



TRANSACTIONS

26th

National Safety
Congress

NATIONAL SAFETY COUNCIL, Inc.

KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI
OCTOBER 11 to OCTOBER 15, 1937

Municipal Auditorium

Copyright, 1937, National Safety Council, Inc.

Foreword

THE Transactions of the Twenty-sixth National Safety Congress, 1937, are published by the National Safety Council in two volumes. This, the first, contains the general, the special subject, and the Industrial Section sessions. The second volume contains the sessions of the Child Education, Home Safety, Street and Highway Traffic, Commercial Vehicle and Transit Sections.

All industrial members of the Council automatically receive Volume I. Volume II is sent to members believed to be interested chiefly in the sessions it covers. Other Council members, however, may obtain it upon request.

Many members have found it worth while to distribute copies of the Transactions to supervisors, foremen, and others in an administrative or supervisory position who may make practical use of them for reference purposes. The following quantity prices are quoted on extra copies: 1 to 10 copies of the large volume (Volume I), \$2 each; 11 copies or more, \$1.75 each; copies of the smaller volume (Volume II), 75 cents each.

THE Transactions are published as a condensed record of the proceedings at the National Congress. The papers of each session or division of the Congress have been edited carefully to eliminate extraneous matter and to abbreviate the less essential portions because of space limitations. Thus the material herein presented is not a verbatim report of all the speeches presented at the Congress, but rather an abridged version made as compact as possible, yet without injury to the technical aspects of any address. The original manuscripts are on file in the Council's Bureau of Information, where they are available for additional reference. Where illustrations were sent by the speakers to the Council, these also are on file.

The National Safety Council at its Congresses seeks to eliminate from discussion matters which are not pertinent to the aim of the Congress or which are contrary to Council policies. It cannot accept responsibility for the views expressed either in the papers presented or in the discussions based upon the papers.

NATIONAL SAFETY COUNCIL, INC.

20 North Wacker Drive
Chicago

Contents

Council Officers and Directors.....	4
Council Purposes and Policies.....	9
Annual Meeting of Members.....	11
Annual Banquet.....	31
Subject Sessions—	
After Work Accidents.....	33
Agricultural Safety.....	41
Community Safety Organization.....	51
Fire Prevention.....	59
Health Service in Industry.....	71
Industrial Dusts.....	85
Industrial Fumes, Gases and Vapors.....	99
Industrial Safety Lectures.....	109
Maintaining Interest in Safety.....	141
Pressure Vessels.....	157
Safety Fundamentals.....	173
Safety Inspectors.....	183
Safety Training.....	193
Safe Use of Acids.....	201
Aeronautical Section.....	211
A.S.S.E.—Engineering Section.....	221
Automotive and Machine Shop—Power Press Sections.....	225
Cement and Quarry Sections.....	249
Chemical Section.....	271
Construction Section.....	285
Food Section.....	307
Industrial Nursing.....	323
Marine Section.....	341
Meat Packing, Tanning and Leather Industries Section.....	371
Metals Section.....	381
Mining Section.....	401
Paper and Pulp Section.....	429
Petroleum Section.....	489
Power Press Section.....	535
Public Utilities Section.....	537
Quarry Section.....	557
Refrigeration Section.....	559
Rubber Section.....	577
Safety Equipment Section.....	581
Steam Railroad Meeting.....	587
Textile Section.....	601
Wood Products Section.....	611
Index.....	621

ational afety Council, Inc.

HONORARY MEMBERS

ASSOCIATION OF IRON AND STEEL ENGINEERS
ROBERT W. CAMPBELL
LAW R. PALMER

OFFICERS (1937-1938)

D. J. FENNEL, President
C. W. DEANEY, Vice-President for Finance and Treasurer
HARRY GOLDBART, Vice-President for Membership
FRANK H. HARRISON, Vice-President for Industrial Safety
HON. HAROLD G. HORTMAN, Vice-President for Public Safety
WALTER S. PAINE, Vice-President for Engineering
A. V. ROHWER, Vice-President for Local Safety Councils
A. W. WHITNEY, Vice-President for Education
W. H. CAMERON, Secretary and Managing Director

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE (1937-1938)

H. W. ANDERSON, General Motors Corporation
J. I. HANASHI, Past President
C. W. BURGESS, Past President
HARRY W. BURGESS, Petroleum Section
C. B. BACLET, ASSE-Engineering Section
H. W. BOULTON, Automotive and Machine Shop Section
HAROLD S. BUTTERFIELD, The American City Magazine
W. H. CAMERON, National Safety Council, Inc.
ROBERT W. CAMPBELL, Past President
ROBERT I. CARRIS, Aetna Casualty & Surety Company
R. A. CHAFFIN, Metals Section
LAWIS A. DELMON, Past President
C. W. DEANEY, The Liquid Carbonic Corporation
MARCUS A. DOW, Past President
D. J. FENNEL, Consulting Engineer
JOHN B. GINSON, Western Electric Company
HARRY GOLDBART, The Pullman Company
FRANK H. HARRISON, International Harvester Company
P. L. G. HASSKRO, Lehigh Valley Safety Council
HON. HAROLD G. HORTMAN, Governor, State of New Jersey
S. B. HORTMAN, Food Section
WALTER G. KING, Past President

OFFICERS AND DIRECTORS, Continued

Wm. C. KNOELK, Milwaukee Safety Commission
JOHN E. LONG, Past President
THOS. H. MACDONALD, U. S. Department of Agriculture
WALTER B. MARTIN, Peoria Association of Commerce Safety Council
I. W. MULLARD, Industrial Gloves Company
HAROLD L. MINER, E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.
PROF. ROGER L. MORRISON, Street & Highway Traffic Section
E. J. O'BRIEN, JR., Louisville Safety Council
WALTER S. PAINE, Aetna Life & Affiliated Cos.
LAW R. PALMER, Past President
C. E. PATTINSON, Past President
ALBERT S. RIGOLD, Industrial Relations Counselors, Inc.
I. T. GUY, HENRY A. RENSIGER, Past President
A. V. ROHWER, Dubuq, Missabe & Iron Range Railway Co.
GEORGE E. SANFORD, General Electric Co.
CHARLES B. SCOTT, Past President
GEN. JOHN H. SUDBURY, Massachusetts Safety Council
JUDGE LEE E. SKEEL, Cleveland Safety Council
C. W. SMITH, Standard Oil Company (Ind.)
WALTER DENT SMITH, Delaware Safety Council
R. T. SOLENTEN, Elliott Service Company
C. P. TOLMAN, Past President
GEORGE G. TRAVER, Greater Chicago Safety Council, Inc.
DR. C. H. WATSON, Past President
A. W. WHITNEY, National Conservation Bureau
T. A. WILSON, Textile Section
W. E. WORTH, International Harvester Co.
ARTHUR H. YOUNG, Past President

DIRECTORS (1937-1938)

GEORGE J. ADAMS, Paper and Pulp Section
H. W. ANDERSON, General Motors Corp.
A. L. ARNSTRONG, Eastman Kodak Company
H. H. BAILEY, Chattanooga Safety Council
J. I. HANASHI, Consulting Engineer
CARL BARBER, St. Louis Safety Council
G. J. BARNETT, Mining Section
ERNEST W. BECK, United States Rubber Products, Inc.
C. W. BURGESS, Western Electric Co.
E. F. BLANK, Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp.
HARRY W. BURGESS, Petroleum Section
H. E. BURY, South Bend Civic Safety Council

OFFICERS AND DIRECTORS, Continued

C. B. BOUTER, ASSE-Engineering Section
H. W. BOUTON, Automotive & Machine Shop Section
F. S. BROWN, Standard Accident Insurance Co.
W. A. BROWN, Safety Department, Nashville Chamber of Commerce
W. T. BUCKENBERG, Employees' Publication Section
S. W. BURGENT, Safety Department, Automobile Club of Rhode Island
HAROLD S. BUTTERFIELD, The American City Magazine
B. J. CACCIARI, Contra Costa County Safety Council
W. H. CAMERON, National Safety Council, Inc.
RAY CARNEY, Kenosha Safety Council
ROBERT I. CULLEN, Aetna Casualty & Surety Co.
R. A. CHARTIN, Metals Section
KENNETH B. COLMAN, Seattle Traffic & Safety Council
J. E. CULINNEY, Bethlehem Steel Co.
LEWIS A. DUFFALO, Consulting Engineer
JAY E. DICKER, Mason City Safety Council
C. W. DEMPSEY, The Liquid Carbonic Corp.
JAMES B. DUGGAS, The Philadelphia Gas Works Co.
DR. LOUIS I. DOMAN, Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.
O. M. EDWARDS, Jr., Safety Div., Syracuse Chamber of Commerce
W. P. ELSTON, Public Utilities Section
D. D. FINNELL, Consulting Engineer
D. L. FINNELL, Kansas City Safety Council
DONALD A. FISKE, Toledo Safety Council
DR. HART E. FISHER, Chicago Rapid Transit Co.
CHAS. C. FISK, Berkeley Traffic Safety Commission
HOWARD B. FORD, Bourroughs Wellcome & Co. (U.S.A.) Inc.
ALEXANDER FOSTER, JR., Quarry Section
JOHN B. GIBSON, Western Electric Co.
HOWARD F. GILBERT, Elizabeth Safety Council
ORNO M. GRAVES, The General Crushed Stone Co.
W. A. GARTIN, American Telephone & Telegraph Co.
HARRY GILBERT, The Pullman Co.
ISAIAH HALE, The Archison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co.
C. H. HAMER, Refrigeration Section
D. T. HARRINGTON, U. S. Bureau of Mines
FRANK H. HARRISON, International Harvester Co.
P. L. G. HASSKAMP, Lehigh Valley Safety Council
R. C. HAVES, Commercial Vehicle Section
G. T. HILMUTH, Chicago, North Shore & Milwaukee RR. Co.
CHAS. F. HUBB, New York Central Lines
HUGH HUBBARD G. HORTMAN, Governor, State of New Jersey
E. C. HORTON, JR., Marine Section

