Subject: Mine Safety and Bush
Posted by Manualblock on Sat, 21 Jan 2006 21:35:44 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

The administration and secretary and Bush appointee Chao have forced budget cuts and personell cuts in the Mine Safety Division to appease the corporate mining interests. Safety is now almost non-existant in new mining operations. In Europe they think we are deliberately putting our people at risk to save pennies. They have oxygen stations and location devices as a matter of course as well as inspections. The Bushwacker doesn't like those precautions because they cost several pennies per man-day worked so he let the owners flag those fundamental regulations.Now there are 15 dead in one month.Time for the union movement to rise again for the same reason they did 150 yrs ago; to protect the workers from the owners. And the Bush should hang his useless head in shame.

Subject: Re: Mine Safety and Bush
Posted by PakProtector on Sun, 22 Jan 2006 02:51:29 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Bush's head is not useless. It has served him and his buddies quite well. It would serve his opponents just as well as the ornament on top of a pike.It is too bad the unions seem bent on getting some set number of minutes for potty breaks on assembly lines, and re-instating serious screw-ups...instead of doing honourable work.Read of John Henry, and play a few ballads to one of the pre-union martyrs. cheers,Douglas

Subject: Re: Mine Safety and Bush
Posted by Manualblock on Sun, 22 Jan 2006 04:30:04 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Yeah; thats true but in their defense the laws and economic realities are against them. Try any serious negotiating or organising and you are in court the next day. Look at how the local government clamp down on organising at Wal-Mart. How the hell they can defeat the workers right to speak to employees is beyond me.Think of all the anti-strike laws on the books now; and as soon as you talk tough they threaten to outsource the whole business rather than treat you fairly.The deck is seriously stacked against even the concept of honoring a contract by management; look at the airlines where the courts simply dissolved a binding contract in the flick of an eye when the companies cried.9 % of labor is organised; not enough to have any influence at the polls. No; it's going to be a long hard road back to workers rights in this country; but you see it coming; all those court battles that are starting to tilt a little towards labor. I guess people are getting tired of being expendable; having no rights; having management dissolve contracts; not having any security or benefits. Shitty way to live.

Subject: Re: Mine Safety and Bush
Posted by PakProtector on Sun, 22 Jan 2006 13:19:12 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Part of the union trouble is that they have squandered their power doing foolish things. Protecting those who misbehave and the like. Unfortunately, it is possible to point to as many union atrocities as they have prevented. Just ask your local featherbeder.cheers,Douglas

Subject: Re: Mine Safety and Bush
Posted by Manualblock on Sun, 22 Jan 2006 13:50:51 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I know; I served as a union rep for over ten years on the railroad. Unfortunatelly there are no perfect organisations and there will always be those who game the system and abuse the rules. Remmember that goes for those in management also.But let me say this. The great majority of union workers want to do the job and give a good days work for their pay. Do we have ocassionally to carry someone who is less than stellar in performance? Yep; a small percentage just like the deadwood brother-in -law and friends of the boss that we as workers must support in their incompetence in the upper echelon. For every union worker who is off base we had to carry one manager promoted for reasons other than competence.This is an old argument and studying the situation tells another story. Look to those unions that have remained strong and vital; high steel workers/fireman/local 3 electrical workers...the list grows. Talk to those guys then tell me they are not committed to hard work and pride of accomplishment. Empowering workers with control over their duties and rewards and providing a safe working environment always results in positive outcomes; without fail.

Subject: Re: Mine Safety and Bush
Posted by Steve Eddy on Mon, 23 Jan 2006 02:51:58 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

The administration and secretary and Bush appointee Chao have forced budget cuts and personell cuts in the Mine Safety Division to appease the corporate mining interests. Safety is now almost non-existant in new mining operations.Really?Last I looked, we were a federal republic comprising some fifty states which were granted the broadest powers under the Constitution. Powers for example which would allow states to regulate mining operations as they see fit. Has there been a constitutional amendment or convention that I missed? I haven't kept up with politics as much as I used to, but I'd like to think I'd have noticed something like that.se

Subject: Re: Mine Safety and Bush
Posted by Manualblock on Mon, 23 Jan 2006 14:43:12 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Mine Safety issues fall under the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977. The federal govt. is responsible for policing mine safety issues across the states and the budget for this is under a federal mandate.

Subject: Re: Mine Safety and Bush
Posted by Steve Eddy on Mon, 23 Jan 2006 17:10:25 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Mine Safety issues fall under the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977. The federal govt. is responsible for policing mine safety issues across the states and the budget for this is under a federal mandate.So? None of that prohibits states from having and enforcing their own mine safety regulations.So where do you get the notion that if the Feds aren't doing their job (which personally I don't believe it is their job), that "safety is now almost non-existent in new mining operations"?se

Subject: Re: Mine Safety and Bush
Posted by Manualblock on Mon, 23 Jan 2006 17:23:54 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Federal Regulations control Mine Safety Issues. Mining Comanies are going to abide by those regulations. Are you saying that States have the ability to over-ride the federal Government rules and establish contrary Mining Safety rules and then tax the citizens heavily in order to provide their own oversight agencies that might or would conflict with the federal government agencies?Which regulations would the companies abide by; the Federal rules that are favorable to them or the state rules that cost them money?

