing of safety equipment pays. I have positive proof that it does pay, because I can use the foundry I work in as an example of the results that can be obtained. The Harvester Company purchased and took over operation of the Waukegan Foundry in February 1946. We had no planned safety program and not many safety rules, such as those we have now requiring the wearing of safety equipment. We had 28 lost-time accidents among our foundry workers in 1946 including one fatality. In June of that year we had a safety program functioning and a goggle and legging wearing rule that worked. Our record thereafter showed how it worked. Of the 28 lost-time accidents in 1946, twenty-five happened during the first six months. We had three lost-time accidents the last six months of that year.

During 1947 we did not have a lost-time accident, and we did not have a lost-time accident again until August 1948, which was the only one of its type that year. So we worked two years with one lost-time accident. During these two years, 1947 and 1948, we worked over 2,159,000 hours with one lost-time accident in a 100 per cent foundry operation. Incidentally, the one accident we did have during 1947 and 1948 amounted to only three days lost time. In 1949 we had three lost-time accidents. These amounted to a total of 48 days lost time, and so far in 1950 we have had two lost-time accidents, one of which amounted to four days, and the other to one day of lost time. I think this record speaks for itself, and if you could see some of the damaged personal safety equipment turned in for replacement and repair, you too would be enthusiastic about equipping your employees with some type of goggles and other types of safety equipment.

In Wisconsin, as probably many of you know, under our Industrial Commission rules, any safety equipment that an em-

ployee is required to wear as a condition of employment must be furnished gratis by the employer. So we do not require that our employees wear safety shoes in order to hold their jobs, but we do our best to sell employees on the idea of wearing safety shoes. We sell two types of shoes, lace and what is commonly called molders shoes, which are the slip-on type with elastic sides. We sell lace shoes in both high and oxford styles. We discourage wearing oxfords except in our cleaning, inspection, core and finishing departments, as hot sand and molten metal in other departments may get in low shoes very easily. These safety shoes have saved many employees from serious injury. I wish I could show you a couple of shoes that have withstood the heavy impact of a casting that accidentally dropped or fell, as you could see how the blow was deflected or how the toe of the shoe was crushed without causing injury to the foot.

We also encourage the wearing of gloves by our grinders and employees who handle castings because an accident such as a cut or burn may take place. Many times a grinder's hand slips and touches the wheel. The glove is cut but the hand is saved from injury. Sharp edges on castings can cause nasty cuts, which can be prevented by the wearing of gloves. Likewise a shifter may accidentally burn his hand on molten metal or on a mold or weight. The gloves used are of the gauntlet and knitted-wrist type with a leather palm. Gloves are sold to employees at cost.

I think I have mentioned the hazards most common in our foundries which are burns, eye, foot and hand injuries, and the measures we have taken to prevent them. Of course, what is done to prevent such injuries is up to you, but we have prevented a lot of these injuries in our plant. Safety education is a never-ending process, and you must put all your efforts into it to keep it alive. A safety program must go on day-after-day so that there will be no letdown.

During the many years that I have been connected with safety, I have told myself on it. If you are sold it is that much easier to sell the other fellow, and if you do sell the other fellow on wearing personal safety equipment your safety program is bound to succeed.

The Problem of Industrial Hygiene in the Foundry

By HERBERT J. WEBER

Chief Industrial Hygienist, American Brake Shoe Co., Medical Department, Chicago, Ill.

Potential hazards to health in the foundry industry are becoming more numerous today because of advances in metallurgical research. Formerly the foundry was identified with silicosis, but recent studies have shown that the incidence of silicosis in the industry is low. However new alloying materials are now being used to obtain special metallurgical properties. Thus today we find lead, zinc, tellurium, beryllium, manganese, phosphorus, radioactive cobalt—to name a few materials—being used routinely in foundry. These have given rise to new hazards and to new problems of prevention. The solution is not the same for all yet, fortunately, there are some common principles of approach that are applicable in a generic way.