OFFICERS AND DIRECTORS, Continued

EVERETT HORN, Madison County Safety Council
S. B. HOUNSLEY, Food Section
H. C. HOWSAM, Power Press Section
FRED B. HUNT, Cement Section
MAYOR NORMAN A. HUNT, Columbus Safety Council
R. D. JEWITT, Springfield Safety Council
THOMAS P. KEARNS, Industrial Commission of Ohio
THOS. L. KILLEY, Paterson Safety Council
J. M. KENNEDY, Rubber Section
Wm. G. KNORR, Milwaukee Safety Commission
Wm. S. KROUSE, Detroit Industrial Safety Council
C. L. LAFONTAINE, Great Northern Railway Co.
MILYARD C. LEHLER, Child Education Section
BARNETT LEVY, JR., Rochester Safety Council
A. AUGUSTUS LOW, Brooklyn Safety Council
THOS. H. MACDONALD, U. S. Department of Agriculture
WALTER B. MARTIN, Peoria Association of Commerce Safety Council
F. W. MATSON, Minnesota Safety Council
R. A. McARTHUR, Transit Section
MILNER MCGINTOCK, Harvard University
I. W. MILLAND, Industrial Gloves Co.
JAMES K. MILLER, Grand Rapids Safety Council
HAROLD L. MINER, E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.
R. B. MONLEY, Industrial Accident Prevention Assn.
PROF. RUDOLPH L. MOURISON, Street & Highway Traffic Section
FREDERICK MURPHY, Albany Safety Council
E. J. O'BRIEN, JR., Louisville Safety Council
GEORGE C. A. OPE, The Detroit Edison Co.
WALTER S. PAINE, Aetna Life & Accident Cos.
LEW. R. PALMER, The Equitable Life Assurance Society of the U. S.
DAVID A. PATTON, Newark Safety Council
MRS. G. M. PATTON, Evanston Safety Council
CHARLES W. PENNOCK, Safety Div. Milwaukee Association of Commerce
C. E. PLATTBONE, American Mutual Liability Insurance Co.
GEO. GEORGE B. PULSIFERY, United States Engineer Office
ARTHUR PORTERTON, Hudson County Safety Council
ALBERT S. REAGAN, Industrial Relations Counselors, Inc.
LT. COL. HENRY A. RENNICK, Lehigh Portland Cement Co.
BOSTON ROBINSON, Eastbay Safety Council
A. V. ROHWER, Duluth, Missabe & Iron Range Ry. Co.
WALTER ROSENTHAL, Western Pennsylvania Safety Council
GEO. E. SANFORD, General Electric Co.

OFFICERS AND DIRECTORS, Continued

HENRY G. SCHAFFNER, Erie Safety Council
 KARL G. SCHOFFER, Railway Safety Council
 HARRY A. SCHULTZ, United States Steel Corp.
 H. E. SEELY, Wood Products Section
 EARL S. SHARTZEN, Utica Safety Council
 GEN. JOHN H. SHERRBURNE, Massachusetts Safety Council
 DR. L. A. SHOURV, Bethlehem Steel Co.
 ERNEST L. SIMONDS, New Haven Safety Council
 A. E. SINCLAIR, Meat Packing, Tanning & Leather Industries Section
 JUDGE LEE E. SKEEL, Cleveland Safety Council
 C. W. SMITH, Standard Oil Company (Ind.)
 EDWIN C. SMITH, Blackstone Valley Safety Council
 WALTER DENT SMITH, Delaware Safety Council
 W. A. SNOW, Construction Section
 R. T. SOLENSTEN, Elliott Service Co.
 E. C. SPRING, Lansdale, Pa.
 GEORGE R. STEPHENS, Safety Bureau, Buffalo Chamber of Commerce
 JOHN STILWELL, Greater New York Safety Council
 ARTHUR M. TOOR, Consulting Marine Engineer
 GEORGE G. TRAYER, Greater Chicago Safety Council, Inc.
 MAJOR R. D. TRIMBLE, Richmond Safety Council
 FRANK E. VITZ, Superior Safety Council
 DR. C. H. WATSON, American Telephone & Telegraph Co.
 HARRY M. WEBBER, Wilmette, Ill.
 DR. DAVID E. WEGLEIN, Baltimore Safety Council
 S. E. WHITING, Liberty Mutual Insurance Co.
 A. W. WHITNEY, National Conservation Bureau
 HOWARD R. WHITNEY, Worcester Safety Council
 T. A. WILSON, Textile Section
 W. H. WINANS, Union Carbide & Carbon Corp.
 F. B. WINSLOW, Safety Div., Birmingham Chamber of Commerce
 W. E. WORTH, International Harvester Co.
 E. J. ZAUFF, Safety Bureau, Duluth Chamber of Commerce
 G. L. ZWICK, St. Joseph Safety Council

Industrial Dusts

WEDNESDAY MORNING SESSION

October 13, 1937

The meeting was called to order by Chairman A. S. Rezula, Executive Secretary, Industrial Relations Counselors, Inc., New

York City, and Vice-President for Engineering, National Safety Council, who introduced the speakers.

What Industrial Dusts Are Harmful? Why?

By SENIOR SURGEON R. R. SAYERS

Chief, Division of Industrial Hygiene, U. S. Public Health Service

While dusts exist everywhere in the atmosphere, it has been recognized for centuries that workers in certain dusty occupations are less healthy than those not so exposed. The number of persons exposed in dusty occupations comprises one of the largest industrial groups. The occupational diseases of workers in dusty atmospheres have been found to be due to entrance of dust into the system by inhalation, by ingestion, by direct absorption through the skin, by irritation of the skin, or by a combination of the foregoing.

The suspensions of particulate matter in air have been broadly termed dusts, fumes, and smokes. Such a classification is necessarily arbitrary, since the line of demarcation between them is not very sharp, and the chief differentiation is based on the size of the particles. Investigations by the Public Health Service in dusty industries¹ revealed that about 70 per cent of the dust particles examined were between 1 and 3 microns in size, only about 20 per cent were less than 1 micron, and the median size was 1.3 microns. Industrial dusts are mainly less than 10 microns in size. However, fibrous dusts in the air, such as asbestos, have been found to contain particles as large as 200-400 microns in the greatest diameter.

While, generally speaking, according to Collis, dusts are more injurious as their chemical composition differs from that of the human body, or from the elements of which the body is normally composed,² it

is difficult to establish a comprehensive definition for toxic dusts. Sollmann,³ after analysis of various definitions for poison, felt that it is very difficult to give a definition which will not be ambiguous in some cases, but believed that the following covers most of the points which must be considered in classing a substance as such:

"A poison is any substance which, acting directly through its inherent chemie properties, and by its ordinary action, is capable of destroying life, or of seriously endangering health, when it is applied to the body, externally, or in moderate doses (to 50 Gm.) internally."

Some dusts are known to be poisonous, while others, in the concentrations usually encountered, are comparatively harmless. However, it may be stated that breathing dust in high concentration is not desirable.

