

Submission to Safety Taskforce

I have worked as a linesman/cablejointer in Dunedin and around the country for our local company for over 30 years. I am also on a steering committee for cable jointing unit standards for ESITO and have just attended a cable jointer/linesmen competition in Hamilton for a week as a judge. Since 1992, with the introduction of the Employment Contracts Act, the changes to the Electricity Act and the deregulation of many industries I, like many others have noticed a marked decline in standards, safety and health in our industry.

Many of the things I have noticed, I am sure, after talking to friends and colleagues pertain to many trades, like, carpentry, plumbing, electricians, communications, arborists, butchers and drivers, but the examples I give are obviously in the industry in which I work.

There have been around 20 deaths and hundreds of serious accidents in our industry in the last 20 years as well as injuries and deaths to trainees, which unfortunately seem to be increasing at a concerning rate.

There are obviously many causes of accidents but the major changes in the workplace that seem to be increasing this rate is far as I can see, are:

- 1) An elitist attitude by those directly involved in setting standards or producing health and safety documents, that alienates them from industry.
- 2) ACC's move towards privatisation and especially their attempts to charge or reward industries according to the amount of accidents they have, and not supporting injured workers properly.
- 3) The move towards contracting out work, the role of the Employment Contracts Act in attacking a unionised work force, and especially the role of the Ministry of Commerce in destroying established work ethics, practices, standards and training.

Firstly 1): There is an ignorance of what is best practice in our industry by groups that control procedures and documents. Documents are produced with no consultation and are just about always reactionary to incidents. Often the solutions are worse than the original method. As an example when our Health and Safety Officer started at work a few years ago he had come from a background where no live work occurred. He was appalled at this but was told to calm down, because it was accepted practice with approved procedures for many decades. Without live work, cities would have no power when any work was done on cables or lines, so this has been the norm for well over seventy years. About three to four weeks after his initial discovery of this practice, he suddenly issued a document telling us what we should wear and how we should do some of the work. Some of this was dangerous so we saw our immediate manager who said it was only a discussion document. We refused to work this way, but next thing the document was policy. We still refuse to work under this method. It shows the arrogance of these people who know nothing of the industry practices yet produce documents telling people with 30 years or more experience how to do things. This was done with absolutely no consultation. Likewise the EEA (Electrical Engineers Association) has forced linesmen to do away with body belts and use harnesses with no

consultation. Our linesmen are struggling badly with this. They get sore backs, can't reach out to their work safely, have trouble reaching their belt gear, and have difficulty getting the belts on and off among other things. The old body belt was user friendly, but I know in some cases they climb with no belt now simply because it's easier. How can this edict from the EEA be an improvement? There were no accidents with the other belts here. Yet we have a bunch of office bound bureaucrats who, most likely have never climbed in their lives telling experienced linesmen of up to 30 years or more what they should wear, with no consultation. I know in Central Otago a linesmen fell off a pole. He was found sitting upright with his wife next to him and his body harness on the ground. She said, "She had taken it off him to make him comfortable". He fell off the pole. You be the judge.

One of our linesmen contacted other power board linesmen and they are experiencing similar problems. He started a petition at our work, got all of our 20 odd linesmen to sign the petition and some technicians who climbed as well, and sent it to the EEA and OSH as well as management and others. EEA never replied and OSH said, they were bound by EEA only, but only after they were prompted about having some responsibilities. Buck shovelling. In fact in the 30 years I have worked at Dunedin we have never meet a delegate from EEA, have had no consultation, no input and have not even been asked if there are any problems or dangers with their procedures. Yet they keep dishing out these procedures. To me this is both arrogant and ignorant. I asked one of our engineers who was going to one of their conferences (we aren't allowed) to bring up the problems with the belts. He reluctantly said he would. When he came back I asked him how he got on. They said that's just the way it is and we must accept it. How can this attitude possibly help safety?

Filling out forms, hazard sheets, take fives and inductions has become an epidemic that has accomplished nothing but complacency. Sign the form and she'll be right. Over 90% of people never read what's on them by my observation, and yet they seem to be the main stay of OSH (or whatever they call themselves) and company manager's safety regimes. In Central Otago two years ago, one of our linesmen Roger Steel was killed at work. A few months after this some linesmen up there were working on a road with no signs and a broken pole that wasn't properly supported by a hiab. One of the other linesmen saw this, and other shortcuts that were being taken, and was so disgusted and upset that he resigned. He was a former police officer turned linesmen and said the industry had just become too dangerous and uncontrolled for him to work in. Management were happy though because all the forms had been filled in. It didn't matter that they hadn't been adhered to. The forms do nothing and should be scrapped. Experience, knowledge, training, resources and quality work prevent accidents, not forms. They are just butt covering. Ask the poor souls at Pike River Mine, no amount of forms would have helped them.

