

negative extensions of a line bring a point, say I, to a point beyond the line connection W and C the value of the triangle is negative. This means that, speaking socially, the enterprise in which the three parties are co-operating is a net social loss.

All important is the balancing of the advantages to the three elements. Today due to absence of centralized superplanning, or its voluntary equivalent, and due to the unrecognized overemphasis upon competition as such, the triangle for many a concern, and for many industries, is negative and as such indicates social loss.

All through this document there run references to the investor, the worker and the consumer. I submit that it is the problem of management to reconcile the interests of these three. Speaking socially, management is responsible for the distribution of the benefits of the venture in which investor, worker and consumer have joined for profit. Conclusions expressed in the form of a document such as we have before us will enable management better to do this job.

The proposed code is a well-made and comprehensive statement of what thousands desire as a guide and inspiration. It is opinion lifted above the level of that of the individual, not only by the designation "code" but by the fact that the Taylor Society will consent to its formal future adoption only after full discussion.

**Rose Schneiderman.**<sup>9</sup> We labor folks have looked upon scientific management with a great deal of misgiving. Our experiences have led us to look upon the manager as the representative of the employer. He is responsible to the employer and therefore the more profits he can make, the better off he is going to be. And profits are not always made without suffering on the part of those who do the work. It is a pleasant experience, therefore, to read this code and to realize that management is going in the direction which will make for a happier, civilization.

I am a bit amused at the way in which the framers of this code tell us that Labor's right to bargain collectively has been generally accepted in this country. Right now I know of four thousand men and women in Danville, Virginia, who are

<sup>9</sup>President, Women's Trade Union League of New York and National Women's Trade Union League of America, New York, N. Y.

fighting merely for the right to organize. I wish Mr. Fitzgerald and the Board of Directors of the Dan River Cotton Mills could listen in on this discussion of the code. It might do them a great deal of good and help to end a very serious situation.

I disagree with Brother O'Connell in the statement that workers' freedom of expression, with or without trade union organization, is the vehicle by which industry can operate more successfully. Personally, I feel that industry never will be stabilized until the workers are organized into trade unions, not only locally but nationally, and can bargain collectively with their employers, who are also organized. The advantage which comes from this type of employer-employee relationship is the only one which can be effective under our modern form of industrialism. Having been a trade-unionist for twenty-five years, I cannot see the company union. In my opinion it is a deterrent to progress and the sooner we recognize this and accept a relationship such as Mr. Comstock outlined, the better off we shall be. This sort of relationship also exists in the men's clothing and other industries, and can exist in every industry if employers will give up their stubborn attitude that it is an invasion of their rights for workers to have that power behind their opinions which organization gives.

I am very happy to see that the yellow-dog contract is condemned. And I am glad of the pronouncement on night work for women.

May I conclude by saying that I hope this code may be the beginning of what Professor Slichter outlined in his discussion of Mr. Douglas' paper. We cannot go on producing this, that and the other thing without knowing what the community needs. We must work out some system which provides for centralized research and planning. The Taylor Society is doing an admirable job in steering employers in this direction.

**Jane Norman Smith.**<sup>10</sup> As a representative of the National Woman's Party I am appearing here today to protest against that part of your proposed code which would deny to adult women the right to work on night shifts.

In reading the proposed code one finds that so far as the ordinary hazards of industry are concerned, protection is planned for all workers and

<sup>10</sup>Member National Council, National Woman's Party, New York, N. Y.

not for women alone. This is at it should be. The night-work proposal applies to women alone. To this we object.

It may be that night work is not good for any worker. Certainly, every argument used against it for women, so far as health is concerned, would apply equally to men. We contend that when night work is in operation, an adult woman should have the same right as a man to engage in it if she chooses. It is for her, not for others, to decide whether or not her earnings in such work compensate for the disturbance of normal routine. It is for her, not for others, to decide whether or not her private arrangements are better served by night work than day work.

When the New York law barring women from work on night shifts in various occupations was passed, thousands of women were thrown out of work in drug and candy stores, restaurants, printing shops, newspaper offices, in railroad employment, at news-stands and as elevator operators (except in hotels). The women concerned did not ask for this restrictive law. It was passed without their consent and against their wishes. It took some of these groups years to secure exemption and the restaurant women are still going to Albany each year to demand the right to choose their own hours of work.

When the representative of the State Department of Labor referred to the hearings at Albany, where "Equal Rights" women appeared against special labor laws for women, he forgot to mention that the women who battled there with the National Woman's Party against special restrictive laws for women were the wage-earning women who have been affected by such laws and others who would have been affected by proposals for further restrictions. These women were not "theorists."

This question of special labor laws for women is not being agitated in this country alone. All over the world women are aroused and are protesting against them. In Berlin, Germany, last summer women representatives from many countries met in conference and formed the "Open Door International," with the object of securing equal economic opportunities with men. This international organization, together with other women's groups, has recently sent a deputation to the head of the International Labor Office, to ask for a re-

vision of the night-work convention, in order to end the discrimination against women.

The claim has been made that women should not be allowed to work at night because they have a double job—housework and their outside jobs. It is foolish to try to regulate the hours of all women wage-earners on the basis of those who have a double job.

We contend that if restrictions are considered necessary for the benefit of the individual and of the race, they should apply to all workers and not to women alone. If that is done, the individual will benefit, the race will benefit and women will be placed upon an equal footing with men in earning their livelihood.

Industrial regulations that apply to women alone are among the gravest discriminations against women. They close many doors of opportunity to women seeking employment. Special restrictive legislation, with its linking of women with children instead of with adults, began years ago in the transition stage of women's much protested invasion of industry. Today, when women are an established and increasingly important part of our economic life, justice requires that regulations and legislation concerning them be on the same basis as that for their male competitors.

**Rose Schneiderman.** I think if Mrs. Smith will compare the conditions and wages of women workers in the states where hours are regulated by law with those of the women workers in states which have no regulation of hours, she will find that wage-earning women are in every way better off in the states which have protective legislation. We do not object to the legal regulation of hours for both sexes, but we do not propose to wait until the men demand such protection. If the Woman's Party is interested in protecting men, why do they not start a campaign for the eight-hour day, without night work, for men? We women workers have not the time to do this—we spend our time trying to improve the conditions of working women, because that is our immediate job.

**Major-General William Crozier.**<sup>11</sup> Reference has been made to General Order Number 13 of the Ordnance Department as a progenitor of this code. As you know the Ordnance Department was using

<sup>11</sup>United States Army, Retired.