

Other Volumes in this (1960) Series

Users of this volume will find much value in its companion volumes, which offer the complete record of the 48th National Safety Congress! Here is the list:

Vol. No.	Title	1 to 9 Copies	10 or more	Stock No.
1	General Sessions and Index to all Volumes..	\$.65	\$.55	022.30-1
2	Aero-space; Air Transport	.65	.55	022.30-2
3	Automotive and Machine Shop; Power Press and Forging	.65	.55	022.30-3
4	Cement, Quarry and Mineral Aggregates	.40	.35	022.30-4
5	Chemical and Fertilizer	.65	.55	022.30-5
6	Civic Leadership; Church, Home, Women, Youth, Farm	.65	.55	022.30-6
7	Coal Mining	.65	.55	022.30-7
8	Construction; Public Employee	.65	.55	022.30-8
9	Electrical Equipment	.40	.35	022.30-9
10	Food and Beverage; Meat Packing, Tanning and Leather Products; Trades and Services	.65	.55	022.30-10
11	Glass and Ceramics; Rubber	.65	.55	022.30-11
12	Industrial Subjects Sessions (ASSE)...	.90	.80	022.30-12
13	Labor	.65	.55	022.30-13
14	Marine	.65	.55	022.30-14
15	Metals	.65	.55	022.30-15
16	Mining	.65	.55	022.30-16
17	Motor Transport; Transit	.65	.55	022.30-17
18	Occupational Health Nursing	.40	.35	022.30-18
19	Petroleum	.65	.55	022.30-19
20	Public Utilities	.65	.55	022.30-20
21	Pulp and Paper; Printing and Publishing	.65	.55	022.30-21
22	Railroad	.40	.35	022.30-22
23	School and College	.90	.80	022.30-23
24	Traffic	.65	.55	022.30-24
25	Wood Products; and Textile	.65	.55	022.30-25
COMPLETE SETS (25 Volumes)...		\$10.50	\$10.50	022.10

All prices shown are subject to a 10 per cent discount to National Safety Council members.

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

3M16102

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

022.30-14

32

MARKED COPY

NATIONAL SAFETY CONGRESS TRANSACTIONS 1960

VOL. 14

MARINE INDUSTRIES

NATIONAL SAFETY COUNCIL
425 NO. MICHIGAN AVENUE • CHICAGO 11, ILLINOIS



SCF-ALLF-02011

19
10
21
22
23
14
24
15
16
17
18

CONTENTS

MARINE SECTION

(a) On Deck Safety	John Kern	4
(b) Engine Room Safety	P. J. Breen, Jr.	8
(c) Galley and Housekeeping Safety	R. V. Baillie	10
(d) Its Relationship to Recreational Boating	Robert V. Hadley	13
Federal Safety Regulation—Beneficial or Detrimental	Robert D. Gidel	15
Management's Responsibility for Safety	Clare J. Snider	18
Who's Setting the Course?	Capt. Robert E. Mackey	22
Preventing Accidents on Cargo Vessels	Capt. James B. Rucker	27
Offshore Safety	Bruce A. Pfeiffer	31
Safety Features in the New Ships	Capt. R. N. LePage	34
Safety—Problems and Solutions	C. J. Mellendeck	40
Blueprint for Sea Safety—A Joint Labor-Management Approach	Joe Algina	43
The Helicopter in Rescue	Capt. W. W. Vennel	47
Regulation, Use and Inspection of Inflatable Life Rafts	Capt. Arthur W. Johnsen	53
A Review of Merchant Marine Licensing Programs	Capt. Roderick Y. Edwards	58
Let's Ship By American Flag	VADM Ralph E. Wilson	61
The Distinguished Sea Rescue Award	Capt. Jones F. Devlin	65
Marine Section Committee Reports		
National Defense Transportation Readiness	Capt. M. I. Goodman	66
MSTS Safety Activities	VADM Roy A. Gano	67
Shipbuilding and Repair Yard Committee	Herman J. Nordstrom	68
Passenger and Cargo Services	L. S. Andrews	69
Safety Awards Committee	Capt. R. E. Mackey	69
Membership Committee	Carl F. Vander Clute	70

