

L13.3
no. 33

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
JAMES J. DAVIS, SECRETARY
WOMEN'S BUREAU
MARY ANDERSON, Director

BULLETIN OF THE WOMEN'S BUREAU, NO. 33

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE WOMEN'S
INDUSTRIAL CONFERENCE**

Called by the Women's Bureau
of the
United States Department of Labor
Washington, D. C.
January 11, 12, and 13, 1923



WASHINGTON
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
1923

State Teachers College Library,
Cape Girardeau, Mo.

[PUBLIC—No. 259—66TH CONGRESS.]

[H. R. 13229.]

AN ACT To establish in the Department of Labor a bureau to be known as the Women's Bureau.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there shall be established in the Department of Labor a bureau to be known as the Women's Bureau.

SEC. 2. That the said bureau shall be in charge of a director, a woman, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall receive an annual compensation of \$5,000. It shall be the duty of said bureau to formulate standards and policies which shall promote the welfare of wage-earning women, improve their working conditions, increase their efficiency, and advance their opportunities for profitable employment. The said bureau shall have authority to investigate and report to the said department upon all matters pertaining to the welfare of women in industry. The director of said bureau may from time to time publish the results of these investigations in such a manner and to such extent as the Secretary of Labor may prescribe.

SEC. 3. That there shall be in said bureau an assistant director to be appointed by the Secretary of Labor, who shall receive an annual compensation of \$3,500 and shall perform such duties as shall be prescribed by the director and approved by the Secretary of Labor.

SEC. 4. That there is hereby authorized to be employed by said bureau a chief clerk and such special agents, assistants, clerks, and other employees at such rates of compensation and in such numbers as Congress may from time to time provide by appropriations.

SEC. 5. That the Secretary of Labor is hereby directed to furnish sufficient quarters, office furniture, and equipment for the work of this bureau.

SEC. 6. That this act shall take effect and be in force from and after its passage.

Approved, June 5, 1920.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
JAMES J. DAVIS, SECRETARY
WOMEN'S BUREAU
MARY ANDERSON, Director

BULLETIN OF THE WOMEN'S BUREAU, NO. 33

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE WOMEN'S
INDUSTRIAL CONFERENCE**

Called by the Women's Bureau
of the
United States Department of Labor
Washington, D. C.
January 11, 12, and 13, 1923



WASHINGTON
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
1923

CONTENTS.

	Page.
Letter of transmittal.....	v
Call to the conference.....	vi
Letter of indorsement by the Secretary of Labor.....	vii
Program of the conference.....	viii
List of delegates who attended the conference.....	ix
<i>Thursday, January 11, 1923—Morning Session.</i>	
Hon. James J. Davis, Secretary of Labor.....	2
Mrs. Harriet Taylor Upton.....	11
<i>Thursday, January 11, 1923—Afternoon Session.</i>	
WHAT WOMEN WORKERS MEAN TO INDUSTRY.	
Mr. Charles Cheney.....	16
Miss Mary Gilson.....	66
WHAT INDUSTRY MEANS TO WOMEN WORKERS.	
Miss Mary Van Kleeck.....	24
Mrs. Raymond Robins.....	34
<i>Friday, January 12, 1923—Morning Session.</i>	
HOME WORK.	
Mrs. Florence Kelley.....	47
HEALTH STANDARDS FOR WOMEN IN INDUSTRY.	
Dr. R. A. Spaeth.....	52
<i>Friday, January 12, 1923—Afternoon Session.</i>	
WOMEN'S WAGES.	
Mrs. Maud Swartz.....	78
Miss Sophonisba P. Breckinridge.....	85
<i>Saturday, January 13, 1923—Morning Session.</i>	
LABOR LEGISLATION FOR WOMEN.	
Miss Melinda Scott.....	110
Miss Merica Hoagland.....	120
<i>Saturday, January 13, 1923—Afternoon Session.</i>	
General discussion.....	136
<i>Saturday, January 13, 1923—Evening Session.</i>	
THE NEED FOR WOMEN TO ENFORCE WOMEN'S LABOR LAWS.	
Miss Tracy Copp.....	171
Mrs. James J. Devitt.....	174
Miss Agnes Nestor.....	178
Miss Mary McDowell.....	184

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
WOMEN'S BUREAU,
Washington, July 20, 1923.

SIR: There is transmitted herewith a copy of the proceedings of the Women's Industrial Conference called by the Women's Bureau in the United States Department of Labor, Washington, D. C., January 11, 12, and 13, 1923.

Reports of all the formal speeches have been submitted to the speakers for their approval or have been furnished by the speakers themselves, and the records of the discussions from the floor have been carefully gone over to insure that they are intelligible and complete.

MARY ANDERSON, *Director.*

HON. JAMES J. DAVIS,
Secretary of Labor.

▼

CALL TO THE CONFERENCE.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
WOMEN'S BUREAU,
Washington, November 22, 1922.

You are cordially invited to send a representative to a conference called by the Women's Bureau of the United States Department of Labor for the purpose of discussing problems of women in industry.

According to the last report of the Bureau of the Census we have over eight and a half million women in gainful occupations. This means that every fourth worker is a woman. The Women's Bureau is charged with the responsibility of developing policies and standards and conducting investigations in the industries of the country which shall safeguard the interests of women workers and thus make their service effective for the national good. In fulfilling this obligation we feel that a conference of women including representation from all national organizations of women and other interested groups would go far not only to focus attention on the problems involved but to help in the development of policies and standards for the effective employment of women in industry.

The recognition of the national and international importance of labor conditions is a paramount need, since the Nation depends for its prosperity upon the efficiency of its workers. No other foundation for commercial success will be so sure as the conservation of practices in industry which make for the health and well-being of the women workers and also assure efficiency in the industries.

It is with this in mind that we are calling this conference and urge the fullest participation by the women of the country. We are especially desirous that your organization be represented and trust that a woman member will be delegated to attend this conference.

The conference will be held in the New National Museum, Tenth and B Streets NW., Washington, D. C., January 11, 12, and 13, 1923.

Sincerely yours,

MARY ANDERSON, *Director.*

**LETTER OF INDORSEMENT BY THE SECRETARY OF
LABOR.**

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, November 17, 1922.

DEAR MISS ANDERSON: I am writing to express my hearty approval of your plans for calling a nation-wide conference of women under the auspices of the Women's Bureau of this department for the purpose of discussing the problems of women in industry.

It appears from census figures that approximately one-fourth of the wage earners of America are women, and apparently the proportion is increasing rather than diminishing. Every thinking American must realize that this situation creates a number of special problems and calls for careful consideration of ways and means for safeguarding the mothers and the potential mothers of the Nation who must so be employed. It is impossible to separate entirely the problems of our motherhood from the problems of our childhood, and there is nothing more important in our civilization than the protection of both of these in their strength and purity. The future of the Nation depends on this more than on any other single factor.

It is with pleasure, therefore, that I approve of your plans for calling a three days' conference for such days in January, 1923, as in your judgment may be most appropriate.

Very sincerely yours,

JAMES J. DAVIS,
Secretary.

MISS MARY ANDERSON,
Director Women's Bureau, Department of Labor,
Washington, D. C.

PROGRAM.

January 11—Morning session, 10.30 a. m.

Miss Mary Anderson, Director of the Women's Bureau, **presiding.**

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.
(If public duties do not interfere.)

HON. JAMES J. DAVIS, Secretary of Labor.

Afternoon session, 2 p. m.

Hon. Edward J. Henning, Assistant Secretary of Labor, **presiding.**

WHAT WOMEN WORKERS MEAN TO INDUSTRY.

Mr. Charles Cheney, of **Cheney Bros.**, South Manchester, Conn., representing the National Association of Manufacturers.

Miss Mary Gilson, superintendent of employment and service department, the **Joseph & Feiss Co.**, Cleveland, Ohio.

WHAT INDUSTRY MEANS TO WOMEN WORKERS.

Miss Mary Van Kleeck, Director, department of industrial studies, **Russell Sage Foundation**; former Director of the Women's Bureau, United States Department of Labor.

Mrs. Raymond Robins, president of the International Federation of Working Women.

January 12—Morning session, 9.30 a. m.

Mrs. Ellis Yost, legislative representative Women's Christian Temperance Union, **presiding.**

HEALTH STANDARDS FOR WOMEN IN INDUSTRY.

Dr. R. A. Spaeth, associate professor department of physiology, school of hygiene and public health, **Johns Hopkins University.**

HOME WORK.

Mrs. Florence Kelley, executive secretary National Consumers' League.

General discussion.

Afternoon session, 2 p. m.

Mrs. Thomas G. Winter, president General Federation of Women's Clubs, **presiding.**

WOMEN'S WAGES.

Mrs. Maud Swartz, president National Women's Trade Union League.

Miss Sophonisba P. Breckinridge, Dean of Women, **University of Chicago.**

General discussion.

January 13—Morning session, 9.30 a. m.

Mrs. Maud Wood Park, president National League of Women Voters, presiding.

LABOR LEGISLATION FOR WOMEN.

Miss Melinda Scott, United Textile Workers of America.

Miss Merica E. Hoagland, director mutual service division, Diamond Chain and Manufacturing Co., Indianapolis.

General discussion.

Afternoon session, 2 p. m.

Discussion continued.

Evening session, 7 p. m.—Dinner.

Miss Julia C. Lathrop, former Chief of the Children's Bureau, United States Department of Labor, presiding.

THE NEED FOR WOMEN TO ENFORCE WOMEN'S LABOR LAWS.

Miss Tracy Copp, special agent, Federal Board for Vocational Education.

Miss Agnes Nestor, vice president National Glove Workers of America.

Mrs. James J. Devitt, chairman of the department of social and industrial relations of the Iowa State Federation of Women's Clubs and member of the State Board of Education of Iowa.

Miss Mary McDowell, University Settlement, Chicago, Ill.

DELEGATES WHO ATTENDED THE CONFERENCE.

Alumnae associations and women's colleges.

Bryn Mawr College Alumnae Association—Mrs. J. Chadwick-Collins.

Elmira College Alumnae Association—Hon. Alice M. Robertson.

Goucher College Alumnae Association—Miss Mary V. Robinson.

Michigan University Alumnae Association—Mrs. Oliver L. Spaulding.

Mount Holyoke College Alumnae Association—Mrs. Frank G. Wilkins.

Radcliffe College Alumnae Association—Miss E. N. Matthews.

Rockford College Alumnae Association—Miss Maud R. Cavanagh.

Smith College Alumnae Association—Mrs. C. S. McDougall.

William Smith College Alumnae Association—Miss Susanna Moore.

Wells College Alumnae Association—Miss Claribel Cantwell.

Wellesley College Alumnae Association—Miss Alice I. Perry Wood.

Wisconsin University Alumnae Association—Miss Katherine F. Lenroot.

Bryn Mawr College—Miss Hilda W. Smith.

Michigan University—Miss Cleo Murtland.

Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America.

Maryland—Miss Mamie Santora.

American Association of Social Workers.

District of Columbia—Miss Rose McHugh.

American Association of University Women.

District of Columbia—Mrs. Raymond Morgan, Mrs. Frances Fenton Bernard.

Massachusetts—Miss Eaves.

American Bar Association.

District of Columbia—Hon. Kathryn Sellers.

American Federation of Labor.

Maryland—Miss Anna Neary.

State federations of labor and international unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labor.

American Federation of Teachers :

District of Columbia—Mrs. Edith C. Paul.

Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks :

District of Columbia—Mrs. Rose Yates Forrester.

Cigar Makers' International Union :

Pennsylvania—Miss Flora White.

International Boot and Shoe Workers' Union :

Massachusetts—Miss Agnes Johnson.

International Brotherhood of Bookbinders :

District of Columbia—Miss Laura J. Graddick.

International Glove Workers of America :

Illinois—Miss Agnes Nestor.

Maryland State and District of Columbia Federation of Labor :

Maryland—Miss Gertrude McNally.

National Federation of Federal Employees :

District of Columbia—Miss Belle Trouland, Miss Roberta L. Lindsey,
Miss Inez Cook.

National Federation of Post Office Clerks :

Illinois—Mrs. Mary V. Halas.

Printing Pressmen and Assistants' Union of North America :

Virginia—Miss Matilda F. Koester.

United Textile Workers of America :

New Jersey—Miss Melinda Scott.

American Home Economics Association.

Louisiana—Miss Clara C. Helbing.

Maryland—Miss Frances Zuill.

Minnesota—Miss Elizabeth Fish.

American Legion Auxiliary.

District of Columbia—Mrs. M. E. Van Ness.

Maine—Mrs. George H. Reed.

Pennsylvania—Mrs. Miller Forbes.

Tennessee—Mrs. Harry S. Perry.

American Medical Association.

Pennsylvania—Dr. Florence Meredith.

American Public Health Association.

Massachusetts—Miss Elizabeth McShane.

American Red Cross.

District of Columbia—Miss Emily W. Dinwiddie, Miss Hendricks.

First Catholic Slovak Ladies Union of the United States of America.

Pennsylvania—Mrs. F. C. Jakabcin.

General Federation of Women's Clubs.

Arizona—Mrs. H. C. Lockett.

Arkansas—Mrs. Edwin Bevens, Mrs. W. D. Reeves.

California—Mrs. L. A. Beebe.

Delaware—Mrs. H. D. Boyer, Mrs. H. M. Waller.

District of Columbia—Mrs. Flourney Menefee, Miss M. Lillian Williamson,
Mrs. Charles P. Grandfield.

Florida—Mrs. W. S. Jennings.

General Federation of Women's Clubs—Continued.

- Georgia—Mrs. J. E. Hays.
 Illinois—Mrs. Edward S. Baily, Mrs. W. E. Simonds.
 Indiana—Mrs. Emogene Taft Lesh.
 Iowa—Mrs. Francis Whitley, Mrs. James A. Devitt.
 Kentucky—Mrs. Norman Sheppard.
 Maryland—Mrs. J. Wesley Brown, Prof. Iva Lowther Peters.
 Massachusetts—Mrs. George Minot Baker, Mrs. J. S. Leach.
 Minnesota—Mrs. Thomas G. Winter.
 Montana—Mrs. W. T. Perham.
 Nebraska—Mrs. John Slaker.
 New Hampshire—Mrs. Charles H. McDuffee.
 New York—Mrs. Elmer Blair, Mrs. John H. Booth, Mrs. Walter S. Comley,
 Mrs. Thurlow Reed, Mrs. H. W. Stelle.
 Ohio—Mrs. C. S. Selover.
 North Carolina—Miss Margaret Gibson, Mrs. Sidney P. Cooper.
 North Dakota—Mrs. George Young.
 Oklahoma—Mrs. John R. Frazier, Mrs. T. J. Stallings.
 Pennsylvania—Miss Florence M. Dibert.
 Rhode Island—Mrs. Caesar Misch.
 South Carolina—Mrs. Adam Moss.
 Tennessee—Mrs. C. S. Steward.
 Texas—Mrs. Maggie W. Barry.
 Virginia—Mrs. Henry Lockwood, Mrs. Henry E. Parker.
 West Virginia—Mrs. John L. Ruhl.
 Wisconsin—Mrs. J. G. Chandler, Mrs. Joshua Hodgins.

Girl Scouts.

- District of Columbia—Miss Henriques.

Girls' Friendly Society in America.

- Delaware—Miss Clara Southwick.
 District of Columbia—Mrs. H. L. Bolton.
 Maryland—Mrs. Reginald B. Stevenson.
 New Jersey—Miss Caroline La Monte.
 New York—Mrs. Byron C. Darling, Miss Margaret C. Maule,
 Pennsylvania—Mrs. J. Charles Heiges.

Home mission societies.

- American Baptist missions—Mrs. Katherine S. Westfall.
 Congregational missions—Mrs. F. E. Bigelow, Mrs. W. E. Chamberlin.
 Free Methodist missions—Mrs. Martha L. Shoup.
 United Lutheran missions—Mrs. J. P. Krechting.
 Methodist Episcopal missions—Miss Mary E. Samson, Mrs. H. S. France.
 Methodist Episcopal Church South missions—Mrs. J. W. Downs.
 Presbyterian missions—Miss Christine T. Wilson.
 Protestant Episcopal missions—Mrs. G. K. B. Wade.
 Reformed Church in the United States—Mrs. W. R. Harris.

Federated church councils.

- District of Columbia—Miss Ethel Bagley, Mrs. H. Moffatt Bradley.
 Maryland—Mrs. James B. Horisberg.
 Missouri—Mrs. W. W. Boyd.
 New York—Mrs. Worth Tippy.
 Pennsylvania—Miss Laura D. Redick.

Independent Order of Foresters.

- Maryland—Miss Anna C. Fischer.

Intercollegiate Community Service Association.

Maryland—Miss Mollie R. Carrol.
 Pennsylvania—Dr. Susan Kingsbury.

International Federation of Working Women.

Illinois—Mrs. Raymond Robins.

League of American Pen Women.

District of Columbia—Mrs. Louis N. Gelbert, Mrs. Theodore Tiller.

National American War Mothers.

District of Columbia—Mrs. C. W. Avery.

National Association of Colored Women.

Virginia—Mrs. Ora Stokes Brown.
 Mississippi—Miss Nannie H. Burroughs.
 New York—Mrs. M. C. Lawton.
 Pennsylvania—Miss Nannie H. Burroughs.

National Association of Manufacturers.

Connecticut—Mr. Charles Cheney.

National Catholic Welfare Council.

District of Columbia—Miss Miriam E. Loughran.
 Illinois—Miss Linna E. Bresette.

National Child Labor Committee.

District of Columbia—Mrs. Ina J. M. Perkins.

National Civic Federation, women's section.

Massachusetts—Mrs. F. Lothrop Ames.
 New York—Mrs. Coffin Van Rensselaer, Miss Maude Wetmore.

National Conference of Social Work.

Indiana—Mrs. E. C. Rumpler.
 Kentucky—Mrs. Jane Dahlman.
 New York—Mrs. Florence Kelley.

National Congress of Mothers and Parent-Teachers' Associations.

District of Columbia—Mrs. Giles Scott Rafter.
 Illinois—Mrs. Irving McDowell.

National Consumers' League.

Delaware—Miss Clara Southwick.
 Maryland—Prof. Iva Lowther Peters.
 New Jersey—Mrs. G. W. B. Cushing, Miss Caroline La Monte, Miss Augusta Tappan, Miss Katherine G. T. Wiley.
 New York—Mrs. Clara Mortenson Beyer, Miss Mary Dewson, Mrs. Florence Kelley.

Ohio—Miss Wilma Ball, Mrs. Leonard Minster.

Pennsylvania—Miss Estelle Lauder, Miss Laura D. Redick.

Rhode Island—Mrs. Parnell Fisher.

National Council of Catholic Women.

District of Columbia—Miss M. Louise Darr, Miss Agnes C. Regan.
 Pennsylvania—Mrs. Teresa M. Molamphy.

National Council Daughters of America.

District of Columbia—Mrs. Naomi E. Swann.

National Council of Jewish Women.

Connecticut—Rhode Island—Mrs. I. E. Blumenthal.

District of Columbia—Mrs. Alexander Wolf.

Maryland—Mrs. Leonard A. Hecht, Mrs. Henry F. Westheimer.

National Council of Women.

District of Columbia—Mrs. Ellen Spencer Mussey, Mrs. Alice Thacher Post,
 Mrs. Glen L. Swiggett, Miss Amy Woods.

Missouri—Mrs. Philip North Moore.

National Council of Women—Continued.

New York—Dr. Elizabeth B. Thelberg.

Virginia—Mrs. Mary M. North.

National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs.

South Carolina—Miss Eleanor B. Taft.

South Dakota—Miss Effie Marie Ross.

National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods.

District of Columbia—Maryland—Mrs. Robert F. Skutch.

Kentucky—Tennessee—Mrs. Harry Lewis.

Ohio—Pennsylvania—Mrs. Abram Simon.

National League of Women Voters.

Connecticut—Mrs. Frederick C. Bursch, Miss Marjorie Cheney.

District of Columbia—Mrs. E. P. Costigan, Mrs. Minnie Fisher Cunningham,

Mrs. Basil M. Manly, Mrs. Maud Wood Park, Miss Marian Parkhurst,

Mrs. Ann Webster.

Delaware—Miss Clara Southwick.

Georgia—Mrs. H. B. Chamberlain.

Illinois—Miss Julia C. Lathrop, Mrs. C. P. Montgomery.

Indiana—Miss Betsy Edwards.

Kansas—Miss Cornelia King Vail.

Massachusetts—Mrs. Julius Andrews.

Nebraska—Mrs. Margaret J. Carns, Mrs. Edgar H. Scott.

Ohio—Miss Rachel Gallagher, Mrs. William E. Henderson, Miss Amy G. Maher.

Rhode Island—Mrs. Parnell Fisher, Miss Alice Weeks.

South Carolina—Mrs. James M. Webb.

Virginia—Miss Lucy R. Mason.

Wisconsin—Miss Tracy Copp.

Minnesota—Mrs. G. Dietrichson.

National Military Sisterhood of the World War.

District of Columbia—Mrs. Charles Irving Martin.

National Organization for Public Health Nursing.

District of Columbia—Miss Gertrude Bowling.

Maryland—Miss Iva E. Schieswehl.

New York—Mrs. Annie Humphrey.

National Research Council.

District of Columbia—Mr. Harold C. Bingham.

National Safety Council.

Wisconsin—Miss Alice B. Smith.

National Service Star Legion.

North Dakota—Mrs. R. W. Cooley.

National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution.

Louisiana—Mrs. C. W. Avery.

Maine—Mrs. Woodbury Pulsifer.

Minnesota—Mrs. George F. Authier.

Tennessee—Mrs. W. G. Waldo.

Wisconsin—Mrs. William G. Wheeler.

Wyoming—Mrs. Frank W. Mondell.

National Society, Daughters of 1812.

District of Columbia—Mrs. Noble N. Potts, Mrs. Amos G. Draper.

Georgia—Miss Katherine Wootten.

Maryland—Miss Grace F. S. Eddins.

New Jersey—Mrs. Ellsworth A. Corbett.

North Carolina—Mrs. C. F. Taylor.

XIV PROCEEDINGS OF THE WOMEN'S INDUSTRIAL CONFERENCE.

National Women's Christian Temperance Union.

District of Columbia—Mrs. Emma Sanford Shelton, Mrs. Ellis A. Yost.
Maryland—Mrs. Katherine A. Lips, Mrs. Margaret Peck Hill.
Minnesota—Mrs. Gerhard Dietrichson.
New York—Mrs. Laura Miller.
Rhode Island—Miss Clara Brown, Mrs. Fred Fenner.
North Dakota—Mrs. Frank White.
Pennsylvania—Mrs. Ella M. George.

National Woman's Party.

West Virginia—Mrs. Jewel Kenney.

National Woman's Relief Society.

District of Columbia—Mrs. Emily S. Stewart.

National Women's Trade Union League.

District of Columbia—Miss Matilda Lindsey, Mrs. Medill McCormick.
Illinois—Miss Elisabeth Christman.
New York—Miss Rose Schneiderman, Mrs. Maud Swartz.
Pennsylvania—Miss Frieda S. Miller, Miss Pauline M. Newman.

Order of the Eastern Star.

District of Columbia—Mrs. Mamie Copes.
Vermont—Mrs. Margaret Carll.

Royal Neighbors of America.

District of Columbia—Mrs. Lida J. Swiggett.

Taylor Society.

New York—Miss Mary Van Kleeck.

Women's Auxiliaries to International Unions.

Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen—Mrs. Frances Raeder.
Inter. Assn. of Machinists—Mrs. Grace B. Klueg.

Women's Benefit Association of the Maccabees.

District of Columbia—Mrs. Eva L. McNett, Mrs. Fannie E. Walters.

United Daughters of the Confederacy.

Georgia—Mrs. N. B. Stewart.

Women's Relief Corps, G. A. R.

District of Columbia—Mrs. Isabel Warren Ball, Miss Myrtle May Loeb sack.

National Florence Crittendon Mission.

Virginia—Miss Florence E. Armstrong, Miss Altona F. Gales.

International Federation of Catholic Alumnae.

District of Columbia—Miss May Agnes Melling.

Young Women's Christian Association.

Connecticut—Miss Winifred Fiske, Miss Louise E. Staebner, Miss Elizabeth S. Brown.
District of Columbia—Miss Florence Dunlap.
Georgia—Mrs. Samuel M. Inman.
Kansas—Miss Cornelia King Vail.
Massachusetts—Mrs. C. S. Benner, Miss Jean Downes, Miss Katherine Duffield, Mrs. Gordon Hutchins, Miss Georgina R. Kinnie.
Michigan—Miss Lydia Holtman, Miss Edith Williamson.
Minnesota—Mrs. Gerhard Dietrichson.
New Jersey—Miss Mabel W. Whitbeck.
New York—Miss Eleanor G. Coit, Mrs. Erie Layton Gates, Miss Henrietta Roeloffs, Miss Olive Van Horn, Mrs. Dewitt Wallace.
Ohio—Mrs. Philip Hull, Miss Louise K. Stoll.
Pennsylvania—Miss Winifred Fisher, Miss Ethel A. Pleis, Miss Gertrude Wilson.
Virginia—Miss Mary Bullington, Mrs. M. J. Caples, Miss Eva A. Nixon.

State rehabilitation work.

Ohio—Miss S. Cary Abercrombie.

State departments, bureaus, or commissions of labor.

Connecticut—Miss J. C. Corcoran.

Delaware—Miss Elizabeth D. Hanson.

District of Columbia—Miss Elizabeth Brandeis.

Georgia—Mrs. Ella Stevens Franklin.

Indiana—Mrs. Arthur T. Cox.

Iowa—Mrs. Ellen M. Rourke.

Maryland—Dr. Annie S. Abercrombie.

Michigan—Mr. Perry J. Ward.

New Jersey—Miss Lydia E. Sayer.

New York—Miss Nelle Swartz.

Pennsylvania—Mrs. Samuel Semple, Dr. Elizabeth Bricker.

Virginia—Miss Emma F. Ward.

West Virginia—Mrs. Mary Dille Emory.

Wisconsin—Miss Tracy Copp.

Personnel workers or employment managers.

Indiana—Miss Merica Evans Hoagland.

Maryland—Miss Elsy C. Conway.

Massachusetts—Miss Sophie E. Allen, Miss Bernice M. Cannon, Miss Martha La Monte, Miss Katherine McNulty.

New York—Miss Louise Moore, Miss Louise Odencrantz, Miss M. Sidney.

Ohio—Miss Ella M. Haas, Miss Mary B. Gilson.

Individuals.

Mrs. Blair Bannister, District of Columbia.

Miss Sophonisba P. Breckinridge, University of Chicago.

Mrs. A. B. Chandler, New Jersey Association of Community Workers.

Miss Helen Crosby, Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.

Miss Pauline Devitt, Oskaloosa, Iowa.

Mrs. Alvin E. Dodd, Washington, D. C.

Miss Mary E. Dreier, New York City.

Mrs. Winifred Ellis, Washington, D. C.

Miss Ernestine L. Friedman, Bryn Mawr Summer School for Women in Industry.

Miss Pauline Goldmark, New York City.

Miss Mary A. Lindsley, manager Grace Dodge Hotel.

Miss Mary E. McDowell, University Settlement, Chicago.

Miss Marie Obenauer, Industrial Survey and Research Service, Washington, D. C.

Mrs. Gifford Pinchot, Milford, Pa.

Sister Miriam Teresa, Washington, D. C.

Dr. R. A. Spaeth, John Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

Mrs. Harriet Taylor Upton, Washington, D. C.

Mrs. Robe C. White, Washington, D. C.

Mrs. Laura C. Williams, Washington, D. C.

Women in Government service.

Miss Grace Abbott, Chief of Children's Bureau, U. S. Department of Labor.

Mrs. Anna L. Burdick, Federal Board for Vocational Education.

Mrs. Katherine M. Cook, Bureau of Education, U. S. Department of the Interior.

Miss Tracy Copp, Federal Board for Vocational Education.

Miss Mary K. Coynington, Bureau of Labor Statistics, U. S. Department of Labor.

XVI PROCEEDINGS OF THE WOMEN'S INDUSTRIAL CONFERENCE.

Women in Government service—Continued.

- Mrs. Helen H. Gardener, United States Civil Service Commission.
Miss Katherine F. Lenroot, Children's Bureau, U. S. Department of Labor.
Miss E. N. Matthews, Children's Bureau, U. S. Department of Labor.
Miss Lucy Minnigerode, superintendent of nurses, Public Health Service,
U. S. Department of the Treasury.
Miss Anita E. Phipps, director women's relations, War Department General
Staff.
Capt. Blanche S. Rulon, Army Nurse Corps, War Department.
Capt. Sayres E. Milliken, assistant superintendent, Army Nurse Corps, War
Department.
Mrs. Clara Sears Taylor, District of Columbia Rent Commission.
Miss Laura A. Thompson, librarian, U. S. Department of Labor.
Miss Anna Weinstock, Conciliation Service, U. S. Department of Labor.
Miss Florence E. Ward, Department of Agriculture.

RESOLUTION.

The members of the Women's Industrial Conference assembled in Washington, D. C., January 11 to 13, 1923, representing 67 organizations in 42 different States, believe that the work of women in industry must be made truly an opportunity to develop to the fullest their powers as workers, both for their own happiness and for the service of society. To this end they must have adequate schooling before entrance into industry, and be free to choose their occupations, to secure training for them to enlarge their opportunities as their experience grows, to receive fair compensation, and to work under safe and wholesome conditions.

But it should not be forgotten that industry includes both skilled and unskilled tasks, and without the unskilled worker no opportunity would be possible for the skilled. A large number of wage earners are in unskilled and semiskilled occupations, and the training and promotion which are possible in more intricate processes have no meaning for them. The conditions of employment of those who do the hardest and most unskilled work, which is a necessary part of our whole industrial system, should be our first concern.

We recognize with appreciation the standards already established by progressive management and urge their more general adoption. We recognize also the important influence of constructive agreement between employers and wage earners, which has played so large a part in establishing standards. By these means and by the action of the community we ask freedom of choice of occupation, and that provision for training and wage rates be determined without prejudice because of sex. These things we ask in justice to women and because we believe that upon them depend the health, happiness, and spiritual development of women themselves, and through them the development of children and the protection of the life of the family.

Industrial problems are realities. No permanent improvement can be achieved except through knowledge of facts about industry and understanding of their meaning for human lives. Therefore, in response to this call of the National Government to us as citizens to counsel together about women in industry, we pledge ourselves to earnest and thorough study of conditions in our own communities. We look to the Women's Bureau of the United States Department of Labor for leadership in describing the realities of industrial life as women have seen and experienced them and in formulating policies and standards.

We urge that organizations represented here give support to the Federal and State agencies through which facts are collected and given to the public, and that on the basis of these facts we build up a program for the intelligent share of women in humanizing industrial processes.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE WOMEN'S INDUSTRIAL CONFERENCE
CALLED BY THE WOMEN'S BUREAU OF THE UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR. WASHINGTON, D. C., JANUARY
11-13, 1923.**

THURSDAY, JANUARY 11.—MORNING SESSION.

Presiding officer, Miss Mary Anderson, Director of the Women's Bureau.

MISS ANDERSON. The invocation will be offered by the Rev. J. J. Muir, D. D., Chaplain of the United States Senate.

INVOCATION.

Our Father and our God, we bless Thee for the land in which we live, for its institutions, and its opportunities for service; and we ask that this gathering so represented, so representative, and having before them so many problems to deal with, may be blessed with Thy great wisdom, in the midst of the turmoil and unrest of these days, and that there may be blazed before them paths not only of usefulness but of highest and best endeavor. Be with this morning gathering; remember each one who shall have a place in the discussions and the deliberations of these days. Grant Thy blessings to Thine honored servant, the President of the United States; and may he, with those gathered about him as his family counselors, be ever guided to the best results and to the highest purposes, not only of our own land, but in our relations with other lands. Hear us today; accept of us and use each one here for the best and the truest ideals of womanhood, through the many disappointments as well as the tremendous successes awaiting in every path of toil.

Hear and help, through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

MISS ANDERSON. We are very glad indeed to welcome the delegates and the visitors this morning. We have called this conference for the purpose of discussing the problems of women in industry. We have on our program men and women who understand the questions before us, who know the problems in the field of industry. We have on our program employers who are going to discuss the problems from their side of the questions. We have workers who are going to discuss the problems from their viewpoints. And with them we have experts on our program who have distinguished themselves in work for industry who are going to discuss our prob-

lems as their observations have found them. What we intend to accomplish in this conference is largely of an educational nature. I do not think, unless the delegates so wish, that we are going to take any particular action, unless that grows out of the assembly itself. We have not brought you together here to do that, because we know that you are representing your organizations, and it would not be fair, unless the organization should vote upon any particular matter, that you should take any action on any question. We do hope, however, that you will take back with you to the people at home the messages that you will be given here through the discussions of the conference, so that they in turn will carry on the educational work of this movement.

This is a very representative body of women. We are gathered here today from 40 States of the Union, from the far West as well as from the East, and we are particularly glad that the women of the country are taking the splendid interest in these very urgent and necessary problems that we have before us.

We have this morning several speakers on the program, and I understand that the Secretary has a message from the President. I want to take this opportunity of saying to you that the Secretary of Labor is a very human man, and that he himself has put in many years of very hard labor in industry, and therefore knows it from a practical standpoint as well as from other viewpoints. He knows our problems and has not only a very keen interest in the work of women and the women of this country particularly but he has a very great understanding of the problems affecting their welfare. I take great pleasure indeed in introducing to you the Secretary of Labor, the Hon. James J. Davis.

HON. JAMES J. DAVIS, Secretary of Labor. I was with the President last evening, talking with him of this conference. Because of the pressure of other business he was unable to be present at this session, but he extends to you through me an invitation to call at the Executive Offices at any time you choose, and he will be delighted to meet you. If we could arrange the time, Madame Chairman, for the delegation to go to the White House, I would be glad to accompany you.

I have a letter here from the President, which I will read:

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am writing you this letter at the last moment, because I find my hope of being able to extend in person a greeting at the opening session of the Women's Industrial Conference is doomed to disappointment by reason of insistent duties elsewhere. I wish you would express my most cordial greetings to the gathering and the assurance of my most sincere interest in its purposes.

Long before women were called to that broader participation in public affairs which is now both their duty and the public's advantage, I was personally strongly convinced of the great benefits which would be derived from a more

insistent expression and more general consideration of women's point of view in relation to social and industrial concerns. The revolutionary change that has taken place in the status of women in the world of business and affairs has not only justified but necessitated that broader and more intimate activity of women in behalf of the particular phases of public and social interests which especially appeal to them. Conferences and continued organized activities of the kind represented by the present gathering are certain to be of very definite public benefit, and I have much pleasure and satisfaction in welcoming the present gathering to Washington and in expressing the hope that its considerations may prove as helpful as its most ardent supporters could possibly wish.

Most sincerely yours,

WARREN G. HARDING.

HON. JAMES J. DAVIS,
Secretary of Labor, Washington, D. C.

We are here to-day in the interest of the eight and a half million women of America who march in the ranks of the Nation's wage earners. It is with profound satisfaction that I see gathered here the representatives of American womanhood from nearly every walk of life—industrial, social, and civic—to consider the problems of women in industry, for serious problems confront us in relation to the women who have taken their place in the industrial life of our Nation, and since these problems are peculiar to womanhood it is eminently fitting that the womanhood of the Nation should lend its advice and aid in meeting them.

These problems are many and varied. They are growing more diverse and more pressing, as the whole course of our economic life becomes further complicated. The fact, as revealed by the recent census, that of 572 occupations listed by the Federal enumerators only 35 failed to show the employment of women, calls for serious consideration. In almost all lines of endeavor women are at work side by side with men, sharing the same conditions, conforming to the same standards, and turning out the same product. In many of these occupations women, by superior adaptability, by particular fitness, have won preference over men as workers. It is significant that during the decade between 1910 and 1920 the number of women employed in our strictly industrial plants, in the manufacturing and mechanical factories, increased by 100,000.

