

objection, will be made a part of the record. If you wish to summarize or make further comments on it why go right ahead.

(The statement referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF PHILIP J. DAUGHERTY, STAFF REPRESENTATIVE OF OFFICE AND PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYEES INTERNATIONAL UNION, LOCAL NO. 2

Mr. Chairman, my name is Philip J. Daugherty and our Union represents over 3,000 office and professional employees in the Greater Washington Metropolitan area. We wish to compliment the Chairman of the Committee, the Honorable B. F. Sisk, on his foresight and interest in introducing this pending Industrial Safety Bill HR 1264. Our organization feels that safety in the working place should be controlled by law irrespective to the type of work being performed or the category of the employer's business. It is clear that the intent of the legislation passed by Congress in 1941 intended that all employees in private industry be equally and adequately protected by having a safe place of employment. As a result of narrow restrictive interpretations by the Corporation Council, the word industrial has been construed to mean only those employees employed in manufacturing and construction are to be covered by the law and that office workers, sales clerks, restaurant and hotel employees would not generally be considered as being engaged in industrial employment. In our specific field it has been our experience that unsafe conditions and improper use and placement of equipment in offices can be just as dangerous to the welfare of employees as would be the case if no safety laws covered construction and manufacturing employees in those particular fields. We are sure that Congress intended no such interpretation as currently in effect and we believe that the Congress should move expeditiously to eliminate this injustice. We are also in favor of striking out the current provision under Section 3, which calls for a fine of not more than \$300 and support wholeheartedly the amendment as called for in HR 1246. The current \$300 maximum fine has had very limited deterrent effect on violators. We feel that a much heavier penalty should be assessed so that the employers are hurt in the "pocketbook" and cannot continue the practice of paying for violations of the law and just write it off as part of a business operation. Simple justice demands that when health and safety and life itself are involved, the highest financial penalty cannot be too severe.

Mr. Chairman, we are grateful for this opportunity to appear before your Committee. We urge prompt action on this Industrial Safety Legislation which vitally effects the lives of so many of our members in the Washington Metropolitan area.

Mr. DAUGHERTY. Well, I will just briefly summarize. In behalf of the office and professional employees we support wholeheartedly H.R. 1264 and we feel that in our specific field that unsafe conditions and improper use of equipment and so on can be just as dangerous as in the manufacture and construction field. And we are sure that Congress when they passed this bill did not mean to exclude the office workers and hotel workers and restaurant workers who have been construed under the law.

We also feel the present penalty, financial penalty, is much too low because the employers seem to be with impunity just treating this violation and paying as a part of doing business. We think that to raise the maximum penalty to \$1,500 or above would certainly be very meaningful in the pocketbook which may cut down on these violations.

We wholeheartedly endorse this legislation.

Mr. SISK. All right. Thank you Mr. Daugherty for your statement. Mr. Gude, did you want to ask some questions?

Mr. GUDE. Yes. I do not know who might answer this. I know that in the State of Maryland under, I believe, the Department of Industrial Safety has developed a series of courses which have been very