

Other Volumes in this (1958) Series

Users of this volume will find much value in its companion volumes, which offer the complete record of the 46th National Safety Congress! Here is the list:

Vol. No.	Title	Single Copy	Stock No.
1	General Sessions and Index to all Volumes.....	.65	022.28-1
2	Aeronautical Industries; Air Transport.....	.65	022.28-2
3	Automotive and Machine Shop; Power Press and Forging.....	.65	022.28-3
4	Cement, Quarry and Mineral Aggregates.....	.40	022.28-4
5	Chemical.....	.65	022.28-5
6	Church Activities; Women's Activities; Youth.....	.65	022.28-6
7	Coal Mining.....	.65	022.28-7
8	Commercial Vehicle.....	.65	022.28-8
9	Construction; Public Employee.....	.65	022.28-9
10	Electrical Equipment.....	.40	022.28-10
11	Farm.....	.40	022.28-11
12	Fertilizer.....	.65	022.28-12
13	Food and Beverage; Meat Packing, Tanning and Leather Products; Trades and Services.....	.65	022.28-13
14	Glass and Ceramics; Rubber.....	.65	022.28-14
15	Home.....	.65	022.28-15
16	Industrial Subject Sessions (Sponsored by ASSE).....	.90	022.28-16
17	Labor.....	.65	022.28-17
18	Marine.....	.65	022.28-18
19	Metals.....	.65	022.28-19
20	Mining.....	.65	022.28-20
21	Occupational Health Nursing.....	.65	022.28-21
22	Petroleum.....	.65	022.28-22
23	Printing and Publishing.....	.40	022.28-23
24	Public Utilities.....	.40	022.28-24
25	Pulp and Paper.....	.65	022.28-25
26	Railroad.....	.65	022.28-26
27	School and College.....	.90	022.28-27
28	Traffic.....	.90	022.28-28
29	Transit.....	.65	022.28-29
30	Wood Products; Textile.....	.65	022.28-30
31	Early Morning Sessions (Getting Results Through Team Play).....	.65	022.28-31
COMPLETE SETS (31 Volumes).....		\$10.50	022.18

QUANTITY ORDERS: On purchase of 10 or more copies of individual volumes, those single-copy priced (1 to 9) at 40 cents each are .35 each; 65-cent volumes are .55 each, and 90-cent volumes are .80 each.

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.

1800045902

PRINTED IN U. S. A.

022.28-16

148

VOLUME 17

1958

NATIONAL SAFETY CONGRESS TRANSACTIONS

LABOR SAFETY



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

S-FORD-120

SCF-ALLF-01912

CONTENTS

Review of Progress in the Labor Conference	<i>P. L. Siemiller</i>	5
Organization and Structure of Our Union Safety Program (A Panel Discussion)	<i>John T. Atkinson</i>	5
	<i>John Gruden</i>	7
	<i>John Ghizzoni</i>	10
	<i>Bruce Thrasher</i>	11
Question and Answer Period		14
Save One Life and Save the World	<i>Rabbi Jacob J. Weinstein</i>	16
Management and Labor Cooperation in Safety	<i>E. J. Thomas</i>	18
Organized Labor's Stake in Safety	<i>George T. Brown</i>	20
Union and State Labor Department Cooperation in Safety (A Symposium)	<i>Robert D. Gidel</i>	22
State Safety Regulations and Codes	<i>John R. Kumpel</i>	24
Cooperation Between State Labor Department and Unions	<i>Albert A. Dean</i>	25
How Unions Can Support State Labor Departments and Make Them More Effective	<i>Robert A. Skipton</i>	28
What Can the State Labor Council Do to Help Local Unions Promote Safety	<i>E. H. Bennett</i>	30
Questions and Answers		32
Officers		35

terence of 1946 of joint union-management-government participation. This planned program of cooperation was carried out and the records will show that during these last ten years, industrial accidents in the lumber industry have been reduced by 68 per cent.

This month is the 10th anniversary of the establishment of this program and I am happy to report that last year there was a 50 per cent reduction in fatalities and a 25 per cent reduction in time loss accidents.

These are the dividends we seek from accident prevention programs: fewer people killed, fewer people hurt, and cleaner and better and safer places in which to work.

This program I speak of must be established on a cooperative basis and, when all three partners in safety cooperate fully, the results are tremendous.

