a letter back from the Board in two weeks which said that the Board had heard my case and they decided against me. I was not represented nor was I called to appear, and the entire decision is made by the agency enforcing the law. It just does not seem quite correct.

I think in substance that takes care of our case.

Mr. Sisk. Does that conclude your statement, Mr. Olmen?

Mr. Olmen. Yes, it does.

Mr. Sisk. Now, Mr. Drazin, do you have a statement that you would like to make? I believe that you have a prepared statement? If you wish to insert your statement in the record and summarize it, that will be fine, or you can read the statement, whichever you prefer to do. (The complete statement of Mr. Drazin follows:)

PRESENTATION OF A SAFETY INSPECTION OF GOODHART PRINTERS, INC.

Gentlemen: On October 3rd, 1961, Mr. R. B. Anderson inspected our plant at 1507 14th St., N.W. and thereafter issued a notice of violations of the D.C. Safety Regulations with 5 violations as follows:

1. Guarding Vee Belts-(All Vee belts and pulleys shall be guarded) (2).

2. Guarding Gears-(All exposed gears shall be guarded) (1)

3. Grounding-(All portable electrical tools and equipment shall be properly grounded) (2)

4. Machine Guarding-(Repair the platen guard so it will operate properly)

5. Machine Guarding-(Repair the two handed control on the paper cutter)

At that time Mr. Anderson explained and cooperated in every manner. We repaired and corrected every violation shortly thereafter, including the grounding of machines with a direct wire to a water pipe from the frame of the machine.

On February 14, 1967 we again were inspected by Mr. Anderson but this inspection began in a very different manner. The inspector entered our office and removed a leather shoulder pouch from his back, placed a camera around his neck and immediately proceeded in our plant. If I remember correctly his first stop was at the Ludlow, a molten metal typesetting machine, which we have operated and owned about 1953; he stopped at the ludlow and snarled, "Where is the guard for that machine" pointing to the Ludlow. I replied "What guard?" He replied "Someone probably removed it." I then again reiterated "What guard?", and continued, "there was never a guard for that machine and I had never seen one in 35 years in the printing trade." He then snapped back, "Where is your parts book?" I immediately stopped my typesetter from his work and instructed him to produce the book. The inspector then proceeded to scour the book for a picture of a guard; after about 15 minutes of fruitless searching, he stated "this book doesn't have one—but get one anyway"—and proceeded to take a picture of the machine.

Coincidentally, earlier that morning of February 14, 1967 we had to move one of our presses to repair a steam heating pipe imbedded in the concrete floor. Our pressman had taken the day off since he could not operate the press because the new concrete was still wet. Mr. Anderson then proceeded to this newly repaired area and immediately noticed that electrical wires from the press control were exposed; I immediately explained and showed him where the power had been turned off on all machines in the area. One of the many items that was temporarily displaced was a light table, a translucent glass topped table with lights underneath used in inspecting printed sheets, etc. He duly took a picture of this

table.

We proceeded to a folding machine where he inspected the air pump, belt and pulley guard. He moved the guard off the belt and pulley it was covering and proceeded to take a photo with the guard removed from its normal place. I immediately interceded and asked why he was taking a picture AFTER HE HAD MOVED THE GUARD FROM ITS PROPER PLACE; he ignored me and did not answer me; I replaced the guard and he continued taking pictures.

On a folding machine there is an attachment which trims off excess paper from phamplets, etc., while being folded. When Mr. Anderson came in this particular morning, we were folding and trimming excess paper off of a printed folder—