**Hazards 2018**

**Meeting 2: How do we challenge the consequences of privatisation, commercialisation and marketisation alongside the deregulation agenda and the selective enforcement of health and safety laws? Privatisation, outsourcing, zero hours contracts, agency workers, many people do not know who they are working for or what contractual rights they have and this is prevalent across all different sectors, professions and jobs. Alongside this a lack of enforcement from HSE, LA’s** and other enforcing bodies because of cuts to these services. We need to develop better strategies to keep us all safe at work

Chair Hilda Palmer, Hazards Campaign, introduced the meeting and two documents were provided as resources see bottom.

The two speakers: **Neil Hope-Collins, Prospect**, and **Professor Steve Tombs, Open University and Centre for Crime and Justice Studies.**

1. **Neil Hope Collins works as a HSE inspector but is here as Prospect member**

HSE and health and safety inspectors are not the only regulators, there are numerous regulators working across the areas identified in the comment.  Prospect represents some of these, others are represented by other unions.  I would be speaking using specific examples from my members working for the Health and Safety Executive but the issues are common to all regulators.

When talking about deregulation the language we use is important as government applies use of various mechanisms to undermine regulation and promote deregulation.

Parliamentary Select Committee enquiries, specific reviews and reports such as Lord Young, Lofsted, the Triennial Reviews of HSE, all these deregulatory mechanism have been used to harm the HSE but they haven’t worked. Select C/te was wholly supportive of HSE and a lot of the Reviews and been very positive. They have established there is a need for the HSE, and it is seen as an effective regulator and not a bad model.

This leaves deregulators with simplest and most effective mechanism- to starve the HSE of funds to kill it off. Last Triennial Review just completed is broadly positive but the funding to HSE is still being cut- there is not a link between funding and good performance or review. (Added Note - HSE Budget has now been cut by more than 50% since 2010)

There is a Review of effective Better Regulation (deregulation) going on at moment, mostly under radar. IER responded, Hazards Campaign responded – add it??? What is this?? Is this it? <http://www.parliament.uk/business/committees/committees-a-z/commons-select/regulatory-reform-committee/inquiries/parliament-2017/deregulation-agenda-inquiry-17-19/> Brexit and deregulation is a new part of the threat to health and safety. Stepping stones for when UK leaves EU – all EU Regulations will be up for grabs. Having done the leg work in the review where either there was a limited response or the response was broadly neutral or supportive when all the regulations that emanate from EU directives come within scope of the Business Impact Target, BIT, and the Regulatory impact assessments there will be no scope to fight. (Hazards Campaign responded to this consultation as did the Institute for Employment Rights and we both recommended that the BIT is abolished – see Steve Tombs later) .

Huge threat coming. Impact of reduced funding to HSE’s size which is being cut again.

2003 Total staff at HSE: 4,163; 2018- 3,619 which is a drop of 35%. Inspectors need back up support workers of various types. 659 staff in the Field Operations Division, FOD, – 21% drop in 5 years. Construction Inspectors - 8% drop; in rest of FOD 36% drop in 5 years. Workload is just ridiculously high. People are leaving as morale is so low.

There is a limit to number of Inspectors HSE can recruit due to the lack of staff to train them. It takes 7 years to train an inspector. More inspectors leaving than can be recruited means HSE is in terminal decline. Public Sector pay policy, 1% cap, also plays a role as once fully trained an HSE Construction inspector can get double the salary in private sector in London

What do we want from regulators? Be careful what we wish for. If we ask for purely numbers of enforcement actions Prohibition Notices, PNs, or Improvement Notices, INs, then this restricts what Inspectors can do. For example with the Construction, Design and Management Regulations, CONDAM, Inspectors can go on site and serve more enforcement notices but this isn’t digging, doing the back trawl, looking at the primary contractor, the client, the designer. This all takes time and if doing that then not issuing enforcement notices. But the ends result of the more detailed work might be far more productive in helping to prosecute and to improve health and safety in that and other workplaces. On Legionella contamination of cooling towers, another example, if you are checking up on a how effectively companies are controlling the risk a couple of years after you first visited then a sign of success is no formal enforcement.  Still valuable work maintaining a threat of detection but if you did the job well in the first place then you shouldn’t need to serve notices again!

