

FILE NAME: Baldwin (BALD)

DATE: 1946

DOC#: BALD005

DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION: Legal - Bingaman v. Baldwin Opinion

159 Pa.Super. 77

AMERICAN BRIDGE CO. v. UNEMPLOYMENT BOARD OF

Case showed Baldwin that < 4 yrs. exp. to pneumoconiosis prod. dust could cause totally disabling, even fatal disease within 12 years from the start of employment.

Pennsylvania, 6.

Unemployment Review that five who had there- 1.10 per hour a to secure suit- of law.

rm, 1946, from employment Com- upon the claim at Appeal No. o. B-4707.

Unemployment

by Evelyn Theresa Davis, claimant, opposed by the American Bridge Company, employer. From a decision of the Unemployment Compensation Board of Review allowing the claim, the employer appeals.

Decision affirmed.

Before BALDRIGE, P. J., and RHODES, HIRT, RENO, DITHRICH, ROSS and ARNOLD, JJ.

P. K. Motheral and Reed, Smith, Shaw & McClay, all of Pittsburgh, for appellant.

R. Carlyle Fee, Asst. Sp. Deputy Atty. Gen., Charles R. Davis, Sp. Deputy Atty. Gen., and James H. Duff, Atty. Gen., for appellee.

RENO, Judge.

In this unemployment compensation case the board found that the claimant had been employed by appellant, American Bridge Company, as a welder at \$1.10 per hour from January 26, 1944 to June 15, 1945, when she was laid off because of lack of work. On June 20, 1945, she was offered employment at a filling station at \$18 per week which she refused because the salary was too low. For this, the bureau disallowed the worker's claim for benefits. Upon her appeal, the referee reversed the bureau, and the referee's decision was sustained by the board upon the employer's appeal.

The appeal raises the same questions decided this day in American Bridge Com-

pany v. Unemployment Compensation Board of Review, Pa.Super., 46 A.2d 510. The board held that in the circumstances prevailing at the time the offered employment was refused five days in which to find suitable work was not a reasonable time. In that conclusion we cannot discover an error of law.

Decision affirmed.



159 Pa.Super. 29

BINGAMAN v. BALDWIN LOCOMOTIVE WORKS, Inc., et al.

Appeal of OLD T.

Superior Court of Pennsylvania.

April 12, 1946.

1. Workmen's compensation § 53

The Occupational Disease Act should be given the same liberal construction that has been given the Workmen's Compensation Act, but, where the requirements of the statute are clear, intention and meaning of the Legislature, as expressed therein, may not be ignored. 77 P.S. § 1401(d, g), 1408(a).

2. Workmen's compensation § 549

While a claimant may combine periods of exposure to a silica hazard in order to reach the required aggregate, he may not include in the computation periods of employment in a different and nonhazardous occupation because he happens to have the same employer for both jobs. 77 P.S. § 1401(d, g).

3. Workmen's compensation § 549

Employment in an occupation having a silica hazard exists only where an employee is subjected to the hazard of exposure to the dust of silicon dioxide. 77 P.S. § 1401(d, g).

4. Workmen's compensation § 549

Although the Occupational Disease Act gives a claimant the benefit of any and all employment during a period of eight years preceding date of his disability due to silicosis, the aggregate employment for four years during the eight years must be in an occupation having a silica hazard. 77 P.S. § 1401(d, g).

employment Compensation
iew, Pa.Super., 46 A.2d 510.
ld that in the circumstances
the time the offered employ-
used five days in which to
work was not a reasonable
conclusion we cannot dis-
of law.

rmcd.



159 Pa.Super. 29

. BALDWIN LOCOMOTIVE
RKS, Inc., et al.

ppeal of OLDT.

Court of Pennsylvania.

April 12, 1946.

mpensation @53

ational Disease Act should
me liberal construction that
the Workmen's Compensa-
where the requirements of
lear, intention and meaning
ure, as expressed therein,
red. 77 P.S. § 1401(d, g),

mpensation @549

imant may combine periods
a silica hazard in order to
red aggregate, he may not
omputation periods of em-
different and nonhazardous
se he happens to have the
for both jobs. 77 P.S.

mpensation @549

in an occupation having a
its only where an employee
he hazard of exposure to
con dioxide. 77 P.S. §

mpensation @549

ie Occupational Disease
ant the benefit of any and
during a period of eight
ate of his disability due to
gregate employment for
g the eight years must be
having a silica hazard.
g).

