LEAD INDUSTRIES ASSOCIATION

Graybar Building, 420 Lexington Avenue
New York, N. Y.

April 23, 1936.

To Members of the Lead Industries Association:

Subject: NATIONAL SILICOSIS CONFERENCE, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Secretary of Labor Perkins called a National Conference on Silicosis, and similar dust diseases, in Washington, D. C., on Tuesday, April 14, 1936, which was attended by about 150 persons interested in the subject, among them the Secretary of the Lead Industries Association. The meeting was opened by an address of welcome by Secretary Perkins, who pointed out it was a function of the Department of Labor to improve working conditions which accounted for the interest of the Federal Government in the Silicosis problem, but that the Department had no authority to enforce its recommendations.

An earlier conference, held in February, on the same topic, attended by representative industrial, labor, medical, engineering, insurance and administrative groups, had discussed the broad phases of the silicosis problem.

At the meeting on April 14, Mr. V. A. Zimmer, Director of the Division of Labor Standards of the United States Department of Labor, presided and introduced Dr. R. R. Sayers of the United States Public Health Service, who made an excellent talk on the medical aspects of silicosis. He was followed by Mr. A. C. Hirth of the Air Hygiene Foundation, who spoke on the manufacturer's view point, and then by Mr. John P. Frey of the American Federation of Labor, who spoke for labor. All three of these talks have been mimeographed by the Department of Labor.

I believe Dr. Sayers' medical paper will be of particular interest to those who are not familiar with the medical phases of the silicosis problem. I shall be glad to procure copies of this paper for any member of the Association interested, or they may be procured directly from the Department of Labor.

The subsequent discussion was participated in by Mr. Searles of the United Mine Workers, who stated that opinion being unanimous to eliminate or control the dust hazard, why wasn't it done now? He was in favor of medical examination by men who apply for employment as he could understand that industry had no desire to employ men who would become a hazard, but there were many cases where a medical examination was used as a pretext to turn down employees. He said he could point out many cases of discrimination in the coal industry.

Dr. A. J. Lanza of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company said there was more medical information available on silicosis than was actually put to practice today. He stated knowledge was ahead of use. There was still much field research, however, which could be done, particularly as no satisfactory answer had been given as to why silicotics contract consumption. Diagnosis was important and X-ray technique a great help, but even X-ray technique had to be standardized.

Mr. L. B. Raycroft of the Self-Insurers Association of Pennsylvania (and of the Electric Storage Battery Company) felt that business had a keen willingness to cooperate in solving the silicosis problem but that numerous small enterprises had difficulty in financing the improvements necessary to eliminate the dust hazard. He knew of one company having a current value of $25,000, which would have to spend $30,000 to eliminate the silicosis hazard completely. It seemed to him that the cost of eliminating the silicosis hazard tended to decrease the desire on the part of industry to employ labor and that the machine would be favored.

Mr. O. E. Mount of the American Steel Foundries, Chicago, Ill., described the experience of manufacturers in his State with the silicosis racket. By close cooperation of the manufacturers with the authorities, a law had been passed which was favored by all parties and has helped to cure the situation.

At an afternoon session, Mr. Zimmer designated, on the responsibility of the Department of Labor, four committees to aid the conference in making progress on the silicosis problem. These Committees, with their personnel and program, are listed on the attached supplement. It is anticipated that these Committees will meet and that the Chairman of each of the four special Committees, and the Director of the Division of Labor Standards, shall constitute a Correlating Committee to coordinate the activities of the various Committees; and shall, with the assistance of the augmented Advisory Committee to the Division of Labor Standards, prepare a composite report of all Committee activities, to be presented at a later date to the National Conference Committee for its further consideration and approval before submitting the same to the National Silicosis Conference.

We shall keep our members posted as further developments occur. If you desire a complete transcript of the proceedings at the meeting of April 14, in Washington, D. C., please let us know.

Respectfully submitted,

F. E. Wormser

Secretary.

COMMITTEE I

COMMITTEE ON THE PREVENTION OF SILICOSIS THROUGH MEDICAL CONTROL

Personnel

Chairman - Surgeon R. R. Sayers (U.S.Public Health Service)

Members - *J. M. Chivers, M.D. (Crane Company, Chicago, Ill.)
L. U. Gardner, M.D. (Director, Saranac Laboratories)
Wesley Graff (National Bureau of Casualty and Surety Underwriters)
Thomas Kennedy (United Mine Workers of America)
A. J. Lanza, M.D. (Metropolitan Life Insurance Company)
W. S. McCann, M.D. (Strong Memorial Hospital, Rochester)
E. P. Pendergrass, M.D. (University of Pennsylvania)
B. L. Vosburgh, M.D. (National Electrical Manufacturers Assoc.)
C. E. Watson, M.D. (President, National Safety Council)
J. Norman White, M.D. (Scranton, Pa.)

Program

This Committee is expected to consider and report on the following:

1. Historical Data: When silicosis was first reported; the occupations in which it has been reported to occur; its distribution.

2. Etiology: Exciting factor; contributory and predisposing factors.

3. Silicosis and Tuberculosis: Their relationship; importance to industry and the individual; importance from a public health viewpoint.

4. Permissible Limits of Dust Concentration: Physiological response to varying concentrations of silica; comparative harmful effects of exposure to various combinations of inorganic dusts (mixed dusts).

5. The Basis of Diagnosis: Specific requirements relative to occupational and medical history, clinical, roentgenological, laboratory and pathological manifestations.

