

behind the possible exclusion of domestic, agricultural workers and persons engaged in casual employment is that to avoid burdening their employers with all of the provisions of the Industrial Safety Act, which are rather involved, and which provisions would hardly be expected to be within the knowledge of the average housewife, for example.

Since Congress in making the Longshoremen and Harbor Workers' Act applicable to the District saw fit to exclude certain employees, including agricultural, domestic, casual employees, the Commissioners take the position that the Industrial Safety Act should be given the same coverage and exemptions, just from the standpoint of uniformity, if nothing else.

Mr. SISK. I would like to ask for any comment you might have, and I am not trying to create any controversy between the witnesses. Mr. Greene, as the Director, do you have any comments on this? What would you see as being the problem of enforcement, and so on, if it was interpreted to be that broad? Would it again afford you problems, or what would be your reaction?

Mr. GREENE. We have problems now covering the people we have authority to cover, because of the lack of staff and budget considerations. Trying to get into homes would present many administrative problems, and since we would have no record of when or how these people get hurt, because there is no provision in the law now, mechanics for reporting these type of accidents to our office—in the law now we receive all employment compensation reports, so we know, we get a picture of what is happening among the average, the regular workers in the city. But we have no way of knowing what would happen in the home, and we probably would not have the force to even get into investigating anything like that.

Then another thing is, I don't know of any workers that would come under the agricultural category here in the District of Columbia whatsoever. I don't know of any even listed in any report under that category.

Mr. SISK. Certainly it sounds to me like it would place an undue burden all right, if we attempted let's say to cover homes. I recognize that there are certain laws protecting domestics. Most all of us as homeowners carry protection in the event of injuries in a home.

On the other hand, I want to be certain that in any amendment changes we don't leave a loophole, because after all, in the final analysis I would assume, Mr. Kneipp, this is a question, certainly hotel employees and so on, you would expect to be covered.

Mr. KNEIPP. Yes.

Mr. SISK. And maids and so on who would be employed in hotels. Do you interpret the language as being broad enough, for example, to cover a stenographer in a lawyer's office?

Mr. KNEIPP. I think it would, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SISK. A clerk in a retail office?

Mr. KNEIPP. Yes.

Mr. SISK. In a real estate office?

Mr. KNEIPP. Yes.

Mr. SISK. How about a newspaper delivery boy?

Mr. KNEIPP. I think he would be covered.

Mr. GREENE. He is self-employed.