In the opinion of the union, the respective responsibilities of management, government and the union should be clearly and correctly defined, and failure to do this will only result in chaos. Management has the legal and moral responsibility to organize and direct a safety program and to see that it is carried out. They must provide safe working premises, proper instruction of workmen, and adequate training of supervisors.

One of the big reasons for the success of the safety program in the Pacific Northwest is that management is carrying out its obligation, and it is our duty as a full partner in the program to see that he does.

Management has gained a lot from safety. He saves money on his insurance costs, he saves money on the protection of his equipment and material, he protects the investment by continuity of production, and develops better public and union relations—so we must believe that safety is good for management.

Safety is good for us, too. We receive dividends—dividends in human happiness and worker welfare, better and safer working conditions, and a better way to live.

We started to build our safety program on a foundation of adequate, proper and complete first aid standards. We made sure that every industrial unit had proper first aid facilities and personnel as required by the state regulations. We insisted that proper and swift transportation was provided for injured workmen by land, by sea and by air. We undertook to organize and set up a joint

safety committee in every operation under contract with our union and that safety meetings will be held regularly at least once a month without fail. As the program developed we sought and got adherence to the state regulations. We also proposed new ones and recommended them to the proper authorities, believing in the principle that there would be greater adherence to safety codes that we helped to write.

Thus it became necessary to work with the Workmen's Compensation Board or the state enforcement agency. They are always available for interpretation of the safety codes. They provide expert advice and consultation on mechanical and industrial safety problems.

Many states and provinces rely upon them for safety posters and educational material. Field staff inspectors cover industrial units and issue stop orders to employers whose equipment and/or work methods violate safety regulations. They are the keepers of accident statistics, records of fatalities and work exposure.

They cannot make our industries safe places in which to work, however, regardless of size or sincerity of administration, but they do make a full and great contribution as a partner in this teamwork with labor and management in safety.

Many union theories were developed. The end objective of our safety program is the development of a safety consciousness in every worker that would protect him on the job, on the highway, and in the home. We believe that safety must start at the top, and if you want a safety-conscious worker you must give him a safety-conscious boss. We are of the opinion that safety must start at the top and be carried right down through all supervisors and departments, right down to the worker on the job. Indeed, much of the success of the program and the results obtained are due to this enlightened supervision. These are the things that we believe in.

No one—no safety director, no state inspector, and no supervisor can protect the worker who is not interested in his own protection. The hazards of industrial units will always be there, so it is very necessary that an educational program be adopted that will sell him the idea that safety is good for him.

Our work in the union safety program became so vast and complicated that it was necessary to appoint a safety director on a full-time basis to educate and train safety committeemen and to coordinate safety activities in the local unions.

It was necessary to organize a local safety council in every local union with its own safety director and to hold meetings on a regional basis every three months. The union policy is developed and recommended by resolutions at our annual union meeting and, when adopted, becomes official union policy. Indeed, I am happy to state that the I.W.A. is the only union in North America that has its statement of policy on paper and is used as a guide by all its local unions.

The educational plan is carried out through our media of propaganda by our union newspaper, our radio time, and television. It is duty of the safety director to conduct lectures and safety talks in plants and logging camps. This has resulted in the development of an attitude and a climate for safety in this industry.

The institution of this program was most difficult due to the fact that there were no footsteps to follow and progress in this field of union endeavor had to be established step by step.

As a union safety director, I do not class myself as an "expert" in industrial safety. Personally, I believe there is no such thing. Some state inspectors and company directors often make this mistake of setting themselves up as experts, but I believe that the worker himself, with his skill, his knowledge and experience, the narrow escapes he has in day-by-day exposure to the hazards of his own work is far better qualified as an "expert," once he has accepted the idea that safety is good for him. When workers protect themselves and each other by cooperating and sharing these things we will have made much progress towards accident-free operations.

It is my firm opinion that the answer to the problem of the prevention of industrial accidents lies in the efforts of union, management and government together.

By JOHN GRUDEN

Director, Health and Safety Department, Ford Local 600, U.A.W., Dearborn, Mich.

The Ford Motor company's Rouge Plant located in Dearborn, Mich., is the only automobile plant of its kind in the world—the only one which can, within its confines, start at one end of the line with iron ore and have a nice, shiny new car roll off the other end of the line. To give you some idea of its magnitude, the Rouge Plant is situated on 1,200 acres of land and is comprised of 16 separate plants within the Rouge Plant proper. Each of those 16 plants, or "units" as we refer to them, is also quite vast. For example, the power house, which supplies power for the plant, generates enough electric current to provide power for all the homes in Boston.