Subject: Re: Mine Safety and Bush
Posted by Steve Eddy on Mon, 23 Jan 2006 17:54:35 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Federal Regulations control Mine Safety Issues.At the federal level.Mining Comanies are going to abide by those regulations.They must also abide by state regulations.Are you saying that States have the ability to over-ride the federal Government rules and establish contrary Mining Safety

rules and then tax the citizens heavily in order to provide their own oversight agencies that might or would conflict with the federal government agencies? They certainly do.Which regulations would the companies abide by; the Federal rules that are favorable to them or the state rules that cost them money?If the state regulations are more strict, they would have to abide by the state regulations, just as automobile makers who sell cars in California must abide by our more strict fuel and emissions standards.And virtually every state which has mining has mining safety regulations. So this notion that because the Feds aren't doing their job (and I don't know that they aren't) that safety is now almost non-existent in new mining operations is just plain nonsense and apparently little more than partisan politics.se

---

Subject: Re: Mine Safety and Bush
Posted by Manualblock on Mon, 23 Jan 2006 18:00:36 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Let me qualify that last statement. The Federal Bureau of Mine Safety controls the issue of enforcing Mine Safety in this country. Just like the FAA controls the issue of Airline and flight safety and Just like the FRA controls the issue of Railroad safety. These administrative bodies are headed by political appointees whose job it is to enforce the safety standards enacted by the federal government.The states don't do this because one; The government needs uniform rules and regulations across the whole country. Otherwise any state with heavily represented mining interests would have weak or unsafe conditions just like the airways or railroads.Two; the mining companies are interstate and as such are federal issues.The Executive Branch appoints the heads of the various regulatory agencies who then create and establish the regulations under which these agencies operate and they have the police powers required to insure compliance.I don't know what your point is but that is how it works.On the Railroad no state agency had any power to tell us what we could do in terms of safety. That was regulated by the Feds in the form of the FRA.

Subject: Re: Mine Safety and Bush
Posted by Manualblock on Mon, 23 Jan 2006 18:03:52 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

See above statement.

Subject: Re: Mine Safety and Bush
Posted by Steve Eddy on Mon, 23 Jan 2006 18:58:31 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Let me qualify that last statement. The Federal Bureau of Mine Safety controls the issue of enforcing Mine Safety in this country. Just like the FAA controls the issue of Airline and flight safety and Just like the FRA controls the issue of Railroad safety. These administrative bodies are headed by political appointees whose job it is to enforce the safety standards enacted by the federal government.The states don't do this because one; The government needs uniform rules and regulations across the whole country. Otherwise any state with heavily represented mining interests would have weak or unsafe conditions just like the airways or railroads.Two; the mining companies are interstate and as such are federal issues.The Executive Branch appoints the heads of the various regulatory agencies who then create and establish the regulations under which these agencies operate and they have the police powers required to insure compliance.I don't know what your point is but that is how it works.That's how it works, huh?Well if that's how it works, and the federal government has sole control over mining safety issues, then could you please explain the Virginia Coal Mine Safety Act (which I mention seeing as it was in the state of Virginia that both of these recent accidents occurred)?If things work the way you say, then you'd better alert the folks of Virginia that their state laws regarding mining safety are null and void. Apparently neither Virginia's Governor nor the members of the Virginia Assembly were aware of this as they amended it about a year ago in order to increase safety standards as well as civil penalties for violations that result in injury or death.se

---

Subject: Re: Mine Safety and Bush
Posted by Manualblock on Mon, 23 Jan 2006 19:19:02 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Every state can express legislation that covers aspects of the safety issue affecting specific issues that occurs in their state. The FMSHA is the governing body that sets mine safety regulations for the country. One of the mandatory safety violations occuring at the Sago mine was the lack of a federal mine safety inspector on the premisis requiered by the FMSHA and the Mining Act of 1977 and it's amendment in 1986. In the event of safety issues brought before the FMSHA the federal regulations hold precedent.All states have bodies of regulations pertaining to specific issues that their state may find in unique circumstances. The Feds run the show. In the case of a dispute federal regulations govern the issue.Please don't try to semantically cloud the story. The FMSHA is the responsible body insuring that the safety rules are followed. They have the power to fine and punish violators.You know my post never suggested there were no laison regulatory bodies on the state level; that would be silly. The feds are the responsible governing body.The budget for safety enforcement and the manpower needed to accomplish that was cut by the current administration Thats a fact and this is the result.Why trivialise the issue and try to shift blame? Thats why the Governer of West Virginia is going to the White House to petition the President for enforcement of the safety standards. If the state was responsible for managing mine safety enforcement he would go to the State Capital.On the side I have never seen a president with so many apologists for his incompetence. Whenever the Federal Government screws up the Bush fans run out to find a scapegoat. It's shamefull. He should be a man and accept his failures. The buck stops there; in the words of a real president. Stop apologising for his incompetence and lack of concern for the citizenry.