Under the pressure of the demand for increased production during the war period, women were forced into industry at a greatly increased rate. The conditions of the reconstruction period have continued the demand for their employment. There is no evading the fact that women are in industry to stay. The duty devolves upon the whole people to see to it that their employment is safeguarded so that the general welfare of the Nation may not suffer. I trust, with all my heart, that the day may never return when we shall see, as the people of my native town in Wales have seen, a woman at work in the

steel-rolling mill, standing before the giant rolls in the seething heat and dust, wrestling with 100 or 200 pounds of iron. That sight is only about half a century gone in the iron and steel industry abroad, but I trust it will never again return. I am confident that we can keep on our way toward giving to all of our women the higher, better, nobler things of life. For our country can be only as good as its women; the Nation of the future can be no better than its mothers. To-day more than one-fifth of the women of the United States are employed in gainful occupations; more than one-tenth of the married women of the Nation are so employed. These figures demonstrate clearly the need for thorough consideration of the problems which confront these mothers and potential mothers of our citizens of the future. Upon the right solution of these problems depends our very existence as a Nation.

For I say to you that the spectacle of American mothers torn from their children while they strive in the toil and turmoil of industry to earn a livelihood for themselves and their little ones is an indictment of our modern civilization, a shame that cries to Heaven for vengeance, a menace to the whole structure of our national life. True it is that the mother who goes down into the valley of the shadow of death to bring her babe into the world will daily traverse that dread valley to preserve the life of her loved ones. But our civilization to-day ought to permit no American mother who has babies to care for to exhaust herself in labor at bench or loom, yearning all the while for the little ones that she has left alone in their helplessness or to the questionable care of strange hands. The mother that drags her weary body homeward after a night of toil in industry, to begin a day of toil in the home for the service of her babes, is sapping not alone her own life but the life of our whole people. Her unselfish devotion is wrecking her for service to the future of the Nation. I say here and now, and I shall stand unequivocally on this proposition: Take out of industry these mothers who have babes to care for. The community owes it to itself to preserve these women for their greater service to humanity, their service as mothers, because the babe at home needs the love and tender care of the mother to develop it. Not all the wealth they can wrest from reluctant industry will equal in importance to the Nation the strong and sturdy citizens of the future that these women can foster by their tender care. No greater task confronts us than this. We can do no greater service to humanity and the future of the Nation than to so stir American public opinion that this evil shall vanish once and for all from American industrial life. An economic structure which is based upon the labor in industry of the mothers of the Nation is false and sooner or later it will come crashing down about our heads. If in this conference we can do this one thing, if

we can, each and every one of us, go hence filled with the determination to stamp out the need for the industrial exploitation of the mother whose babes need care, we shall have accomplished much.

Women in industry form a new condition in our life. Throughout long ages men have struggled in the relation of employer and employee. The male worker through years of effort has clearly defined his position, has definitely established his standard of wages and working conditions. In many cases he is organized to maintain the rights and privileges he has won as a worker. Women in industry are largely without the protection which has come to the male worker through the traditions of his craft and the long years of precedent which surround his employment. Women have demonstrated that they are entitled to equal pay for equal work in industry, but in many cases it has been found difficult to establish even this simple standard.

This problem is a problem for the whole people. No great forward step in our industrial relations can be taken without the cooperation of the great body of thinking men and women of the country, who in their views of national questions make up the powerful force called public opinion. It is with these thoughts in view that you have gathered together to consider the problems of the woman in industry. Through your sympathetic understanding of these questions we may look to the enlightenment of the whole country.

I need not impress upon you that these problems are more than mere matters of industrial technique, or of industrial efficiency. They are problems essentially human, which must be met and solved from the human viewpoint. For whatever position woman may occupy industrially her great service to humanity, to the Nation, is her capacity as a mother. We must see to it that we do not sacrifice motherhood upon the altar of greed for industrial production. We must keep ever in mind, no matter where in industry we find her, the words of the poet:

A mother is a mother still,
The holiest thing alive.

I want to take this opportunity to call to your attention the work of the Department of Labor. The Department of Labor, as you know, was organized to foster, promote, and develop the welfare of the wage earners of America and to advance their opportunities for profitable employment. That's what we are trying to do in the Department of Labor. The department is made up of several divisions and bureaus, with which it directs the Government contact with the 41,000,000 that are classed by the census as "gainfully employed."

You are familiar with the women in industry, and you are going to discuss their problems and matters affecting them here to-day and during the rest of the week; and I hope that much good will

come from this conference. In addition to that, in the department we have to deal with problems affecting children in industry. The bureau handling that great question is presided over by Miss Abbott; and I am sure that every one of you will agree with me when I say that the right woman is in the right place. And we are going to try, my friends, to develop this Children's Bureau in such a way that every American mother and every American child will be very glad and happy that Congress created the Children's Bureau, for the Nation's future depends upon these children. I believe with all my heart in the child. I believe that every child has the God-given right and heritage and should have the opportunity to fill its place in the vast fabric of this Nation. I believe in the education of the head and the heart and the hand. What I mean is that, instead of turning out of our schools at 18 and 19 years of age children fitted only for the "white collar" professions, they ought to be trained to know how to make a living for themselves and their families. I believe that man's highest duty to God is his duty and service to childhood. To this I pledge to you here all the force that I have at my command.

In addition to that, we have in the Department of Labor the Employment Service, for bringing the man and the job together, trying to develop the Employment Service in this country and build up an employment service here so that it will not be necessary for the worker when he is out of work to travel aimlessly from one place to another, but that when he is out of work he may go to the employment agency in his own town and find out where he can obtain work without exhausting his funds. When he goes to that agency he will not be asked to pay \$5 or \$10 to get himself a job when he ought to have his job free. In trying to develop that work we are doing the best we can with the limited appropriations that Congress has given to us.

By virtue of my office I am a member of the Federal Board for Vocational Education, and that's something that you women ought to be interested in—vocational education. You ought to look into the matter of this Federal board; it's an important part of the Government of the United States. Prior to the passage of the Sweet bill, which created the Veterans' Bureau, we had charge of the rehabilitation of the disabled soldier. The Government is appropriating now \$500,000,000 for the rehabilitation of the disabled soldier. You know a poor old iron puddler, coming into a job of this kind, and having these vast appropriations under discussion, is apt to be somewhat staggered at the bigness of it all, and I remember when I came into office we needed \$140,000,000 to do this work of building hospitals, for the rehabilitation of the soldier; and I remember I went to the President, and I said, "We

need this money for the rehabilitation of these boys," and I told my story; and I remember how affectionate he was about it, when he put his hand on my shoulder and said, "Jim, it doesn't make any difference how much it's going to cost to rehabilitate the disabled soldier; if it's all the money we can rake and scrape, we must do it, because we owe it to those men who made the sacrifice!" And we have appropriated \$500,000,000, and this is what I want to bring home to you, that our Government is taking care of the disabled man in industry.

I started to work when I was a boy, before I was 8 years of age. I have seen in my years of experience the men and women coming out of industry mangled and crippled. If it's right for a country—and I am for it with all my heart—to take care of the disabled soldiers after the war, have we not the same right and obligation to take care of the disabled men and the disabled women in industry? We want your earnest cooperation with this Federal board, to develop this rehabilitation of disabled men and women in industry.

We have also in the Department of Labor the Division of Conciliation. Since I have been in office we have had more than 800 strikes—more than two every day—and the largest ones that have been recorded in the history of the human race. It has been trial and trouble; and I am of this opinion, my good women—I join with the President in this thought—that we would be better off, and it's coming to the day when we will have to recognize that it's better, to gather around a council table before the strike rather than after it. It's too late to talk about it when men are out for months, and then agree on what could have been agreed upon before the strike.

In addition to those matters, one of the big problems affecting the working men and women of the Nation is that of immigration. Just the other day we had between five and six million men out of work, and they passed the so-called 3 per cent law—3 per cent of immigrants to be admitted, based upon the number that were here in 1900. That means, if you have a thousand Turks they are entitled to 30 more admissions into this country; as 3 per cent of 1,000 is 30. When their quota is exhausted no more can enter this country. There is a great army of men talking now of putting down the bars to let more immigrants in. Why in the name of heaven do we want to put down the bars? If you want a thousand men in a particular line, do you want to throw down the bars and let them come in and crowd out the other American workingmen and American working women? There is a big problem, and I stand with all my heart for the retention of this 3 per cent immigration law as it now stands. It's a great hardship to see these men and women coming to this country and not being admitted, but it means much to us. I favor

that the examinations should be made on the other side. As I said to the Assistant Secretary one day, with all of these appeals—and there are some 2,000 of them every month—coming in to the Secretary of Labor's office, I feel that the hangman's job is an easy one compared with mine at times. It is a difficult thing indeed to separate a mother from her babe for any reason at all. It's hard.

And then, again, those who come to us under the law, let us say to them, "Welcome to America!" As long as the law permits them to come in, let's welcome them, and let's make them happy, after they come here. There are in this country to-day between seven and eight million of unnaturalized citizens. The other day over here in Luzerne County, 156 of these people applied for their second naturalization papers, and only 36 of them were granted, because the court said they were not ready yet to become American citizens. What does that mean to these people? We let them come to this country but do not take the proper care of their broken citizenship after they have come to us.

I have a picture in my mind of my mother, bringing six of us into this country, and what I ask for the aliens is what I would have liked to have had for my own father and for my own mother. I believe, my friends, that it's time to help those who are here. They may be opposed to it, of course. I remember the time when a great organization in this country refused to have compulsory school attendance in America. But we have learned better since and know that such a law is wise and beneficial. We let between seven and eight million immigrants into this country, and then we act as though we did not care whether these people learn anything about the traditions or the history of America, but you make it compulsory for your own children to go to school so that they may know something about the country in which they live. There is opposition to it in both camps. One side says they don't want it because of this, and the other side says they don't want it because of that; but both of them are looking at this matter from a selfish point of view. They are not thinking of the alien himself. And so I believe that every alien in America should be enrolled. We ought to take him, enroll him, teach him the traditions of America; we ought to be kind and helpful to him and to his family, and help them on their way to become American citizens. Upon this very alien in the future will depend much in America.

There are a good many people going about over the country preaching the doctrine of hate and preaching the doctrine of revolution. Who presents the Government's side of this proposition to our friends, the immigrants? Who tells them the story of this country when others are talking about the overthrow of the Government? I heard a writer say the other day that all of the women practi-

cally who are managing the affairs of this conference, and mostly those that were leading women in industry are of the "Red" type. If I know anything about American womanhood, if I, as I look into your faces this morning, know anything about human nature, I can say to that man that no better womanhood in America exists than in those that I am talking to now, so far as citizenship is concerned. And so, my friends, I believe that we ought to help these immigrants who come here, and be kind to them and do the things that are worth while for them. And to those who are preaching the doctrine of hate, and to those who are preaching the doctrine of overthrow of the Government, and those that have no respect for the traditions and the history of America, I want to tell them that the Secretary of Labor is always happy when his department is able to deport that kind of an agitator from this country of ours.

I know something about work, as I told you. I started when I was a boy, and understand the problems of labor. A steel manufacturer talked with me during the President's conference to try to abolish the 12-hour day in the steel industry. I have known this man for a long time. He was born just a few miles from where I was, and he said, "Jim, what's the sweetest picture of your boyhood that stands out in your memory?" And I said to him, "The sweetest picture that comes to me now is one of my boyhood, when I was about 11 years of age, working with my brother. We 'changed each other' on a 12-hour shift." I thought I would bring this picture home to him. I said, "We got up, as you know, at 2 o'clock in the morning to go to work, and my brother would be at the mill at 2.30, and I was leaving at about 2, and I would get home about 2.30." And I said, "Forty years ago we had no electric lights. We did not have the conveniences that you have to-day. And on the dark dreary mornings my brother, who was younger than I—and I was only 11—would leave just about the time I was coming home from work. My mother used to get up in the morning, on those dark and dreary mornings, and give brother a cup of tea and a frugal breakfast which he ate by the aid of our old lamp, before he went to his work. And we thought that with that lamp we were well-to-do, because we had a kerosene lamp in the house. And with his bucket in his hand my brother would trudge off to work and I would be coming home. And I remember that my mother would come to the gate and sing a little song in her native tongue which brother could hear until he met me about halfway from the mill on my way home. And then I would stand there and sort of relay the song; that is, I would sing and whistle for him until he got clear to the mill, and I could see him all the way by the light that came from the stacks of the great rolling mills and the blast furnaces. And then my mother would continue her little song at the

gate until I got home, to encourage me. That was her way of lightening just a bit the weary beginning and end of a toilsome day for my brother and myself." "That," I said to my friend, "is the sweetest picture that clings to memory's page and will stay with me through life."

But, members of this conference, that kind of life, with boys going into industry at 11 years of age and earlier, and young girls going into industry, must forever be banished from America. The place for the boy and the girl at that age is in the home and in the school.

Perhaps this matter of the registration of the alien that has been mentioned does not worry some of the people to-day, but it gives me great concern when I think of some of the literature that comes into my office. And I just want to close with a brief thought which I want to put to you: Do you believe that these problems are not serious? Do you believe that they are mere issues of expediency, merely questions of to-day? Listen to what a distinguished member of a certain eastern European racial group in America is quoted as saying:

This country is not a "nation"; it is a gathering together of peoples from every corner of the earth. No one racial group, no matter how early settled in this country, can furnish more than one note in this vast symphony of nations.

This means only one thing. It means that this new American, and those who follow him, believe that there is no real America. It means that the history of this country, its traditions, its civilization will be forgotten. It means that the term "American" as applied to our people will not exist. It means that this great country, stretching from sea to sea, is to be a mere jumble of racial groups, preserving their racial customs and their racial language, without common interests or common ideals. It means that the whole fabric of social, economic, and political life built through the toil and sorrow and suffering of the last 150 years on this continent is to be shattered. It means that the principles of union and liberty, for which millions have laid down their lives, shall perish in a welter of discord like unto that which fell upon Babel.

That is not the America I know. It is not, I trust, the America that my children will know. My people did not come to this country with any such America in mind. My father came here to better his condition in life, and by hard toil he accomplished his purpose. He came to become an American, and to bring up his family in that equality of opportunity which America meant to him and them. When as a lad of 8 years I followed my mother, as with her six children she led the way from the shadows of the old Castle Garden immigrant station at the Battery, I came to a new life. She did not bring her brood here to preserve in them a miniature reproduction

of the land she had left behind. Raising her eyes to the wonders of Broadway, to the towering buildings that typified the greatness of the land that lay beyond them, she cried with tears in her eyes: "This is the land I long have sought." She visioned her sons as part and parcel of this great new civilization that stretched out before her. She mourned not for what she had left behind. On the threshold of the United States, all that there was about her of the Old World fell away, and she and her children faced the future, not as foreigners, not as aliens, but as Americans—Americans in heart and Americans in soul. I say to you that when those who come to us from abroad fail to consecrate themselves wholly and entirely to America, to American life, to American institutions, we have lost the thing which has made this a great Nation. I say to you that the man who comes from abroad bringing only his hands and his head and is leaving his heart and his loyalty behind him is not fit for a place among us.

When new Americans talk of racial groups sounding but a single note in the symphony of America, I say to them that America can be no symphony. America can be but a single note, a clarion call, sounding aloud to all the world the eternal principles of liberty under law, of the rights of humanity. We can have no divided allegiance in our citizenship, no double loyalty. An American must be for America against all the world.

And I am glad and happy to have had this opportunity of telling you something of our work in the Department of Labor, and of holding up before you some of those ideas and ideals of Americanism and of American institutions that this conference will consider and help forever to maintain.

MISS ANDERSON. The delegates from the General Federation of Women's Clubs have to go and meet the President just at this time. That does not mean that the session of the conference is adjourned because some are leaving. It seems to me that it would be very timely that we accept the invitation from the President to go over with the Secretary of Labor in a few moments ourselves, to be received, I think, after the General Federation of Women's Clubs have had their reception. But before we go I can not refrain from calling upon one of the best friends that we have, and when I say we, I mean the Women's Bureau in the Department of Labor; a woman whom you all know—I think at least most of you know her personally—who has been a great suffrage worker. She has always had the women's cause before her, before, perhaps, any other issues of life, and I take great pleasure in calling on Mrs. Harriet Taylor Upton.

MRS. HARRIET TAYLOR UPTON, vice chairman of the Republican National Committee. Madam Chairman and friends. I am just going

to take one moment, and I say "friends" because I think you all are friends of mine, because I know you are my friends and I am yours. I have been with these industrial meetings ever since they began almost, but I have never been as an industrial worker, and now I am here as an industrial worker, am I not; because if anyone does a political job he or she has to work without much compensation or much reward. And so I feel that I belong to you this time, and I do feel so proud of the women who are at the head of the two bureaus in the Labor Department. We couldn't have two finer women. Now I see them under the most trying conditions, because nobody ever comes to me when things are going pleasantly; they always come to me when things are going to pieces. And those two women come just as other people come, but they never come scowling; and they are always thankful for the little wee bit that I have been able to do for them and for women through them. And if you knew all of the things Miss Anderson does, with all of that splendid backbone that she has! Now, I am a little short of backbone myself, and so I really appreciate that in Miss Anderson. And if you could have heard Miss Abbott yesterday at the hearing on child labor, you would have been so proud of her and this other great leader, Miss Anderson, that I doubt whether you would have calmed down sufficiently to be in your seats at this session to-day. Miss Abbott did a perfectly splendid job at that hearing, and when a Senator—you know that scowl that the Senator on a committee always gives you—they have to give it to you. They have to make you think that they know something that you don't know, when, as a matter of fact, you know a whole lot more about the thing that they are pretending to know about and really don't know much about. That's a part of their job. And when this man scowled at Miss Abbott and said, "What! Do you believe what you have got in this bill is the best thing?" Miss Abbott said, "No, I don't. I would rather have something better. What could you think of that would be better?" Well, of course, he didn't think that was coming; he hadn't expected anything like that. He thought she was going to snap back at him, because some Senators are a little bit touched because people have snapped back at them occasionally in times past. But that isn't the way with your Miss Abbott, nor that isn't the way with your Miss Anderson. And so I want to express to you the appreciation that we women who are in the field of industry and in politics, the appreciation that we should have and do have for these two women who are leading in the Labor Department and who are leading our friends in industry.

Now I know that sooner or later the politician passes, and I know the better woman she is—and sometimes I think the better man—the quicker she passes. So I may not be here next time, because I am

so very good. So while I am here I want to say to you that if ever I valued anything in my life I value your friendship, which I feel I have; and if I ever have the time—which I have not now—to think about my past life—and of course I am going to have that time, because pretty soon I will have to wear glasses and all kinds of things. And then I won't be able to hop around as I do now. I know that. And when I get to that age when we have time to think over some of the pleasantest things of our lives I will think of the friendship which I have had with you and with your members; and somehow it does seem to me that the woman who works herself and the women who lead the workers have a certain thing in their souls and in their hearts and on their lips which the rest of humanity do not quite possess; and I appreciate that, and I appreciate and love them.

Now, just one word further: When I was working in suffrage, I used to tell, just as politicians tell when they get on the stage, what they are going to do, you know. And I used to tell what women were going to do when they got the vote. I am naturally a merry creature, but when I get away from merriment I am the most dolorous and doleful creature you ever saw. And one evening I got home, and I was tired, and I said to Miss Anthony, that great and beloved leader of suffrage, "I wonder if we are not claiming too much if women receive the suffrage? Do you suppose women will do all the things that we say they will do?" And I was just about to burst into tears, because I burst into tears just about as easily as I burst the other way. And I will never forget her face—that splendid face of that wonderful woman—when I said further, "Now, Aunt Susan, do you think they will make good?" And she said, "I know they will make good." And so I say to you, I know you in industry will make good for the betterment of industry and of our common and beloved country!

Miss ANDERSON. Just before we adjourn we want to have a few announcements.

Whereupon, the following announcements were made:

Judge Kathryn Sellers invites the delegates to the conference to a reception this afternoon at half past 4. Judge Sellers is judge of the juvenile court of the District of Columbia and is a member of this conference as delegate of the American Bar Association. The reception will be held at the Women's City Club, 22 Jackson Place. There will be no cards for admission. All delegates are invited.

To-morrow afternoon, from 5 to 7, Mrs. Davis, the wife of the Secretary of Labor, has asked the delegates to a reception to meet the ladies of the Cabinet. Admission will be by card, and the delegates who have not already received their invitations are asked to stop for them at the registration desk in the corridor of the Museum.

Saturday afternoon at 4.30 Mrs. Alvin Dodd has invited the delegates to a reception to meet Mrs. Calvin Coolidge, Mrs. Mary Roberts Rhinehart, Mrs. Maud Wood Park, Mrs. Alice Ames Winter, and Miss Mary Anderson.

MISS ANDERSON. Do not forget the tea this afternoon. Judge Sellers is the judge of the juvenile court of the District of Columbia, and was the first woman judge in the District. She is giving this tea in honor of all the delegates and the visitors this afternoon at the Women's City Club.

The meeting this afternoon will be in this place, and will commence at 2 o'clock. We will adjourn now, and go directly to the White House, where the Secretary is making arrangements for our reception. We will also find there the photographers again awaiting us.

(Whereupon, the opening session of the Women's Industrial Conference was concluded at 11.56 o'clock a. m.)

THURSDAY, JANUARY 11.—AFTERNOON SESSION.

MISS ANDERSON, temporary presiding officer. The meeting will come to order. The chairman of the session this afternoon is one who needs no introduction. He is one who has worked with labor, I think, all his life. He does not claim to be a trade-union man, but he is working for and with labor always. I take great pleasure indeed in introducing to you the permanent chairman for this afternoon, the Assistant Secretary of Labor, Mr. E. J. Henning.

HON. E. J. HENNING, Assistant Secretary of Labor. Permit me to extend just a word of welcome on my part for the Department of Labor. I trust you will enjoy your stay. We are glad you are here. We hope you will remain longer than the three days intended for the conference so that you may study Washington. I hope that you can come and visit the Department of Labor. We do not live in one house unfortunately. Some of our bureaus are in different buildings, but the main building is on G Street, between Seventeenth and Eighteenth, just west of the White House. We shall be very glad to have you come over. Some of the ladies who were visiting you this morning were at the department when I left studying the machinery we use there in dealing with immigrant appeals in the Bureau of Immigration. We will be very glad to have you come and see us.

We expect much from this conference in the Department of Labor. We need help. We need your assistance. We will profit from what you do here, I am very certain. Miss Anderson said that I have worked with labor. I have also labored. I do not know that Miss Anderson intended to give the impression that I have not been a workingman or a working boy. I started to toil as early as did the

Secretary of Labor, but had the fortune later in life to get into schools and colleges, and, fortunately, or otherwise, into a profession. I rather think I should have enjoyed, had I had the opportunity, the life of a machinist better than the life of a lawyer. My ambition was to be a locomotive engineer, but my folks just simply wouldn't have it, and I was compelled to remain in an employment which they furnished until I was 21, and then it was deemed too late to become a machinist.

Miss Anderson said I do not profess to be a trade-unionist. Well; I perhaps am not a trade-unionist, but I am a member of a labor union affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. I joined it at a time when I could get no benefit from the organization, but to show my interest in the folks in the Federal Employees' Union. I am a member of the Federal Employees' Union, and very proud of my membership.

The Secretary this morning gave you in very concise and effective way a bird's-eye view of the work of the Department of Labor. We have, as you know, the Women's Bureau so brilliantly presided over by Mary Anderson; the Children's Bureau, in equally capable hands, being headed by Miss Grace Abbott; and we have other women officers in the department. We find them particularly effective in the humanities in our department.

The Department of Labor is distinctly the human interest department of Government. I mean thereby that we have no bureau of any kind dealing with business. The bureaus are all bureaus that deal with men, women, and children. And so we find the work of woman very important in our department. We hope to accentuate, during our administration, the importance of the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor, the importance of the Children's Bureau of the Department of Labor, and particularly the junior division of the Employment Service of the Department of Labor, presided over by Miss Stewart, a division in the employment service dealing with the juveniles; that is, young men and women below the age of 18 years particularly, but up to 21. In that service we seek to help the boys and the girls to find themselves, to discover their vocational aptitudes, and endeavor to get them into contact with that type of labor for which they are apt to be best fitted. We believe that when God Almighty makes a human being He has some distinct purpose that He desires to have carried out by that individual, and some particular job; and lucky is the boy or the girl who finds the job that he or she would rather perform than play, and most unfortunate are those who do not find that particular place for which they were intended. And so we seek in that service to help the boy and the girl, high-school students, and the

students of the lower grades, and all young folks, to make the right contacts, to keep them from going into industry while too young, and to help them get into industry in the proper way. So we have much that is of interest to women, much in the department in which we need your help. We need your criticisms; we need your sympathetic interest. And I will repeat we bid you welcome; we want you to know that the Department of Labor in every bureau is at your service while you are here.

The subject this afternoon divides itself, as I notice, into two divisions, "What women workers mean to industry" and "What industry means to women workers." We have the good fortune to have with us to lead off under the first subdivision, a gentleman who is the representative of the National Association of Manufacturers, Mr. Charles Cheney.

WHAT WOMEN WORKERS MEAN TO INDUSTRY.

Mr. CHARLES CHENEY, *representing the National Association of Manufacturers.*

This morning the Secretary of Labor, and again just now the Assistant Secretary of Labor, exhibited themselves as victims of child labor, having begun at the age of about 8 years to enter the ranks of industry. I think I beat them by about two years. When I got out of school for Saturday afternoon or playtimes, I divided my time fairly evenly between playing by the brook and running into the mill to help run some of the machines, and I had more fun in the mill than I had by the brook. And I am glad to see that the Assistant Secretary of Labor has recommended doing that thing which you would rather do than play.

Among my earliest recollections was getting in surreptitiously and getting some people to let me run their machines for them. Some years later I had the misfortune of not being very well, and I was sent back into the mill for a cure. I spent nearly a year in the carpenter's shop, and, if I do say it, I am a pretty good carpenter still. And then after I had finished my young training I went into the mill in earnest, and that time I really got on the pay roll; got a dollar a day. And I spent 10 years in overalls with my sleeves turned up; and we used to work 10 hours a day and sometimes 15, and I did my stunt with the others. And I know what it is to be a workingman. I know not only what it means to work, but I know how these workingmen think and feel. They are good friends of mine, even to-day, after I have been out of the shop for many years. I can go back there and find that I still am one of the crowd. And I think I know something of what their wives think about, and value, and the girls and the young men as well. I feel very much at home among working women. I only regret that I do not see more of them here to-day. I know how to talk to that kind of women.

Now, I am not going to be sensational. I am going to make no attempt to say anything novel. I am not going to try to back up anything I say with statistics and records. That part of the game will be done much better than I can do it by the others in this conference. I am only going to try to give you, in a very informal way, something of the impression, and what I believe to be the lessons, that I have learned through a long association with industry and with women in industry. I may say some things—I may take a point of view a little bit different from some others here. I have purposely, and I wish you would understand this, presented this thing from a slightly different point of view from that of those who mostly will speak to you at this conference. I am not posing as a reformer, as an uplifter, as an inventor, as a discoverer of the new; but I simply want to talk to you about what looks to me at least like ordinary common sense. And if to you it does not seem to be common sense, please consider that it differs from your views not because I am a reactionary representative of an industrial creed but because I tell you how some things look to an honest employer. At least I would like that amount of allowance made for my vagaries, if they may appear to be such.

It is a good old-fashioned practice to start to talk with a text.

Genesis ii, 18: "And the Lord God said, it is not good that man should be alone. I will make him an helpmeet."

In discussing the subject assigned to me I must assume a great deal of latitude. The answer to the query as to "What women mean to industry" is so obvious and so short that I shall let myself wander off into a consideration of some of the various aspects of the whole series of problems related to the employment of women.

Women mean to industry a supply of labor. The very word "industry" implies the employment of labor. Each different industry has its own labor requirements and its own labor problems. Its labor supply must be governed, first, by the kind of labor best suited to the work to be performed; and second, by numbers and character of laborers available; and, third, by the relative economy of various grades or classes from which the selection is to be made, allowing for the legal and natural limitations of each. So it follows that industry will give employment to women or to men, either because they are better adapted to the employment or because scarcity of labor forces it or because the work can be secured at the lowest cost. It must be remembered that the lowest cost does not necessarily mean the lowest wage.

The employer usually finds these varying factors all more or less present when selecting his labor, and they seldom remain constant; so he is meeting a new problem each day and its solution is often

most difficult. Men and women are not employed just because they are men or women, but because for some of these reasons, or some combination of these reasons, it is advantageous to have them.

It is well to keep this simple fact clearly in mind—it is often forgotten—because, in seeking to add to the natural variations which exist between the sexes additional—and perhaps artificial—qualifications, designed to favor or to protect women, there is grave danger of setting up obstacles in the way of their free employment, so that they may be handicapped and put at a disadvantage.

Everybody clearly sees the natural differentiation between the sexes, and there can be no room for question that these sex limitations require due allowance as to time, conditions, and work; but there seems to me to be a tendency to magnify the differences and to lose sight of the essential unity and similarity between them. And it is a little perplexing that this should be so just at the time when women are demanding—and getting—equal rights and equal treatment with men; and, moreover, at a time when they have just given a new demonstration, as they did during the war, of their fitness and ability to do so many kinds of work which has been considered as belonging exclusively in man's domain.

All through life and in most of the vast complex of human relationships we find a constant play in ever changing variation of this sex problem, with differentiation on the one hand and unity on the other. Whenever we lose sight of either of these two fundamentals we are sure to go astray, and I believe that what is most needed now is to visualize the points of equality rather than to exaggerate the difference.

Man and woman are not two separate species with conflicting interests and diverging aims. Neither are they essentially different in their responsibilities and their obligations. Their destiny is to bear together the burdens of life, and together to bring into being the succeeding generations, and to watch over and support them during the years of dependence.

I often encounter the thought that the entry of women into industry is something new, and that it is rather a reversal of the old order. Nothing could be further from the truth. On the contrary, women were the first industrialists. In the beginning, man was the warrior and the hunter, and pretty much all of the ordinary business of life was conducted by the women. They made the clothes, cooked the food, shaped the pottery, carried the burdens, and did most of the work. Nor did this order change very materially as civilization advanced. When man had ceased to be a nomad and a savage, he began to give more of his time and his labor to creation, to building, to husbandry, and even to industry, but never to the exclusion of

woman, who continued not only to maintain the home but to provide it with the greater part of its equipment and its personal requirements.

Horace Bushnell pointed out in his "Age of Homespun" that the early marriages which were the rule a few generations ago were explained by the fact that the man was not shouldering, as a burden, a woman who expected to be given a living, but that, on the contrary, he was securing a partner and an aid to work together with him for the common good. She was a bringer of help and a creator of wealth. We still have numberless cases of this kind, but the idea is becoming a little old-fashioned. Are we really gaining or losing by the change?

While woman in industry is nothing new, there is something distinctly new both for women and for men in the modern development of the factory system; and it is with this system that we are now principally concerned.

I have pointed out the historical background of women in industry principally for the purpose of making it clear that the employment of women in factories is not inflicting a new burden upon them, but is simply transferring the labor to a new place of work, and that as she formerly labored at home she now labors in the shop. So far as the woman is concerned the change is much more a social one than one of the amount of work to be done.

The change of locale from the home to the shop has brought with it many new conditions of life, and it certainly carries with it some serious problems, not only as concerns the woman herself, but perhaps more especially the family.

Let me interject, the mother who works may occasionally be that crushed creature whom we hear about, who was forced into the shop, leaving her child in an almost abandoned condition at home. There are such, sad to say, but that does not represent the type of married women going into industry. Most of these married women going into industry are women with their family more or less advanced, who go rather to supplement the family wage than as a representative of the type just mentioned.

In regard to the family I have some anxiety, and I do believe that so far as it is possible, the mother should be kept at home, but I think that that is a matter that can only be solved by the individual. It will not do to deprive the woman by either law, regulation, or ruling of the free right to support herself or her family in such manner as she can.

As industrialists we can and should take a lively interest in all that concerns the lives of our workers, but industry, as such, is chiefly concerned with the shop; i. e., What kind of a shop is it; what provision has it for health, comfort, and decency; what com-

penetration and treatment do the employees receive; and what kind of discipline and efficiency is maintained? Are the tasks properly set and are the requirements and rules reasonable, just, and considerate? I am not speaking for "sweat shops." I don't know just what a "sweat shop" is, and I have never seen one. I am speaking of factories; of industry. I have no hesitation in saying that the transfer of work from the home to the factory has marked a tremendous advance for the women. They leave the house every day and dress to meet the world; both excellent means of breaking the monotony of life and of getting air and movement. They work in well lighted, well ventilated and sanitary rooms which are vastly superior in these respects to home surroundings. They receive compensation far in excess of anything ever received for home work. They have a much wider social contact than formerly. The hours of work are relatively short, and the amount of work demanded is not excessive.

The old saying that "Woman's work is never done" is no longer true. That is, it is not true of the factory. One of the problems which is never solved is how to control the work which the woman will do outside of the factory and outside of working hours. No sort of limitation of hours is of any avail in the case of the woman who will do all of the home work plus all of the shopwork, or that other who will run a boarding house and take in washing after hours, or act as a clerk in a store in the evening. This is something which is always involved and usually overlooked in research investigations upon the subject of fatigue in industry.

The most controversial question in connection with the employment of women in industry is that of the compensation to be given as compared with that of men. Many claim that there should be actual equality, and many attempts have been made to express this thought in a formula. Perhaps the most successful attempt at such expression is that "Women should have equal pay for work of equal value." This may approximate the truth or be far from it, according to our understanding of what "equal value" means. How shall we measure value? It certainly can not be accurately measured for any class of workers by the length of time worked. Of all known systems of compensation, what is known as "day pay" is the least defensible, although it has to be resorted to in cases where other kinds of measures have not or can not be worked out.

Neither can value be finally determined by the measure of quantity and quality of product alone.

There are other factors entering into "value" which have to be considered. Length of service is an important item. Not only do workers become more valuable by reason of long experience, but there is serious loss through change of hands due to interruption of work and employment and training expense. Each new appren-

tice means a very large outlay. Teaching is in itself a considerable charge, and there must be added to that the loss of quantity and quality of product and the wastage of materials. This so-called "turnover" cost, in some cases, runs up into the hundreds of dollars for each new hand. Regularity of attendance is most important. Every absence means loss of use to the plant and equipment and unabsorbed overhead expense, and also is apt to interfere with the work of others who suffer through the failure of continuous supply of materials required by the succeeding processes. Roughly speaking, an employer spends about as much in overhead expense as he does for wages; and when a hand is absent and his production unit has to remain idle, his employer loses in idle machine expense as much as the worker does in pay.

An employee having a continuous or cumulative record for production and quality is obviously worth more to the employer than the one who has simply done the task well for a spurt. An employee who can perform several different tasks, and can consequently be utilized at need in different ways as changing conditions require, is of more value than one who is restricted to one kind of work. One who can do unassisted all of the various movements connected with one operation is worth more than one who has to be helped in lifting or other exertion requiring strength. Just brute muscle has its worth; and so on through a long list of varying factors. The employer is not buying from his employee units of product. He is buying service and he will pay for that service what it is worth as compared to other forms of service which may be available. Let me say, this applies to men as well as to women.

Having these things in mind, consider that women rarely enter industry with the intention of making it a life's occupation. They expect to work in the shop only until they can marry, and they do marry and pass on, usually just as they have completed a long enough apprenticeship to begin to be most valuable. It is true that some married women do return to work, but it is not the rule, and should not be the rule; and even when they do continue their shop work, they do it in addition to home work, and can not bring to it their undivided attention and strength, which is proved by the fact that married women lose much more time than single women do.

Also consider that the working women lose by absence about twice as much time as men do, and that in many of their tasks they have to be assisted or supplemented by men.