Sometimes I think preventive measures are becoming so complicated that only a trained hygienist is capable of applying them intelligently. On the other hand, there are certain common sense procedures that should seem obvious even to the uninitiated.

In the light of our present knowledge, you cannot deal with beryllium for example, in the same way as you would with silica or with radioactive materials, and respirators are not a solution. As I have said elsewhere: "Respirators are a stop gap—a dubious remedy. In the first place their use tells one into a sense of false security. Suppose management issues respirators to all exposed employees instead of controlling the dust and fume; and thereby in its mind disposes of the hazard, has it solved the problem? If the solution of industrial hygiene problems were that simple, you need no industrial hygiene program other than a respirator service, and you need no industrial hygienists. But actually, men will not wear respirators continuously because they are forced to breathe against a resistance; and for work requiring exertion or where there is exposure to heat, a respirator is a cruel remedy. Furthermore, unless the respirator fits tightly, it is worthless. In my experience, this device may be defined as a muzzie type ornament loosely pendant from

the neck and used in dirty industries to distinguish the laborers from the office employees.

"If a respirator must be worn, except for unusual cases and for intermittent or casual jobs, it is an indictment of the working environment and an admission of unhygienic conditions. It should be a last resort when all other solutions have failed or are impractical."

This is not to condemn respirators *per se*. They have their use and there is a real need for them in the situations mentioned but they have been readily seized upon as a panacea for all ills due to exposure to foundry dusts and fumes. Properly and appropriately worn, they are effective.

As I said before, the problem of prevention is a complicated one. Some foundries are mechanized, some are production shops, others jobbing shops. One makes beryllium bronze castings, another tellurium iron, and yet another manganese steel. Correct and safe procedures will be different in each instance and the limitations of this paper prevent a detailed analysis of these specific problems.

However, there are some control factors common to all and within the reach of the poorest plant. Oddly enough they are, in my opinion, the most powerful weapons in the fight against occupational disease. They are:

1. *A willingness on the part of top management to correct bad conditions.* Lip service is futile and is readily sensed by the line supervision. The annual pep talk at the safety dinner is not enough. Supervisors must be made to account for departmental hygiene as well as for production. In my experience, unless you have the support of top management, the most expensive exhaust systems will not bring about good working environment.

2. *Good Housekeeping.* It costs little but pays the biggest dividends. A cluttered and dirty area in a foundry causes accidents and occupational disease.

I will venture to say that the greatest reduction in the incidence of occupational disease and of accidents in the foundry will be brought about by good housekeeping. It is almost a complete answer to the question: "What can I do about industrial hygiene?" and yet it is often so ignored. If a plant manager walked into the treasurer's office and found twenty-dollar bills lying on the floor, in the waste basket, on the window ledges, he'd be scandalized. Yet, in his own plant, equipment and material—all of which represent dollars—are strewn about in the same careless manner.

A certain foundry decided to put a new concrete floor in the core room. When the contractor arrived to set the forms, he found a perfectly good concrete floor about a foot below the dirt. That is a true story!

It has been shown by Hatch that occupational disease is directly proportional to crowding.

A study of 43 foundries in New York State revealed the following startling relationships between housekeeping and the incidence of silicosis.

Housekeeping	Plants	Silicosis Incidence (Percent)		
		Median	Maximum	Minimum
Fair	5	1.9	2.8	1.0
Poor	18	4.4	15.4	1.0
Bad	22	5.4	13.8	0.8

Note that no foundries were classified as having good housekeeping; only 5 were fair, 18 poor, but most of them bad. Note also the sharp reduction in the incidence of silicosis between plants with bad housekeeping and those with fair. What would the difference be if the comparison were made between plants having bad and very good housekeeping?

In one of our own brass foundries we had approximately 14 cases of lead poisoning a month. With little change in the ventilating system but by reason of an excellent regimen of good housekeeping alone, we have not had a single case in over five years.

