

MR. HILLMAN:

This being the first formal meeting of the Board of Arbitration, it may be necessary to go over a little the details of what has been done leading up to this meeting. Some time last July the employers in the country at large thought it wise to take up the future negotiations affecting wages and general conditions--meaning by the word "general" those which would naturally affect nationally all the clothing markets--and they considered it wise to have a national conference. The reason for it was the following. On account of the great shortage of labor and the general unrest among labor, conditions had arisen in several markets that made it necessary for changes. These adjustments taking place in the midst of the season were a great hardship on the employers. It was claimed, and in my judgment properly so, that the employers should get a definite time during which no change in the wage scale should take place. After those conferences, an official letter was sent to our organization asking us to meet at our earliest opportunity and discuss the conditions for the next season. We met in June in the city of Rochester, and a joint council was established at that time for both sides to take up these matters. Our organization then instructed all its local organizations throughout the country to determine what it is that they feel is desirable on their behalf for the next season, so that we could take it up and make a general arrangement for the country at large. Chicago was called upon to make their requests and demands, and they worked out a certain number of changes that they would like to take place. Those requests were placed with our organization. But something happened so that the national conference at this time could not take place, and the matter was again referred back to the local markets. Now all the markets have made adjustments for the next season--in some cases they started in November, in some cases October 20, and in one particular case, by decision of the trade board, the back pay was made retro-active as of October 2d. (Baltimore)

MR. HILLMAN:

This being the first formal meeting of the Board of Arbitration, it may be necessary to go over a little the details of what has been done leading up to this meeting. Some time last July the employers in the country at large thought it wise to take up the future negotiations affecting wages and general conditions--meaning by the word "general" those which would naturally affect nationally all the clothing markets--and they considered it wise to have a national conference. The reason for it was the following. On account of the great shortage of labor and the general unrest among labor, conditions had arisen in several markets that made it necessary for changes. These adjustments taking place in the midst of the season were a great hardship on the employers. It was claimed, and in my judgment properly so, that the employers should get a definite time during which no change in the wage scale should take place. After those conferences, an official letter was sent to our organization asking us to meet at our earliest opportunity and discuss the conditions for the next season. We met in June in the city of Rochester, and a joint council was established at that time for both sides to take up these matters. Our organization then instructed all its local organizations throughout the country to determine what it is that they feel is desirable on their behalf for the next season, so that we could take it up and make a general arrangement for the country at large. Chicago was called upon to make their requests and demands, and they worked out a certain number of changes that they would like to take place. These requests were placed with our organization. But something happened so that the national conference at this time could not take place, and the matter was again referred back to the local markets. Now all the markets have made adjustments for the next season--in some cases they started in November, in some cases October 30, and in one particular case, by decision of the trade board, the back pay was made retro-active as of October 24. (Baltimore)

The reasons for the change are many. There is the increase in the cost of living; the fact that the employers are asking for a guarantee that this settlement should hold for a length of time, and the probabilities ~~for~~ of a rise in the cost of living in the next five or six months--for, in our judgment, all the elements are tending in the direction of further increase in the cost of living. If necessary to go into details, we could give further reasons why we should expect that the cost of living should keep going steadily up for some time to come--the European situation, and the situation here in the country, where there is no constructive program that would give us any hope for industrial adjustments. This has been illustrated by the miners and the steel situation, and will be brought to us in the near future in the railroad situation; and the mine situation, in my judgment, has not been settled at all. I would not be surprised to be getting new demands from the miners after this is settled.

The next situation is that we think we are entitled to higher standards. Every governmental agency takes it ~~for~~ granted that all labor is entitled to is to figure the difference in the cost of living between 1914 and 1920, and figure up whether it has risen 14 1/2% or 6 3/4 %, and they consider that labor should not ask for anything more. As a matter of fact, the point of view of labor in our organization is that we are entitled to much higher standards, and there is no reason at all why the industries of the country should not provide properly for labor. We feel that what we are asking is only, as a matter of fact, a beginning in asking for proper standards for labor. The old partnership between labor and capital is very unsatisfactory from the point of view of one of the partners--labor. We feel that we are getting very much the worst of it, and that in unemployment and seasonal work labor has been made to carry the biggest part of the burden. The only reason for this that labor ~~should~~ consider is, in our judgment, if the industries cannot afford it--if the industries cannot afford to give labor more, then labor should not demand more.

The reasons for the change are many. There is the increase in the cost of living; the fact that the employers are asking for a guarantee that this settlement should hold for a length of time, and the probabilities of a rise in the cost of living in the next five or six months--for, in our judgment, all the elements are tending in the direction of further increase in the cost of living. It is necessary to go into details, we could give further reasons why we should expect that the cost of living should keep going steadily up for some time to come--the European situation, and the situation here in the country, where there is no constructive program that would give us any hope for industrial adjustments. This has been illustrated by the miners and the steel situation, and will be brought to us in the near future in the railroad situation; and the mine situation, in my judgment, has not been settled at all. I would not be surprised to be getting new demands from the miners after this is settled.

The next situation is that we think we are entitled to higher standards. Every governmental agency takes it for granted that all labor is entitled to as to figure the difference in the cost of living between 1914 and 1920, and figure up whether it has risen $14\frac{1}{2}\%$ or $6\frac{3}{4}\%$, and they consider that labor should not ask for anything more. As a matter of fact, the point of view of labor in our organization is that we are entitled to much higher standards, and there is no reason at all why the industries of the country should not provide properly for labor. We feel that what we are asking is only, as a matter of fact, a beginning in asking for proper standards for labor. The old partnership between labor and capital is very unsatisfactory from the point of view of one of the partners--labor. We feel that we are getting very much the worst of it, and that in unemployment and seasonal work labor has been made to carry the biggest part of the burden. The only reason for this that labor should consider is, in our judgment, if the industries cannot afford it--if the industries cannot afford to give labor more, then labor should not demand more.

In our own situation, for the last seven or eight months labor could have gotten a great deal more in our industry than it is enjoying to-day; the demand for labor is very great, and if labor would avail itself in our situation of the general law of supply and demand, our wages would be up pretty high--we always have suffered from the other end if the law of supply and demand acted against us. But in our cooperation with the employers we have taken the position that the stability and the protection of industry is more important than the temporary or even permanent boosting up of wages. This point again, I think, will not be questioned very much. I think it is generally conceded in the industry that if our organization had not lent its offices to holding down the tendency for high wages, wages would have been much higher than they are to-day in the industry. And if we are holding back our membership and telling them they should not accept increases, then we should guarantee them and give them what is fair under conditions as they are to-day.

