FILE NAME: Colgate (COL)

DATE: 1970

DOC#: COL039

DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION: Articles from National Safety Congress Transactions - Labor Safety

ıber

Order Form 1970 Congress Transactions

Quantity Ordered	Stock No.	Vol. No	Title	1-9 Copies	10 or more.
	022.22-1	1	General Sessions & Index to all Volumes	$ .95	$ .75
	022.22-2	2	Aerospace; Air Transport	.95	.75
	022.22-3	3	Automotive & Machine Shop; Power Press & Forging	.95	.75
	022.22-4	4	Cement, Quarry & Mineral Aggregates	.55	.50
	022.22-5	5	Chemical; Fertilizer; Research & Development	.95	.75
	022.22-6	6	Civic Leadership; Church, Women, Youth, Farm	.95	.75
	022.22-7	7	Coal Mining	.95	.75
	022.22-8	8	Construction; Public Employee	1.25	1.10
	022.22-9	9	Electronic & Electrical Equipment	.55	.50
	022.22-10	10	Food & Beverage; Meat & Leather Industries; Trades & Services	.95	.75
	022.22-11	11	Glass & Ceramics; Rubber & Plastics	.95	.75
	022.22-12	12	Industrial Subject Sessions; Associations	1.25	1.10
	022.22-13	13	Labor	.95	.75
	022.22-14	14	Marine	.95	.75
	022.22-15	15	Metals	.55	.50
	022.22-16	16	Mining	.95	.75
	022.22-17	17	Motor Transportation	.95	.75
	022.22-18	18	Occupational Health Nursing; Hospitals	.55	.50
	022.22-19	19	Petroleum	.95	.75
	022.22-20	20	Public Utilities	.95	.75
	022.22-21	21	Pulp & Paper; Printing & Publishing	.95	.75
	022.22-22	22	Railroad	.55	.50
	022.22-23	23	School & College	1.25	1.10
	022.22-24	24	Traffic; Driver Improvement	.95	.75
	022.22-25	25	Wood Products; & Textile	.95	.75
	022.22-26	26	Early Morning Sessions	.55	.50
	022 22-27	27	Public Safety	.95	.75
	022.22-28	28	Home Safety	.95	.75
	022.11		COMPLETE SET OF 28 VOLUMES	$14.50	

Automatic 20% discount to NSC members; 10% to U. S. Federal Government Agencies. Payment must accompany all orders of $5.00 or less.

SHIP TO:

Organization_____

Address_____

City_____ State_____ Zip Code_____

to Attention of_____

BILL TO:

Organization_____

Address_____

City_____ State_____ Zip Code_____

to Attention of_____

Customer's Purchase Order Number_____

MAIL TO: **NATIONAL SAFETY COUNCIL**
425 North Michigan Avenue • Chicago, Illinois 60611

1970

COPYFLEX COPY
LIBRARY

VOLUME 13

NATIONAL SAFETY CONGRESS TRANSACTIONS

LABOR SAFETY



NATIONAL SAFETY COUNCIL
425 North Michigan Avenue
Chicaao, Illinois 60611

wherever. That is, at changing the institutional conditions and jolting the built-up myths of decades that have deluded the public into thinking that these losses are unavoidable and a necessary price of operating a highway system and owning cars.

It won't happen without heat, unfortunately. The track record of self-induced change in the auto-highway construction field is poor, and there's no reason to think it will improve. If it was better, we'd have had collapsible steering columns decades ago, and passive restraints before 1970. As for the road builder—$820 million just to correct non-major safety deficiences along already opened Interstate!

It is much too early to say that pressing highway loss problems are solved or even that mechanisms have been put in operation to solve them dependably without sometimes abrasive but still vitally needed public intervention.

POLLUTION—A COMMUNITY AND OCCUPATIONAL PROBLEM

By THOMAS F. WILLIAMS
Assistant to the Administrator, Environmental Health Service, Public Health Service
U. S. Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare, Rockville, Md.

The current wave of interest in environmental problems, which has already proved more lasting than many predicted, suggests that we are beginning to remember that the safety of people is the most important factor in the complicated ecological equation.

