

rules. According to this booklet it says that—it suggests that it is a guide. It suggests that if a belt goes over 250 feet per minute and it is of a certain size or less, and in our particular case incidentally the regulation here calls for a belt a half an inch wide. Our belt is one-eighth, so it is four times less than the minimum requirement, I mean we are talking about technical terms, there is a slack in the belt. In other words, it has a functional purpose. We cannot seem to get this point across that actually the belt is installed as a safety device on the machine. The reason for it is it has some slack in it, if for any reason a friction gear does not disengage the operator can reach, can go around the machine and flip the thing off with his finger. He does this so that the top of the machine will stop operating. So actually it has a functional purpose. By guarding this you destroy part of the functional purpose of the machine.

But, further on the machine, the only two manufacturers that make the machine are Linotype and Unitype, most plants have Mergenthaler Linotype machines and they are similar in appearance and similar in results. But, there is no need, I mean there is no reason to assume they all go at the same speed. Our machines and any machine including, excluding the ones that set photographically, can be adjusted to run at 323 feet per minute or 230 revolutions, whatever the thing is, all the way up to 278 or 279. So by changing a little sprocket on our machine we could conform to the law. By reducing the speed, this achieves nothing. It is the same belt, in the same position, going approximately eight percent slower. It has the same degree of unsafeness as going twenty-seven miles an hour in a twenty-five mile zone. I mean the extreme outside would be equivalent to two miles above in a twenty-five mile zone. But, we could reduce all this by just changing a sprocket. But, operators are temperamental people and they like to have the machine run and most machines run seven lines a minute, we could make them run 6.75 and conform to the statute. But, it does not eliminate the hazard which supposedly exists.

We have shown, I think, conclusively that it is not a hazard and creates a greater hazard than without it on.

Mr. GUDE. Thank you. I notice, Mr. Drazin, you mention the inspector came into the plant to remove the guard and then took a picture of the machine?

Mr. DRAZIN. Yes. That is another objection to tactics which the entire industry objects to and I was one of them subject to it. I did observe the inspector on this particular occasion was inspecting a belt on a folding machine which I had a guard cover. He removed the guard, moved it out of the way and proceeded to take a picture of it. And, as I stated in my statement, I interjected, why are you moving the guard and taking a picture and he ignored me and continued so I immediately moved over and put the guard back on where it was. The machine was not operating, by the way. And, if he was going to take a picture take it as he found it. I was amazed that he moved it. Two of my men witnessed it. They were amazed too, but I passed it off.

Mr. GUDE. Could there be any reason he would want to take a picture of the machine without the guard.

Mr. DRAZIN. If he had a reason he did not answer me. I asked that exact question.