Fee for Intervention, FFI, has proved a useful tool. We fought against it but can see now it is a useful lever for compliance as it brings a bill for employers - £129 per hour of inspectors time from minute they step over threshold until the issue is resolved if they find a ‘material breach of regulations’. and acts similarly to an IN. (FFI is not available to Local Authority Inspectors though some are arguing for this link to APPG report <http://jostevens.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/APPG_Local_Authorities_Report_2018_AW.pdf>

Grenfell can be understood in terms of so far as is reasonably practicable –SFAIRP - and austerity. SFAIRP is well understood by business in terms of H&S regulations and is implicit in other regulatory frameworks. The balance between safeguarding and cost of putting it in place, For example £10,000 to protect workers from paper cuts is not SFAIRP. SFAIRP not a judgement at individual company level but societal level on the basis of value of a life. This means that a cost of many thousands for a safety measure that would prevent the death or serious injury or ill-health or workers would be considered SFAIRP.

Some Trade Unions and activists dislike SFAIRP and want more prescriptive laws, generally those who regulate like the concept. Austerity poses the idea that society has no money, society is poor and therefore the judgement of what is reasonably practicable is changed to reduce the level of protection.

For example, businesses deciding to save money on cladding because pf tight budget and austerity and this is more likely to happen if this decision is not subject to strict inspection, scrutiny and strict appliance of the law. Without independently accountable health and safety, Building Regulation inspectors, then the decision is left up to the company’s and arguable backed up by a wider societal view that greater safety measures cannot be afforded, we can’t afford it. In this way then austerity is a tool that allows deregulation, and deregulation allows austerity to continue.

CONDAM- Construction Design and Management Regs- is a good model for laws - Plan, Manage, Monitor. Model is that if you pay for work therefore you are responsible. Fighting for health and safety means also having to campaign austerity, including public pay policy. We must end austerity.

**Professor Steve Tombs, Open University and Centre for Crime and Justice Studies.**

Going to talk about the politics and economics of deregulation and the end of social protection under austerity.

While I broadly agree with Neil on SFAIRP, it doesn’t apply to Grenfell as the £213,000 saving by the Tenant Management organisation, TMO when Royal Borough of Kensington& Chelsea, RBKC, had £274 million in reserves, one of richest councils in UK, just doesn’t wash.

Blair /Brown government talked of light touch, limited touch regulation, renamed Thatcher[‘s deregulation ‘Better Regulation and set up the Hampton Report. They introduced the ‘deregulation fetish’. We call it that as a fetish is something that is worshipped for its magical mystical powers, that it will deliver something, fulfil a wish. <https://www.crimeandjustice.org.uk/sites/crimeandjustice.org.uk/files/Better%20regulation%20briefing%2C%20April%202016_0.pdf>

The idea that deregulation strips away bureaucracy is a lie. It is highly bureaucratic. There are dozens of ‘Better Regulation’ structures, units and organisations such as Better Regulation Unit (BRU) in each government department with a Better Regulation minister, Better Regulation Executive (BRE), Regulatory Delivery Director, Better Regulation Authority; Regulatory Policy Committee (RPC) Department etc. All have exposed the Bureaucratic bullshit. And endless review of health and safety regulation and enforcement: The Hampton Report reduced admin burden, Audit Commission - 36 reports; Regulatory Reviews Lord Young 2010, Lofsted, 2013, Red Tape Challenge, Triennial Reviews of HSE.

Regulations are social protections and my book ‘Social Protection after the crisis; Regulation without enforcement’ explains this in more detail. <http://policy.bristoluniversitypress.co.uk/social-protection-after-the-crisis> Steve only mentioned his book as I had a copy there and I can recommend it as very informative essential.

A few key points:

Deregulation is not about cutting paperwork, bureaucracy or saving money.