A just consideration of these limitations must make it clear that an employer must take them into his calculations when determining how much he can afford to pay in comparison with other forms of labor, and the more such differentiations—each of which constitutes

a reduction in value—are arbitrarily attached to the employment of women, the greater will be the margin of difference between the pay of men and women, and the more difficult it will be for women to obtain employment. It is folly to suppose that those differences can be set aside by any arbitrary dictum or law.

All of this argument is only an explanation of the world-wide fact that the market rates for women's work are less than men's rates. When there is found in operation a universal law, it is fairly safe to assume that there is sound foundation for it. At least the burden of proof is upon those who would reverse it.

It seems clear to me that it is women's disadvantage to add arbitrary handicaps to be surmounted by them in their competition for employment and compensation, but there are also very practical reasons for keeping on a basis of equality in the matter of time to be worked. To fix one working schedule for women and another for men is to overlook the fact they work together as integral parts of one single organization. In most cases, when the women, forming an important part of the whole, leave the shop the men must quit also, either because the work can not go on with smoothness and coordination, or because it is too uneconomic to operate with so great an idle machine expense. The short-time workers must therefore be chargeable not only with the loss due to their own failure to function but also with the consequent loss of efficiency of the men as well.

The most familiar argument in favor of a short day for women is that there are times when they are not in fit condition to stand the strain of long hours. This is not logical. When they are not in fit condition they should stay at home and rest. Even a short day is too much for them at such time; but the whole working schedule should not be continuously slowed down to the pace of those who are for the moment weakened. That is too much of a handicap to industry, and, as the workers can only be paid out of the products of industry, to the workers themselves.

It has been many times demonstrated that it is highly desirable that industry should be so organized in each locality that there is a fairly even distribution of the amount of work open to men and women. When there is a scarcity of work for women they compete among themselves to such an extent that they force down the wage level, and even the low wage does not bring employment for all. A usual accompaniment of such a condition is a high wage for the men, as it is necessary to make up the shortage in the family incomes. This is not conducive to a healthy social status.

I think highly paid men with low paid women is a poor mixture.

I have said so much about the limitations of women that I want also to speak of their virtues. Many of them are wonderfully fine, helpful, intelligent, capable, and dependable. Here and there one

stands out as a perfect ideal of an industrial aid. I have known of instances when a woman was so quick, so attentive, and so diligent that in her bonus earnings she outstripped all others in the department, both men and women, and earned enough more than her foreman did to make him feel aggrieved.

Women present many problems in connection with the shop. They are sensitive and require extraordinarily tactful and kindly treatment, and much personal consideration. They do not object to firmness where it is just, and they prefer to work under the direction of men than under other women. In fact, women in the shop are not in any way different from their sisters outside. They are indispensable and they are a problem.

God bless the women!

Now, if that looks reactionary to you, unprogressive, benighted, I wish you would please consider that it comes from one bearing a large part of the responsibility for the conduct of an industry having a continuous operating record from 1838 up to date, employing, when in full operation 5,000 hands, one-half of whom are women; that it is probably one of the best organized, best equipped organizations of industry to be found in the country, if not in the world; with the most advanced ideas as to medical hygiene, welfare work—all kinds of things which can be thought of. That in that whole long record which is coming so near to the century mark, that we are beginning to wonder what we will do when we cross the hundred-year line, in that whole 100-year record we have had just one real strike, and that was planted on us because people thought we were getting along too well without some arrangements which they thought they would prefer. In other words, we were an open shop, and had to be made an example of. We are progressive, but we are trying to keep our feet on the ground. We want to go forward, but we do not think that everything that's labeled new is the thing to chase after. Neither do we think that everything which was done by those who passed before us was folly and wrong. We want to make sane, well-balanced, judicious, moderate progress. We do not believe in isms; we do not believe in revolutions. We have a suspicion of too many laws. We think industry and industrialists and their workers can work out most of their problems in the natural way among themselves. We feel that arbitrary regulations as to hours of work, conditions of work, output, compensation, everything else, are and should be flexible. There is no such thing as an arbitrary fixed length of day which is suitable for industry. To say that a 48-hour week or a 50-hour week or a 60-hour week is the right length of week really is not sensible, my friends.

Each different problem is a problem by itself. Each different kind of work requires different conditions, different surroundings, and

carries with it a different amount of fatigue, and a different amount of call upon the operator for his contribution. Many times what are called long hours of work are not long hours of work. An operator may be in the shop eight hours, nine, ten hours a day, and do four or five hours of work.

I am not losing sight of the fact that hours of work should not be gauged exclusively by the fatigue. I recognize clearly that there's another side to it; that hours of work should not be so long as to deprive the operative of a fair amount of leisure time outside for recreation and social purposes, rest, and so on.

I am through. Now just bear with this, and do not be in a hurry to say it is not so. Take it home and think about it, and whatever else you do, remember that it's honest.

Mr. HENNING. I am advised that Miss Mary Gilson is not present, and will present her paper on this subject to-morrow.

We now pass to the other subhead, "What industry means to women workers." This will be discussed by two women, the first one to be heard is a woman who at one time was with us in the Department of Labor, connected with the Women's Bureau, and who is now director of the division of industrial studies of the Russell Sage Foundation, Miss Mary Van Kleeck.

WHAT INDUSTRY MEANS TO WOMEN WORKERS.

MARY VAN KLEECK, director Department of Industrial Studies, Russell Sage Foundation.

From one point of view it is quite impossible to define "what industry means to women workers," even if I had hours to speak, because, according to the census of 1910, it means eight and one-half million different things. Or if you do not wish to define industry as including all gainful employment, we may say that it means in manufacturing and mechanical pursuits, one million nine hundred thousand different things; and in professions, one million different things; and in trades, that occupation which has been growing, so far as the employment of women is concerned, at a more rapid rate even than manufacturing, industry has for women six hundred thousand different meanings. We are confronted with diversity of occupations and diversity in the characteristics of the women working in them, and we must be very careful in generalization. But we can correct the inadequacies of the experience of any individual by accumulating the records of a great many individuals.

No woman in any one occupation in all this varied list can speak from her own experience for all of the women in all of the occupations. But women have discovered that it is not impossible to pool

their experiences, and the Women's Bureau in the Federal Government represents the pooling of the experiences of women in industry, and its findings may be taken, therefore, as expressing what industry means to women workers. My speech, therefore, should be to summarize these 27 bulletins that the Women's Bureau has issued in the period since it has been organized, setting forth facts that it has gathered together from the experience literally of thousands of women in industry in this country. If these facts be studied carefully we shall not need to generalize from too narrow an experience, because our experience is accumulating all the time.

That is the first point for us to bear in mind in a conference of this kind; that in all our discussion we are going to be guided by the composite picture of what industry actually means in the lives of women to-day; and that we are unwilling to base our decisions upon the theories of any groups, unless they are tested by adequate experience. The Women's Bureau has had the hearty support of many women's organizations, and they have thereby committed themselves to the support of this basic work of accumulating experience and reaching decisions on that basis.

Let me say, first, that there are two points of view from which we might approach a problem like the employment of women in industry. We may emphasize, on the one hand, the possibilities of individual action. That is very natural for us in America. We are apt to say that the individual has complete control of his or her own fate, that the individual who works hard and is faithful and loyal is going to win out, and, in the familiar American faith, will "get ahead" in whatever career or vocation he or she has chosen. To be sure, if we did not believe that the spring of action is in the individual, we would not be getting together here for conference, in the belief that we as individuals can take some effective action.

Another group, however, believes that the environment masters the individual, and that the environment must be controlled, because as problems get more and more complicated the individual is lost. Surely it is true that if we did not believe that there are forces which must be controlled in the social and economic life we would not be getting together here for this conference.

But I take it that what this conference believes is that in the experience of a great many individuals are certain common elements, and that as industrial and social life has grown more and more complicated in this country, and in other modern industrial nations, the individual must draw on the experience of other individuals. We do not "get ahead" alone; we act in groups; and there is an interplay between the life of the individual and the environment. The more conscious is our group thinking, the more clearly we compre-

hend that we are all involved in situations which are affected by influences impersonal in their origin, but that nevertheless we can control those elements in the interest of the common good. The more we realize this relation of the individual and the group to impersonal forces, the more fundamental will be our thinking about women in industry. Thus we are brought back to the fact that the only basis for common action or for group thinking in the realm of industrial problems is a common fund of information which is drawn directly from the experience of women themselves in industry and formulated and brought together for our enlightenment. These facts must be the starting point for the discussions of this conference.

We are not without a considerable body of information in this country. One of the very earliest investigations that was made by the old Bureau of Labor organized under the direction of Carroll D. Wright was the study of working women in large cities, and in that investigation there were brought out certain familiar facts. In the eighties, those investigations observed the effect of the Civil War upon women's economic position, and the way in which the withdrawal of men into military service or the injury or death of the breadwinners in the families had driven women into industry. The complaint of the sewing women was reflected in our daily papers in the period following the Civil War, and during that period the evils of long hours of work for low wages were again and again emphasized.

And then about 20 years later, in 1907, we had a nation-wide investigation of the condition of employment of woman and child wage earners. Nineteen volumes were published at that time by the Federal Government. Thorough studies were made of certain typical industries of importance in the employment of women—the cotton textile industry, men's ready-made clothing, the glass industry, and the silk industry. Other studies were made of the employment of women in stores and factories, costs of living, and the health of women in the textile industry. In those nineteen volumes we have a foundation for efforts toward improvement which must continue to have our attention until the problems there outlined are under some sort of control.

Then we come to the time of the organization of the Women's Bureau in the war period and the accumulating data which are coming out of its investigations made since the war. The significant feature of these investigations seems to me to be that the Women's Bureau has been engaged in the very practical task of trying to show the women in the various States just what action they can take. This very thorough study in 1907, that I have referred to, valuable as it was, was not directly focused upon the possibility of local action

to correct conditions. It was implied in it, but it was not clearly the purpose of the investigators, and although to a certain extent differences were shown in different localities, the community and its own problems, and the possibility of action by its citizens, were not the focus of attention. In contrast, as you know, it has been the purpose and the policy of the Women's Bureau to make its investigations upon invitation from groups in various communities who showed that they were eager to follow up the results by action, and it has been the response of the women's organizations in various localities which has made possible that kind of practical procedure.

I wish to call attention, also, to certain special studies, which the Women's Bureau has made, which illustrate the typical problems in the employment of women throughout the country. There is this most recent bulletin, *The Occupational Progress of Women*, which outlines the differences in the proportions in which women's employment has increased in the various industries between 1910 and 1920. It shows that the increases have been larger in professional work, and in what is called "trade and transportation," than in manufacturing. That indicates the widening of new opportunities for women in occupations in which the conditions are distinctly different from those of manufacturing pursuits.

Then there is this report on "Industrial opportunities and training for women and girls," which stresses again the fact that closely involved with the range of opportunities open to women should be the opportunities to be trained in a variety of occupations. The picture which that report gives is one of many resources for industrial training for boys in various communities, but a very narrow range of opportunities for training open to women even in those communities where the number of occupations in which they are employed has been greatly enlarged, especially during the war.

Here we have a report on "Some effects of legislation limiting hours of work for women," which shows the intention of the Women's Bureau not only to describe conditions before laws are passed but also to study the effects of legislation. I am calling attention to these bulletins merely to indicate the types of problems that are before us in considering women in industry.

Another very interesting study is "The family status of bread winning women." The basis for it is the material regularly gathered by the Bureau of the Census and here analyzed by the Women's Bureau more fully than the funds of the Bureau of the Census permit for any specialized topic. The Women's Bureau, taking the census material for a typical industrial community, has analyzed the exact family status of women who work, so we no longer have to guess about whether married women are working and whether the ma-

majority of those in industry have young children. It has been said here to-day that the married women in industry are not mothers of little children. This bulletin tells a different story, which I shall come to presently. These references are made now merely to illustrate the topics on which we have information which can guide our thinking, so that we need not feel that we are without a practical basis for decisions.

What, then, on the basis of available information, does industry mean to women workers?

It seems to me that it means three things that we should emphasize here. First, it represents a chance to earn a living; how good a one it offers can be discussed later. Second, industry has constituted for women what one might call an endurance test. Third, it is an opportunity for women to join in the constructive upbuilding of a better order. It is possible to suggest only the outlines of these three large subjects.

First, is the chance to earn a living. It is quite true, if we study the experience of women in industry, that their entrance into various occupations has resulted from the necessity to earn money for themselves or for their families. Thus, they are carrying out their traditional responsibility of being helpmates, as a previous speaker has defined their function. I shall have something in a moment to say about what the chance to earn has actually meant, but let me first say that industry also means for many women a joy in work. We are not talking accurately about the problems of women in industry if we forget the real joy that women take in a job which gives any opportunity for expression of their powers. Those powers are varied, and they find expression in different types of occupations. There is such a thing in industry as real joy in work. Women are gaining an increasing sense of power through economic independence. Because of it, they desire to break down the prejudices which exclude them from certain occupations.

All of these various aspects of economic independence and joy in a job as an opportunity for independence have been summed up repeatedly in the phrase "equality of opportunity." I suggest that equality of opportunity is a very inadequate goal for women. In the first place, it seems to indicate that men in industry all have perfectly satisfactory opportunities. In the second place, it seems to set limits to our achievement. If I have undertaken to do a certain task, I desire freedom to accomplish that task as successfully as my own capacity permits. I do not think that I spend a great deal of time thinking whether I am equal to any man in that job, or whether I am having the same sort of opportunity as a man. I believe that the habit of measuring ourselves as women with men as a group is a remnant of all the trouble that we have been through

to get the vote. The basic purpose that we must have in mind is that every worker, and that means every human being, because every human being needs work for the full expression of personal power—that every individual in society must have a chance to use his or her own characteristic powers. And I am not a bit afraid of discovering, if we are given a fair chance, that women can do certain things very much better than men; and likewise, I am not at all concerned if, given a fair chance, we should discover that men can handle certain tasks more easily than women. As a slogan in the primitive stage of thinking about our economic opportunities “equality of opportunity” may be all right, but as a goal or a program it is not large enough for us.

If, then, we have in mind as our objective the best development of the powers and capacities of the individual in the industrial order as we find it, what are the present obstacles? What do we mean by saying that industry means for women an endurance test? It is impossible to do more than to sum up these obstacles to progress. We mean, in the first place, that as a matter of fact wages for women have been lower than for men. We must not forget that fact when we talk about possible methods of changing the basis of wage determination for women. It is not after all because they are women, but because they are the low wage group that we must study their problem and discover the basis for determining their wages.

Mr. Cheney has outlined certain very interesting facts as to what constitutes wage determination in the experience of an employer. I found in my mind as he was talking a running commentary of additional questions. I wanted to ask, for instance, how valuable prolonged experience of any worker, man or woman, is to an industry. I wanted to ask why it is that in certain industries sometimes as low an age as 35 years and often 40 or 45 is set at what men call the dead line after which a man will not be newly employed, so that industry seems, as it is organized today, to be throwing aside experience and saying that it has no use for the older workers. In other words, though it may be true that in the more highly skilled occupations the amount spent by the management in training should be returned by the worker in prolonged service, is it not also true that in certain occupations the young, untried worker is more valuable than the older worker, using “more valuable” in the sense that Mr. Cheney has defined it as measured in low costs of production? A great deal more is involved in that whole question of length of service than appears on the surface. Involved in it is the exact requirement of the particular occupation rather than generalization about the length of women's service.

We need an entirely different approach to our wage problem. We need an analysis of what should be the factors in determining wages.

The fundamental point of controversy, however, is that the question of what the wages should be is less important to both employer and employee than the crucial issue of who sets them. If wages are set by a very large industrial organization, with no voice expressed by the wage earners in it, then is it not true that the rate will be determined primarily in accordance with the demands of cheap production, and that little or no consideration will be given to the social aspects of wages as income?

When we advocate minimum wage legislation for women we are not favoring a uniform rate to be paid throughout all industries, in all parts of the country, but rather we are saying that the best way to settle the question of wages is to get together representatives of employers, representatives of the workers, and representatives of the public, who, sitting around the table, will study the facts and determine that wage which will represent a balance between social needs as reflected in standards of living and the needs of the industry as reflected in costs of production. Those who advocate minimum wage legislation are not proposing that manufacturers should be told what they should pay, and that the rate should be determined arbitrarily by groups quite outside the industry. The proposal for a new method of setting a minimum through a representative commission is the outgrowth of experience in setting wages in certain industries with due consideration of the needs of all the groups involved, in contrast with the more prevalent practice of ignoring the needs of the less articulate groups. Wherever arbitrary power is exercised in decisions involving so many different interests, the probability is that the less powerful will be forgotten.

Some of the engineers in the country are considering the possibility of making a study of the basis of determining wages. The American Federation of Labor recently passed a resolution suggesting the same kind of investigation. Progressive employers, including Mr. Cheney and his associates, are experimenting in better methods of weighing all the elements involved in wages. The war taught us that the cost of living should enter into the determination of earnings and must, therefore, be considered as a factor in setting rates, and with that necessity we face one of the very complicated problems of industrial management. First, facts are needed, and, secondly, its solution demands insight into the social consequence of the wage scale. Facts and insight are what is being sought now for the low paid group of workers, who happen to be women in industry.

Then, there is the whole question of hours of work, but it is impossible to take time to discuss it adequately. I would like to suggest that Mr. Cheney has shown us that the organization for which he speaks has studied its problems and sought to maintain a high standard. It has not been a fly-by-night enterprise, which has tried

to make as much profit as possible to-day regardless of what happened to it or its workers to-morrow. Hence experience in dealing with women in industry in Mr. Cheney's organization is very different from the record of experience in less well-organized, less socially managed factories. But consider the question of hours of work even in a well-managed plant. It is not within the power of the individual to determine her hours of work where there are five thousand employed. Mr. Cheney has even said that it is exceedingly difficult to set different hours for women as compared with men in that plant. And how utterly impossible it is, therefore, for an individual girl in a large establishment to choose what hours she shall work. May I add in that connection that if there are days when women are weaker, as it was expressed here this afternoon, taking care of health every day of the month and never permitting excessive hours would go far toward converting weakness into strength for women in industry?

Experience shows that the most effective results are achieved for the industry and for the worker by keeping daily hours always at a reasonable level. Exact medical examination of the individual is not necessary to demonstrate the desirability of the 8-hour day. I remember one meeting at which I happened to be present when a group of employers were asking that some representatives of women's organizations should demonstrate in connection with a proposed 8-hour bill that nine hours of work a day were dangerous to the health of women but that eight hours were not dangerous. Unless, they said, you can show us exact medical statistics on that point we shall not support the 8-hour day bill. Obviously exact statistics on that point are not available. To secure them would require much more elaborate physical examinations than are now made in any industry. We need here a combination of what might be called social common sense and scientific procedure. We have had scientific procedure in determining that fatigue is physiological, and that from fatigue one must rest if it is not to become exhausting. That is the scientific basis for setting some limit to the machine which otherwise would run all day long, and all through the night, because the machine does not know fatigue. But it is not necessary for us to study every one of the occupations in industry and determine a different working day for each of them. We have had an accumulated social experience through years and years which trade unionists and unorganized workers are expressing in their desire for an 8-hour day. That is just as scientific a fact, this desire of theirs for the 8-hour day, as any kind of physical measurement of individuals or of output might be. Upon the basis of a growing social standard, we must build, using as our method the scientific and technical facts which

show us how to arrive at the goal which is set by our social vision. Our social vision grows out of our experience as to what is good for our communities.

All these illustrations merely show the surface of the problems affecting women in industry, but perhaps they will indicate that here is an opportunity for women to join in the building up of industry on a new basis. We need not argue the need for that. If you pick up any newspaper and read news that is of general significance from abroad or from this country, can you find very much that does not go back to labor and economic conditions? Is it not clear that labor is the fundamental international problem of our day? Is it not necessary to civilization that women be prepared to do their part in constructing a better social order?

Experience has shown us that women have suffered from industrial conditions, and that they have actually suffered in a way that men have not, because women are the bearers of children, and responsible for taking care of the home. Let me point out that contrary to some statement made here this afternoon, the study by the Women's Bureau of the "Family status of breadwinning women" does not demonstrate that the married woman in industry is one whose children are grown. This was a study of census material not open to suspicion as a biased inquiry by investigators trying to make a point but gathered by census agents in the regular house-to-house canvass. It shows that in the families of working mothers, the children were young. The report says that "approximately 60 per cent of the employed mothers had children under 5 years of age." This and other information in that study are facts. They show that industry presses upon women and through them affects the home and the children. Facts indicate, also, less economic power on the part of women. Experience in all countries is showing the necessity for exerting some measure of control over the industrial environment in which women are employed.

A recent statement by an officer of the United States Steel Corporation that physically and socially the 8-hour day is right, but economically it is not possible now for the steel industry, made in the face of the fact that other steel companies now in this country are operating with the 8-hour day, brings up the question of whether or not we do not also need more effective control of men's work. In the answer to that question, however, much is involved. Meanwhile, if we are really practical in our approach to the problems of women in industry, we must recognize that there are differences in the social effects of the employment of women as compared with men, differences in the conditions which they encounter, differences in their power to control their environment, and reasons, therefore, why the community, in order to give more, not less, freedom to the

individual woman, should control these conditions in her environment which restrict individual freedom. If we women are to approach this very large task successfully, two of these suggestions may be useful to keep in mind.

The first is the necessity for that habit of thinking in terms of facts. From this habit we shall become vigorous in the support of fact-finding agencies in State and Federal Governments. I think that nothing is more cheering, since women have had the vote, than the vigilant support that the women's organizations of this country are giving to the Women's Bureau in the Federal Government. They are thereby proving that they recognize the importance of facts.

Second, as a means of preparation for an effective share in the reconstruction of industry, is the strengthening of the voluntary organizations of women. I am thinking of a number of them. I am thinking, for instance, of the National Consumers' League, with its beginnings in the effort of a group of women in New York City who suddenly began to realize that the conditions in the stores ought to be controlled by the women who purchase there, and then gradually they extended that idea to the discovery that in the last analysis the consumer is the employer. From stores they carried their activities back to the factories, and in the working out of the idea that the consumer is the employer to its logical conclusion, the league has recognized labor legislation as expressing the standards of the largest number of consumers—that is, all the citizens of the country.

Then we have the General Federation of Women's Clubs, and all that they have been doing, especially in recent years, to support labor legislation and to encourage their members to study how higher standards can be secured for women in industry, whether by labor laws or by voluntary action in industrial establishments. More recently, the organization of the National League of Women Voters comes as a reenforcement of great importance in legislative programs affecting women. The National Women's Trade Union League is another of our assets in this effort, representing as it does, the banding together of the wage-earning women themselves, and their interest in the support of those expressions of the standards of the community which we call labor laws.

I am thinking to-day of another organization, a religious organization, which has been making a valiant fight for recognizing that industry in its effect upon human beings is a matter of religious import, and I am thinking of a leader in that organization, whose work on earth has so recently ended, Florence Simms. Thirteen years ago I happened to meet her at a student conference. That was in 1910, before many organizations of women had been taking

an interest in industrial questions. I remember her saying then how important she felt it to be that the Young Women's Christian Association should make the students in the colleges realize the meaning of industrial problems. I need not tell you how steadily she kept that vision before her, how through experience abroad, following the armistice, she saw the big forces that were sweeping upon us, and felt that religion was a power which must seek more adequate expression in industrial relations; and then how important was her influence in leading her organization to that brave stand at the Cleveland convention, taken in the face of threats that if an industrial program were adopted there the business men of the country would withdraw their contributions from the Young Women's Christian Associations. Though that threat was clearly printed and circulated at the convention, the association overwhelmingly adopted its industrial program.

It is good for us to think to-day of the valiant work that is being done by these voluntary organizations to get higher standards accepted and adopted in industry. Is not the keynote of all this work the release of women's powers, giving them freedom to develop to the fullest their capacity for their own happiness and for the service of society?

Mr. HENNING: I notice in the audience United States Senator Medill McCormick, of Illinois; also Miss Robertson and Mrs. Huck, Members of Congress. I will request these Representatives of Congress to come to the stage and occupy seats here with us. Will the ushers kindly bring them forward? [It was found that Mrs Huck was not present.] If there are any other women Members of Congress present we invite them to the stage.

Miss ALICE ROBERTSON, of Oklahoma. I am here as a delegate; not as a Member of Congress, but as a working woman.

Mr. HENNING. Fine, Miss Robertson! The subject of "What industry means to women workers" will be further discussed at this time by the president of the International Federation of Working Women, Mrs. W. Raymond Robins.

WHAT INDUSTRY MEANS TO WOMEN WORKERS.

Mrs. RAYMOND ROBINS, president International Federation of Working Women.

Standing before you on this platform this afternoon I feel very much at home, for it is only three short years ago, in November, 1919, that the First International Congress of Working Women ever held in the world, as far as we know history, met in this hall at the invitation of the American working women, at the invitation of the National Women's Trade-Union League. Nineteen countries were represented. We met again two years later in Geneva, Switzerland,

and to-day this International Federation of Working Women, called into being by the working women of America and made possible through gifts from American women in every State in the Union, representing every social group—this federation to-day represents women workers from 40 nations. I would like to bring to your attention some of the conditions in industry which are being discussed with an effort toward settlement the world over. It helps us to know that in other lands also many of the same industrial difficulties arise and that the industrial question is a world question.

One of my friends, a very intelligent woman, sitting with us this afternoon, said to me not long ago, "What is this industrial question? You are forever talking about the industrial question. What is it? I am tired of hearing of it." Friends, the industrial question is simply a human question. It is one aspect of our human struggle toward a finer, fuller life for all. Every age has its peculiar problem which must be met before any other question can be settled. And to-day the question which is a world-wide question and one of interest to millions of men as well as women is the question we call the industrial problem. What is our relationship to it as citizens of a great Commonwealth and as Christian men and women who in this as in other ways would try to follow the Master?

We have heard from Mr. Cheney—one of the great leaders among the manufacturers of our country—who is trying to bring about decent conditions within his factory. It is only right that we should remember that there are many men who are trying to do their utmost fairly and squarely for the men as well as the women workers; that they are trying to find their way through and out of these extraordinarily difficult times industrially—difficult not only because of the war but because of new forces released by the war, because of a new power, the rising of another group of folks into relationship with life.

Perhaps it will help us to think historically for a moment. As Americans we represent largely the middle class, and it is not so long ago, friends, that the middle classes were fighting for the right of recognition as human beings. That was what the fight was about. The struggle was on for many centuries between the nobles and the burghers, and all through the history of the last 1,000 years we find the story of the rising of the middle classes. We also find that these folk who wished to prove their worth were accused of such simple, such familiar things as wishing to wear velvets, when the wearing of velvets was the prerogative of the wife of a nobleman! To-day it is the working class, the men and women of the working group, asking for a larger share in life. It is the nonacceptance of conditions of life as they exist which causes the disturbance within the social order. To-day it is the working class challenging these condi-

tions. Yesterday it was the middle class, it was your forbears, my forbears, Mr. Cheney's forbears who were the disturbing factors in the existing social order.

In considering the industrial question of to-day, it is well for us to realize that in addition to those manufacturers who are trying to play the game squarely there are others who, though they may be trying to play the game on the square, are so held by their own limitations, by the difficulties of the situation that they find it almost impossible to do alone that which might be done with them and for them and for their workers if all of us would play our part.

Let me give you a picture of what I am trying to say: For over 17 years Mr. Robins and I have lived on the top floor of a tenement house in the most crowded and congested district of Chicago. We are living in the seventeenth ward. This ward has an area of less than one square mile with over 75,000 people living in it. We are packed together like sardines. We represent the most unskilled and the lowest paid workers. Now, in these 17 years many things have happened. When I first came to the seventeenth ward, so extraordinarily vivid and alive, it seemed to me that the entire clothing industry had settled in our ward. The sweatshop seemed to prevail everywhere. A sweatshop is a word defined by the dictionary as a place where work is done and living attempted. As we all know, the men and women in the sewing trades represented then the largest groups of exploited workers. In the homes near me lived the women called "home finishers," women who finished automobile coats and overcoats selling for high prices in the retail stores of our city. There was no relation between the wages paid the workers and the price paid by the public. The evil of the contract system is too well known for me to enter into the details here. Who were these men and women? They were just folks, mothers and fathers, sons and daughters, human beings with mind and character of endless possibilities of strength and beauty, with the power of the spirit within them, this spirit which, when set free, is one further expression of God in the world.

Now, it is because that is denied, because the long day in industry denies the chance to grow, denies to the power within us growth and fulfillment, that we are face to face with what we term social and industrial unrest. Conditions of industry in many trades and occupations are so hard that they deny the chance of growth. Take the seventeenth ward. Let me give you one picture of young girls, girls of the lately arrived immigrants and also daughters of our American farmers trying to earn their way and earn their daily bread in the maelstrom of our great city. Take these young girls, waitresses, dishwashers, kitchen help, in the cheap restaurants of our city, working from 5 or 6 in the morning for 12, 14, 16 hours a day.

I have met them many a morning running to work like so many little rabbits to their burrows. Or take them in some of the many nonstandardized factories still working for \$5 or \$6 a week. Or take the mothers, many of them of these tenement homes, coming home at 2 o'clock in the morning from their work of scrubbing in the Loop, and others leaving at 2 o'clock in the morning to do their early work. I am not saying that these hard-pressed, poverty-stricken folk represent all of America, but I do say that they represent one cross section of our America and that they represent conditions of life which make for the denial of all the finer aspects of life. These conditions are a ringing challenge to our faith. Ask anyone who has lived or who knows intimately the life in the great industrial centers of our cities, or in the great industries of our country, ask anyone to tell you how these conditions weigh upon the heart and mind and conscience. Ask Mary McDowell, of the stockyards in Chicago—not a schoolteacher of Brooklyn! It is significant that faces are more distinct than names. We sometimes get duplication in names, we do not in faces. Miss McDowell belongs to the stockyards of Chicago. Perhaps the individuality of the face is simply a foreshadowing of that individuality, which God is trying to express through each one of us. At any rate there are thousands of others who can tell you the same story that I am telling you.

In the early days of Chicago I found some chalk marks on a sidewalk, and it so chanced that I was able to find the little girl who made those marks. She was the daughter of one of those scrub women of whom I have spoken, a widow earning her daily bread for herself and her child. Friends guaranteed an education to the child and a home to the mother. The child went through the public schools of Chicago, through the Art Institute of Chicago, through the Art School at Paris, and finally won the Prix de Rome. To this one child the door of opportunity was opened, to how many does it remain closed?

How many boys and girls, how many men and women who might add to the expression of beauty and joy, how many are crushed under industrial conditions? And isn't it right that the women of America should come together and say that as mothers, we find it too costly to bring children into the world unless their fullest heritage be made possible? Much has been said about the entrance of women into politics through the vote. Many predictions have been made as to what a woman voter would or would not do. I take it, it is much too early to reach any conclusions, but I am certain there is one aspect of the political question which will finally be the determining factor in the vote of the women of our country. I refer to the fact that we are more deeply concerned than men—because it is our life work—with feeding, housing, and clothing the

world. We are not theorists. We can not feed, clothe, and house the children, we can not keep warm and clean the home on theories. We are realists. Let us say to our governors, masters, and rulers, "We are weary of our hagglings and debates and theories. The earth is rich with the means of life. Eager brains and strong hands there are in plenty. We demand such use of land and labor as will insure us bread and warmth and education and peace. At each election we intend to test the party in power by the facts of our human welfare."

I was interested to have Mr. Cheney, Mr. Davis, and Mr. Henning all tell us that they were workers when they were boys. I am the wife of a man who began work when he was 8 years old. Isn't it splendid that they were able to get from under? But what of the tens of thousands, friends, who are still held under the pressure of industrial conditions? Don't we owe them something? Suppose that in a given factory there are 10,000 workers, and we are told each one may rise from the ranks of the workers and become president of this great corporation. Yes, there is that chance. But suppose that all of the 10,000 employees take the chance and everybody gets to the top. What then? Isn't it necessary to realize that not all the gifts of life are executive gifts? Isn't it necessary to realize that there are endless varieties of gifts and aspirations in the human heart, and that this is the power in the individual which must be set free? Isn't that the task before us? And isn't it fair to ask of all of us that we will see to it that in this America of ours the conditions of life at the bottom are as fair and square as we know how to make them? Isn't that the purpose of our America? Isn't it true that America was not created to bring forth here and there a great artist, or a great scholar, or a great sculptor, or a great poet, however deeply grateful we are for every poet, artist, and scholar? America was created to bring forth a great people, and the people at the bottom are a part of this America of ours, which we love so passionately, which we would serve so devotedly, because we care so passionately that America be true to her ideals.

During the nine years that I was a member of the executive board of the Chicago Federation of Labor and also as president of the National Women's Trade Union League, I had the great opportunity and privilege of meeting many employers and settling with them some of the problems confronting them and their workers. Perhaps the most noteworthy change that has been brought about in any industry in this last 10 years is that extraordinary change which has been brought about in the sewing trades. When I was in London a year ago and it was known that a million dollars had been given by one of the great organizations of the needle trades, they

turned to me, those men and women of Europe, and said "You don't mean to tell me that these are garment workers, clothing workers? Why these workers are at the bottom of our ladder." "Yes," I said, "they were with us too, but there came a great uprising among the women workers." Don't let us forget that among the women came the great uprising and we had our shirt-waist strikes and the strikes of the garment workers, and in the city of Chicago 50,000 unorganized workers went out on strike. The Federation of Labor and the Women's Trade Union League arranged for commissary stores, for 16 weeks making possible the feeding of 50,000 people a day. Now what happened? One of the great leading employers of our country, Mr. Schaffner, who has since died, wanted from the very beginning to make possible an agreement, and for a number of weeks the firm he represented was the one firm willing to make an agreement. Many thousands of these workers—Poles, Italians, Greeks, Bohemians, Russians, Ruthenians—lived near me as neighbors; Americans, too, must not be forgotten. We talk so much of the immigrant worker that we get the impression that the American working woman is off somewhere having a good time.

To return to the trade agreement. A trade agreement is an achievement, a moral achievement, because it represents on the part of both the workers and the employers the willingness to cooperate with each other. This is not an easy task. The firm must train its superintendents and foremen to a new conception and to new methods of dealing with the workers. They must learn that cooperative action takes the place of individual action. The workers must be trained to a new conception and to new methods of settling disputes. In this instance in regard to the trade agreement with the great clothing firm of Hart, Schaffner & Marx, there were 12,000 workers who entered into an agreement with the firm after the great strike in 1910 and 1911. You will understand that it was no small task to train to a new conception of settling disputes 12,000 workers of 11 different nationalities. I am telling no tales out of school when I tell you the following incident. I was sitting in our office one day when a whole group of buttonhole workers, union girls, rushed in and told me that they had gone out on strike. I turned and said, "But it is in the agreement that we will not go out on strike." While I talked with them the telephone rang and Mr. Schaffner was at the other end, and he said to me, "Mrs. Robins, do you know there is a strike among the buttonhole workers?" I said, "Yes; I know." "Well," he said, "don't you know there is a clause in the agreement that there is to be no strike during the life of this agreement?" I said, "Yes; I do know it." "Well," he said, "will you admit that you have broken the agreement?" I said, "I don't see how I can help admitting it; the agreement is broken."

"Well," he said, "I am glad you admit it." I said, "Mr. Schaffner, may I ask you a question? Do you know what Mr. —— did in the coat department and do you know what Mr. —— did in the pants department?" When he stated that he had not heard of any of these occurrences, I said to him, "Don't you think perhaps I am in the better position of us two? I at least know when we break the agreement, but you are kept in ignorance."

There was a pause and then a request that I come over so that we might discuss the questions at issue. For the first time in this great industry, the trade agreement made it possible for workers and employers to get together. When we met first after the great strike we had a sense of antagonism one toward the other. That was natural. When we met a year later and signed a new agreement—remember I am speaking of 11 and 12 years ago—when we met after the signing of the first agreement we met as friends, as comrades, who together had suffered in a common cause. We were able to tease each other. I remember one gentleman turning to me and saying, "Mrs. Robins, when are we going to get rid of Jessie, she is such a trouble maker?" And I answered, "Just as soon as you get rid of Mr. X. He is another trouble maker."