This is the first market that is submitting this matter to arbitration. In New York City, the matter was agreed upon by the representatives of the employers, and the men of our organization. In Baltimore, in the two largest houses in the city, we have come to a mutual agreement in conference. In the city of Rochester, where we have an agreement covering an arbitration clause, the matter was mutually agreed to in conference. And the other markets have followed now. As a matter of fact, in the actual life of the industry, whatever is decided in these markets is automatically followed in the others. In Boston the dispute was simply about scales, not upon the question of increase. Philadelphia has also given increases. Even in Canada they have made larger increases than what we ask in the market here. We represent a membership of 35,000 or 40,000 people in a very successful and efficient clothing market, and it is expected of us that when this adjustment is made, the organization will lend all of its power to maintain stability in the industry. We think that this market should not make an adjustment less than other markets. The employers are entitled to be in a more advantageous position than those of other markets because

In our own situation, for the last seven or eight months labor could have gotten a great deal more in our industry than it is enjoying to-day; the demand for labor is very great, and if labor would avail itself in our situation of the general law of supply and demand, our wages would be up pretty high--we always have suffered from the other end of the law of supply and demand acted against us. But in our cooperation with the employers we have taken the position that the stability and the protection of industry is more important than the temporary or even permanent boosting up of wages. This point again, I think, will not be questioned very much. I think it is generally conceded in the industry that if our organization had not lent its offices to holding down the tendency for high wages, wages would have been much higher than they are to-day in the industry. And if we are holding back our membership and telling them they should not accept increases, then we should guarantee them and give them what is fair under conditions as they are to-day.

This is the first market that is submitting this matter to arbitration. In New York City, the matter was agreed upon by the representatives of the employers and the men of our organization. In Baltimore, in the two largest houses in the city, we have come to a mutual agreement in conference. In the city of Rochester, where we have an agreement covering an arbitration clause, the matter was mutually agreed to in conference. And the other markets have followed now. As a matter of fact, in the actual life of the industry, whatever is decided in these markets is automatically followed in the others. In Boston the dispute was simply about scales, not upon the question of increases. Philadelphia has also given increases. Even in Canada they have made larger increases than what we ask in the market here. We represent a membership of 35,000 or 40,000 people in a very successful and efficient clothing market, and it is expected of us that when this adjustment is made, the organization will lend all of its power to maintain stability in the industry. We think that this market should not make an adjustment less than other markets. The employers are entitled to be in a more advantageous position than those of other markets because

of the piece-work system and more efficient methods. They have availed themselves of a more efficient system and are entitled to its advantages. But if they are placed in a more advantageous position with regard to actual wages and increases, I think it would be unfair to the workers, and employers in other markets. We should think of our responsibility to the industry as a whole.

I will present briefly the adjustments that have been made. In New York, where the wages are much higher than here, and where it is a completely week-work market (the least allowance that should be made for piece-work should be 20%) they have given an increase of \$5 to all the tailors, and this was \$5 on top of a number of adjustments that had been made. Six dollars was given to the cutters. In the city of Baltimore, which is perhaps the nearest to the city of Chicago, though much smaller, they have the piece and week-work system, and as some houses are run exactly like the Chicago system, the proportion of week and piece would be 25% to 75% -- 25% referring to piece work. In the Strassburg (?) Company they have the A B C standard output, which makes it nearer to the piece-work system than what is generally called the old week-work system, and it was agreed that the week-workers should be increased at the same rate as the piece-workers. The increase there was 20% to all workers earning over \$20, and 25% to all workers earning \$20 or less. The week-workers were given a \$6 increase, and the scale of wages for tailors was made \$40. Where the scale was larger, in some instances there was an increase of \$10 to pressers and \$10 to cutters and trimmers, bringing the scale up from \$35 to \$45, two increases of \$5 each being given.

In the city of Rochester we have received a \$6 increase and a \$5 increase for all those who make \$20 a week and under. Piece-work was to be figured accordingly. Also the establishment of scales in the different departments--\$41 for cutters and pressers, and \$38, \$35 and \$33, I believe, for trimmers. In Philadelphia I think they followed the New York settlement of \$6 and \$5 settlements, and in some cases,

of the piece-work system and more efficient methods. They have availed themselves of a more efficient system and are entitled to its advantages. But if they are placed in a more advantageous position with regard to actual wages and increases, I think it would be unfair to the workers and employers in other markets. We should think of our responsibility to the industry as a whole.

I will present briefly the adjustments that have been made. In New York, where the wages are much higher than here, and where it is a completely week-work market (the least allowance that should be made for piece-work should be 20¢) they have given an increase of \$5 to all the tailors, and this was \$5 on top of a number of adjustments that had been made. Six dollars was given to the cutters. In the city of Baltimore, which is perhaps the nearest to the city of Chicago, though much smaller, they have the piece and week-work system, and as some houses are run exactly like the Chicago system, the proportion of week and piece would be 25¢ to 75¢ -- 25¢ referring to piece work. In the Strasburg (?) Company they have the A B C standard output, which makes it nearer to the piece-work system than what is generally called the old week-work system, and it was agreed that the week-workers should be increased at the same rate as the piece-workers. The increase there was 30¢ to all workers earning over \$20, and 25¢ to all workers earning \$20 or less. The week-workers were given a \$6 increase, and the scale of wages for tailors was made \$40. Where the scale was larger, in some instances there was an increase of \$10 to pressers and \$10 to cutters and trimmers, bringing the scale up from \$35 to \$45, two increases of \$5 each being given.

In the city of Rochester we have received a \$6 increase and a \$5 increase for all those who make \$20 a week and under. Piece-work was to be figured accordingly. Also the establishment of scales in the different departments--\$41 for cutters and pressers, and \$38, \$35 and \$32, I believe, for trimmers. In Philadelphia I think they followed the New York settlement of \$6 and \$5 settlements, and in some cases,

\$7 and \$8. Going over to Canada, the average increase is perhaps \$8 or \$9; in Toronto, \$9 or \$10.

One argument that has always presented itself when we have discussed a change of prices was the question of the mid-season adjustments. This time we have given notice to the employers in September that we were going to ask for a readjustment, and the employers were very anxious to have us make whatever we wanted known before the season started. Since it was more or less settled what the people wanted, the employers were able to make reservations in the marketing of their goods. I think we could not be held responsible if they have made the proper reservations or not, and we are assuming that they have made them, for otherwise they would have pressed for an immediate adjustment.