Saying the enforcement regime is not fit for purpose is not denigrating civil servants. The HSE/LA H&S enforcement system is not ILO compliant- Art 6 refers to inspections as often as necessary. In 2015/16 there were 18,000 inspections by HSE and they enforce health and safety at work in around 900,000 premises so on a statistical mean basis that is once in every 50 years that a premise can expect to be inspected. As a comparison, buying a rail ticket – if I thought that my ticket would only be checked once in 50 years then I wouldn’t bother to buy one, I’d risk it.

We need to renew the regulation system to reflect the new economy of work - precariat, ‘gig’ economy, long/complex supply chains etc. The Health and Safety at Work Act 1974, HASAWA, needs to be amended. The term ‘Employers’ needs to be changed to ‘Businesses’ to cover all workers - common sense. Bring HASAWA up to date. Enhance the role of workers, and workers reps especially safety reps, and safety committees, and extend their role into new areas.

**5 specific things that need to be repealed/reversed:**

1. **BIT – Business Impact Target** set in 2015 to cut costs to business of regulations by £10 billion by 2020, which was an arbitrary goal. The conflict between saving business money by cutting regulations and protecting our lives and health is clear when think about cost of plain packaging for cigarettes. BIT is all about costs to business not the cost to us of failing to regulate/enforce health and safety on business.

For more explanation I have added extract from IER Document on BIT that Steve co-authored:

The Business Impact Target (BIT) The introduction of the BIT in 2015 outlined the Government’s formal commitment to reduce regulatory costs for business by £10bn between 2015 and 2020, and obliged government departments to appraise regulations with regard to their cost to business. In 2016, the regulations noted to have the greatest cost implication for businesses were the standardisation of tobacco packaging and the prohibition of psychoactive substances. As this illustrates, the BIT creates an institutional bias in favour of businesses, potentially at the public’s expense.

The NAO has stated: *“Cost assessments tend to be an overestimate because innovation potential is rarely assessed and are routinely based on exaggerated figures from industry - in the past trade organisations have systematically inflated cost estimates to combat new regulations.”*[[1]](#endnote-1) The narrowly defined scope of the BIT cost appraisal process lends disproportionate weight to lobbying from business interests.

The BIT does not account for, or attempt to mitigate, the presence of economic externalities such as public health impacts, which will be picked up down the line by the taxpayer. This represents a transfer of responsibility for the safekeeping deficit from government to citizens.

The Business Impact Target should be abandoned because it operates as an unnecessary bulwark against effective regulation.

1. **Repeal and remove the need for Regulatory Impact Assessments, IAs,** as they do not cost the benefits of regulation. For more explanation I have added extract from IER Document on BIT that Steve co-authored:

Regulatory Impact Assessments (IAs)

As part of the BIT, regulators are obliged to publish an IA alongside proposed policies or policy amendments, which sets out estimated cost implications for businesses. Social and environmental impacts are often mentioned, but not monetised, and therefore given no weight in the appraisal process - and the Regulatory Policy Committee (RPC) cannot ‘red rate’ a policy on these grounds. This framework means that public policies predicted to save businesses money - but which also forecast public harms - may legitimately be waved through.

For example, the IA for the repeal of 23 local building acts across England in 2012 points to a potential *“increase of approximately 3% (per thousand fires) in fires getting ‘big’,* but was validated on the basis of estimated cumulative cost- savings of nearly £1m from removing the requirement to install smoke extractors or sprinklers in buildings. The Regulatory Impact Assessment appraisal process is therefore unacceptably biased towards business, at the expense of citizen safety and wellbeing.

This narrow approach to assessing regulatory value has been similarly criticised by the NAO which has concluded that: *“too often RIAs are used to justify decisions already made rather than an ex ante appraisal of policy impacts”.* IAs should be abandoned because they fail to enable adequate appraisal of policy and because they fail to adequately take into account wider societal benefits of regulation and associated long-term cost savings.