I know of a foundry that removed 60 tons of dust from the superstructures. Such material finally exceeds the angle of repose, and dust from the superstructures is constantly set air-borne by building vibration. Particles of physiologically significant size will remain suspended in still air for very long periods thus contaminating the atmosphere long after the dust-producing op-

eration has ceased. A spherical particle having the same density as quartz will fall 0.016 foot per minute or 1 foot per hour in still air. This important fact has not been fully appreciated by the foundry industry.

I have found high dust concentrations in foundries with very good ventilating systems because the floors and rafters were seldom if ever cleaned. For this reason, I have been strongly in favor of central built-in vacuum cleaning systems capable of maintaining a vacuum of 12 inches of mercury at six outlets simultaneously. Such systems are not expensive. In fact, I believe a built-in vacuum cleaning system is as important as a good ventilating installation if we are to have good industrial hygiene in the foundry.

3. The third important control factor is education. I have found unsafe conditions in the foundry because the supervision was ignorant of the toxic effects of the materials they used or of the hazards involved in a given process.

For example, one foundry was blissfully engaged in the production of beryllium copper, totally unaware of the reported extreme toxicity of beryllium; and the material was handled and processed with the same indifference as phosphor-copper.

Another plant making copper castings was surprised when the workmen contracted lead poisoning because the copper contained less than 2 per cent lead. They forgot about the vapor pressure of lead at the melting temperature of copper and, as a result, there was a high concentration of lead-in-air around the unexhausted furnaces.

A third plant did not know that fumes from welding and burning steel and gray iron castings is principally iron oxide. In the concentrations produced by those operations, iron oxide will cause a lung condition known as siderosis. Siderosis consists of a pigmentation of the lungs due to deposits of iron throughout the lung fields. It is nondisabling and is harmless much as a tattoo mark on the skin is harmless though undesirable. However, the iron deposits are radio-opaque and their shadows seen on a roentgenogram are very similar in appearance to those caused by fibrosis due to free silica. As a result, a diagnosis of silicosis is frequently made and compensation for a non-existent disability results.

Now foundrymen are not toxicologists or industrial hygienists and, therefore, cannot be expected to know the hazards involved in founding. But the United States Department of Health, branches of which are set up in each state, is at their service at no charge. This is a fact-finding organization without coercive or police powers; and, therefore, no plant should fear to call on

them for assistance if the plant really wants technical advice.

The foregoing three factors then: (1) Conviction on the part of top management that good industrial hygiene is good business; (2) Good housekeeping; and (3) Education, are prerequisites in any foundry hygiene program. Without them, it is foolish to discuss safe practices or to install expensive ventilating systems.

Presentation of Awards

By GROVER C. BROWN

Secretary, Industrial Relations Committee, American Iron and Steel Institute, New York, N. Y.

The metals industry was one of the first to be recognized as a separate and distinct section of the National Safety Council. Metals, together with nine other industries was organized as a separate section in 1915. The first safety contest for this section was held 14 years later in 1929. Today we are celebrating its 22nd consecutive safety contest.

Only 34 units were entered in that first contest, all under one general classification but divided into groups A and B according to size. Through the years this section has grown until it now encompasses nine separate classifications, each divided into three groups, A, B, and C according to size. As you know, these nine classifications are: steel mills, iron and steel rolling mills, non-ferrous metals and products, foundries, machine shops with foundries, heavy fabricating, light fabricating, heavy machinery and light machinery. Included within these nine classifications are 2,315 separate operating units scattered geographically from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico and from the Atlantic to the Pacific coast. All are eligible to compete in this Metals Section's Safety Contest.

A "Unit" may be a single plant or department or a group of plants or departments, a part or the whole of a company. These 2,315 operating units have combined payrolls of more than a million employees, all potential players on the many scores of safety teams eligible to compete in this contest.