The other situation that must be taken into consideration is that the cost of labor is a very small part of the cost of the actual suit of clothing. My own estimate is that it is 20%—and I think that that is probably very extravagant. An allowance of 15% would be very much nearer to the situation. The cost of labor compared to the actual selling price would be not more than 15%. A \$60 garment would not have \$12 direct labor. So the effect on the actual cost of clothing is very small. We feel that by devoting all our energies to seeing to it that the industry is running, that it is going on with production—by keeping this 15% of the cost running, we are making our contribution to keeping the prices low. I think that we are not a sufficiently large factor to affect the actual cost of clothing. The retailer sells to-day for \$50 a garment that used to sell for \$25. If he sells the same number of units and the selling price has not gone up, he is now making double the amount he had when he sold them at \$25. There is also the question of large taxation put on by the country. Most of the industries are putting it on to the custom manufacturer, and in most cases charging a profit on the taxation that is going into the cost of the product. All these things make for high cost, and labor

\$7 and \$8. Going over to Canada, the average increase is perhaps \$8 or \$9; in

Toronto, \$9 or \$10.

One argument that has always presented itself when we have discussed a change of prices was the question of the mid-season adjustments. This time we have given notice to the employers in September that we were going to ask for a readjustment, and the employers were very anxious to have us make whatever we wanted known before the season started. Since it was more or less settled what the people wanted, the employers were able to make reservations in the marketing of their goods. I think we could not be held responsible if they have made the proper reservations or not, and we are assuming that they have made them, for otherwise they would have pressed for an immediate adjustment.

The other situation that must be taken into consideration is that the cost of labor is a very small part of the cost of the actual unit of clothing. My own estimate is that it is 20%--and I think that that is probably very extravagant. An allowance of 15% would be very much nearer to the situation. The cost of labor compared to the actual selling price would be not more than 15%. A \$80 garment would not have \$12 direct labor. So the effect on the actual cost of clothing is very small. We feel that by devoting all our energies to seeing to it that the industry is running, that it is going on with production--by keeping this 15% of the cost running, we are making our contribution to keeping the prices low. I think that we are not a sufficiently large factor to affect the actual cost of clothing. The retailer sells to-day for \$50 a garment that used to sell for \$35. If he sells the same number of units and the selling price has not gone up, he is now making double the amount he had when he sold them at \$35. There is also the question of large taxation put on by the country. Most of the industries are putting it on to the custom manufacturer, and in most cases charging a profit on the taxation that is going into the cost of the product. All these things make for high cost, and labor

is not in a situation to remedy that. All that labor can do is to keep the wheels of industry running.

The piece-work system is the most efficient system, and is preferable, in spite of the injustices that labor may suffer from it. In this situation our big job is to keep the industry running properly. I do not know of any other industry, organized or unorganized, that is situated as our industry is. Our industry is ~~not~~ composed of people who would just as soon strike as not, other things being equal; but we have succeeded, in spite of this condition, in making it the only industry that is actually running. It is running because the workers feel that it is the best method, and not because of coercion. We have actually worked out the moral sanction behind work. The workers feel that they have a duty and responsibility to their industry. Everything is being done to keep the thing running properly. And we do not want our people to feel a few months from now that they have got the worst of it, because we are going to ask them not to change jobs and to make individual adjustments. I feel that that would be a very poor adjustment, a very poor saving. Conditions in the market will remain as they are for some time to come. We have a right to expect that there is going to be under-production because of the world-wide condition of production. Labor is not in a mood to settle down quickly; the employers are in a mood, not to see how much trouble can be avoided, but how much can be made; and the administration is in a position where you cannot expect for a couple of years ~~that~~ anything but politics. We have the problem of keeping our industry isolated from the general unrest. Something should be done to protect the situation as we have it.

11

is not in a situation to remedy that. All that labor can do is to keep the wheels of industry running.

The piece-work system is the most efficient system, and is preferable, in spite of the injustices that labor may suffer from it. In this situation our big job is to keep the industry running properly. I do not know of any other industry organized or unorganized, that is situated as our industry is. Our industry is xxx composed of people who would just as soon strike as not, other things being equal; but we have succeeded, in spite of this condition, in making it the only industry that is actually running. It is running because the workers feel that it is the best method, and not because of coercion. We have actually worked out the moral sanction behind work. The workers feel that they have a duty and responsibility to their industry. Everything is being done to keep the thing running properly. And we do not want our people to feel a few months from now that they have got the worst of it, because we are going to ask them not to change jobs and to make individual adjustments. I feel that that would be a very poor adjustment, a very poor saving. Conditions in the market will remain as they are for some time to come. We have a right to expect that there is going to be under-production because of the world-wide condition of production. Labor is not in a mood to settle down quickly; the employers are in a mood not to see how much trouble can be avoided, but how much can be made; and the administration is in a position where you cannot expect for a couple of years that anything but politics. We have the problem of keeping our industry isolated from the general unrest. Something should be done to protect the situation as we have it.

The Problem of Unemployment in the Men's Clothing Industry.

The Problem:- The evils of unemployment need no further emphasis. Even in the absence of statistics, such as illuminate the problems of child labor, industrial accidents, and sickness, the dire distress resulting from the insecurity incident to modern industrial organizations is generally recognized and, unfortunately, accepted. "Unemployment is the only purely industrial hazard. It is far and away the most disastrously costly of all hazards. "(a) "Nothing is more dangerous to the standard of life, or so destructive of those minimum conditions of healthy existence, which must in the interests of the community be assured to every worker, than any widespread or continued unemployment. "(b) "We know in a general way that unemployment has existed during prosperous conditions of industry to an appalling degree. For years the states of Massachusetts and New York published figures showing percentage of unemployment among trade union members in those states. In Massachusetts the unemployment percentage among unionists rises to 17.9 per cent in 1914, while the minimum at any time since 1908 was 3% in 1918. The unemployment percentage was even greater in New York State, the maximum being 40.1% in 1913, and the minimum 5.9% in 1912." "The cost of this most costly and destructive of all industrial hazards, unemployment, is appalling. Its money cost, reckoned

(a) Royal Meeker, The Monthly Labor Review, September, 1919, p.4

(b) Labor and the New Social Order, British Labor Party Conference, June, 1918, p.9.

The Problem of Unemployment in the
New England States.

