

dustry without the bitter clashes we have had in the past, we changed that technical language to read "collective agreements." The term has the same meaning, but better expresses our approach.

Another point has come up as a result of an invitation issued to one of the railroads to participate in this discussion. The company regretted on the ground that theirs was a *transportation* company while the Code purported to apply only to "industrial enterprises." I think the Committee can easily take care of this by a few minor insertions.

Again, we have cut out the term "company unions." I am sorry Mr. Ritchie is not here, but Mr. Edelman is. This is another instance of what I meant when I said that perhaps we had been a bit provocative in the language we used. We each of us have our own ideas about what "company unions" are and what they signify in industry. Some of us are very decidedly on record about them. But we found that by taking the whole range from the fairly conservative employer on the one side to the fairly liberal labor leader on the other side, the term "company union" has meanings inappropriate to this document. We tried to dodge the difficulty by putting quotation marks around the term, but that did not seem to accomplish what we wanted. However, we are not conscious of having weakened our first statement or having materially changed it except by these rather minor changes in language.

The word "standard" was put before "union" at the last meeting of the Committee. The feeling was that we wanted to get away from being so specific as to say that we had in mind either an A. F. of L. union or a dissenting labor union, so we said "independent" labor union. Then some of our union friends, among others, thought that was a bit provocative—that there were some labor unions that were independent, and some that were not—so we tried to meet that simply by putting in the word "standard," which includes orthodox labor unions and dissenting labor unions—almost any kind of labor union that stands on its own feet. The Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, for example, is a "standard" labor union.

Another criticism of the Code that has come from a good many different people, including members of our Committee, concerns its length. The thought has been frequently expressed that the

Code would be more generally useful if it could be made shorter. We have already cut it in half. I think the sense of the Committee is that it is easier to end up—if we ever do—with adopting a code that is short enough if we start with something that is fairly elaborate, rather than to start in with something like the Ten Commandments and develop the other way. I do not believe that we can say at this time what the ultimate action of this Committee will be. Personally, the Code seems to me to be of a pretty fair size now.

Another criticism that has been expressed by some local people is the use of the term "code." Of course, we are right from the standpoint of the dictionary. Perhaps the feeling has been that the sort of thing a code implies is something like a set of laws that are rather inflexible. The real reason we object to the term "code" in this field is that at present we know so little. The field is so new that we have not become accustomed to codifications of any kind. When I joined the American Society of Mechanical Engineers—I am not going to admit how many, but it was not so many, years ago—we did not have any codes. I believe I am right in that statement. Now we number our codes by the score. We have gone far within a generation.

Perhaps when the fields of industrial engineering, human relationships and production engineering have been developed further, and we know more than we do today, codes will have a familiar ring to our ears, and we shall have become more accustomed to them; certainly the word "code" will not mean to us just what it does today.

One of the reasons why we have gone ahead as far as we have on this road toward a useful and acceptable code is that we decided that we would not fix any date for its adoption. The Code may easily be quite as useful unadopted—before its adoption—as it will be after. If we can keep this group interested, perhaps we can remain a standing committee for some years to come and keep tinkering with it. The moment you begin to tell people you are going to close the doors, they get excited. There is ample time for every viewpoint to be expressed, before any formal ratification takes place. The Committee is on its knees begging you and anybody else to give us any ideas that you may have as to how this instrument can be made to represent the best practice in American industry.

There is a misunderstanding in some quarters certainly as to just what we have tried to do here. We say that we have taken these practices out of the experience of the top half of American industry. Now, that does not mean that there is any plant in any industry, even in the top half, that can say, "Yes," to everything in this document; but it does mean that there is nothing so far as I know in it that is purely theoretical. In other words, you can go to plants in the top half of American industry and find in practice practically everything in this document, so that it is not, as has been said, the counsels of perfection, neither is it purely theoretical.

The Code

I. Purpose, Scope and Use

This code is offered for use by those persons who are responsible for working conditions and human relations in industry, *who wish their procedures and policies to be rated above the average in standards of employment in the United States.* It is not a counsel of perfection. Leaders who keep ahead of the procession in advancing standards for labor as industry increases its productive capacity will regard this code as a minimum. But perhaps half the industrial enterprises in the nation may find themselves below its requirements in some particulars.

All, however, are invited to check their conditions by it point by point; to report those points at which a higher standard has been proved practicable; and to experiment with those possibilities not yet attained by them.

If the word "code," through its association with legal procedure, implies some form of compulsion, or if through its usage in mechanical engineering it suggests greater precision than is yet possible for human relations, it should be pointed out that the compulsion and the precision of this code rest upon the accuracy with which it has formulated actual experience in industrial establishments. The group which has drafted it has only sought to record good practices as encountered in what may be described as the upper half of American industry. As industry in the United States is essentially dynamic and progressive, the good practice of today may be expected to become the average tomorrow and the minimum the day after. The

proposal is made, therefore, that the code be rewritten as often as the experiments of leaders in the improvement of human relations and conditions demonstrate that better practices and higher standards are feasible.

Industry as used in this code may be defined as including those branches of economic activity in which men and women are employed in numbers for wages in occupations involving the use of machines or auxiliary to them; or employing workers in subdivided tasks.

Employment as used in this code includes human relations and conditions in an enterprise or an industry.

This idea further subdivides into wages and earnings; hours of labor; security of employment; policies and procedures as to selection, training and promotion, including minimum age, provision for older workers, personnel organization, supervision and foremanship; safety and health in work, including physical conditions of workrooms, protection against accident and occupational hazards, medical supervision and attention; provision for representation of workers' interests and points of view, including possibility of a hearing in an individual grievance and the more positive opportunity to make suggestions for improvement in processes; and arrangements for the collective functioning of employes as a group.

As conceived by those who are formulating the code, the persons "responsible" for employment, for whose use it is designed, include in the first instance, the employer, who as financial owner of the business has the power to change conditions. Perhaps he has shared his power and his responsibility for human relations with some organization of employes within his workshop or in the industry as a whole; in that event, the code is addressed also to the employes as members of a group and to the leaders chosen by them. Sometimes the individual owner or manager has given place to stockholders, more or less numerous, who are the owners; and management, employed by the owners, constitutes a separate group of individuals who share the responsibility for conditions of employment. In those rare but significant instances in which plans are in effect for co-operation in management on the part of trade unions, the leaders and members of the unions share also the power to put this code into effect. In public utilities the public as a whole becomes responsible for fair wages and good working conditions and relationships. *The code is addressed, therefore, to all who have any degree of power to put its provisions into effect.*