I am sure that many of you were working for environmental improvements long before anti-pollution themes were being worked into soap operas and into advertising campaigns for every kind of product from soup and soap to cars and cosmetics. I am sure also that you welcome this long delayed burst of sanity and that you see many other indications that the public is finally demanding that the institutions of our society, both public and private, begin to constructively work toward solving these complex problems.

We who serve these institutions are caught short. That same public demanded so little of us a short while ago that we are poorly prepared to meet their expectations. Under such circumstances it is to be expected that representatives of Government at all levels, representatives of industry, labor, and of other private organizations will sometimes complain that we cannot overnight rectify the errors of hundreds of years. Yet we must be patient with those who are impatient with us. Their impatience means that a real and profoundly important re-examination is taking place.

This re-examination covers not only man's relationship to nature, but also to his institutions, and to his fellow man. It's taking place at the highest levels of Government, and among our young people, among intellectuals, and in the growing consumer movement, and, I'm glad to say, in labor and industry, too.

People are questioning whether rights of private property are so sacred that they include the right to untrammelled exploitation of natural resources. They are questioning—indeed they have already rejected—the validity of an industrial cost-accounting system that regards the air and water as free resources for waste disposal.

They are beginning to understand that concern for the environment is essentially a concern for man. We may legitimately be concerned about the fate of the bald eagle or the grizzly bear or the giant redwoods. And we should indeed question a human ethic that callously destroys other life forms. But in the final analysis, the question is: What is happening to *man* in an environment in which these things which share his delicately balanced ecosystem are already threatened with destruction?

Not only are streams and lakes dying

before their time, and birds, fish, and other wildlife threatened with extinction, but human health is affected by the barrage of microbiological, chemical, and physiological insults that man has injected into his environment. We know something about the effects of environmental pollutants on human health—the relationship between some urban air and occupational pollutants and respiratory disease or cancer, for example. But we have barely begun to explore some of the more subtle, long-range hazards, including pre-natal and genetic effects and the psychological and sociological impact of unwholesome environments.

People are also beginning to appreciate the fact that what is commonly termed "pollution" is not the whole of the environmental problem. The environment of life is more than open land, air, and water. It's also the special environment where we live, work, and play. President Nixon made this very clear in a message to the Congress in which he called for new occupational safety and health legislation:

"There has been much discussion in recent months about the quality of the environment in which Americans live. It is important to note in this regard that during their working years most American workers spend nearly a quarter of their time at their jobs. For them, the quality of the workplace is one of the most important of environmental questions. The protection of that quality is a critical matter for Government attention."

Since I plan to discuss community air pollution first, let me describe briefly the important Government attention was has been given to the question of protecting not the workplace per se, but of our total environment.

Last December Congress passed the Environmental Policy Act. When President Nixon signed the measure into law as his first official action on New Year's Day, he stated that the need to arrest the deterioration of our environment is the "now or never" issue of our time. In his State of the Union Message, the President said: "The great question of the seventies is, shall we surrender to our surroundings, or shall we make our peace with nature and begin to make reparations for the damage we have done to our air, our land, and our water?"

Pursuant to the Environmental Policy Act, the President appointed a three-man Council on Environmental Quality to coordinate Federal policy and action in the environmental field, in much the same way the Council of Economic Advisers guides and advises in financial and economic policy. The Council's first report, issued in August, shows the breadth of the Government's activities, which have been fragmented throughout many agencies, making a truly coordinated strategy difficult.

In an effort to end the peacemeal approach, the Administration is now establishing two new Federal agencies to bring together the major environmental activities of the Federal Establishment.

The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration is in operation, and the Environmental Protection Agency is to begin operations in a few weeks.

The Environmental Protection Agency will be a separate executive agency, outside the Cabinet, reporting directly to the President. It will bring under one organizational roof the Federal programs dealing with air and water pollution, solid wastes, pesticides, and radiation. It will be responsible for establishing and enforcing standards, monitoring pollution in the environment, research and demonstration, and assistance to State and local Governments.

The EPA then, will handle the front-line attack on environmental damage to health and property. The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration will be responsible for long-range research on pollution problems of the future, especially the trends we suspect are taking place on a global scale in the oceans and in the atmosphere.

NOAA is a new agency in the Department of Commerce, expanding the Department's Environmental Sciences Services Administration.