Twelve years have gone by since this first agreement was signed. Out of the struggle, out of the joint efforts of the workers and the members of the firm cooperating with each other during these years, one of the worst exploited industries in America has been transformed into a great standardized industry. All of the other clothing firms in Chicago and in the great cities of the East have since come into line. What are some of the results? One of the great tragedies of life, even 10 or 12 short years ago, was the entrance of the child at 10 or 12 years of age into the factory life. Laws did not matter. As most of the workers were undersized it was easy to give another age—to claim to be 14 years old. All my fellow workers here know that thousands of American factory girls did not stay in school after the fifth or sixth grade. Now, last February, in this seventeenth ward where still thousands of clothing workers live, 92 per cent of the children who graduated at the grade school entered the high school. Ninety-two per cent! Think of it. Is there any need of putting into words the gain to the child, the community, and the Nation?

America needs an educated citizenship. America needs educated men and women, and the public school was established in the thought and with the purpose of giving every child a fair chance. My plea for a shorter work day isn't merely that human strength gives out after a certain period of strain. I want the shorter work day because overwork reduces humanity to a mere machine. We were not created to be only boot and shoe makers, glove workers, steel workers, or

workers in the textile mills, or even scrub women; we were created to be men and women, husbands and wives, fathers and mothers, brothers and sisters, friends and citizens. Time is the great gift of life. We need time for thinking, for dreaming, for fellowship, for service, for communion with each other and with our God. We need time in which to grow. We need time for joy. We need to remember the words of the Preacher, "And God set the world in their heart." Time and growth can alone bring to fruition the powers of the mind and heart in each of us.

Mr. HENNING. I am certain that we should all be delighted if Congresswoman Robertson would give us just a few words.

Hon. ALICE ROBERTSON, Member of Congress from Oklahoma. I can not tell when my childhood began. I belong to a class of men perhaps more put upon than any in the country, in the world, and yet I never heard of their striking—ministers. My father was a minister, and his only brother was a minister; both of my grandfathers were, and my great-great-grandfathers, in a steady line back for ten generations. I was the daughter of a missionary to the Indians, the granddaughter of a missionary to the Indians, a missionary teacher myself, beginning as a child. We all worked together, and the hours were always long and the deprivations were many. When I was 10 years old I used to try to make my little brother's trousers. My mother was translating the Gospel into the Indian language. And it was mighty hard work to make those trousers so that they were coming and going right. And they used to have waists and buttonholes. Talk about a strike of the buttonhole workers. I couldn't strike; I just made buttonholes.

Seriously, people say, "What's the matter with America to-day?" The matter with America to-day is that we women of America are forgetting to drop to our knees. I was 7 years old when the Civil War began. We were refugees—we missionary people. We were given 24 hours to get out from beyond the Mason and Dixon line, because we were northern blood, though I am of southern birth and southern breeding and a southern woman. But we were given 24 hours to get out. I went through all that. I know what it is to be a cold, hungry, refugee child. I know what it is to have scant clothing and scant food. But God always took care of us, and the food was always there. I was not in school from the time I was 11 until I went to college at 17. I did my own studying without even parents to hear my lessons. And I went into school as a substitute teacher when I was 13. For years I was a child worker. I was an antisuffragist, because I began so early to do a grown person's work. And then to do a man's work. And my father died, and the legacy he left me was to take up his work. And I did, and I paid the

price. The most wonderful thing that God ever gave to human beings was motherhood. The most beautiful thing that was ever put into the world is a little child. And when women go into industry in preference to motherhood, because they want silken garments, because they want certain freedom, because they want more of so-called amusement, and the time comes when they are old, they may see their lives reflected many times in the lives of others as they have grown older and see the light and realized that their ambitions are shown in those of others.

But there's nothing—and I, an old maid, say it to you—there's nothing God ever gave of sweetness and joy in life like little tender arms around the neck of a mother. And we, in considering industry for women, must put that always above other considerations.

I have had many women, many girls as well as many women, work under me in the course of my business life, and the girls did not work for me, they worked with me; and I knew them, and they knew me. And I can look back without one feeling of any wrong or injustice done to a woman by myself as employer or as friend. Do we stand together and help each other along those lines?

I did not mean to speak to you. I came here not to speak, but as a delegate, if there might be opportunity, to vote. Now, I would like to know this: I have been a woman working with my hands, as I have told you. I can scrub a floor most beautifully. And I can do it with the pride that goes back to my Winthrop blood and to my Edwards blood and to all the rest, because I have always taught every girl who came under my influence that it's what we are, not what we do; if we bring our work up to our level, we do not descend—not if we have the right stuff in us.

Some of the finest men that I have known in my life have been men who have come up from coal diggers, come up from everything. If they have the divine spark in them, no laws of man will hold it down. We can not dampen the heavenly fire.

Oh, yes; I got the degrees that I endured for as a child. They came to me as honorary degrees; and when they held out to me doctor of laws, "No," I said, "I am not worthy." And finally they said, "Why, you have been interpreting human life. That degree was given the other day to a woman for interpreting Shakespeare, and you have been interpreting human life ever since you were a child." And then I took it.

Now, I would like to ask just one thing. Do not consider me impertinent. I shall, after the 4th of March, go back to being an industrial worker in something; for, while I had a home, and every opportunity of making a living, I was taken by the nape of the neck and thrown into politics. I am an antisuffragist, who did not enlist, who did not volunteer, but when in God's providence He sent the

draft to the women in America, I was no slacker. And I wanted to get into the things that would make life for the women in our country worth while. But in politics the women must begin at the very bottom, and become citizens. Now, please, as I am soon to be an industrial worker again myself, I want to know——

Won't all who are actually making a living in industry—all actual wage earners here, stand up? Thank you very much. Now, all who came here as I was sent here, to represent my university, would you stand up?

Mr. HENNING. And now I am certain we should like very much, indeed, to have just a few words from the brilliant Senator from the great State of Illinois, from that great industrial city of Chicago—Senator McCormick.

Hon. MEDILL McCORMICK, Member of the United States Senate from Illinois. You will recognize something of the difficulty and embarrassment with which I speak, when I say that I came not only without credentials and merely to listen, but that on reaching the platform and learning that it had been supposed that I should address you, I found among the delegates not only several whom I represent now as a Senator from the State of Illinois, but two who have been among my critical constituents, as I have successively represented them in the legislature at Springfield and the two Houses of Congress—Mrs. Robins, who is on the platform with me, and my wife, who apprehensively gazes at me from the audience. I say they have been my critical constituents. They taught me before enfranchisement that the great thing to be achieved by equal suffrage was the determination of public questions in the home, and not on the street corner. We have learned, since my education began, that at least the great questions which concern us all, which concern society and the thing upon which it is based—the family—may be discussed with determining intelligence in the family and by the family. We have learned that those who are charged not merely with the responsibilities of their own citizenship but with the responsibility for the up-bringing of the citizens who are to succeed them, may in their several and collective capacities decide most wisely what may be done at home.

You may very well imagine that if I came here this afternoon not to speak it was to draw renewed courage and inspiration from the wellsprings of your hope. It happens that there has been confided to me by groups of men and of women, groups of women who are here represented, the presentation to Congress of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States. After 10 years' difficulty and indecision by the courts, we are at last certainly faced in the National Government with the necessity of making an end to the

shame and crime of child labor in the United States! I do not have to argue here for the adoption of the amendment. There would be no one here who would say that—as one of my colleagues in the Senate said yesterday—an amendment to this end was merely a humanitarian measure, who would consider for a moment that it was not a social measure, an economic measure, a measure for the national defense against enemies abroad, and the consequences of child labor at home.

Strangely enough there are people who seem to forget that if little children are robbed of their school days and playdays, they are not the only ones injured. If they grow to manhood and womanhood and are unable by their own agencies and resources to escape from the consequence of their childhood, the burden which they can not fully bear themselves as citizens then must be borne by their more fortunate fellows. Thus we all suffer by the injury which is done them. Their fate touches our fate.

This much, when you go away, I would have you remember, if you would, that the measure pending before Congress is not a statute easy to modify, to extend in its scope from time to time. It is an amendment to the Constitution, which in turn can not, in the nature of things, be amended again in the course of many years. For that reason it is essential that the terms of the amendment should be broad, and that we should leave to successive Congresses, as representatives of the people, the determination of the scope of the laws which are passed under the amendment. This is a growing country, and thank God we are a people with a growing consciousness and conscience. The law which would meet the problem to-day will be inadequate 20 years from now. Therefore we must write into the Constitution powers to meet not merely the problem of child labor to-day but through the whole generation ahead of us. Is that clear?

Secondly, time is important, for this year the legislatures of all the States are sitting in the State capitols. If Congress acts upon the amendment in season, it can be submitted to the State legislatures before they adjourn this spring or early this summer. It may be incorporated in the Constitution before Congress assembles in Washington again next December; and in another year we may undo what five judges out of nine in the court did when they rendered their decision, and we may carry out the purpose of the people of the United States to protect the children of this land. There are none in the country who are or who can be as influential as you in securing an amendment broad in its terms, and in assuring its prompt acceptance by the Congress and the legislatures of the States. Your opportunity, my friends, is as great as I conceive that your duty is heavy.

Mr. HENNING. And now, my friends, let me once more remind you that the Department of Labor in all its bureaus will be glad to see you and serve you while you are here.

I just want to repeat the names of the bureaus so you may know the things we deal with. We have the Bureau of Immigration; the Bureau of Naturalization; the Bureau of Labor Statistics, which is a veritable gold mine of economic facts; the Conciliation Service, where we seek to avoid industrial strife; the Children's Bureau; the Women's Bureau; the Employment Service; and the Bureau of Industrial Housing. We have innumerable things worth your time to study and to look into, and we want you, when you go home, when you have a problem of any kind which has to do with industry, just drop a note to the Department of Labor, and we, in nine cases out of ten, can furnish you the information and give you just exactly what you want to know.

I thank you for the opportunity for being with you this afternoon, and we will now have the announcements and then will stand adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 4.38 o'clock p. m., the Thursday afternoon session was concluded.)

MISS ANDERSON, temporary presiding officer. This morning's program deals with health standards for women in industry and also with home work. These two subjects are very closely allied, for health standards pertain not only to industry but also to the work in the homes. We know that home work in many instances carries with it a hazard, sometimes because of uncleanliness and sometimes because of the hazard of sickness in a home where is being done work which is then carried out and sold on the market.

This morning we have as our presiding officer the legislative representative of the Women's Christian Temperance Union. Mrs. Yost is in Washington doing national legislative work for this organization, but she does a great deal more than that. She does a great deal of work in behalf of other organizations and their legislative programs. And I want to say that Mrs. Yost in representing her organization has been one of the staunchest friends of the Women's Bureau, and has helped us a great deal. I take pleasure in introducing to you Mrs. Ellis Yost, legislative representative of the Women's Christian Temperance Union, as the presiding officer this morning.

Mrs. Yost. It is very selfish for the presiding officer to take any of the time she believes belongs to any of the speakers. We have this morning the first speaker, Mrs. Florence Kelley, who needs no introduction to this audience or any other American audience. She is known for the work she has done, and it is my pleasure to present to you at this time Mrs. Florence Kelley, of New York, executive secretary of the National Consumers' League, who will speak to us on the subject of "Home work."

HOME WORK.

Mrs. FLORENCE KELLEY, general secretary National Consumers' League.

It is painful to be still talking about an evil that has been recognized for more than half a century and to have to confess that this evil does not grow less. Although it changes its character somewhat it does not really grow less, following the efforts made with great persistence and in great variety, first in the hopeful expectation of abolishing it, and later (when that proved impossible under our form of government) attempting to control it and to minimize the harm that it entails. Neither by organization nor by legislation can we claim success.

First, we must be quite clear what we mean by so comprehensive a term as "home work." In some States the schools give children credits for what they call "home work." If a girl helps her mother in the house by making beds, setting the table, washing dishes, and doing certain kinds of cookery, she may claim a limited number of school credits for this home work. Boys mow lawns and dig the potato patch, if there is one, and get school credits for home work.

But we mean something quite different. We mean the invasion of the home for industrial purposes with goods belonging to persons who do not live within that home. So far as I know, the first example on any large scale in this country came when the sewing machine was adapted to making shoes. Shoes used to be sent out even before the Civil War, and on a much larger scale after the Civil War, for handwork in homes in New England. Then on a still larger scale immediately after the war, when the sewing machine was generally a part of the equipment of factories, there followed a flooding of the homes of the poor, in cities where American industry began to develop, with all kinds of garments to be worked upon by hand by mothers and children, supplementing the work done by machines.

This still persists in some measure. I have within a month seen, in that part of New York City which used to be par excellence the area of home work, a little boy carrying on his head during school hours, a bundle of men's trousers as large as himself, on the way from a neighboring shop with steam power machines, to this child's home. There his mother would "fell" these trousers in the good old way that used to be the rule and is now a surviving exception, so uncommon that when I saw this child I tried in vain to remember when I had last seen a child carrying a bundle like that. Years ago, just after 1900, when the National Consumers' League first attacked the evil in New York City, we gathered photographs of men walking along with nothing visible of the back and head under the mountain of women's cloaks or skirts, or men's coats or trousers—a mountain of garments rising above the man, with a leather strap around his forehead, and up to the top of the mountain, to keep the goods from falling into the street. Next larger than that size came the great bundles sent about on horse-drawn trucks.

In those days there were two dangers that we used to describe in trying to interest legislatures. One was the great danger of carrying germs, especially in woolen clothes; the other was the tendency of the distribution of this work in the slums to keep people in those slums. For through hideous little shops goods were peddled out into tenement houses. If the families of the very latest immigrants lived close enough to these little distributing centers, the middle-sized

children could carry goods for the mothers and smaller children, thus saving car fare and time of an older person in fetching and carrying the goods from great distances. We used to say, truthfully, that this was one of the many influences which kept the immigrants anchored in the undesirable parts of the city from which they would be freed if this particularly odious form of industry could be prohibited.

Instead of prohibition new home-work occupations have come in. The old ones have gone into the factories in large measure, to stay there. But we are always finding new things, and some of the old ones. There is at this moment for instance, a very large industry in the preparation of fine crochet work in homes. Some of it is done directly for the great department stores, some for manufacturers, some for jobbers. It is hard to trace, but it is a large and thriving industry.

Nor do people even yet realize when they see beautiful cutting rooms in some store where orders are taken, that all they do see is the fitting room or cutting room. They are allowed to see that. They do not imagine where the things are going that they order, and none of us knows where the things have been that we buy. For people who would rather buy things which had not had on them the scabs of the scarlet fever children, for those who would rather exercise a choice whether or not their things shall be prepared in clean and light workrooms furnished by the employer, or by the bedside of the sick, no choice is possible.

The fundamental evil of industrial home work, as we still have it, is unchanged. The fundamental evil is the invasion of the home, the upsetting of the experience of everybody in the home as to what a home is for. Wherever the mother is seriously engaged in working at the invading industries there is always dislocation of the home life. It is almost always seasonal work that comes flooding in. It is rush orders as a rule that the mothers get. And from the time that the invaders arrive—the bundle of clothes, or the supply of beads for passementerie, or the hair for hair work, or whatever the goods that are sent into the homes—they hold the center of the stage for the mother; they are the center of her activity, and make the central claim on her time. The children are shooed from the house to stop distracting her. It seems a monstrous thing that we can not prohibit this; but long experience has taught us that no way has yet been invented of getting around the constitutional difficulties.

We have had to give up several hopes for these ever-changing, ever-growing industries. One was the hope that when publicity was turned on them they would shrivel. That has not been the

case. It is an old theme, and nobody is particularly interested in publicity about it. We had hopes of regulation by inspection. There is not money enough in the richest State to pay for inspection that would really guarantee so extensive an industry as home work is in Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania.

So far we have to register failure. No one can say that the people in the Eastern States have not made patient, long-continued effort to control these conditions. More hundreds of thousands of dollars are squandered in each passing decade in sham inspection. This inspection can not be anything but sham, though by means of it the thoughtless public is lulled into a sense of security. Everywhere registration and inspection has in the long run failed.

While the development of sewing machines has called back to the factory some processes, like buttonholing and button sewing, the development of other things has enormously broadened the distribution of these processes. I refer to the cheap and trustworthy parcel post and to the invention of motor trucks. These carry enormous quantities of goods across the Hudson on the ferries, to be made up in New Jersey. As soon as the goods get across the Hudson River they are free from our New York inspectors. If the inspectors of home work can not cover New York City, certainly they could not hope to cover New Jersey. But there is no moral obligation upon an inspection department in New Jersey to inspect home work done for manufacturers in Manhattan. So trucks are valuable, indeed, for owners of goods, broadening the area and greatly increasing the freedom of the home-work industries. We might as well try to follow all the mosquitoes hatched in New Jersey meadows as to follow the trucks and the parcel post to learn where the goods are that come from Manhattan.

The economic curse for the workers from all this disorganization of industry can be stated in a few words. It is an old formula applicable to every area in which this form of industry is still a parasite upon legitimate employment. It is a formula used by employers in factories well conducted in all other respects but this one. It is: "If you do not like these wages, or if you do not care to take home an extra package with you this evening after you have worked your allotted hours in the factory, there are plenty of people in New Jersey and Connecticut who will be eager to take these things." And that formula has been dreaded for half a century, never without a depressing effect on the department store or the factory in which it is uttered.

Always there is this lowering influence—just like the presence of bad air—upon the people's intelligence and vitality; this lowering influence is always at work in industries in which materials are

light and easily portable; and the trade organization of home working mothers is insuperably difficult.

Everybody who works under that pressure knows that any day wages may be cut, because effective resistance is impossible. There are always people outside willing to pay the rent and not count that into the price, and willing to add their earnings to those of an underpaid normal breadwinner, or perhaps to starve along on insufficient pay where there is no normal breadwinner.

There is one experiment which we have never made. It has been made in England since 1910, and in Australia since 1896; and the people in those countries think it well worth continuing. The Australians appear to be entirely satisfied with it. The Cave report in England on the sweated industries indicated that the English people have thought it well worth going on with. I refer to the application of minimum wage laws to notoriously underpaid industries, where we have no minimum wage legislation. I do not know of any American case in which it has been applied even experimentally to the sweated trades. It was created—the first experiment was made in Australia—for the purpose of dealing with the sweated industries as they grew up under the large Chinese immigration into Australia. It was said that if the employers had to pay the Chinese as much as white folks they would lose their passion for importing Chinese for undercutting white workers. They tried it with four industries—with furniture making, in which the Chinese were very largely employed, and in three forms of needlework. So far as the records show that which was intended solely to be used with the sweating system, proved itself good, and has been extended to a large area of standardized industries. We hear nothing now of sweating in Australia, or New Zealand, or Tasmania.

In England home work has not been abolished, but it is believed that the worst injury of this downward pressure on wages in the standardized industries has been greatly reduced. It is hard to judge, because of the difficulties of the after-war conditions over there. But there is an authentic report which everyone who is interested in the subject of depressing influences in the standardized industries should read; that is Lord Cave's report, the most recent on the subject.

There has been assiduously spread throughout the country the report that a recent adverse decision of the Court of Appeals with regard to the minimum wage law in the District of Columbia is final; but that is an error. That decision is not final; it is only a matter of time until it will be reversed. We who have been working for years, and years, and years—I myself have been at work since 1886—struggling to keep the light turned on this evil form of industry; we who have been making one experiment after another in the effort

really to regulate it hope that if this conference should be repeated five years hence the present moment of suspension of the District law may be a matter of past history. We believe that the Supreme Court of the United States will yet hold minimum standards of compensation for women in the worst paid industries to be within the power of Congress and the States.

Mrs. Yosr. The subject "Health standards for women in industry" is to be discussed by an eminent authority, Dr. R. A. Spaeth, associate in the department of physiology, School of Hygiene and Public Health, Johns Hopkins University. I take great pleasure in presenting Doctor Spaeth.

HEALTH STANDARDS FOR WOMEN IN INDUSTRY.

Dr. R. A. SPAETH, associate in the department of physiology, school of hygiene and public health, Johns Hopkins University.

We are all accustomed to look back upon the Great War as an essentially modern phenomenon. Gas bombs, submarines, and surgical miracles gave to the World War an atmosphere of modernity, the more striking when we meditate upon certain of its social aspects. It is interesting to find that a curious reversion occurred in the return of women in industry. I say "reversion" and I say "return" advisedly, because we are told historically that industry had its beginnings in the hands of women. The ever activistic male in ancient society apparently spent his time in the pursuit of wild animals. With the gradual disappearance of big game and the beginning of agriculture and the domestication of animals, human males were forced to turn their attention to the more subtle pursuits of industry, which had already developed to a considerable extent in the hands of women. Historians tell us that agriculture and pottery and tanning and various other industries involving the working up of the by-products of the chase were all begun by women. Since then a curious change has occurred. Man brought a peculiar genius for organization and system into industry, and eventually nearly usurped the ground which had formerly been occupied by women. Ultimately, as you all know, women, except in primitive agricultural communities, were relegated to an entirely secondary position in industry, and industry was practically taken over by men. This taking over of industry by men brought many women practically to a condition of parasitism, especially in highly civilized societies.

In recent years there has been, of course, a tremendous swing of the pendulum in the other direction. Women have arisen in a body and they are returning to industry. It is interesting that the war should have brought this about. It illustrates the broader historical truth that when the services of the human male are demanded for

fighting, his normal occupations are taken over by women, even at the highly sophisticated level of our modern social organization.

One of the problems that has arisen in connection with this reentry of women into industry may be briefly stated as follows: Are there physiological, physical, and psychological peculiarities among women, as compared with men, which call for the establishment of special health standards for women? Can we define these characteristics in the first place; and if so, what are the health standards that should be adopted?

It will be necessary, in order to make some of my points clear, to compare certain characteristics of women and men; and I wish to state at the outset that this is merely a force of necessity, in order to present my material in an objective fashion. I hold no brief for men or women as superior types in any universal sense. I wish to make that point perfectly clear at the outset, in order to avoid a misunderstanding.

To deal for a moment with the physical differences between men and women: In industrialized countries the male in general is physically superior to the female. By that I mean that as regards total physical strength, and as regards athletic performance, men, by and large, have better records than women. If you examine the figures, you will find that men can swim and run and throw a ball and drive a golf ball farther and faster and better than women. This difference is apparently not due to any fundamental (anatomical) difference between the sexes, so much as it is a product of essentially different environments. Girls do not have the opportunity for the hyperactivistic life that small boys lead, and the result is shown in the extent of their physical development.

As a matter of fact the problem of the physical inferiority of women has been met, at least has been attempted to be met, by legislation limiting the weights that should be lifted by women. It is interesting to go over that legislation, because you find that in one State women are permitted to lift a weight of 15 pounds and in another State a weight of 25 pounds, and if you look into the situation in England, especially in the reports of the health of munition workers committee, you will find that women successfully lifted weights as high as 57 pounds during the war. Obviously empirical legislation is not the scientific way of meeting the problem. In my opinion the main value of such legislation lies in calling the attention of employers to the fact that there really is a problem here.

If we attack the problem of strength limits among industrial women and men, it seems to me that the rational procedure is to determine the strength requirements of jobs in terms of the strength performance of successful individuals on such jobs and then hire individuals who conform to these limits or who are at least above

the minimum strength requirements. This sort of physical measurement of total muscular strength can be carried out very simply by Martin's test, which was developed by Prof. E. G. Martin, of Stanford University, California.

The disadvantage of women's secondary position in the matter of physical strength can be largely overcome by attention to the following important matters: First of all, the analysis of strength of which I spoke; secondly, the selection of workers in terms of strength limits; thirdly, the introduction of various labor-saving devices, such as cranes and small trucks and inclined planes; fourthly, a change in handle and pedal lengths, which frequently will reduce leverage, and in that way facilitate operations; fifthly, instructions in the lifting and handling of heavy weights; and, finally, the introduction of rest periods where work is continuous.

You will observe immediately that all of these recommendations apply equally to men and women; so that we may say, whatever the statistics may show regarding the physical inferiority of women, the industrial situation demands strength saving conditions of maximum efficiency for both men and women. I should therefore say that even if women can not swim 100 yards or drive a golf ball as fast and as far as men can, nevertheless their physical inferiority—in quotation marks—is not a serious limit to their performance in modern industry.

Now, there are certain physiological characteristics that seem to back up the statements that I made regarding the physical limitations of women. For example, the red blood corpuscles seem to be more numerous in men than in women; and the iron content of the blood in the hemoglobin is greater in man than in woman. Both of these facts suggest that men are adapted more completely to a life requiring sudden spurts of energy. Of course there is nothing practical that can be done about these two points. But I merely mention them in order to show you that there is confirmatory objective evidence for the other statements that I made.

I might mention at this point the importance of physical examination for men and women equally, and certain dangers that women are exposed to specifically. Some of you may know—those of you with some medical training—that the commonest form of hernia in man, the so-called inguinal hernia—does not occur in women because of the occlusion of the inguinal canal. There are, however, other forms of hernia—the so-called umbilical hernia and the vaginal hernia, also—which are particularly liable to occur among women who have borne several children. The inference is, therefore, that multiparous women should, so far as possible, be kept off jobs requiring heavy lifting. Here then for the first time, we touch upon a real, and, in my opinion, the only fundamental difference between men

and women, namely, those structural and functional differences associated with the maternal function in women. Here we obviously have no basis of comparison with men, and we can safely launch our statements without feeling that any resentment will follow on the part of either men or women.

The problem of pregnant women in industry is a tremendously important one. At the International Labor Conference which met here in Washington in 1919 the recommendation was made that for six weeks before and six weeks after term, women should be excluded from industrial work, and should be paid full wages. That is a highly idealistic and Utopian idea, and I really wish sometimes that society were organized in such simple fashion that we could adopt a recommendation of this sort. It would mean that for 25 per cent of her time a pregnant woman would be paid a full industrial wage without any return whatever to her employer. Imagine yourself in the position of an employer for a moment. A man comes to you and says "I should like to work in your factory, but I expect to have three summer months off." Would you hire such a man? Personally I should not. It is only university employees so far as I know that get that kind of a vacation. You would naturally resent being forced to employ a person with those restrictions and you would say, "No, this isn't a practical proposition for me." In industry the pregnant woman or the married woman who is likely to become pregnant, is therefore at a distinct disadvantage, in my opinion, as compared with the unmarried woman. She is likely to be more of a liability than an asset. Childbirth in civilized communities and in medical circles is to-day considered a major surgical operation. Pregnancies of women in industry therefore are likely to cause diminished or uncertain performance, and ultimately always absenteeism. The employment of married woman who are likely to become mothers therefore places them at a disadvantage, as compared with unmarried women in industry.

During the war, the munitions plants in France and England (I believe in Germany also) established what they called light employment depots where pregnant women could go and work on gloves, overalls, and other light sewing jobs. This arrangement proved to be practical under war conditions. However, such a scheme is all very well when both labor and children are at a premium, but I am somewhat skeptical as to the practical application of such procedure when labor is not at a premium and babies are also abundant, in other words, under normal conditions.

It seems to me that ultimately the solution of this problem must be the relieving of women with small children from the necessity of industrial occupation by the paying of a genuine living wage to their husbands. In some quarters the feeling has been expressed that

if practical birth-control information could be given to industrial workers by industrial physicians and nurses the problem would be very much alleviated. In my own experience, whereas I feel that experiment would certainly be worth trying, I do not feel that it would be a panacea for the difficulty, because, as many of you know, industrial workers are not nearly so ignorant of birth-control matters as perhaps Mrs. Sanger and others would have us think. As a matter of fact, they are not educated up to the point of the responsibility involved in bringing children into the world, and therefore what is needed is an educational campaign in addition to legal dispensing of birth-control information. The control of conception is certainly preferable to the condition which is notoriously known to exist in England since the passage of the factory acts. In England's industrial population children are no longer an economic asset and the result is that the birth rate has fallen tremendously. At the same time the number of abortions has enormously increased.

The claim is made in some quarters that women are more susceptible to disease than men, especially to certain diseases. You all know that I have in mind plumbism or lead poisoning. Now if we examine the statistics of lead poisoning we find that there is only one occupation in which the statisticians can agree that there is a greater susceptibility on the part of women than men, namely, in the job known as "dipper's helper." Curiously enough, all of the other figures show either an indifferent answer, or that men are more susceptible than women. Doctor Collis gives a very interesting illustration of the undependability of the view that women are more susceptible than men to lead poisoning. He states that in 1897 women in England were forbidden to work in the lead industry because of the effect of lead in causing stillbirths and abortions. Among the nonacclimatized men who took their places there was a great rise of cases of plumbism. Twenty years later when non-acclimatized women replaced men on the lead jobs in 1917, everyone expected the incidence of lead poisoning to rise among these women. As a matter of fact, it did not. That was at the same time, of course, a compliment to the industrial measures designed to prevent lead poisoning and to the resistance of women.

Now that is not the whole story, because at the close of the war when the men returned to the lead industry in England everyone expected the lead poisoning incidence to stay where it was, but as a matter of fact the number of cases of lead poisoning increased. So we can say there is very little direct evidence regarding the greater susceptibility of women to lead poisoning. Women should certainly not be encouraged to work in lead industries, because of the abortive action of lead. But with lead poisoning as with certain other diseases, like tuberculosis, that are

prevalent in industry, it is difficult to prove statistically that women are more susceptible than men simply because they are women.

We all know that mortality data are frequently presented to show the relative fitness or resistance of women as compared with men. You know perhaps that men die more easily than women, but the morbidity statistics—the sickness statistics—show that women, certainly in industrial circles, show a higher rate of morbidity than do men. An examination of those statistics, however, reveals the fact that it is only for certain age groups that this is true. It holds for the age group from 20 to 55 years, which is precisely the range of the sexual maturity and activity of women. So that the distribution of illness—I quote now from the statistics of the Leipzig sickness fund, which many of you have seen—suggests that the high morbidity among women is again associated primarily with her maternal functions.

The menstrual function is often presented as a deterrent to the employment of women. Employers claim that women periodically lack efficiency, and do not perform so well nor nearly so speedily as men. This problem has been studied psychologically by Dr. Hollingworth, at Columbia University, and more recently by Miss Epstein, in Dr. Lee's laboratory, using Martin's test. Miss Hollingworth found there was no reduction of psychological efficiency in a group of women during the menstrual days; but Miss Epstein noted that there was a reduction of about 5 per cent in their physical performance at that time. If you investigate the opinions of the employers in England during the war, it seems that with properly regulated working conditions (and by that I mean with adequate ventilation, illumination, and seating facilities) menstruation is actually facilitated, is less painful, and is more regular among industrial workers than before these women began their industrial employment. In other words, regular physical activity seems to be beneficial, so far as regulating the menstrual function is concerned. It is important to note, however, that women should not be permitted to carry out their work sitting continuously. It is particularly bad for women, apparently because of the tendency to develop conditions of constipation and the development of a congestion of the blood supply in the region of the ovaries. The question of seating facilities is one that again applies almost equally to men and women. You all know that work should ideally be carried out, so far as possible, either sitting or standing, whether done by men or women.

There are certain psychological peculiarities of women as compared with men. Women are superior in carrying out rapid repetitive motions, and the empirical demonstration that you find in industrial plants verifies laboratory experiments. You find women actually

engaged on work of this sort, and carrying it out with a high degree of success.

Here again, we have a group of differences between men and women, which are perhaps universally and objectively interesting from an academic viewpoint. But practically the problem again is one of selecting individuals, either men or women, who are particularly adapted to specific jobs. Some of you may recall the experiments of Doctor Link, who is now with the United States Rubber Co., with the Winchester Arms Co., in New Haven. Doctor Link carried out a series of experiments in which he selected shell inspectors and shell gaugers, and found that certain psychological tests could be given to individuals which would definitely and objectively select women for the one job as compared with the other. In other words, whatever may be the psychological peculiarities of women it is necessary to select both men and women in terms of the psychological requirements of jobs as well as applicants.

A word more about the length of the work day. The statement has been frequently made that women should have a shorter work day than men. It is just possible that the reason for this may be more economic and discriminating against women than in their actual interest. If, for instance, we should have legislation which should demand a 7-hour day for women as compared with an 8-hour day for men, obviously women would be at a disadvantage. The common practice of having domestic duties to perform at home both before and after work hours seems to me to make it advisable that women should have their work so far as possible, presented on a task basis. A particular job should be given them, and when the job is finished the women can go home. In that way, we get away from the problem of a definite length of hours that should be applied to all individuals in all trades. It is merely a utilitarian and opportunistic procedure to insist upon an 8-hour day because there happen to be eight convenient hours in which we can work; it seems absurd to apply the 8-hour standard, or to attempt to apply it universally to all kinds of work. I feel, therefore, that so far as possible, work should be arranged so that it can be carried out on a task basis, rather than on a work day hour basis. Such an arrangement is particularly advantageous to women, because of their domestic responsibilities.

To sum up, then briefly, we find that there are certain physical, physiological, and psychological differences between men and women. This is not a secret. You have suspected that for a long time, most of you. We do not find, however, except in the maternal function that these differences are of such a nature as to call for special health standards for women, as compared with men. However, it is extremely important to bear in mind that we advocate the establishment of the highest possible types of working conditions in all plants

for both men and women. In other words, I am here to defend my own sex also against the idea that special standards should be introduced for women only. I feel not only that the best working conditions should be introduced for both men and women but that women, by reason of the sentimental and chivalrous theories to which men still cling can frequently bring about the realization of such high health standards in industry. I thank you very much.

Mrs. YOST. At this time the conference is open on the general topic of health standards for women in industry. Those who desire to speak may have an opportunity to do so now.

Miss MARY GILSON, superintendent of employment and service department, The Joseph & Feiss Co., Cleveland, Ohio, I am very much interested in the scientific approach which Doctor Spaeth has made, and I am much interested in what he has said about introducing tasks among women in industry. In the clothing industry it is quite possible, but in some other industries, where there is automatic machinery which must be kept busy a certain number of hours a day, it is claimed not to be possible. In the clothing industry many of our operators are home early in the evening, but we begin at 7.30 in the morning, I will acknowledge. But the point is, where there is automatic machinery, such as in the textile industry, where the manufacturers claim that they must keep their spindles and looms going a certain number of hours a day, the problem is different; and also in the metal trades, the manufacturers claim their machinery has to be kept going. Now, that brings up a different problem.

As far as what Doctor Spaeth has said concerning the hours of men and women, we must acknowledge that matter of home work—my paper will later deal with this subject—but where you can not have a short working-day for both men and women, you must acknowledge women must have shorter hours, because of the fact that most of them do hold two jobs. I would like to know whether Doctor Spaeth has talked with a great many working women on this subject, because I feel that it is something that has not been approached in a scientific way. I do not think you are theoretical, Doctor Spaeth, but I do feel that there is a practical way of approaching the subject. Women must hold two jobs in spite of the fact that we may not want them to do so.

Miss MERICA E. HOAGLAND, director mutual service division, Diamond Chain & Manufacturing Co., Indianapolis. Miss Gilson, may I ask, in stating your problem as to two jobs, did you refer to home work or to actually going from a factory and going into a store and performing more hours of work?

Miss GILSON. I meant the average woman has a great deal more to do in the home. She has more outside duties at home than a man has.

MISS HOAGLAND. May I say here that I think the time has come when women will have to begin to educate the men out of the idea that the woman who is an equal wage earner must do all of the tasks in the home. I know any number of men and women working, not always in the same factory, but in near-by factories, who, when their tasks are over in the factory, go home and perform together the tasks that are common to them, to make the home. This is becoming more and more interesting to the men, because of the labor-saving devices. They can use their mechanical ingenuity in keeping in repair and in using these devices; and I can tell you now that there are more labor-saving devices used in the homes where the men participate in the household duties than otherwise. It is quite an education to the men, and I believe that we as women should carry to them that message that will say to them, "If we perform half of the tasks in the factory, if we are contributing to the family income, then you must share our tasks in the home."

