

agreement which provides for making changes in due order and in due time.

The subject of hours of labor will probably be debated for the next hundred years. I believe there must be a point between fatigue, on the one hand, and staleness of the worker, on the other hand, which should determine the length of working time. Theoretically if we could find a way of measuring production records accurately we could regulate hours to meet production needs. Conceivably a one-hour or a four-hour day might suffice. That is not in hailing distance but in theory we could at least approximate it. On the other hand there is the danger of workers becoming stale and losing skill if they work too little. Some point between fatigue and staleness should regulate hours.

I want to repeat what I said in the beginning that I think this the best statement I have seen on this subject and that I think the second section the most important. Without it nothing is possible; with it everything is possible.

John P. O'Connell.⁵ This document seems to me a very good start toward a general human-relations code for industry.

Industry has always been handicapped, I believe, by a tendency to stifle expression on the part of those engaged in it. There is a separatist movement in industry with a feeling on the part of the operatives that their opinions are not of any value. This develops reserve and resentment in them. Many of the claims of industry that operatives are not doing their full share are due to the fact that industry withholds from them the right to express their ideas and to participate fully in discussion. I have always felt that those who work in industry have the knowledge and that an expression of their ideas should be wanted. If it is wanted the workers will become a force within industry which will bring additional success to every venture. Organizations of workers have been for the purpose of gaining this freedom of expression. If this code can further such expression either through organizations or otherwise it will have gone a long way. If the atmosphere for such freedom can be created the workers will find the proper forum—whether labor union, or still a different form of organization.

⁵Secretary and Business Agent, Sheet Metal Workers Local Union No. 33, United Textile Workers of America, Salem, Mass.

That is the point we have worked on in the Pequot Mills. We have tried to give the workers the feeling that it is their industry and that their ideas are wanted. They feel they have a part in it and are able to meet the problems that come up, or to find a common ground for their solution.

We all realize that continuity of employment is a pretty big promise for an employer to make but every effort should be made toward it. Management frequently realizes the importance of this as an objective but does not believe that it is within its power to gain that objective. When managers have the benefit of free expression on the part of the workers it will at least become an essential part of their program.

In all our conferences at Pequot Mills, we have been engaged in providing ways to secure continuity of employment. As soon as a worker has that he is able to budget himself yearly instead of weekly. His mind is at rest and he can be concerned with the problems of industry instead of his own home problems. As long as he feels he is going to be continuously employed he can find time to think and to investigate conditions in his own shop. If a worker does not know whether he will be employed the next month or the next week he does not have much interest in the industry in which he is employed. The group discussions between management and workers at Pequot Mills have done much for the success of this plant and therefore for continuous employment. Shut-downs and lay-offs, even in times of depression, have not figured very largely in the picture.

The strengthening of these two points in the code are my only suggestions for change.

I have been a little bit puzzled to know how such a code could be promulgated in industry. The first step has been taken in formulating the code. The next is to have it accepted. If this could be accomplished a great many of the worries of management would be eliminated.

Within our own industry the adoption of such a code would soon help to put labor costs on a comparable basis. In spite of higher wages at Pequot Mills, other plants are unable to compete with us because of our greater production. The relationship between management and workers has not only brought about higher wages and shorter hours but greatly increased productivity, with the result that other concerns engaged in

the same line are unable to compete with us. And our greater productivity has been due to just two things: the fact that we have worked for continuity of employment and fullness of expression on the part of the workers. Aside from the definite provision for conferences there is no day or hour when any matter cannot be taken up with a foreman, supervisor or with the office. And there is no loss of time in getting together.

I believe our time-study procedure should be of interest to this group. Until recently I had never had anything to do with time study. In the labor movement I had heard it damned but I had had no experience with it. One of the first things we did with the Research Committee at Pequot Mills was to spend six months in training workers' representatives in the art of time study. It improved the morale of the workers considerably to know that their representatives were going to have something to do with this study. Before time-study work was started a representative of the management and a representative of the workers went to each worker and explained what was to be done. They saw that the two (union and management) were working together and they did all they could in co-operating to see that a good job was done.

In the twelve years we have been working in this way at Pequot Mills, there has ceased to be any feeling that a contest exists between two parties, other than in the development of ideas.

Eugene B. Patton.⁶ One of the early drafts of this document fell into my hands with the request that I put down my reactions to it. I did this and felt quite pleased to find that practically all the things I had criticized in the first draft had been adjusted in this one. My vanity suffered a bit, however, when the chairman told me he had not been informed of my having read the first draft!

In view of the eighteen people who have unanimously agreed to this statement it would seem like an act of temerity to criticize it now. In fact I feel as though one doing statistical work were out of place in this group. I am reminded of the country preacher who was speaking from a platform erected on a mountainside in Tennessee. When he wanted to put across a telling point he leapt straight up in the air and came down with

⁶Director, Bureau of Statistics and Information, New York State Department of Labor, New York, N. Y.

such force that the platform gave way and he rolled down the mountainside. As soon as he could get back, he asked "Where was I?" And one of the sisters replied, "You were in Second Timothy." He said, "I knew I was in the tall grass somewhere!" And that is pretty much the way I feel.

I do know that there was one thing in the first draft of this document which has been omitted in the present one and for the omission of which I am sorry. I believe the first draft specifically protested against private fee-charging employment agencies. I wish that that condemnation might have been retained.

Of course I agree with the eighteen prominent and expert individuals in expressing general approval of this document. And I think it is much better to have such standards precede an act in law. It is desirable that leading firms establish and maintain high standards of their own accord. Their experimentations may later take general legalized form with much greater effectiveness. We all live under legislatures and have confidence in their general intent and purpose but we have to develop confidence in their wisdom on specific subjects.

Under the heading "Objectives of an Industrial Enterprise" I have made a note to the effect that the economic objectives are here recognized. To my mind these support the humanitarian objectives. Immediately upon reading that paragraph the history of workmen's compensation came to my mind. A great many firms had effective workmen's compensation for accidents before there were any statutes anywhere. The general movement seemed to come along, as so many movements have, on a wave of humanitarian impulse. As a matter of fact, it was really put over when employers generally recognized that there was a genuine economic basis for workmen's compensation. I am glad to note, therefore, that you very commendably recognize that fair wages, adequate consumer buying power, etc., are economically essential to the proper functioning of industry.

I was much pleased to hear Mr. O'Connell's description of their time-study procedure and the attitude of workers toward it. I had thought that would be the most controversial provision in the document. In general labor, whether organized or unorganized, has seemed to be much opposed to it. I think that probably the only way to allay the suspicion of workers toward time study will be to