6. Prognosis: Considering history, exposure, and removal from further exposure; progress; how influenced by infection.

7. Basis for Establishing Disability: Methods, cause and degree.

8. Medical Supervision of Workers: Physical examination; placement of workers.

9. Specific Needs in the Field of Medical Education: Relative to special training and knowledge of industrial processes.

10. Medical Records and Reporting:

11. Management's and Employees' Responsibility: Cooperation with medical personnel and authorities.

12. Research: Facts which further research should be planned to reveal.

* Membership on Committee not definitely accepted.

COMMITTEE II

COMMITTEE ON THE PREVENTION OF SILICOSIS THROUGH ENGINEERING CONTROL

Personnel

Chairman	-	Warren A. Cook	(State Department of Health, Conn.)
Members	-	James R. Allen	(International Harvester Company)
		J. J. Bloomfield	(U.S. Public Health Service)
		*Thomas Donnelly	(State Federation of Labor, Ohio)
		Prof. Philip Drinker	(Harvard School of Public Health)
		C. E. Fry	(Chief, Bureau of Industrial Accident Prevention, Dept. of Industrial Relations, California.)
		Leonard Greenburg, M.D.	(Division of Industrial Hygiene, N.Y. State Department of Labor)
		Daniel Harrington	(U.S. Bureau of Mines)
		Willis G. Hazard	(Owens-Illinois Glass Company)
		A. O. Jones	(American Foundrymen's Association)
		J. G. Meiter	(Employees' Mutual Liability Co.)
		W. P. Yant	(Supervising Engineer, U.S.Bureau of Mines Experiment Station, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Program

This Committee is expected to consider and report upon the following:

1. Housekeeping: Its relation to other preventive measures.
2. Plant Design: Layout, isolation of processes.
3. General Ventilation of Work Places: Methods, efficacy.
4. Enclosed Processes: Their general application to operations when practical and effective.
5. Wet Methods: Practicability and effectiveness.
6. Local Exhaust: Its application to specific industrial operations, design, efficiency.
7. Personal Respiratory Protective Devices: Their uses and limitations.
8. Atmospheric Dust Concentrations: Standards for estimating; value as a measure of effectiveness of control methods.
9. Management' and Employees' Responsibility: Maintenance of control equipment; inspection; repair and use.

* Membership on Committee not definitely accepted.

N 1861.02

COMMITTEE III

COMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC, LEGAL, AND INSURANCE PHASES OF THE SILICOSIS PROBLEM

Personnel

Chairman -	V. P. Ahearn	(National Sand and Gravel Association)
Members -	Daniel D. Carmell	(Assistant Attorney-General, Illinois)
	J. Dewey Dorsett	(Industrial Commission, N.C.)
	Evan I. Evans	(Supervisor, Actuarial Division, Ohio Industrial Commission)
	John P. Frey	(American Federation of Labor)
	Henry D. Kessler, M.D.	(Chairman, Rehabilitation Commission, N.J.)
	Louis B. Raycroft	(Pennsylvania Self-Insurers)
	Henry D. Sayer	(Association of Casualty and Surety Executives)
	T. C. Waters	(Chairman, Maryland Occupational Disease Commission)
	Robert J. Watt	(Massachusetts Federation of Labor)
	S. E. Whiting	(Liberty Mutual Insurance Company)
	W. H. Winans	(Union Carbon and Carbide Co., N.Y.)

Program

This Committee is expected to consider and report upon the following:

1. Extent of Hazard: Industries affected; estimate of the number of workers exposed to the hazard.

2. Compensation Phases:

   (a) Summary of the present laws affording compensation for silicosis; analysis as to form; advantages and disadvantages.
   (b) Compensation and its tendency to deprive industry of experienced employees, and workers of an opportunity of employment.
   (c) Basis for compensation.
   (d) Accrued Liability problem; suggested methods of solution.
   (e) Premium rates; comparison under different forms of compensation laws and administration.
   (f) Benefits; forms, substance, and application.
   (g) State funds, types; advantages and disadvantages.

3. Financial Losses due to Silicosis: Affecting labor, employer, and the public.

4. Litigation Problems: (Racketeering)

COMMITTEE IV

COMMITTEE ON REGULATORY AND ADMINISTRATIVE PHASES OF THE SILICOSIS PROBLEM

Personnel

Chairman -	L. Metcalfe Walling	(Labor Commissioner, R.I.)
Members -	F. C. Agnew, M. D.	(American Standards Association)
	Dan Boney	(Insurance Commissioner, N. C.)
	Manfred Bowditch	(Director, Bureau of Occupational Hygiene, Massachusetts)
	A. L. Fletcher	(Labor Commissioner, N.C.)
	Joseph A. Haller	(Safety Engineer, Compensation Commission, Maryland)
	Ambrose B. Kelly	(American Mutual Alliance)
	Oliver S. Mount	(American Steel Foundries, Chicago)
	Michael J. Murphy	(Director, Workmen's Compensation, N.Y.)
	Victor A. Olander	(Secretary, Illinois Federation of Labor)
	Stanley Osborn, M.D.	(Health Commissioner, Conn.)
	*W. C. Woodward, M.D.	(American Medical Association)
	Voyta Wrabetz	(Chairman, Industrial Commission of Wisconsin.)

Program

This Committee is expected to consider and report upon the following:

1. Responsibility of State departments of labor in the adoption of regulatory measures relative to standards for inspection enforcement.

2. Responsibility of State health departments in research, reporting, and educational program.

3. Collaboration of State agencies responsible for health of workers:

   (a) Between agencies within the State - Health and labor
   (b) Between various State labor departments
   (c) Between various State health departments

4. Industrial Hygiene Units: Responsibility as a State agency; outlining program in relation to silicosis control.

5. Workmen's Compensation: Administrative problems; administration of State funds; medical boards; rate-fixing agencies and their problems.

6. Rehabilitation and Medical Care.

* Membership on Committee not definitely accepted.