Subject: Re: Mine Safety and Bush
Posted by Steve Eddy on Mon, 23 Jan 2006 19:45:58 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

On the side I have never seen a president with so many apologists for his incompetence. Whenever the Federal Government screws up the Bush fans run out to find a scapegoat. It's shamefull. He should be a man and accept his failures. The buck stops there; in the words of a real president. Stop apologising for his incompetence and lack of concern for the citizenry.I make no apologies for Bush who I have never voted for and couldn't give two shits about.My gripe is with those who mistakenly believe that the sun rises and sets on Washington, DC, and that if Washington isn't doing it, then it doesn't exist.You said that due to the Bush administration (which conveniently leaves out the entire legislative branch which says something about your agenda here) safety is now almost non-existent in new mining operations.That's just complete and utter bullshit. There are state laws, regulations and agencies which address issues of mine safety quite independently of the federal government, such that even if the federal government did nothing at all with regard to mine safety, your statement would still be complete and utter bullshit.Your "buck stops here" comment while making for quaint political rhetoric ignores the fact that it is state and local government which has the greatest responsibility for the safety and wellbeing of its citizens. If anyone is being an apologist here it is you, apologizing for those entities which have the greatest responsibility and subsequently the greatest culpability with regard to any lack of safety regulations and their enforcement that there may be here.se

Subject: Re: Mine Safety and Bush
Posted by Manualblock on Mon, 23 Jan 2006 20:41:43 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

The President appoints his cabinet members and those positions in the federal government involving the regulatory agencies. Thats what an incoming administration does. He appointed the secretary of the In terior who oversees this administration. It is not the Congress who does this and it is not the states. It is the president and his cabinet.So much for my agenda and your understanding of government. Of course this is politically motivated; the president's hiree's failed; he's a politician hence the political component of this post.The regulatory bodies stem from the executive branch and it is their reponsibility to insure that the regulations are in place and enforced not the states, nothing to do with rising or setting suns; just with doing your job.As far as my post being bullshit I will offer you the same courtesy.The safety measures required by all of the rest of the worlds mining industry are watered down by the Bush administration. Do some research.

Subject: Re:CSPAN is Broadcasting the FEDERAL GOVT Hearing on It's Responsibility in the SAGO mine disaster.
Posted by Manualblock on Mon, 23 Jan 2006 23:24:39 GMT

The hearings concerning the federal governments responsibility regarding the Sago mine disaster are on CSpann 2. You can watch them now and see the truth if you are really serious about this.

Subject: Re: Mine Safety and Bush
Posted by Bill Martinelli on Tue, 24 Jan 2006 00:17:20 GMT

I wouldn't mean to minimize the tragedy or deaths of mine workers; but do honestly believe the fed should be responsible for controlling mine safety? I would think the safety act of 77 was an intent for some guidelines and minimum standards. I don't think the fed should have the responsibility for policing mines. I would rather see it done by the state and county. Who was president in 77, Carter? any idea what the plan was intended for?

Subject: Re: Mine Safety and Bush
Posted by Manualblock on Tue, 24 Jan 2006 01:38:04 GMT

Well let me address the point of your post here. The mining industry is very labor intensive/dangerous and it's importance to the economy of this country is very high. I can't quote the exact figure but it is substantial the amount of energy we get from coal. I could look it up but I know you know.The potential damage to property and lives in the event of an explosion or disaster is significant to say the least and the amount of resources needed to extricate and process coal is a significant figure of our GNP.Those factors alone should be indicative of why the federal government is deeply involved in the regulation of the whole coal mining and energy supply infrastructure.Then there is the issue of national security; during the energy crisis of the 70's the fact that we rely on coal to a great extent for our energy needs prompted many new legislative initiatives.But as a simple logical explanation the federal government is deeply involved in every industry that is deemed of importance to our economy and security. Steel/coal/transportation/oil/electrical generating capacity/ you see.Then from personal experience I can tell you that when lives are at stake; when a mistake or faulty process can kill people as it does pretty regularly in the coal industry; we take it very seriously. I would fax you a report on a train accident where a guy was killed due to a violation of the automatic block signal rules. The report is over 500 pages and it includes stuff all the way back to what the Engineer got on his SAT's. No shit. It's a different outlook when you are the guy in the white bronco they are rushing to the nearest emergency room for a drug test after an accident. My point? They take the loss of life seriously enough to require that safe practices be monitored and controlled on the federal level so as to provide for oversight and uniformity of code. One solid mine explosion could take out a town. There is not enough money in most state tax coffers to provide the kind and amount of oversight needed for these industries and they must be monitored by an agency that answers to