The problem of unemployment in the New England States is a serious one. It is a problem which has been with us for many years, and which has become more acute in recent years. The problem is not only a problem of the New England States, but a problem of the whole country. It is a problem which affects the lives of millions of people, and which is a problem which we must solve if we are to have a better future.

The problem of unemployment is a problem which has many causes. One of the main causes is the fact that the demand for labor is not keeping pace with the supply. This is due to a number of factors, including the fact that the population is increasing, and that the number of people who are seeking work is also increasing. Another cause is the fact that the demand for labor is seasonal, and that many people are only able to find work during certain parts of the year. A third cause is the fact that the demand for labor is changing, and that many people are not able to find work in the new industries which are developing.

The problem of unemployment is a problem which we must solve if we are to have a better future. We must find ways to create more jobs, and we must find ways to help people who are unemployed. We must find ways to make sure that everyone who wants to work can find work. We must find ways to make sure that everyone who is unemployed is able to support themselves and their families. We must find ways to make sure that everyone who is unemployed is able to live a decent life.

(1) Report of the Committee on Unemployment, New England States, 1917, p. 2.
(2) Report of the Committee on Unemployment, New England States, 1917, p. 2.

in terms of product unproduced, services unrendered, and capital goods, lost or deteriorated in value, I estimate or guess, would amount to more than half the value of the yearly product of all our industries. This means that we are operating our industries on a 66 2/3 per cent efficiency basis and are losing by not producing something like 35 billion dollars a year, just because we have not recognized that ignorance, however blissful, is mighty expensive." (c)

Whatever hardship unemployment inflicts upon workmen in industry generally, it inflicts in even greater measure upon the workmen in the men's clothing industry. With regard to the two most serious forms of unemployment, the cyclical and seasonal, the incidence of unemployment has been in the men's clothing industry more widespread and its intensity greater than in the common run of industries in this country. Quantitative estimates of the extent and duration of unemployment at different periods are in the present state of information impossible; but the range of unemployment has been known to vary from one month to considerably more than a quarter of a year. We have, therefore, the spectacle of about 200,000 men and women exposed to the dangers of long periods of unemployment, chronically underemployed even in periods of normal business activity, assuming the risks and responsibilities of industry, without any safeguards against the most serious of economic insecurities. The outbreak of widespread unemployment in the industry in the past few months again brings to the fore a problem which, during a period of false security engendered by abnormal war activity, seemed to have been solved. What.

(c) Royal Meeker, The Monthly Labor Review, Apr. 1920. pp8.10

then, are the steps that have been taken in the past to meet this problem and what are those measures that, in the light of past experience, are most likely to produce results?

Early Treatment of the Problem.- The attribution to personal incompetency of evils really due to social organization is a phenomenon not rare in economic history. Accordingly, unemployment, industrial accidents, occupational disease are at first charged against personal disability and their burdens are borne by the individual. Only when the burden becomes to the individual unbearable, does the organized community take official cognizance of it. Action then takes the form of charity. Community support under these conditions is a concession made to suffering and not the payment of a debt. The individual is free to take a job and to profit from it; his are the benefits derived from an industrial system resting upon the principle of unrestricted competition; upon him, consequently, must fall the evils, as well as the benefits, of chance. So the theory runs. And under its influence, the existence of unemployment is taken for granted; its causes are not studied; its relative burdens are not weighed; and the road to solution is temporarily blocked.

The Period of Transition.- This quiescent attitude toward so fundamental a problem could not, of course, last. The growth of labor organizations means a redistribution of economic power and influence. This influence is gradually exerted in such a way as to force a reconsideration of old questions. In the earliest and

weakest stages of their development, labor organizations attack unemployment by building up funds and by distributing these funds to members in need. That system saves men from becoming public charges and restores to them their dignity. But it still lacks the attributes of a constructive measure, since it makes no provision for the examination and removal of those factors that themselves produce unemployment. Its effect, therefore, is to mitigate the influence of an evil but not to remove the evil. With the growth in the number and strength of labor unions, however, a tendency to discover and to distribute responsibility in new categories is at once noticeable. In many of the unemployment insurance schemes existing on the Continent of Europe today, contributions to the insurance funds are made either by the employer, the employee, or the State, by combinations of two of these agencies, or by all three. The most advanced instance of the last type is the English Unemployment plan, in which equal contributions are made by employer and employee, and an additional subsidy is contributed by the State. The theory of such a plan is vague and ill defined. It marks a timid and hesitant step in the direction of a plan in which the burden of the cost of unemployment is imposed where it is likely to effect a prompt and thoroughgoing attack on the root of the evil. The tripartite division of responsibility and of cost is a compromise and a concession to temporary obstacles.

Contribution by the state apparently rests on the principle that the general community benefits from a competitive order and that it is, therefore, willing to assume the costs incident to the maintenance of that order. As an abstract proposition, this contention carries considerable force. But in so far as it implies

that the assumption of financial burdens by the state will lead to a critical scrutiny of the source and nature of the cost and to its elimination, the proposition is not consonant with experience. State action has in the past been effective against the grosser and more obvious industrial abuses. And it has failed where the abuse is tied up with complex problems of industrial organization. The provision, also, for contributions by employer and employee has the earmarks of a practical, or perhaps political, settlement of a difficult issue, in which more than one interest is involved.

Unemployment a cost of industry.- A survey of the scientific literature on unemployment indicates that the weight of authority conceives unemployment as a cost of industry.

"I do not want to see an unemployment insurance law, modeled after the British Act, enacted in this country. It is very clear to me that industry should be made as nearly self-supporting as possible. Unemployment is the one hazard that is purely industrial Yet nothing has been done about it by industry and next to nothing by society. The whole burden falls upon the individual except for the feeble, sporadic help given by a few trade unions. Industry should be made to pay the costs of production. A part of the costs of production under the present organization of industry is unemployment tempered by underemployment and overemployment. It would be very simple to put the money costs of unemployment upon industries The premium rate would be lowest for the most stable industries and highest for those in which employment

that the possession of financial resources by the state will
lead to a certain quantity of the services and nature of the
cost and to the elimination of the possibility of not answering
with experience. State action has in the past been effective
against the growth and development of industrial classes, and
it has failed where the state is not able to control production
of industrial organizations. The government, also, has contributed
by capital and enterprise has the character of a practical, or
perhaps political, settlement of a difficult issue, in which
there is no interest in involved.

Unemployment a part of industry - A survey of the conditions
in connection with unemployment indicates that the weight of responsibility
rests on industry as a part of industry.

