

**Executive
Council
Report**

*conference
cancelled*



47

**47th Annual
Conference**

**Margate
May 16-18 1967**

SECTION G		<i>Para. Page</i>
Education		
Introduction	126
National School 1966	76 126
Regional Schools 1966	77 127
E.C. and District Officials' School	78 128
District Education Officers Meeting	79 128
T.U.C. Correspondence Courses	80 128
Scandinavian Study Days	81 129
SECTION H		
Obituary	130
SECTION I		
Accident and Injury Fund	131
APPENDIX A		
By What Yardstick	135

SECTION A

NEGOTIATIONS - NATIONAL JOINT COUNCIL AND LOCAL AUTHORITIES

NATIONAL JOINT COUNCIL: At the annual meeting held on July 21st, 1966, Alderman McVie of the Employers' Side was appointed Chairman for the ensuing year with the Union's President, Brother Enoch Humphries, as Vice-Chairman.

Brother Parry, General Secretary, was re-appointed as Secretary of the Employees' Side and together with Mr. R. E. Griffiths, representing the Employers, acts as Joint Secretary to the Council.

The Union's Executive Council with the addition of the Vice-President, Assistant General Secretary, Brothers P. Smith and B. Packer (Officers' National Committee) together with representatives of the National Association of Fire Officers, constitutes the Employees' Side.

Advisers to the Union are: Brother Bagley, National Officer in respect of retained conditions of service, and Sister G. Preston for firewomen.

National Joint Council Executive Committee — Union representatives: Brothers Humphries, Parry, Harris, Kilburn, Dean, Barber and Gunter.

National Joint Council Officers' Committee — Union representatives: Brothers Parry, General Secretary, E. Jones, Executive Council and B. Packer, Officers' National Committee.

National Joint Council Working Party — Union representatives: Brothers Humphries, Parry, Gunter, Harris, Dean, Barber, Rigby, Hyman and Paine.

Where reference is made in the following paragraphs to the sections and paragraphs of the Conditions of Service, these refer to the current issue. It is anticipated that the Grey Book will be fully amended and reprinted before Conference meets with the possibility that sections and paragraph numbers might be changed.

1 Wages and Hours

ON THE 20th January, the National Joint Council Working Party, set up to examine pay and duty systems, held its first meeting.

The Union was represented by Brothers Humphries, Parry, Harris, Gunter, Dean, Barber, Paine, Hyman and Rigby. A representative of the National Association of Fire Officers also attended.

At the very outset it was agreed that the Working Party was dealing only with the aspect of pay and hours as related to ranks below that of Station Officer. An invitation was extended to the N.A.F.O. representative to remain as an observer but was not accepted and their representative withdrew from the meeting.

Alderman A. E. McVie, of the Employers' Side, was appointed Chairman.

The Chairman stated that the purpose of the Working Party was to examine the applications of the Employees' Side in respect of:—

- (i) an improvement in the overtime rate to time-and-a-third of a man's actual basic pay based on the 48-hour week;
- (ii) the acceptance of the 48-hour week as the standard system of duty;
- (iii) a substantial wage increase with the maintenance of the existing differential for control room staffs (male) and equal pay for male and female control room staff.

Discussion ranged over a wide field of principle and detail. For the Employers it was stated that the key note of the current and previous agreements on duty systems was flexibility related to the differing needs of fire areas and the more economic use and development of manpower; that this was in accord with the Government's call to all sections of the community to help the country by increasing productivity against the background of a growing manpower shortage, and the Employees Side was asked to agree that there was a duty on both sides to see that these principles were as valid in 1966 as they had been in previous years.

The Employers would like to have an exchange of views on ways of improving productivity and the economic use of manpower which would produce more pay for more availability. Their view was that members of brigades would be most interested in more pay for more hours and that this should be pensionable. Reference was made to the Employees' application for removal of the restrictions on outside employment, and the Employers indicated that in their view it would be better for the service if the men were given opportunities to earn more money by doing more for the service rather than looking elsewhere for additional money.