Every year toxic matter from industrial, municipal, and domestic sources is being released into the air over the United States at a rate of about 200 million tons—or, if you prefer your share, close to a ton for every American.

The cost to the Nation of the effects of air pollution is estimated to be 10 to 20 bil-

lion dollars annually. These figures include damage to buildings, equipment, fabrics, land values, farm crops and animals. They do not take into account the valuable resources that are spewed out in the air as waste.

As to the impact on human health—acute episodes of pollution in London, New York, Tokyo, and other cities have clearly been associated with soaring death and illness rates, especially among the elderly and those with weakened hearts and lungs. It is also well-established that air pollution contributes to the incidence of such chronic diseases as emphysema, bronchitis, and other respiratory ailments.

There are other hazards that can be identified but are perhaps even more difficult to quantify. The levels of carbon monoxide in heavy traffic, for example, often reach levels that can affect human judgment and behavior. This factor, together with impairment of visibility, undoubtedly contributes to our automotive accident toll.

What is even more disturbing—science is only beginning to explore the possible effects this chemical pollution may have on the prenatal stage of life, or on the genetic endowment we pass on to future generations.

As for the long-range planetary effects—some scientists believe that increased carbon dioxide levels in the atmosphere will soon begin to demonstrate a "greenhouse" effect, hastening the melting of the polar icecaps and raising the level of the oceans. Others speculate that on the contrary, atmospheric pollution will usher in a new Ice Age. You may have it either way you want it—neither prospect has much appeal.

In the Environmental Health Service, we are presently engaged in an effort to control air pollution under 1967 amendments to the Clean Air Act. Briefly, to control stationary sources, we publish criteria on health and welfare hazards and related documents on control techniques. States develop air quality standards and establish implementation plans which are applied on a regional basis throughout the country. With regard to motor vehicles, the Federal Government has direct standard setting and enforcement authority.

The House and the Senate have now passed new and stronger air pollution legislation. The bills differ widely in many respects and are now being subjected to the conference procedure in an effort to iron out these differences.

First, with regard to automobile emissions. The Secretary of HEW was authorized by 1965 legislation to establish Federal standards limiting the emission of pollutants from auto exhaust. Federal emission standards for motor vehicles went into effect with the 1968 model cars for hydrocarbons and carbon monoxide, with more restrictive standards being effective with the 1970 model and further restrictions proposed for 1972 and 1975. Standards for nitrogen oxides are anticipated in 1973 with further restrictions anticipated in 1975; standards for particulate matter are also anticipated in 1975.

Furthermore, last July, after we found that 1970 cars were not as clean as the standards intended, we announced new and more accurate test procedures to assure that new cars in 1972 and later would fully meet the intent of the exhaust emission standards.

The House bill would continue the present standards-setting procedure, while the Senate version would prescribe, as part of the statute, specific standards for exhaust emissions of carbon monoxide and hydrocarbons which must be met by 1975, and for nitrogen oxides which must be met by 1976.

Both pieces of legislation would strengthen Federal authority by authorizing production-line testing to insure compliance. Testing is now limited to prototype vehicles. The Senate bill includes a 50,000-mile warranty for satisfactory emission control.

So far, our National Air Pollution Control Administration has published criteria on sulfur oxides, particulate matter, photochemical oxidants, carbon monoxide, and hydrocarbons —together with information on effective and practical control techniques. Within a short time, we expect to publish criteria and control information on nitrogen oxides, lead, fluorides, and polynuclear organic matter.

During the last year and a half, we have drawn the lines around 61 air quality control regions, and expect to bring the total to 90 by the end of the year. These will embrace all the major metropolitan areas of the country, some of them lying wholly within a single State, others involving two or more States.

The States affected have been engaged in

the process of establishing their own air quality standards, for these designated regions, based on our criteria, and in developing approved implementation plans, in accordance with an established timetable.

A total of 19 States have adopted air quality standards for their air quality regions—and 15 of these have been accepted by the Secretary of HEW as sufficiently protective of public health and welfare. Plans for implementing the standards have been submitted by seven States and are now under review.

The legislation proposed by the Administration for passage this year, and the bills passed separately by the House and Senate, all are aimed at strengthening our control efforts by the establishment of *uniform Federal air quality standards*. There seems to be little doubt that any legislation enacted will result in our National Air Pollution Control Administration defining national air quality standards, which as a minimum must protect human health, at least for those pollutants which are most pervasive.