CONTENTS—Continued

Government Safety Discussion Group	Capt. T. J. Fabik	70
Cargo Ship Safety Discussion Group	Robert Coe	71
Tanker Safety Discussion Group	Glenn E. Ankum	71
Joint Safety Discussion Group	Capt. R. H. Smith	72
Great Lakes Ship Safety Discussion Group	Robert E. Kratzert	73
Safety Information and Poster Committee	Capt. Milton Breece	73
Vice General Chairman, Great Lakes Area	David L. Buchanan	74
Vice General Chairman, Gulf Area	Robert Rader	74
Vice General Chairman, Pacific Area	L. C. Ford	75
Assistant General Chairman, Programs and Conventions	Harold M. Wick	76
Public Relations Committee	Frank Braynard	77
Ship Safety Achievement Awards	Capt. Jones F. Devlin	77
Statistics and Contests Committee	Jack L. Morrow	78
Report of the General Chairman	Robert L. O'Brien	78
Officers of the Marine Section, 1960-61		80
Other Volumes in 1960 National Safety Congress Transactions	Back Cover	

19

20

21

22

23

24

15

16

17

18

MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSIBILITY FOR SAFETY

By CLARE J. SNIDER

Marine Services Manager, Ford Motor Company

What is safety?

As a matter of habit, most of us try to define a problem before attempting to solve it. As might be expected, we have not solved all of our safety problems at Ford, but we have found from experience that a clear definition, or, as we generally refer to it, a "problem blueprint" is a valuable aid.

Webster's Dictionary defines "safety" as: a condition of being safe; freedom from danger or hazard; or keeping ones self or others safe. A rather brief definition for a word that is in reality as broad as life itself.

Accepting Mr. Webster's definition, you will note that he clearly indicates safety is a team responsibility and that team work is synonymous with coordination; the type of coordination that can only result from program planning and the participation of all, from the ordinary seaman handling lines on the dock to the master piloting a giant ore carrier through the narrow channels of the St. Marys River.

All? Not quite—since the actual work tasks are performed aboard the ships many miles from their home ports, it is conceivable that many safety programs have neglected to consider shore management's responsibility for safety. A working safety program involves more than a simple distribution of a rule book, the posting of posters and the occasional admonition to be careful. The larger or total program necessarily must include the enthusiastic participation of management.

We of the Marine Services are fortunate that "safety first" has been a way of life at Ford for a long time. We have available to us a well developed safety program. With the aid of representatives of shore management such as division safety engineers, we are continually in the process of adapting our industrial safety programs to fit the needs of our vessels. We recognize that you cannot simply tear a page from a rolling mill safety program and apply it directly to marine personnel, since many of our basic problems are unique to marine operations.

However, we have found that there is much to be gained from taking advantage of the experience of industry, and that we are not as different as it would appear at first glance.

For example, consider our last two disabling injuries. In 1956, an engineer was seriously injured when he tested a 440-volt circuit with a 110-volt test lamp. In March of 1957, another engineer lost a portion of his finger when a fellow-worker struck it with a sledge hammer. Either of these injuries as well as others that preceded them could have for the most part occurred in any type of manufacturing operation.

As an integrated department of the Steel Division, Ford Motor Company, we have taken full advantage of the staff and engineering services available to us for two basic reasons. First, when it pertains to safety, we are in a hurry. We can't afford the time spent on unnecessary trial and error. Today's remedial action is too late to prevent yesterday's injury accidents. Secondly, we recognize that if we are to fulfill our responsibilities as members of management, we must avail ourselves of professional help in planning our safety program activities.

It is our belief that management's principal responsibility is to demonstrate active safety program leadership. We all expect the ship officers to provide consistent, safe, on-the-job leadership. It becomes our responsibility then to provide not only the tools but active program direction. In order to provide you with a better appreciation of that relationship, permit me to review it in a little greater detail. Our medical, statistical, safety meeting, safety promotion, reporting, in effect, our complete safety program is coordinated with that of the Steel Division as would be the case of any other department. Our statistics are maintained in a manner comparable to other marine activities and as members of the Steel Division safety team. Disabling injuries are charged against the company, and the division, as well as against our department.