The essence of the Employers' thinking, therefore, was more pay for more availability rather than shorter hours. The Employers expressed concern at local pressures by members for the 48-hour week and payment of overtime, which was in breach of the current agreement, and asked the Employees to exercise control over their members at local level while negotiations were in progress.

In an effort to support any national agreement it was suggested that there might be a committee at national level composed of both sides which would look at propositions from individual authorities or local members so as to prevent any excesses by either side.

For the Employees the General Secretary stated that if what the Employers had in mind was a national scheme for higher pensionable pay linked with more availability, then they would naturally be interested in the details, but they emphasised that in the absence of detailed proposals there could be no determinative consideration given to the matter. Any such proposal would require to operate nationally. They were not prepared to discuss schemes which left it to individual authorities to decide whether or not opportunities for extra earnings should be made available to the men.

The Employees' Side were particularly anxious not to see an extension of the day manning system, as such, in urban areas; and they were concerned that any proposals by the Employers' Side should not involve a forced movement to or occupation of tied houses. To this several members of the Employers' Side replied that the day manning system was in their experience popular with the men, and that in almost all cases the provision of accommodation provided no problem since most authorities were able to give some assistance to obtain alternative housing when the man left or died in service.

Referring to the application for the 48-hour week to be made the standard system of duty, the Employers were of the opinion that it was premature to answer this application while discussions were proceeding. There was first a need to undertake a deeper investigation of duty systems. To concede the 48-hour week now would be tantamount to giving a pay increase outside the agreement, and they invited the Employees' Side to confirm that they stood by the present agreement.

In reply Brother Parry indicated that he could understand the Employers taking this view, but that social needs of the time had been recognised by almost all fire authorities in conceding the 48-hour week. The Union could not now be expected not to press for the 48-hour week for the small number of brigades left on the 56-hour week duty systems.

Before concluding the first meeting, the Union urged the Employers to be ready at the next meeting to bring forward detailed proposals for examination.

The initial proposals

When discussions were resumed in April, the Employers, whose views in respect of duty systems had been clearly indicated at the first meeting, were prepared to set out their proposals whilst still not relating these propositions to pay.

They took as their starting point the fact that it was not possible to effect a direct comparison with industry in relation to hours since they were concerned with a service. In the national interest there was a need to have more effective use of manpower, as they hoped that this fact, allied with suitable pay adjustments, would provide a basis for arrangements acceptable to everyone. They wished to secure the co-operation of all parties including the Home Office in meeting standards of cover with economies in manpower. They would welcome views on proposals to reduce the basic systems to two—residential and shift working—although they felt that there was also room for the continuation of the 24/24 duty system.

The residential system, in the Employers' view, was suitable for many areas of the country at present covered by shift systems. The extra payments attached thereto would be related to the 48-hour week and would be an improvement in those now payable. There would need to be provision for sympathetic treatment of housing problems. The proposals were without prejudice to the existing retained service.

The shift system would be used in areas where the nature of the risks, including intensity of calls, render the residential system unsuitable or where residential systems could not be applied for reasons relating

to housing, etc., problems; although as a long term objective this possibility should be borne in mind. It was hoped that men on a 48-hour week could, where required by the fire authority, provide extra hours of operational or administrative work (particularly in respect of fire prevention) for extra pay.

The Employers proposed to set a date for those men still working a 56-hour week to reduce to 48 hours. The 24/24 system which seemed to be liked by some members, would be retained but with improved payments. The proposals, however, involved long-term action, and there was therefore a need to consider interim action.

It had to be borne in mind that the Government's approach on prices and incomes set a norm for increases in pay, and this 3½% norm would be applicable to the Fire Service unless other factors were taken into account. There was an opportunity, however, to increase pay in return for extra liability or productivity.

The Employers were trying to take a constructive view of the needs of the Fire Service and of the economy of the country. The Employers accepted that there were bound to be difficulties in settling the relationship of the proposals to pay, but that in the present context of Government policy, additional contributions to productivity could justify pay increases above the norm. The Employers hoped that the proposals would be attractive to the members because only by such means would pay improvements above norm be possible and acceptable to the authorities because manpower economies would be achieved. There might, of course, be a case for the N.J.C. to exercise a certain amount of control over the detailed implementation of such an agreement.