For those pollutants considered to be immediately hazardous to health, the Federal Government would be empowered to curtail or eliminate discharge into the atmosphere.

In addition, it appears that the Federal agency will be empowered to establish emission or performance standards for *new* sources of pollution, and possibly for modified, existing sources. This would mean that a new power generating plant, for example, would have to comply with Federal standards limiting its emission of pollutants or prescribing the effectiveness of its control devices.

As for implementation of air quality standards: under the Senate-passed bill, States would have a year and a half to develop approved implementation plans and another three years to achieve compliance with the standards. The House bill is less specific—a "reasonable time" would be allowed.

The question naturally arises then—if we have uniform Federal standards and Statewide implementation plans, what happens to the air quality control regions already designated? Under the House bill, all regions already marked out would remain in effect and others could be designated by the Federal Government. Under the Senate bill, interstate regions embracing parts of more than one State would be continued, but designation of regions within the States would be part of the States' responsibility.

In any case, the States, in implementing the standards, would be required to approach the control process on an effective regional basis which would, of course, be in accord with present procedures and would build on progress already achieved.

Interested and concerned citizens have played an important role in our progress so far—for, as I am sure most of you know, the Clean Air Act has specifically required that States must hold public hearings in developing State standards for their air quality regions. I am glad to say that an opportunity for citizen views to be heard is included in the legislation now under consideration.

Although the Federal Government would now establish the standards, the States will be required to hold public hearings in developing their implementation plans. Citizens will have an important role to play in making vital decisions about the methods—and the timetable — by which clean air will be achieved.

The occupational health problem, like the community air pollution problem, is an undesirable by-product of progress. As the President pointed out in the message I cited earlier, many industries have made progress in protecting worker health and safety on their own. Many professional organizations such as the National Safety Council have worked to promote better working conditions, but the overall record is still uneven and unsettling

In our industrial society, it is in the factory or on the farm or in the mine that the very contaminants that finally become pollutants of the natural environment are first encountered. It is a high-risk environment—from the standpoint of both safety and health —and yet some of the very people who are understandably concerned about the industrial waste that is poured into our air and water have not yet taken their first clear look at the environmental problem of 80 million American workers.

Each year thousands of persons are killed in occupational accidents; 3,600 persons die from occupational diseases; more than 2 million persons are injured seriously enough

While we may be justified in complaining that we cannot overnight rectify the errors of hundreds of years, we must, at the same time, move purposefully and swiftly toward a new standard of ecological excellence, in consonance with the scientific and technological realities of today. We must take this giant step here on earth for all mankind, for as President Nixon has said, this is the "now or never" issue of our time

WHAT'S BUGGING YOU?

A PANEL DISCUSSION

Presiding: EDWARD J LEGAN, International Representative, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, AFL-CIO, Washington, D. C.; Incoming Vice-Chmn, Labor Conference, N.S.C.

Moderator: DALE MARR, Vice President, Local No 3, International Union of Operating Engineers, San Francisco, Calif.

Panel: CHARLES T. GREENE, Director, Industrial Safety Div., District of Columbia, Minimum Wage and Industrial Safety Board, Washington, D. C.; JOSEPH LEONARD, Safety Director, International Longshoremen's Assn, New York, N. Y.; STANLEY P OCHMANSKI, Customer Services, Safety Services, Eastern Air Lines, Inc., Miami, Fla.; MARCO VESTICH Assistant Director, Safety Dept, United Steelworkers of America, Pittsburgh, Pa., NATHAN WILLENS, Industrial Hygienist, Illinois Department of Labor, Chicago, Ill.

(Previously submitted questions are presented to the panel by Mr. Marr.)

MARR: Why are the heads of big industrial union departments such as apprenticeship, safety, workmen's compensation, and insurance noticeably absent from these types of safety sessions?