Mrs. JULIUS ANDREWS, representing the Massachusetts League of Women Voters. Dr. Spaeth spoke of women in industry being perfectly familiar with the methods of prevention of pregnancy. Now, is not it a possibility, Dr. Spaeth, that these women may not use proper methods, so that the danger of injuring their physical condition is greater than in the case of women at home?

MISS JULIA LATHROP, representing the Illinois League of Women Voters. I want to say a word in the highest admiration of what I take to be Dr. Spaeth's main point, which is that there is one fundamentally just and socially equitable, progressive way to deal with the women in industry, and that is to raise the conscience and the law and the practice of this country up to a point where a man is able, by his earnings, to support his wife and his children in adequate comfort and decency. There may be invented, in the course of time, some other social unit instead of the family; but it will not be in our day. And whatever that social unit is, you can not have a wholesome society without that unit's perfection. And so long as we have the family in its present state, it needs the care of a mother, the intelligence and devotion of a mother to young children if they are to be reared with all those growing standards of education and of health which we insist upon so earnestly in meetings, and which we lack so much in putting into operation in the factories, as the doctor has said, and in our schools, and in our everyday life, and perhaps, above all, in our housing, as we all of us only too well know. If you want an illustration, go and look in the alleys of the Capital City of of the United States at this moment.

I am very much in favor of those gentle interests in the affairs of the household being cultivated on the part of men. I think it is a

sort of refinement which they need, perhaps. It gives them better understanding of what their wives do, and it is a pretty accomplishment. But I think it has nothing to do with the economic situation which confronts us. The question of what women shall do is a question which we can not answer. Now, the most we can do is to clear the ground to give them a fair chance, to preserve them for the sake of the race.

Perhaps women themselves must brave the hazards which the doctor has set forth with a rare degree of candor. Perhaps we must arrange to let them meet, as they must usually, the competition and the standards of our own day which are not necessarily the standards of to-morrow and the day after; but above all, it is necessary for us to think and work on the basis that the essential and permanent thing, so far as our human eyes can see it now, is this preservation of female life, this recognition that maternity is not only a function but a profession, and that it must be supported and respected as such, and that the partnership between the man and the woman in marriage is such that the man shall earn a livelihood for the family, and that the family shall be solaced and nurtured primarily by the wife.

Mrs. COOLEY, representing the North Dakota Service Star Legion. The real answer to these questions is a matter of training, because nowadays the young women are trained to be more athletic, to know more about their health, to know more about themselves, than was formerly the case. Now, I have lived in the West for a long time. When my daughter-in-law was 20 years old the war came on. She not only took up the work of teaching in the University of North Dakota but she did other work in the Service Star Legion, and the Red Cross, and everything. As far as physical strength is concerned her strength is equal to almost any man. I have seen—she is a slim, delicate-looking young woman—I have seen her carry 200 pounds easily down through my yard to my garage. Now, it is simply because she has led a free outdoor life, and was trained in athletics. It seems to me that in order to get our women strong and healthy, in order to meet this problem, you have to educate them in that way.

MISS MARJORIE CHENEY, representing the Connecticut League of Women Voters. I would like to ask Doctor Spaeth for certain information. My inference is from what Doctor Spaeth has said that many men and women are so alike, except for this little detail of the maternal function, that any special legislation for women is undesirable. Has Doctor Spaeth found that Doctor Hamilton's report comparing the mortality from tuberculosis among men and women has been called into question? A similar report has been published by the National Industrial Conference Board. The outstanding statement that Doctor Hamilton makes is that, whereas the difference

in mortality from tuberculosis between men and women shows that the rate is higher for men not engaged in industrial pursuits than for women, that when you compare operatives in industry, the rate for women immediately rises sometimes 100 per cent higher. A similar result has been shown in the reports of the National Industrial Conference Board. The mortality policies for group insurance also indicates the almost double mortality among women in industry as compared with men.

Does not this evidence present some presumption that special protective legislation is required for women, and, lacking the scientific determination of what tasks are suitable for certain employment, are we not justified for the time being in applying the rough and ready limitation of hours? I think that when the time comes, if it ever does, that the task system can be applied to all industry, and woman set free when she has completed her task, it will certainly solve many of our problems; but the tendency in industry seems to be toward the introduction of more and more highly automatic machinery in which the speed of the machine determines the speed and the total production of the workers. When that condition obtains—and I think it's true to say that it increasingly obtains—it is perfectly evident that there will be bitter opposition, and it will be quite impossible to determine the work by the task system; and we will be bound by the hour system.

Mrs. FLORENCE KELLY, executive secretary, National Consumers' League. I listened with some consternation to Doctor Spaeth's development of his theory that we should now begin to apply the task system, undeveloped as it is, as a substitute for the also largely undeveloped system of shortening women's working-day, with a view to protecting their health. I suppose we should all agree to everything that Miss Lathrop said, but I would like to make a deduction from that, in connection with Doctor Spaeth's remarks, of this character, that it is probable that one reason why men have hitherto devoted relatively little energy to the effort to improve sanitary conditions, compared with the efforts which they have made to improve their wages, is not that they care less, so far as they are instructed, with regard to improved sanitary conditions in the places where they work but that they accept the burden which society lays upon them, at least theoretically, and formerly laid upon them with much less acceptance than now, of wholly supporting their families; so they have been obliged to concentrate their efforts on earning money. If the man is to remain the breadwinner, the first thing that he has to consider is the wage that he can command while he is in health, and he is naturally—under the pressure in which he lives in this country—disposed to take risks, very great risks, of impairing his health for the sake of his current earnings at the time

when his family is most expensive, when his wife is entirely out of the earning field and his children are few but small.

Now before we can have any adequate application of any task system, we should have to have a voice—I should think a fully equal voice—on the part of the women for whom the tasks are arranged. I should think they would have to have at least as much to say about the tasks which they would accept as they now have to say through the ballot as to the length of the day that they are willing to work. It is quite true that our present restrictions of hours are about as unscientific as they well could be; it is probable that more men have the 8-hour day by law now than women, because all of the miners who work under ground west of the Mississippi River assured to themselves the 8-hour day long ago by changing the constitutions of the States in which they live; and all of the men employees of States and cities and counties find it perfectly easy—so far as they are officeholders, and they are usually, or so far as they are employees of contractors, working for those political units—they find it relatively easy to determine the hours that they will work, and the great mass of Government employees consequently have a shorter working-day than most women have in private industry.

It is quite true, as Doctor Spaeth said, we have at the present moment an unscientific basis for the length of the working-day that people now have. The only thing which seems so obvious is that since women have the maternal function to perform, and since they have the additional work to do in the home, and since they now have the power to decide for themselves in larger measure than ever before what their statutory minimum shall be, that they should go very cautiously and very modestly forward, and not uphold, in the name of science, the sudden substitution of a relatively untried way of protecting their health, for that which has at least had some degree of trial in many countries besides our own, and which appears at the present time to be working fairly well, where we have gotten the 8-hour day for women wage earners.

Mrs. Yost. The time for this discussion is limited, and we will only have time left for Doctor Spaeth to answer some of these questions.

Miss ROSE SCHNEIDERMAN, representing the New York Women's Trade Union League. I want to ask just one more question, Madam Chairman; I do not know whether Doctor Spaeth knows that the working people have all through had the task system and the piece-work system, and that we are opposed to both, because they lead to speeding up and the sweating system. I also want to ask Doctor Spaeth whether we have to wait to get the 8-hour day for women

until we obtain the 8-hour day for men. As a trade-unionist, I may say we bargain; we get what we can for the group that is lower down, and wait until another opportunity presents itself.

DOCTOR SPAETH. I should like to answer Miss Cheney's and Miss Gilson's statements, more or less simultaneously; that is, regarding the question of introduction of automatic-machinery jobs, and the possibility of introducing a task system on those jobs. Of course that's perfectly true that those particular jobs present very great difficulties. They may not be insurmountable difficulties, however, where the speed of the job is determined by the speed of the machine, where therefore the stability—the industrial stability of women employees is an advantage. But where their particular aptitude for rapid repetitive movements can not come into play, because the pace is set by the machine, it seems to me that the task might well be limited by the performance of a certain number of hours at that machine, with the introduction of shifts of other women. In that case, provided the women whose hours were shortened did not object to it, which is always a possibility, we might still combine an automatic machine with the task system.

I was thinking particularly of the work in the clothing industry and in the rubber industry, where task systems are being applied, and applied very successfully, as Miss Gilson pointed out.

The report on tuberculosis which Miss Cheney mentioned I have not had occasion to study in detail, and therefore I am not in a position to commit myself or make a statement at this time regarding the particular proclivity of women to tuberculosis.

Now regarding the general shots that have been taken at the attitude of the male toward women. I may say that I agree with everything that's been said, so far as the absurdity of having the man feel that he can go home at night and place his feet on the table, and watch his wife get supper ready, and put the children to bed. I agree with all that. But I have meditated about it somewhat, and it is an extremely interesting problem. I wish we had more time to go into it. But so far as I can discover, there are two general attitudes which men take in regard to women, so far as work is concerned. One of them is a very ancient attitude, based somewhat on superstition, nevertheless letting the man out of the job. I will quote you one instance of it. A priest is said to have discovered among the Oronoco Indians some years ago that the Oronoco women were permitted to plant the grain with children at their breast; and the priest suggested this was not an equal distribution of work; whereupon they replied that the priest did not understand about these things, but the women, since they themselves had the maternal function, were in a position to plant the grain with a far higher

degree of prosperity for the crop than the men! Consequently, so to speak, it was better that the women should do it.

Another universal psychological attitude is that of the male in which he protects the women for their own good. Now that is an extremely common procedure. However, if you dig a few millimeters below the surface, you will find that legislation has been enacted, for example, for the good of women, to keep them out of jobs, where curiously enough, the wages were exceedingly high! Apparently you agree with that point of view!

The whole idea of protecting women by legislation, therefore, presents many pitfalls. I am not here to discuss the general social procedure and the danger and vicissitudes of the male psychology, as compared with the female psychology. But those are problems which are enormously complicated and difficult, and I want to point out merely the fact that I appreciate some of the difficulties and especially the attitude of members of my own sex.

I must call your attention to the still more brutal attitude of the male that you meet occasionally. I am reminded of it by the familiar story where a farmer was present at the funeral of his wife, and some one was consoling him for his loss, and he said, "Yes, she was a good woman, but a little light for my work!" That is still a third attitude which we are not accustomed to look for in a civilized community.

The other questions that have been raised—as to birth control methods. I am not in a position to discuss this point because I would have to know what those methods were, and to observe the actual results of their use.

Of course, I am entirely in accord with everything that Miss Lathrop said.

I am likewise in complete agreement with the importance of training young girls in athletic ability and athletic achievements. I am entirely in favor of that. And as I stated at the beginning of my paper, the physical differences between men and women are so largely environmental that perhaps it will take another generation or two of modern athletic golf club swinging women to demonstrate their physical ability.

Now, regarding Mrs. Kelley's and Miss Schneiderman's statements of the dangers of piecework and the sweatshop, I appreciate those dangers, too, rather completely. I have had occasion to go into that in some detail. I realize again the rationalizations on the part of men, the excuses that are put up—supposedly to protect both men and women against their work; and nevertheless the cutting of piece rates and the introduction of sweatshop methods which occur. I did not wish to be misunderstood when I suggested the ultimate desira-

bility of a task system. I did not wish to diminish the importance of limiting the hours of work to eight hours for women and men also. I appreciate that that is certainly the practical procedure for the present, and I am heartily in favor of it. But I do feel that the domestic disadvantages, that is, the disadvantages of being forced to carry out domestic tasks, place women at a distinct disadvantage as compared with men in industry. I think that at some far distant and more or less Utopian time, perhaps when men no longer put their feet on the table, but when they come home to proceed to take care of the children and wash the dishes, etc.—in other words, lend a hand in the domestic duties—that perhaps that difficulty will be somewhat removed. I still think, though, that wherever possible the task system for women may be introduced with advantage without, however, wishing to minimize the importance of the 8-hour day legislation as a protective procedure.

Mrs. Yost. May I read a telegram?

NEWARK, OHIO, *January 12, 1923.*

MISS MARY ANDERSON, *New National Museum, Washington, D. C.:*

Greetings from the department of women in industry, Ohio Women's Christian Temperance Union.

LUCY E. SIMPSON, *Superintendent.*

At this time we are to hear Miss Gilson, who could not speak yesterday. Miss Mary Gilson, superintendent of the employment and service department of the Joseph & Feiss Co., Cleveland, Ohio.

WHAT WOMEN WORKERS MEAN TO INDUSTRY.

MISS MARY GILSON, superintendent of employment and service department of the Joseph & Feiss Co., Cleveland.

When Miss Anderson first sent me the tentative program of this conference, I protested that she had assigned me a far too inclusive subject in asking me to talk about "What women workers mean to industry," and so I asked her if I might not limit it to my own concrete field, the application of employment management to women in industry. But when I began writing my paper, I found myself becoming more inclusive even than the original topic had permitted me to be, and I found myself writing about women in and out of industry, as seen by an employment manager. I hope I have not wandered too far over the globe.

At a convention of the Industrial Relations Association of America, recently resuscitated under the name of the National Personnel Association, which was held in Chicago a couple of years ago, there were four topics assigned to speakers at one of the sessions, oil, rubber, textiles, and women. The topic of women was given to me, but I somehow found it impossible to picture myself coming up to the

mark with a speech as profound and inspiring as I knew the speeches on oil, rubber, and textiles would be, and I therefore flunked out, asking the program committee to put Mary Van Kleeck on the general program for a general address instead. The result was that 3,000 people in the Chicago Auditorium lost any desire they may have had to class women in the category with rubber, oil, and textiles. I only wish that my habit of tampering with subjects assigned to me by program committees always might have as happy results.

It seems to me it cultivates the inferiority complex in women and the superiority complex in men to segregate too persistently the problems of women from the problems of men in the industrial world. And both of these complexes are responsible for muddying the waters of the woman question both in and out of industry. However, much as I deplore the persistent and what I consider pernicious tendency to put us under the microscope as a peculiar species of the human family, with peculiar and vicious habits, I must acknowledge that I am quite in sympathy with that school which recognizes the fact that there are physical and social differences between men and women. I had no patience with the type of man who in presuffrage days used to say he'd be hanged if he would give up his seat in a street car to a woman if women got the vote, nor have I any patience with his successors who seem to think suffrage has made men and women physically alike. Our feminist friends try to convince us that we are merely aggravating the social differences by recognizing them, but I think they fail to see that tradition and custom, while often illogical and stupid, are facts to be faced. For example, we live in an age when it is still considered a joke for a man to help with the housework even though his wife works in a factory all day. Theory is one thing and fact another when we discuss special legislation for women, and often facts are more stubbornly resistant to common sense than theories.

As for the consideration of women's special problems as they relate to employment management, I find it is in plants where women are treated first as human beings, and second as women that "equal opportunity" is likely to be more than merely a pretty phrase. This does not mean that there are not differences which require attention and frank acknowledgement, but I must confess it difficult to write a paper on women as affected by employment management, because nearly all the questions which come to me and my department for an answer are questions relating to men and women alike.

Moreover, employment management can not be considered as a thing apart. It is inextricably bound up with conditions affecting the world of industry at large, with sound foundations laid by State and Nation, with community conditions, with sane and intelligent public viewpoints.

It does not seem necessary to define with great detail the duties of an employment manager to such an audience as this. I am sure you have read in dozens of magazines and newspapers enough about employment management in industry to give you a comparatively clear conception of the fact that the employment manager is responsible for helping to upbuild and maintain the physical and mental well-being of the working force of a plant. This of course involves the selection of workers, the training of these workers in workmanship, in qualities of character, including reliability, frankness, responsibility, and many other qualities. Few self-respecting men or women are willing to be known any longer as "welfare workers," because that term was used in too many establishments where the work of an employment manager never got beyond the superficial. Not that I wish to disparage physical features in the form of safe and sanitary working conditions, cafeterias, rest rooms, playgrounds, dispensaries, libraries, and so on. These things are essential to the maintenance of a physically and mentally fit body of workers. I believe many progressive firms consider their doctors and nurses as essential to production as the machine maintenance department. But I wish to stress the fact that when you visit a factory the things unseen are more important than the things seen. I refer to methods of management, to the quality of foremanship, to the instruction of new workers and of people promoted, to wage systems and incentives, to the encouragement of freedom of opinion and to the development of responsible and thoughtful expression of opinion, to methods of promotion, to the machinery for hearing and adjusting complaints. I refer also to the moral conditions of a plant which are not visible to the naked eye of the visitor as are physical conditions. As for "equal opportunity," I wish to remark in passing that it takes more brainwork to evolve and maintain machinery for putting it into operation than it does to orate about it.

The employment manager of to-day, to perform his work effectively, must have an integral part in the management of the plant, must be consulted by management and workers alike concerning the evolving of policies which affect the entire body as citizens and as earners. The reason why much of the so-called personnel work of this country has fallen short of achievement in some places and dismally failed in others, is because the management has not conceived of this work as an integral part of the whole, as a part not only instrumental in but vital to the entire system of production and the well-being and development of producers. During the war many employment or personnel or industrial relations departments were prematurely born. If any department in industry needs prenatal care, it is surely the employment department. Without this it will almost surely sicken and die. And too few man-

agers had the vision and understanding during war times and too few of them have these qualities to-day to furnish adequate prenatal care and adequate nourishment and intelligent guidance after birth. For such places, I can see nothing on the horizon of the future, save haggling and suspicion and continuous and increasing dry rot or turmoil, either of which is ultimately disastrous.

It is my firm conviction that no matter what form of organization of workers the various industrial establishments of our country will adopt, there will always exist the necessity for a department in every establishment which will be held responsible for helping to eliminate waste in the management of our industries by the increasingly intelligent selection and placement of workers, and for helping them to qualify physically and mentally for the job higher up.

It is important for the employment manager to keep constantly in mind his duty in the training and developing of people to avail themselves of the opportunities for earning both money and advancement. There is too often a tendency on the part of both employers and employees to lose sight of the fact that earning ability is not synonymous with earning opportunity. An established rate may be high but if a worker has not the health nor the mentality nor the attitude of mind to earn this rate his envelope will not be a fat one. More and more we realize that it is not the hourly rate nor the piece rate which tells the whole story but that yearly earnings depend largely on the steadiness of workers and upon their physical and mental ability and their desire to earn. It is a large part of the employment manager's duty to analyze the causes of these qualities and to promote them by every possible means.

If, then, it is the employment manager's duty to help to maintain a healthy and contented body of workers, it stands to reason that he must concern himself with steadiness of attendance. In the average plant the absenteeism of women is far greater than that of men. I said a few minutes ago that theory and fact do not coincide in many phases of the woman question. Feminists argue that women should so arrange their home duties that they can be free to undertake any outside work unhampered by their work at home. But in how many cases does this really take place? In my experience it is unusual. For example, daughters are seldom free from home duties as are the sons of the family. I remember the case of one of our girls who was becoming unduly fatigued and seemed to lack resistance to colds and headaches. When we looked into her home conditions, her mother, a fat, comfortable, and tradition-worshipping woman, told me that Mary always got up very early to pack the lunches of her six big brothers and that when she came home at night she always had her hands full, sewing on buttons and mending for them. It never occurred to Mrs. Peterka that the big brothers could

do anything for themselves. Now, any of you who are inclined to think we accept with grace any such situation as this, please disabuse yourselves of the idea. We do not. But while we are trying to reform a great, inert mass of Irish and English and Italians and Americans and Bohemians and Poles and Hungarians and all the rest of the world that thinks fuzzily on the woman question, we are not in favor of letting Mary die of long hours of work before our reform is accomplished. It was partly because we realized it would take a few centuries to work this reform that we established a 5-day week seven years ago and have clung tenaciously to it through mighty temptations to relinquish it when orders were big and customers impatient for deliveries. And the result has been a noticeable steadying of attendance on the part of our women workers.

We have in our factory about 1,000 women workers and about 500 men. The men do not care so much about a 5-day week as the women do, because you see that tradition that men are in danger of effeminating themselves if they engage in housework still holds in the great majority of the homes still unaffected by our reforming hands. And there is an example of how this "special legislation" (or, more accurately in our case, these special arrangements) which is supposed to cause such havoc in depriving women of equal opportunity actually works out. We continue to employ as many women as ever and our men certainly do not give up their jobs because our hours are arranged for the convenience of the majority of our workers, who are women. More important than all, we have an excellent and never failing supply of women applicants, because women like a 5-day week. And it does not take much of a stretch of the imagination to see that the more applicants you have the better chance you have for good selection. It is partly because of our 5-day week and partly because of our working conditions and partly because women have an actual opportunity to obtain desirable positions in our organization that we have such a fine body of women workers and women executives.

We must frankly acknowledge that not only is the percentage of absenteeism higher among women than among men in the average plant, but their length of service is shorter. Ethel Puffer Howes, in a recent number of the Atlantic, seems to regard these disqualifications of women as a group as an insurance company would regard the matter. She says that in as much as our group percentages are bad, individuals must suffer. In other words, we are considered by the average employer a "bad risk." I have never subscribed to the doctrine that the individual must suffer for the group and I firmly believe that in as much as there are so many exceptions which prove the rule we must reward the exceptions by means of a little extra effort in separating the sheep from the goats. But here, too,

machinery is necessary. Records are important. The sheep must be rewarded on the basis of accurate records of attendance.

A good many years ago when I first began working in an industrial establishment I had a much more comfortable time with my theories than I have to-day. So many of them have been upset by the experience of the past 10 years that I now find it rather hard to summon courage even to formulate a theory. So often my experience has demonstrated that the theory of to-day becomes the joke of to-morrow. We may, for example, honestly believe the theory that it is all wrong to advocate shorter hours for working women than for working men. I used valiantly to uphold this theory. We may honestly hold that men's social needs are as great as those of women and that here is one place where we can surely still the cry for special legislation. But, if we are confronted in our daily experience by the fact that the majority of women have many more exacting duties at home than the majority of men, we are forced to admit that we can not afford to sacrifice the present health and well-being of women to a well-sounding theory. While we are mulling over our experiments with cooperative housekeeping and other ways of preventing duplication and waste of effort in the home, we must face facts as they exist to-day and as they probably will exist for several hundred years to come. That man who said, "There is one road on which speed laws are never violated, the road to progress," spoke the truth. This incubus of tradition which so affects the life of women at home and at work is a slow moving old incubus and we must not be too optimistic about rolling it off our backs right away. In the meantime we must keep women workers in such fit condition that when we do roll it off we shall not be too weak to stride off without its weight. That is why I am in favor of shorter hours for women than for men, merely as a temporary and expedient means of keeping women in good condition until we evolve a Utopia in which work will be so organized that women will not hold two jobs, each one of which is quite enough to absorb their energy. In other words we must guard against permitting industry in women to destroy women in industry while the many problems affecting women in industry are still so far removed from the quod erat demonstratum stage of solution.

But here again we are not consistent. We see women in banks and insurance companies and in offices all over the land doing office work which is now so highly mechanized, and we do not ask for legislation to protect them from long hours. Our legislation applies chiefly to factories and stores. And in all these things we are so inclined to be influenced by what comes within the realm of our experience. For myself, I know that there are many factory machine jobs in our plant which are less trying, less monotonous and less exacting than

some of the office machine jobs which are performed by office girls. Yet I have some estimable and ardent friends who have brothers and uncles and cousins whose office girls work long hours on highly mechanized work in insurance offices and banks and I am sure they never come in for the sympathy which these friends of mine pour out on women who are working in factories in other kinds of work no more exacting.

During my early years as an employment manager, I well remember the smug sense of virtue we used to enjoy when we told visitors to our plant that we discouraged married women from working because we felt that they had quite enough to do at home. And oh, how many men, college professors and manufacturers, Europeans and Americans, used to add to my self-satisfaction by a figurative clap on the back and a figurative, "Keep it up, old girl, you are one of the needed props of a tottering civilization." But to-day I sit back and review my past in the light of a complete reversal of conduct.

More and more as time went on and I added to my store of experience, my calm and unruffled sea of theory was disturbed by individual cases which somehow would not stay under my blanket of generalization. John Dewey has said, "Wisdom is the result of reactions toward experience." Well, we feel we have acquired more wisdom during the past 10 years on the subject of the married woman in industry than we could have acquired in 20 years at Columbia or Oxford. Here, for example, was a married woman who was living with her parents and who said that there was not enough work for two women to do and that while she was young and strong she wanted to earn some money to help buy a new home. And here was another woman who had no children and who claimed she was so "lonesome" at home all day long and she longed to work again with her old friends and companions. And here was a woman who said she had made the mistake of her life in getting married, that she hated housekeeping and didn't know how to bring up children. And one could well believe it on visiting her home. Who were we to say to the first, "No, I am perfectly sure you can find enough to do if you bake your own bread and make your own clothes"; and to the second, "It is ridiculous for you to say you are lonesome and long to be with your old friends over here at the factory. You could cultivate resources within yourself and then you would not need companionship"; and to the third, "No, I do not approve of your hiring your next door neighbor to care for your children even though she does it better than you do. You should exact more of yourself in the way of housekeeping and motherhood." I am not mentioning the business and professional women in good positions

who prefer having their housekeeping done by others in order that they may engage in work more congenial to them.

You see all these things reach so far back into our educational system and our homes and churches and community life that I have learned that mere moral preachments and theories do not solve their intricacies. Again, our friends the noncompromisers may say, "But aren't you just aggravating the evils of the situation by employing married women? Aren't you making the ultimate solution more difficult?" I say that there is no question in the world that more deeply concerns the whole fabric of the home and society than the increasing employment of married women in industry, but I also say that the answer to the question will not be found by closing the doors of industry and opportunity to married women. I also repeat that blanket generalizations on the subject of married women in industry are not the result of wisdom born of experience. This is also true of generalizations concerning unmarried mothers or girls with what is vaguely termed a "past." Sometimes you are considered by your fellow workers to be sentimentally charitable if you are willing to forget, at other times you may find you are "in wrong" if you are inclined to be strict in these matters. Every case must be gone into carefully as an individual and not a general matter.

When it comes to most matters relating to women in the daily life of the plant, they are not very different from those affecting men. Both men and women can do their work more capably where the physical working conditions of the plant are good, where management methods are progressive, and where plant policies are effected through group representation and group agreement.

Those of us whom Lothrop Stoddard is pleased to call "misguided superiors" because we become impatient with the slow progress of the years and like to give things a push—though none of us is willing to acknowledge herself so misguided as many, nor so superior as some—have had a good deal of fun these past few years in urging a few women to steal a march on the centuries and so arrange their home duties that they could give practically undivided attention to their work and to the cultivation of outside interests which would keep them mentally and physically fresh for their work. And what has happened? Why, they have demonstrated that there is no mysterious black art about holding down a red-blooded, responsible executive job in a plant where the management is broadminded enough to give them a chance. Self-confidence which comes from backing and encouragement of management enters into the psychology of success. Women are so often discouraged by attitude and atmosphere. I consider that one of the greatest joys and privileges I have had in connection with my work at The Joseph & Feiss Co.

has been the small part I have played in demonstrating to manufacturers of Europe and America who constantly visit our plant that our women executives are forging ahead shoulder to shoulder with our men executives in resourcefulness, originality, assumption of responsibility, intelligent management, and in all the other qualities which go to make up a top-notch executive in a modern, well-organized plant. You do not hear of our men executives talking about the sensitiveness and long-windedness and self-pity of women, for our women executives have pushed their way out of the smoke barrage of tradition. It has taken a real pioneer spirit for our women executives to reach the positions they hold to-day. Women in industry are subject to constant assault by their families and by women out of industry. It has perhaps been even harder for the college women who have worked their way through the groundwork of experience than for the women who came up from the ranks. I think that at one time or another every one of our college girls was at the point of giving up her work because she was assailed so unceasingly by her family and friends with, "What! working on a power machine? But why do you need to do that?" Or "How can you stand to get up so early in the morning?" or "How can you stand it to work in a factory?" and so on. Only the courageous withstood this sort of pressure until they arrived at a place where they saw the absurdity of it. I tell this merely to explain that it is harder for women than for men to make the effort which brings success, because it is usually taken for granted by a man's family and friends that foundations of experience and hard work must be laid.

And what has this opening up of opportunities higher up meant to our entire body of women workers? It has meant that they do not merely read in newspaper columns about expanding opportunities for women but they see the door of opportunity swinging open before them. That many do not care to go through the door is not characteristic of factory workers any more than of the large majority of school-teachers, library workers, office workers, saleswomen, and many other women. It is partly due to the fact that it is human nature for the majority of people, and this applies to men as well as to women, to avoid responsibility and partly to the fact that women as a whole, and I mean college women as well as factory workers, are still vacillating in their own minds about whether it really pays to become efficient and valuable on jobs which may be temporary. We must be frank enough to acknowledge that the majority of young girls who go into the business world are thinking of their work as a stop gap between school and marriage whether or not it proves to be such in many cases. As a matter of fact, our experience has been that the girls who have the best jobs and the highest wages have more selective vision in matrimony.

They do not rush into hasty marriages. Equal opportunity in industry gives them an equal opportunity in matrimony. And this reacts favorably upon their attitude toward work, and their value to industry and the community.

But we women in general need a new viewpoint if we are to avail ourselves of the equal opportunity which exists in all too few of our industrial establishments. We need to think of our work in new terms and to realize to the fullest extent that it pays from the point of view of self-respect and self-development to do our daily tasks efficiently and ably no matter how long we expect to be in industry. For are not honesty of workmanship and reliability and neatness and deftness and capable performance valuable traits in married life and in housekeeping and home making as in the working world? I must, however, in all honesty reiterate that in only too few of our industrial establishments to-day is equality of opportunity more than a phrase and sometimes it is not even flashed on the screen as a phrase. There are thousands of establishments large and small where women are encouraged to begin at the bottom with not the faintest chance of viewing the top even with field glasses. It is also largely true in the world of medicine and law and the church. It is the exceptional woman who can storm her way through the barricades of prejudice to a position of dignity and honor in any of these professions.

I was much amused when somebody sent me a clipping from Washington about equal opportunity. "Because women have been accorded equality with men in the political and commercial world they are no longer entitled to the special protection which has been their right from time immemorial, according to the decision of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals to-day in declaring the minimum wage law of the District of Columbia invalid.

"No reason is apparent," it was contended, "why the operation of the law should be extended to women to the exclusion of men, since women have been accorded full equality with men in the commercial and political world. Indeed, this equality in law has been sanctioned by constitutional amendments and so fixed has a tendency in this direction become established in English-speaking lands that the opportunity for official and business preferment upon complete equality with men is limited only by the scope of her aspirations." This is what one might term oratory.

Bertrand Russell has said in his recent lecture on "Free thought and official propaganda" that there can be no freedom of thought where there is any outward compulsion. I think women out of industry who are interested in women in industry are often controlled by outward compulsion in the form of stereotyped thought and hack-

neyed phrases. How glibly are the terms "democracy in industry," "control of industry by the workers," "self-expression," "solidarity of the workers," "class consciousness" "driving piecework," "speeding up," and other inherited expressions reeled off our tongues without any sense of their full import and application. We must learn to discourage loose thinking and platform phrases which are in no way helping industry to solve its problems, but which are merely befogging the entire situation. I quote particularly phrases relating to the democratic control of industry merely because women who are awakening to an interest in industrial questions are inclined frequently to talk as though the organization of women workers in trade-unions would solve all our problems and cause us to live happily ever after without thoroughly examining and weighing other forms of organization of workers. In some quarters to-day, the person who extols shop councils or any form of internal shop organization is anathema and in other quarters the person who extols trade-unions is another variety of anathema. Is not the answer to all these extreme viewpoints, which are usually based on emotion and not on reason, that we must be tolerant and receptive of all forms of group representation and not claim perfection for any one form? And we must be thorough and conscientious in our collection of data if we are to win confidence. Moreover, now that women are more and more responsible for steering the wheels of government it is not merely desirable but necessitous for those of us who are especially interested in women in industry to keep the experimental viewpoint and to be open minded toward all forms of experimentation if we wish to further instead of impede progress in industrial relations. Sometimes we are so eager to be right that we are like the small boy that prayed, "Oh, Lord, please make San Francisco the capital of California, 'cause I said it was in my geography examination."

It is a temptation to write of industrial problems in a large and sweeping manner. The industrial problem, to be sure, is a world-wide problem and we must see its enormous and far-extending ramifications if we are to approach its solution. But the time will never come when we can afford to ignore the concrete and definite phases of the daily life of the worker. And it is in the individual plant that the petty irritations of the day must be bravely met and operated upon by people who must not be intrusted with executive responsibility unless they know when and how to operate wisely. Let us recognize the fact that no inconsiderable number of our present-day employers are demanding more and more of themselves and of the executives under them in the kind of housekeeping and homekeeping of their own plants which will be no small contribution toward the housekeeping and homekeeping of industry in general. Mr. George L. Bell has truly said, "In working out the labor prob-

lem we must look not for a solution but for a process. Human nature is involved in the problem and therefore it is always changing and a progressive problem can not be met with a static solution." I can not help feeling that it is in this spirit that we must approach all the problems affecting women in industry. It is only by realizing the truth of the Japanese proverb, "There are many roads up the mountain but there is the same moon at the top," that we can attain the goal for which we are all striving, a fair and square deal for our sisters in industry.

Mrs. YOST. Mrs. Kelley desires me to state that the decision of the court in the District of Columbia is the decision of a lower court, and that the minimum wage decision is on its way to the United States Supreme Court, to have its final hearing, so the law is still operative to a certain extent; not fully.

Members of the conference and guests are urged to be present at 2 o'clock this afternoon. The conference will open promptly at that time. The conference is now adjourned.

FRIDAY, JANUARY 12.—AFTERNOON SESSION.

MISS ANDERSON, temporary presiding officer. Will the meeting come to order, please, for this afternoon's session? We are going to discuss the question of women's wages. We want to start promptly, because both speakers have half an hour each, and we want to leave ample time for discussion. We have to close promptly at 4.30, because we want to get to the tea this afternoon at Mrs. Davis's. All of the ladies of the Cabinet will be in the reception line, and we want to be there promptly at 5 o'clock.

This afternoon we have as presiding officer a woman who is well known throughout the United States, as well as on the other side of the waters, a woman who has been with us in our thoughts and actions, and who has been interested always in the question of women in industry and women in the home. It gives me great pleasure indeed, to introduce to you Mrs. Thomas J. Winter, president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, as presiding officer this afternoon.

Mrs. THOMAS G. WINTER, president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs. The meeting will come to order. I feel myself very greatly privileged to act as your presiding officer this afternoon, for I represent a very large group, something over 2,000,000 women, who are largely home women, but who do not feel that the questions that you are considering are questions of class or questions only of function. We know that to-day the home woman gives her labor in the home, and to-morrow she is the receiver of wages in the factory. We know that to-day the girl who receives

wages in the factory will perhaps to-morrow be laboring without wages in the home; that there is no question of separation into classes, but that it is wise for us sometimes to consider the functions and their relation to women.

The General Federation, I am glad to say, holds all over the country a very warm sympathy for women of all kinds who are bearing the burdens of life, and a very firm belief that in legislation, and that in all social activities as well, there should be the very best conditions of life for our women.

This afternoon we are to consider the matter of women's wages, and I am very glad to introduce to you, as the first speaker, Mrs. Maud Swartz, president of the National Women's Trade Union League.

WOMEN'S WAGES.

Mrs. MAUD SWARTZ, president of the National Women's Trade Union League.

The topic for discussion is "Women's Wages." I would like to consider, during my time, the question of the living wage.

There have been three methods, so far, of establishing wages for workers. The first, which is the regular market price; that is, the law of supply and demand governing this price. It is entirely set by what you can get a worker for to-day or to-morrow. If there are many workers, the price is lower; if there are few workers, the price is higher. Then we come to another method of settling the price of wages, and that is where, in order to create an incentive, the employer offers something more than the market price; he offers it in different ways, such as under a piecework system, by which, if you can produce more than a certain number of thousands of articles, you will get a certain sum over and above; or your piecework rate may be raised if you are able to do better than has been done in the factory up to that time. There is also the bonus system, by which those who can produce more than the ordinary amount will receive a bonus; or it may be given for regular attendance. And there are all sorts of methods of trying to increase the efficiency of the worker.

