

tions between industry and the governmental industrial hygiene facilities throughout the country have been good. In general there has been an endeavor to be practical and rational in establishing and administering rules and regulations, and to aid and assist industry in providing healthy working conditions. Industry respects these facilities and values the services that are given. These relations should be very helpful in resolving any differences of opinion on codes and regulations if mechanisms for cooperative effort are provided.

In mentioning the model code that is in course of preparation by the ACGIH, it was pointed out that the comments and criticism of industry, labor, and other interests on the draft had been invited, and that a part of the review had been conducted by the American Standards Association. The plans for the future course of this model code are not known to the speaker, but it would appear to be in keeping with propriety and practicability to suggest processing it through the American Standards Association, where the participation of all interests could be formally recognized. That association is national in scope. Its code procedures provide for creating balanced committees composed of representation with good specialized knowledge for dealing with a particular subject, from all interests—labor, industry, and the public. American Standards Association Codes represent a consensus of good knowledge and good American practice. It is believed that the issuance of an industrial hygiene code under this Association's procedure, with a combined representation of all interests, would greatly assist in obtaining national recognition and approval. One way of selling an idea to a prospective customer is to share the idea. That procedure not only helps to sell the idea, but at the same time removes its faults.

Type, Scope, and Content of Codes

The type, scope, and content of industrial hygiene codes are subjects on which there is honest and sound disagreement among and between both regulatory and non-regulatory interests, from several viewpoints. A basic question pertains to whether codes should be specialized, such as specific industry, trade, occupation or product codes, or whether they should be general, all-inclusive, all-industry codes. Both practices are in use, both have advantages and disadvantages, but either one would be satisfactory if well developed and administered. The next question pertains to coverage within a particular type of code, it having been previously stated that the present coverage of codes ranges from little more than general sanitation, to moderately complete coverage of environment. It is believed that coverage should be complete to the extent that valid information is

available for defining the requirements. A third question pertains to whether the scope shall be confined to the rather general present concept of duties of industrial hygienists in effecting control of environmental factors that are directly related to health as commonly interpreted, or whether it shall include subjects of safety and health and medical services that are commonly recognized to be within the purview and province of industrial safety and industrial medicine. The proposed model ACGIH code previously referred to follows the latter pattern to some extent. For a long time the speaker has had a conviction that insofar as harmful agents of industrial environment are concerned, the knowledge, skills, procedures, and teamwork that is required to control the agents and protect workers are too similar, overlapping, and interdependent to segregate industrial health, industrial hygiene, and industrial safety into three distinct services or jurisdictions. Attempts to do this are not only difficult but also rather unreal. However, this viewpoint of broad scope and content of codes may be too idealistic for wide acceptance at the present time, owing to existing practices of industrial organization and administration of departments of medicine, hygiene, and safety.

Some Agreement on Scope

The differences of opinion relating to type and scope of industrial hygiene codes will be difficult to harmonize, at least in the near future, because there is more than one good answer to many of the questions. Perhaps the way will be open to more progress if attention would be given to relative importance of some of the questions. The speaker has previously indicated his opinion that either type of code, specific or all-industry, would serve the purpose if well developed and well administered. Of more importance is a practical definition of scope or at least some agreement on scope among both the interests and the professions that are involved in carrying out the provisions of a code. Adequate representation of all interests should be a part of any code-making body. When industrial hygiene codes transgress to a significant extent into fields of safety and medicine they should bear a title that is indicative of their scope. The most urgent present need is, that regardless of variation in scope and coverage among codes, the definition of good practices and requirements should, to the extent that they are included in codes, be more uniform than now prevails among the codes in this country.

It is rather generally agreed that a quantitative definition of hygienic environment in terms of required qualities and harmful chemical, physical, and biological agents, is a very essential part of an industrial hygiene code. Such definition is a statement of an objective which, if attained, will provide the desired result of healthy work-