Accident and incident forms have become confrontational. They ask why wasn't something done often relating to some obscure policy that may or may not be in a document that nobody reads. Tradesmen communicate verbally and demonstrate hands on when training, not by written documents. The upshot of these forms, that make us all feel that we are being accused of a crime, for having an accident, is that the cause of accidents isn't always written down the way it occurred. Lies are told because there is a fear of ramifications. This means the real cause of close calls are not always reported. This creates more dangers.

Close call reports are encouraged which sounds fine. Management says this shows all is well. E-mails are sent to and thro by management internally. Unfortunately they are never discussed or brought

back to the workers, (who are the ones who have close calls after all), to decide what actions can be done to stop reoccurrences. Another waste of time and money that should be spent on training and resources. I enclose a hazard form with the problems highlighted.

OSH seems to have a similar outlook on things. Their aim seems to be to seek prosecutions rather than learning from the accidents. Once again this results in cover ups that stop the real causes of accidents from being investigated. This is bad. Once I had to attend an accident where two plumbing contractors hit a cable in a mud tank and were burnt. The OSH officer interviewed me months later, clearly with the intention to blame and prosecute the workers. I said, I could see how hard it would have been to realise the cable was there (it was encased in concrete in the actual mud tank and they were busting through it). He insisted they should have known the cable was there by the plans. I said, they were a bit ambiguous, but obviously seeking a prosecution, he said, while reading the plans, it was perfectly obvious. I had to point out that he was reading the plan upside down and the part he was looking at was on the other side of the road. He brushed this off. The real cause of this accident was lack of experience of those reading the plan and a situation that had probably been created forty years ago. A prosecution would solve nothing and obviously what those poor workers thought or knew was never going to be asked to prevent the accident happening again.

No doubt you have had submissions from HR departments in workplaces such as ours, and from OSH and ACC. These should be treated with a grain of salt as far as I can see. They should be the listeners not the submitters. They have had their turn. They have collectively failed workers over the last twenty years and it is time they show a bit of humility instead of blundering on.

PPE has become another infatuation for these organisations over the importance of training, experience, knowledge and common sense. Many times PPE should be worn only for a certain part or area of the job. Yet, there seems to be a one fits all policy. Often this leads to health issues like tiredness, over heating, dehydration, unable to grip things properly, unable to see things properly and parts of the PPE falling. For example, Transpower requires full length overalls in their yards with gloves on. Sometimes, e.g. Benmore, the yard is dead, its 30C and the workers are just doing up bolts. What is the need for all this gear? We are meant to wear fireproof overalls and jackets even when we are just digging. You may have noticed a similar situation has just occurred in the red zone in Christchurch with contractors unable to wear shorts. Workers' health is not considered. Ridiculous. We are meant to wear hats with visors that fall off into the live conductors when doing live work. When wearing these visors you can't see what you're doing either, which I thought would be handy when you are working with 440V conductors alive. Common sense and a concern for health has gone out the window in the pursuit of butt covering by EEA, OSH and senior management. It creates more dangers than it solves in many cases, through this one fits all policy. I liken it to having to get from A to B. You have a mine field in front of you. You can walk through it with all the PPE, mine detectors and gear on, or you can walk around the outside where there are no mines. OSH etc is asking us to walk through the mine field rather than walking around the outside. This outside in our case, would be training, staff levels, experience, knowledge and equipment. There is not enough emphasis on health, only PPE. I know this is far from unique to our workforce and can be found across most trades. No wonder accidents are so prevalent in New Zealand with this arrogant and ignorant attitude. There is no discussion or consultation with workers about this being the right thing to do.

