

tributed, constant purchasing power among wage-earning consumers.

3. Industry should undertake to secure the replacement of accumulated "anti-trust" legislation by a system of comprehensive, codified legislation having the same purposes. These laws have been passed in a piece-meal, makeshift manner without definite ultimate objectives and unifying principles. The new legislation should have two objectives brought into harmony: safeguarding of society from monopolistic and other exploiting industrial activities; and freedom of industries to integrate for the purpose of promoting regularization.

4. Industry should establish a system of planning for its collective activities which would direct the efforts of its constituent individual enterprises toward a relationship of constant balance between consumer demand and the application of capital and labor to production. The technique of such collective planning should be worked out by experiment and experience. In its early stages at least, large results could be achieved by the publication of revealing current data concerning the state of industry (by specific industries and their functional activities, and by regions), by forecasts of tendencies, and by specific public recommendations to various industries on the part of a National Economic Council.

Charles Day

May 15, 1879

May 10, 1931

THE sudden death of Charles Day on May 10 was a shock not only to the many friends who knew his personality but also to that wider business community which had observed and admired his business career. He was a founder member of the Taylor Society, and although he wrote the record of his creative work in the organization and procedures of his own enterprises, instead of in general personal consulting practice or in many books, in the scientific management movement his name belongs with those of Taylor, Dodge, Goodrich, Gantt and Gilbreth.

He was born in Philadelphia May 15, 1879, and was graduated Mechanical Engineer from the University of Pennsylvania in 1899. After apprenticeship in engineering he became in 1901 a member of Dodge & Day, specializing in engineering, management and construction work. In 1911 was organized Day & Zimmermann, Inc., engineers, con-

tractors, management auditors and managers, a firm of which he was at first president and at the time of his death chairman of the board. This firm made a notable record in construction, equipment and management of industrial plants, electric-light plants and railroads. Mr. Day had many other business interests and was a director of many industrial and public-service corporations, among them the Pennsylvania Railroad, Fidelity-Philadelphia Trust Company and the Interborough Rapid Transit Company. In addition to these major business interests he was a member of the civilian board appointed by Secretary of the Navy Meyer to investigate the efficiency of the Navy Yards, and during the World War a member of various boards: the Storage Committee of the General Munitions Board, the Depot Board appointed by the Secretary of War, engineering advisor of Col. House's Commission, Special Mission to France of the Secretary of War, and board of trustees of the Emergency Fleet Corporation. He was a member of the board of Franklin Institute and a trustee of the University of Pennsylvania.

Although not a voluminous writer, he contributed a considerable number of articles to technical magazines, and his only book, "Industrial Plants," was a significant pioneer work.

To those who knew him intimately Charles Day was more than is indicated by this formal recital of connections. Although quiet, modest, retiring and with a personality of lovable simplicity, he had the power and influence which come from energy, a scientific mind, vision, a public spirit and fearlessness. Whatever the enterprise or institution in which he assumed a responsibility, that responsibility was exercised to help its progress in the direction of public service. Identified with an industry which has had a continuing struggle with public opinion, his energy was ever exerted to bring them into harmony. No personal or institutional interest could turn him from the path of truthfulness. His testimony before a public service commission was never subtly fashioned to promote private as against public interest. He told the facts with scientific impartiality. Representatives of the public interest respected, admired and valued him. If ever the time comes when American industry feels the need of a national planning council, the personality and work of Charles Day may well serve as the model for specifications for its membership.

Planning Industry¹

A Plea for Balance Between Labor Saving and Labor Utilization

By ROBERT J. McFALL

Chief Statistician for Distribution, Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C.

PLANNING on the scale of any single industry cannot be successfully put into effect without taking into consideration the activity of business in general and the purchasing power of the potential buyers.

A fairly successful program might be developed for a specific industry if it were possible to forecast the gyrations of the general business world. At best, however, this would be but a second-rate basis for planning, for no industry can reach its optimum while the rest of the business world is sick half of the time. Moreover, even with the aid of intricate statistics, true prophets seem to be few in this generation.

Truly successful planning, for any permanent industry, must include provision for a fair degree of stabilization within the industry and for such development of its markets as may be secured and maintained. Such planning should be based upon stabilization and the healthy development of general business. If the business world in general is liable to severe and unforeseeable disturbances, no plans for any specific industry can be very dependable. If our general economic world is in danger of serious and more than temporary retrogression, any plans on the scale of a single industry are likely to prove abortive.

It would appear that all schemes so far developed to stabilize business in general have been inadequate. Up to two years ago many thought that, with greater statistical knowledge and a more highly organized banking system, business had been stabilized on a permanently higher basis; at least a higher basis than that former one where utter loss was caused by constantly recurring bad years. Such hopeful views were expressed up to the very eve of the market panic, but the panic

¹Paper presented before a meeting of the Taylor Society, Philadelphia, Pa., April 30, 1931. This paper is entirely unofficial. Any opinions expressed are the private views of the writer.

came and also a general world-wide business depression of the first magnitude.

If statistical knowledge is what is needed for business stabilization, it would appear to some of us who are engrossed in the field that what we need is not so much more statistics, for we now have more in quantity than mortal man can well digest, but broader statistics, or knowledge from larger points of view. What good would the mere statistics on the building-tile industry be if we knew nothing of the whole building industry which is its market? The statistics on the automobile industry itself are of limited value if we know nothing of impending breakdown in the general purchasing power of the public. We need more fundamental data on the broader movements in the business world in general, and not merely statistics on finance and on specific industries.

Business as a whole has been sick for well over a year in almost the entire civilized world. The severe sickness has brought to open attention some symptoms of modern economic life that are believed by some to threaten to persist, or at least to recur with increasing severity, unless new and drastic measures are taken to overcome them.

We hear so much now of unemployment that we almost marvel when we see men actually working. The talk of overproduction has spread like an epidemic from the agricultural field until it affects well-nigh everything. Some think that we merely have underconsumption, but the difference, upon analysis, is not entirely plain. It is claimed that we have an oversupply of capital equipment and productive capacity in almost every industry; that the available equipment can readily produce many more goods than can possibly be sold, with or without a profit. Grave doubts have been raised as to the possibility of increasing sales materially by means of reducing prices. More serious even than any oversupply of productive machinery is the apparent oversupply of labor with its consequent unemploy-