But we have a third method which is coming more and more into vogue, and is being considered more and more by the enlightened nations of the world, and that is the wage in direct relation to the cost of living. There are many groups in this country that have indorsed this idea of wages; even the Kansas court of, let us say, rather sad memory, indorsed the idea of wages based on the cost of living.

As a definition of the living wage we can take W. Jett Lauck's, which is a very good one. Most of you know who Mr. Lauck is. He

has worked for a long time for railway employees, and he states that in his estimation the living wage is "a wage which would meet the normal demands of the average worker in a civilized community." Of course, there are many other definitions of what a living wage is, but that seems to cover the situation pretty thoroughly.

Now, as to the amount of what a living wage should be—and of course anything that I say here applies to women just the same as it applies to men, because we are talking of a living wage for workers, both men and women. Several organizations in this country have made studies on the wages and the living costs of different sets of workers throughout this country. The National Industrial Conference Board has made eleven studies in different industrial localities. The National War Labor Board has made one, covering the whole country. Mr. Jett Lauck has made very valuable contributions to this study himself, through the studies he has made of the railroad men. But the study of the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics is perhaps the most important one. It has made eight studies in eight different coal mining districts, and the reports of all these organizations are before the people of the United States. Their idea of a living wage has been different of course. Their studies have been made in different parts of the country, of different industries, and naturally there is some leeway between what one organization believes forms a living wage, and what they believe becomes a living wage in one industry and another. However, there is not such a vast discrepancy as you might think between the sums, because they run from about \$1,300 a year to \$1,700 a year, and that is what is more or less accepted now, perhaps the higher figure being the most true one for a living wage for a family of five.

Now we ask, Why five? That means a father and mother and three children. There is no doubt that many families in the United States have not three children, but also there are many families that have more than three children. Some basis must be set; and it is generally conceded that, after all, the average family does produce two children to replace the father and mother, and an extra one to carry on the race. Otherwise we would cease to exist.

The price is different in different localities. In New York living costs are different from smaller towns throughout the country. Now, one of the great questions which presents itself to us about the living wage is, Can industry afford to pay a living wage? That will perhaps really be the crux of this question. The manufacturers tell us that it would ruin industry, that it would force many industries out of the districts in which they are, and that they must pass the

price on to the consumer who will not be able to bear the burden of it; and other and more terrifying things even than that. Now, let us examine, for a few minutes, these opposing reflections which come from the manufacturer, and all those who have not yet been won over to the idea of the principle of the living wage, because those things are most important, and if we can not succeed in answering them effectively, then at least at present we can not succeed in making people believe in a living wage.

Now, in Australia, where the legal minimum has been in effect for over a generation, the country, as we all know, is a very prosperous country and growing continually in population and in riches. Australia started with five sweated industries in 1896. I think the most significant thing about the situation in Australia is that at present almost all of the highly skilled trades are included—carpenters, printers, builders, shoemakers, and dozens of others of the most highly skilled trades in the country have voluntarily come under the minimum wage. Therefore we must admit that in Australia, at least, a living wage may be considered successful. Therefore we must acknowledge two things: First, that in Australia it has not ruined industry. In fact, we are obliged by the facts to recognize that it must have made industry prosperous. The second point that we are obliged to recognize is that it has been acceptable to the workers, because it is impossible to believe that 100 trades would be voluntarily under the minimum wage laws of Australia, many of them from the most highly skilled and organized trades, if this were disagreeable to the workers of Australia and did not fulfill their aspirations. In Great Britain it started with 4 of the most sweated industries, and in 1921, 28 trades were already under the minimum wage board. The skilled trades in Great Britain are also creeping in one by one under the living wage or minimum-wage board of Great Britain. Of course, in Great Britain the fact that the skilled trades are coming in is explained in a very interesting manner, because during the war the wages of the skilled trades, as well as of the other trades, were naturally raised, as they were raised all over the country, and the extraordinary thing is that these people have found it necessary to come to these boards in order to be able to maintain their prices. That is, without it they have not always been successful. So that in a way the skilled trades are now in Great Britain attempting or desiring to come under the boards in order to be able to maintain their standards.

Now, will it close down the industries? Will a living wage brought about over large aggregates of workers in the United States tend to close down certain industries in the United States? Yes and no. We will not deny that it will tend to close down the industries that prosper purely on low standards. There are in this country

and all countries employers who maintain themselves merely because they can forever nibble at the wage of the workers whom they are employing. They are nothing but people who are living on the bounty of the Nation. They are living on gratuities, because when a worker, boy or girl, man or woman, is not receiving the amount which will tend to keep him or her in a proper condition to maintain a decent standard of life there is some one else in the community who is supplying the difference. Now, that some one else may be a member of the workers' family, and very often is. There are millions of workers to-day who could not live if it were not for the fact that either their brothers, their husbands, or their fathers are supplementing their wages.

The other industry in which that man works—the man who does the supplementing—is really paying for the employer who is either paying his boy, girl, his woman, or his man a low wage. It is not only other industries and other workers who are supplementing these people, but the vast aggregate of charitable organizations that are maintained throughout this country, and into which millions of public and private funds are poured yearly. The worker who is constantly in a condition of more or less undernourishment, whose clothes are poor, whose housing is a disgrace to civilization—and there are many of them—it is impossible to expect that this worker will be a first-class worker and a really first-class citizen. If you add to this that he may have children who he is bringing up under those conditions, you have a situation intensely aggravated because the employer who is hiring that man—casually hiring him, for many of them are casually hiring workers—is not only being subsidized by some one else but he is drawing on the future of the Nation.

There is this to be taken into consideration with the bad employer—that is, the employer who lives purely upon his ability to get a low-paid worker, he is constantly forcing what you might call the decent employer to do the same thing. There are thousands of employers in this country, many thousands, who are anxious to pay decent wages, who want good conditions, but they are constantly and daily in competition on the labor market with men who make their living merely by dragging down the lives of the workers by taking an extra 50 cents or an extra dollar off their week's wages. And so the really first-class and decent employer is more or less forced into a position of doing the same thing in order that he may be able to remain in that field, because no employer who is not able to make profits over and above his costs of production can long remain in the industrial field. Therefore we say that, yes, it will force out the inefficient businesses; it will force out the inefficient employers. And I say God speed the day! It will force the work of the country into the best

and most efficient establishments, into the establishments where the best and most efficient methods are used. In other words you will change the point, you will change the whole trend of the employer's effort away from the cutting, the everlasting nibbling at the wage, into the field of greater efficiency, and better machinery, a study of his overhead, and, in other words, the most efficient and the best methods in industry.

Now, that has been definitely shown in the United States, because the United States to-day is the country that has the best developed machinery in the world, and in many ways the best developed technique in industry. Why? Because the American workers are the most highly-paid workers—that is, by and large—of all the workers of the world, and the manufacturer has been forced to this position by our demand for continually better conditions and better wages. Some one says that a man is just as lazy as he dares to be; and the employer that can make his living, can make profits, by this deterioration of his workers, the deterioration of the oncoming generation, will not turn his attention to better methods of work. There is no reason for it. But with a living wage he is forced into these methods or forced to the wall, and that is where he belongs. Therefore, we say that it will tend to elimination of the worst forms of industry, to the immeasurable gain of the worker and of the Nation.

Now, let us examine the passing of the cost on to the consumer. This is not so formidable as you might think. Yesterday I noticed with great interest that Mr. Cheney said that the employers spend as much for overhead as for wages, and yet they tell us every day in the paper that the money merely goes into wages; that if they raise the wages a few cents why, of course, that's going to be impossible because they will be swamped. They rarely ever talk about the rest of their overhead. It has been figured out very carefully in a certain large candy factory in New York City that if the women employed there were raised from \$14 a week to \$16.50 it would actually cost the consumers one-fourth of 1 per cent per pound more than they are now paying! So that you see spread out all over the industry the cost is not what many of our papers and many of our manufacturers would try to make us believe.

A careful study of the railroad employees presented to the Railroad Labor Board showed that to raise 17,000,000 workers to a living wage, which they were then not receiving, would increase the total wage cost 22 per cent. Now, the question is, Are we willing to spend this one-fourth of 1 per cent more per pound for candy, and do we think it worth while to spend 22 per cent—do we think it's worth while to add 22 per cent onto our wage bill? Perhaps we would if we consider the cost to the Nation of low wages.

The unskilled, as I said, or casual worker, who is living for years with insufficient food and clothing and limited housing, is not in any sense an addition to the life of the Nation, but in many ways merely a menace. The charitable organizations are maintained in order that when these people, the casual laborer, the unskilled laborer, who is unable at any time to attain a decent standard of life—that when they fall by the roadside the organizations may be there to lift them up. Sickness in the family, death, the shortest period of unemployment, all throw this class into their laps. They must be cared for. And this is the method that has been devised for caring for them. We therefore say that a large part of this charity and of this subsidizing could be saved if these workers could be assured of a living wage which would give them at least enough to maintain themselves in decency and in comfort at work and a small surplus which would enable them to take care of sickness or death in the family or a short period of unemployment.

Now, in my particular work, working with the Workmen's Compensation Commission, I am constantly faced with the fact of girls who have been injured coming to me and saying, "I have been out of work a week. I have no money." You always find on inquiry that that girl is making \$10 or \$12 a week and it is impossible for her to save even 5 cents. So with one week's injury or sickness she is absolutely up against it and somebody has got to find the difference; and if it is not done by the family or parents, then charity must begin, and then you begin that influence by which it is so much easier to go to charity when you have once been there.

In other words, what I want to say is that we pay the price: The individual employer may not pay the wage. We pay it. We pay it in a hundred forms, and all of those forms are very ugly forms. We would like to ask that the individual employer, if he has intelligence to be an employer, the efficiency to be an employer, be the one upon whom this falls; and if he is efficient and intelligent, he can intelligently and efficiently pass it on to the consumer and yet remain in business and do good business besides. Don't forget that back of passing it on to the consumer the workers are the vast mass of the consumers; and if these people were all in a condition where they were enabled to buy, we could buy back the product which we now make and in many ways are not able to buy back. We could buy it at a higher price than we are able to do if we had the price with which to buy it.

Another interesting point is that a living wage would tend to eliminate children from industry. The employers who employ children are profiting upon the lives of those little children, and in the meantime men and women of adult life are walking the streets looking for jobs, because the employer will not pay a wage that a man or

woman can live on, but he will sap up the lives of little children and then throw them out when they are adults because he can still draw on a market of children at low wages.

I want to remark here that the living wage in no way means a maximum wage. Don't let us get confused about this thing. A living wage is merely a wage which will enable the average worker to live in decency and comfort—normal decency and comfort—in a civilized community like ours. It does not prevent the worker with higher capacity and skill from earning greater wages than the living wage. This is demonstrated in our organizations and unions where we have a scale of minimum wage. Of course it is rather a higher scale in some industries; that does not prevent the man or woman who has a higher grade of work to sell from getting more for his or her work. That is merely the minimum in the industry.

Now, I just want to say one or two words about some of the foolish ideas that people have about the minimum wage in general. We are told that the minimum wage, just as I said here, will always tend to become the maximum, and no one can rise above it. But from some studies that have been made, for instance, in the District of Columbia in 14 printing plants in 1919, 25 per cent of the printers were receiving above the minimum in March, 1920; 39 per cent were receiving above the minimum in October of 1921; and in April of 1921 76 per cent were receiving above the minimum. Now, does this look as if the minimum always becomes the maximum? In the District of Columbia, of course, we have also this other argument—this is specifically for women—that any tendency to regulate the wages of women by boards of minimum wages would naturally throw vast numbers of them out of work. I do not think that's very complimentary to begin with, because if we are worth so little that the employers merely employ us because we are so dirt cheap I think we ought to look to ourselves. There is something seriously the matter with us. If all we have to offer is merely cheapness and not service, there must be something very definitely the matter with the working women generally. But that is not true, because in the District of Columbia two years after the minimum wage decree had been in existence there was a falling off of only 2.6 per cent in the different trades. Now, this was during a period of marked business depression, and when thousands of women had left the District of Columbia due to the after effects of the war. In fact I believe 75,000 women were discharged by the United States Government. So that in reality, examining even these figures, there is reason to believe that not only was there no decrease except that which was entirely due to the after effects of the war but there was in reality probably an increase.

In California, in 1921, the examination showed that 61 per cent of all the women employed were receiving above the minimum.

Now, one could go on indefinitely, but I leave to Miss Breckinridge to tell you perhaps in a more detailed and interesting manner some of the things which can be said about the living wage in general and the wages of women in particular.

Let us not say these things can not be done. It has been said too often in the world, "This can not be done." But there is always a group of far-sighted, intelligent visionaries, if you please, who say, "Well, it can not be done, but it will be done." And we do think that not only can this be done but it must be done, because those of us who believe in this country do not believe it is merely a country for people to come to in order to continue the same things they had on the other side, but a country to come to where there are going to be better things, where life is going to be better, where we are going to raise up a better race; and in order to do that we must give people a chance; and it is just as important that people shall have good food as it is that they shall have reasonable hours and good plumbing. And we say that we know that it can be done, with the intelligence and the wisdom of the American people; and we believe that it will not be very long before there will be enough people in this country believing in an adequate living wage for all workers, for he who gives his life in industry is surely worthy of a decent living.

Mrs. WINTER. I think I have a very keen personal satisfaction in introducing the next speaker, because, having far outdistanced me since she was one of the younger students when I was a student in college, I have watched her from afar with admiration, and the distance seems to have grown greater year by year. Miss Sophonisba Breckinridge, of the University of Chicago, who is to speak to us on the subject of the equal wage.

THE EQUAL WAGE.

MISS SOPHONISBA P. BRECKINRIDGE, of the University of Chicago.

The problem of the "Equal Wage to Men and Women for Equal Work" is both very simple and very complicated. One might say that the theory is simple but that the process of realizing conditions in accordance with the theory is very complicated. The statement that there should be equal pay for equal work regardless of sex so conforms to all notions of equality and fair play that any other rule of practice would indicate the presence of the cad and the absence of such conditions as prevail in any recognized sport.

The assumption underlying the theory of the equal wage, however, is the assumption that wages are paid in accordance with work done. This is, however, far from the fact, which is that the rate of pay being determined, earnings will be, at that rate, in accordance with work done. But rates of pay are fixed by the relative bargaining power of the parties to the wage agreement,

and capacity and amount of work are only two out of several elements that enter into the relative bargaining capacity of workers compared with employers. That capacity depends, among other things, on the power to choose and the power to wait. In these two powers the woman wage earner is unequal to the employer and likewise to her fellow wage earner of the other sex. In the matter of occupational opportunity, the woman wage earner is sadly inferior to the man wage earner, and so has been and often still is unable to demand and to obtain an equal wage, even when she can, and this is rare enough, secure the opportunity to do "equal work." I do not object to calling attention to this inferiority, which characterizes the position of the woman wage earner as compared with that of the man because of unequal occupational opportunity. It is, in fact, in my judgment highly important that it should be duly emphasized.

The speaker this morning spoke of women "reentering industry." He was of course so intelligent that he never attempted to deny that early industrial work was the work of women. It is true that women during the latter stages of industrial organization have had a less influential place. Women have, however, never been out of industry. They have always made their important contributions to the sum of commodities for daily human use; but, of course, since the introduction of capitalistic organization, industry has taken on, as a result of the organizing capacity, which seems to belong to a peculiar degree to men, a predatory, warlike arrangement and in that arrangement, where force is a dominating factor, those who are weaker receive an apparently inferior status.

I do not object, as I have said, to using the word "inferior" in that connection. I do, however, object to having the word used in connection with physical differences, because I think it is a great misapprehension to say that the differences in men and women are differences in superiority and inferiority. They are differences of kind and of function. It is true that the girl can not dig coal as a man can dig coal, but neither can a man wash a baby as a woman can. But one has only to look at the figures of the last three censuses to see that occupational opportunity is still most limited for women. If you take these figures showing the numbers of jobs into which women go you will see it is small compared with those open to men. This distribution of jobs has not been the result of reason and foresight. We are very proud when an able woman, elected judge in the State of Ohio, lifts the whole plane of a judge's work in that State to a higher level. But any open-minded, honest scrutiny of judges and their work would show what a good able woman could accomplish in that field. Yet it is

not long since all women were shut out of the legal profession and women judges are still very novel phenomena.

To take a predatory organization and civilize it by saying that not power, whether physical or economic, but reason, judgment, experience, and concern for the well-being of the community shall dominate (some may call this feminization) is what we intend to do to the wage scale and the wage system.

To do this, however, we should have the facts, and it is a grievous thing that the Government has not given us the facts. I hope that this conference will adopt a resolution, or that the members will attempt to do those things looking toward securing complete analysis of the figures obtained by the census in 1910 and will demand that the figures of 1910 and 1920 shall be fully given out, that we may know what is happening all over the country in its industrial life.

There are two very important sets of facts which should be had and should be kept constantly in mind. These are (1) the facts with reference to what I have called "occupational opportunity"; and (2) the facts with reference to the burdens women workers carry in their responsibility for the support of others besides themselves.

It used to be said that women workers were "pin-money workers"; that women and girls, tired of home and its monotony, worked for the change and the variety and to get themselves the little extras.

There was published in 1907 by the census a valuable compilation of figures, obtained in 1900, called "Statistics of women at work," in which there was a description of the way in which women workers were organized into family groups. Later there was a study made, a series of 19 volumes, describing the conditions of woman and child wage earners, and of late we have the bulletins from the Women's Bureau. The facts to some extent have been brought out as to the way in which women and girls were members of family groups. The study published between 1907 and 1912, for example, showed the way in which wage-earning families look upon the labor of their daughters. It was interesting to note what a large proportion of the girls and daughters of lawful working age in most of the industries studied, of the daughters still members of the family group, turned in all their wages, and how the girls turned in a larger amount, although they earned lower wages, than the boys. In other words, you had from the beginning the fact that the girls were expected to work, and the obligations laid on the young girls' shoulders were shown to be heavier than those laid on the young boys' shoulders at that time.

One must notice also the relative age classification of the women and girls as compared with the men and boys. The great number of the women workers are in the younger age groups. Of course it is not so with the men workers. However, it must be borne in mind

that while a large number of the women workers are in the younger group, the number of the women that stay on in the older groups is large enough to deserve every consideration from the point of view of opportunity for training for permanent wage-earning life.

On all these points we greatly need the data that can only be supplied by the census, and adequate bases of fact are peculiarly important, because the whole discussion of women's wages has taken on a new aspect since the outbreak of the Great War and because more than ever before it is necessary now to discuss with women's wages men's wages and the relation of the individual's earnings to the family well-being.

Studies from the Children's Bureau make it plain that there is a relation between a high infant death rate and a low earning capacity on the part of fathers of families in which there are infants, but we know nothing as to the proportion of men workers who are fathers of families in which there are infants nor of the loss in families because women or girls are paid too low a rate, nor as to relations between the misery of elderly people whose daughters earn an "individual" and not a "family" wage.

The question of "dependents" has taken on a new aspect. In 1915 some English women tramway employees struck because, while they were granted certain payments after the principle of the equal wage, they were refused some bonuses that men were granted. They secured their demands but the Government became alarmed lest the principle of "equal pay" be really recognized as a governing principle in English industry and public service. They were truly frightened and said to themselves that it was true men got, and had always got, higher wages than women, but there had never been any good reason for this or any satisfactory explanation that could be used to justify the continuance of the practice to the common sense of the post-war community. They said, "Perhaps, if we appoint a committee perhaps they can find such an explanation." So they appointed the War Cabinet Committee on Women in Industry to ask two questions: (1) Have we treated the women fairly in the past? (2) Shall we treat them fairly in the future in the matter of the equal wage? Appointing a committee is often a very good way out of such a difficulty and this committee did its work perfectly. The majority said substantially (1) that, while women had had very limited occupational opportunity and a very unequal wage, there was nothing surprising about that; and (2) that the payment of the unequal wage instead of being unfair was really most fair, because men did have and women did not have dependents to support. Now, the committee knew nothing of how many men nor of how many women supported dependents, and they knew that the number of dependents had nothing to do with the wage a man got, though the

number might affect his earnings by making him more or less industrious and regular at his work. But neither the knowledge of the relevant matter nor the ignorance regarding the irrelevant affected their willingness to find the explanation the Government was seeking for, the policy they wanted justified to a waiting post-war conscience.

There is now quite an interesting body of material on this subject. The Fabian group of women in England said immediately when this began to be used as an excuse for the unequal wage, "We will find out about whether women do or do not support dependents." So they made an extensive study, and they came to the conclusion that about 48 per cent of the wage-earning women were carrying the support of dependents. That, of course, was a very large proportion of women to be bearing the burden of their own support and that of others, when the extreme youth of many wage-earning women is taken into consideration. This study was followed by several others, giving smaller proportions, possibly because they related to different occupational and age groups. These studies brought up some interesting questions. One question is, What do we mean by a dependent? Mr. Rowntree, who came to the conclusion that a man should be able to take care of a wife and three children, while a woman should be paid on an individual basis, thought of a wife as a dependent, although he defined a dependent as a person who received a contribution in return for which he was expected to render no service.

In view of this attitude one would certainly agree with the economist, Professor Nicholson, who thought that the best way in which you can possibly raise the status of the married woman and improve her situation when she is making the most important bargain of her life is to give her wide freedom of choice as to whether she will take that kind of dependency for her job or some other kind of a job. It has, in fact, not been long since women were concerned to get a law saying if a married woman did work for wages outside her own home her earnings should belong to her and not to her husband; because under the old law she owed him her personal service under her marital contract. If she did these jobs for some other man instead of for him the money was his, just as her time was. So it is entirely incorrect to speak of a wife as a "dependent."

Now, in this country we have no figures along these lines. We do have, however, a large proportion of wage earners carrying a partial support of others—that is, responsible for more than their own support—and we should have complete facts with reference both to men and to women workers, and one thing is certain: Whatever the English committee may say, women workers are not going to continue to work under conditions that make them a perpetual menace to the standard of life men and women together have built up. They

are not going to be the perpetual prospective scabs in industry; they are not going to consent to tempt by their cheapness the employers to admit them to wider occupational opportunity. Neither are they going to remain excluded from any kind of job fitted to their powers. On this subject they are quite clear, both because of their interests as women and because of their regard for the national welfare.

The idea of the family wage, to which reference has been made, this wage a man is supposed to earn because he supports a wife and three young children, is not a satisfactory solution. If women are shut out and relegated to the individual wage, that is one reason why it will not do. But there are other reasons. It will not do for the men with more children, and there are many such, though we do not know how many. The national income will probably not allow of its being paid to the men who have fewer than three. In other words, if one thinks in terms of dependents, a far more perfect scheme than that of paying men more than women will have to be devised. It must be a scheme which applies to dependents of a certain category, and the sex of the worker must have nothing to do with it. If there is inequality on the basis of sex, let it be admitted as part of a predatory scheme that has neither reason nor justice, only habit and power, back of it. It should also be pointed out that if the principle of the equal wage is to be applied, there are other demands to be put forward. We must first demand for the younger workers a larger measure of occupational opportunity, which can be secured for them only by an enormous widening out of the opportunities for vocational training and guidance.

We must further in every way possible the reasonable and sound invention of devices in the way of cost accounting, personnel work, and so on, which will enable us to have not an equal wage but a wage for a job, and open up opportunities for that job to everybody, male and female alike. Only so can you get the intelligence of the women of the country added to the intelligence of the men of the country and the civilization of the country put on the highest basis. In other words, women should stand squarely for absence of discrimination on the basis of sex, for the living wage, for that rationalizing of the industrial process which will open up to women opportunities in all of those lines of endeavor for which they are qualified and which will have no accidental authority on the part of persons who happen to exercise the employing function and wear trousers.

Now, of course, it must be remembered that we are in a period near to the war; that war always means, for the time, the exaltation of force and the lowering of the opportunity for the exercise of the rationalizing processes. The present condition can not be endured

and it will not be endured beyond the moment when reason again will become more dominant, and the reasoning processes will give to men and women alike the opportunity to make contributions to the community well-being.

Mrs. WINTER. I know that you are going to be glad to know that Miss Abbott is in the hall. We want you to come to the platform and explain to us the child labor amendment, Miss Abbott.

Miss GRACE ABBOTT, Chief, Children's Bureau, United States Department of Labor. I am glad to have an opportunity to explain one technical point with reference to the children's amendment that we want everybody to be entirely clear about. In the drafting of an amendment the groups that have been at work on the drafting of it, and have been consulting together, have had in mind one or two points that they wanted to be sure to get across in the amendment. One of these was, first of all, that under the terms of the amendment Congress should be given power to enact what would be minimum standards; that there should be left to the States the right to raise those standards, but not to lower them. That is, we would endeavor to get for the children of the country the full benefit of our federal form of government. We conceive it impossible that any State will be jealous of its power to exploit its children, but that it would be jealous of any lessening of a power to give higher standards of protection than the Federal Government might decide to do. In other words, the amendment was drafted not to give to Congress exclusive jurisdiction but to give to it only the right to establish minimum and not maximum standards.

Then we have also had in mind not the present situation alone but the future. I suppose all of you know that the age of 14 was not arrived at by any scientific determination of what is the best time for the child to go to work. It has been the result of the pulling of opposing forces. The doctors did not say "This is the time when they can work most easily"; because it is after all a time of peculiar delicacy for both boys and girls. The educators did not say "We are through with them and you can have them for industries." But we had at every legislature two groups pulling against each other, and what was accepted was the most that under the circumstances the friends of children were able to get.

We have usually had, in addition to an age minimum, an age period above the age minimum during which the employment of children legally permitted to work was regulated. That is, if the age is 14, we usually have a 14 to 16 regulated period during which they can not do night work, nor work more than eight hours, nor in certain kinds of employment involving special physical or moral

hazards. In a few States the regulated period extends to 18 years of age and there are a few instances of regulations up to 21.

The amendment which we are especially interested in, which has been introduced in the House by Congressman Foster and in the Senate by Senator McCormick, provides that Congress shall have the right to limit and prohibit the employment of children under 18 years of age, and that the States shall also have this right provided they do it not to lessen but to increase the protection for children. Now I find, and I am not alone in that, that a good many people get excited about the phrase "children under 18 years of age," and I want all of you to have that quite clear. It may be that we shall decide that it is possible to change "under 18 years of age," and I say "we" in the larger sense, after consulting with the Senator and Congressman who have introduced the measure and with the agencies that are especially interested in it, 11 women's organizations, and many others, it may be we shall decide that instead of saying "under 18" it is possible to say "all children." The only difficulty about that is what the courts have decided the words "child" and "children" mean. If it has been generally construed to mean the age of puberty—12 for a girl and 14 for a boy—there is no use getting an amendment which would go no further than that. At any rate, the proposed amendment to the Constitution with the words "under 18 years of age," if it passes, only gives to Congress authority to legislate with reference to children under 18. Whether it will pass any acts at all is still uncertain. What age limits may be established is still in the lap of the gods. The amendment is an enabling act giving to Congress powers to legislate in this field, the Supreme Court having decided that it does not now have that power.

I hope this is entirely clear, because one or two have spoken to me about it and have thought that the amendment prohibited the employment of children up to 18 years of age; and, of course, we have not thought of asking Congress to do that. I presume the most we could expect immediately would be a little more than the standards of the first and second Federal child-labor laws.

We already have in many States occupations that are extra hazardous physically or morally, from which girls and boys are excluded up to 21 years of age. So that the amendment does not go as far in giving power to Congress as some States have found necessary for some particular types of occupation. An amendment, if adopted, must make possible new standards of protection for children, as new processes and new dangers appear.

May I say finally how very interested the Children's Bureau is in the kind of discussion going on here. I wish very much that we had

a chance to welcome you all to the Children's Bureau. If any of you have time to come to the Children's Bureau, we shall be glad to see you and to put at your disposal any of the material that we have. Miss Matthews, who is the head of the industrial division, is attending the sessions regularly, and will be especially glad to do anything she can to help in any way. I thank you very much.

Mrs. WINTER. The questions of the day are now open for discussion from the floor.

Mrs. BEYER, representing the New York Consumers' League. Miss Abbott has told us that the child-labor amendment is far from being a certainty; that Congress has not taken action yet. We here represent the women of 41 States. Practically all of our State legislatures will meet this year. We want Congress to act upon the amendment in time to submit the amendment to the States for ratification; otherwise we will have to wait at least four more years. Let us as individuals and as representatives of the women of our States go to our individual Congressmen and Senators and tell them we want this amendment, and we want it at once, before the 4th of March. If we do that I am certain they will listen to us and take action, and that we will have this child-labor amendment a part of the Constitution within this year.

Mrs. WINTER. I happen to know that Mrs. Beebe has come to us with a message from Mrs. Edson and the other workers in your cause in California.

Mrs. L. A. BEEBE, representing the Industrial Welfare Commission of California and the California Federation of Women's Clubs. I desire to present Mrs. Edson's regret at not being present. However, she thought that the members of this conference would be glad to know something of the status of the minimum-wage legislation in California, and also something of its effect. So she has prepared a few lines, which I will read to you more rapidly than I could talk.

CALIFORNIA INDUSTRIAL WELFARE COMMISSION,

Los Angeles, January 4, 1923.

To the Women's Industrial Conference, New National Museum, Washington, D. C.

MESDAMES: It is with deep regret that I am not able personally to be at this conference, which bids fair to be of such great importance to women in industry. I thought it might interest you to know something of the present status of the minimum-wage work in the State of California.

On December 29, 1922, the industrial welfare commission sustained the \$16 minimum wage which was originally put into effect in July, 1920. Last April the commission made a reduction of \$1 in the needle trades and certain other manufacturing industries. The serious period of unemployment which hit California in 1921 and the spring of 1922 was reflected particularly in our manufacturing industries, and we find from pay-roll studies that there were 3,000 fewer women employed in March, 1922, than were employed in the same establishments in 1920, when the minimum wage of \$16 first went into effect.

It was this unemployment situation that had the most influence upon the commission in its decision of making a different rate for the manufacturing industries. We seem to be recovering rapidly from that condition, and there also appears to be an upward trend in the cost of living, particularly in the cost of rent, throughout the State. This seemed to justify the industrial welfare commission sustaining its present wage of \$16, as we felt that our budget made in 1920 was not sufficient in some respects. The budget has been amended, therefore, and we feel that we are now on safe ground.

The \$15 minimum wage fixed in April, 1922, was held up by an injunction. In preparing the defense the commission found a technical defect in the call for the public hearing on which this amendment was based, and this defect invalidated all subsequent action. The whole procedure necessary to the establishing of a minimum wage had to be gone through again. Investigations showed that in the meantime the situation had changed; unemployment had decreased, and there had been a slight increase in living costs. The commission is, therefore, sustaining its minimum of \$16, but is clearing up some places in the apprentice regulations which in our experience we feel we can better.

It is most evident that the whole question of minimum-wage legislation is now at its critical period in the United States. It has been thoroughly demonstrated to the State of California that in periods of business depression California is vitally affected by the low standards existent in the industries in competitive States. It means not only that California manufacturers are not able to hold their out-of-State markets but also that their market in California is taken from them by goods manufactured in States where labor is paid much below the minimum required in California. I feel that it is only a question of time when our standards will have to be lowered in competitive industries unless we can secure Federal minimum-wage legislation or unless many more of the competitive States pass minimum-wage legislation.

I feel that one of the biggest jobs we have done is the education of the employing interests of California as to the benefit of such regulatory legislation. It has been the policy of the commission since the beginning of the work to have as many informal conferences with employers' groups as possible, bringing in certain key men in the industry who were educated as to the limitations of the work as well as to the end desired. This has resulted in an intelligent cooperation in many instances. This cooperation was shown in our recent public hearings, when representatives of the largest industrial organizations in the State came before the commission asking the commission to sustain the \$16 minimum, their reasons being that under proper regulation they found that their unfair competitors were not able to undercut them by paying starvation wages and that the standardization of the industry had made for efficiency on the part of the workers. I sometimes think that the by-products of such regulation are almost as important as the primary purpose.

We are faced to-day with a new administration pledged to a policy of economy and efficiency. This is supposed to be brought about by the consolidation of many departments. The Industrial Welfare Commission fears for its life, as the tendency of such consolidations has always been to minimize this work.

It may interest you to know that in 1914, when the Industrial Welfare Commission made its first investigations of women's wages throughout California, we found that 52.5 per cent of the women and minors in the mercantile industry of the State received less than \$10 per week. In the laundry industry 64 per cent of the women and minors received less than \$10 per week. In October, 1917, three weeks after our minimum wage of \$10 became effective,

it was found that 90 per cent of all of the women in the mercantile and laundry industries of the State received less than \$16 per week. In March, 1922, 90 per cent of the women workers of the State of California received wage rates of \$16 per week and over. As to the future of this work in California, no one can make a prophecy. We know that the crisis in our work has come.

In closing I wish to say that in California, where we have had adequate financial support for this work, it is recognized as having done a great service in raising standards for thousands of women in the State and as having added millions of dollars to their incomes which they would not have received otherwise; it is also recognized by the fair employing interests as being of great economic value.

Yours cordially,

KATHERINE PHILIPS EDSON,
*Executive Commissioner Industrial Welfare Commission,
 State of California.*

Mrs. STOKES, representing the National Federation of Colored Women's Clubs. Our president, Miss Brown, of Wilburport, Ohio, sends you greetings, and wishes to say to you that the Negro women of this country are with you in whatever legislation is enacted for the betterment of the wage earners of this country. You can not better the status of the wage earners as a racial group of white women without bettering the conditions of the colored women. And as you have talked about the minimum wage I sat here and said, "I represent thousands of women who are working for less than the minimum wage." I think of the thousands of women who are working in the tobacco industries of this country, and those women, the Negro women, work where the dust hazard is the greatest. The Negro women who work in the glass industries work close to the furnace, and I have seen them in the American Glass Works in the city of Richmond, where I was a welfare worker for three months during the war—I have seen those women covered, as though they had been in a snowstorm, with powdered glass, and I asked the foreman if he did not think they were working in a very dangerous position, and could not they have something to protect the lungs, and he said, "Why, we are within the law."

I want to tell you, my dear women, that the Negro women of this country are watching your deliberations. We are thinking, we are forging ahead, and we are asking ourselves this one question—and I am going to tell you about it, and I don't want you to answer me, because I want you to keep your answer to yourself: Are you—as women who are representing national organizations—giving the Negro women the equal chance, the proper chance, in your own communities and your own organizations? When we enumerate the number of national organizations that you have, we know that in sections they close the door of opportunity in the face of the Negro

women, and say, "We do not want you as a member of our organization." We are thinking about that, and we are praying about that, and we want you to remember that, although our group represents the group that is working for less than a minimum wage, and you refer to us as the fellow that's the farthest down, I want you to know that every day and in every way we are growing better and better.

Mrs. M. C. LAWTON, representing the New York State Federation of Colored Women's Clubs. I want to bring to you the greetings of ten to fifteen thousand colored women who are working arduously, assiduously, and trying to lift themselves above their surroundings. And I have no hesitancy in saying that our women are really the working women of the country. They are underpaid—not only underpaid but they often have to live in worse conditions than any other racial group in this country. But even though we are sometimes made to feel that we are inferior to other people, we do not let that blind us. We know as well as we know our names that the time must come in the civilization of a great country like this when efficiency and capability must count for something. We know that color and hair must sink into insignificance where capability can always come to the front. And our women are organized in New York State thoroughly. They have for their motto "Lifting as we climb," and we are not contented until we know that the farthest-down group is going to receive the same recognition that those who have attained the top have won.

Miss EAVES, representing the American Association of University Women. The Women's Educational and Industrial Union has investigated some of the questions raised in the recent discussion. As yet the results of our studies have not been published, but probably you might like a sort of preliminary result of these investigations.