Secondly (2): ACC is another problem especially where injuries are concerned in the work place. By charging different rates or levies (never the original intention of ACC) it was assumed employers would try to reduce accidents. The reality is somewhat different, with the focus on keeping people at work when they are injured by way of light duties etc and trying to minimise the reporting of lost time accidents. The accidents still happen but the worker ends up suffering and not healing as quickly. We are told it is good for us to be working with injuries but, what these paper shufflers don't realise is that most of us are sore most of the time through understaffing and less trainees and experienced workers. This is the result of the employment law and the Ministry of Commerce, but I'll get to that later. When we finally go to the doctor we are really sore and usually at our wits end. Often we just need one or two days or a long weekend to come right. We are told to go to the company doctor who clearly has a vested interest in pleasing the company not the patient. He often prescribes light duties that bear no relationship to our normal work just so the company doesn't register LTI's. We are kept at work often in cold stores or outside standing and getting more miserable. Many workers simply take sick leave or try to grin and bear it at our normal work. This looks good for the employer and ACC but simply means more suffering, prolonged injury for the worker and worse still the non-reporting of accidents because people just take sick leave. How does this help with health and safety? The proposal to further privatise ACC is also a big worry for health and safety. In the late 90's our employer wanted to keep their premiums down when they had a private insurer (Fusion) and on occasions it was implied it would be better to take sick leave or holiday rather than report accidents. You were made to feel guilty because there were incentives if no one reported an accident, eg. free jackets. Accidents would still happen, it doesn't prevent them, but you can imagine how some people felt bullied by others not to report accidents so as to get their prize. How does this possibly help any meaningful discussion on the prevention of accidents and analysing close calls? Workers were also put under massive mental stress by the private firms with payments often taking place six to eight weeks after they decided if the accident was an accident. There were more lies about what actually happened to make sure it was an accident under their criteria and so that you couldn't be blamed for it. Many workers were threatened with mortgage payment closures, late fees, hire purchase problems and debt collectors, because of these delays. Imagine what chance there was of workers being focused on rehabilitation or their work with this going on. It was failed policy, increased real accidents and must not be allowed to happen again if the government and task force are serious about reducing accidents. That's the real world.

Likewise ACC tries to blame many of the injuries on pre-existing conditions, thus making it hard for workers to get treatment, operations or time off after accidents. For example, I broke my elbow at work, but was told it was just as likely to happen the next time I walked through a gate at my age (50 at the time). In other words it's more expected at my age. Well, of course it is, working outside, lifting heavy weights (70-100kgs often) and working in cold and awkward conditions. Surely this condition is expected, especially when compared to someone working in a warm, clean, comfortable office lifting paper clips. The condition isn't pre-existing, but is expected as a consequence of your work. ACC still take the same premiums from me and my employer, as they would for a younger person, yet if we have an accident often we don't get covered despite a significant event taking place. This is discrimination, surely. I had to pay for my operation so I could stay at work (\$6000 plus sick pay and holiday. Total \$9000). My surgeon said, I had broken bones, but the surgeon paid off by the ACC said it was arthritis. Why should workers have to pay for accidents at work at the whim of

ACC endorsed surgeons? This means many people try to battle on in pain because they are not lucky enough, as I was to afford the operation themselves. They are obviously more likely to have accidents in this condition or shift the burden of work onto their workmates. This results in more stress, more rushing and a likely increase in accidents as those left try to cover for the injured worker. I was covering for someone else when I had my accident and had to do something that would normally require two men, by myself. ACC and its board are happy but no one else is. Whatever happened to our wonderful no fault scheme? I really fear there will be a significant increase in accident rates as ACC becomes more focused on privatisation and apportioning blame for accidents by financial incentives.

Finally (3): Without doubt the most serious cause for the decline of health and safety in our workforce, and I'm sure many others, is the way workers are treated through the introduction of the Employment Contracts Act and especially through the deregulation of industries as promoted by the Ministry of Commerce.

Contract workers invariably have lower wages and conditions, and are competing for ever lowering number of quality jobs. Things that have happened that have increased the likelihood of accidents include longer hours, less breaks, and because of less unions in the workplace a feeling that you must do the job regardless of the risks so you don't let yourself or co-workers down. This was obvious at Pike River where safety was ignored so that gangs could keep working. Individuals or small groups (contracting units) became more important than the overall safety of the workforce. Strong unions would have prevented this, and unfortunately it is obvious in our industry similar things are happening. There has been a number of injuries and one death in Central Otago where our company's workforce is largely un-unionised. There are no checks of the overall picture as each gang is more focused on their own little group rather than the whole workforce. In Dunedin we are around 50% unionised, there are less accidents and close calls and there is a feeling that we would try to look after one another as a whole workplace. That is, we are not competing as much with other groups among our workforce.