"I do not want to see an unemployment insurance law, modeled
after the British law, enacted in this country. It is very clear
to me that industry should be made as nearly self-sustaining as
possible. Unemployment is the one factor that is greatly retarded
..... The problem has been that it is industry and not
to be solved by a state. The whole matter is the industry
except for the state, which is a very small thing.
Industry should be made to pay the cost of unemployment, and
of the state of a state which has the power of regulation of in-
dustry is responsible for the unemployment and overproduc-
tion. It will be very difficult to see the state of industry
most from industry..... The business must be able to afford the
most serious investigation and the least of which is the

is regularly irregular." (a)

"An individual is not self-supporting unless his earnings amount to a sufficiency for life and not merely to a sufficiency for the time of working. An industry is not self-supporting unless it yields wages not only for the time of employment but also for the time of inevitable unemployment as well -- unless it maintains all the men required by it both while they are in active service and while they are standing in reserve. "(b)

".....if a reserve of labor is required by any industry, then that industry should maintain that reserve not only when working, but also when it is unavoidably unemployed. "(c)

"If there were no free workers no new business could be started, and no extensions of established business would be possible. Progress is impossible without change, and new work or added work inevitably means change for some people. While this does not necessarily always mean suffering, many times it does bring positive economic loss. Progress of industry and society ought not to mean loss of time and economic deprivation to the worker. If industry profits from the 'reserve' mass of unemployment and necessitates the 'reserve', then it ought to assume economic responsibility for what it causes. Whatever the general economic loss accruing from the 'reserve' forces of labor, the cause does not inhere in the workers. It is plainly evident in the fluctuations of industry."(d)

-
- (a) Royal Meeker, Monthly Labor Review, September, 1919, p.8.
 - (b) W.H.Beveridge, Unemployment, A Problem of Industry, p. 236.
 - (c) From report by R. Williams, Divisional Officer for the North-Eastern Division of Labor Exchanges.
 - (d) G.R. Miller, Social Insurance in the United States. p.65.

is regularly increasing." (a)

"An industrial is not self-sufficient unless the earnings

amount to a self-sufficiency for life and not merely as a self-sufficiency for the time being. An industry is not self-sufficient unless it yields more not only for the time of expansion but also for the time of contraction. An industry is not self-sufficient unless all the new required by it can be met by its own resources and this only one working in reserve." (b)

".....if a reserve of labor is required by an industry,

then that industry should maintain that reserve not only when

working, but also when it is unworkably unemployed." (c)

"If there were no free reserves no new business could be started,

and no extension of established business would be possible. Progress in industry is based on change, and new work is added with steadily

more change for new people. While this fact not necessarily change

more industry, every time it does bring positive economic loss.

Progress of industry and society ought not to mean loss of time and

economic satisfaction by the worker. It is industry growth that the

'reserve' mean of unemployment and unemployment the 'reserve' that

it ought to mean economic responsibility for what it means. That

even the financial economic loss coming from the 'reserve' is not all

lost. The same loss is also in the reserve. It is clearly

evident in the literature of industry." (d)

(a) Royal Commission, Working Paper No. 1, 1917, p. 1.

(b) J. B. Clark, "The Economics of Unemployment," p. 1.

(c) J. B. Clark, "The Economics of Unemployment," p. 1.

(d) J. B. Clark, "The Economics of Unemployment," p. 1.

This attitude toward the problem is due not only to the feeling that the cost of unemployment is properly chargeable against industry but, more particularly, to the results of experience with the older devices. Unemployment insurance in its past and present manifestations is almost entirely alleviatory in effect. Under existing systems of insurance, energetic and sustained preventive measures have not and apparently will not be taken. The failure of this expedient in this respect has, therefore, led students of the problem to formulate new plans whereby a substantial financial payment is imposed upon the responsible party, the industry, through the medium of the employer. By thus assigning responsibility and cost, the stimulus for prevention is provided. The application of this theory to unemployment, while new there, is characteristic of the institution of insurance, generally, and particularly, of the systems of workmen's compensation now operative in most states in this country. That the imposition of the cost of an evil on the industry will be effective seems to be the opinion held by competent students.

"Nothing so stimulates preventive effort as definite responsibility for the losses entailed. Preventive measures proved inadequate to meet the problem of industrial accident until stimulated by the enactment of Workmen's Compensation Laws." (a)

"Unemployment insurance, if the cost falls first on employers, would rapidly stimulate a rational continuous effort by them to regularize industry; or any other legal requirement by which unnecessary irregularity was made costly to the operators would induce similar effort, and would tend to place unemployment at a minimum." (b).

(a) Report of the Health Insurance Commission of Pennsylvania, Jan., 1919, p. 7
(b) G.R. Miller, op.cit., p. 93.

This attitude toward the problem is one not only of the feeling that the cost of unemployment is largely borne by the

industry but, more particularly, to the attitude of acceptance with

the other nations. Unemployment insurance is the first step

in the direction of a more active role for the State in the

the system of insurance, through the national government's

have not and apparently will not be taken. The failure of this

expected in this respect has, however, the elements of the problem

as to whether and when there is a substantial amount of payment in

from upon the responsible party, the industry, through the action of

the industry. By this means the responsibility for the cost of the

for protection is provided. The application of this theory to the

element, this new theory, is characteristic of the industrial

insurance, generally, and particularly, of the system of workers'

organization now operating in that system in this country. That the

operation of the fund as an evil of the industry will be effective

seems to be the opinion held by competent students.

"Further an alternative method of dealing with the

policy for the longer period. The industry's system of insurance

to meet the problem of unemployment is not entirely new. It is

known as the "German System" and is

described in the report of the committee on the

could easily be adapted to the American situation by the

the industry as well as the State in which it is operating. It is

likely that the cost of the system will be borne by the industry

which will be the main object of the system.

Report of the Committee on the Unemployment Problem, 1911, p. 11.

Discussing the Unemployment Insurance Bill, the Manchester Guardian (February 27, 1920) states. "The chief point about the Insurance Bill is that it will not do what its author, Sir Robert Horne, regards as the first essential of such a measure. That is, it will not relieve the mass of workers from the dread of unemployment..... To prevent unemployment the easiest way is to make those who have the power of giving or withholding unemployment financially responsible. Under a national scheme such as this the burden is so widely distributed that ~~neither~~ no employer, nor even a whole trade, has any real inducement to keep the maximum number of people at work. Only when each trade has to bear the cost of maintaining its own unemployed are we likely to have either an economical distribution of benefits or a scale of relief which will allow a person who is temporarily out of work through no fault of his own to maintain his family in decency."