This year 706 units have satisfied all requirements and completed the contest. This is equivalent approximately to one out of every three units eligible to compete. (A few additional units participated through part or all of the contest period but for some reason have failed to fulfill all requirements to the end and are not now included in this total.) To build up this total of 706 competing units, the heavy fabricating and light fabricating divisions each supplied 128. Light machinery supplied 103 units, foundries—96, and heavy machinery—90. Sixty-nine units came from steel mills and 32 from non-ferrous metals and products. Iron and steel rolling mills and machine shops with foundries contributed the remainder with 30 each. One hundred and sixty-six of these units are in Group A, 239 in Group B, and 301 in Group C.

Ninety-six of these units have emerged from this contest as 1st place winners. This is equivalent to an average of approximately one for every seven units which satisfactorily completed the contest. (A winner is a unit with a perfect score or with the lowest score in its respective group.) Group A, of largest units, is credited with 9 winners; Group B, of medium sized units, has 13 winners; and Group C, of smallest units has come through with 74 winners. The ratios of number of 1st place winners to number of contestants is therefore—

For Group A—1 for every 18.4 units
For Group B—1 for every 18.4 units
For Group C—1 for every 4.1 units

A total of 87 perfect scores were achieved among the 96 1st place winners in this contest. Two of these perfect scores were made in Group A, 11 in Group B, and 74 in Group C. It will be noted that all winners in Group C had perfect scores.

Of the 96 1st place trophies to be awarded, light fabricating will capture the largest share, or 23; next in order will come foundries and heavy fabricating, each with 19. Light machinery will receive 14, and heavy fabricating 10. Finally, steel mills have won four trophies, machine shops with foundries three, and iron and steel rolling mills and non-ferrous metals and products, two each.

(In addition to the 96 first-place winners which will be awarded trophies, there are also 15 second-place and 18 third-place winners, which will be awarded certificates.)

The concerted efforts of the 706 contestants in this Metals Section's contest have resulted in reducing the average accident frequency rate in this industry from 6.55 attained in the 1948-49 contest to 5.35 for the current contest—a reduction of 18 per cent. Each of the nine classifications in this section can take just pride in the part which it has played in this noteworthy accomplishment. Among them, improvement ranges from a maximum of 24 per cent for foundries to a minimum of 14 per cent for both heavy machinery and non-ferrous

metals and products. Machine shops with foundries improved 22 per cent; light machinery 21 per cent; heavy fabricating 20 per cent; and iron and steel rolling mills 19 per cent. Steel mills, which had the lowest rate among all of the classifications in the 1948-49 contest, has maintained that position in this contest through an improvement of 16 per cent and a current low frequency rate of 3.44.

A number of companies have winning units in more than one classification and more than one group. Only one company, however, has more than one winning unit in Group A, and none has more than one winning unit in Group B. Specifically, Bethlehem Steel Company has two winning units in Group A and one in Group C. U. S. Steel has one in Group A and nine in Group C. Republic Steel has one in each of Groups A and B and seven in C. Westinghouse Electric has one in each of Groups A and B and two in C. Jones and Laughlin Steel has one in Group B and four in Group C. Finally, the E. I. DuPont Company, the James B. Clow Company, the Pullman Standard Car Company, and the Western Electric Company each have one winning unit in each of Groups B and C.

It should be noted that American Brake Shoe Company, although not having winning units in more than one group, has the distinction of 14 winning units in Group C.

Possible Clue for Further Accident Reduction

By WM. C. OBERG

General Manager of Operations, Carnegie-Illinois Steel Corporation

We, in management, who head up company activities, whether they be safety, operations, engineering or any of the other phases of our business, spend a great deal of time studying the problems connected with our specific activities and those of our industry as a whole. As a result, we obtain definite pictures of our objectives, how we shall attain them and the part each member of our organization will play. We strive in this manner to know how to be ready for any eventuality and how to begin action when a particular problem arises.

The essential facts must be separated from the many details that surround them.