BINGAMAN v. BALDWIN LOCOMOTIVE WORKS

Cite as 46 A.2d 512

Pa. 513

5. Workmen's compensation @1365

The mere continuation of a contract
of employment does not determine a claim-
ant's right to recover under the Occupa-
tional Disease Act for disability due to
silicosis, but proof of the silica hazard is
an essential part of claimant's case. 77
P.S. § 1401(d, g).

6. Workmen's compensation @549

Where during the eight years preced-
ing employee's death, his employment with
defendant in an occupation having a silica
hazard did not exceed 3½ years, compen-
sation was not recoverable for death of
employee as due to exposure to silica
hazard. 77 P.S. §§ 1401(d, g), 1408(a).

Appeal No. 11, March term, 1946, from
judgment of Court of Common Pleas, Mif-
flin County, No. 287, May term, 1945; Wil-
liam W. Uttley, President Judge.

Proceeding under the Occupational Dis-
ease Act by Dallas M. Bingham, claimant,
opposed by Baldwin Locomotive Works,
Inc., successor to Standard Steel Works
Company, employer, and others, wherein,
after the death of claimant, Dorothy M.
Bingham filed a claim petition in her own
right and for her dependent minor children.
Awards of compensation made in both cases
were set aside by the Court of Appeals
and, upon the death of Dorothy M. Bina-
man, appeals were taken by Charles M.
Oldt, administrator of estates of Dallas
M. Bingham, deceased, and Dorothy M.
Bingham, deceased.

Affirmed.

Before BALDRIGE, P. J., and RHODES,
HIRT, RENO, DITHRICH, ROSS, and
ARNOLD, JJ.

F. Brewster Wickersham, of Metzger &
Wickersham, and Huette F. Dowling, all
of Harrisburg, and Henry J. Sommer, of
Selinsgrove, for appellants.

Paul S. Lehman, of Lewistown, for ap-
pellee.

RHODES, Judge.

The question for determination on this
appeal has been stipulated as follows: Did
Dallas M. Bingham's employment with
defendant satisfy the statutory require-
ment of "an aggregate employment of at
least four years in the Commonwealth of
Pennsylvania, during a period of eight

years next preceding the date of disability,
in an occupation having a silica or asbes-
tos hazard?"

Dallas M. Bingham filed a claim peti-
tion on September 9, 1940, and set forth
therein that he became totally disabled on
December 8, 1939, as a result of silicosis
while in the course of his employment with
defendant. The employee died on Decem-
ber 6, 1940, and his widow, Dorothy M.
Bingham, then filed a claim petition in
her own right and for her dependent minor
children on January 13, 1941. The referee
awarded compensation under both petitions.
The Workmen's Compensation Board even-
tually affirmed the awards and the findings
of fact and conclusions of law of the
referee. From the board the defendant and
the Commonwealth appealed to the Court
of Common Pleas of Mifflin County; the
exceptions were sustained, the awards were
set aside in both cases, and compensation
disallowed. Dorothy M. Bingham having
died, suggestion of death was filed. Charles
M. Oldt, Administrator of the Estate of
Dallas M. Bingham, deceased, appealed to
this court to No. 10, March Term, 1946, and
Charles M. Oldt, Administrator of the
Estate of Dorothy M. Bingham, deceased,
appealed to No. 11, March Term, 1946,
which appeal is now before us.

It has been stipulated that the same ques-
tion is involved in both appeals, and that
the decision of this court in No. 11, March
Term, 1946, will be controlling in the ap-
peal to No. 10, March Term, 1946.

Deceased had been employed as a chipper
in defendant's foundry; and the compen-
sation authorities found that he had been
engaged in an occupation having a silica
hazard, and that his total disability and
subsequent death were caused solely by
silicosis.

The pertinent provisions of the Pennsyl-
vania Occupational Disease Act of June
21, 1939, P.L. 566, are paragraphs (d) and
(g) of section 301, 77 P.S. § 1401(d) (g),
and paragraph (a) of section 308, as amend-
ed, 77 P.S. § 1408(a).

To sustain the awards it is necessary
that the proofs and findings establish that
deceased had had an aggregate employment
of at least four years in this Common-
wealth, during a period of eight years next
preceding his disability, in an occupation
having a silica hazard, and that defendant
was the last employer in whose employment
deceased was exposed to such hazard.