"As a means of indemnifying the employee against injuries caused by accidents over which he has no control, the tendency has been to throw the costs of such accidents upon industry or business and make the consumer pay the expense, due to industrial accidents, by the establishment of a system of regulated accident insurance....."

Similarly the City of Chicago should shift the burden and cost of unemployment which cannot be prevented.... so that such cost will fall indirectly upon the general public.... "(a)

From the preceding discussion two general principles of far-reaching importance emerge:

1. Unemployment is beyond the control of the worker; it is

Illustrating the Unemployment Insurance Bill, the Committee
Chairman (February 27, 1932) stated: "The chief point about the
Insurance Bill is that it will not do what its critics say,
regards as the first essential of such a measure. That is, it will not
relieve the rate of interest from the burden of unemployment.
To prevent unemployment the central way is to make those who have the
power of giving or withholding employment financially responsible.
Under a national system which this the burden is to which distributed
that make an employer, not even a whole trade, has any real influence
to keep the number of people at work. Only when each trade has
to bear the cost of maintaining the one unemployed are we likely to have
either an economical distribution of benefits or a scale of relief
which will allow a person who is temporarily out of work through no fault
of his own to maintain his family in decency."
As a means of indemnifying the employer against injuries caused
by accidents over which he has no control, the Government has been to share
the costs of such accidents upon basis of or insurance and to be the one
never pay the expense, but to indemnify accident, by the establishment
of a system of regulated accident insurance.
At the City of Chicago Council after the London and cost of un-
employment which cannot be prevented.... so that each cost will fall
indirectly upon the general public.... (a)
from the following statement the general principles of the
reaching report was written:
1. Unemployment is beyond the control of the worker; it is

due to defects in the management and control of industry; its cost is therefore, properly charged against industry as an element in the cost of production, comparable in kind to such other elements as wages, the expense of maintaining machinery, the cost of industrial accidents, etc.

2. The cost of unemployment must be met from a fund, established and supported by the industry and segregated for the purpose of meeting that cost alone. In this way, only, can the burden of the cost be sufficiently felt by those who must take steps to reduce it. It seems to be a cardinal principle in social insurance that specific allocation of the responsibility and burden is an indispensable first step in the eradication of the evil.

Practical application of these principles. - Fortunately the application of these principles has recently passed beyond the stage of theoretical discussion to that of actual performance. In the memorandum prepared by the Dutch Government for presentation at the International Labor Conference in Washington, 1919, the following statement appears, "In 1919 the employers of the port of Amsterdam guaranteed a minimum wage to a special reserve of port workers, payable whether they were employed or not. The city authorities of Amsterdam have created a similar reserve of workers in communal enterprises. The bourse de travail calls up the worker when necessary, but regular payment is made when the worker is not employed."

The report of the Committee on Scientific Management and Reduction

the to defects in the management and control of industry, the fact
is therefore, properly stated, that industry as an element in
the cost of production, comprises in itself its own share of elements as
wages, the expense of maintaining machinery, the cost of industrial
accidents, etc.

2. The cost of management must be not less a third, but
established and measured by the industry and recognized for the pur-
pose of setting that cost aside. In this way, only, can the burden of
the cost be sufficiently felt by those who must take steps to reduce
it. It seems to be a cardinal principle in social economics that
specific allocation of the responsibility and burden is an indispens-
able first step in the eradication of the evil.

Practical application of these principles - Unfortunately the ap-
plication of these principles has recently passed beyond the stage of
theoretical discussion to that of actual performance. In the con-
ference prepared by the Labor Government for presentation at the
International Labor Conference in Washington, 1919, the following
statement appears, "In 1919 the majority of the cost of maintenance
guaranteed a minimum wage to a small number of men, women, and
children that were employed in it. The only authorities of
industry have created a system of control of workers in general which
gives the worker no control over the matter when necessary, but
resists payment to him when the worker is not employed.

The report of the Committee on Industrial Management and Labor in

of Costs, appointed by the Industrial Council for the building Industry of Great Britain, made in the fall of 1919 and concurred in by three employers, recommends that "the the case of unavoidable unemployment, the unemployed workman by maintained by the industry itself. Each employer will be required, upon joint certificate from himself and a union representative to pay weekly into an unemployment fund....." "The necessary funds should be raised, as a first charge on production, by means of a weekly percentage on the wages bills, to be paid by each employer to a joint committee of employers and employees. Although collected by a joint committee, the unemployment pay is to be distributed by the trade unions, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Building Trades Parliament, the scale varying from full wages for a man with a wife and four children to half wage for a single man." (a)

The most recent and clearest adoption of the principle that the cost of unemployment be borne by the industry is embodied in the report. (March 31, 1920) of the English Court of Inquiry into the wages and conditions of dock labor. In presenting the case of the dock workers to the Court of Inquiry, Mr. Bevin said: But registration alone is not sufficient. If unemployment amongst the registered men occurs there is nothing to fall upon but the Government unemployment benefit of 15 shilling a week. I am in favor of the industry maintaining its own unemployment. If it is moral to have maintenance charges for docks, then it is equally moral to have maintenance for labor The demands of the workers included first the provision that "A Dockers' Register, controlled by the Union, should

(a) Interim Report on Organized Public Service in the Building Industry, The Nation, New York, January 24, 1920.

be established with a view to abolishing casual labor" and second that "the maintenance of the unemployed should be a charge upon the industry." The majority report of the Court of Inquiry finds 1. "That into all ports, docks, and labors of the Kingdom a system of registration of dock labor shall be introduced" and 2. "That the principle of the maintenance of unemployed casual labor is approved." The port employers have accepted the report and are discussing with the unions the details of its application.

The Proposed Unemployment Program in the Men's Clothing Industry. -

In its pending negotiations with the manufacturers of men's clothing, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America has asked the manufacturers to create an unemployment fund, based on the contribution by the manufacturers of a specified sum per worker per week. The proceeds of this fund will be used in granting relief to unemployed workers in the industry. The general principles on which these demands are based have already been discussed. The next step is the consideration of a few specific conditions and of the more fundamental administrative principles, with a view to indicating the benefits and advantages of the proposed plan.