We have been particularly interested in the question of what proportion of the wage-earning women are supporting others. We have approached the question of the earnings of the women from the standpoint not alone of whether they are sufficient to maintain a better standard of living but also from the standpoint of whether the earnings of these women will leave a small margin which will enable them to be self-supporting in old age. I think in our discussions of the minimum wage we have neglected that factor. We have failed to consider the fact that as these women grow older they must be responsible for providing for the period of incapacity which is inevitable in old age.

In our studies we have discovered that the reason for the variations in the percentage of women who have dependents is the failure to classify these women in age groups. When we examine the proportion of women in different age groups caring for dependents

we find many variations. The younger women frequently carry their pay envelopes home unopened to the mother, who is the financier of the family; so that it might be said that although they contribute all their earnings to the family budget, they have no dependents, because what they earn does not more than support themselves. But as a woman grows older, a different situation arises. We find that the women who are over 30 years of age support a very much higher proportion of dependents. The history of the family situation is like this: Of course, you all realize that about 90 per cent of the wage-earning women have their lives bound up in the family group. While they are young their fathers and brothers are earning, and the whole family is well above the poverty line. As they grow older those who do not marry remain members of the older family group. The brothers marry and go away and feel no further economic responsibility for the older family group. The unmarried sister remains in this older family group. She cares for the father and mother, and in these industrial communities the father's wage-earning capacity becomes lower rapidly as he gets into the upper forties and fifties. And she cares also for the wreckage of this earlier family. If the sister's husband dies, the sister comes back to the old family; and so with a brother who becomes incapacitated; and they have to be cared for. And so the women over 30 have many family dependents.

Of course, no conscientious, sensitive woman is going to say in the face of the actual needs of members of her own family, "I will put aside \$5 a month, so that when I get to be 65 years of age there will be income to support me"; and so these women give all they can spare to the exigencies of the time. In the meantime, as they grow older, these dependents of the older generation die, and so when these women become 60 to 70 years of age, all above what they could earn has been given in the care of these dependents, and their situation is most pitiful. I will not take your time to give incidents which I have seen, many of which are most distressing.

And so I would like to supplement these discussions of the necessity for a wage that will maintain a proper standard of living by saying that when we establish a minimum wage for women we should take into consideration the necessity that these women may not only be able to meet whatever natural family obligations they have, but also that there will be a margin which will insure support in old age, or else that we, like other civilized nations, shall undertake to establish some sort of old-age pension systems for our workers.

MISS HAAS, personnel worker for National Cash Register Co. I think this afternoon is the climax of this conference for me. I doubt very much if there is a woman in this house who has had as

many years of industrial life as I have had. You see my head is frosted. I went as a child worker into a great industry of Ohio. When we speak of the limit of a child as 18 in our compulsory-education work, my heart throbs pretty rapidly, because I know as a child worker what that is going to mean to the moral status of the boy or girl in Ohio in the next generation. At 18 I was clerking in a store, when we had no laws that closed our stores at night, and where I worked every night of the week for \$2 a week. I can hear voices in this house right now that might say, "What could you do with \$2?" It helped keep the children of the home together. And as I went out from one avenue to another trying to find myself, without one day of high-school education, without one day of education of any kind except in the school of hard knocks after I left the grammar grade, I think I can understand the real possibilities of any law that could ever be created that will protect the childhood of our country.

The only reason that I dare stand before an audience like this is because, by the grace of God and of a Christian mother, who somehow intuitively knew how to put her arm about me and protect and guide me, the same force that was directed as she directed, had it been directed oppositely, would have made a mighty force for the bad.

When I see the president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs coming into this audience this afternoon, acting as the presiding officer of an audience that has come together for the purpose of studying industrial conditions for women, I have to feel that the grace of God was sufficient to guide me into the federation work. Back in 1896 my employer of labor came to my department one day and said, "Miss Haas, won't you help us plan an organization for our women? They should be organized in some kind of group for the uplift of women." He urged us to organize, and we immediately entered the General Federation of Women's Clubs. Then, in 1896 in Louisville, I had the privilege of attending the biennial—and I had to go to the dictionary to find out what "biennial" meant. From that hour on I have been closely associated with the Federation of Clubs. But if 25 years ago anyone should have said to me, "Miss Haas, the General Federation of Women's Clubs will come to see the time when they will study the industrial women's life," I would have said, "You are crazy. Women belonging to the General Federation will never do anything like that." And yet here we are in the evolution of women in this world; we find to-day the best women of our country, who have never had to spend one hour in the workroom, realizing that they owe something to their sisters. To-day I am serving in the capacity of the supervisor of 700 women for the

National Cash Register Co. in Ohio, where I was a factory inspector over seven years and then served as organizer for many years, when my company asked me to come back and take up the work that I am doing at this time.

And in answer to the speaker of yesterday who said women do not want women to supervise them, I want to give this answer, "You have not picked the right woman." When I went back to the cash-register company and the girls realized I was there again and head of the personnel division they flocked about me and said, "Oh, Miss Haas, are you going to be our mother and help us in our struggles?" And yet we had the minimum wage in our industry that our State had never granted. Ohio will tackle that legislation this winter, but to-day we have a minimum of \$15 a week in the cash-register works, and wives and mothers come and ask us if we will not find a place for their daughters when they leave high school. They come and say, "Miss Haas, the whole standard of this organization is above the standard of other organizations, not because of dollars, but because of the general uplift of the women with women supervising them."

And, my dear women, let us cooperate in our efforts toward securing a Federal law. Ohio stands high in her laws, yes; but Ohio is not better than any other State, and other States need that law for the protection of their children. Ohio finds the money to build high schools. We found billions of dollars to waste in the last war. If that money could have been spent in building high schools in our country, how much it would have meant to the children and the institutions of the next generation! We would have a higher degree of intelligence, we would have a higher state of manhood and womanhood all over our country, and we would be a beacon light for other countries if we would go down into our pockets and give our children the education they need. And I say to you this afternoon, go back and fight for a Federal child labor law and fight for a Federal educational bill that will not retard any child from a high-school education. If we can spend money for other things that bring no uplift to civilization, then let us spend our money for this; and if the family can not send their child to high school, the Government should not deny to such a child a high-school education just because the family purse can not meet it.

I do not want to see the married women stay in factories in our industry. We say this to young girls who come and tell us they are going to their own homes. They leave the industry because no greater obligation can they meet than to preside over their own homes. And the American home can not be built by the woman in the factory. To it must be given her whole life, with or without

children. If there are no children in that family, there are hundreds who need a home and who may be taken into those childless homes. The childless home can find plenty of children who need homes. It's a good experiment. Try it out.

Work for a decent living wage that will give the girl a chance to lift her head above the temptations of life. There are two roads to be followed, the upward and downward. There is no middle ground. And we must help give the girl a fighting chance to be an honest, upright woman; and that is what we are standing for in Ohio; and I beg of you to stand for it in every State of the Union and work out a Federal bill.

Mrs. MARGARET PECK HILL, representing the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Maryland. This meeting has made us think. I was in the South about three years, in Georgia, Tennessee, and Alabama, and I think of the thousands of black women going to work in the early day, who worked in the cotton fields long hours, and of the thousands of women working all over the country, unorganized. You have at least made us think, and we mean to get busy. So I thank you for the inspiration you have given us and for this wonderful meeting.

Miss BURROUGHS, representing the Pennsylvania Federation of Colored Women's Clubs. As I sat here and thought of the fact that 57 per cent of the colored women in this country who are wage earners work in the homes of the white women of this country, I began to think about the opportunities that are ours. This 57 per cent of the wage earners who are household assistants are unorganized. There is a movement on foot on the part of the colored women to form a national association of wage earners. In fact, such an organization is now in its incipiency. But I want this afternoon to call your attention to one or two things about which you have been thinking, and things concerning which a number of women in this organization have been working.

First, the very fact that you have daily contact with 57 per cent of the colored women of this country gives you an opportunity to apply and to try out some of the ideals that have been so beautifully expressed in this gathering. We know that you are absolutely sincere. But here's the acid test. And there are women in this audience who are fair enough and brave enough to stand that test, and there are other women who haven't thought about it.

I was sitting here thinking that it is possible for large numbers of women in this country to help in efforts of this kind, because there are women back in their homes now who are caring for their children, who are laundering their clothes, who are looking after

their work, and who are doing those things faithfully; and they can be trusted. And so you are here looking after the interests particularly of the white women of this country. And while you are looking after the interests of the white race in this country I am begging you this afternoon that we shall consider together; for it's no time for feeling and exploitation of notions, but it is a time for the women of both races to face this problem squarely and to realize that this unorganized group is the backbone of the economic life, so far as the white women are concerned, of this country and that it gives opportunity to these women to engage in all kinds of work, and gives opportunity for leisure and helps in so many ways that I can not now enumerate; so that you women who have these advantages and hire these women must see to it that they are helped in the matter of standards.

I am not talking about wages. I really think sincerely many of them are overpaid for what they are doing. It is a matter, however, of living and setting up a standard. The big thing, so far as the colored women who work in the homes is concerned, is not a matter of more wages. I should not contend for that to begin with, though if you are talking about the minimum wage you will be fair and pass it around to all women. But I am thinking of the conditions under which many of those women live. I am thinking of how they sleep in basements and over garages, and of the temptations there, and I am thinking it is the greatest chance that the American white women have. The colored women are not on trial in this country. It is a test of the sincerity and opportunity of the white women of this country rather than of the colored women.

And so I say that for those women who do the work and live under these conditions, these conditions should be improved. We should sit around the council table and together plan to look after the moral as well as the physical condition of the colored women, 57 per cent of whom work at domestic service in this country. The thing for which I would stand for that particular group is for finer and better service, and for better living conditions, and for white women to feel and for colored women to feel that they have so much in common, since the colored women are on your pay rolls and not on the pay rolls of your husbands, particularly; that together we are going to see how well we can work it out, how efficiently we can serve on the one hand, and how fine and how fair and how just you can be on the other.

And I trust that this conference shall not close until there shall be women here who say, "If we can in any way help in the organization that will mean efficient service on the part of colored women who

work and better opportunity for those women who work at service, I will join hands with any organization that really means to put the job over!"

We want this thing done and we can not do it without you, and we trust you will address yourselves to this while you are attending to the other problems in our country that are just as important, just as essential, just as vital, but in attending to those do not forget your sisters in black, who are willing to bear the burden with you in the heat of the day, under all circumstances and conditions.

Mrs. JULIUS ANDREWS, representing the League of Women Voters of Massachusetts. We have heard several discussions this afternoon to the effect that a Federal minimum-wage law would be the best for us all. While there is no contradiction of that, we are still facing the State problem in Massachusetts. Every year the question arises about the repeal of the minimum wage, and the manufacturers continue to say, as they always do, that we are driving the industries of Massachusetts to other States, particularly the South. Now, it is the idea of a great many delegates from the different States of this country, when could there be a better time to arouse enthusiasm of these women, who are now voters you must remember, to go back to their States, to their cities, and try and see that in every city and State we shall have a minimum-wage commission, and that we shall not allow those States who have fought the battle to continue to fight it every year, because the manufacturers bring up these bills.

It has been so bad in Massachusetts that a commission was appointed to investigate the whole situation, and we very much feared—and still are not quite sure—that it might be repealed. However, I have had word from the committee that the danger is almost over.

Now, I think that it is up to our sister States to go back home and see that in their States they shall have minimum-wage boards established if they want to see that Federal law. They never will get a Federal law until more States have the minimum-wage boards. Now, I think that one of the lessons of this conference that we have to bring to those that have been rather slow is that they, too, must work, and not leave it to the same old States to continue the fight.

Mrs. WINTER. The Chair saw Miss Lathrop drifting to the front, and then she stopped. I wonder if she will not come a little farther forward and speak to us?

Miss JULIA LATHROP, representing the Illinois League of Women Voters. Thank you, Madam Chairman. You know I will have a last word, the old-fashioned woman's last word, to-morrow night. Therefore I believe I will not say anything at this time.

Mrs. HENRY LOCKWOOD, representing the Federation of Women's Clubs of Virginia. I would like to leave with this audience one point

that is of importance, and it's a point that when they go back home they are going to meet most often. Do not do it in a Federal way; do it in your States. Give your States the benefit of the education, and stand by the State. Now, the difference between a State law and a Federal act is that the State can give it to you and the State can take it away, but an amendment to the United States Constitution stands for always.

Mrs. EDITH C. PAUL, representing the American Federation of Teachers. As a member of the American Federation of Teachers we are also affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, and that means that the teachers indorse all of the projects for legislation in connection with women and children in industry that have been discussed at the sessions of the conference.

Mrs. WORTH TIPPY, representing the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America. The churches of the United States are not as yet directly organized for work with women or in behalf of the industrial women, but they send their greetings, and as I represent them, I am here to listen to the discussions and to take back to them recommendations and information for future consideration.

Miss ROBERTA L. LINDSEY, representing the National Federation of Federal Employees. I just want to say one word on the question of dependents that has been discussed to-day. Many years ago I was talking to an official of one of the Government departments on the question of salary—we call it "salary" in the departments; it means "wage" just the same—for men and women. He said, of course the men should receive more money than the women, even though it be for the same work, because the man is the head of the family. I said of course that may be true, but sometimes the woman is the head of the family. He said that rarely does that happen; most of the women who have dependents have them voluntarily. My answer was, then if the women do have dependents voluntarily, I think the woman who does is the better citizen, and so she should be remunerated. And I further said, aside from all that, if the woman is doing the same work she should receive the same pay, provided she is doing it in the same efficient way.

I have nothing further to say except I wanted to throw that little thought out so that you people who are delving into figures and economic discussions will bear in mind that it is a thought which a great many men have, that the unmarried woman, whether she be a spinster, an aunt, or a widow, is voluntarily taking care of people, and she could work for less if she did not do it.

Mrs. ISABEL WARRELL BALL, representing the Woman's Relief Corps. Madam President, I have listened very carefully to the addresses that were made yesterday, and have listened very carefully

to the discussions of addresses that presumably were made to-day. Unfortunately, being a working woman who works from 8 o'clock in the morning until 6 o'clock in the evening, and from about 6 o'clock in the evening often until midnight, it was impossible for me to come and listen to the papers this morning.

The question of child labor and child industry is one in which I am intensely interested, because as a child—because of conditions surrounding my earlier childhood—I was a worker. My father went into the Union Army, leaving my mother with little children clinging to her skirts, she practically an invalid. I, a child not yet 7 years old, sawed every stick of wood that we burned through the winter of 1862. That was child labor. Later, Madam President, when we went from the great State of Illinois, where I was born, to the even greater State of Kansas, where I grew up, I again engaged in industrial work. I had not even finished grammar school when I left the State of Kansas. The conditions in Kansas in 1873 were not conducive to the comfort of any woman unless you could live on sandstorms, atmosphere, and good society. I wonder how many women who are sitting here have really and truly worked as this lady here has and as I have. She tells about doing something—I forget what it was—for \$2 a week. A little later I will come to that. How many of you have ever herded cattle? How many of you can break sod, or mow? So few women are engaged in anything of that character. Ladies, I have done it all. There wasn't a cowboy in the whole wide West who could ride a pony as I could, or herd cattle any better, or turn out 250 cattle out of 50,000 cattle that were going along the old Santa Fe Trail.

I taught the first school in our county with not even a grammar-school education. I taught in an old saloon dance hall. There were only two frame houses in the town. I had not a book, a bell, a map, a seat, or anything of that character for my children, but my little children, from about 4 to 7 years of age, with four or five big boys, when there was no work out on the ranch, went back of the school-house to the sand hills and themselves picked and sawed the wood that would make seats for themselves. In that little saloon school-room these children were working also. I wonder sometimes if the children working in clean, light manufactories, for instance, are not better off than they are in the foul holes where they have to sleep and eat and have their being if they are not working. They do not get very much out of the schools, for the reason that our school-teachers too largely are working for wages and not for humanity. We women are not always just in these things. And so, when you are considering that part of things, try to remember the women who

are placed over these helpless little ones in the schools, and then remember the miserable mothers who send these children to school to get them out of the way. We ought to think high thoughts. We ought to get high ideals. How many of us are going to do it until it hurts? And the things that hurt in helping are the things that help the world. How many of us can go home now with that ideal in our hearts and feel we are determined to help until it hurts and do not wait for a great big school or a great big factory? This blessed colored woman over here has told you the truth.

How many of you are going to begin in your own kitchen to better conditions?

I sat here yesterday absolutely drenched in the sweat of humiliation when the great audience here hissed that wonderful woman, Miss Robertson. I stood with her absolutely in every expression that she made. And she is a woman who has worked from the hour that understanding burst upon her up to the present hour.

What the conditions surrounding women and children are she knows, and yet this great audience, unjust absolutely, would not permit her to give expression to her own ideals and her own thoughts. And yet some one just before her had given voice to the same arguments, and you applauded. Are you just to your own? If you have not differing ideals here, why promote a convention of this character? Now, we have to deal with ourselves. I am a newspaper woman. I have been working for over 50 years, 45 of them in newspaper work. I doubt if there's a woman in this building right this minute who can give expression to such a thing as that. And I expect to work for 20 or 30 years longer. I hope I may. Every hour of my day is spent in doing just that which you are trying to do in a degree. So I am taking up the individual woman, the individual helpless child, and seeing what can be done for her as associate editor of the National Tribune. Now, ladies, unless we can be just to ourselves and to our kind, how in God's heaven can we go out and be just to anybody else? Miss Robertson is one of the advanced women of the world, and you know it. It was a crime that she was not returned. She stood upon her own feet in a body of men who respected and admired her, helped her in every way, believed in her beliefs, and yet you hissed her. Was that just? Wasn't that injustice? And she was right. I have within my knowledge 200 women who were doing exactly what she said these women who were crying out for more money were doing. They wanted silk dresses and silk underwear. And year in and year out this thing goes on. I can not do anything with it. I talk to them privately, quietly, try to make them understand what these conditions are. No; they want the bright things of life, and they are going to have

them. And yet when Miss Robertson said it, although Mr. Cheney said it first, you hissed her.

Now, the thought that I give to you as the representative, as I have told you, of 250,000 women over this broad land, all under one emblem, the thought that I give to you is this: "Be just to your own; be just and honest; to thine own self be true. It follows then as the night the day thou canst not be false to any man!"

MISS JULIA LATHROP. I know that this is hardly parliamentary, but I feel that I would like to speak as to what happened yesterday afternoon. I heard no hissing. There may have been some slight hissing in the audience; I do not know. I think perhaps some of the things said by Miss Robertson were better understood by the older than by the younger members of this audience. I heard some few indications of perhaps disagreement, a little laughter, but I think that on the whole Miss Robertson could not herself feel that she was treated with discourtesy. And I feel very sure that, on the whole, the audience not only had no desire to treat her with discourtesy, but that the laughter which I heard was to the greatest degree amiable, that everybody respects Miss Robertson for the person that she is and for the fine history that is back of her, through her whole life in Oklahoma.

MRS. WINTER. Now, we have just three minutes more before we must listen to some announcements before adjournment.

JUDGE KATHRYN M. SELLERS, of Washington, D. C. A good many of you know Miss Robertson stood at my right at the tea, and I know that all of the delegates greeted Miss Robertson in the most hearty way, and expressed their pleasure at meeting her. She was very happy, and we had hard work to keep the line moving; so I am sure that Miss Robertson herself does not feel that she was badly treated. While she may have the impression that perhaps you did not agree with her, she was most amiable and happy to be there, and you all greeted her in such a cordial way that if anything had happened in the morning I am sure she quite overlooked it, and I know she has no feeling about it. I just wanted to add that word.

MRS. WINTER. I know we will be glad to have Miss Breckinridge bring this matter to a close.

MISS BRECKINRIDGE. I did not in my remarks say anything about the colored women workers because I think this bureau has stood absolutely for these women in industry, and its largest bulletin so far has been devoted to the negro women in industry. The greatest satisfaction that I have heard expressed about the conference is that we have in this group these extraordinary women coming from the colored women's groups. We have a common problem. The heaviest burden rests on them, for they are the lowest paid and

work under the worst conditions. Of course, this all goes without saying, and this conference stands first and last for the women that are at the bottom, including them, but not exclusively for them.

Mrs. WINTER. I believe the Chair can say truly that the conference stands for the principle that women shall not serve industry but that industry shall be made primarily to serve womanhood and human rights. To-morrow morning the session of the conference will deal with "Labor legislation for women," the speakers being Miss Melinda Scott, of the United Textile Workers of America, and Miss Merica E. Hoagland, director mutual service division, Diamond Chain & Manufacturing Co. of Indianapolis, and the meeting being presided over by Mrs. Maud Wood Park, president of the National League of Women Voters.

The meeting is adjourned.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 13—MORNING SESSION.

Miss ANDERSON, temporary presiding officer. We will open our program this morning with an address by Mrs. Maud Wood Park, president of the National League of Women Voters. Mrs. Park, I have the honor to state, will also be our presiding officer at this morning's session.

Mrs. MAUD WOOD PARK, president of the National League of Women Voters. I wanted to come to this session this morning, even though I had been unable to attend the earlier sessions, because I want to express the profound interest which the National League of Women Voters feels in the subjects that are under discussion in this conference. From the very organization of the league, three years ago next month, this has been one of the major subjects, and in charge of a national standing committee, and we feel that there can be no question with which women could more properly concern themselves than the conditions surrounding women and girls in industrial occupations.

Now, a second thing that I want to express is my own great regret for having missed the earlier sessions, for the reason that I believe a conference of this kind to be of the utmost value, because it is intended to give those of us who are naturally interested in the subject the facts upon which alone we should base any legislative campaign. I feel very keenly that this is not a subject which should be approached from the emotional or sentimental side, but it is a subject wherein if the facts be known they will give us all the ammunition that we need, and therefore a conference of this kind seems to be most interesting and valuable.

I have asked Miss Anderson to be good enough to relieve me from taking charge of the discussion this morning, because I believe that speakers who know as much about this subject as the two speakers this morning do, and the general discussion afterwards, ought not to be presided over by anyone who has been absent from the previous sessions. So I am going to have the pleasure of introducing to you as the presiding officer of the morning the chief who introduced me, and as I do so I want to say that I am not going to tell you about her for obvious reasons. I feel a good deal like the little girl whose teacher was trying to find out for the purposes of the annual enrollment the names of her parents. The child insisted that her father's name was Mr. Grimewold, and no question

elicited anything except the brief information that his name was Grimewold. The teacher finally asked what name her mother called him, and the child, almost bursting into tears, said, "My mother doesn't call him names; she likes him." We won't call Miss Anderson names; we like her.

Miss ANDERSON. The first speaker on the program this morning is Miss Melinda Scott, representing the United Textile Workers of America. Miss Melinda Scott has a national reputation as a trade-union organizer and also as a worker on legislative problems and bills; and it is with great pleasure that I am introducing this morning Miss Scott to speak on "Labor legislation for women."

LABOR LEGISLATION FOR WOMEN.

MISS MELINDA SCOTT, representing the United Textile Workers of America.

Representing the United Textile Workers of America, I wish to bring to this conference greetings from the textile workers, and I wish especially to thank those splendid women and men, those organizations, national and local, which have been of such splendid assistance to the United Textile Workers who have been out on strike for the last 10 months against a reduction in wages and a lengthening of hours from a 48-hour to a 54-hour week. The organization that I represent wishes to thank you.

As a trade-unionist I believe in organization, and I want to say here that the discussions so far about bettering the conditions of the working woman have mostly concerned themselves with legislation; but there is another method by which the conditions of the women workers may be improved, and that is by trade organization.

I believe in organization, because organization in itself is an education. I believe in placing the workers in a position where they may help themselves. I do not suppose I was born a trade-unionist. I probably was born like any other kid, but it has grown on me out of necessity, and necessity was so great that it wouldn't allow me to grow as high as my grandfather was, who was over 6 feet tall. He never worked in the factories. My father had to, and so did I, and we see and can recognize—those of us who are in the labor movement and those of us who are out of it but who are thinking—the direct results of child labor, when we see the men and women physically stunted by being obliged to do tasks unsuited to their age and strength.

I do not claim that the trade-union movement is infallible. It makes mistakes; it is a human institution; but I do claim that its record is for the uplift and the benefit of all of humanity. It helps to safeguard the woman, the child, and the home, thereby safeguarding the Nation.

As I said, I believe in trade organization, but after working many many years in the labor movement I have realized that women in some instances need special legislation. While the trade-unionists can usually get conditions improved through their organization we are not selfish enough to stand aside and not be willing to help those who are the most helpless, because, after all, there is nothing so cheap and so helpless as the women and children in industry. The majority of them are helpless to help themselves, and because of women's acceptance of things as they are, because of their submissiveness, because of their home training, their church training, their school training, if they have any asset in general, it is that women have been taught to submit, and until they are in a position to help themselves I advocate certain legislation for them.

The first thing I advocate would be that every child should get a square deal at birth, and if that child is to be born right the mother should be able and in a position to rest before and after childbirth, not only for her own good but for the good of the child. No matter how some of us may talk about the equality of women, we know that women are not physically built like men; and no matter how we would like them to be equal they can not possibly be as long as there are the two sexes, and it is foolish for us to theorize on that subject. I worked for many years in suffrage and I remember some of the women who are now advocating and saying that there should be no protective labor legislation for women, and they are the ones who used to say, "Women should get the vote whereby they might be able to bring about a shorter workday for women." I can't swallow that bunk. I never had a career. I was lucky to have a job. I never had a college education, but I am trying to make the fight that every child shall have at least a high-school education. If every child is to get a square deal he must be given a chance to be born right first.

I am not theorizing when I say that children have been known to be born in the factories, on the floor in the dressing room, if there was one, and then we talk about the sacredness of motherhood. I am not advocating birth control. I am advocating only that the women who are bearing the children shall be given an opportunity to rest before childbirth; that they shall be taken care of; and that so long as they have to be helpmates and so long as they have to be home workers, they shall be protected when they also have to be mothers and at the same time have to be wage earners. I am asking that they be allowed to do one job at a time.

For the child, I am asking that it be given a square deal, and I contradict a statement made here by some one who said that every child was born with an opportunity and a chance in life. It isn't so, and I know it.

I am in favor of a child-labor law. We want the children in the schools and not in the factories. We want every child to be assured of an education that will fit him for life and its most serious duties. We want every child to have a playtime; and that playtime should be in its childhood, because we who have suffered from child labor know that if we miss the playtime in childhood we never have a chance to play.

The first year the working women had a summer school in Bryn Mawr I went there to see some of the girls. Some of them were not quite girls; they were grown-up women, and I was asking them what they thought about the summer school, and what they thought about the college, and how they had enjoyed it; and, of course, they told me that they had never realized how much they had missed. One of them said to me, "Miss Scott, I like it all. I am so afraid of thinking of the time we've got to go back to the grind. But I do feel so foolish when they ask us to play." Oh, I know what that meant, and so do some of you. The workers have never been taught how to play. I understood exactly how those girls felt when they were asked to play at recreation time. Childhood must be given its chance. The Supreme Court has declared the child labor law unconstitutional. It says that a tax can not be put on the goods, and yet it does not say anything about its being unconstitutional to tax tobacco or matches or other products. It is quite right it should do that; but, oh, when they thus decide against the life and the playtime of the child, I think it is time that the Supreme Court judges were elected and not appointed.

A great many of us think about child labor in the abstract, but those of us who have been working in the labor movement know what it means. We know what it means for children to be awakened in the early morning or in the middle of the night to go to work. We know what it is for them to have to go to work in the dark and go home in the dark. We know how they feel sometimes through experience when they see other children more fortunate than themselves playing on the street. Oh, that longing that they have that they might, too, be allowed to play. And I ask you women, mothers of men, are you not going to see to it that this child labor bill is passed? If we do nothing else, let us make up our minds, especially those of us who have been through the mill, and those of us who feel that the children of the future should have a better time than we've had in the past, let us make it possible for them that they shall not have to work in sweatshops and in homes, working and toiling when they ought to be out in the sunshine, growing physically and **mentally**.

And what can we expect of the citizenship of America when we **stunt** these children, and they come born, as it were—the majority of

them—of tired mothers and tired fathers? They are put out to work before they are able in many instances. The strongest of them survive, the weakest of them go under; and yet these are the little ones of whom the Master said, "Suffer little children to come unto Me, for of such is the kingdom of heaven." In what condition, women, are we going to send these children back to the Father? Are we going to send them back maimed and mangled through industry, having been deprived of the joy and happiness of life? And we can not talk to these children, to these overworked mothers and fathers, about higher things when their bodies are half starved, and when their minds are too tired to think. I am asking you this morning if we do nothing else, let us make up our minds to make one supreme effort, because the responsibility rests on us that this Federal child labor bill shall go through. It shall pass. It is up to us.

I advocate a shorter work day for women—48 hours a week, with one day's rest in seven. There are 1,000 men working eight hours a day to every one woman. The world's work can be done in eight hours, and if everybody worked it could be done in less, and the time is coming when everybody who eats will have to work, because the world is moving on. I advocate a shorter day for women because women in the majority of cases, as I said, are not only helpmates, they are washerwomen, home makers, breadwinners, and when they finish their 9 or 10 hours in the factory, and when they have seen to it that the children are washed and bathed and put to bed, they have then got to do their home work. When we realize that the machines of iron and steel are oiled and cleaned and rested every so often, does not it seem that this human body of ours which is made of flesh and blood would naturally need to be rested somewhat. Eight hours a day is long enough for anyone to work, and longer than that is simply a waste of time and energy. We know where there has been a shorter day the output has been greater and it has been of a better grade. We know that in the latter part of the day when people are getting tired, more accidents happen. I believe strongly in a 48-hour week, and you must realize that I am not alone in believing that, for we have just had an example of it with the United Textile Workers of America who struck against conditions in the latter part of 1921. They suffered a reduction of 22½ per cent in wages, but the hours were not touched. In February of 1922 there was declared another reduction of 22½ per cent and a lengthening of hours from 48 to 54, and something inside of the worker said, "No; thus far shall you go and no further," and these workers struck mainly and principally for the shorter work day. I have no authority for saying it, but I believe in my own mind that had they offered them the reduction and not touched the hours, it would have been accepted as it was before.

When you realize that a textile worker in New England before the war, in the cotton industry, on the average earned but \$9 a week you will realize what it meant to these people to stand out from February to the end of November for a principle.

I don't want to tire you by telling you the details of the strike. I should rather fancy that if I did I might be out of step with some of the things that have been said here. But I do want to say this, that in most of the mills a settlement was made with the exception of the Amoskeag Cotton Mills in Manchester, N. H. Two or three years ago their capital stock was \$4,000,000; to-day it is \$44,000,000, and yet they were the most arrogant of all the employers who said that they did not intend to give the workers the 48-hour week, and the workers, after almost a 10-months struggle, went back to work protesting against it, but with the hope that the Legislature of New Hampshire would give them the 48-hour week.

I want a 48-hour week by law, making it impossible for these captains of industry to be able to hold out the workers and starve them out. If it had not been for the kindness of a great many of you people seated here they would have been starved into submission. We had a commissary department, and in Camp Thomas, R. I., those of you who come from Rhode Island know that we had them under tents. They were evicted because they refused to work, although the right of an American citizen to work is granted by the American Constitution—and also the right of every person to lay down his tools when he sees fit to protest against conditions as they are. Of course, the families with a great many children were the first to be evicted, and we saw them there. They did not uphold these strikers for having large families; they did not uphold these working women for being mothers and wives and helpmates and truck horses. But they put them out on the street because they had the backbone to protest against conditions as they are to-day. And amongst that group on Labor Day, I saw them there under canvas in tents, and a boy of 11 years of age, stone blind. Industry has no heart. They were out because they protested against the conditions. And I want to have our law so amended that these conditions in future will be impossible.

I am in favor of a bill that will eliminate night work for women. Apparently there is somebody here that agrees with me. I know, too, that there are a good many that do not. Why? I am going to tell you some of the reasons why. Those of us who know the conditions where women work at night know that in a great many cases they are working for less wages than men do at night. We know that women are asking to be allowed to work at night because of their necessity. Shall we allow them to do it? I remember when we were working for suffrage, from the opposition there was a great deal said about women having the ballot—it would ruin the home.

The very fact of women leaving their homes for a few minutes to put a ballot in a box would be the ruination of the home. And yet, by all the powers that be, the same women are saying that women ought to be allowed to work at night—that it does not injure the home. Now, we know that the majority of the women who are working at night are married women. We know that they are working probably through necessity. We know that the homes are neglected, that the children are neglected, and we believe that night work should be eliminated, not only for the women's sake but also for the children's and the homes' sake. We know the dangers of women working at night. I do not want nor like to talk much about the morals of working women, because I believe and know that the morals of the working women are of a higher standard than any other class of people. It is true, long hours, low wages, do tend to weaken a woman if she should happen to meet temptation; but, oh, my friends, we have not time to think about those things; we are so busy with this bread-and-butter question, with this thinking how we can get home, how we shall do our work, and how we can possibly be back on the job at machines next morning.

The women who work at night are thinking all the time about the children they left at home, and the children next day when the mother is trying to sleep. How many of us have thought of the possibilities of a working woman being able to sleep in the daytime? Some of you may possibly come from homes where you are away back from the street, from the trolley cars, from your next-door neighbor, but have you thought of the women who live in tenement houses or live in the flats close to each other, where the children are running in and out all day playing? How is it possible for those women to get any sleep? It is dangerous to health. Some time ago there was an advertisement in a newspaper in New Jersey which called for a waitress—a good-looking waitress, it said—hours to be from 8 to 2 o'clock in the morning. Do any of us think of the dangers of a girl leaving her work at 2 o'clock in the morning, or 3, or 1, or 4? Now, it is all right, women, for some of us. We are able to take care of ourselves when we go home. But there are thousands of little girls who are unable to take care of themselves. They do not know life as it is, and in many instances we do not want them to know it. It is dangerous, and therefore we appeal for a law that will eliminate night work for women.

I should like to see a law abolishing home work. Perhaps some of you may think I am asking too much. But isn't that the way we get things, by asking for a whole lot?

It has been my good fortune to have dealt with manufacturers, and I want to testify here that we have some mighty good men who are trying to do the right thing. One of them taught me this: He

said, "Miss Scott, don't insist on getting this set price"—that we were asking for a certain kind of work—"then you can compromise." I should like to see, and I hope we shall have the abolition of home work, because of its insanitary aspect. It is a menace to all of the community. It tends to lower the wages of the women in the factories. Most of you know, no doubt, that in trades where some part or exactly the same kind of work is being done in the factory, and where the work is being given to the home—not to be done at night, but home work to be done in the daytime—that where the work is done in the homes, the manufacturer does not have to pay the overhead charges. He does not have to pay for machinery. He does not have to pay for needles, silk, or thread. And girls who do the same kind of work in the factories are obliged in some instances to buy their own machines, the hemmer, the silk, the cotton, and, in many instances, to pay 7 cents on the dollar for electric power that runs their machine in that man's factory. When the home work is given out, you can very well see that it does endanger the wages of the women who are working in the factory, and of course, we do believe in the sacredness of the home, and there isn't much sacredness about a home when it is turned into a factory. We have forgotten that, some of us. There is no sacredness about that, and it is not a home; and some of us women try to protect the children and try to protect our homes from disease. But I say very few of us know that a great many of the things that we are wearing, a great many of the things that we buy for the children to play with, are made by home workers, made in the homes; here the work is spread on the beds, and the children are running around in many instances half sick, with no ventilation. It is supposed of course, that they are well supervised, that the inspectors get there, but we know that there are not one-half enough inspectors to do the job. It can not be done, and the only security we have is to work for the elimination of home work.

Besides, how many children are brought into the industry, as it were, when the work is done in the homes? We can go into any of these houses, and especially among the flower and feather workers, and we can find there the children sitting around the table working late at night, and the little children, 5 and 6 and 7 years old, weaving paper around the stems of those paper violets and other flowers that they sell in the 10-cent store. The mother gets 3 cents a gross for making them. And we have seen and heard the mother asking the little child, "Keep awake a little longer, Mary. Try to help mother by cutting these papers, by turning the paper around the stems. Try to help mother and she will be through soon and will be able to put you to bed." Sacred motherhood. What a farce.