All things must be simplified to the extent that the primary objectives are clear and well-defined and each member of the organization understands the full scope of his job. Despite the time and energy that might be put into studying a particular problem and determining the course of action to be taken, what would be gained if each individual did not fulfill his part in the over-all plan? It is not primarily the plan devised and put into effect that solves problems and brings progress to industry, but rather the job done by each of us while putting that plan into action.

To accomplish whatever task we might

Possible Clue for Further Accident Reduction

have to perform, therefore, specifications have been established for each management position in our plants, including the safety engineer.

The first responsibility is "analyzing and appraising the adequacy of existing safety and sanitation conditions, procedures, methods, practices and training." The single objective safety program approached the industrial safety problem by reviewing past experiences and determining those situations that resulted in accidents in the past.

Through such a plan, the safety engineer develops an "awareness" of critical situations which must be corrected to prevent a recurrence of accidents. Another approach is the prevention of accidents before they happen, based upon an awareness of the causes of injuries. The utilization of both of these approaches requires careful analysis of accident reports, procedure, and past records. But these, in themselves, will not permit the safety engineer to do a thorough and effective job.

Each operation must be studied separately on-the-job to determine where potential accidents are "waiting to happen." Awareness is an understanding that is based upon facts obtained through careful study and analysis of all the factors bearing on the safe performance of every job and operation. The development of his own awareness of accident possibilities, therefore, is the safety engineer's first step toward making himself ready for the problems that lie ahead. It is also essential to his helping the operator to do the best possible safety job.

An actual case of lack of awareness concerns a workman in a billet yard who perched on the end of a billet protruding from the pile and proceeded to cut it off with a burning torch. His lack of awareness resulted in a fractured leg. Consider the case, also, of a workman who proceeded to burn off a wall bracket which extended from the wall about four feet above the ground. When the bracket was separated, it fell on the man's foot and also resulted in a fracture.

In both of these cases, the men involved were "looking without seeing." They were not aware of the possibilities of injury existing in the job being done. The safety engineer, therefore, must assume the responsibility of creating an awareness of

injurious situations as they may exist throughout his area.

In a line and staff organization such as ours, line departments have full authority and responsibility for the execution of new improvements and programs. They determine what should be done and give the orders to do it. On the other hand, the safety engineer, as a staff representative who understands that line authority does not belong to him, must not only develop his own sense of awareness, but also that of line department supervisors in his areas.

Closely allied with the analysis and appraisal of safety matters are the safety engineer's duties in connection with accident investigation. The safety engineer makes an independent investigation of each lost-time accident. In addition, he participates in an advisory capacity when department and division superintendents conduct formal reviews of these accidents. On such occasions, he critically examines for adequacy the facts presented, as well as the judgments of the group, and then collaborates with them in developing corrective measures.

In connection with all of the work so far described, a variety of information in the form of reports and records reaches the hands of the safety engineer. It is his responsibility to see that this information is maintained in suitable form for the use of department and plant management in controlling and preventing injuries. In some cases, such as single objective awareness and control charts, records are maintained in the various departments.

We all recognize that the pay-off of safety investigations and appraisals comes when effective controls are established and accident frequencies go down. This matter requires complete collaboration between the safety staff, line department management personnel, and other staffs concerned. The safety engineer consults with his superior, the general supervisory management to determine plans, procedures, and programs designed to eliminate accidents. At such times, the safety engineer again acts in an advisory capacity, passing along his recommendations to those members of the department who have sole authority to take the action he suggests. In a similar manner, he collaborates with various staff departments for the purpose of providing better service to the line.

Officers of the

METALS SECTION

NATIONAL SAFETY COUNCIL 1950-51

General Chairman—PAUL E. GRUNDMAN, Safety Engineer, Rustless Iron and Steel Division, Armco Steel Corporation, Baltimore, Md.

First Vice-Chairman—HOWARD HOLLAND, Supervisor of Safety, The Youngstown Sheet & Tube Company, East Chicago, Ind.