According to Fairhall, the damage arising from the inhalation of toxic dust may be either local or remote, and depends upon whether the material is a protoplasmic poison, whether it is caustic in reaction, or whether it is absorbed into the blood stream and carried to other centers which are in turn affected.⁴

It is now well established that exposure to certain kinds of dusts, such as those containing considerable quantities of free silica, has increased the morbidity and mortality rate from respiratory diseases; while metallic dusts, such as lead and its compounds,

have been associated with general systemic poisoning? Dusts may be swallowed with saliva, water, or food, and direct poisoning has been traced to absorption by this method; other dusts may act as irritants and produce affections of the skin, irritate mucous membranes of nose, eyes and throat, often causing inflammatory diseases of these organs.⁸

Some inorganic dusts are able to penetrate deep lung tissues and are sufficiently insoluble to be retained there. Some of these may be active in the human tissues, causing definite and permanent injury, while others are inert and may be retained for years, apparently without serious damage; some are gradually absorbed without causing pathological changes.⁹

All inhaled particles are soluble at least to a small extent. If harmless, cell activity is stimulated so that phagocytes remove the dust. If the solute is toxic, the viability of the phagocyte is affected and an ineffective accumulation results. At the same time, further solute may diffuse into neighboring tissues, setting up an irritation and subsequent fibrosis. The nature as well as the solubility of the solute is an important factor, but of two substances of approximately equal toxicity, the more soluble form causes the greater damage. However, substances of such low solubility as silica may ultimately produce extensive injury.¹⁰

Kettle has stated that harmful dusts, if inhaled into the lungs, may activate a latent tuberculous infection; they may exaggerate an active tuberculous lesion or a concurrent infection. If sufficient quantities of a harmless dust are inhaled, some of it remains in the lungs and causes a mild degree of fibrosis merely through mechanical irritation, but such fibrosis is never sufficient to interfere with the function of the lungs.¹¹

Some writers state that while the influence of nonpoisonous dusts on health is a debatable subject, abnormally high death rates from bronchitis and pneumonia are sometimes attributed to chronic exposure to noxious dusts. Large amounts of dust are occasionally found in supposedly normal lungs, at autopsy.¹²

According to Drinker, there are four different types of reaction produced in man by the inhalation of dust. The first and most important are the "irritation" reactions, such as rhinitis and asthma,¹³ which cause specific lung pathology and often are followed by

pulmonary tuberculosis. The second type of reaction is caused by toxic dust: like lead, cadmium, and radium. A third type of material follows the inhalation of finely divided metallic fume particles such as zinc oxide, and is known as metal fume fever. The fourth reaction, allergic in character, is caused by breathing organic dusts such as pollen and certain types of pulverized wood and flour. In all four cases the sole cause of the disability may be dust inhalation, but the reactions from toxic dusts result from swallowing as well as from inhalation.¹⁴

For various reasons it is difficult to set up an absolute classification for dusts. Opinion is rapidly changing regarding so-called inert or harmless dusts and further investigation may prove some of them to be injurious. Some dusts may have both a toxic and an irritant action; while on the other hand, the poisoning resulting from exposure to a dust may be the combined effect of more than one mode of entrance into the body. However, the following classification of dusts, according to physical characteristics and physiological effect, is useful for convenience.

I. Organic Dusts

Organic dusts are those which contain carbon, and were originally supposed to come from organic substances derived from animal or plant life. Living dusts come under this classification, and are thought to be of the same order of size as industrial dusts, with which they are frequently associated. Bacteria are usually between 0.5 and 3 microns, except in a few cases, such as the pultrax bacillus, which ranges from 1 to 122 micron in breadth and 4.5 to 10 microns in length and 10 or 12 microns in diameter. However, it is possible that the larger and heavier varieties, like the larger and heavier dust particles, settle due to gravity, and do not remain suspended in the air.

Many thousands of organic substances, carbon-containing, are made synthetically by chemical processes, such as dyestuffs, explosives, etc.

1. *NON-IRRITATING ORGANIC DUSTS.* As the name implies, these are comprised of nonviable particles, which may or may not be inherently toxic or irritant, but which nevertheless produce untoward effects in the human organism. "Allergic" dusts, or those in which only certain persons are or may

become hypersensitive, with resulting asthma, rhinitis, or other disturbances, are included in this classification.

a. *Toxic and/or Irritant.* Toxic or irritant dusts are all organic dusts which produce untoward symptoms, either systemic or local. Those producing local symptoms are usually described as irritant; those producing general or systemic symptoms are termed toxic. A dust may be both toxic and irritant.

In reported cases of injury or death following inhalation of dust from organic compounds, among the chief offenders are paraffin, the dinitrobenzenes, chlorodinitrobenzenes, trinitrophenol, and nitronaphthalene. Eye damage due to inflammation of the cornea has occurred among workers exposed to methyl violet dust. The dust from paraphenylenediamine derivatives is particularly irritating and dangerous, causing not only a severe form of dermatitis where the dust comes in contact with the skin, but also producing acute inflammation of the mucous membrane of the respiratory passages.¹⁵ Toxic dusts may be generated during the handling of powdered dyes and in preliminary dyeing operations, particularly the hydro-extractor process, where particles are disseminated in all directions.¹⁶ Coal tar and indigo dyes are substances most frequently used.

Cases of amblyopia have been reported from exposure to inhalation of tobacco dust.¹⁷ It has been found that inhaled tobacco dust exerts a nicotine action on the organism fifteen times greater than that produced by the same quantity of smoked tobacco with an equal nicotine content.¹⁸

Severe dermatitis is experienced by many workers handling powder containing T.N.T., which is used in making high explosives. Picric acid, which is also used for this purpose, requires drying and in this latter state has been found to produce a dermatitis. Picric acid is also the oldest synthetic organic dyestuff.¹⁹ Dermatitis occurs among handlers of silk with varying frequency. Sals determined that a rash occurring among workers in a silk factory was due to dust from silk cocoons imported from Africa.²⁰

Persons engaged in the manufacture of quinine and quinine preparations suffer from skin phenomena, which occur for the most part on exposed parts of the body, and may be caused by ingestion or by quinine

dust, or powder form of the preparation exerting a direct irritating effect on the skin. Dermatitis due to other vegetable substances such as vanilla, powdered amygdal thrum, etc., have been reported.²¹

Dental lesions, of occupational or have been reported among workers in a The gingivitis caused by sugar dust is, sified as purely mechanical, with developing caries. Digestive disorders, respiratory conditions, and cutaneous ditions (especially of the face) were found.²²

b. *Allergic.* Many apparently innocuous substances may produce reactions in persons of peculiar personal susceptibility. term "allergy" is used to describe this condition of hypersensitiveness or susceptibility and allergic phenomena most frequently manifest themselves in skin reactions. However, they may cause acute reactions elsewhere in the body. When the respiratory tract is involved we have such well known diseases as hay fever or asthma. These diseases may develop as a result of hypersensitiveness to such substances, as pollen from plants, horsehair, rabbit's fur, feathers, etc.

For instance, furriers, workers in cloth industries who are exposed to wool dust, etc., may suffer from hay fever or asthma. It is unnecessary for the offending dust to reach the depths of the lungs—suffocation for example are reported to produce effect after being caught in the upper respiratory passages. Should such a potent substance be finely ground it could reach the alveoli and as a result probably polysensitization reactions would be accelerated. In a survey of a plant where resin mixed, ground, and milled, it was found that 80 per cent of the occupational dermatitis there was due to hypersensitivity hexamethylenetetramine and formaldehyde contained in the dust to which the workers were exposed.²³ During the first process

cotton spinning, cotton-strippers are exposed to dust arising from cotton husks and seeds, which produces a typical form of it.

Primary wood dust has been of interest to its purely mechanical action, but if greater care is required in handling sawdust, especially woods coming from tropical countries, because of the essential oils impregnating them, which when freed in the dust affect the health of the workers concerned. Some of the woods capable of causing skin lesions are Brazil wood, satinwood, teakwood, cumaru or tonka wood, black ebony wood, West Indian malagasy, guaiacum, coccoloba, chestnut wood, yewwood, California sequoia, etc. All persons who handle these woods are not injured, only those particularly susceptible to substances they contain becoming affected.

2. *LIVING ORGANIC DUSTS.* These contain particles capable of exhibiting phenomena of life (especially the property of reproduction or multiplication), such as bacteria and fungi. They are usually found in low concentrations and are associated with multiplying dusts in the air.

a. *Bacteria.* One of the most important among these is the anthrax bacillus, which is contained in the dust from skins, furs, wool, and animal hair, horns, hoofs, bones, etc. This disease may occur in two forms: cutaneous (in which the organism affects the skin), and pulmonary (when it is inhaled, in the form of anthrax known as wool-sorters' disease).

Cases of tetanus, reported in connection with lime manufacture, were traced to the lime material, the bacillus having been found in the factory dust. Diphtheria, tuberculosis, smallpox, typhoid, or other bacillus-produced diseases, may result from exposure to infected dusts.