Competitive Status of the Employer under the plan. - In its simplest form, this proposed program should not in the slightest degree disturb the competitive relations of employers within the industry. To the degree to which unemployment is ineradicable, the cost will be shifted to the consumer like any other cost of production -- and properly so. It is believed, however, that a large part of the unemployment as it occurs in the industry today is not only not inevitable but is reducible in extent if steps to reduce it are taken.

be established with a view to abolishing casual labor" and second that "the maintenance of the unemployed should be a charge upon the industry." The majority report of the House of Inquiry states: "That into all parts, States, and Towns of the Kingdom a system of registration of casual labor shall be introduced" and a "that the principle of the maintenance of unemployed casual labor is agreed." The four employers have accepted the report and are discussing with the unions the details of the application.

The proposed Government Bill is the first step towards

In the pending negotiations with the representatives of the clothing industry the Government has asked the representatives to create an unemployment fund, based on the contribution of the workers. It is proposed that the Government will be asked in pending relief to unemployed workers in the industry. The general principle on which these demands are based have already been discussed. The next step is the consideration of a few specific conditions and of the more fundamental administrative principles, with a view to introducing the principle and arrangements of the proposed plan.

Administrative details of the Government Bill are: - In the first place, this proposed program should not be the slightest degree binding on the competitive relations of employers within the industry. To the degree to which unemployment is inevitable, the cost will be shifted to the consumer like any other cost of production -- and properly so. It is believed, however, that a large part of the unemployment as it occurs in the industry today is not only not inevitable but is avoidable in so far as it is avoidable in so far as it is avoidable.

Where that is the case, the more progressive employers will turn their attention to the problems of industrial organization involved in the evil and will attempt to meet them. Such attention to the nature of the problem should be encouraged by provisions that would penalize excesses in unemployment and reward reductions. The employer whose contributions would be reduced by this device would thereby acquire a legitimate competitive advantage over his fellow employers.

That deliberate and sustained efforts on the part of employers to check the volume of unemployment will be successful seems to be the opinion of students of the problem. In much of the contemporary writing on the subject, the volume of unemployment is conceived to be a function of the efficiency of industrial management. This is distinctly the view of W.H. Beveridge, perhaps one of the leading authorities on unemployment in the world. Sidney Webb in the preface of a book on "Seasonal Trades" holds that "the seasonal alterations of overpressure and slackness to which so many workers are subjected, with such evil results, are due only to failures of adjustment. There is no more 'inevitability' about them than about the rattling of a motor-car". In the regularization of industry a large responsibility lies directly upon employers to regularize their own businesses. Every attempt should be made within the limits of each business to make every job a steady job. Sincere efforts in this direction on the part of the employer can accomplish much." (a) "The contri-

(a) John B. Andrews, A Practical Program for the Prevention of Unemployment in America.

There is in the case, the more progressive engineers will
turn their attention to the problem of industrial management
involved in the work and will attempt to meet them. Their efforts
lead to the nature of the problem should be recognized by management
that would result in attention in management and toward engineers.
The engineer whose contribution would be reduced by this action
would thereby receive a significant compensative advantage over his
fellow engineers.

That deliberate and sustained efforts on the part of engineers
to check the volume of management will be essential seems to be
the nature of the nature of the problem. In view of the foregoing
writing on the subject, the volume of management is essential to be
a function of the efficiency of industrial management. This is the
essence of the view of J. B. Edwards, perhaps one of the leading
authorities on management in the world. Among other in the position
of a book on "Industrial Management" which says "The essential element
of management and efficiency is that of the work which the engineer
does and will receive, and the only to achieve it is to be
in the management, that is to say, the position of a
manager. In the organization of industry a large responsibility
lies directly with the engineer in relation to their own position.
Every manager should be made aware of the nature of work which he
does every day a change in the nature of work which he is engaged in
the part of the engineer and management work." (a) The engineer

(a) This is a function of industrial management for the solution of
management in industry.

bution that employers can make toward the steadying of our industries is obvious. By deciding earlier what and how much they will produce and by resisting the temptation to crowd work by requiring overtime, they can do much to make production regular and continuous throughout the year, instead of, as at present in so many industries, feverishly active at certain seasons and almost stagnant at others." (b)

Financial reward to those employers whose unemployment record shows improvement is a device already incorporated, in small measure, in the English Unemployment Insurance Act. "The Board of Trade shall, on the application of any employer made within one month after the termination of any calendar year, or other prescribed period of twelve months, refund to such employer out of the unemployment fund a sum equal to one-third of the contributions (Exclusive of any contributions refunded to him under any other provisions of this part of this act) paid by him on his own behalf during that period in respect of any workman who has been continuously in his service through the period, and in respect of whom not less than forty-five contributions have been paid during the period." Another provision, designed to produce the same result, imposes upon employers proportionately larger premiums for workmen engaged for one or two days than for those engaged for a week. In both instances the financial incentives are too small to have any marked effect. But the principle,

reinforced by substantial contributions, is sound.

Cooperation of the Worker.- Any plan, however, perfect in its mechanical outlines, will not succeed unless it enlists the enthusiastic cooperation of the worker. And much time and effort has been expended by the captains of industry in this country in the past few years to earn the cooperation of labor. Yet a member of a trade union who finds himself ousted from a job because of the introduction of a new labor-saving machine and who is not supported during his period of unemployment will not view with pleasure the introduction of machinery into the industry in which he works. He will in all probability be found on the floor of his union advocating restrictions against the introduction of machinery. (a) Exposure to serious unemployment of another nature will also make him a vigorous protagonist of high initiation fees and restrictive apprenticeship regulations. It is the reasonable human method of warding off disaster with an obstacle. Such, further, is likely to be the temper of the workmen until industry's obligations are recognized and assumed. It is commonly agreed that ownership and management carry an element of profit and a certain measure of dignity and power. That ownership and management are under the obligation to workmen to assure them adequate wages, proper working conditions, and, among other things, continuous

(a) "This will mean...that we must introduce labor-saving machinery, and more capable administration, and also, persuade the worker not to limit his output. But we can hardly expect him to sympathize with our efforts so long as they may expose him to the risk of immediate suffering through unemployment." R. Seebohm Rowntree, *Some Obligations of Industry to Labor*.

reinforced by substantial contributions, in some,

Government of the Worker. - Any plan, however, perfect in its working-

cal outline, will not succeed unless it entails the enthusiastic coopera-

tion of the worker. And much time and effort has been expended by the

capitalist of industry in this country in the past few years to gain the

cooperation of labor. Yet a member of a trade union who finds himself

deprived from a job because of the introduction of a new labor-saving machine

and who is not supported during his period of unemployment will not view

with pleasure the introduction of machinery into the industry in which

he works. He will in all probability be found on the floor of his union

advocating restrictions against the introduction of machinery. (a)

Exposure to serious unemployment of another nature will also make him a

vigorous proponent of high initiation fees and restrictive apprentice-

ship regulations. It is the reasonable human method of warding off

disaster with an obstacle. Such, further, is likely to be the temper

of the worker until industry's obligations are recognized and assumed.