Second Vice-Chairman—H. S. SIMPSON, Safety Engineer, Caterpillar Tractor Company, Peoria, Ill.

Secretary—J. J. NOLAN, Safety Engineer, Bethlehem Steel Company, Bethlehem, Pa.

News Letter Editor—A. H. ZEILINGER, Safety Engineer, The Colorado Fuel & Iron Corporation, Pueblo, Colorado.

News Letter Co-Editor—W. J. M. REDWOOD, Safety Supervisor, Industrial Relations Department, Algoma Steel Corporation, Ltd., Sault Ste. Marie, Ont., Canada.

Engineering and Practices Committee—GERARD O. GRIFFIN (Chairman), Director of Safety, Dravo Corporation, Neville Island, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Steel Industry—A. G. WHISMAN (Chairman), Supervisor of Safety, Gary Steel Works, Carnegie-Illinois Steel Corporation, Gary, Ind.; W. E. BARKER, Safety Advisor, East Works Plant, Armco Steel Corporation, Middletown, Ohio; W. D. WILLIAMS, Assistant Supervisor of Safety, The Youngstown Sheet & Tube Company, East Chicago, Ind.; W. T. McLEAN, Supervisor of Safety, Carnegie-Illinois Steel Corporation, Youngstown, Ohio.

Foundry Industry—J. D. HOLTZAPPLE (Chairman), Personnel Supervisor, Continental Foundry & Machine Company, East Chicago, Ind.; *D. A. FARRELL (Advisory Chairman), Supervisor of Safety, Carnegie-Illinois Steel Corporation, Pittsburgh, Pa.; *IRVIN A. BRINKMAN, Director of Employment, Safety & Welfare, Mackintosh-Hemphill Company, Pittsburgh, Pa.; E. J. WALLMAN, District Supervisor of Safety, American Brake Shoe Company, Chicago, Ill.; C. J. VAN DAMN, Safety Director, Campbell, Wyant & Cannon Foundry Company, Muskegon, Mich.; A. G. STARRETT, Personnel Director, The Buckeye Steel Castings Company, Columbus, Ohio; EARLE M. LAYMAN, Director of Personnel, General Steel Castings Corporation, Eddystone, Pa.; SHERMAN RICHARDSON, Assistant Personnel Manager, American Radiator and Standard Sanitary Corporation, Pittsburgh, Pa.; T. R. SEELING, Employment Manager, Manufacturing Division, Well-McLain Company, Michigan City, Ind.

Fabricating Industry—W. H. WILSON (Chairman), Safety Director, Ambridge Plant, American Bridge Company, Ambridge, Pa.; FRED B. SKEATES, Personnel Director, Link-Belt Company, Chicago, Ill.; H. PALMINI, Safety Engineer, J. I. Case Company, Rockford Works, Rockford, Ill.; WALTER E. WILLIAMS, Safety Engineer, Butler Manufacturing Company, Galesburg, Ill.

Non-Ferrous Metals Industries—C. L. BRADSHAW (Chairman), Safety Director, Aluminum Company of America, Pittsburgh, Pa.; *H. G. HENSEL (Advisory Chairman), Safety Director, The Youngstown Sheet & Tube Company, Chicago, Ill.; MILES I. ABEL, Executive Vice-President, Magnesium Company of America, East Chicago, Ind.; C. L. RIENZO, Supervisor of Workmen's Compensation, Revere Copper and Brass Incorporated, Rome, N. Y.; T. F. BRADY, Superintendent, First Aid and Employment Department, The International Nickel Company, Incorporated, Huntington Works, Huntington, W. Va.; WILLIAM S. VISOKAY, Superintendent of Safety, Bridgeport Brass Company, Bridgeport, Conn.; W. J. NEEDHAM, Safety Eng., Anaconda Copper Mining Company, Anaconda, Mont.; C. L. MCCOY, Director of Personnel, Chase Brass & Copper Company, Cleveland, Ohio.

