

case—in our particular case, after ten months no impartial body has heard our problems.

In my particular shop, again, in seventeen years we have had two accidents, and both accidents happened on the metal saw which is properly guarded. As a matter of fact, it is the best guarded piece of equipment in my plant. And no legislation would correct these two accidents. It is possible in the future we will have more accidents on the saw, but it is generally caused by carelessness or stupidity, neither of which we can legislate against, nor can we teach them not to cut themselves. Accidents, as far as we are concerned, are not economical. We are certainly as much for safety as the Board itself. And we feel that any reputable employer is too.

We would like to have some place we can go where rather than the Director of Safety, a decision be made as to whether or not the equipment is hazardous. We do not believe that the enforcing agency here should decide whether or not the interpretation is correct.

The problem directly affecting my particular plant, I would like to point out first that the reason, primarily the reason for the two witnesses, that in my particular plant we are only a type-setting plant so that we do not do any actual printing so that we are pretty much contained with Linotype machines. My friend here has a printing shop where, of course, there is a more broad coverage. However, his problems have been somewhat similar as far as interpretation and enforcement and the right to appeal are concerned.

The Government Printing Office, which is the largest printing office in the world, which is under direct instructions from the President to reduce accidents, tried out the guards that they have been suggesting for our industry and have found out that they are not satisfactory. And I have here in my bag a notarized statement to that effect by the Public Director of the District Print Shop which is operated by the District of Columbia, do not have a guard, at least did not have. And I take it in both these cases it is lack of jurisdiction. But, further is that the plants themselves do not feel that this particular thing was a hazard. The Superintendent of the Composition Department of the Government Printing Office has stated also in an affidavit which I have that he does not believe in this particular guard. All the people who manufacture the machines, the representatives of the union that represents our workers and the management, we have not found a single witness who in any way feels this particular problem is a hazard. As a matter of fact the safety officer at the Government Printing Office in his affidavit has stated the hazard has increased with the addition of the guards.

If the purpose of the Safety Director is to eliminate hazards and foster safety as it says in the preamble here of your original Act, then I think that the decision by the Board which actually increases the hazard should properly be brought before the attention of the Committee. There seems to be no other body that we can go to to bring our problem to.

In substance, this is our problem. We would like to have something incorporated in the Act that would allow us an appeal.

They say they have a Board, but I was told in a letter, a copy of which I have, that if I did not approve of this decision I could appeal to the Board in writing. I appealed to the Board in writing and I got