Bacterial sensitization can be the cause of many of the allergic diseases, namely, asthma, urticaria, hay fever, urticaria, angioneurotic edema, eczema, or migraine headaches.

b. *Fungi.* Dusts containing the mycelia and spores of parasitic fungi give rise to annoyance and discomfort. "Maltster's" itch from the dust alone has been reported. In rovee, reeds used for ceilings are stacked while still wet and undergo fermentation; they become covered with a white powder of dry fungus of the *Mucor* family. Spores

trichium dermatodes), which is scattered when the bark is stripped off. This powder is irritating to the skin and mucous membranes. Mycelia and spores of moulds are commonly found to cause rashes; for instance, the black powder coming from macerated sugarcane stalks. Among bakers, the mycelium and spores, in the form of a white mould (hyphomycetes) from the rhatian canes used, get shaken out when the canes are split, hammered, and cut, causing painful fissures to develop on the skin where they alight.

A form of asthma or spasmodic cough, suffered by cotton weavers and known as aspergilliosis, has been considered due to inhalation of spores of a mildew which sometimes occurs on the threads. In a study of silicosis among miners, made by the Public Health Service, a number of cases of typical military calcification were encountered. Unstained smears of those cases examined were positive for fungus, two types of *Aspergillus* fungi being identified. All of the subjects but one were farmers, teamsters, feedmill workers, or residents of small agricultural towns where grain is marketed. Farmers are exposed to fungi in threshing wheat, baling hay, or handling various small grains.

Some other fungus diseases such as actinomycosis and blastomycosis are associated with occupational exposure to dust. The former occurs among workers handling straw, hay, grass, vegetable debris contaminated with mould, etc. Actinomycosis is likely to affect people engaged in commercial handling, storing, and cleansing of grain (grain distilleries, flour mills, grain crushing, breweries, and malting houses, etc.).

II. Inorganic Dusts

Inorganic compounds are of mineral origin, not requiring a living organism to produce them. A number of dusts not usually classed as toxic may, under some conditions, produce untoward effects on the human organism. Classified under inorganic are toxic and/or irritant, fibrosis-producing, and nonfibrosis-producing dusts.

a. *Toxic and/or Irritant.* Toxic dusts are those which are inherently toxic when inhaled, ingested, or otherwise absorbed. Among those which produce systemic poisoning, some of which are also irritant, are the dusts from heavy metals and their salts, such as lead, mercury, arsenic, cadmium,

zinc, etc. Irritant dusts are injurious by reason of their strong irritative or corrosive properties.

As a rule, inhaled irritant substances immediately cause a reaction in the upper respiratory tract of such severity that they are prevented from reaching the lungs, although they may cause lung damage by extension of inflammation if the mucous membrane is corroded. Lime, calcium oxide, and the di-chlorides are examples of irritant dusts. An inorganic dust may possess both toxic and irritant properties, and the poisoning produced may be the combined effect of more than one mode of entrance into the body.

Of the directly poisonous dusts, the most widely prevalent are those of certain lead compounds, particularly the oxide, carbonate and the chromate. The dust is readily absorbed by the mucous membrane; some dust passes into the stomach and is dissolved by the gastric juice.

According to Fairhall, perforated nasal septum is a common occurrence among workers with bi-chromate dusts. In a study made by the U. S. Public Health Service it was found that continuous daily exposure to concentrations of chromic acid mist greater than 1 milligram in 10 cubic meters is likely to cause definite injury to the nasal tissues. It is believed that a similar concentration of the dust would be equally toxic.

In the case of poisoning from some heavy metals, exposure may be to both dust and vapor. For instance, investigations have shown the safe limit of total exposure to lead oxide dust and fumes to be less than 1.5 mg. per 10 cubic meters of air, except for prolonged exposure. In exposure to mercury dust and vapor, it was shown that the incidence of chronic mercurialism increases rapidly with increasing mercury concentration, after such concentration exceeds 20 mg. per 10 cubic meters.

Alkalis and metallic oxides are common causes of dermatoses. Lye, potash and lime are known to cause irritation to plasterers, cement-makers, bricklayers, masons, stonecutters, modelers, and metal platers. Ulceration and perforation of the nasal septum occur among workers exposed to the dust of soda ash; systemic poisoning also occurs from inhalation of calcium cyanamide dust.

Cases of dermatitis, scleroderma and can-

cer are reported have been caused by exposure to dust of arsenic compounds. Certain aluminum salts are skin irritants and aluminum dusts may contribute to the infection of skin and mucous membranes, through mechanical action.

b. *Fibrosis-Producing Dusts.* The most important of these are the inorganic, slightly soluble dusts which cause fibrous changes in the lung tissues, some of which are serious, and some of which cause little or no disability. So far as is known, no inorganic substances other than silicon derivatives cause more than a very moderate degree of fibrosis of the lung. Moreover, there seems to be no evidence that any other constituent of ordinary dusts can influence so unfavorably a pulmonary infection.

Although other dusts, when inhaled in sufficient concentrations over a long period of time, have been shown capable of producing a pulmonary fibrosis, nevertheless, the pneumoconiosis characterized by nodular fibrosis has to date been shown clinically and experimentally to be associated only with the inhalation of dusts containing free silica.

Since this dust, to exert its harmful action, must enter the finer divisions of the lung, the particle size of the atmospheric dust may bear a definite relationship to the injurious effect produced. The silica must be present in the air in particles small enough to enter the finer air spaces and of such dimensions that the phagocytic cells may engulf them. The greater majority of particles found upon microscopic examination of the lung fall within the limits of from 1 to 3 microns. Examples of silicon dusts are granite, quartz, sand, pumice, slate, etc.

In a recent study among anthracite miners, the correlations between exposure to dust (which contained silica) and the evolution of constitutional changes left little doubt as to the etiological significance of the dust in the air breathed. Like correlations were found between the silica exposure and the extent of pulmonary changes. When the inhaled dust consists of silica combined with bases, silicates, some degree of change in the pulmonary tissue may result. In this respect asbestos dust seems to be unique among silicates in the prevalence and severity of the disease it causes.

The chief distinction between silicosis and conditions due to simple reactions caused by other dusts is the active proliferative

Bloomfield, J. J. and DANA, L. M. "The Prevention and Control of Industrial Dusts." *Public Health Bulletin* No. 212, April 1915.

Colby, Edgar L. "Industrial Pneumoconiosis." *Public Health Bulletin* No. 212, April 1915.

Lectures, 1915. H. M. S. O., London.

Sullivan, T. "A Manual of Pulmonary Hygiene." W. H. Saunders & Co., Philadelphia, 1915.

Turnes, J. "Journal of Industrial Hygiene and Toxicology." Vol. 1, No. 1, 1920.

Turnes, J. "The Sampling and Analysis of Industrial Dusts." *American Public Health Association, Yearbook*, 1923, 16.

Colby, W. E. "Dust Hazard in Industry." *Public Health Bulletin*, 1925.

Air Hygiene Foundation of America, Inc. "The Prevention and Alleviation of Industrial Diseases." *Public Health Bulletin*, April 16, 1926.

Kellie, E. H. "The Hazards of Industrial Dusts in the Industry of Mining and Metallurgy." *London, June 1, 1931.*

"Dusts, Fumes, and Smokes." *Occupational Hygiene Series, International Labour Office*, Geneva, 1920.

Drinker, Philip. "Caustion of 'Acuminosis'." *Journal of Industrial Hygiene and Toxicology*, October, 1916.

Drinker, Philip. "Occupation and Health Series." *International Labour Office, Geneva*, 1920.

Drinker, Philip. "Industrial Methods." *Oxford University Press, London*, 1931.

Burstein, A. "Nicotine Action from Industrial Tobacco Dust." *Journal of Industrial Hygiene and Toxicology*, December, 1925.

White, R. Prosser. "The Dermatitis of Occupational Affections of the Skin." H. K. Lewis & Co. Ltd., London.

Schwartz, J. "Skin Hazards in American Industry." *Public Health Bulletin* No. 213, October, 1915.

Dowling, J. C. "Industrial Dermatitis: The Prevention and Local Agents." *Review of Recent Literature*, *Journal of Industrial Hygiene and Toxicology*, July, 1935.

Turnes, J. "Occupational Lesions in Workers in Sweden." *Journal of Industrial Hygiene and Toxicology*, February, 1928.

Turnes, J. "Flour Mills." *Occupation and Health Series.* International Labour Office, Geneva, 1929.

Turnes, J. "Sugarcane Plantations in Demerara." *The Industrial Bulletin*, Atlanta, N. Y., Feb. 19, 1930.

Drinker, Philip, and Hatch, Theodore. "Health Hazards in the Flour Mill." *Public Health Bulletin*, No. 229, Sept. 1916.

Turnes, J. "Sugarcane Wounds." *Occupation and Health Series, International Labour Office*, Geneva, 1930.

⁷⁰ Sayers, R. R. and Jones, R. R. "Silicosis and Similar Dust Diseases," National Silicosis Conference, Washington, D. C., April 14, 1936.