Steel Warehousing Industry—JOHN C. CUSHING (Chairman), Director of Industrial Relations, United States Steel Supply Company, Chicago, Ill.; *F. W. KELSEY (Advisory Chairman), Supervisor of Safety & Welfare, Jones & Laughlin Steel Corporation, Jones & Laughlin Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Wire Manufacturing Industry—PETER CONTARDO (Chairman), Safety Director, John A. Roebling's Sons Company, Trenton, N. J.; *J. F. COLLINS, Supervisor of Safety, The Youngstown Sheet & Tube Company, Youngstown, Ohio.

Metallic Coating Industry—BONNIE TRENT (Chairman), Chairman, Plant Safety Committee, American Hot Dip Galvanizers Association, Inc., Pittsburgh, Pa.; *C. M. ALLEN (Advisory Chairman), Staff Supervisor of Safety, Armco Steel Corporation, Middletown, Ohio.

Program Committee—GEORGE J. EIGENROD (Chairman), Safety Supervisor, Republic Steel Corporation, Buffalo, N. Y.; E. H. HOUCK (Vice-Chairman), Superintendent of Safety and Welfare, Aliquippa Works, Jones & Laughlin Steel Corporation, Aliquippa, Pa.; T. R. SMITH, Safety Supervisor, Republic Steel Corporation, Youngstown, Ohio; J. E. NICHOLS, Director of Safety, Reynolds Metals Company, Reynolds Metals Building, Richmond, Va.; EDWARD MARTIN, Director of Safety, Oliver Iron and Steel Corporation, South Tenth and Muriel Streets, Pittsburgh, Pa.; ALLEN M. MORGAN, Manager, Industrial Relations Department, Haynes Stellite, Kokomo, Ind.; G. F. GRACE, Assistant to General Sales Manager, Industrial Chain Division, Columbus McKimmon Chain Corporation, Tonawanda, N. Y.; J. N. MAHAN, Supervisor of Safety and Insurance, Continental Steel Corporation, Kokomo, Ind.

Contest and Statistics Committee—HUDSON W. REED, JR. (Chairman), Director of Industrial Relations, The American Welding & Manufacturing Company, Warren, Ohio; E. J. LANGLAND, Safety Director, Great Lakes Steel Corporation, Ecorse, Detroit, Mich.; W. W. MacVICAR, Superintendent, Safety Department, Bethlehem Steel Company, Sparrows Point Plant, Sparrows Point, Md.; J. P. LEONARD, Personnel and Safety Director, Blaw-Knox Company, Pittsburgh, Pa.; W. ROY WIDDOES, Director of Industrial Relations, Lukens Steel Company, Coatesville, Pa.

Poster Committee—D. D. MATEER (Chairman), Supervisor, Safety and Welfare Department, Pittsburgh Works, Jones & Laughlin Steel Corporation, Pittsburgh, Pa.; A. E. ASEL, Safety Supervisor, Sheffield Steel Corporation, Kansas City, Mo.; H. J. JONES, Manager, Industrial Relations, The Colorado Fuel & Iron Corporation, Buffalo, N. Y.; STANLEY W. HALL, Safety Engineer, Steel Operations, Ford Motor Company, Dearborn, Mich.; H. L. REBRASSIER, President, The Society of Ohio Safety Engineers, Wheeling Steel Corporation, Wheeling, W. Va.; PAUL LUNDQUIST, Safety Director, Acme Steel Company, Riverdale, Ill.

Membership Committee—E. O. KUMLER (Chairman), Assistant Director, Industrial Relations, Safety, Casualty & Pensions, American Steel & Wire Company, Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio; R. M. DAVIS, General Supervisor of Safety, Homestead Works, Carnegie-Illinois Steel Corporation, Munhall, Pa.; W. M. NELSON, Manager of Safety, Republic Steel Corporation, Republic Building, Cleveland, Ohio; A. L. LOTT, Manager of Industrial Relations, The Steel Company of Canada, Ltd., General Offices, Hamilton, Canada; C. J. VANDEVENTER, Safety Director, Atlantic Steel Company, Atlanta, Ga.; R. H. BUMGARDNER, Manager, Safety and Casualty Bureau, Tennessee Coal, Iron and Railroad Company, Birmingham, Ala.; MILO W. GRAY, Safety Director, Weirton Steel Company, Weirton, W. Va.