The transportation unit has 110 miles of railroad tracks with 22 diesel locomotives, and boats that bring in two million tons of iron ore a year. There are also 61 miles of conveyor lines and the Rouge Plant has its own inter-plant bus system.

The coke ovens produce approximately 3,500 tons of coke daily, a blast furnace

produces 3,200 tons of steel daily, an electric furnace produces 18,000 tons of steel a month, and the open hearth produces 5,000 tons of a special kind of steel daily. The rolling mill has an output of approximately one-half million tons of steel a month.

Then there are other plants such as the foundries, the glass plant, the world's largest stamping plant, the engine plant, frame plant and assembly plant.

For the employees' protection there is a plant hospital within the confines of the Rouge Plant which has a staff of 171, including 12 doctors and 30 nurses. One hundred ten acres of space is utilized for parking lots which provide enough space for 21,000 automobiles. This should give you some idea of the vastness of the Ford Rouge Plant.

Now I would like to give you a brief background of Ford Local 600, UAW, to acquaint you with the largest local union in the world.

When Local 600 came into existence in 1941, at which time a collective bargaining agreement with the Ford Motor company was signed, we had approximately 80,000 members.

Presently there are approximately 250 full-time union representatives covering the 16 units in the Rouge Plant. Each of the units has nine officers, such as president, vice-president, recording secretary, etc., as well as bargaining and district committeemen. The number of committeemen allocated to each unit is determined by the number of employees in the unit on a prorated basis. All of the units come under the jurisdiction of Ford Local 600.

The war years came close on the heels of the Union's recognition and, of course, production of war materials for our Armed Forces became the principal concern of everyone. But as soon as the fighting was ended and we could once again turn our attention to matters of importance to the workers, "safety on the job" came high on the list of things upon which we would concentrate.

Because we had no formal knowledge in the field of health and safety, training was of prime importance. The International Union of the UAW initiated a course in Industrial Health and Safety at its F.D.R. Summer School in Port Huron, Mich. Safety engineers from the U. S. Department of Labor, Washington, D. C., were engaged to teach the course. In 1946, Local 600 sent five union representatives to the school to take the course—I was one of the five. Later we also took courses which were made available to us by the UAW Health Institute in Detroit and Wayne University.

We were fortunate in having as our instructors, during the course of our study in the field of industrial health and safety, such competent men as:

Lloyd Utter who is presently the UAW director of safety and chairman of the Labor Conference.

Roland Blake, senior safety engineer of the U. S. Department of Labor.

Dr. Swartz, the noted dermatologist.

Dr. Frederick, noted Detroit industrial hygienist.

The late *George Thompson* who was the UAW director of safety.

Alfred C. Funke of Wayne University.

By late 1946, we formed the first local union health and safety committee. This committee in turn organized health and safety committees in each of the 18 units in the Rouge Plant. Here again, through arrangements made by our International Union and Wayne University, classes were set up at our local union headquarters for the newly appointed members of the unit safety committees who were trained to handle problems in their respective units.

In June 1947, Local 600 took out membership with the National Safety Council so that it could avail ourselves of the Council's invaluable advice and other services.

Late in 1949 our health and safety set-up was finally given official recognition by the Ford Motor company. Credit and thanks for this recognition must be given to Manton M. Cummins who was then manager of labor relations and has since been elevated to the position of assistant general manager of industrial relations. Fortunately, Cummins is a broadminded person and had the foresight to realize that a joint labor-management safety committee would be beneficial to the company, as well as to its employees. As a result of our receiving recognition, a health and safety agreement was reached and a grievance procedure was established on September 28, 1949.

My quickly relating this sequence of events may have misled some of you into thinking that the Ford Motor company agreed to this joint union-company safety program merely because we asked for it. Well, it wasn't that easy. It took considerable time and some heated discussions to convince the company's representatives that we were sincere about wanting to make the Rouge Plant a safer place in which to work. And, despite the fact that this program has been in effect for almost a decade, we still on occasion have heated discussions with the company's representatives in our efforts to get some points across. But it is now obvious to all that this close cooperation between the union and the company has paid off because the frequency rate of accidents has dropped 86 per cent and the severity rate dropped by 69 per cent.

In 1950, when Carl Stellato was first elected President of Local 600, one of the first things he did was to establish a health and safety department in the Local Union.

President Stellato appointed me as director of that department upon its inception, which is still my present assignment. As the director, I am on 24-hour call and many is the time that I've been awakened from a sound sleep in the wee hours of the morning and asked to investigate an accident in the plant.