1. **.Abandon Growth Duty at heart of compliance code 1st duty in the code for Enforcement Officers.**

The ‘Growth Duty’ Section 108 of the Deregulation Act 2015 sets out a ‘Growth Duty’ for regulators:

*(1) A person exercising a regulatory function to which this section applies must, in the exercise of the function, have regard to the desirability of promoting economic growth.*

*(2) In performing the duty under subsection (1), the person must, in particular, consider the importance for the promotion of economic growth of exercising the regulatory function in a way which ensures that—*

*(a)regulatory action is taken only when it is needed, and*

*(b)any action taken is proportionate.*

I have added extract from IER Document on BIT that Steve co-authored:

The purpose of this duty is to introduce a more economically-focussed calculative rationale into regulatory decisions. Its logical effect is that front-line inspectors must provide a rationale other than that of legal compliance, and to dilute the proper focus of regulatory decisions on public safety concerns. Moreover, it is inevitable that, as in the case of IAs discussed above, this narrow prescription of “economic growth” fails to take account of wider economic benefits of regulation.

Because it operates as an unnecessary bulwark against effective regulation and fails to take full account of the economic benefits of regulation, the ‘Growth Duty’ should be ended, through repeal of Section 108 of the Deregulation Act 2015.

1. **Repeal the Primary Authority Scheme (PA)**

Primary Authority Schemes protect large national business chains like Asda and Sainsbury’s and are a privatised, marketised system of regulation. I have added extract from IER Document on BIT that Steve co-authored:

PA allows a company – and, since April 2014, franchises and businesses in trade associations – operating across more than one Local Authority area to enter an agreement with one specific Local Authority to regulate all of its sites, nationally. Under the PA scheme, the company, franchise or business association can reach an agreement with one Local Authority to regulate its systems across allof its stores in every Local Authority for complying with a relevant body of law – occupational health and safety or food hygiene, for example. The company makes a payment to the Local Authority nominated as ‘PA’ and agreed through contract. The benefit for the company, of course, is the absence of effective oversight in the vast majority of its outlets. These can be visited in other areas, but any enforcement action needs to be undertaken through the Local Authority which is the PA. In short, PA places regulation in a market context: Local Authorities compete with each other to sign up large companies to the scheme, seeking to conclude contracts based upon monetary exchange. And in practice it operates as a bulwark against enforcement.

The PA has mushroomed in recent years. In April 2014, 1,500 businesses had established PA relationships across 120 Local Authorities; at 27 March, 2017, there were 17,358 such relationships across 182 authorities. Moreover, PA now applies across a vast swathe of areas of regulation, including occupational health and safety but extending to food safety, and a wide range of regulators, from environmental health and trading standards departments to fire and rescue services and port authorities.

Because it operates as an unnecessary bulwark against enforcement and fails to take full account of the economic benefits of regulation, the PA scheme should be ended, through repeal of Sections 67 and 68 of The Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act 2013.

1. **One law in, One law out, then, 1 in 2 out and now 1 in 3 out. Madness!.**

I have added extract from IER Document on BIT that Steve co-authored

The One-in-One Out (OINO) Approach to Regulation The OINO approach decrees that the value of the UK’s regulatory stock must be considered in the light of the associated net impacts on business, rather than the net impacts on society. The procedure serves as a brake on operational policy-making on this basis. As such, the OINO approach contains an inherent structural bias, which prioritises business interests above, and sometimes at the *expense* *of*, societal interests. In 2014 Brandon Lewis MP (then Housing Minister) cited the One-in-One-Out rule as justification for his decision not to mandate the fitting of sprinklers in domestic and commercial properties.[[2]](#endnote-2) Experts now attest that the presence of sprinklers in Grenfell Tower would undoubtedly have saved lives. At best, OINO legitimises the safekeeping deficit. At worst, it can lead to catastrophic social harms.

Oxford University’s Smith School 2017 comparative analysis of the OINO approach in 8 countries found that: *“none of the countries we review has demonstrated that this policy innovation has actually led to improvements in economic efficiency”*. OINO is arbitrary, illogical and potentially harmful and it should be abandoned.

It’s time to review the Robens Report 1971 that set up HASAWA – a worker-led review of H&S across the board.

Nervous of proposing change to laws as mistrust all politicians to manage this in favour of workers,

CONDAM looks like it is a good model for the supply chain - Plan, Manage, Monitor. Model is that if you pay for work therefore you are responsible.