⁷¹ Sayers, R. R., Jones, R. R., and Jones, R. R., "Silicosis, Moniliform, Dallas-Veterans, Jones, Brecken, Hall, and W. H. Brinley, "U. S. Public Health Bulletin No. 231, December, 1935.

⁷² MacMahon, F. L. "Industrial Pulmonary Disease due to the Inhalation of Dust," The Lancet, July 4 and 11, 1936.

⁷³ Dreessen, Waldemar C. "Effect of Inhaled Marble Dust as Observed in Vermont Marble Finishers," U. S. Public Health Service Reprint No. 1630.

⁷⁴ Lynza, A. J. "Control and Prevention of Silicosis," Symposium on Silicosis, California Tuberculosis Association, San Francisco, 1937.

⁷⁵ Newquist, M. N. "Medical Services in Industry and Workmen's Compensation Laws," American College of Physicians, Chicago, 1931.

⁷⁶ "Medical Care of Industrial Workers," National Conference on Industrial Health, Inc., New York, 1935.

By ARTHUR S. JOINSON
Assistant to Manager, Engineering Department, American Mutual Liability
Insurance Co., Boston, Mass.

pensive methods for making the air clean are still in the realm of dreams. Much work must be done to know more about silicosis and more how to make atmospheres safe *inexpensively*. As an accident prevention job, dust control lies almost entirely within the administrative responsibility. The control measures are capital expenditures of considerable size.

I do not mean that unless a dust suppression job was engineered it can be no good. There were many good installations that were never figured at all but grew like Topsy. The re-

There are estimates only to judge the magnitude of the dust health problem, and it is so closely associated with other health problems that a clean-cut estimate of it alone is impossible. We do know that it is great in the aggregate, and for the individual plant it may be very bothersome and expensive.

What actually makes quartz dust cause silicosis is not known. It does, so the air breathed by workmen must not contain harmful quantities of respirable quartz dust. Inex-

A dust-suppression installation is a safety device, designed and operated to provide protection against possible disease and provide a sense of security which must be absolute. Its safety is not rushing air and rattling clips but a minimal residual dustiness. There is no more pathetic defeat for a dust-control job than to find faith in its effectiveness so low that workers must wear respirators to find the re-usable safety that was expected from the hoods, ducts and fans.

Let us examine some of the features by which we recognize this dust hazard problem, leaving out the socio-legal aspects.

The Industrial Hygienist

Safe Limits

At the present time the medical men and hygienists believe that quartz dust is sa-

In the first case, the quality of the hazard is an opinion arrived at after study of all the environmental conditions including general sanitation, occupational hygiene, a scientific analysis of the dust exposure, the exploration of dust exposures, the nature of dusty operations must be viewed from physical, chemical and mechanical aspects, the determinations of dustiness in the not only counted and classified by particle size, but chemically and mineralogically analyzed. The plant layout must be studied with respect to dust production and distribution, and the housekeeping and existing dust control equipment evaluated. The presence of specific hazards, such as toxic gases, abnormal temperature and humidity conditions, etc. must be explored for their complicating effects upon the whole picture. This is distinctly an industrial hygiene job, and some of the most critical data requires only medical viewpoint. This is absolute in the case of tuberculous study and the qualifying of men for employment.

So far, not one atom of engineering has suppressed dust is involved. It is entirely an analysis of hazard. The diagnosis must be that the dustiness is hazardous to health or that it is safe. If it is hazardous, it must be brought down to a specified residue. If it isn't, leave it alone. On the second point, if the hygienists cannot specify threshold limits gradient downward for relatively less hazardous dusts, let the engineer not worry about it. The diagnosis is dust which is harmful and do as much of it. The remedy is control of the dust. The engineer designs controls which will produce the lowest practical residual dustiness. He should not attempt to write his own specifications of threshold limits or permitable dustiness. This may be an important goal in the study of dust health hazards.

below a million particles. They seem willing to graduate upward to 20 million for medium silica and 50 million for low silica percentages. Five million particles is virtually dust free, and is very difficult and expensive to achieve and maintain. The declaration of safety of the installations must remain in the hands of the medical and hygiene groups in whose hands now lies the responsibility for determining the hazard.

We now enter the chapter of our discussion intended to demonstrate that dust control is an engineering job, that it must be given scientific treatment, not guess work, applying engineering methods which are based upon a knowledge of physical law, the behavior of dust, the performance of air-moving machinery, etc.

Prerequisite Knowledge

Let me recite briefly, a few of the things which, in my opinion, the engineer should know to do this job correctly. He must know how to make a survey. Surveys depend upon sampling, and sampling is not a catch-as-catch-can proposition. It involves the place, the time, the frequency, the amount in a sample, and the number of samples so that maximum, minimum and average data mean something, so that credibility can be given them.

For the type of sample involved he must know how to weigh or count respirable dust, as distinguished from large masses of non-respirable dust which complicate the picture. He must know how to observe the sources of dust flows as distinguished from conditions of general dustiness. He must know the sources of dust and the principles involved in the dispersion of dust. He must determine how much dust enters the problem because it is part of the material, and what dust is created in the process by the fracturing of the material.

Any less survey cannot tell the engineer what his task of dust control is. To visualize that task intelligently he should know the physics of Brownian motion, laws of resistance to the motion of particles moving in air, both when the air is in turbulence and for stream-line motion. He should know terminal velocities, movements due to centrifugal motion; flocculation and the effects of air motion and the effects of humidification on it. He must know all about the difficulties of wetting and what is known about overcoming these difficulties. He should know the several elec-

trical phenomena which bear upon dust behavior.

There are all principles of physics which explain the behavior of dust and upon which engineering practice must be based. They must be understood and be taken into account. Dust control is not a matter only of general ventilation; the engineer must study the production as well as the dispersion. The problem should be analyzed to determine the applicability of segregation, enclosure, wetting, local exhaust and general ventilation.

In some instances, substitution of non-hazardous material, or non-dust-producing operations may have specific application, and they should be explored first. This implies plant engineering. I am convinced that many bad installations are bad because plant engineering was not used. In the designing of exhaust systems installed to capture the dust at the points of generation the physical behavior of air moving toward hoods and in ducts must be known, and that knowledge used. Each system must consist of collection hoods, piping, air-cleaning plant and a source of suction. Before selecting a hood for a job the engineer must know dust dispersion by dynamic projection as well as dust dispersion by air currents, and design the hood accordingly.

Knowledge Needed

The aerodynamic characteristics of suction hoods appear to be little known because little thought was given to them in designing thousands of hoods which can be found everywhere in industry. All the possibility for entrapping dust and much of the efficiency of the system lies in this factor. Air velocity, static suction, and rate of air flow are all related, and they must be known. It is essential to use high velocity of air in certain types of exhaust systems to entrain dust projected at high velocities as in the case of a granite surfacing machine, and low velocities must be used in others, as in the case of cleaning asbestos fibre of dust to prevent wasting material.

Quantity of air and its velocity must be determined, then the piping should be designed to take into account the behavior of air-flow through pipes at low and high velocities. Where the problem is complicated by the large sized particles which go along with the fine dust, how these behave must be taken into account. Pressure losses are very important elements in the design of an exhaust

system. Loss at the hoods, loss at the bends, and loss in the ducts must not be guessed at. Pipe design must take into account the gage pressure of the metal and reinforcing to withstand pressures and erosion.

The selection of a fan and its motive power is a matter of calculation, not guess work. Power consumption in the system is calculable, fans follow certain laws, so the engineer must know the behavior of axial flow, propeller type, radial flow, paddle wheel and other fan performance.

More physics and engineering calculation goes into the air-cleaning apparatus. The selection of gravitation, inertial or filtration method depends upon what the dust is, the calculation for any methods requires knowledge of discharge through stacks, the determination of sizes of settling chambers; the behavior of cyclones. The use or non-use of a filter, and if so, what type, how it should perform, how big it should be, what kind of resistance and how much each kind offers, to say nothing of their proper location with relation to cleaning, accessibility, etc., are all items for accurate engineering determination. Apparatus to check the behavior of installa-

tions must be at hand and used. Performance cannot be left to guess work. Supplying sufficient air to be exhausted is part of the problem. The same may be said of heating.

Do I give the problem too severe a turn up? I think not. Remember these two things:

1. You are dealing with hazardous material so small in size and so little of it weight that it is as invisible as the air it heats it.

2. Physical laws involved in the behavior of dust and air do not permit inexpensive methods of control. I am acquainted with budgets set up for this purpose which amount to more than a quarter of a million dollars and I know of many where 60 to 80 thousand dollars is involved.

The need for this much engineering is recognized by men who know. Although much has been done toward getting the knowledge into handbook shape. Perhaps the best of this sort to date is "Fundamentals Related to the Design and Operation of Exhaust Systems" developed under American Standards Association procedure.

The Doctor's Part in Controlling Dust Hazards

By A. D. LAZENBY, M.D., F.A.C.S.