VESTICH: Speaking for the United Steelworkers Union, Safety Director Paul Schremp could not be here because of personal reasons. He was so anxious to be here that he waited until Monday, October 26 before he decided that he definitely could not come and that he would send me in his place

MARR. It may be that this questioner was thinking about heads of other departments than the safety department when he asked this question. If this is the case, I believe we all must admit that heads of departments other than safety have other conventions and commitments to handle, and since they do have safety people, the safety people are the ones designated to attend these sessions. Actually, most of the safety directors of unions which have safety directors are here. If local union representatives feel that other department heads from large industrial unions should be here, it is up to them to indicate this at their various meetings, conferences, and conventions.

MARR: Our local union has just started a safety program and we would like to know what advice and assistance we can obtain to be certain we do the most effective job possible

OCHMANSKI: First of all, I would suggest that you outline objectives which will reflect what you want to do with your safety program. Then, develop a policy statement which will be endorsed from the top officials of the union down to the grass roots membership. Then follow your objectives as closely and as efficiently as you possibly can.

LEONARD: I would like to add that you be sure you do not appoint any politicians to conduct your safety program. Appoint only dedicated and interested people to this responsibility.

VESTICH: Be sure that you have contract language that establishes and endorses a labor-management safety committee. No program can succeed without this type of authority. This kind of contract language should include right of entry to any work area, right to a copy of any inspector's report, the right to bring in your own experts for consultation, the right to refuse to work at a job you believe is unsafe, etc.

GREENE: You must remember that if you expect management to assist and comply with policies and objectives, you must be

certain that the union also complies and respects the objectives of the program. This is definitely a two-way street. Especially, the membership of the union must definitely understand that the officers of the company and the union are going to demand that everyone follows the requirements and objectives of the program.

WILLENS: I agree with Marco Vestich that the union should have the right to reports of inspectors, and I as a state inspector would welcome being permitted to provide a copy of my report to the union. However, as the Illinois state law indicates, I cannot do this. In relation to the question as asked, assistance can be obtained in setting up a safety program from U. S. Department of Labor representatives, State Labor Department representatives and, naturally, the National Safety Council.

MARR: During many past years, a lot of safety people said that safety and health is management's responsibility. Actually, this is true but, unfortunately, if management does not accept the job, it is the union person or worker who gets hurt. Therefore, many unions find that they will have to exert the initiative to start a safety program. Our union has found that training the membership on safety and health hazards and what to do about them when they are identified has been very effective in reducing accidents. Naturally, during this training many foremen and other management people can be taught if they are not already inclined to follow effective safety and health principles. A safety program is useless if our members are not wearing personal protective equipment that is provided and if they are breaking safety rules that have been established. This is why the educational process is so necessary.

LEONARD: As I have mentioned before, we have included the wearing of personal protective equipment in our safety contract, and as far as I am concerned the men are going to wear the equipment or they're not working. I am willing to put my job on the line for this purpose. As long as the personal protective equipment, such as hard hats in our case, are necessary and are fitted properly, the men have to wear them.

GREENE: I would like to add one thing, and that is whether it's wearing personal protective equipment or installing mechanical safeguarding, none of it is of any value if these requirements aren't properly and thoroughly enforced. Naturally, to make a regulation or an agreement enforceable, it must be worded properly, and it should not include exemptions which make enforcement practically impossible. Therefore, I suggest that you keep enforcement in mind when you word your agreements and regulations.

DELEGATE: Our union has a labor-management safety committee at one of the Monsanto plants and we work together superbly. We have three union members and three supervision members on the committee and we meet once a month. We also investigate accidents. Our union representatives on the committee are elected by the members, and this works best. As long as the union representatives do a good job and realy represent the membership, they are reelected. This keeps these positions out of politics because of appointments.

DELEGATE from Local 185, United Steelworkers of America: We are having a problem with our contracted company because they insist on purchasing safety spectacles from a certain company. Our union safety committee and many of our members would like to be able to use spectacles from another company because they are more comfortable and provide a better fit. Our members are even willing to pay the difference in the cost, but the company refuses to cooperate. Also, our company only requires hard hats in certain areas of the plant, which makes it practically impossible to enforce this rule. In addition, many of the foremen and plant protection personnel will not wear the hard hats even in those areas where they are required. Naturally, this kills the hard hat safety program.