Appellant's contention is that deceased's contract of employment continued with defendant from May 11, 1934, until December 8, 1939, a period of five and one-half years. Appellees assert that deceased's employment with defendant, in an occupation having a silica hazard, during the period of eight years next preceding December 8, 1939, the date of his total disability, did not exceed three years, six months, and twenty-four days.

The referee and the board found that during the period of eight years next preceding December 8, 1939, Dallas M. Bingham actually worked in defendant's foundry during the following periods of time: May 11, 1934, to October 15, 1934; February 4, 1935, to June 13, 1935; April 9, 1936, to June 13, 1938; May 1, 1939, to and including December 8, 1939. They also found that deceased worked for defendant in 1923, 1925 to 1928, in 1929, and in 1930; that during these periods he was employed in the capacity of a chipper; that during the eight years preceding December 8, 1939, he had no employment other than with defendant with the exception of lumbering and farm work; and that he accepted from defendant every call for work. It thus appears that deceased's period of employment in 1934 was five months, four days; in 1935, four months, nine days; in 1936 to 1938, two years, two months, and four days; in 1939, seven months, seven days, or a total of three years, six months, and twenty-four days.

[1] Appellant apparently misconceives the import of section 301(d) of the Occupational Disease Act, 77 P.S. § 1401(d), and insists that the continuation of a contract of employment controls this type of case. The board subscribed to this theory and concluded that deceased's employment extended from May 11, 1934, to December 8, 1939, a period of five and one-half years, notwithstanding its finding as to the periods when deceased was employed as a chipper in defendant's foundry. We fully recognize that the Pennsylvania Occupational Disease Act of June 21, 1939, P.L. 566, 77 P.S. § 1201 et seq., should be given the same liberal construction that has been given the Workmen's Compensation Act. *Roschak et ux. v. Vulcan Iron Works*, 157 Pa.Super. 227, 235, 42 A.2d 280. But, as the court below in its opinion very well stated, where the requirements of the statute are clear, the intention and meaning of the legisla-

ture, as expressed therein, may not be ignored.

[2] Had deceased worked for defendant between the intervals of his employment as a chipper in another occupation having no silica hazard, there could be no recovery although he had been employed by defendant for five and one-half years between 1934 and 1939. In *Tokash v. Early Foundry Co. et al.*, 157 Pa.Super. 467, at page 471, 43 A.2d 553, at page 554, in an opinion by Judge Ross, we held: "While a claimant may combine periods of exposure in order to reach the required aggregate, he may not include in the computation periods of employment [in] a different and non-hazardous occupation because he happens to have the same employer for both jobs."

During the periods when deceased was not engaged in defendant's plant as a chipper, he was not exposed to any silica hazard. He was not working at all, or he was farming or lumbering for others.

[3] It is significant that in paragraph (a), section 308 of the act, 77 P.S. § 1408 (a), the Commonwealth can be held liable for a part of the compensation only where the occupational disease has developed to the point of disablement after an exposure of five or more years. A proviso contains similar language in section 301(g) of the act, 77 P.S. § 1401(g). We desire to make it clear that in our opinion employment in an occupation having a silica hazard, section 301(d) of the act, 77 P.S. § 1401(d), exists only where an employee is subjected to the hazard of exposure to the dust of silicon dioxide. Act of June 21, 1939, P.L. 566, § 108(k), 77 P.S. § 1208(k); *McGarvey v. Butler Consolidated Coal Co. et al.*, 157 Pa.Super. 353, 356, 43 A.2d 623. See, also, *Agostin v. Pittsburgh Steel Foundry Corp. et al.*, 157 Pa.Super. 322, 43 A.2d 604; *Tokash v. Early Foundry Co. et al.*, supra, 157 Pa.Super. 467, 43 A.2d 553.

[4-6] Section 301(d) of the act, 77 P.S. § 1401(d), gives a claimant the benefit of any and all employments during a period of eight years preceding the date of his disability. But the aggregate employment for four years during the eight years must be in an occupation having a silica hazard. The aggregate employment must carry with it the hazard for the required time. The extended periods of

l therein, may not be

sed worked for defend-
ntervals of his employ-
in another occupation
azard, there could be no
he had been employed
five and one-half years
1939. In *Tokash v.*
et al., 157 Pa.Super.
A.2d 553, at page 554,
Judge Ross, we held:
may combine periods
r to reach the required
not include in the com-
f employment [in] a
azardous occupation be-
to have the same em-
."

ds when deceased was
efendant's plant as a
: exposed to any silica
t working at all, or he
bering for others.