the highest authority for the reasons I cite.Thats the best answer I can offer. I am sure a good attorny who deals with the National Transportation Safety Board; or the Secretary of State could provide a much more complete answer. This is only my experience and small knowledge of how this stuff works.On a personal level; would you really want to be in some coal mine 400 feet underground in a state where you know they have no resources to fund the agencies required to insure your safety? I mean they require by law that a mine safety inspector be onsight during all operations.So lets say it was a nuclear facility; would you want the local town councilman running the agency for safety of plant operations; Homer Simpson?

Subject: Re: Mine Safety and Bush
Posted by cheetah on Tue, 24 Jan 2006 03:44:05 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I don't recall there having ever been the kind of saftey stations, that the WVa, legislature is pushing through the State House. But oh yes, Bush is responsable for ALL this nations wrongs for the past 200 yrs.

Subject: Re: Mine Safety and Bush
Posted by Leland Crooks on Tue, 24 Jan 2006 11:50:26 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Just the last 4 or 5. Aside from his "with me or against me mentality" which I could live with, his squandering of the international goodwill after 9/11 is the single most egregious thing he's done. The whole world was behind us. Even lots of folks who don't like us. With a little diplomacy, we could have been standing astride the world as an even greater beacon of democracy. And still have gone after the terrorists, possibly even his pet project Iraq. As it is now, we've become almost a pariah, it will take 20 years to recover. Only our economic and military strength make them listen now, our moral highground has washed away like a New Orleans dike.

Subject: Re: Mine Safety and Bush
Posted by Manualblock on Tue, 24 Jan 2006 11:51:36 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

The MSHA after the 1977 legislation cut mine deaths by more than half. The Bush administration appointee's cut 10% from the agencies budget; 9% of the mine safety inspectors from 1180 to 1043; disregarded the fines levied against private non-union mine owners and lowered the fine's on average more than 250%; from an average of 1500$ for an infraction to less than 150$ then never even collected the fines; backlogged over two years. They rescinded the two exit regulation

and refused to implement the GPS system and the oxygen station safety system.The mine owners responsible for this Sago incident gave the Bush campaign well over a million dollars in donations.

Subject: Re: Mine Safety and Bush
Posted by Manualblock on Tue, 24 Jan 2006 11:56:05 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

9/11 was the action of a criminal gang of Saudi extremists. The proper venue for investigation and apprehension of the criminals who blew up the World Trade Center was the international police and the FBI. They would have captured Osama by now. With the co-operation of the whole world offered by almost every nation of whom most lost people in the bombing. Instead we went to another country to steal oil for the friends of George.

Subject: Re: Mine Safety and Bush
Posted by fitz on Thu, 26 Jan 2006 16:47:55 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Well there were 47 coal mine deaths in 1995, as opposed to 22 in 2005. The highest in 10 years.Bush pulled a pretty neat trick under Clinton.

Subject: Re: Mine Safety and Bush
Posted by Manualblock on Thu, 26 Jan 2006 20:57:31 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I see you looked at the first mining safety site listed on the web.Without going deeply into the data here is the comparison.In 1995 there were just shy of 143k miners working. They mined just shy of 200 million tons of coal.In 2005 there were 103k miners mining just shy of 146 mill tons of coal.The percentage of deaths per ton of coal mined and the no of mine workers equals .o32% in 1995 vs .022% in 2002. There are numbers of years during the Clinton administration where the average mine death per worker/tons mined is lower than the .022% figure. 1995 was a year in which; due to a spike in coal prices there were mines opened that were not safe and did not comply with the Mine Safety Act of 1977 and 1985.There is much more to this story but don't quote the figures for one year like somehow that tells the whole story.

Subject: Re: Mine Safety and Bush
Posted by fitz on Thu, 26 Jan 2006 21:23:47 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Subject: Re: Mine Safety and Bush
Posted by Manualblock on Thu, 26 Jan 2006 22:18:47 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Clinton was down in the mine clearing out the debris and hammering up supports. He fixes the mines all by himself.Clinton hasn't been president for over 5 yrs. But you guys still bring him up; miss him ehh?Most reasonable people wish he could run again.

Subject: Re: Mine Safety and Bush
Posted by fitz on Thu, 26 Jan 2006 23:13:21 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Thanks for confirming my post. Have fun complaining.

Subject: Re:Yep; things are much better now.,
Posted by Manualblock on Thu, 26 Jan 2006 23:32:32 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

nt