The Ministry of Commerce however, is putting serious pressure on our company to contract out more of their work as they did in the 1990's. The result of this was catastrophic as far as the workforce was concerned.

It resulted in a less skilled workforce where people were only required for certain types of work. This meant a "Rabbit Board" mentality where only the problems encountered under the contract were fixed. Broken arms, broken insulators, burnt fuses, loose braces etc were not fixed if they were not part of the contract. This means a lowering of maintenance standards and obviously more traps. Work that could be planned was left and therefore often became fault work, which is more dangerous as it may be needed to be done at night or in bad weather conditions. Usually it is needed in a hurry as well and there are usually unplanned power cuts involved. Staff numbers halved as many experienced and fully trained people left the industry. They don't return (when 200 were made redundant in 1997 in Auckland, Queenstown who was short of workers wrote to every one of them, there were no replies). Instead you get poorly trained staff from Fiji or the Philippines. Because contractors only required one type of worker there is obviously less recognition by them of dangers or even the ability to fix these dangers. Outage times doubled in the 90's and clearly there is

less pride or interest in the place contractors are working as they don't have ties to the area where they have gained the contracts.

Under pressure from the Ministry of Commerce less is spent on maintenance so again there is less staff, more hazards and safety is compromised. Networks lose control of reliability and their staff numbers, so training, competence and experience is lost. Outsiders often have no experience of local conditions; minimum standards become the norm so there is poorer work quality and more dangers. At one stage we won a contract for four men to Christchurch, while Christchurch won a four man contract in Dunedin. They were literally passing each other on a Sunday night at Timaru. This away work caused marriage and family stress, tiredness with travelling and living out of motels, unfamiliarity with the new work place, work stress and inevitability increased costs. How can this be good for safety? Yet, the Ministry is putting pressure on Aurora and others to carry out more of this lunacy. They care not one bit about workers or the networks, only their ideology. Idiots!!! Stop them if you are serious about health and safety.

The separation of lines and retailers by Bradford's Bill meant faults men are sent to faults by the retailer who may be based in the other end of the country. Information and background is often not asked for, or passed on which creates dangers to the faults men. Because he may be a contract worker he himself is not always fully trained (semi-skilled) or familiar with the local area and may encounter problems he is not trained to cope with. All of this creates more danger in an already dangerous industry.

The worst thing about their ideology, is training slows, or as in our case in the 90's stopped. There are less skills to do all the work as a result, especially in an emergency. Those left become over worked and understaffed. However, because of the Ministry of Commerce, maintenance standards are even lower and more fault work (danger) is created for a smaller over worked workforce. And they wonder why accidents are so high.

Ring feeds etc are not planned for, or as prevalent in this environment so more rushing, overtime and risky bridging is required to get the power back on as the retailer demands. With increased hours and jobs under threat, morale becomes low, thoughts are elsewhere, and an attitude of don't care comes into play. This is very dangerous and can be squarely blamed on the Ministry of Commerce.

The lack of trainees in the 90's happened throughout the country in most trades. In our case this resulted in fewer people maintaining the same system. Standby (after hours) rosters were decimated and continued to be so. We had twelve sets of two men on each week prior to 1992 and have got down to a low of four and a half since. It now hovers around to five or six sets which means a lot more hours on a more poorly maintained system. A lot of those on the roster now have very little experience of fault work or line work at all for that matter. Obviously, experience in this work is essential but now many trainees are being thrown into this work after two and a half to three years. Prior to 1992 linesmen were not usually on the roster for nine years.

It should be noted that the recent death of the faults man at Mossburn occurred to a lineman with only five years experience who wanted to leave the industry. Often these men are sent by themselves initially, and simply often don't have the experience to deal with these situations. Previously there were several classes of linesmen, cable jointers and even cable layers. For example

