

it immediately and continued operating the press with no problems. In the 1967 inspection, we were charged with a repeated violation of this safety regulation, when in fact we actually rectified the violation immediately. We feel the Industrial Safety Division, without a final inspection in 1961, made their determination in an arbitrary manner.

B). Guard on ATF Chief 20 press is within main frame of press—he took a photo of this. Manufacturer did not make guard because it is actually within the main frame of the press.

C). ATF Chief 15 press bought in 1963 has a sheet delivery guard constructed of parallel $\frac{1}{8}$ " steel rods spaced $1\frac{1}{4}$ " apart. Inspector Anderson states that we are in violation of the regulation and required us to place over this an additional wire mesh.

What constitutes properly guarded seems to be any interpretation that the inspector wishes to make. No guidelines are in the regulations.

Two weeks after the inspection of February 14, 1967 I was mailed a summons to appear before the corporation counsel.

While waiting for our turn for a hearing, I listened to a hearing by Corp. Counsel Clark King and another inspector from Mr. Green's office with a Mr. — of the Gibraltar Construction Co. The gist of the conversation was as follows: Mr. King listened to both parties and then said to the inspector, "I think that this man has shown no malice, he sent a form to the Labor Dept.—the name on the Form—I don't think he tried to hide anything." Then there was a pause—and Clark King continued speaking to the inspector. "Well, what do you want to do?" The inspector casually replied "The usual." Whereupon Mr. King said "I think you ought to talk it over." The inspector then replied "I can't do anything. I'll have to go back and talk it over with Mr. Green."

"The usual" seemed hardly a just method of fixing the penalty.

During our hearing with Mr. Clark King there came a time when a statement by Mr. Anderson that he (Mr. Anderson) called me in 1961 and asked me if all the violations had been corrected? I was astounded and immediately interjected "That's a lie", whereupon Inspector Anderson pulled out his copy of a form and showed a purported 1961 notation that he had spoken to me and was assured orally by me that all the violations had been corrected. This fact immediately cast a pall over the hearing to our disfavor. Needless to say, we were found guilty and were required to post a \$300 collateral.

Upon my return to the plant, I was still amazed that I said the inspector had lied and he produced the paper with the 1961 notation. I discussed this point with some of my long-time employees to try to help me remember just when he called. Curtis Hall, one of our pressmen immediately stated "Harry, I talked to that man; he called one morning before you came in, and he asked me if we had the guard for the Davidson press. I remember it exactly because I went back to the press and checked to see if the guard was on the press—as it was. I then returned to the phone and told him, 'Yes'. I didn't tell you, because I didn't think it meant anything. I thought the inspector wanted information—I gave it to him and forgot about it."

Now, I understood why I said "That's a lie"; the inspector did not know that he hadn't actually spoken to me but based a criminal charge against the corporation on telephone conversation of over 5 years previously.

A number of years ago, the sales tax division of the D.C. Government noted a confused area in the Sales Tax Law dealing with diplomatic employees of foreign governments. I was one of these businessmen. Shortly after discovering this misunderstanding by their investigations; they sent out a detailed explanation in the spirit of helping the businessman conduct their affairs within the law.

The Safety division, after an obvious misunderstanding of the law, regarding for instance, grounding of time clocks did not notify any printer that the Safety division requires that time clocks be grounded. No official oral or written notification was ever sent to any printer to my knowledge. We feel that the safety division is not out to help the businessman to stay within the law but to penalize him.

After our hearing, I sent a man from our office to post \$300 collateral; while at the police station, he was notified by the police officer that a date had to be set for the trial and the latest that he could make it was one week from that day. When I became aware of this, I tried to call our attorney. When I would be unable to reach or discuss the case with our attorney, until after the date set for trial, I called the Corporation Counsel's office to ask for a continuance. The Assistant Corporation Counsel stated that he could not change a date without Mr. Green's