In order to graphically outline the shore influence on the safety program currently in force on the three vessels making up the Ford fleet, we have prepared the following slides:

Safety Meetings. In order to make shipboard safety more meaningful, responsibility for safety meetings is divided into three basic areas. A mate, an engineer and the steward are designated as safety meeting chairmen for their respective areas. Records are maintained to make sure that each member of the crew attends at least one formal safety meeting per month. Crewmen attend the one-hour meetings on an over-time basis, that is, they are paid for the off-duty time spent at the safety meeting. This payment helps underscore in their minds the fact that we are sincerely interested in their safety.

As is the case with any successful meeting, safety meeting agendas are prepared in advance. An important phase of this preparation is the time allotted for crew participation. Although we are fortunate to have at our disposal a large quantity of "ground" material, we have found from experience that when the crewmen participate in the meetings, everyone profits from it. Particular care is taken in selecting the chairman in order to appoint the person best qualified to conduct the meetings, one who has proven that he can maintain meeting discipline in order to prevent the meetings from becoming monthly gripe sessions.

Safety Meeting Report. A copy of a report submitted by one of our chairmen is forwarded to my office and the industrial safety section. The names of those crewmen having attended the meeting are recorded and checked against a master sheet in order to make sure that every man has been contacted and attended at least one formal safety meeting per month. The safety meeting report is for record purposes only, and the chairman includes only a brief outline of the safety meeting topics reviewed. A monthly report is prepared by the division industrial safety section indicating the safety meeting performance of the 19 operations and staff areas comprising the Steel Division. These reports have a tendency to keep us on our toes since they are reviewed with us by the Division General Manager at his weekly staff meeting. I can

assure you from experience that a poor record of safety meeting performance is considered to be as reprehensible as a bad cost performance.

Safe Job Procedure. In addition to the formal safety meetings, each vessel participates in the Safe Job Procedure Program. The chairman selects a simple task and with the help of the crew, examines every aspect of the selected work task in search of ways that a crewman could be injured and what he must do to avoid injury. In a surprising number of instances, our crewmen have helped us find a safer way to do a job. The chairman outlines the safe job procedure on this specially prepared form which he in turn reviews with other crew members. The Safe Job Procedure Program has proved to be an effective method of creating job safety awareness and teaching crewmen to think a job safely through.

Safety Log. At this point, it might be well to impress upon you that although we have found divisional safety program integration to be both natural and beneficial, management has not failed to recognize that in many respects our departmental problems are different. The Steel Division safety program was purposely designed with provisions for considerable departmental freedom in order to encourage the growth of departmental safety activities tailored to fit the needs of a particular operation. Our close association with the steel manufacturing staff areas has not resulted in our losing our identity. On the contrary, it has served to sharpen the contrast. Each department has its own specific rules. Our Marine Services Safety Log is regularly distributed and reviewed with each crew member.

A few of our more obvious departmental rules are:

No man shall go over the side without a life jacket and attendant.

No man shall work over the side on scaffold without safety belt securely attached.

All personnel working on deck must wear hard hats.

All men must wear goggles when grinding or chipping.

All men must wear gloves and life preservers when handling lines on dock.

No one is permitted to stand on railings.

No one shall enter tanks alone.

Ladder watch is to be maintained at all times.

All decks must be kept clean.

Instruments. Aside from the posted ship general safe practices, one of several special devices used to provide our crews with the safest possible work environment is for example, portable combustible gas indicators. All below-deck areas are checked for combustible gases before welding or oxygen acetylene cutting is permitted. In addition, a burning permit signed by the fire department is required before welding or cutting is permitted anywhere on the vessel. All tanks or bilges are checked for the presence of noxious gases or the lack of sufficient oxygen with the aid of instruments before crewmen are permitted to enter.

Hard Hats. In addition to the mechanical safety devices, an important phase of our safety program is the personal protective equipment provided or made available to our crewmen. For example, all men working on deck are required to wear hard hats provided by the company. When we say all, we mean literally everyone, including ship officers, dock foremen, and myself when I go aboard.

Safety Shoes. Without a doubt, the most popular item of safety apparel is safety shoes. Crewmen purchase at the wholesale price attractive, quality-made safety shoes from a large, well-staffed company shoe store located less than 100 yards from the dock. We will never know just how many of our people have escaped injury because they were wearing safety shoes.

