

I place an order for a guard and this was in February, about the 20th or thereabouts, near that day, and I have not received a guard yet nor a communication from the manufacturer. Now, I am waiting for it. I will install it when it comes in.

Mr. SISK. Getting back to what I understand, Mr. Olmen was your original reason, at least as I understood your statement, for appearing here was to seek what you felt would be a more logical remedy for appeal to the Board. I believe that was the reason that you were primarily concerned, that where a question having to do with safety arose, whether it had to do with guards for these machines or other matters, which I am sure that you would be concerned from a safety standpoint, that in the event of a difference you feel that you should have some specific right to appeal. Am I stating correctly what your position is?

Mr. OLMEN. I think that pretty generally covers it. More specifically, is that there is a dispute between the industry, I am not talking about an individual now again, if a dispute arises as to whether or not it constitutes a hazard, if there is some doubt, and I think that for instance in this particular case a doubt was arisen by all the experts and in this particular case we ought to have a hearing before someone and if they rule adversely, incidentally, there is no question about carrying it out. I have carried out other directors of the committee for seventeen years, I mean of the Director of Safety for seventeen years. We have never had a problem. We have never had a problem with the fire inspector or the police or anybody who comes into the place. It is all done, incidentally, and particularly the fire people, it is done on a cooperative basis. It is done where they suggest and sometimes we suggest to them. And I think a safety program trying to be carried out without this cooperation is—it loses a lot of its weight.

We are certainly in favor of any safety measure they can introduce. But, if this measure does create a further hazard in the estimation of both manufacturers, employees and employer I think there is doubt enough that we ought to have a fair hearing some place.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Gude, do you have any questions?

Mr. GUDE. Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. Which machines specifically would it be up to the Washington Post or the Star, you say they have installed these guards.

Mr. OLMEN. Yes, they have installed them. I do not know just when, but I would say recently.

Mr. GUDE. As a result of this case?

Mr. OLMEN. Yes, sir. Not as a result of my particular case.

Mr. GUDE. Which machines would they be specifically.

Mr. OLMEN. Well, you see, you do not get into the specifics on this thing. As a matter of fact, the entire case is based on the speed of the belt.

Mr. GUDE. In other words, any machines that have belts on them according to the speed would be subject to provisions, such as if belts have a certain speed then the guards would have to go on? Is that the idea?

Mr. OLMEN. Well, this code which I have a copy of which is American Standards Association, which incidentally no longer exists, it has been replaced by a new U.S. Research Institute which cooperates with the Labor Department of the Government for promulgating new