

The group in passing the resolution did not by any means commit itself to the idea. It simply said, "this thing is relevant and may go before the conference." In the little time we had for getting our ideas out, a considerable amount of material was presented and was read and turned back to the general committee.

The Labor Group presented its plans in a series of what Mr. Gompers called "propositions." The Employers' Group presented its ideas in a series of what it called "statements of principles." The method followed in calling these two groups made it possible for them to have programs ready at the opening of the conference. That was not so in the case of the Public Group. Most of the members of the Public Group had ideas, many had several ideas, and some of us had time to get our ideas before the conference and some of us did not.

The result was that there was a very heterogeneous batch of resolutions from the Public Group, and it is these that I have fitted into the programs of labor and employer to see if the makings of a plan for this future conduct of industry were in this first Industrial Conference.

An idea that developed at once was that we should have some classification of the things that were to come before us, some classification of terms and considerable definition.

The conference did make a start at getting this. Mr. Paul Feiss, of Cleveland, put in a resolution in which he asked that for the purposes of the conference the classification of parties involved in the consideration of the problem before the conference be as follows: "Union labor, government employees, public utility employees, plant unions, general unorganized labor, capitalists, management, government, farmers, general public." You see, that was an attempt to get the factors that we were to deal with there.

The Employer Group in putting out its statement of principles made a little attempt at definition. It had a rather interesting definition, I thought, of industrial organization. "Industrial organization is the product of an agency of an association of management, capital and labor, voluntarily established for economic production through cooperative effort. It is the function of management to coordinate and direct capital and labor for the joint benefit of all parties concerned, and the interest of the consumer and of the community. No employment relation can be satisfactory or fulfill its functions for the common good which does not encourage and require management

and men to recognize a joint as well as an individual obligation to improve and increase the quantity and quality of production to as great an extent as possible consistent with the health and well-being of the workers."

In discussing the factors in industry, it was interesting to see that management had small attention. In the propositions that were put in by labor there was no mention of management. Labor and capital were the only two factors in industry so far as one could tell from anything that they put in. The Employers' Group did recognize management in the paragraph which I have already read.

Mr. Dennison was the only advocate for management that had appeared when the conference broke up. Two of his resolutions I have here, and while he was modest in his talk and ran over them lightly, I think that you would be glad to have the exact wording of this one, for instance: "Resolved that a substantial number of the members of the governing bodies of corporations should be chosen from among the managerial forces, the legitimate interests of all stockholders being duly safeguarded by appropriate contracts."

Another resolution Mr. Dennison put in was interesting. "Resolved, that managers and employees of each industrial concern should work together to provide, study the development and installation of improved industrial methods, including methods for the increase of producing efficiency; for the reduction of the wear and tear of the work on the body and mind of the workers; for increasing the interest of the work and its power to satisfy the desire of the worker for worthwhile accomplishment; for improving the working environment; for the more intelligent placement and education of workers; for the better adjustment of the work to the man; for the reduction of managerial friction and violation of the self-respect of the worker; and for the better selection and training of foremen and superintendents on the basis of their ability to lead rather than to drive their workers."

You see, we had something there that we could have worked on for some time. It was the intention of more than one in the Public Group, if we did get to work, to ask some of you gentlemen to come in and to help us at particular points. You can imagine how much help it would have been to the conference if we could have called in Mr. Archbald, for instance, to tell us some of the things that he told us this afternoon in regard to the conduct of coal mining.

A good deal of attention was given in the various resolutions to those matters with which collective bargaining chiefly concerned itself—wages, hours and the condition of labor.

Take the matter of wages. The "propositions" offered by labor and the "statement of principles" that the employers put in, both recognized the right to a living wage, that is, a wage sufficient to maintain the workman and his family. Labor defined this living wage as one "that would insure that the worker and his family should live in health and comfort according to the standards of American life." The employers' Group recommended a standard of living "that would be satisfactory to a *right-minded* man in view of the prevailing cost of living." Of course, knowing the Employers' Group, we were bound to have a good deal of fun over that *right-minded* man. It was one of my regrets after the dissolution of the conference not to have had that come to discussion. You may be sure he would not have been the kind of man that the Labor Group would have considered "*right-minded*."

Both Labor and the Employers' Group agreed to the principle of equal pay for equal work in the case of women. A set of resolutions covering women's work founded on the standards advanced by the Women's Bureau of the United States Department of Labor, defined this basis for determining her wage as occupation, not sex, and declared that the woman's wage should cover the case of dependents as it does in men, and not the individual.

An interesting contribution to the wage question was made by Mr. Russell in this resolution: "That the opinion of the conference is that the basic principle of wages should be this: that they should first be equitable under existing conditions, and then, without imposing any necessity or occasion for strikes to obtain that end, that they should automatically, on the foundation of an agreed-upon index number of prices, follow changes in the cost of living; and in determining what is an equitable wage there should be taken into consideration the profits of the industry concerned and the requirements scientifically ascertained for normal and wholesome living, with a reasonable margin to be added for comfort, culture and refinement."

The Labor Group in its demands did not look beyond the daily wage. The Employers' Group did look beyond the daily wage. In its proposition regarding wages it declared that they should recognize the quality and quantity of the worker's product, the value and length of his service, and they should reflect a partic-

ipation in the enterprise to which he was devoting his energy.

Here, of course, was pregnant matter for discussion. It would have carried us into profit-sharing and the consideration of its various forms. We were bound to give a good deal of time to profit-sharing, although only one resolution on the subject came before the body, presented by Mr. Brookings.

Mr. Brookings' resolution was a combination. It looked not only to profit-sharing but to a participation in management, and to the encouragement of thrift.

Hours were considered in the program of both labor and employer, and in the resolutions concerning women and children. It was obvious from the temper of the Employer Group that the flat eight-hour day asked for by labor would have been combatted as too inflexible to suit all forms of industry. The employers would have made the week rather than the day the standard, and would have allowed variations. It was obvious too that the Employers' Group was prepared to fight the eight-hour day on the ground that many industries cannot afford it. No other expression in regard to hours came out excepting in the resolution on women and children.

Under the broad head which includes so many important things, that is, conditions of work, little came before the conference. It is rather curious that labor in its propositions had practically nothing to say about conditions. The employers put out a statement which I think a majority of the conference would not have accepted. They laid it down that the conditions under which labor works should be as safe and satisfactory to the worker *as the nature of the business permits*. There are too many loop-holes in that phrase, and it came into immediate clash with the great and powerful National Safety Council. The National Safety Council lays it down as a principle that, whatever the nature of the business, it must be made safe and satisfactory, and that it can be made safe and satisfactory to the worker if the problem is scientifically attacked.

There was only one resolution coming from the Public Group that could be classified under this head of conditions of work, and that was with regard to housing. Mr. Feiss, of Cleveland, put in a very good resolution. What he asked was, "that the Conference recommend to the President and Congress the immediate establishment of a Federal System for the creation of home loan banks, and for the release of capital for home building."