As I stated before, a health and safety grievance procedure was established for the purpose of handling the workers' complaints in an orderly fashion; there are three stages in the procedure. The first stage provides that the committeeman should first attempt to settle complaints by discussing them with the immediate supervisor. If a satisfactory solution is not reached, the committeeman refers the matter to the union safety director in the unit who takes it up with the general supervisor. If a solution is still not arrived at, the unit safety director must reduce the complaint in writing and submit it to the zone labor relations office. That office has the complaint investigated by the company safety department, the industrial hygiene department or plant engineering.

When that investigation is completed and a report made to the zone labor relations office and the plant manager, a meeting is arranged with the Union's unit representatives for a complete discussion of the problem. Should all of these steps of the first stage of the grievance procedure fail to resolve the matter, the second stage provides that the unit representatives must process a formal grievance and submit it to the local union health and safety director.

The safety director of the local union investigates the complaint to determine its merits and arranges a meeting with the central labor relations office; the representatives of the unit involved also participate in this meeting. If the company's disposition in this stage is not satisfactory, the third stage provides for an appeal to the Ford department of the International Union.

If in the opinion of the International Union's investigator the grievance has merit, he makes arrangements for another meeting with the central labor relations office. Should the matter not be corrected as a result of this meeting, the International Union can then give the Ford Motor company a 12-day strike notice. I am most happy to say, however, that we have settled hundreds of health and safety grievances in the Rouge Plant

and have never yet had to resort to giving a strike notice and we sincerely hope we shall never have to. However, we feel it gives us a measure of security knowing we have this recourse should it become necessary.

It may seem unsavory to speak of strike action in connection with health and safety but, believe me, we would make certain we were right before we would take such action. No one is permitted to in any way play politics with health and safety nor do we pursue a health and safety complaint just to appease someone. We obtain all the facts and if we think one of our representatives is wrong—we tell him so.

A recent example of this was a Union representative's complaint about excessive carbon monoxide in his building. Upon taking a reading, I found it below the requirement of the state's regulations. He disputed the reading on the carbon monoxide meter and felt the workers under his jurisdiction were subjected to a terrific health hazard, and he was ready to process the grievance through all stages of the procedure. While we were in the office discussing the matter, he was puffing away on a cigarette. So I took a carbon monoxide reading of the smoke he was producing with the cigarette and showed him that it was much higher than the reading taken in the work area in question. That not only convinced him the grievance had no merit but almost made him become a non-smoker.

On the other hand, there have been occasions when a hazard was discovered which required immediate attention and we deviated from the health and safety grievance procedure by telling the employees on such unsafe job not to work until it was corrected.

Labor today has a responsibility to its members and the community to play a much bigger role in accident prevention than ever before. It is not our intention to take upon ourselves responsibilities which belong to management—we only want to work with management to make factory work as safe as possible.

Those members of management who discourage and decline the Union's offer to participate in their safety program as a joint labor-management endeavor either have no foresight or they are ignorant of the facts because, as we all know—*safety is everybody's business!*

that will promote better safety and health conditions in all industry. We further solicit the help of management in the support of equitable safety laws both at the state and federal levels.

It is the earnest desire of the United Steelworkers of America to offer fullest co-

operation in the field of safety and health and we are sure that if the desire to cooperate is evident between labor and management that this will in turn help reduce the number of industrial accidents and bring about a corresponding improvement in the industrial health of the country.

QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD

Q: (to Gruden)—What is the most important single factor that brought about acceptance of union participation in the safety program by Ford Motor company?

A: Gruden—We proved to Ford that we did not want to take away their prerogatives and convinced them we wanted to cooperate. While Ford may take all the credit for the success of their safety program, that is something we don't dispute with them about; actually, we don't care who gets the credit for it just so long as our people are safe.

Q: (to Ghizzoni)—Should safety be a priority at the policy-making level and included in contracts?

A: Ghizzoni—Yes. It is very appropriate and imperative that it should be made the number one problem at the negotiating table.

Q: (to any panelist)—I come from Minneapolis and belong to a labor-management organization where we have had fairly good success. I want to go back to my committee members with definite information that safety pays. What are the facts and figures which prove that a company can save if they have an accident prevention program? I also want figures from the worker's standpoint—how much does the worker lose by having an accident?

