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 cooperation 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 Prevention 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 company 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:

a) It is union policy to participate in the program.

b) 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.