Eye Protection. We are currently in the process of fitting every crewman with approved eye protection. Notice I said "approved eye protection." That is, the eye protection provided is specifically designed to meet the needs of the various work classifications. In addition to the approved eye protection, crewmen may elect to purchase, at approximately half the retail cost, prescription safety spectacles from a local distributor who has regular office hours at several convenient locations throughout the Rouge Plant area. This is in preparation for a complete eye protection program to be inaugurated soon.

Gloves. A review of our supervisor's investigation of injury reports, completed by

ship's officers for every accidental injury requiring first aid, indicated that an alarming number of our crewmen were injuring their hands while handling cables. We have long had a rule that crewmen are not to handle lines without gloves. In order to implement the rule, we recently included in the ship stores a supply of leather gloves which are available to any of the ship personnel at the company purchase price of 88 cents per pair.

Inspections. Ship's officers are prompt to correct unsafe practices and conditions as they are noted during day-to-day ship routine. However, we recognize the vital importance of a regular formal inspection program. In addition to the usual Coast Guard inspections, division safety engineers complete a formal inspection of each vessel once each month. A report of inspection findings is promptly forwarded to my office. Of course, many of the recommendations are completed by the ship's officer accompanying the safety engineer during his inspection before the report has reached my desk. We have found that these inspections by shore personnel are important, since often our crewmen and officers have learned to live with work practices or conditions that they have found to be hazardous.

Suggestions and Proposals. We take advantage of every available means of encouraging ship's personnel to participate in their safety program. One effective method has proven to be the suggestion and proposal program. This program provides crewmen with a monetary award for ideas which improve ship efficiency and add to its safety. By far the largest number submitted pertain to safety, many of which are adopted and the crewmen paid. The money paid crewmen for effective safety suggestions is another method of impressing upon them our sincere interest in their safety. Officers receive citations for submitting adopted management proposals on safety items.

Competition. The Steel Division has established a departmental safety award system. A keen competitive spirit is maintained between the individual departments. A competitive departmental safety performance report is distributed each month. Departments having worked a million hours without a disabling injury are recognized by providing every employee with a token safety award. Of course, this is in addition

to our participation in the National Safety Council contest. Incidentally, when we were fortunate enough to earn the National Safety Council Award of Honor, additional copies of the award were purchased so that we could prominently display on each vessel.

Safety Promotion. Many different types of safety promotion are utilized. Since our personalities are different, we do not all react to promotional material in the same manner. Some of our people, for example, will take the time to read accident reports distributed among the crew. Others will not. For that reason, we use a variety of material ranging from posters, accident reports, films and specially prepared recall material as utilized in an intensive Yellow Flag program conducted approximately one year ago. Incidentally, we found that outside companies such as insurance firms, are a valuable source of promotional material.

Materials acquired from the National Safety Council have proved to be an important contribution. We do not restrict promotional materials to marine subjects. We are as interested in crew safety during off-duty hours and at home as we are while they are on duty. Therefore, we regularly distribute, for example, traffic safety material. We recently completed a thorough visual aid and demonstration program on mouth-to-mouth resuscitation. Some of the accompanying materials distributed were specifically designed to be taken or mailed home.

Maintenance. Maintenance schedules are regularly reviewed in order to reduce to a minimum any dangerous repairs that would otherwise become necessary while the ship is under way. Particular attention is paid to electrical equipment such as switchboards, winches, etc. All such equipment is thoroughly inspected, adjusted and repaired where necessary by specialists during the winter lay-up.

Material Handling. We know from experience and this is true in industry generally, material handling is a hazardous activity. We have attempted to improve material handling aboard ship and from dock to ship by the installation of electrically operated hoists. Ship freight elevators are regularly inspected and their use restricted to specifically designated individuals.

Quarters. Bunk ladders and safe room furniture has been furnished. These are but a few of the safety precautions taken to make living safer for the crew.

So far we have only reviewed the positive side of our program. Of course, we, like everyone else, have our day-to-day problems. Unfortunately, some of these recur all too often.

Drinking. A disconcerting problem is that of excessive drinking ashore and sometimes aboard ship by the crew members. Drinking on our vessels is, of course, strictly prohibited, but we have known crewmen to smuggle intoxicants aboard in their luggage. At our home port, plant guards are alert for signs of intoxication on the part of employees returning from shore leave, but some of these escape detection and are a serious safety problem when they get aboard.