after two years, after four years etc that gave an idea of their experience for certain jobs. This has been wiped. Cable layers who were semi-skilled were classed as assistant, grade one or grade two. These men recognise cables, could dig around them safely because of their skills and experience, and assisted the cable jointers in trenches, joint holes, shoring up, or running cable. Now nothing. We are sent inexperienced men to dig around live 400, 11000, 33,000 fault cables who have never even seen a cable before. We end up doing the job ourselves as we obviously value their safety more than our senior managers. Sometimes we are sent men from Selectrix who know even less. We do the job ourselves again as it is dangerous and they don't know what we require. This increases our workload and means more stress and physical work for us before we cable joint. This only happens in New Zealand. I know the English jointers who come here never dig and are amazed we don't have dedicated digging gangs. We used to!! Likewise the running of cable with powerful winchers. Obvious dangers here but now unlike years ago, totally inexperienced men are set out to do this dangerous work. Let me be clear, our immediate managers try their best to fix this situation but are basically over ruled by higher management, because they cannot afford to train people and keep them on because of the contracting out idealism of the Ministry of Commerce. Lack of staff has meant many long term injuries for many of us. Lack of numbers means we struggle with heavy work alone or in ones or twos where once there may have been five or more men. Many of us take pain killers to cope. I go home and put my hands in hot water just so I can hold a knife and fork sometimes after work. Many of my work colleagues have similar problems due to over work and understaffing. The blame for this can be laid fair and squarely at the hands of the Ministry of Commerce and Max Bradford. It is no coincidence, I believe, he was also the Minister of Mines responsible for changing the way inspectors of mines were employed. This was noted by the Pike River inquiry. Under-staffing and under-resourcing leads to accidents. So how are organisations like the ministry allowed to enact policies that they know increase accidents? Self-regulation means short cuts and to say otherwise is a lie. It results in accidents, misery and deaths to workers and yet they aren't held accountable. Why is this?

In 1994 I did a survey at work and the average age of a linesmen/ cablejointer at work was 35, my age. Fifteen years later, in 2009, I did the same survey and my age was still the average, that is 50 years old. Obviously in one of the most physical jobs in the country this gross under resourcing and lack of trainees increases injuries and accidents. Lack of experienced staff in their 30's and 40's means more danger to trainees who are thrust into work (eg faults, HV live work, switching etc) that they simply shouldn't be doing.

After all this the commercial side as well as the safety, training and outage side of things has failed. There has been a 190% increase in residential power bills while inflation has gone up only 55% in the same time. What a waste of lives and resources. And yet the Ministry of Commerce is now questioning our parent company Aurora and urging it to contract out more work. Despite this, we have just started to take on a few trainees and have had a slight increase in numbers through the efforts of our immediate managers and supervisors. But if the ministry gets their way that will stop, there will be more redundancies, less skills and experience, less training, more accidents and deaths. People in the workforce are totally disillusioned that this calamity could possibly happen again. Recently, for the first time I have heard people say they are scared at work. Many, myself included, will simply walk away from the industry if the ministry gets its way, as it will be clearly too dangerous. This will manifest into even more dangers for those left as there will be even less skills, knowledge and experience. They, the ministry, clearly don't care about workers safety. They do this

knowingly and aware of the disaster they created in the 1990's. If ever there was a case for corporate manslaughter or assault to be introduced then the ministry and Bradford should be the first charged I believe. They are inept, inefficient, arrogant (our employer has told them of the above consequences) and listen to no one. It needs skilled, experienced men to run these organisations, not boys. But unfortunately for us workers these boys are very, very dangerous.

As I said, their influence does not just cover our industry but many trades. No doubt task force members have noticed contractors digging in the broadband. Nowadays these labourers often work in the rain as do many other workers. Unless there was an emergency or outages etc. they didn't use to work in the rain. Now with contracting and harsh employment laws they do. Accidents are more likely as conditions become slippery. Visibility in holes and of traffic is limited. Not only that, previously this down time was used to get WOF's for vehicles, greasing and maintaining equipment and vehicles, getting compliance things like glove testing, weight testing and D-shackles, strops etc attended too. All these now have to be fitted in between jobs so a lot of necessary compliance and thus safety measures are ignored. The time required for these things is not factored into pricing. This is not good (think Pike River). People working in the rain are obviously more likely to get flus and colds and in areas like Dunedin increased aches and pains, arthritis and just generally feeling more miserable by being wet. Though the trend is for age expectancy to increase I believe you will see a decline in life expectancy for this group in 10 to 20 years time, as the ill health caused by these changes kicks in.

These same contractors involved in the broad banding went through about twelve cables in about two months when they started in Dunedin. These ranged from street lighting to high voltage. It was only luck that nobody was badly hurt or killed. Significant areas of town lost power and this in itself causes health issues. One person had a heart turn in a lift disabled by the power cut. The reason this happened was the contractors were using the wrong equipment (toothed buckets) and were being operated by men untrained in digging on the road and footpath. Some had only previously worked in garden centres. There have been improvements but the point is they were thrust into work they were not trained for, and an accident could have happened to them, or the nearby public, at anytime.