MARR: In support of what the delegate just said, since the safety spectacle industry is progressing so fast and coming out with so many new innovations, it is only common horse sense that labor and management should periodically review their safety spectacle program to determine if more effective and/or more comfortable spectacles can be purchased. The other day I went to my eye doctor and informed him I wanted a pair of safety spectacles ground to my prescription. The doctor spent quite a bit of time trying to talk me out of the safety spectacles. Naturally, I informed him

to lose time from their work; and more than $2 billion is paid out in compensation claims. And we must remember that these figures are probably understated, because occupational illnesses are often improperly diagnosed or not reported.

Certain toxic fumes, dust and vapors — cadmium, mercury, nitrogen dioxide, for example—may strike a swift and deadly blow, or, on the other hand, other contaminants of the workplace at lower levels of concentration can do their harm insidiously over a long period of time.

Three and a half million American workers are exposed to asbestos in the course of their daily work. After some years, they have a good chance of succumbing to asbestosis, the dust disease of their trade, that is, if lung cancer doesn't get them first. Mesothelioma, a malignancy of the lung or pleura, which is so rare that it strikes only 1 in 10,000 of the general working population, was found to be the cause of 1 death in 10 in a study of insulation workers. Can we write this off as a special and limited problem? I don't think we had better—for asbestos is something that is increasingly present throughout the environment—and there is some evidence that long or massive exposures are not needed to produce mesothelioma.

Coal tar pitch can cause skin cancer, and some chromium compounds are suspected cancer agents. Arsenic and lead, and hundreds of new and modified chemicals, are every day pollutants of the industrial environment. And many of these same poisons flow into our streams or air as industrial wastes or are released at the burning dumps which become the final resting place of the products of our industry.

Among soft coal miners, the death rate from respiratory disease is five times that of the general working population. Two weeks after the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969 was enacted, 42,200 former coal miners had applied for disability compensation for the "black lung" disease which has been the scourge of miners for generations.

We thought for many years that byssinosis—the "white lung" disease of cotton textile workers — was not a problem in this country, although it was known to be a problem elsewhere. Recent studies suggest that we were wrong—that "white lung" does in fact disable and shorten the lives of thousands of textile workers.

In other words, many of us are being exposed to a double or triple dose of environmental pollution—in the work environment, and in the community environment as well.

The only real distinction is that the occupational setting is a limited and more easily controllable environment than the natural one.

While Federal occupational health and safety programs are not to be housed in either of the two new Agencies I discussed earlier, interest in this problem has virtually paralleled rising interest in the environment. This is related in part, I am sure, to something I said earlier—that in our industrial society it is in the workplace that contaminants and some of the other stresses of our urban environment are first encountered. It is noteworthy in this regard that virtually all of the pollutants on which we are developing National community air quality criteria are generally found at even more hazardous concentrations in certain working environments. The two Federal departments most directly concerned with occupational health and safety are Health, Education, and Welfare and Labor. We may be sure that the new Environmental Protection Agency will be working closely with both of them in the years ahead.

I believe that enactment, in 1969, of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act marked the beginning of a new era in dealing with occupational health problems. As you probably know, the Act established a Federal standard for dust levels in coal mines, based on HEW recommendations and authorized the Department of Interior to promulgate any additional or revised standards necessary to protect the miners' health and safety.

The Bureau of Occupational Health, which is part of our Environmental Health Service, has responsibility for developing improved health standards for mines. It also must insure that all underground coal miners in the U. S. receive regular medical examinations to detect occupationally-caused disease and is charged with finding techniques for the prevention and control of occupational diseases among miners and others working with or around coal mine products.

The Bureau has been moving ahead under

these new authorities, both in research and in the establishment of a system to insure regular physical examination of miners. Earlier this year, State medical teams under contract to the Bureau began examining miners in seven States, while Bureau medical teams are continuing comprehensive medical studies begun earlier. Bureau staff are optimistic that they can meet the requirement of the Act that first-round medical examinations for all active miners (some 90-100,000) be completed by next July.

Special instrumentation is being developed for the necessary medical tests and dust sampling.

The Bureau has also published regulations governing dust sampling techniques and has promulgated recommendations for potable water and sanitation in mines and for medical assistance in mine emergencies.