Personnel. A threat to shipboard safety may be the caliber or degree of proficiency of some present day seamen. Many of these men are slow in understanding verbal instructions and must be closely supervised by the officers to protect them from injury.

Rejections. We have had to reject these men as they come aboard. We also find many are too old and of small stature, factors which, when coupled with their slow rate of comprehension, makes the performance of ordinary ship tasks dangerous.

Promotions. Of course, the lack of qualified personnel in the lower classifications makes on-the-job promotional training a more difficult task. Consequently, we must carefully consider the drifters who move from ship to ship for the higher classifications when openings are available. The problem of disqualifying the unsafe worker is becoming more difficult all the time. We ordinarily receive the cooperation of the maritime union; however, these men are continually trying to get back into our fleet.

Despite these problems we have made definite safety progress as has the marine industry generally.

We are confident that by working together, assisting one another wherever possible, by taking advantage of the experience of others and with management assuming its rightful responsibility for charting the safety program course, actively participating in its administration, we will continue to witness a decline in our accident rates.

In summary the following are of equal importance for a well rounded effective safety program:

Education
Promotion
Cooperation

Enforcement
Inspection
Recognition

We have tried to work all these into our safety program in order to accomplish our goal of a perfect safety record each year.

WHO'S SETTING THE COURSE?

By CAPT. ROBERT E. MACKEY
Asst. Mgr., Operations, Marine Department
Texaco, Inc., New York City

A seaman falls out of a bosun's chair and breaks a leg. To him personal safety has suddenly become a vital matter. He'll make sure that he doesn't fall out of a chair again, at least for a while.

In a larger sense, the marine industry is continually falling out of the chair, being "hurt" year after year by the rising cost of claims and insurance premiums, as well as the bad effects upon morale when injuries occur. What steps can be taken to prevent the recurrence of this undesirable situation? What courses must we sail to avoid inefficient operations and needless costs? And who is going to set these courses?

Before trying to answer these questions, let's look at the extent of the safety problem facing the American Merchant Marine. Statistics compiled annually by the National Safety Council show that marine transportation ranked 38th among 40 American industries rated in 1959. With regard to frequency of disabling injury, only coal mining and lumbering fared worse than we. With regard to severity of disabling injury, we were next to low man on the totem pole, only the coal miners sustaining more severe injuries in 1959.

Looking at the matter in dollars rather than statistics, a close friend high in marine insurance circles has given me his careful estimate that in a recent year, the cost of claims to the underwriters has been in the neighborhood of \$70 million. Eventually, through increased premiums, the shipowners will foot this bill—a sum large enough to build nine or ten coastwise vessels and to provide for as many as 450 additional jobs for American seamen and officers.

The American Merchant Marine simply can't afford to pay the highest wages in the world, build the finest, most comfortable vessels, and continue to pay far and away the highest settlements for illness and injury claims.

The picture is not all black, of course. Many of us here who have attended these meetings year after year and have gone back and influenced our managements to plan and work and spend for increased shipboard safety are convinced that good progress has been made. But the record has been uneven between different companies. Many outfits have set up very effective programs; others haven't done as well. We hope and expect that the companies that are lagging will catch fire and forge ahead.

For to put it frankly, the weak links in the chain may cause us to drop the load. Insurance gets more costly for all of us, companies with good and bad records alike. Seamen untrained in shipboard safety circulate throughout the industry which puts an added burden on the vessels that are conscientious about shipboard safety. Areas of poor safety performance in the industry become the targets of governmental or union action which is not selective but tends to interfere generally with management functions and responsibilities.

Which leads me to answer my earlier question and to develop briefly with you a personal working philosophy I hope you will consider carefully.

You and I, marine management, are the ones who must set the courses toward better shipboard safety. I just don't believe,

for moral reasons as well as good practical business reasons, that you can give away or share responsibility for shipboard safety with any outside person or group. Operating managers who have kept a fleet running over the years know its problems better than any one else can: the condition of the vessels, the nature of the cargoes, the peculiarities of the trades engaged in, and, most important, the composition and characteristics of the crews aboard ship. Solutions to problems are not found by parcelling out responsibility. It is time to stop blaming the unions, the U. S. Public Health and others for our difficulties. We must accept the responsibility for safety and strive to uncover the proper answers. Once we have put our houses in order, we will then be in a position to insist on the cooperation of others.