Clearly there are major health and safety issues involving the Ministry of Commerce and the contracting out of services. A lot more regulation and accountability needs to be applied to these idiots and corporate manslaughter introduced. I have no doubt, they, and the Employment Contracts Act, have been responsible for much suffering, injuries, and some deaths.

In summing up, 2 more things: I believe the wrong questions are being asked when accident investigations are done. Without pre-empting the enquiry into the death of the poor linesman at Mossburn, everyone in the industry knows roughly what actions or lack of, led to the linesman's death. What needs to be asked never is. Knowing the dangers of what he did, why did he do it anyway? What was his training in this environment? How many faults had he attending while training? How many had he been to by himself? How many hours did he normally work? How many weeks had he been on call? How far did he travel? What else was going on at work (for example wage negotiations, contracting out) and most importantly was this common practice and had it been done before? This is where the no fault approach is essential or his workmates will cover up to save their own jobs.

Roger Steel died two years ago. For the first six months after his death we weren't even informed exactly what happened. We were told this was because it was before the courts. But the point that seemed lost to management was we could still be doing the exact same things Roger had done when he was killed. We didn't know what unexpected dangers we may have been facing but our company was more concerned about upsetting the judge. What nonsense. We eventually only heard the details about what he physically did wrong and basically were told not to do what he had done. But, he would have known the things he had done were wrong and probably hoped he would get away with it. Why did he do it, should be the emphasis of any enquiry, not the how. Incidentally he was working by himself when he shouldn't have been. The boys in the ministry again!!

The people who have accidents are trades and manual workers and yet the practices they work under, are largely controlled by bureaucrats, who can't or don't get injured at work, who are aloof, and often ignorant and arrogant about best practice. They need to be disestablished and replaced by regulated controlled organisations, who have the health and safety of workers as their first concern. Presently, this is absolutely not the case.

My last comment involves the task force itself. I wanted to appear at the meeting in Dunedin, but it was very poorly advertised and I only learned of the date after the meeting. I wrote to the secretary and media man, but feel that their perception of consultation is flawed. I have had great difficulty writing this and finding out about the commission. Most people in manual work would be happy to tell you of their problems, but like me, have extreme difficulty and a lack of time and resources to put it down on paper. I feel it was therefore essential that work place forums involving dangerous industries were held. It is only there you would hear from people involved in accidents and not just those, such as OSH, employers federation, ACC and the likes who have time to put pen to paper. They have had their time to do things, and have failed. All you get is more of the same old, same old.

Virtually no workers I have spoken to know of the task force. On the Monday after the death of the linesman from Mossburn, we had a meeting and were briefed on his death. There was no real information about what happened. I asked why our company had not informed anybody about the task force meeting in Dunedin the previous week. The reply from our direct manager was he didn't know about the meeting. I said this was poor, but subsequently our senior manager, second to the CEO, responsible for about 150 workers, including the section where Rodger Steel was employed, said he didn't even know what the task force was, or of its existence. No one in the room (40 people) knew about it. Clearly, there is a problem here, don't you think?

As I said I also went to Hamilton, where many of the countries leading trainers and tradesman were attending a week long competition. The CEOs of a couple of the larger electricity companies mentioned the task force but very few, only two tradesmen that I met, knew of the task forces existence. Our own CEO sent out a newsletter (Which I've enclosed) about the task force on the 16th of November, after submissions closed. This is the total correspondence from our company to workers about the task force. Notice there is no mention of input from the work force, typical. Something is seriously wrong with the way the task force is being promoted here. CEO's don't get injured, we do. I feel the time period for submissions needs to be extended and proper ads published (full page) and TV adds shown so that people know about it and have time to submit. I only found out about the taskforce through a TV interview with Helen Kelly, and about the website

through a reporter who attended the Dunedin meeting. After 20 years since any type of review "Workers", deserve better and a fair chance to tell their stories and help improve safety.

In conclusion, I have included examples of just a few of the events that have happened in our work force to show a workers perspective, and not the sterile, form filled environment that ACC and OSH live in. The task force needs to get away from this comfort zone. There must be a renewed drive towards, knowledge, experience, training and more training, good resources (manpower and plant) and quality work, over a profit at all cost mentality to improve health and safety in the work force. Only consultation, cooperation, humility, and mutual respect by all parties, will improve New Zealand's poor safety record. It has been captured by vested interests far too long.

Graeme Jeffery

Ph