**Some Questions and comments**

UNISON Safety Rep: Work in Building Control and agree with Steve. There is real conflict of interest when inspectors work for the companies they are meant to regulate/enforce. Privatisation of planning legislation. Grenfell has had a positive effect as it has scared Councils. Local Authority Planning Departments are becoming self –funding with private regulators such as Building Inspectors who have no accountability except to the clients who are paying. Real regulators are so busy trying to funds, scared to enforce on architects as then they will then not be used any more. It’s taking Primary Authority, marketisation and privatisation/outsourcing of regulation a step further. The neoliberal aim is to have a self-funding regulatory system in Local Authority sector - not independent and democratically accountable but bought and paid for by those who are meant to be scrutinised and regulated to protect us all

TUC Tutor: Union safety reps organising and using the function and powers we have can make massive impact in improving health and safety at work. For that to work effectively we need the TU Act 2016 and all anti-TU laws to be repealed and this must be a major campaign demand. And we also need good trade union education but funding for TUC Education courses has been cut and cut and many units have been closed. We need TU education out in community, in schools, from cradle to grave.

GMB Safety Rep in national chain of supermarkets agreed on dangers of Primary Authority but asked about mechansims for ensuring consistency across country.

Questions about Automation and Artificial Intelligence- and benefits for all- reducing working day to 6 hours? New Zealand experiment recently went very well and had positive effects at all levels.

We discussed the last Labour Party manifesto which includes IER proposals, and setting up a Ministry of Labour. Rebecca Long-Bailey Shadow Minister for Dept. of Business Enterprise Industry and Skills, BEIS, is looking at how regulatory bodies such as the HSE would be taken into the Ministry of Labour.

The Hazards Campaign has put in a submission to make it clear that while we agree a Labour inspectorate looking at all aspects of abuse and exploitation of workers, on wages, hours, contracts - as well as health and safety, we want the HSE to be an independent H&S regulator, retaining its skills and expertise. We argue for low pay and insecurity to be recognised a serious health and safety issues and that they should come under the HSE’s remit. See <http://www.hazards.org/lowpay/degraded.htm> which is centrepage article in the current Hazards Magazine which you all had in your delegate Bag.

We argue strongly against HSE inspectors becoming more generalist as has happened to LA EHOs where they are mostly general food safety, environmental and health and safety general inspectors now and it doesn’t work well and we argue for an end to deregulation/better regulation, repeal of all the 5 points Steve makes above, repeal of TU Act 2016 and all anti-trade union legislation. We go on to propose a radical worker-oriented, preventative, precautionary, participative, tripartite, properly funded HSE/LAs with teeth and the sole aim to prevent death, injury and ill-health at work. This Briefing for Labour Party: ‘Health and Safety Fit for Workers’ will be on Hazards Campaign website shortly http://www.hazardscampaign.org.uk

Neil  made it clear that HSE Inspectors in practice would not apply the Growth Duty in a way that undermines their enforcement actions and the health or safety of workers. Hazards Campaign said Local Authority and Environment Agency Inspectors specifically mention the Growth Duty when dealing with cases in which we have been involved, and the constraints it imposes on them when trying to protect workers/community lives and health. Neil’s own point about SFAIRP is really about the Growth Duty and business interests.

A Unite convenor spoke about working for a L.A and having been outsourced/privatised many times, now with Mears. We need to get our heads around austerity as a political choice not an economic necessity Many members do not engage politically and many vote Tory, UKIP. We represent them for health and safety for terms and conditions, pay negotiations but the union role as political educator has been dropped and undermines our efforts.

Delegate asked about the advantages of deregulations- creating better choice, more competition.

UNISON Safety Reps asked if you disagree with HSE decision not to prosecute, can it be challenged?

**Some responses from speakers:**  
**Neil** reiterated that he was here from Prospect not HSE but outlined the process of challenging HSE decision. Write to Principal Inspector at HSE explaining why you think this is the wrong decision. If no joy, escalate upwards, copy to CEO .If no joy t=at HSE, then go to Ombudsman. Neil has himself been subject to an Ombudsman inquiry and while HSE Inspectors fear they will be ‘hung out to dry’ by complaints from local groups, by the found the process thorough and fair and was exonerated.

Yes austerity is a political choice and we must proclaim that constantly.