A labor union, as the certified representative of the employees, may and should play its proper role in challenging management's action in the field of safety to obtain changes they feel advisable. At the same time, the union should cooperate in every way possible to reduce injuries if they are sincerely interested in the welfare of the people they represent. But, and this is a big "but," it was never intended, nor do responsible labor officials propose, that unions relieve management of its proper function of managing. Let's keep this distinction clearly in mind.

I'm not going to challenge you with this idea of full management responsibility without offering some suggestions, based on practical experience, as to how it can be brought about.

The first thing, and this is most critical, is to create a suitable climate in which to work. To do this it is necessary to recognize that the men on your vessels are your employees, and should be treated accordingly. Seamen are changing with the times. They are first-class citizens; many are purchasing homes and cars, are educating children, have continuing responsibilities. They don't quit a ship on whim. These men, who comprise a large and growing segment of American seamen, are the ones who will work with management, if they are given progressive leadership—leadership which is compounded of consideration, recognition and respect.

It is surprising how often the main safety effort is directed toward the conditions of equipment and structural layout aboard ship. And yet well-proven statistics show that less than 4 per cent of all injury is caused by equipment failure. The remaining 96 per cent is caused by "man failure" in the form of haste, inattention, carelessness, and ignorance. How to assume responsibility in these important areas? To provide leadership toward teamwork aboard ship where each individual understands that accident and injury lead to personal loss? That accident and injury affect all by lessening job security? That sustaining an injury is avoidable and unnecessary, and ill becomes a professional seaman who takes pride in his work?

These are ideas, or concepts, that must be understood and agreed upon by officers and men aboard the vessels before they will be acted upon. Management's chief responsibility, you see, becomes one of teaching, or propagandizing, or selling, if you prefer that word.

Let me outline the planks in a safety campaign that Texacomarine has worked out over the years aimed directly at putting the safety idea across, getting it accepted and acted upon. The five planks are good supervision, indoctrination, investigation, inspection and group meetings. Before describing these activities briefly, let me say that none of them has been developed to a point where we are completely satisfied with it. But we are convinced we are heading in the right direction because there is a part to play in each of the activities for the unlicensed man, the ship's officer, and for management.

Good Supervision—Few will argue with the importance of good supervision. It's basic, although not easy to achieve or to evaluate. You will agree that a good supervisor is one who gets his people to do what he wants, when he wants it, the way he wants it, because they want to do it. This is not utopia. You can expect it of a good supervisor.

Go aboard one of your ships, ask around, find out how many department heads know the names of their men. A good supervisor knows not only their names, but something about their backgrounds and experience, what jobs they do well or poorly.

phoon and subsequent participation in the successful rescue of her crew. The presentation is being made in the course of the annual meeting.

Two ship Safety Achievement Citations of Merit were issued this year. One went to the tanker *Gulfube* of the Gulf Oil Corporation for taking a crew off a disabled yacht; the other to the motorship *Western Pioneer* of Kimbrell-Lawrence Transportation, Inc., for taking off the crew of the wrecked Canadian fishing boat *Queen Kathleen*, in heavy surf off Unimak Island. The *Western Pioneer* citation was presented in Seattle at the October 19 meeting of that port's Propeller Club. The *Gulfube* citation has yet to be presented.

REPORT OF STATISTICS AND CONTEST COMMITTEE

By JACK L. MORROW
Safety Director, Grace Lines, New York City

Two items of interest to the membership arose in 1960, both relating to the existing structure of competing groups in the contests.

Early this year, upon announcement of the results of the dry-cargo ship contest, the question was raised as to whether the Panama Line should be in the private operators' contest or should be transferred to the government group. This question was discussed at length at the executive session in New York last spring, with all sides given an opportunity to present their arguments.

It was resolved that the Panama Line be placed in the government group, effective with the 1959 contest year.