During the past two years a great number of bills pertaining to occupational health and safety of other workers have been introduced in the Congress. This is an unprecedented occurrence. Never in our history has there existed anything resembling comprehensive Federal legislation in this field. Bills have been reported out of committee in both houses of Congress, and are due to come up for floor debate when Congress reconvenes in November. While the bills differ in some respects, their basic similarities suggest that real improvements in occupational health and safety are at last on the horizon. Both bills would cover all businesses engaged in interstate commerce. They provide that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare establish a National system for gathering occupational disease and safety data and develop criteria for healthful working conditions, on which National uniform standards could be based. The Department would, for the first time, be allowed right of entry so that such data would be meaningful. Both bills provide that the Department of Labor could set standards and enforce them. These standards would apply uniformly to like industries across the country. Both bills would provide States with the opportunity to enforce these standards, provided they could qualify to do so. If States failed, the Federal Government would provide the necessary backup.

As you know, the Administration's recommendations are contained in the Steiger bill in the House and in the Dominick bill in the Senate, both of which call for a National Board to set uniform standards derived from the criteria developed by HEW and to be enforced by the Department of Labor. The Board would include representation from industry, labor and other concerned groups. While neither of the bills which have been reported out of committee contains this provision, inclusion of such a board is apt to be reconsidered when the bills reach the floor. Whether new legislation will be enacted and signed by the President in this session of Congress is still in doubt. There is no doubt, however, about the fact that legislation for the protection of the worker from occupational hazards has finally risen to its proper place among our National priorities.

The two problems I was asked to discuss today fall within a number of legislative and organizational initiatives that the Government is taking to insure that our basic institutions can respond in a timely way to compelling challenges for change and renewal.

Industry, too, is today showing signs of a new understanding of its responsibilities, not only for the health and safety of workers and for the products it offers to the consumer, but also for its impact on the environment.

And labor is extending its interest to include the fight for a livable environment for all. Union members, for example, have begun to play an important role in the public demand for *effective* community air pollution standards in several states.

Steel workers, auto workers, and chemical workers have taken the first, unprecedented, steps to work pollution control into the collective bargaining system.

What has been so often lacking to date in our efforts to save the environment . . . lacking on the part of industry and labor, and on the part of Government as well is the willingness to tackle these problems as a fundamental part, not just a side issue, of American life.

In our present situation, I think all of us are coming to realize that some hallowed "rights" and "privileges" may have to be placed on the line if the rights of *all*—and of the generations that come after us—are to be preserved.

While we may be justified in complaining that we cannot overnight rectify the errors of hundreds of years, we must, at the same time, move purposefully and swiftly toward a new standard of ecological excellence, in consonance with the scientific and technological realities of today. We must take this giant step here on earth for all mankind, for as President Nixon has said, this is the "now or never" issue of our time

---

WHAT'S BUGGING YOU?

A PANEL DISCUSSION

Presiding: EDWARD J. LEGAN, *International Representative, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, AFL-CIO, Washington, D. C ; Incoming Vice-Chmn., Labor Conference, N S.C.*

Moderator: DALE MARR, Vice President, Local No. 3, International Union of Operating Engineers, San Francisco, Calif.

Panel: CHARLES T. GREENE, Director, Industrial Safety Div., District of Columbia, Minimum Wage and Industrial Safety Board, Washington, D. C.; JOSEPH LEONARD, Safety Director, International Longshoremen's Assn, New York, N. Y.; STANLEY P OCHMANSKI, Customer Services, Safety Services, Eastern Air Lines, Inc., Miami, Fla.; MARCO VESTICH Assistant Director, Safety Dept., United Steelworkers of America, Pittsburgh, Pa.; NATHAN WILLENS, Industrial Hygienist, Illinois Department of Labor, Chicago, Ill.

(Previously submitted questions are presented to the panel by Mr. Marr.)

MARR: Why are the heads of big industrial union departments such as apprenticeship, safety, workmen's compensation, and insurance noticeably absent from these types of safety sessions?

VESTICH: Speaking for the United Steelworkers Union, Safety Director Paul Schremp could not be here because of personal reasons. He was so anxious to be here that he waited until Monday, October 26 before he decided that he definitely could not come and that he would send me in his place

MARR: It may be that this questioner was thinking about heads of other departments than the safety department when he asked this question. If this is the case, I believe we all must admit that heads of departments other than safety have other conventions and commitments to handle, and since they do have safety people, the safety people are the ones designated to attend these sessions. Actually, most of the safety directors of unions which have safety directors are here. If local union representatives feel that other department heads from large industrial unions should be here, it is up to them to indicate this at their various meetings, conferences, and conventions.