**Steve** – Deregulation making things better? Maybe, but not in terms of health and safety. In case of old GPO and waiting lists for telephones and you can have it in any colour as long as it’s black, deregulation did improve choice and reduce waiting lists etc. But the marketization of virtually every sector means that the process of privatisation/outsourcing is now done by 4/5 big companies, so it is a myth that it increases choice and competition to benefit us. In fact it is a rigged and stitched up market to benefit the few big corporations that reap the profits..

Primary Authority – there are the same laws across the whole country but differences in approach and may be inconsistencies and Primary Authority was claimed as mechanism to create more consistency, but not true. Depends whether you want consistency of approach or outcome and these are different. Local circumstances, issues, mean each case is different and so fairness of approach may not lead to exact same outcome in all cases.

Grenfell is an example of marketization and lowest bidder/tender without sufficient independent regulator scrutiny, and in fact bought and paid for inspectors, leads inexorably to cheapest methods for biggest profit whatever the real and often deadly cost to lives and health.

In case of Grenfell. It was not Council controlling the refurbishment of the tower but a TMO, an arms length organisation. It’s a neoliberal instrument. Marketisation is having a very negative effect on democracy in terms of social housing but also in terms of regulation itself which is no longer under the control of democratically elected councils but down to market forces.

**Neil** agreed, marketisation of the Building Regs means construction/development companies can buy their Building inspector, pay for her/him. And we all know s/he who pays the piper calls the tune?

A good discussion was held. We ended with agreement that in order to tackle deregulation in all its guises, we need to be much more radical. Much less reasonable in our demands as that has not really got us anywhere. Cutting laws, slashing enforcement budgets and changing the very nature of enforcement and those that do it via marketisation, privatisation, outsourcing generally, and the effect of all of these on regulation is, as Steve says, corporations should be abolished.

1. Resources: Hazards Campaign summary of deregulation of health and safety since 2010, below, and Hazards Campaign demands for 2015 election ‘Time to step up and act for health and safety’: http://www.hazards.org/votetodie/stepup.htm [↑](#endnote-ref-1)
2. ****

   **Perfect storm of ‘austerity’ attacks on the working class from cradle to grave 2010-2015 and worse 2015-2017, 2017-2020?**

   * On public services e.g. NHS, Education, child care via budget cuts, job cuts and privatisation
   * On Social Security safety net e.g. massive cuts to in & out of work benefits, bedroom tax, benefit cap
   * On employment rights, union rights, union reps facility time
   * On wages, employment conditions, hours of work, workload, zero hours contracts, security,
   * On pensions, cuts and increase in age for pension
   * On health & safety – deregulation, slashing enforcement
   * Divide and rule, public vs private, ‘scroungers vs strivers’, sick vs well
   * Supported by Employers organisations, “Loony libertarians” Think-Tanks, & corporate media to slash the state, shrink government, national and local
   * Race to the bottom and we are fighting for our lives and those of our children and their children

   **UK Neoliberal Government lies to justify attacks on Health and Safety**

   * H&S is over the top, ‘gorn mad’, nazi inspectors terrorising business, killing jobs, albatross round business neck, must be killed off - January 2012 Cameron New Year Resolution
   * Compensation culture is rife
   * H&S useless red tape, strangling business, stopping kids getting work-experience,
   * Health and safety is a ‘burden on business’
   * Most workplaces are ‘low hazard/risk’
   * H&S only common sense; employers do right thing; workers should be more responsible for own H&S