A: Callahan—As chairman of the Oregon Labor Commission, we carry on a comprehensive safety program because we have found it pays. We use 5 per cent of our total income for the promotion of accident prevention. That, I believe, represents the greatest amount of money that is allowed in any state. We have 103 people working on accident prevention throughout the state, and spend about \$800,000 annually.

The benefits paid out in Oregon are substantially higher than those in Washington. The amount the employer has to pay into the fund is much less despite the fact that the benefits paid out are much higher. The employer in Washington pays substantially higher than the employer in Oregon in spite of the fact Oregon benefits are substantially higher than Washington benefits.

The benefits in California are not quite as good as those of Oregon, but I would not say that they were substantially less. The slightly lower pay rates the employer has to pay are substantially higher than what is paid in Oregon.

It is not realistic to pick out one particular benefit or one particular industry and attempt to make a comparison. If comparisons are to be made, then we must take an average of all benefits. We will have to consider all benefits and all of the industries before one can make a true comparison.

As the first step in our safety program, we teach first aid. This is one of the things on which a safety program must be built. An example of how this training pays off is illustrated in the following story. And it also shows that safety "pays" off for the company, the worker and the state.

A supervisor for the state power company, together with another man, was making an inspection of a power line. He was suspicious of a guy line on one of the poles. He grabbed the line, and the anchor of the guy line pulled out from the ground. The guy line whipped and made contact with a high voltage power line below the insulator, giving the man a severe electrical shock from which he received burns—and he also stopped breathing.

The man accompanying him on the inspection had very recently been trained in first aid by a member of our Accident Pre-

vention division. He promptly applied artificial respiration and the victim was revived.

If this man accompanying the line supervisor had not been trained in first aid principles there is no question but that we would have had a fatality because there was no one else around to administer artificial respiration.

The victim was brought to a hospital where in due time he recovered. The total claims for him cost \$447 and a few cents. I had the personnel of the Computing department figure up how much would have been necessary to pay off the fatal claim had this man not survived. The amount necessary to set aside in the reserve would have been nearly \$27,000.

This is one example of clear proof that an accident prevention program does pay. And it pays over and above the benefits in a humanitarian manner; the wife still has her husband, the children still have their father.

Yes—safety pays many times over. Compensation payments for an injured man amount to much less than what he earns on his job. If the man were totally disabled, our state will pay him a certain amount of money for the rest of his life. In other states, they may pay only up to a certain amount.

Q: (to Atkinson)—What is the make up of a plant safety committee? Who chairs it?

A: Atkinson—It consists of an equal number of employee representatives and management representatives. They will elect their own chairman and secretary, and these officers can be either management or union people.

Q: (to Atkinson)—Who plans the safety program?

A: Atkinson—The organization and direction of a joint safety program is the responsibility of management. They plan it and see that it is carried out.

Q: (to any panelist)—What can you do in the following circumstances? For example, the management operates a government-owned plant. You report an unsafe condition and they (the management) say that since the government owns the plant, it's up to the government to correct the unsafe condition.

A: Atkinson—The regulations are laid down in the state safety codes. If the com-

pany does not take action, you then report to the state. It is the duty of state government to supply the necessary enforcement and help in an accident prevention program.

A: Callahan—Have you made an effort through a local safety program in your local union? If you haven't, you should. If you can't get results, don't quit trying. We need the prestige and authority of good state safety programs everywhere because while there are excellent safety programs in some plants, others are poor or wholly inadequate.

A: Thrasher—This problem has been of great concern to the Steelworkers for a long time. Suppose a man is asked to work under dangerous conditions. We put into our contract for union members if the job is unsafe, the man has the right to be relieved from that job. It is his own personal opinion which decides whether it is safe or unsafe.

Q: (to Atkinson)—Tell us how you go about educating the man in the field.

A: Atkinson—The instruction of the workman in safe working procedures on the job is the responsibility of management. They must train their employees.

The educational part of the union is:

- It is union policy to participate in the program.

- The union uses the media at their disposal for educational purposes. We use our union newspaper, radio time, television, meetings and conventions to get across the safety message. We also educate through lectures. Each local union should develop a safety director who can lecture, plan programs and sell safety to the membership.

Q: (to Atkinson)—What should be done with the person—union or management—who breaks safety rules?

A: Atkinson—Management has the right in their union contracts to discipline and discharge for proper cause.

Q: (to Thrasher)—Is it beneficial for local unions to belong to the National Safety Council?

A: Thrasher—Yes, they should belong provided they are given the recognition that they rightfully deserve in this organization.