Chief Surgeon, Maryland Casualty Co., Baltimore, Maryland

Considerable confusion has existed in the past as to just what is the physician's function in the prevention of dust diseases, and just what is the engineer's. It is very obvious upon even casual thought that the two sciences must work hand in hand in their efforts to solve the problem.

The physician through his special training must be able to tell the engineer what dusts are dangerous and what are not. He must know how those dusts enter the body and the manner in which they do their harm. He must be trained in the examination of persons who are to be employed to work in dust, and to discover those who are already diseased, or are peculiarly susceptible to dust disease. He must be able to detect the first signs of disease in workers who are exposed to dust, and must be prepared to

recognize the disease when it is fully developed. It is not necessarily the physician's function to analyze dust. That is a task for the chemist and the petrographer. It is not the physician's function to count the particles of dust in a given industrial atmosphere. That is really the function of the engineer. Ventilating equipment for the removal of dust, nor even to be more than an advance as to the means that must be adopted to render the atmosphere safe.

The physician nevertheless must correlate with his medical knowledge and with the studies of the industrial worker the findings of the engineer. A diagnosis of silicosis, for example, requires not merely characteristic occupational history and characteristic phy-

cat 1 25, but the knowledge as well that the present has been exposed to hazardous dusts in dangerous concentrations.

All dusts when inhaled in excessive quantities may be considered as harmful, but only a few can be regarded as dangerous. From the standpoint of their dangerous properties, they may be divided into three general groups:

1. Those which are dangerous because of their poisonous action, such as lead, arsenic, mercury, and similar substances.
2. Those which cause only irritation in the respiratory tract, resulting in such conditions as bronchitis or local inflammation; such substances as vegetable fibre, cork dust, flour, starch, and other relatively innocuous organic or inorganic materials.
3. Those which tend to produce fibrosis of the lungs, thereby predisposing to respiratory infections, especially tuberculosis, such dusts as asbestos, silica dioxide or magnesium silicate.

I shall confine my remarks chiefly to dusts occurring in the latter category.

It has been generally believed that the harmful effects of dusts inhaled into the lungs depended more upon their physical structure than upon their chemical. It was believed, for example, that silica dioxide, or quartz, was particularly harmful because of its crystalline structure, and the hardness and sharpness of its particles. This conception is now known to be faulty. The dusts which cause their damage by mechanical interference with function are the dusts which are relatively innocuous, whose symptoms are transitory, and which subside upon removal from exposure to the dust.

Chemical Effect Is Harmful

The disease of particular interest to us today, silicosis, owes its harmful effects very largely to a harmful chemical reaction occurring between silica dioxide and the body tissues. It so happens that silica dioxide is decidedly a tissue irritant to the body, regardless of the part of the body it invades, it causes local irritation, local destruction of tissue, and the replacement of that tissue by scars.

Thus, given a dust containing silica dioxide in sufficient concentration, in sizes small enough to permit its entrance to the ultimate air spaces in the lungs, we have a situation which offers danger to the worker.

We have no real knowledge as to figures, but as a simple rule, we can adopt for practical purposes the thought that the human body can withstand successfully a concentration of dust containing 100 per cent silica dioxide in a particulate size less than 10 microns, in a concentration not in excess of 5,000,000 particles per cubic foot. If we decrease the percentage of silica dioxide present in the dust, we can correspondingly increase the concentration with comparative safety. We must, of course, take into account the portion of the worker's time spent in the dusty atmosphere.

To arrive at a rough conception of a safe atmosphere, we multiply the percentage of free silica in a given dust by the total number of particles per cubic foot. If the result is under 5,000,000 the condition may be considered relatively safe. If the result is over 5,000,000 the condition must be regarded as unsafe.

Bear in mind too that silicosis is essentially a disease of great chronicity. Except in a few exceptional instances it will require from seven to thirty years for a worker to develop advanced silicosis. It is evident too that coincident dusts may either retard the development of silicosis or hasten it. Recent research seems to indicate that the admixture of aluminum dust to a silicious dust will greatly inhibit the reaction of the latter; whereas a silicious dust combined with some alkaline coincident dusts may hasten the development of silicosis.

Much research is now under way in problems such as this. We have never learned how to cure silicosis, but we are learning rapidly how to prevent it. Our knowledge in this respect seems to be limited to the removal of dust from the breathing zone of the worker. Later discoveries may show us how to modify existing dusts with contaminant dusts that will render silica dioxide innocuous.

Owing to its very great chronicity, it is only the rare case who actually develops disabling silicosis during his industrial lifetime. It is realized, of course, that exceptional instances take place, but the coincidental ravages of age usually keep pace with the effects of dust, so that much of the disability usually attributed to silicosis is often, in fact, actually attributable to other diseases or incapacities which advancing years bring in their wake. To me the great peril of silicosis, the peril not only to the industrial

worker himself, but his family, co-workers and the public generally, is the accompanying susceptibility to tuberculosis.

Complicated by Tuberculosis

Silicosis per se does not kill. Tuberculosis as a complicating factor of silicosis rarely reverts despite treatment, and the individual so afflicted is not only totally disabled himself, but a definite menace to all with whom he comes in contact, particularly the fellow worker who may have silicosis. So, perhaps the most important places in which the services of the physician in a dusty trade are necessary are—first, along lines of discovering and barring from exposure to a silicious dust those persons who may already have arrested tuberculosis; and secondly, discovering those persons already exposed to dust, possibly already silicotic, in whom tuberculous infections may have developed.

It is well recognized that no individual should be exposed to dust containing silica dioxide until he has undergone a thorough physical examination, including carefully made and interpreted x-ray films of his chest. It is likewise obvious to anyone familiar with silicosis that no person who is exposed to silicious dust should be denied the privilege of frequent physical examinations and x-rays of the chest, not entirely to discover the existence of possible silicosis, but to discover a coincident tuberculosis if such exists.

A man so diseased should, in protection to himself and to all with whom he comes in contact, be removed from industry. Let me emphasize the uselessness of a physical examination, unless it be accompanied by properly taken x-ray films, except in cases of gross tuberculosis.

It is the function of the physician, therefore, to conduct in a thorough and an intelligent manner the pre-employment examination of all persons who are to be engaged in a dusty trade. The purpose of this examination should be threefold: First, to discover and bar from employment in dust, any person who is suffering from tuberculosis in an active, a quiescent or an arrested state.

A possible exception might be made in individuals suffering from a so called healed primary complex, or a healed childhood infection. It is well known that exposure to

silica dusts are very likely to even actively a tuberculous lesion which is quiescent or arrested, and in such a situation, the chance of recovery remote.

The second problem which confronts the physician at the pre-employment physical examination is whether a given individual by reason of secondary physical changes is more susceptible to the development of disease than a normal. Is he suffering from the use of nose or upper respiratory tract, such as chronic sinusitis, disease of the nose or air passages, or obstructions produce mouth breathing?

We must remember that silica dusts are not dangerous until it reaches the lung; that the normal individual retains in the nose and the upper air passages a quantity of the dust inhaled from the atmosphere. In instances where this nasal protection is disturbed, exposure to silica dust may be dangerous to that individual where it would not be to another.

It is believed that certain diseases of heart and circulation, of the kidneys, of the lungs, all may render a man more susceptible to silicosis than normal. The physician at his pre-employment examination follows certain established criteria in respect and bar from exposure to dust those persons who through exposure to dust may be more ready prey to silicosis or tuberculosis.

Re-Examination Needed

After the applicant for employment successfully passed his physical examination and is engaged in a dusty trade, the physician is not yet exonerated. This man must be periodically re-examined to discover the early appearances of secondary fibrosis, but what is even more important, to detect the early evidence complicating tuberculosis infection.

A man should not be dismissed from employment in a dusty trade merely because he has evidences of non-disabling silicosis. Workers in dusty trades, especially cutters, molders, pottery workers, similar craftsmen, are usually highly skilled and it seems unfortunate from a social and economic point of view to deny them employment so long as they are physically able to carry on, especially since the actual abiding qualities of silicosis are in doubt.

They should be denied employment in a dusty trade if that condition is found at pre-employment examination, but they should not be barred from continuing an employment in which they are already engaged. Of course, in such instances you, as engineers, must realize that you have failed, because if you had kept the breathing zone of the worker free from dangerous dusts, silicosis would not be present on physical examination.

In this work of preventing dust diseases in industry, it should be evident that the closest and most intelligent cooperation between the physician and the engineer is necessary. The physician must, through his knowledge and research, tell the engineer what dusts, or, for that matter, what other substances used in industry are harmful. He must tell the engineer how such dusts or other materials enter the body, how they leave the body and what they do in their passages through or their residence in the body.

