

a management member, and a public member. It is still so comprised at this time. And often the public member, I mean the labor and management member get inquiries from groups, their groups and what not and they come into the Board with questions about certain things people ask them. The Board goes into quite a bit of study on different subjects. The question of this printing and belts, we went into a lengthy study on before the Board ever reached a decision. Even no matter how it looks otherwise these belts must be guarded because they do meet this criteria. Now, when they reached this decision they had prosecuted two other firms prior to the time that Mr. Olmen wrote his letter for—to be heard before the Board. The Board voted then, we have already set this policy, we have already prosecuted, the courts have sustained it, now why should we at this time open up this particular thing for this particular individual.

And it is not true as stated earlier, the printing industry has no part in this case whatsoever. I am working very closely with the printing industry now on developing cooperative liaisons in cases so we can establish schools, training schools for their foremen in their plants and maintenance men. We are going to set those up the first thing in the Fall like we have in the construction industry and we have also in the laundry industry. Now, we are working very closely with this and I just spoke to their group at a luncheon meeting just this past week and for just this purpose. Now, we have no other contact in this case as such. They are guarding their machines. They can see the reasoning behind it, for nothing else, just to protect people who walk through their plants, because if we did not have some knowledge of what this regulation says is a minimum standard then we could not defend ourselves in cases of the public who got hurt in here and came to us and said why do you permit these things to go unguarded when you know that this nationally is an accepted regulation which says this type of guard for a belt and it shall be guarded and it does not say should in the regulations, it says shall be guarded. And we have to accept it as this. We checked all these belts. They are running faster than 250 feet per minute. We cannot ignore this particular thing.

And we are getting fine cooperation from the printing industry at this time and they have gone along with this and I think it is a milestone that we have now reached this point with the printing industry because we are backed in this thing by the Labor Department. They are particularly interested in this because under the Walsh-Healy Act this is a similar requirement for all industries that operate under the Federal contract.

The man he mentioned at the Government Printing Office which happens to be the safety engineer is a member of my society, the American Society of Safety Engineers, and he released the statement and he was very apologetic to me for having to do it. He said he was forced to do it and he apologized for it because it was not a statement that a safety engineer could make based on his knowledge of machinery and equipment and other things.

Mr. SISK. All right. I appreciate very much your taking the time to come back and make these comments and with that—

Mr. KING. I think it might be of some help if we did bring up that in a court case, a case in the court, the only issue before the judge at the time there was a trial is the question of whether this regulation