The second item was recently referred to the General Chairman and relates to a resolution by the Tanker Safety Discussion Group that the separation of the government and private operator groups should be eliminated and that they should all be in competition with each other. I understand this was referred to the Vice Chairman for their views, but has not yet been resolved.

REPORT OF THE GENERAL CHAIRMAN

By ROBERT E. O'BRIEN
Vice President, Operations, Moore-McCormack Lines, Inc., New York City

The Marine Section of the National Safety Council has continued, during the present year, its activities in promoting safety in the marine field.

The spring session, which was held in New York on March 30 and 31, was most successful, and the nine papers presented during this session were very informative.

The Ship Safety Achievement Award for Meritorious Service Saving Life at Sea, jointly sponsored by the Marine Section, National Safety Council and the American Merchant Marine Institute, was presented in the dry-cargo division to the *Blue Grass State* of States Marine Lines and the *Mormacted* of Moore-McCormack Lines. No

awards were presented in the passenger or tanker divisions; however, certificates of merit were awarded to the *Gulfube* of the Gulf Oil Corporation and the *Western Pioneer* of Kimbrell-Lawrence Transportation Incorporated. Certificates of honor for vessels completing two or more years without a lost-time accident were presented to 37 vessels representing seven dry-cargo and tanker operators. It is significant to note that 15 of these vessels were operated by Texaco, Incorporated.

The distinguished Sea Rescue Award was presented to the USNS *Sgt. Archer T. Gammon*.

The awards for best papers delivered during the contest year will be announced later in the program.

We were guests of Alcoa Steamship Company at a luncheon on the 19th of April in connection with the presentation of awards in the privately owned cargo-passenger vessel category for 1959. Alcoa Steamship Company was the winner of the first place award. The second place award went to the United States Lines, and the third place award was tendered to the United Fruit Company.

Ocean and Coastwise, Tanker Division

- First—Atlantic Refining Company
- Second—Tidewater Oil, Eastern Division
- Third—Texaco, Incorporated

Inland Waterways Division

- First—Tidewater Oil, Eastern Division
- Second—Sun Oil Company
- Third—Texaco, Incorporated

Cargo and Passenger Vessels—Inland Division

- First—Wyandotte Transportation Company
- Second—Ford Motor Company
- Third—The Cleveland Cliffs Steamship Company

Shipbuilding and Repair Division (Heavy)

- First—General Dynamics Company
- Second—Maryland Shipbuilding & Drydock Company
- Third—Tobbs Shipyards Corporation, L. A. Division

Shipbuilding and Repair Division (Light)

- First—U. S. Steel Corporation, Marine ways

- Second—Ashland Oil & Refining Company, River Repair Terminal
- Third—The Pittsburgh and Comeau Dock Company

Stevedoring Division—General Cargo

- First—Kauai Consolidated Terminals, Incorporated
- Second—Castle and Cook Terminals
- Third—Hilo Transportation and Terminal Company, Ltd.

Stevedoring Division—Bulk Cargo

- First—Union Dock Company
- Second—The Erie Dock Company
- Third—The P. & E. Coal Dock Company

On March 10, through the efforts of Charles A. Culver, the Marine Section Session of the Delaware Valley was held at the Bellevue-Stratford Hotel in Philadelphia. After an opening welcome address by your general chairman, papers were delivered by Frank O. Braynard, Director, Bureau of Information, American Merchant Marine Institute, and by Robert D. Gidel, Chief, Safety Division, U. S. Department of Labor.

On May 3 a luncheon was sponsored by the American Waterways Operators at the Whitehall Club, New York City, to honor the winners of the 1959 Barge and Towing Vessel Industry Safety Contest. Awards were presented to representatives of the winning companies by your general chairman.

During the spring of this year, a four-man committee appointed from members of the Tanker Safety Discussion Group met with Coast Guard officials at Washington, D. C. to discuss plans for the proposed film on shipboard fire fighting for the tanker industry. We are deeply appreciative of the U. S. Coast Guard's efforts in cooperating with us in this matter.

In closing my report, I wish particularly to thank Harold M. Wick for his assistance and guidance.

A special thanks also to Warren D. Lindsay, Safety Director of United States Lines, for his fine job in editing the "Newsletter."

My thanks also to all who have contributed throughout the year in helping me to carry out the work of the Marine Section.