   **Damage to health and safety since Tory-led Coalition - Con-Dems - took power 2010**

   * Lord Young – ‘Common sense, common safety’ – occupational health off the agenda?
   * 35% cut to HSE’s already inadequate budget over 3 years- up to nearly 50% now; L.As massively cut
   * Grayling’s strategy March 2011: “Good Health & Safety Good for Everyone” – Fee for Intervention (FFI); arbitrary 33% cut in proactive inspections means 11,000 fewer, HSE, 65,000 fewer LAs inspections; Lofstedt Review
   * Lofstedt Report ‘Reclaiming health and safety for all’ November 2011 – ‘No need for radical change’ BUT paved the way for:
   * No new laws but from Europe & no gold plating- Call for EU deregulation-
   * ‘One in, one out; one new law to ‘two out’; now one in THREE OUT! + ‘Sunsetting’ clauses
   * No new ‘burdens’ on SMEs <30 for 3 years
   * Enterprise & Regulatory Reform Bill - civil liability removed
   * Red Tape Challenge x 3
   * Attacks on facility time but not Safety Reps and Safety C/te Regs - yet
   * Legal aid cuts for Personal Injury, charges for tribunals, Beecroft fire at will;
   * SARAH/Good Samaritan law against what government admitted was a myth!
   * Alternatives to regulations- responsibility pledges, prayer? Self-regulation, earned autonomy
   * Shut HSE Infoline and No Tel No.s on HSE website – HSENI still has Tel Nos.
   * 20+ Regs repealed, Approved Codes of Practice (ACoP) reviewed- including downgrading the ACoP for Management Regs to guidance, guidance dumbed down
   * Riddor >3 day to >7 day reporting + cut in No. Incidents and injuries to be reported - Not in Northern Ireland
   * ‘Growth duty’ on HSE & non-financial regulators – in Deregulation Bill
   * Deregulation Bill - Exempting Self Employed from H&S law unless on prescribed list
   * Attack on tripartism on HSE Board – latest employee rep (Jonathon Buame ex FDA) not Matt Wrack, FBU & TUC backed; public interest rep. is ex NHS senior manager; all on HSE board are retired and business oriented; 2 employee reps Paul Kenny, GMB, Sarah Veale,TUC retired and one replaced with ex Greggs manager! Tripartite C/tes eg WATCH c/te cut
   * ‘Independent’ Triennial Review of HSE - Report 9/1/14 gave thumbs up to HSE but government went ahead anyway with ‘commercialisation’, appointed Dr. Richard Judge as CEO to further commercialise the HSE , ‘Don’t Pimp our Watchdog!’ [www.hazards.org/safetypimp](http://www.hazards.org/safetypimp)
   * July 2015 the HSE appointed a Workplace Health Expert Committee with no union or workers’ voice to advise the HSE :http://www.hse.gov.uk/aboutus/meetings/committees/whec/
   * EU Deregulation – UK Business leaders forced Better Regulation into European Commission to cut Red Tape; EU REFIT Programme/Better Lawmaking report passed in European Parliament is deregulatory stopped new laws on MSDs, Hairdressers H&S etc ; DWP Report - Appraisal of HSE’s approach to negotiating and implementing European legislation, Kim Archer DWP published online 31st October 2014 praised HSE’s approach and undermined government criticism; Stoiber Group proposed exempting all SME’s from all employment law!, Stoiber now appointed European Commission special adviser on ‘Better Regulation’! Feeds into TTIP, CETA, TiSA…..
   * Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership TTIP , CETA, will give power to corporations to sue nations (ISDSs), more power to set laws that will reduce workplace, environment and health and safety standards via Regulatory Cooperation, open public services to even more privatisation, and will over-ride democracy with corporatocracy. See also, TPP. TiSA etc
   * Dame Black et al Work & Health; Sickness Absence Management Reports, based on the false notion that because it is generally good for you therefore ALL work is good for you, & if sick, work will make you better!
   * Dame Black’s work led to the Fit Note, and Work & Health Service – renamed ‘Fit for Work’ - tender won by Health Management Limited, a (US) MAXIMUS Company; In Scotland it will be delivered by NHS, includes- ‘voluntary’ referral by GP or employer for assessment as to whether ‘fit for work’ after 4 weeks off sick/long term sick leave, and if so making a ‘return to work plan’. Maximus which also won the ESA WCA contract, has been convicted of multi $million fraud in USA.
   * SRSC Attacks: July 2015 New Tory Government published the (Anti)Trade Union Bill with draconian attacks on trade unions right to strike, on check off, facility time and also on time off for safety reps in the public sector and allows ministers to restrict this for all safety reps by amending the Health and Safety at Work Act and allows attacks on the SRSC Regs more generally. This despite work related ill-health and injury costing the loss of over 27 million working days a year but strikes only 0.8 million days lost.
   * 2015 General election – Tory government with small majority – Manifesto confirms commitment to deregulation.
   * 2015 TU Bill in force- restricts TU capacity to protect health and safety by collective activity and poses threats to safety reps.
   * June 2016 -Brexit vote- great threats to health and safety legislation via Great Repeal Act, and via any new trade deals
   * CETA Signed – contains modified ISDS- Investor State Dispute Settlement clause which allows Canadian corporations to challenge existing or better UK health and safety and other protective laws as a barrier to trade.
   * May 2017 General Election Tory minority government – Manifesto confirms deregulation as key policy + Brexit threats
   * Rejuvenation of Red Tape Challenge specifically for Brexit by Oliver Letwin, former Cabinet Office minister said the Red Tape Initiative would take a sector-by-sector approach, launching around 10 inquiries to seek views on what EU constraints could be jettisoned in the interests of boosting productivity – held meeting on morning after Grenfell on what health and safety measures could be cut for construction materials…..
   * Great Repeal Bill – Taking all EU law ( that not already enacted into UK law which is most of health and safety) into UK law to be examined to see what can be scrapped. Threats this would be expanded to scrap existing non EU, and EU health and safety laws already enacted into EU legislation. It allows Government to use ‘Henry VIII’ powers to remove laws they don’t like without bringing them before Parliament for proper democratic scrutiny. Huge threat.
   * Paradoxically good health and safety now more essential than ever - workers are on their own, work is more intensified, nasty and brutish; social security benefits for being made too ill or injured to work, or sacked, are paltry and far harder to get; civil compensation far harder to get, and we all have to stay healthy to work longer to reach pension age.

