

Mr. SISK. It is not a practice?

Mr. JACKSON. Not to my knowledge it is not.

Mr. SISK. It certainly should be. It would be a practice which I would think, whether it is required or not required it would seem to me to be only logical and good judgment on the part of the architect having the responsibility for design of the building.

Here again I am not sure as to what extent his responsibility extends from the standpoint of inspection and conformity to the building permits, but in my own State of California the regulations are very specific as to his responsibility and the fact that he has to maintain inspection on the site at all times to see that not only the safety regulations, the health regulations, the fire regulations et cetera are all conformed with. I am somewhat startled that that would not be the general practice here.

Mr. SCHNABEL. No, sir, and I think that the essence is what we are talking about. We don't find nor can we conceive of cases when this thing is all completed, we find that it does not comply with safety regulations and that structural changes or any other changes could be ordered at that time, which just does not seem rational.

Mr. SISK. We always assume when a new permit is issued for a building for a specific use, and I would think that normally there would be little problem on the part of the Director of Safety in that case. Now, of course, we can always get into the case of the fact that a year later that use was changed, in that that building was leased, and a wholly new operation, a new type and more people et cetera go into it. Then there is not any question, I believe you gentlemen agree with me, that there might have to be changes to conform to make it safe for this differing use. Would you not agree that that would be a correct statement?

Mr. SCHNABEL. Yes, we do agree, certainly.

Mr. SISK. Again, let me thank you very much for your appearance. I think it has been helpful to the Committee, and it will certainly be considered once we get to the point of writing up the bill.

We have on our list Mr. Stanley Olmen of the Nave Typographic Service and Mr. Harry Drazin, president of Goodhart's Printers. Are you gentlemen appearing together?

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SISK. We will call now Mr. Wilbur Garrett.

**STATEMENT OF WILBUR R. GARRETT, JR., CHAIRMAN OF THE
SAFETY COMMITTEE, MASTER BUILDERS' ASSOCIATION, INC.**

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, my name is Wilbur Garrett. I am Chairman of the Safety Committee, Master Builders' Association. Since your time is so limited, I would like to file this statement in opposition to these amendments, but the particular amendments are the increase in fine and the forfeiture of collateral.

Mr. SISK. Would you prefer to file your statement with the committee or would you prefer to come back? These hearings will be continued.

Mr. GARRETT. I would like to file it now and then if I can, I shall return.