In reply to a question, the Employers' Secretary agreed that eventually the object would be to have as many men as practicable on the residential system of duty.

In reply the Employees' Secretary, Brother Parry, said that the Employers had covered familiar ground which had all been heard before and amounted to really nothing more than the present extended duty systems arrangements. Since no firm figures had been mentioned there was a need for the Employers to go further than this if the exercise was to be worthwhile.

The Employees' Side were concerned about the extension of the residential system which in time might mean that the day manning system was introduced to many stations in urban areas. In their view the residential system was not just a job but a way of life more or less akin to barrack life, due to the necessity for members and their families to live adjacent to or on the station. This could mean that some 10,000 families could be asked to lead a completely different way of life. As in other productivity deals the price must be named, and since the Employers were asking to buy the way of life of a man and his family, were they thinking along the lines of a £1,500 a year fireman? The Employees' Side would also wish to emphasise that any proposals should be applicable equally to all members uniformly throughout the whole of the Fire Service.

The Employees' pay claim was for a substantial increase based on

(1) wage drift which had worsened the fireman's position by 42s. 3d. per week, (2) the reduction in the working week generally applicable in other employments to 40 hours and the social imbalance created thereby. The pay claim, it was understood, was for settlement by August, 1966, but the claims for overtime to be calculated on the basis of time and a third and for the 48-hour week to be made the standard were for immediate settlement. The General Secretary reminded the Employers that the Fire Brigades Union would be holding their Annual Conference in May, and that it was impossible to judge the Employers' proposals on the present basis.

The General Secretary reiterated that there was no prospect of acceptance of the Employers' proposals unless they covered all brigades and that it would be necessary to tell their members what would be involved in the Employers' proposals. They could not ask their members to vote and decide on something which they could not fully appreciate.

It was at this meeting that the attitude of the Employers towards the Service and firemen became crystal clear. There was no basis, they claimed, for comparing firemen and their pay packets with industrial workers. Firemen do not work 48 or 56 hours a week! Firemen were allowed to count meal breaks in their working week!

Members' Reaction

With the attitude of the Employers quite clear, the Executive Council determined that the membership should be made aware of likely developments. To this end Head Office officials and Executive Council members addressed meetings of combined District membership throughout the length and breadth of the country.

Nowhere were firemen prepared to "sell out" on the 48-hour week that had been achieved, or forego the promise of a 48-hour week, if this was to be the limit of the Employers' understanding. Reject any thought of a return to longer duty systems!

If the bar to comparison of hours and earnings with industrial workers was the counting of meal breaks in weekly hours or the standby periods waiting for fires, then, said the membership, "put firemen on a 40-hour week and we will make suitable arrangements to work 40 hours."

With the experience of these meetings behind them the Executive Council resolved to withdraw from any further discussions on extended duty systems, and in May, the General Secretary despatched the following letter to the Employers' Secretary:—

3rd May, 1966.

Dear Mr. Griffiths,

Fire Service Pay and Duty Systems

During the period that the National Joint Council Working Party on Fire Services' Pay and Duty Systems has been in being the Union has had the benefit of exchanges on these matters with many thousands of its members at many centres throughout the country. It was therefore in the light of these experiences that my Executive Council were able to consider the Employers' paper on Fire Brigades' Duty Systems.

My Executive Council have noted that as distinct from new national standard proposals on Duty Systems the document does in fact retain all the main diverse arrangements of the existing Duty Systems Agreement.

Although it is true no figures were offered, from what was said it is quite apparent that, for instance, in the case of Residential Systems what is on offer is at best only a marginal increase on what is already available for the Day Manning System in the present Duty System Agreement. My Executive Council had a very thorough discussion on this part of the Employers' document and in the end decided against becoming involved any further in discussions on that System of Duty. To reiterate what was said at the Working Party meeting my Executive Council feel that the reintroduction of a Residential System to the Fire Service is to involve firemen not so much in an extension of hours but as a new way of life which also involves their families; something which is out of keeping with modern social progress.

