

gence in this case and should pay for it in the courts as criminal negligence. And I recognize the problem that you have. You are not in a position to bring that about, but I think certainly this now deals with something that is a much more serious situation than I realized existed right here in the District and I am sure this is something that the Committee will be interested in.

Mr. KING. Mr. Sisk, I think the big problem in all of these cases at the present time is the fact that we do have a \$300 maximum and the court if it gets one of these cases regardless of what happened, says well what can I do. He has got \$300 up and that is all I can fine so what do I gain by bringing him in here.

Mr. SISK. Under the statute, Mr. King, under the statutes and code of the District of Columbia are penalties dealing with what could be, and maybe my terminology is not correct, practically criminal negligence of permitting a man or ordering a man to do a job in such a way that he is killed in the act of doing that job or performing that task and doing it in such a way that it is in violation of the safety regulations of the District. Certainly the courts under existing codes, do they not, have the right to go well beyond that \$300?

Mr. KING. I think what we are mixing up here is this: the United States attorney would handle any prosecution involving criminal negligence and that would be under a different statute completely. What we are talking about here is the safety standard regulations and, of course—

Mr. SISK. Specifically for the failure to comply with safety regulations separate and apart from what happened?

Mr. KING. Certainly. So, if you had a criminal case it would be of a criminal nature that would be for the United States attorney. Now, that is an entirely different statute.

Mr. SISK. All right.

Mr. KING. In other words, this would be under the Safety Standard regulations and, of course, the court would charge him under the Safety Standard regulations as the Corporation Counsel would be required to do. And he comes up in the court and the man has got \$300 up and the statute says the maximum is 300 the court says what can I do.

Mr. SISK. Yes. Well, I think that very well places this in the proper perspective.

Now, Mr. Greene, I particularly wanted to ask you, I am sorry Mr. Gude had to step out briefly, but I merely wanted to ask you to comment with reference to this problem of giving a hearing to an individual who has been notified of a violation in which some question arises. Now, we discussed in some length you remember the other day this problem and as I understand it, Mrs. Newman, of course, your Board is actually a volunteer board?

Mrs. NEWMAN. Yes, it is.

Mr. SISK. You are not a full time board or fully paid board?

Mrs. NEWMAN. That is right.

Mr. SISK. In view of the testimony by the gentlemen from the printing industry this morning and the other questions raised, I was interested in what problems there would be if the Committee in its wisdom, and this is pure speculation you understand, attempted to set up some kind of a hearing as a matter of right; that is, where a ques-