ant that in paragraph
the act, 77 P.S. § 1408
alth can be held liable
mpensation only where
ease has developed to
nent after an exposure
's. A proviso contains
section 301(g) of the
l(g). We desire to
n our opinion employ-
ation having a silica
d) of the act, 77 P.S.
ly where an employee
azard of exposure to
lioxide. Act of June
§ 108(k), 77 P.S. §
v. *Butler Consolidated*
Pa.Super. 353, 356, 43
Agostin v. Pittsburgh
et al., 157 Pa.Super.
Tokash v. Early Foundry
57 Pa.Super. 467, 43

(d) of the act, 77
a claimant the bene-
mployments during a
s preceding the date
it the aggregate em-
ars during the eight
occupation having a
ggregate employment
e hazard for the re-
extended periods of

nonemployment or employment elsewhere
involved no such hazard on the part of
deceased. It is not, as appellant contends,
the mere continuation of a contract of
employment that determines a claimant's
right to recover under the act. More is
required than the continued relationship of
employer and employee. Proof of the silica
hazard is an essential part of a claimant's
case. *Hurtuk v. H. C. Frick Coke Co.*,
157 Pa.Super. 317, 321, 43 A.2d 559.

The application of appellant's theory
would require substantial change in the
statutory law.

We think deceased's noncompliance with
the act is clear, and precludes recovery by
appellant. On the findings of fact an
award could not be sustained.

Judgment for defendants affirmed.



159 Pa.Super. 122

HARTMAN v. STANDARD STEEL WORKS CO.

Superior Court of Pennsylvania.

April 12, 1946.

Workmen's compensation §549

Where claimant, seeking compensation
for disability due to silica hazard, had
worked for same employer off and on dur-
ing a period of eight years, but during that
time claimant also worked for others where
he was not subject to a silica hazard, and
the period of his employment when he was
subject to such hazard was less than four
years, compensation was properly disal-
lowed. 77 P.S. § 1201 et seq.

Appeal No. 2, March term, 1945, from
order of Court of Common Pleas, Mifflin
County, No. 45, October Term, 1943; Wil-
liam W. Uttley, President Judge.

Proceeding under the Occupational
Disease Act by Grover H. Hartman, claim-
ant, opposed by Standard Steel Works
Company, employer. From a judgment af-
firming the decision of the Workmen's
Compensation Board disallowing compensa-
tion, claimant appeals.

Affirmed.

Before BALDRIGE, P. J., and
RHODES, HIRT, RENO, DITHRICH,
ROSS and ARNOLD, JJ.

F. Brewster Wickersham, of Metzger
& Wickersham, all of Harrisburg, and
Donald M. Johnson, of Middleburg, for ap-
pellant.

Paul S. Lehman, of Lewistown, for ap-
pellee.

RHODES, Judge.

This is an appeal by claimant under the
Pennsylvania Occupational Disease Act of
June 21, 1939, P.L. 566, 77 P.S. § 1201 et
seq. The claim for compensation was dis-
allowed by the referee. The Workmen's
Compensation Board affirmed the referee's
findings of fact, conclusions of law, and
order of disallowance. The court below
affirmed the board and dismissed claimant's
appeal.

The referee found that claimant was to-
tally disabled on March 21, 1942, as the
result of silicosis contracted while in the
employ of defendant. Claimant had been
employed by defendant at various times,
and the periods in the eight years next
preceding his disability on March 21, 1942,
were as follows: March 21, 1934, to Oc-
tober 22, 1934; July 15, 1937, to June 14,
1938; November 14, 1939, to March 21,
1942. Claimant's period of employment
with defendant in 1934 was seven months
and one day; in 1937 and 1938, ten months
and twenty-nine days; in 1939 to 1942, two
years, four months, and seven days, or a
total of three years, ten months, and seven
days.

Claimant was employed by the Hill Brick
Company, Beavertown, Snyder County, Pa.,
as follows: May 1, 1936, to November 12,
1936; January 19, 1937, to January 30,
1937; March 4, 1937, to July 15, 1937;
April 18, 1939, to November 13, 1939.
Claimant's employment with the Hill Brick
Company did not subject him to a silica
hazard. Claimant's employment as a chip-
per by defendant did involve such hazard.

The referee disallowed compensation for
the reason that claimant did not have an
aggregate employment for four years in
the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania during
a period of eight years next preceding the
date of disability in an occupation having
a silica hazard. The aggregate employ-
ment of claimant with defendant was three
years, ten months, and seven days, during