Must Make Analyses

The engineer must in turn tell the physician of the harmful dusts and other substances surrounding his workers. He must make chemical and petrographic analyses of the dusts, and other indicated analyses of the atmosphere in the workshop. He must make dust counts and check his counts at regular

intervals, conferring with the physician in an effort to discover whether, in the light of their joint knowledge, working conditions are dangerous. He must develop and install carefully designed ventilating equipment. He must arrange for modification of chemical and other industrial processes, where such modification is possible, and must bend his efforts toward removing from the danger zone of the worker the offending substance, whatever it may be.

Too many engineers construe this function loosely. They pass on to the physician as his responsibility certain functions which essentially are theirs: such functions as dust analyses, dust counts, and similar technical duties. All too often it is considered adequate merely to install a fan.

Ventilating devices in dusty work rooms must be constructed only after careful engineering study has given a knowledge of the physical properties of the air and of substances polluting it. It is possible to calculate to a very fine point the volume of air that must be removed from a given spot to remove the dust originating at that place, and the engineer must approach his task from just as scientific an angle as the physician approaches his.

There is no room in industry for haphazard methods on the part of either the physician or the engineer.

ADJOURNMENT

checked and repaired

one, and we will give it attention. In addition, I suggest a man from each department, him in to our safety training these men so they will have them all meeting these men a closer industry work and permit us to do. I will, until further meetings with all the we can make clear the address you men must assume, to see that your men are our safety rules and the employees. We can also individuals who do not seem one hundred per cent.

Safety Work?*

Telephone Co., Chicago

difficult problems facing the foreman his responsibility of the job measures, we have taken he must feel that the safe his responsibility and feel to do something about it. is there an accident on a considered particularly hazardous

we that the foreman or to conduct the work sure that he does and a proper training program

me that a majority of all accidents are directly or due to the failure of supervision to function properly, that supervisory training in accidents is necessary.

of a supervisory training more difficult procedure of a technical or vocational. Apart from the technical, there does not seem formula. There is, of

course, some similarity of procedure in directing the work of any man on any job; but different industries employ such different types of people, under such a wide variety of circumstances, and place such a divergence of requirements upon them that the problem of supervisory training in its more comprehensive aspects is peculiar to each type of industry.

The general treatises on leadership give the groundwork, but the subject matter for

any supervisory training course for any particular industry lies within that industry. We must go out and see how our job is being supervised now; analyze the procedure of every foreman and supervisor; compare them and select the best; look upon supervision as a process in itself, and see how best to direct the work of the people. It is a long, tedious, and costly process, but one which, carried through to completion, will pay dividends in the end.

WEDNESDAY LUNCHEON SESSION

October 13, 1937

The Wednesday Luncheon session of the Cement and Quarry Sections was addressed by Isaiah Hale, Superintendent of Safety, Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railroad, who spoke on "The Common Sense of

Safety." The address was substantially the same as another address by Mr. Hale before the Steam Railroad Meeting. The complete paper will be found in the Steam Railroad section of this volume.

WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON SESSION

October 13, 1937

Work of the National Silicosis Conference

By R. CAMPBELL STARR

Assistant Safety Engineer, U. S. Department of Labor, Division of Labor Standards, Washington, D. C.

Silicosis is strictly an occupational disease. Medical science has not reported silica dust as affecting any individuals except those who, over relatively long periods of time, have worked in an atmosphere where the air which they breathe contained excessive concentrations of free silica.

The interest of the U. S. Department of Labor in a broad social and economic problem such as this has its origin in the Organic Act, effective March 4, 1913, which created

the Department. This act, among other things, gives the Department of Labor the duty "to foster, promote, and develop the welfare of the wage earners of the United States, to improve their working conditions, and to advance their opportunities for profitable employment."

With this in mind, and believing that through joint effort of all concerned, much could be done to eliminate the hazard, the Secretary of Labor called together in Wash-

February 26, 1936 a group of about 20 men representing leaders in industries having a silica problem, labor leaders, and outstanding representatives of the medical, legal, and engineering professions, as well as insurance carriers and State administrators.

After considering various phases of the silica problem, this group generally agreed that through a pooling of knowledge and a frank discussion through the conference method important advances could be made toward first, overcoming the hysterical attitude on the part of employers, labor, and others; second, after careful investigation, to consolidate in one place all known data with regard to the preventive engineering methods; third, analysis and recommendations in connection with adequate standards of compensation for those workers disabled as a result of the disease.

As an outgrowth of this initial meeting, another group, similar in composition to the first conference, but expanded to include some 200 individuals, was invited to come to Washington on April 14, 1936 to outline ways and means of attacking the problem. After hearing silicosis discussed from the standpoint of the employer, labor, and the medical profession, by outstanding experts in the field, this large group endorsed the conference method as proposed, and as a result four main working committees were appointed by the Secretary of Labor with the advice and consent of the group to investigate and report upon the outstanding phases of the silicosis problem. These committees were:

- (1) Committee on the Prevention of Silicosis through Medical Control.
- (2) Committee on the Prevention of Silicosis through Engineering Control.
- (3) Committee on the Economic, Legal and Insurance Phases of the Silicosis Problem.
- (4) Committee on the Regulatory and Administrative Phases of the Silicosis Problem.

A fifth committee, known as the Correlating Committee, was named. It was under the chairmanship of W. H. Cameron, Managing Director of the National Safety Council, and consisted of the chairman of the four technical committees just mentioned and two ad-

visors, one on labor problems and one on mining matters.

These committee members served without compensation and gave freely of their time and effort in studying the problem from their respective viewpoints. After nine months of careful and searching study, these committees advised the Secretary of Labor that they were ready to report. Consequently, on February 3, 1937 the Second National Silicosis Conference was called in Washington. At this time summary committee reports were presented to the Secretary and considerable discussion was given them.

Shortly after this second national conference the Department published, as Bulletin No. 13 of the Division of Labor Standards, the summary reports of the four committees referred to above, together with an abstract version containing the principal findings and recommendations written in non-technical language.

The full reports of the committees, comprising several thousand typewritten pages, are now being edited and will go to the printer very shortly. It is expected that they will be issued in four separate volumes sometime during the fall or early winter.

Nature and Extent of Silicosis

Physicians generally agree that silicosis, in the human's language, is a disease of the lungs, caused by breathing air containing silica dust, in which the normal lung tissue is replaced by fibrous or scar tissue.

Silica dust is found in many industrial operations, but the hazard is acute only in such industries as metal mining; anthracite mining; quarrying, drilling, and tunneling in granite, gneiss, and sandstone; smelting and refining; foundries; potteries; glass works; stone-products industries; grinding; luffing; and sandblasting.

Of the 40,000,000 workers in the United States, only 1,000,000, or 2 per cent, it is estimated, are in any way exposed to the hazard of silicosis. About half of this number, or 1 per cent of the total number of workers in the country, are exposed to a serious hazard, and approximately 110,000 of these have silicosis in some degree. Medical examination of men actually at work indicates that between 4,000 and 5,000 workers are seriously affected by the disease, in addition to

those already permanently detached from their employment by reason of disabling silicosis.

The status of the 1,000,000 workers exposed to the hazard of silicosis was analyzed thus by the committees making the survey:

A percentage of the 4,000 to 5,000 workers having silicosis are completely or partially disabled because of this disease and have their difficulties further complicated with tuberculosis.

The remainder of the 4,000 to 5,000 have silicosis and disability in some degree, but no tuberculosis.

Approximately 103,000 have silicosis, but no disability and no tuberculosis.

Approximately 900,000 are exposed to silica dust, but have not contracted the disease.

Contrary to popular belief, silicosis is slow to develop. Usually it takes seven years or more of exposure to silica dust for a worker to contract the disease. A few cases that have been known to develop in as short a period as one and one-half years occurred under extreme and unusual conditions. On the other hand, many workers have labored under ordinary exposures to silica for more than 30 years without demonstrating any trouble whatever that could be diagnosed as silicosis.

Silicosis Prevention

Silicosis can be prevented in three general ways: First, by preventing the creation of silica dust; second, by preventing the dispersion of dust into the atmosphere of a working area; and third, if it is impossible to apply the first two methods, by the use of personal protective equipment such as respirators, to prevent the inhalation of the dust.

In carrying out a prevention program, many agencies must cooperate. In the view of the committees studying the problem, the employer is called on to do most of the work and to spend most of the money. But his work and money will never accomplish the maximum results unless the worker is willing to cooperate and carry his share of the responsibility for helping to control dust and for using the personal protective equipment.

In addition, physicians can play a definite part in preventing silicosis, as can also en-

gineers, insurers, companies, legislators, administrators, and others.

The reports of the conference committee on engineering control and medical control recommend specific procedures for attacking the problem through those two avenues of prevention. A partial list of these recommendations follows:

Survey the working conditions to determine the severity of the hazard and indicate what needs to be done to decrease it.