It is commonly agreed that ownership and management carry an element of

profit and a certain measure of dignity and power. That ownership and

management are under the obligation to workers to secure them adequate

wages, proper working conditions, and, among other things, continuous

(a) "This will mean...that we must introduce labor-saving machinery, and have capital administration, and also persuade the worker not to limit his output. But we can hardly expect him to sympathize with our efforts so long as they may expose him to the risk of loss of authority through unemployment." Mr. Theodore Roosevelt, Some Obligations of Industry to Labor.

employment, should also be generally recognized. For it is not until such obligations are fully discharged that real cooperation can be sought.

Under the operation of the plan, the cooperation of labor is likely to be enlisted in even a greater degree by the ability of the employer to maintain a permanent labor force throughout the year. It is reasonably certain that an industry characterized by frequent periods of unemployment and substantial underemployment is exposed to a high rate of labor turnover resulting from the efforts of workmen to find that employer who can assure the steadiest employment. Much of the expense of hiring and training should be reduced under a system that will be eminently favorable to a greater permanency of tenure.

Utilization of Productive Capacity. - A loss of industrial capacity, due to unemployment, of 33 1/3- percent, as estimated by Royal Becker, may be very wide of the mark. And the estimate is not susceptible of statistical test. But no one doubts that the loss in output, resulting from unemployment and underemployment, is as great or greater than the loss ascribed to underproduction by workmen. In the face, however, of cries for increased output, some industries announce part-time operation and other shut down completely. Aside from the effect of such a condition on the mind of workmen, the loss to the public and to the employer, arising from the failure of industry to make full use of its mechanical and human resources, is so great as to recommend the consideration of

employment, should also be generally recognized. For it is not
until such obligations are fully discharged that real education can
begin.

Under the operation of the plan, the proportion of labor is
likely to be shifted in favor of a greater service by the ability of
the employer to maintain a permanent labor force throughout the
year. It is reasonably certain that as industry is developed by
constant periods of unemployment and substantial unemployment is
exposed to a high rate of labor turnover resulting from the efforts
of others to find that employer who can secure the essential equip-
ment. Part of the expense of hiring and training should be reduced
under a system that will be extremely favorable to a greater permanency
of service.

Unemployment as a Social Problem - A loss of industrial
activity, due to unemployment, of 25 1/3 percent, as calculated by
Royal Institute, may be very close to the mark. And the estimate is
not susceptible of statistical test. But no one doubts that this loss
in output, resulting from unemployment and underemployment, is no small
or greater loss than has been ascribed to under-education by workers. In
the case, however, of either the 14 percent figure, or the estimate as-
cribed to the Institute, the question arises that the estimate is
based on such a condition as the kind of services, the loss to the public
and to the employer, arising from the failure of industry to make full use
of its potential and human resources, is no greater as to percentage the
contribution to it.

any plan which may reduce the cost.

Relation of the Men's Clothing Industry to Other Industries. -

New industrial and economic proposals are almost always met with the objection that the conditions they attack are national in scope and that, consequently, the proposals must have the same limits. In this particular case, it might be urged that the clothing industry is so inextricably connected with other industries in this country and abroad that the unemployment problem cannot be solved in the one industry without simultaneously solving it in all of the others. The whole history of economic and industrial progress, however, leads precisely to the opposite conclusion. Trade unions, as instruments for improving the conditions of workmen, rose first in particular establishments in particular localities. Where they first got a foothold, there they first made and enforced their demands. Extension of their fields of influence marks a later stage of development. The present status of trade unionism, with its system of national collective bargaining and national standard rates, is the latest stage in a long and tedious process of evolution. Very much the same characteristics mark the growth of economic legislation. Restrictions on woman and child labor, minimum wage legislation factory inspection laws moved slowly and painfully from industry to industry, from locality to locality. Even at the present time, it is by no means true that economic legislation bears with equal weight upon all industries, in all places, or even upon all establishments within the same industry.

The fact in the matter is that economic progress is the result

any plan which may involve the cost.

Position of the State in relation to the industry.

The industrial and economic proposals are almost always met with the objection that the conditions they attack are not in the nature of a threat, consequently, the proposals must have the same limits in this particular case. It might be urged that the existing industry is an industry connected with other industries in this country and argued that the unemployment problem cannot be solved in the one industry without simultaneously solving it in all of the others. The whole history of economic and industrial progress, however, leads directly to the opposite conclusion. There will be, as instruments for improving the conditions of workers, those that in particular establishments in particular industries. Where they first get a foothold, there they first make and extend their demands. Extension of their fields of influence marks a later stage of development. The present status of trade unions, with the system of national collective bargaining and national standard rates, is the latest stage in a long and tedious process of evolution. Very much the same transformation marks the growth of economic legislation. Restrictions on women and child labor, minimum wage legislation, factory inspection laws were slowly and gradually the industry in industry. From industry to industry. Even at the present time, it is hard to name the last economic legislation passed with regard to all industries, in all places, or even upon all establishments within the same industry. The fact is the matter is that economic progress is the result

of experimentation. The experiment is conceived and tested by the more enlightened and more progressive members of the industrial community. Upon the results of voluntary experiments of this nature is social progress largely built. If any single industry or part of it were to wait for action upon their neighbors the effect would be stagnation. In the field of industrial relations, the men's clothing industry has fashioned a machinery of adjustment and expression which has fast become the model of its kind. The same industry has again the opportunity of stimulating industrial progress by offering the solution to a problem, before which industry has lain helpless.

Leo Wolman.

of experimental. The experiment is conducted and tested by
the most intelligent and most experienced members of the
total community. Upon the results of voluntary cooperation of
the nature in which progress is made. In any degree
industry or part of it was to wait for action upon their
the other would be adequate. In the field of industrial relations,
the new's striking industry has conducted a movement of adjustment
and adjustment which has been the result of the time. The
new industry has again the opportunity of adjusting industrial
progress by creating the relation to a position, before which the
industry has been adjusted.

the volume.