Final Education Committee—ROBERT S. B. HOLMES (Chairman), Director of Training and Safety, National Tube Company, Frick Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.; E. D. MORGAN, Superintendent of Plant Protection & Safety, Bethlehem Plant, Bethlehem Steel Company, Bethlehem, Pa.; J. A. DOWNEY, JR., Director, Personnel & Safety, Sloss-Sheffield Steel & Iron Company, Birmingham, Ala.; ARTHUR D. MURPHY, Director of Safety and Suggestion Plan, Crucible Steel Company of America, Pittsburgh, Pa.; KENNETH I. WARD, Assistant to Supervisor of Safety, The Youngstown Sheet & Tube Company, Youngstown, Ohio.

Trade Association Liaison Committee—EDWARD C. METZEL (Chairman), Industrial Relations Department, United States Steel Corporation, Pittsburgh, Pa.; J. R. VAN SYCKLE, Safety Supervisor, Republic Steel Corporation, Republic Building, Cleveland, Ohio; R. M. WALSH, Assistant Director, Safety and Plant Service, Inland Steel Company, Indiana Harbor Works, East Chicago, Ind.; J. F. JULI, Safety Director, Consolidated Western Steel Corporation, Los Angeles, Cal.; G. A. RILEY, Supervisor of Safety, American Brake Shoe Company, New York, N. Y.; A. R. WOLFE, Assistant Treasurer, American Smelting and Refining Company, New York, N. Y.; HARRY E. FRAVER, Safety Director, L. A. Young Spring & Wire Corporation, Detroit, Mich.

Health Committee—DR. S. A. NORRIS (Chairman), Chief Surgeon, Jones & Laughlin Steel Corporation, Pittsburgh, Pa.; DR. RICHARD J. BENNETT, Chief Surgeon, Carnegie-Illinois Steel Corporation, Chicago, Ill.; DR. W. F. LYON, Supervisor, Medical Services, International Harvester Company, Chicago, Ill.; DR. E. H. CARLETON, Medical Director, Inland Steel Company, Indiana Harbor Works, East Chicago, Ind.

Members-at-Large—*E. F. BLANK, Assistant to Vice-President, Employee and Public Relations, Jones & Laughlin Steel Corporation, Jones & Laughlin Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.; GROVER C. BROWN, Secretary, Industrial Relations Committee, American Iron and Steel Institute, New York, N. Y.; *R. A. CHAFFIN, Vice-President, Industrial Relations, Continental Steel Corporation, Kokomo, Ind.; *R. H. FERGUSON, Assistant Director of Industrial Relations, Republic Steel Corporation, Republic Building, Cleveland, Ohio; *G. T. FONDA, Assistant to President, Weirton Steel Company, Weirton, W. Va.; *E. H. FYLER, Superintendent, Industrial Relations, Carnegie-Illinois Steel Corporation, Gary Steel Works, Gary, Ind.; *H. J. GRIFFITH, Assistant to Manager of Coal Mines, Jones & Laughlin Steel Corporation, Vesta-Shamokin Coal Division, California, Pa.; *F. A. LAUERMAN, Director of Industrial Relations, Republic Steel Corporation, Youngstown, Ohio; *J. A. OARTEL, Pittsburgh, Pa.; R. L. SCHMITT, 130 North Bayly Street, Louisville, Ky.; *H. J. SPOERER, Director of Industrial Relations, The Youngstown Sheet & Tube Company, Youngstown, Ohio.

Staff Representative—WM. N. DAVIS, Senior Engineer, National Safety Council, Chicago, Ill.

*Past General Chairman.