Secure information on best procedure for design plant for dust control.

Provide building ventilation.

Store dusty materials in dust-tight bins.

Enclose material-handling equipment.

Isolate dusty processes.

Provide wet methods of operation.

Water, oil, and other liquids may be used effectively.

1. To suppress dust at the point of origin in such operations as rock-drilling; haul-dumping, pulverizing, and milling rock and ore; grinding metal on grindstone; abrasive-wheel cutting of granite and sandstone.

2. To prevent the redispersion of dust that has settled on the floors, walls, and other surfaces such as in the granite industry and in foundries.

Design equipment to control dust.

Establish good maintenance and house-keeping procedure.

Provide respirators.

Instruct the workers.

Responsibility of Workers

The cooperation of the workers is necessary if the hazard of silicosis is to be reduced to the minimum. The worker should realize that the safe practices recommended and the equipment provided are designed to prevent injury to himself and to his fellow employees. The equipment should be used as directed and every effort should be made to maintain it in good working order. Furthermore, the worker is frequently in a position to observe faulty equipment and unsafe practices, and he should make it a point to report all such conditions to his supervisor.

Statutory Regulation

While the primary approach to the problem must be the prevention and diminution

of the hazard, the fact must be recognized that until silicosis has been wiped out, workers who now have the disease, as well as those who may contract it, must receive workmen's compensation just as do those workers who are injured in accidents.

Accordingly, the committees of the silicosis conference were unanimous in presenting the following recommendations:

Coverage for silicosis in the compensation acts of all States.

This coverage should be compulsory.

Because of competition between the same or similar industries in various States, the laws, rules, and regulations of the several States should be as uniform as practicable.

Should Be Insured

The employer should insure his obligation for compensation either through self-insurance subject to the posting of adequate funds, or with an authorized insurance institution.

Insurance should not be denied any employer, provided the State authorities certify that he complies with the State requirements as to proper safe working conditions, and pays the premiums involved.

Workers having active pulmonary tuberculosis and silicosis should be removed from employment. Such workers should be granted suitable compensation payments and medical care.

Workers disabled from silicosis (but with no tuberculosis) should ultimately be granted the same amount of compensation as those disabled by accidental injury.

Two years is a reasonable minimum limitation period for filing claims subsequent to the date of the last exposure.

Further Activities of the Department of Labor

In carrying out its duty as stated in the basic law, the U. S. Department of Labor has conceived that there is immediate need

for the conversion of known facts in the medical and engineering fields working toward prevention, and in the legal, insurance and regulatory phases looking toward adequate workmen's compensation, into a practical, readily understood program which will adequately take care of the silicosis problem.

In its program of cooperation with the 48 States, the Department of Labor has included a section covering silicosis and similar dust diseases. This breaks down into three main sub-headings: (1) Assistance in the preparation of reasonable and adequate codes, rules, and regulations prescribing methods of prevention; (2) assistance in the establishment of equitable standards of workmen's compensation for those employees disabled as a result of the disease; (3) a general educational program among State officials, factory inspectors, etc. so that they will be equipped with adequate knowledge concerning the disease, its method of prevention, and its proper treatment under the workmen's compensation law.

Follows Two Lines

This application program, which is just now getting under way has been commenced along two principal lines: (1) The compiling of practical information concerning actual dust control installations in typical silica hazardous plants, together with approximations as to cost, not only of installation, but also of maintenance of dust control equipment in such plants; (2) a program of visual education supplementing the summary and full committee reports of the National Silicosis Conference. It is contemplated that in this field such media as film strips, lantern slides, posters, illustrated bulletins, etc. will be utilized. Further, in connection with the various exhibits of the department, shown at various large expositions, trade association meetings, labor and technical organization meetings, etc., it is contemplated that much factual information will be used, pointing toward ways and means of correcting the hazard and of establishing adequate standards of workmen's compensation.

Following the address by Mr. Starr a round table discussion of outstanding

hazards in quarry operation took place. This concluded the Wednesday program.

Steam Railroad Meeting

WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON SESSION

October 13, 1937

The session was called to order by W. W. Wood, Baltimore and Ohio Railroad, Baltimore, Md., who presided, introducing the speakers and directing the discussion.

The Past, Present and Future of Railroad Safety

By J. M. SYMES

Vice President, Operations and Maintenance Department, Association of American Railroads, Washington, D. C.

No industry in the world requires more diversified study and more exacting application of safety principles than the steam railroad industry. Picture a quarter of a million miles of railroad line covering in a virtual network the vast expanse of the United States. Over this network are operated a billion train miles annually. Vast yard and terminal operations are necessary to make up the beginning of the journey of passengers and goods, and to break up at the end of that journey the 12 million trains that accumulate that billion miles. These trains carry 500 million passengers and one billion tons of freight annually. It requires more than one million railroad employees to run the trains, make them ready for road movement, supervise and safeguard their movement and maintain the equipment and roadbed, as well as perform the many other duties incidental to the production of railroad transportation.

Safety has in the past, is today, and always will be the first principle in railroad operations. But it is within the past fifteen years that greatest advances have been made in railroad safety. During that period we have seen a complete remodeling and modernization of railroad physical properties. Roadbeds have been strengthened; bridges, trestles and culverts rebuilt; tracks have been laid with heavier rail and with treated ties of greater service life and de-

pendability; grades and curves have been eliminated or reduced; signal systems have been modernized and extended; other safety devices have been installed; new and more powerful locomotives, embracing all modern safety devices, have been purchased; new cars, both freight and passenger, have been installed. This capital improvement program has cost the railroads about eight billion dollars since 1923, and a large part, if not all, of that huge sum had a beneficial effect, directly or indirectly, on the safety of operations.

But the engineer's job is never done. As soon as new equipment, new rail, or other devices are installed the engineers go to work to develop more efficient and safer units. The railroads spend millions of dollars annually in research and laboratory work experimenting with engineering improvements. In all this work safety is of primary importance. An invention which might mean great economies to the railroads would not find its way to a single locomotive or car if its use in any way lessened the opportunity for safe operation. Conversely, any improvement, mechanical or otherwise, promoting safety of operation immediately commends itself to railroad officers and employees. The search for greater safety will continue so long as railroad transportation is used.

About a quarter of a century ago, the

THURSDAY AFTERNOON SESSION

October 14, 1937

Safety. An Executive Operating Problem

By R. C. WHITE

Assistant General Manager, Missouri Pacific R. R., St. Louis, Mo.

Safety is an obligation of management. Without the constructive leadership and day-to-day urge from the executive and operating heads, the movement would lapse into a perfunctory activity.

The safety movement is recognized by executive and operating officers as a medium for building up and maintaining that relationship, that fellowship, which broadens our views, enriches character, and brings the Golden Rule into practical application.

Management recognizes that our economic system must enable men to live on an increasingly high plane. It must enable them to fulfill their desires and satisfy their reasonable wants, and give them that feeling of security which is essential to happiness and efficiency.

Having made the decision that safety is an executive problem and responsibility—that accidents must stop—it is then essential that management promulgate, and follow through, a plan that will definitely fix this decision in the minds of all the individuals who collectively comprise the industry. The follow through must be such that department heads, superintendents, and every member of the supervisory force will appreciate the need for a constant, active interest in safety; will understand that passive interest will no more produce results than would the same interest in production. Supervisors must be made to feel that the prevention of accidents demands the same type of heads-up supervision that is given to the other problems affecting cost and service.

The executive must find a way to indicate directly that it is the responsibility of the department heads to carry out management's program, that authority is placed in each superintendent's hands to put accident prevention on the same basis as production.

A complete, factual and descriptive report of each accident must be made. This must be

followed by a thorough analysis to find the direct and underlying causes and the procedure necessary to prevent a recurrence.

Proof of its sincerity will depend primarily on whether management will make the first essential move in the program—that is, authorize the expenditure of money necessary to make the maintenance and operating plant a safe place to work.

Safety and Efficiency

Analysis of the underlying causes of industrial accidents and preventive measures to be applied has made it increasingly apparent that those factors which are producing accidents are very largely the same factors which tend to lower the quantity and quality of production. Expressed in another way, safety and efficiency are as inseparable as though one word.

In coupling safety with efficiency I have not minimized it as an executive problem, but have endeavored to indicate that its solution is an executive responsibility, both to his individual industry and to the employees that make it a going concern.

Rail transportation is a scientific business in which laboratory research, expert engineering, trained builders, and skilled workers share a part.

One of the main factors is a group of employees who are loyal—who appreciate that their railroad must give the kind of service that will stimulate and accelerate the development of the territory traversed.

The successful solution of our problem demands the type of aggressive individualism in executive leadership that will attract and command loyal, collective, cooperative effort on the part of all who produce rail transportation.

Our major concern is leadership—leader-