

I may say there are no other Members of the Board here, but this is a unanimous feeling on the part of the three Members of the Board.

Mr. SISK. Thank you for that statement. Are there any other statements?

Mr. GREENE. I have a statement.

Mr. SISK. Would you like to make a statement?

Mr. GREENE. Yes, sir. As Director of Industrial Safety, I have the job of seeing to it that the safety regulations of the District of Columbia are complied with in places of employment. Through the years, the extent of the coverage of the Industrial Safety Act presents no problems either to our office or to the courts, for it was accepted that the law applied to all places of employment, excluding only places where federal or district employees worked.

Through the years our division received reports from the United States Employment Service as to the number of employees working within the District of Columbia and types of industries involved. We also receive all accident reports from the Bureau of Employees' Compensation, as required in the original law. In fiscal 1966, these reports indicated that approximately 290,000 people worked in private employment and that 29,758 of these workers suffered on-the-job injuries; 11,984 were disabling and 38 were fatal. These figures have been a part of the Commissioners' annual report since 1941.

The Industrial Safety Division is the only agency which investigates accidents which occur at places of employment. In a typical week, the Police Department or the Fire Department reports an amputation at the Railroad terminal, a fall down a stairs by a retail clerk, a death to a construction worker, and an electric shock injury to a worker in a drug store. We have been investigating accidents of this type for years and saw clear authority to do so.

H.R. 1264 would erase the possibility of any narrow interpretation of the Industrial Safety Law and permit the division to investigate accidents, investigate complaints of unsafe working conditions, inspect workplaces, and educate both employers and employees all for the betterment of all the working population in the District of Columbia.

Mr. SISK. Thank you, Mr. Greene.

Mr. King, do you have any comment?

Mr. KING. No, I have nothing to add.

Mr. SISK. With reference to your statement, Mr. Kneipp, I wanted to ask a few questions to understand just how broad you felt the proposed legislation would go. As I understand it, you are a bit fearful that maybe it goes a little bit too far, is that right?

For example, go to a private home employing domestic help, do I understand that you feel that would be covered under existing law?

Mr. KNEIPP. Yes, sir, under the bill.

Mr. SISK. Under the proposal.

Mr. KNEIPP. Yes, sir.

Mr. SISK. I would like to correct that.

Mr. KNEIPP. I think the proposal is this, Mr. Chairman. I am not saying that these domestics shouldn't be protected, but I think that we should look at what burden would be placed on the housewife, for example, if the domestic were injured in her home.

She would come under the burden of the Act. She would have to make her reports to the Industrial Safety people, and I think the idea