MARR: Our local union has just started a safety program and we would like to know what advice and assistance we can obtain to be certain we do the most effective job possible.

OCHMANSKI: First of all, I would suggest that you outline objectives which will reflect what you want to do with your safety program. Then, develop a policy statement which will be endorsed from the top officials of the union down to the grass roots membership. Then follow your objectives as closely and as efficiently as you possibly can.

LEONARD: I would like to add that you be sure you do not appoint any politicians to conduct your safety program. Appoint only dedicated and interested people to this responsibility.

VESTICH: Be sure that you have contract language that establishes and endorses a labor-management safety committee. No program can succeed without this type of authority. This kind of contract language should include right of entry to any work area, right to a copy of any inspector's report, the right to bring in your own experts for consultation, the right to refuse to work at a job you believe is unsafe, etc.

GREENE: You must remember that if you expect management to assist and comply with policies and objectives, you must be

certain that the union also complies and respects the objectives of the program. This is definitely a two-way street. Especially, the membership of the union must definitely understand that the officers of the company and the union are going to demand that everyone follows the requirements and objectives of the program.

WILLENS: I agree with Marco Vestich that the union should have the right to reports of inspectors, and I as a state inspector would welcome being permitted to provide a copy of my report to the union. However, as the Illinois state law indicates, I cannot do this. In relation to the question as asked, assistance can be obtained in setting up a safety program from U. S. Department of Labor representatives, State Labor Department representatives and, naturally, the National Safety Council.

MARR: During many past years, a lot of safety people said that safety and health is management's responsibility. Actually, this is true but, unfortunately, if management does not accept the job, it is the union person or worker who gets hurt. Therefore, many unions find that they will have to exert the initiative to start a safety program. Our union has found that training the membership on safety and health hazards and what to do about them when they are identified has been very effective in reducing accidents. Naturally, during this training many foremen and other management people can be taught if they are not already inclined to follow effective safety and health principles. A safety program is useless if our members are not wearing personal protective equipment that is provided and if they are breaking safety rules that have been established. This is why the educational process is so necessary.

LEONARD: As I have mentioned before, we have included the wearing of personal protective equipment in our safety contract, and as far as I am concerned the men are going to wear the equipment or they're not working. I am willing to put my job on the line for this purpose. As long as the personal protective equipment, such as hard hats in our case, are necessary and are fitted properly, the men have to wear them.

GREENE: I would like to add one thing, and that is whether it's wearing personal protective equipment or installing mechanical safeguarding, none of it is of any value if these requirements aren't properly and thoroughly enforced. Naturally, to make a regulation or an agreement enforceable, it must be worded properly, and it should not include exemptions which make enforcement practically impossible. Therefore, I suggest that you keep enforcement in mind when you word your agreements and regulations.

DELEGATE: Our union has a labor-management safety committee at one of the Monsanto plants and we work together superbly. We have three union members and three supervision members on the committee and we meet once a month. We also investigate accidents. Our union representatives on the committee are elected by the members, and this works best. As long as the union representatives do a good job and realy represent the membership, they are reelected. This keeps these positions out of politics because of appointments.

DELEGATE from Local 185, United Steelworkers of America: We are having a problem with our contracted company because they insist on purchasing safety spectacles from a certain company. Our union safety committee and many of our members would like to be able to use spectacles from another company because they are more comfortable and provide a better fit. Our members are even willing to pay the difference in the cost, but the company refuses to cooperate. Also, our company only requires hard hats in certain areas of the plant, which makes it practically impossible to enforce this rule. In addition, many of the foremen and plant protection personnel will not wear the hard hats even in those areas where they are required. Naturally, this kills the hard hat safety program.

MARR: In support of what the delegate just said, since the safety spectacle industry is progressing so fast and coming out with so many new innovations, it is only common horse sense that labor and management should periodically review their safety spectacle program to determine if more effective and/or more comfortable spectacles can be purchased. The other day I went to my eye doctor and informed him I wanted a pair of safety spectacles ground to my prescription. The doctor spent quite a bit of time trying to talk me out of the safety spectacles. Naturally, I informed him