My Executive Council were indeed most concerned by the strong way in which the Employers' Side of the Working Party kept pressing the view that firemen's hours should not be considered as equivalent to hours worked in industry because it was said only part of a fireman's duty time was active duty. They feel that this outlook completely fails to give recognition to the conditions of hazard which firemen face constantly. Every man going on duty in the Fire Service goes fully prepared to take all the risks involved in fire fighting for the full tour of his duty. The function of fire-fighting requires a man on duty to be adjacent to a fire engine for the whole of his duty period, and my Executive Council consider that it is only reasonable that all hours spent on duty at the Fire Station should be paid for as such.

The Fire Service is about the only service or industry where the principle of a 40-hour week has not yet been conceded. The majority of the resolutions in the Hours Section of the Union's Annual Conference Agenda are calling for a 42 or 40-hour week for the Fire Service.

It could well be that to exclude any further discussions on Residential Duty Systems would have an effect on the Employers' views to other parts of their document. One question bound to be asked at the Union's Annual Conference is whether or not, with the exclusion of Residential Systems, there is a basis on which the Employers are prepared to talk about more economic use of manpower in a manner which recognises correctly the social disparity of the long hours of duty of firemen. This in fact is the point which we feel ought to be discussed at the meeting of Joint Secretaries and Officers of the Council prior to the Union's Annual Conference.

(Signed) Terence Parry,
General Secretary.

Discussions Continue

At the next meeting of the Working Party the Employers' Secretary referred to the communication received from the General Secretary and

expressed the hope that there would be a frank interchange of views between both sides on the question of duty systems. The Employers expressed surprise at the Employees' attitude to an extension of residential systems, since it was their experience that those members who were conditioned to it seemed to like it. The residential system provided good pay for the members and a good bargain for the community in that it was economical in the use of manpower.

They wished to emphasise the usefulness of the residential system and their desire to adjust pay in the Fire Service to take account of trends elsewhere towards a reduction in hours. To this end they had in mind to propose a forward date for the 48-hour week to be made the basic or standard system; the retention of the other systems so as to maintain flexibility; an improvement in the extra duty allowances for day manning and the 24/24 systems; an improvement in the overtime rates; the extra duty allowances and regular rostered overtime to be made pensionable and a pay increase which took account of the norm and also of the reduction in standard hours. The Employers felt that in respect of the latter an adjustment in pay equal to around 2 hours would be appropriate, current general reductions in hours being of that order.

The Employers emphasised that consideration of productivity would not only be a help to the country but would also help in reaching an agreement producing increases above the norm of 3½ per cent.

Thus, the third meeting of the Working Party saw a shift in the Employers' position. *For the first time the Union's pay claim was being discussed. There is no doubt that the views of the membership, expressed at the mass meetings and conveyed in the letter of 3rd May were instrumental in bringing about this change.*

Employers' Offer

Before the Working Party met again, the General Secretary was able to forward to the Employers' Secretary details of pay and hours of firemen employed at major airports by the Ministry of Civil Aviation. At the same time attention was drawn to the rates of pay for firemen employed at airports run by local authorities. The Employers' Secretary was reminded that pay and hours for local authority airport firemen were superior to those of the local authority fire brigades, although the respective Joint Councils had the same Employers' Secretary:—

29th June, 1966.

Dear Mr. Griffiths,

It will be our intention to submit one or two further considerations to the N.J.C. Working Party when it considers firemen's pay and hours on 1st July, 1966, and I thought it would be helpful to give prior indication of these matters to the Employers' Side.

Firstly—we would draw the attention of the Employers' Side to the level of remuneration of firemen employed at the major airports in Great Britain.