   **A Better World for all is possible if we work together to fight back inside &outside work for decent jobs & lives**

   * **Hazards Campaign Demands for General Election ‘Hey! Whatcha gonna do? It’s time to step up and act for health and safety at work’:** [**http://www.hazards.org/votetodie**](http://www.hazards.org/votetodie)13 point plan including ‘The great deregulation lie’.
   * Educate, organise, campaign and agitate to keep work safe
   * Defend health and safety in your workplace, use all your rights, SRSCR not cut – yet!
   * Fight back -with members, union, community, specific campaigns & build support for good workplace health and safety; link work with community campaigns: Decent jobs for Decent lives!
   * Challenge and oppose government/corporation/media lies on deregulation and slashing enforcement with members, press, media, public forums; use FFI; Lobby MPs and MEPs, make the case for good health and safety as a human right and as economic benefit; reject any toxic free trade treaties with US or wherever which would give power to foreign corporations to sue UK/EU governments over protective laws, downgrade health and safety and chemical standards, allow corporations to write laws.
   * Be the eyes and ears of the much reduced HSE- raise ‘concerns’(complaints) using HSE’s new safety rep complaint/concerns process to report concerns AFTER exhausting internal procedures:<http://www.tuc.org.uk/workplace-issues/health-and-safety/safety-representatives/safety-representatives-resources/reporting>; http://www.hse.gov.uk/involvement/hsrepresentatives.htm
   * Reject the Race to the Bottom and fight for a Race to the Top in UK/Europe and Global Solidarity!
   * Support Hazards magazine for a safer, saner future where workers are at the centre of safety policy, not the victims of it and which is a win-win deal: <http://www.hazards.org/votetodie/citizensane>, HSB interview: <http://www.healthandsafetyatwork.com/hsw/hsb/citizen-sane-and-hse> ; **‘Like’** the We Love Red Tape facebook page: [www.facebook.com/votehazards](http://www.facebook.com/votehazards)

   Greater Manchester Hazards Centre acts as Secretariat for Hazards Campaign, Janet Newsham acts as Chair of National Hazards Campaign; Hilda Palmer, Facilitator of Families Against Corporate Killers

   **Greater Manchester Hazards Centre Windrush Millennium Centre, 70 Alexandra Road, Manchester M16 7WD**

   **T: 0161 636 7558 E:** [**info@hazardscampaign.org.uk**](mailto:info@hazardscampaign.org.uk) **Twitter @JNewsham @hazardscampaign @HildaPalmer** [↑](#endnote-ref-2)