

## GENERAL DISCUSSION

---

MR. FRANK E. CLARKE.<sup>1</sup>—Mr. Sebald in his discussion of Mr. Stoffer's paper<sup>2</sup> may have given the impression that ASTM did just about everything wrong in every dissolved oxygen clinic. I will not defend our position except to say that when a bunch of fellows assemble for only a week at a foreign power plant, regardless of how good a power plant it might be, one can expect the sort of answers we got in all of our clinics. We have not given up. I have been in the dissolved oxygen clinic business since 1941 when I first started to work for the Navy, and Committee D-19 recently has taken a fresh start on clinic planning. We think we have learned a lot from our past experiences and we expect to come up with better answers this time.

Concerning oxygen meters, the fact that Mr. Ristaino,<sup>3</sup> talked only about

the Hartmann-Braun, does not mean that the Navy has no experience with others. We have tested most of them and are using some of them. You should not expect them to be the panacea for the power plant. All of these instruments are mechanical, electronic or electrical devices with no brain. They are subject to the innate cussedness of inanimate objects, and if you expect them to work perfectly without an intelligent being behind them, you are going to be in trouble. For example, if you operate the Cambridge meter on a system that is generating oxygen without nitrogen, you are in trouble. This could occur in a nuclear power plant. Use a little common sense in operating whatever instrument you choose and I think you can get good operation from any one of them provided you originally select the proper instrument to do the job at hand.

---

<sup>1</sup> Supervising Engineer, U. S. Naval Engineering Experiment Station, Annapolis, Md.

<sup>2</sup> See p. 3.

<sup>3</sup> See p. 40.