The rates of pay and weekly hours of firemen employed at major municipal airports you will be conversant with as the Secretary of the National Joint Council for Local Authorities' Conditions

of Service. You will know that the earnings of that group, based on an average week of 48 hours, substantially exceed the rate of pay for top rate firemen employed in local authorities' fire brigades also on a 48-hour week, although firemen employed at Abbotsinch, Ringway and Elmdon are also employees of Glasgow, Manchester and Birmingham corporations (all of whom incidentally also pay a plus rate to members of their city fire brigades). At Speke aerodrome fire cover is provided by the Liverpool City Fire Brigade, who also pay a plus rate.

The Employers may not know of the rates of pay of firemen employed at major airports by the Ministry of Civil Aviation, and I therefore set out for their information, the details of the most recent agreement for firemen employed by that Ministry at Heathrow, Gatwick, Stansted, and Prestwick.

Firemen employed at Heathrow, Gatwick, Stansted and Prestwick Airports: Revised rates of pay and overtime rates from 27th February, 1966.

REVISED RATES OF PAY

The revised rates of pay for a week of 40 hours net, which will be reckonable for all purposes, will be as follows:—

Grade	Heathrow		Elsewhere	
	Heathrow	Elsewhere	Heathrow	Elsewhere
Fireman	Trainee	278/4	265/10	
	1st year	288/4	275/10	
	2nd year	295/10	283/4	
	3rd year	303/4	290/10	
	4th year	310/10	298/4	
	5th year	318/4	305/10	
Leading Fireman	6th year	325/10	313/4	
	1st year	313/6	301/-	
	2nd year	321/-	308/6	
	3rd year	328/6	316/-	
	4th year	336/-	323/6	
	5th year	343/6	331/-	

(These rates apply only to adult males. Employees under 21 years of age will be paid at the appropriate percentage of the adult rate).

REVISED OVERTIME RATES

Overtime, calculated on a daily basis, will be paid at the following hourly rates:—

Grade	Weekdays	Sundays	Public Holidays	
			(except Christmas Day)	Christmas Day
Heathrow				
Fireman Trainee	10/7½	11/10½	11/10½	14/2
1st year	11/-	12/2½	12/2½	14/8
Leading Fireman	12/-	13/3¾	13/3¾	15/11¾

Elsewhere

Fireman Trainee	10/1¼	11/3¼	11/3¼	13/6½
1st year	10/6¼	11/8¼	11/8¼	14/0½
Leading Fireman	11/6¼	12/9½	11/9½	15/4¼

For each year above first, the above hourly rates should be increased by the following amounts:—

Weekdays 3½d.

Sundays 3¼d.

Public Holidays (except Christmas Day) 3¼d.

Christmas Day 4½d.

If a full Saturday night or Sunday morning or afternoon shift is worked as overtime, the appropriate Sunday shift premium will be paid in addition to basic pay for the hours worked.

SHIFT AND SUNDAY PAY

The following *daily* premium payments apply.

	Sunday	Night	Morning and afternoon
Fireman	60/-	20/-	10/-
Leading Fireman	63/6	21/-	10/6

(Shifts commencing on Saturday night are paid Sunday shift payment.

Shifts commencing on Sunday night are paid night shift only).

CALL MONEY

Any worker who, having completed a normal day's work (this to include a normal shift or normal night's work) and having left his normal place of employment without having been notified that he is required to work overtime and having thereafter been summoned from home to work during overtime hours, shall be paid the sum of 10/- as "call money" in addition to any payment to which he becomes entitled by reason of working.

Secondly—no doubt you will have studied Report No. 18 of the National Board for Prices and Incomes on the pay of industrial civil servants, and while it could not be claimed that the structure of that group of work people was in any way parallel with the Fire Service, nevertheless we believe it worthy of note that a clear factor which does emerge from that report is that the Prices and Incomes Board is firmly recommending that:—

"In the new pay structure for each industrial group pay would be best expressed in terms of a weekly wage for a 40-hour week. It would clearly not be possible to establish what it should be without some initial regard, at least in the case of key occupations, to the actual level of wages (not basic rates) for a 40-hour week for time workers engaged in similar activities in outside employment."