Mrs. NEWMAN. I am not sure they would be covered.

Mr. KNEIPP. I think there is some controversy.

Mr. GREENE. As to whether they are casual workers or not.

Mr. SISK. I was going to say, in the amendment as I understand it, I have not had an opportunity, by the way, to study the Commissioners' report and to analyze exactly the amendments they propose, but as to this idea of casual workers, how would you interpret "casual worker"? I believe you mentioned that in your statement, is that right, Mr. Kneipp?

Mr. KNEIPP. Yes, Mr. Chairman. I think a casual worker at least in my thinking, is the handyman, the person that a householder might employ to remove some trash or do odd jobs about the house; he is not necessarily a domestic. He is just a sort of handyman. Whether you call him a domestic or not is another question.

Mr. SISK. That is true if he was working let's say in my home or in your home. Yet, let's say an individual might fall under that category if he was doing a minor repair on a faucet, although the work might fall under the job of plumber.

I mean you might use a casual worker in a place of business or somewere else. I just want to be sure that in any definition we get involved with here, I would hope that any amendment that we put into the bill does not create an administrative monstrosity. I certainly am not opposing the amendment, because I do think that we want to make this enforceable, because I recognize the job that Mr. Greene, as the Director has, and that the Board has. But in connection with the casual work, that is a rather broad term, and we do not want to make it impossible to administer.

You referred to newspaper boys. I understand you don't know whether they are casual or not.

Mr. GREENE. The only information I can give you is that we have no record of any workmen's compensation insurance being applied to a newspaper delivery boy, and then an accident ever being reported.

We have another condition that falls in this casual category—a man who washes windows in an office building, who contracts this job on his own, and he has no employees. He washes the windows himself. He doesn't involve any other employees. He has no compensation insurance on himself. The law doesn't require him to carry any. So, he is not involved with anything, with any regulations that our agency has charge of.

Mr. SISK. Of course, if he is in the field of contracting, normally such protection as he would have would be his own responsibility.

Mr. GREENE. That is right.

Mr. SISK. I mean isn't that generally the rule anywhere?

Mr. GREENE. This is the rule, as long as he had no employees.

Mr. SISK. Yes, because I would think that he would be pretty much on all fours with, for example, a ditching contractor. You would contract with him to dig a ditch. Of course, if the ditch caved in, he has contracted it and it is not the responsibility of the person having the work done. It is the responsibility of the contractor who has contracted to do the job.

Mr. GREENE. We expect the employer to be the one responsible for the safety of the employee.

Mr. SISK. That is right, the one holding the contract.