I should like very much to see a law that would insure proper sanitary conditions for workers. I know perhaps some of you are tired of hearing that term "sanitary conditions." Some people just say it and don't know what it means or what it implies. But some of us do know what it is to work in a factory, work long hours, 9 and 10 hours a day, standing on your feet, until the feet and legs are swollen. You think you will almost drop in your tracks. You are wishing that there might be a place where you might retire for a few minutes. We know of factories, no matter what the law says, where there are no dressing rooms. We know of certain instances where girls have become sick, and they have had to be laid on the floor because there was nowhere else to put them, and you would be surprised, some of you women, if I were to tell you in what industry that was, because some of you are wearing those stockings. (You know those conditions which are guaranteed not to aggravate anybody when they have put on a stocking and worn it for a day or so.) Do you know that in some industries and in some factories that women have no toilets without being obliged to go to the desk of the manufacturer sitting there and take a little key from the side, push out or upon a great big heavy door and go downstairs on the landing below? The same toilet is used by another firm downstairs. If there happens to be a girl in there from the floor below, or the floor above, you are to wait on the landing until she comes out, or you go back and put your little key back in front of the manufacturer and everybody knows where you have been. Do women want to work under those conditions? Do you realize that many women will not leave the room, and how dangerous it is to health? And with these laws on the statute books providing sanitary conditions, toilets and dressing rooms, we also beg that there be an appropriation made, that there may be inspectors enough to go around to see to it that the law is carried out.

Before I leave that subject I want to say this: I have heard, during this discussion, of managers and specialists in factories who have decent conditions. Some of them may have that, but I am not theorizing. I want to say that less than a year ago I myself worked in a factory. I stood on my feet for nine hours a day watching the clock. When it came to the last hour, praying I might have endurance enough to stand on my feet until it was time to go home. No stools to sit on at lunch hour. There were three steps that led to a fire escape. If you wanted to sit down there you shared it with the men having their lunch. These conditions are bad for industry and the manufacturer is a bad business man to allow these conditions, because workers can not turn out their best work. They can not do the work that is expected of them when they are overtired.

And those extra long hours are simply wasted, and it is good business to have a shorter work day. There is better work turned out. It is a good business proposition and it has been proved.

I am in favor of a minimum wage law being enacted until women, as I said in the beginning of my talk, have the courage, the opportunity, and the backbone to stand on their own two feet and insist on better wages and better conditions. Until that time, I am in favor of a minimum wage law being enacted that will enable women to get a decent living wage, not just a bread and butter wage, but a wage, as that friend so well expressed it yesterday, not only for just bread and butter, but that they may be able to lay a little aside for sickness or old age.

Some of the arguments I have heard about the minimum wage and about women wanting higher wages are remarkable. They have said that women wanted higher wages only to buy silk stockings and silk petticoats and so on. More power to them. Who has a better right to have them than those who work for them? I am not advocating that it is always wise to do these things. But that comes with education. But I can remember how I once wanted a red dress. Oh, I wanted that red dress, and if I could have gotten money enough together, no matter what else happened, I would have bought that red dress—and hang the consequences. You know the majority of the workers are just about two weeks away from the poorhouse all the time. And a little bit more or less does not matter. But what we want to do, of course, the proper thing to do, is to educate the worker to take care of her earnings; but, oh, isn't it nice to think that youth, in spite of the long hours and low wages, has still energy enough to want to go to a dance at night and dance their heads off after working 10 hours in a factory? The Lord certainly gave the workers a sense of humor. And if they still want to buy silk petticoats and silk stockings, all right; if they can get them, I say all right, go to it!

Workmen's compensation: I think we ought to have a workmen's compensation law that will be adequate to take care of the injured workmen, to take care of the widow, to take care of the children.

And I think along with that—Miss Anderson tells me my time is nearly up and I just want to touch on it briefly—along with the workers' compensation law, there should be a law passed for the rehabilitation of not only men but women in industry. We have the law, and rightly so, for the rehabilitation of soldiers. But how many of us have thought of all the soldiers, the men and women, who are injured in industry? And how many of us have come up right against it? A year ago I went into a meeting and I heard the girls—a union meeting, of course—and I heard the girls belonging to that trade-union talking about a little girl who had just come in

from New Jersey because there was no work in New Jersey; and she had taken herself over to New York. She was a hat trimmer, trimming men's hats. She had been in the district about a month, and she pricked her finger, and the dust got into her finger. It was August, and you know youth. She wanted to make money; she was a pieceworker. She did not think about washing her hands. We go on, you know, we are so careless about these everyday things that happen to us. She went on with her work and next morning her finger began to swell. She went to a doctor and he could not quite make out what it was but ordered her to a hospital. To make a long story short, that girl had blood poisoning which partly paralyzed her arm and her leg. She has been in a plaster of paris cast for over a year. That girl has not a soul to help her but her sister 18 months older than she is, but the girls saw to it that she did not want. That girl will probably not be able to follow her own trade. If she is, it will be many, many a year to come. She has to be taught a new trade. She is only 19 years old. She is at the beginning of life. And where would she be, friends, if it had not been for the workmen's compensation law, and thank God, if it had to happen, it happened in New York where New York compensation laws are much better than they are in the State of New Jersey. She will get now, I believe, either \$15 or \$16 a week as long as she is disabled.

And while we are thinking of these laws, and as we go home talking legislation, let us think of this; the workers of industry who are maimed day after day, let us help them to get back into industry and to be made useful citizens again.

The trade-union movement has come to stay whether we like it or not. I am proud and happy to have been able to help to bring together employer and employee where we might sit around the table discussing our labor problems, the price to be paid, and it is only in that way that the difficulties in industry are going to be settled, so that there will be fewer strikes. We do not believe in strikes if we can help it, but we do insist on the right to strike if needs be, and no manufacturer who is honest need be afraid of organized labor when he understands it. It is only because some of you do not understand it that you disagree with us. We are not trying to tear down things. We are not saying that people should not have comfort and pleasures and beautiful things. No! The only thing that we are saying and trying to bring about is a condition where all of us might enjoy them and not some have it all, and those of us who create the beautiful things of life often have so little of them. I, as a trade-unionist and a member of organized labor, have no apology to make to anybody. Organized labor has come to stay. It is going on and

on, and any one who does not know anything about it or understand it is behind the times. I thank you.

Miss ANDERSON. The next speaker on the program is one who is connected with industry, not as a trade-union organizer, but who is in the mutual service division of the Diamond Chain & Manufacturing Co., of Indianapolis, Ind. She, too, has had practical experience with the women workers and other workers in industry, and men as well; and I take great pleasure in introducing to you Merica Hoagland, the director of the mutual service division, Diamond Chain & Manufacturing Co., of Indianapolis.

LABOR LEGISLATION FOR WOMEN.

Miss MERICA EVANS HOAGLAND, Mutual Service Director, Diamond Chain & Manufacturing Co., Indianapolis, Ind.

The condition of some eight and a half million adult women in business, in professions, and in industry is the concern of this women-in-industry conference called by the Women's Bureau of the United States Department of Labor.

To American women, through the passage of the nineteenth amendment of the United States Constitution, have been granted the rights of citizenship. The possession of some of these rights as regards their use are matters of interpretation to many prejudiced men and also to a number of indifferent women. Citizenship for women is now in process of interpretation, appropriation, and assimilation. It may be a decade before it is actually merged into our body politic. Infinite patience and adaptability are most desirable qualities in this transition period through which women as citizens are passing.

As an individual, descended from pioneers in the Ohio Valley States, I have inherited with my recently acquired citizenship rights, a freedom of contract guaranteed me by the Ordinance of 1787. I would not now willingly surrender for womenkind that priceless liberty so safeguarded by our courageous and wise forefathers and their equally wise descendents among the lawmakers of Indiana.

Being a member of an industrial organization the owners and management of which willingly accord to the employed groups associated with them the right of self-expression, my ideas and ideals have become interwoven with their square-dealing policies. I would not wish to disturb these by arbitrary legislative limitations.

Through the series of studies of women in industry being made by a State federation of business and professional women, of which I am a member, the conviction is growing stronger and stronger that regulation through the cooperation of owners, managers, and those employed is far preferable to the proposed protective legislation, imposed without the consent of the majority of those affected by it

and executed by tax-supported more or less autocratic bureaus or commissions.

Facts presented at Chicago prove that these bureaus and commissions are still in the experimental stage.

Child labor should cease to exist. Even the best of stores and factories are undesirable places in which to train immature "children" or "young persons" for citizenship. Their health and happiness is in constant jeopardy. However, part-time employment, with vocational training, for healthy young persons should replace the enforced idleness imposed upon many of our young people to-day.

While it seems to some of us undesirable to repeal at one fell swoop the protective legislation enacted for women in the past, it appears not only desirable but quite necessary that henceforth labor legislation shall be equally applicable to adult men and women, to whom equal economic opportunity shall be one of the achievements of the near future when the repeal of discriminatory laws shall have gradually been accomplished, as better methods of regulation gain acceptance.

The following comment was made by a graduate engineer, a member of the Rainbow Division of the World War, in answer to my inquiry as to what he thought of protective legislation:

Women, after an age-long fight for commercial and political equality, have finally won their battle in all progressive democracies. Men have yielded to the patent justice of their struggle and have granted them full political equality and equal industrial opportunity.

That women do not now occupy half of the high places in commerce and industry must be laid to the fact that they are beginners and must overcome the logical handicap that men by virtue of their long occupancy in controlling positions have placed between themselves and women.

Why, then, should women, having won this place in a man's world, deny their whole philosophy of thought by demanding protective legislation?

To a man it seems like just another feminine inconsistency for women (after reaching the goal of their fight for equality) to demand, so to speak, a protective tariff in what they have signified should be an open, competitive field.

Such a course casts a cloud upon the logic of their position and the equity of the decision found in their favor.

Full credit may be given those organizations or individuals who possibly with the most sincere and earnest purpose in the past have sought to remedy ills, real or fancied, through the passage of drastic protective laws. Sometimes this protective legislation may have been made necessary by the ill-advised, often inhuman, practices of some benighted employers. But there is an apparent weakness in the persistence and in the modifications with which such protective legislative programs are being continued. I refer to the minimum wage law which the Consumers' League is still advocating and the exemptions being proposed in Indiana and possibly in other States

where limitation of hours legislation is proposed. Exceptions are being made for certain classes of influential business and professional women, many of whom feel keenly the injustice thus being imposed upon women in industry. These business and professional women of Indiana will oppose the passage of discriminatory legislation in which in proposed laws, under the guise of health, the police powers of the State are being invoked.

As to the minimum wage law declared unconstitutional in the District of Columbia, surely the efforts of women could be better directed than in such channels. Hobble legislation is even less desirable than hobble skirts, because it is more difficult to break the hobble in it. It is just as much out of style in this democratic Republic of ours.

At the beginning of this new year we should realize that there is an ever-increasing number of progressive employers maintaining well-organized systems of scientific management, including personnel administration, shorn of the undesirable paternalistic welfare features incidental to the 1914-1918 period of development. Scientific management necessarily carries with it personnel departments.

Engineering skill is designing and installing improved machinery more and more to take the burden from human backs, to turn out greater quantities of goods at less cost, with fewer persons employed on each job, and these earning higher wages. The returning demand for products soon should supply employment for the extra labor thus released by these improvements in machinery and management.

It is a poorly organized industry indeed that will not voluntarily install sufficient rest periods during each working day to offset the monotony of highly specialized work or to so regulate the speeding-up process as to give due consideration for human conservation which calls for seats for persons wherever and whenever they are needed.

Improved compensation laws have also been accompanied by first-aid or dispensary departments being installed in stores and factories.

These improvements are permanent and likely to increase by their own momentum. Some assurance of this lies in the number of employers, engineers, and personnel-research associations bound together by common interests to maintain human engineering on high levels. Human hatred is destructive in its influence and should be replaced by constructive thinking.

I might call your attention to the situation which arises in the case of women who work eight hours in a plant which normally operates nine hours. In a great majority of industries women operate very expensive machines and must be provided with men assistants to include material handlers, expert mechanics for the adjustment of machines, accompanied, of course, by more or less high-salaried supervising executives. In case the women cease to work after eight hours, all of the overhead charges which would normally be applied to the

ninth hour must of course be distributed over the eight hours actually worked. This increases the overhead by $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent, and in such an installation as I describe the overhead is usually at least double the amount of the wage paid to the women.

It is also usually true that other departments, although using only men employees, are dependent upon the product of the women's departments for the supply of materials used in production. This means that if the men's departments are to continue on a longer schedule than the women's an additional amount of machine equipment must be placed in the women's departments to furnish enough product for the other departments to operate continuously. With the third serious objection that the commotion caused by an early departure or the late entry, as the case might be, of women workers in a shop employing both kinds of help would cause considerable interruption and lack of efficiency in the men's departments, you will see that it would be practically impossible to employ women in any manufacturing establishment where the numbers of male and female workers were somewhat equally divided.

The above statements made by a progressive employer, a graduate engineer, probably express the views of many other employers of men and women whose continuous work is interdependent.

In view of the tendencies of to-day, it seems more than futile to ask for a continuance of protection, which, in our future struggle for the economic equality of men and women, would prove a handicap indeed. Sex cleavage at this juncture appears to be suicidal.

Protective legislation of the past is the scaffolding upon which our women workers have stood while their industrial structure has been building. With hundreds of occupations open to them, with ballots in hand, the time is fully ripe when those on the scaffolds shall scrap them and step within the inclosures and begin to discuss with their employers, with their men and women associates, and in their communities the economic and social problems in whose solution they themselves should have no small part. In fact, the stand that many of the most advanced thinkers are taking on this subject calls for the organization of shop groups, clubs, or forums where employed and employer groups in each industry may systematically enter upon the intensive study of their plant problems and freely discuss them. The responsibility for pursuing such social and economic discussions at stated intervals should be placed upon the personnel management of each going concern.

Some 30 years ago the women of this country banded themselves in clubs and entered upon general cultural discussions which were the talk of the town and country. Treated lightly at first as fads, these clubs became substantial facts and units of usefulness throughout our broad land. Gradually the general culture programs were reduced to admit the discussion of social and economic subjects, village improvements, public libraries, and like subjects. These soon led the women into legislative halls, and there they obtained much of that training necessary to secure for themselves the elective franchise

which had been bequeathed by the pioneers in the suffrage movement and also enabled them to acquire some knowledge of legislative procedure.

In due process of time, when the business and professional women organized themselves into a federation, to their credit may it be said that the conditions of women in business, in professions, and in industry became one of their chief concerns, and they have already begun to discuss with those whose interests are involved their business, economic, and social problems.

Possibly the trade-union and other union labor organizations may not look with favor upon these department-store or shop forums, but I am frank to say to the unorganized working women of America that in gaining this new liberty of ours I see no advantage in claiming an inheritance of industrial warfare nor any future security in assuming the shackles of strikes. Public interests also demand their cessation. Let not the paid walking delegate of any union, the paid welfare worker of any league, or even the paid directors of women's bureaus despair of their jobs, for at best we can not hope to accomplish in record time our great objective. In reaching it there will be many attractive careers open to earnest women in several lines of personnel administration, including positions as employment and record supervisors, mutual service directors, nurses, dieticians, and research analysts.

Since labor legislation for women is thus presented as highly undesirable, let us glance at the kinds of labor legislation that we may agree is desirable for adult persons. They may include better physical surroundings in well lighted, heated, and ventilated buildings, with proper maintenance of machines and safety appliances; personal hygiene and prevention of health hazards; compensation extensions; vocational training, information, guidance, and placement; better housing and transportation; reduction of seasonal unemployment; adoption of work standards and uniform employment records, properly checked to reduce causes of labor turnover.

Any comprehensive study of labor conditions should include the physical surroundings of places where people work; the physiological, individual adjustments to secure a more comprehensive health development; the sociological status of human relationships to homes and communities; improved cost-accounting systems to determine accurately and fairly when progress has been made by various groups of employers and employees so that investment may be made secure, wages and promotions may be awarded, thus eliminating economic wastes; and psychological measurements made of performance standards, which should be recorded, charted, and conclusions duly drawn.

The placement of machinery and equipment with reference to light, heat, ventilation, routing of work, and materials is essential. Anticipation of possible breakdowns in equipment or machinery is necessary. Joy in one's work when a machine is in good condition is soon dispelled when a worn-out machine gets out of order and drives an operator into an irritated state, when accidents are more likely to occur. If women were ever justified in using profanity these are the occasions to provoke it. Prompt delivery of goods in stores, supplies in offices, schools, and hospitals, and parts in factories should insure better service on the part of the worker, who in turn should also be held responsible for elimination of lost time due to careless handling of goods or equipment.

When we uncover the root causes of subnormal health in any establishment or group of workers we will be better able to make constructive recommendations regarding restoration methods to be followed.

Business and industrial surgical practice is now invoked to a marked degree to secure a more comprehensive health development among workers. Human relationships to machinery, to commercial life, to home life, and to public health are in need of constant adjustments.

The introduction of a system of periodic medical examinations for all employed persons is strongly urged. It has been proved that such systems are an undoubted aid in reducing health hazards and consequent loss of time and happiness.

Workers as citizens of a community, commonwealth, and country have certain inherent rights, with corresponding duties, conferred upon them by legal constitutions and charters. To interpret these rights in terms of present-day living is the province of social science or sociology. They include home conditions, communities, opportunity for saving, for recreation, and fellowship in churches, clubs, lodges; also education, prohibition, and health.

Where and how people live can not but affect their contentment and usefulness.

Wages should be determined by production and sales standards, accurately measured by the average week's performance and its relation to a fair and just division of financial returns distributed as follows:

(a) To those who invest capital and scientific management in a business or manufactory.

(b) To groups of employed persons upon whose invested qualifications, health, and labor they and those to whose support they contribute must depend.

(c) To the buying public or the consumers whose self-preservation and interests demand that they should be able to purchase useful

commodities at fair prices based upon just returns to invested earnings of employer and employed groups of persons.

When uniform, generally accepted cost-accounting systems are adopted we may hope to measure progress and improvement in work and workers, to exercise more control of production, and to judge more accurately what is fair in the matter of wages, hours, etc. We must accept the fact that no policy can be soundly based which ignores economic principles.

What quantity does a worker produce in a week's time?

What is the market value of the above service or production?

What is a fair profit to the owner or employer?

What is a fair financial return to the worker for the labor performed?

Is an honest price made to jobbers and to ultimate consumers?

These are questions which only cost accounting can accurately answer.

I hope that what I have said may be of value in placing greater stress upon the urgent need of various employed and employer groups meeting to discuss their social and economic problems to the end that personnel administration shall more and more be submitted for labor legislation which when enacted should be in the interests of adult persons as workers rather than a continuance of "protective" or class legislation for women that does not also include men.

MISS ANDERSON. I see that Congressman Beck has entered the hall, and I am going to ask Miss Copp to bring him onto the platform—Congressman Beck, from Wisconsin. We are very glad indeed to have him in our midst, and I am asking him to say a few words to us.

HON. J. D. BECK, Member of Congress from Wisconsin. I am not going to get into any argument with you people, because I know better than to do that; and I don't believe I will tell you anything about myself! I might say, however, that I have had the opportunity in my life to support all the legislation that has been mentioned to you this morning, and I am wondering whether, after we get perfect child labor laws, perfect laws regarding women in industry, sanitation, and all that, whether the struggle won't go on just the same almost as if we didn't have them? I have had a little experience in enforcing labor legislation and in enforcing the child labor law in particular. I have had occasion to wonder a great many times whether we weren't almost taking the bread and butter out of the mouth of the child and the parent by refusing a permit to work. And the same is true in the case of women. So what little experience I have had has led me also to wonder. Now, I will precede that statement with another. I think that child labor legislation such as has been advocated, and women's hours of labor, and laws relating to women in industry are an absolute necessity. But I came here from

a State which I think has taken advanced ground in all this kind of legislation, a State where I had assisted in getting through a law giving women equal rights with men, because I thought they wanted them, and I did what I could to help get them. But when I came down here I happened to say that I was in favor of that, and the first thing you know a little woman that I have a very high regard for—have known her for a number of years, known of her earnestness and work for women—jumped upon me with both feet. So I don't know whether I am for that law now or not. But all of our child labor legislation in the State where I live, all the legislation we have for the benefit of women, has been enacted from the point of view that those pieces of legislation are necessary for the protection of the human race, and not because they are enacted for the benefit particularly of women. We have enacted them because we know that if the human race is to exist, that if our labor and our capital are to continue in this country, we have got to protect the women and children of the United States. So we did not look at these laws as any special legislation in the interest of women, and I am sure that our courts will hold that they are not, and will hold that they are still on the statute books of the State of Wisconsin. But as I said, I was jumped upon for saying that when I first came here, so I don't know whether I am for that law or not.

Now, there are a great many things that I would like to say to you, but I am a little afraid to, particularly because of that, and partly because every Congressman over on the hill got a document the other day which said that the leading spirits in this movement were anarchists and communists, and, of course, I don't know what to say to a bunch of people like that.

You know I am a farmer. I will tell you that much about myself. I am just a farmer, and we had a farmers' conference here in Washington a year ago. Now, nobody called us a lot of Bolshevists and Socialists and reds and radicals. We took care that that wouldn't be done. We saw to it that no farmers attended that conference. We had bankers, and we had merchants and manufacturers, and all that kind of thing. And about 10 people out of the 1,000 who were present ventured so far as to call themselves farmers, but even they weren't really farmers! Now, we avoided all of that. So I think this conference should have been composed of some of the owners of the cotton mills in the South, and a few owners of paper mills, and the like of that, where children and women work. If they had come here in the interests of the women and children, you wouldn't have been called Bolshevists and anarchists.

But up in Wisconsin we have got used to that. Whenever we want to start out in Wisconsin to put something across, we do something

to get all the papers in Wisconsin to holler "Bolshevist" and "Red" and "Socialist" and "Communist" and then we are sure we are making progress. And so we have got used to that there. But I fear the folks here haven't gotten used to that, because I know some good people in Washington have really shivered because of the people supposed to come to this conference. And now you have to help them likewise to get used to this thing.

To me, the struggle is on the part of those who produce the wealth of this country to get a little greater share of that wealth to do with as they please, instead of allowing it to pass on to those for whom they produce the wealth to do with as they please. Why, during the war, do you know that some of these "thousand per cent patriots" who made use of the term "Bolshevist" and "Socialist" freely, whenever they got ready to take a million or a billion out of the workers of this country, used those terms and applied them to the people, and then proceeded to take the million or the billion, whichever they happened to want; and they did that thing to the extent of taking \$38,000,000,000 out of the producers of wealth in this country during the war. Now, you haven't any more idea of what \$38,000,000,000 means than I had. But I want to give you just a little idea. Suppose a thousand of you able-bodied women had been created on the day that Adam and Eve were created in the Garden of Eden, and had started work at \$5 a day, and suppose that it cost you nothing for food or clothing or anything else, but that you were able to lay up all that sum of money—\$5 a day. You would not only have had to work every day, Sundays and all, winter and summer, rain and shine, from that day to this, but you would yet have nearly 15,000 years to work before you could lay up that huge sum. Now, that is equal to \$600 a year for every producer of wealth in this country, and the members of his family, or about \$3,000 per family. That's what the struggle is for, and it never will be over until that battle is won, and whenever the members of each family in the city or anywhere else get the \$3,000 that they are entitled to, that they have produced, we won't be talking so much about child labor, or women's hours of labor, because they will do a pretty good job taking care of themselves. But we need these laws just the same; and we need more. We need a condition in this country so that the producers of wealth can get the things they are actually entitled to. I thank you.

Mrs. FLORENCE KELLEY. May I correct one incorrect statement in which my name was used?

Miss ANDERSON. The meeting is open for discussion, Mrs. Kelley. Go right ahead.

Mrs. KELLEY. I was astonished when we heard Miss Hoagland saying that I said that "inspection does not inspect." The proudest

recollection of my life is the recollection of the four years when I was the responsible head of the inspection of industry in the State of Illinois. I do not know what happened before or since, or elsewhere, but I know that during those four years in that place inspection inspected! And I believe that, in general, factory inspection and mercantile inspection are immeasurably useful in this country and indispensably necessary, so long as we have competitive industry. But what I said was—and I said it because I have learned from about 25 years of close observation that this is true—what I said was that it is impossible to keep the system of work done by mothers and children in the homes, and to diminish the evils of that evil system by inspection. The remedy is inadequate to that particular evil.

And may I also call attention to another inaccuracy which is of very great importance, because confusion on this subject is of growing importance in this day? The same speaker cited the majority opinion in the recent decision here in the District of Columbia on the District of Columbia minimum wage law, without pointing out that this is the decision of a local subordinate Federal court. It is not the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States to which this opinion has been appealed. We have reason to hope and believe that that case may be reached next May by the Supreme Court of the United States, and until that is done, the citation of the hostile decision should always be accompanied by the statement that this is the decision of a divided subordinate local Federal court.

MISS BRECKINRIDGE. I want to, if I may, say one word in correction of a statement with reference to the connection between civil rights and political rights. It is a source of great confusion to combine these two. Women had civil rights, the right of freedom of contract, long before they got the political rights under the amendment to the United States Constitution.

May I also say that I agree thoroughly with Miss Hoagland in the importance of keeping up to date in the matters that are before us. I heard a lawyer—a very distinguished constitutional lawyer—say about a week ago that about 15 years ago he came to the doctrine of freedom of contract as applied to labor legislation in connection with women, and after about 25 years of judicial recognition, he said it would be decided to be an impossible judicial principle. It is inconsistent and can not endure. There may be courts which will recognize it for 25 years, but no longer than that can so unsound a principle exist. He said, “A week ago, in view of the decisions for the past 15 years, I saw that I was overgenerous and not sufficiently respectful to the judicial mind.” He said, however, there will be exceptions in the profession, and judges, like others, will be unequal in their ability to follow the better law. The thought of the inferior

Court of Appeals in the District of Columbia is an illustration of the way in which the lower courts are holding the law. It is contrary to all of the authority of the State courts and contrary to the opinion of the United States Supreme Court. Therefore it is most important that we should keep track of this better thought of the judicial mind. On that point Miss Hoagland, I am sure, will be very glad to inform herself.

In 1895 a benighted court of Illinois defeated this principle of freedom of contract, and that has been considered as important from that day to this.

Miss LUCY R. MASON, representing the committee on women in industry of the League of Women Voters of Virginia. I am glad that the speakers who sometimes represent opposing views to those held by the majority of the audience are temperate in expression and have been received fairly by the audience. I think we have proved that women can be fair in discussion. Speaking of legislation, I believe the women voters have gone on record as favoring protective legislation for women. May I remind you first of all that every employer who has himself become sufficiently enlightened to put the best standards in his factory not only is serving his own employees but is serving the community, and is raising the standard for every competing employer in that city.

Now, some say the good employer can not compete with others. The best factory in Richmond raised the level of factory life in that community and put our factory women on a higher basis. Always it has paid economically, and has paid for the community. Now, every employer can not see it; every employer won't see it. They will go on with their stupidity.

Miss Hoagland said just now that the individual is for the State. I want to know what the State is. Is it for the individual or not? The State should be for the individual also as well as the individual for the State. Should not the State represent the best thought of the community and bring up the employer to the highest standards?

Miss Hoagland spoke of efficiency standards. We do believe in them absolutely, in the highest efficiency standards for the worker and for the machine. But do you know that always the lower efficiency standards are in the 9 and 10 hour plants? A State law frequently compels an employer to put his firm on the wisest economic basis so he may accomplish in the hours given him the work that must be done. It has happened again and again that we do not find that the States with the shorter hours are losing their manufactories. I live in the South, and I know conditions there, and I want to call attention to our little pamphlet "Women in Industry." This pamphlet will show why. We do plead that when a man is not progres-

sive enough to see the highest standard that the community shall take hold and bring him up to the highest standard.

Mr. Cheney was speaking yesterday of the task system rather than hours of service. It would be difficult to do this in our manufacturing industry in the South. It almost has to be a time limit with us.

Mr. Cheney also said that in most industries the longer a worker is with a firm the more valuable he is to the firm. In our work it is not true. The 16-year-old girl is more capable of earning her salary than a woman of 30. When our girls reach 32 or 33, they are going down hill rather than up. The average age of woman in industry is between 16 and 25. They are nothing but children, and we professional women and college women speak of equal rights and equal opportunity, and we know it is absolute bosh!

We want to ask for opportunity to grow and develop. You know the types of groups we represent. But, after all, isn't the great contribution we have to make to society something? Let us see God in every human child. Let us put our constructive power, not our sentimentality, but with sentiment and intelligence let us bend our efforts to getting the best we can for each individual. The fact that you and I can come to a common understanding and recognize what the trade-unionists and manufacturers have done in reaching a common understanding, shows that we can do this thing. Let us go back to our homes determined to work for protective legislation for those not able to protect themselves.

Mrs. ROBERT W. BRUERE, industrial editor of the Survey. I come to the conference with one interesting statistic; and I want to say that I was not choked off by child labor or anything else in my education, so that this statistic is probably reliable. We do not, any of us, want women or anyone else to work more than 60 hours, to work for less than a living wage, or in insanitary conditions, or to work without compensation for injury. The only question in the matter of this legislation for women is how we shall get these things, whether they shall be given to women, or whether women shall get them for themselves. That seems to be the only question that is up in these matters. If women are to get these things for themselves they must get them in groups. What we have got in the way of industrial legislation has been so secured.

But there is also a group that says that only women who actually work in industry shall get them for themselves. I suppose the difference is psychological. With the best statistics I could get from the Government departments and trade-union organizations as to the increase of organized women, it appears that if they go into industry at the rate they are going now, and if the organizations of women in industry increase as they are increasing now, they will be in a position to enact such legislation as they choose in 127

years 2 months and 8 days! Now it's been a little while since I have been working in geometrical progression, and I am willing to throw off the 2 months and 8 days and leave it 127 years! And the question I want to put to this conference is whether we can wait, as society, for 127 years for women to have a living wage, to have their hours regulated to what it is wise for them to have, and the other things which the law can give them and which they can get through the law.

MISS HENRIETTA ROELOFS, representing the National Y. W. C. A. I suppose a majority of us have come here to find a sense of direction for our program for the ensuing year, especially our legislative program, and I have tried to listen to each address with an open mind, and not come to any conclusion until all the addresses were finished. They are now finished, and I find this, that we are talking usually about two things—a future goal and an immediate program of activities.

I could agree with almost everything that the people said about the future, because most of them prefaced it by saying they were not quite sure they were on the right track but they knew they were going toward the goal of humanizing industry. Now I am going toward that goal, too. We are going to try to find the principles on which industry should be based. But my sense of exploration for those future principles does not deter me from the immediate human problem of meeting the immediate human situations as they are to-day.

As we sit here, my program, as I see it, would be of a twofold nature. I would work at once for the human problem which can be better solved by protective legislation for women. But it does not prevent me from thinking that perhaps it is temporary, and perhaps after a number of years we won't have to work for that. We will work because of our knowledge of science, our knowledge which has been gained through all of the engineers, scientific experts, research experts, and the rest. Perhaps we will have gained that which will make it not absolutely necessary to work for protective legislation. At that time we can work for women as human beings entirely and perhaps not as women.

Nor will we always treat men and women the same. The problems are one fundamentally. But I think that the test of our sincerity in working for the ultimate goal is met by our willingness to meet the human problems day by day.

The National Young Women's Christian Association believes in protective legislation to-day. Perhaps it won't always. It does to-day. It will for two years between our conventions, and we are going to put all our efforts in the immediate problem which lies before us of trying to get better laws and conditions for women and

children. At the same time we are not forgetting to study. That is why we are glad to be here to meet other groups. We hope the Department of Labor will continue its research, and that every organization will study with an open mind, and perhaps we will find principles so that we can understand better what we ought to do. And, as I say, the Y. W. C. A. is going to work for this to-day, and the test of our sincerity is the effort and the power we are going to put in these human problems which we know are before us because of the situation that exists to-day.

Mrs. LOUIS N. GELDERT, representing the League of American Pen Women. There is one point in the industrial life I would like to touch. I agree with Miss Lathrop when she says that the principal unit of our national life is the family. I agree that where men and women both work in industry the man should shoulder an equal part of the housework. I believe that the married woman has a right to industry, but I believe that the child-bearing woman should be kept out of industry wherever it is possible; that it is the part of the employer-manager to examine into home conditions, and where there are little children at home and a husband also employed, where it is possible, this child-bearing woman should be kept out of the factory. The most generous of the factory regulations allow a woman six weeks or a month before the child is born and perhaps six weeks afterwards. From being the mother of six children, I know that a 6-weeks-old child should not be left to the care of strangers, and we believe that this is the first point where the child-welfare question should be approached, and we also know that where the home life of the industrial worker is raised the industrial life is going also to be raised.

Mrs. L. A. BEEBE, representing the Industrial Commission of California and the California Federation of Women's Clubs. There are one or two points I would like to answer in Miss Hoagland's talk. First of all, I would like to say that in California we would like to raise the standard of all women's work to that of men's work.

Also one little remark on the equality of opportunity: Recently in the inspection which I made in connection with my work I visited a new factory that had moved to California from Kansas. Knowing that California had higher standards and higher wages than Kansas, they still brought their work to the coast. They brought a woman with them who had been in their employ 35 years. Most factories do that, bring some head woman or women with them to start the new work. That woman had never received more than \$12 a week, and in California, because we had a \$16 law, they gave her \$17 a week to establish that factory! That is the equality of opportunity for women and men! The effect of protective legislation in California has been that it has been very satisfactory not only to many,

many of the workers, probably all of them, but to many, many of the manufacturers and also of the chambers of commerce and to the various mercantile groups.

Two years ago, when there was a movement on foot in our legislature to throttle our department, the chambers of commerce and the manufacturers' associations throughout the State came to our rescue, saying that we had raised industry to so high a plane that they were able to meet competition in many ways they had not been able to do, because it did away with the unfair employer of labor.

In the year 1921, the labor statistics presented to our legislature show that during the years 1919 and 1920 in California there was practically no increase in men's wages throughout the entire State. The increases probably all came previous to the armistice, in November, 1918. During 1919 and 1920 prices increased, and in 1920, you know, they had reached practically the peak of the high prices. It was in 1919 that the Industrial Welfare Board of California established the minimum wage, and in 1920 they raised it to \$16, to meet living conditions. It did not result in any appreciable decrease in the employment of women. Every one suffered in the winter of 1921 and 1922 in unemployment, and yet, through the advertisements of our big industrial organizations and chambers of commerce, they claimed that California was one of the white spots of the United States, with the lowest percentage of unemployment and of unemployed women. It was then that our commission did lower the minimum wage one dollar; and later on, because of a technical error, new hearings were called, and the minimum wage was again sustained at \$16. But we have had the support of various groups of organized manufacturers, organized mercantile men, and can work in cooperation with those groups without antagonism; and I know they do not feel that the restrictive legislation in California has injured their industries, as attested by the fact of the many eastern concerns that have come to establish their plants in southern California, regardless of our 8-hour day, of our \$16 minimum wage, and no night work, and many of the other restrictions that we have, and which have been talked of this morning.

MISS ANNA NEARY, representing the American Federation of Labor. I, too, want to emphasize one point brought out in this splendid, beneficial conference; and I am sure that there is not anybody here that has not been impressed with every address that has been made.

Regardless of whether we are entirely in accord with the views expressed, we certainly have learned something by hearing the other fellow's point of view. I was impressed particularly with the last speaker, who stood so forcibly for individual contracts. I was wondering if those who have been in employment service, and who

have been at the head of large establishments where numbers of women are employed whose main job has been the uplift and the betterment of the girl—if they are not fair enough to admit that the one big job for them is to prevent organization of the women in those respective establishments. If individual contracts should be upheld, and stood for as a constitutional right, isn't also the right of association with our fellow workers a constitutional right that should be upheld?

What do we mean by organization? Does not every individual here represent some organization? Could we be here if we did not represent an organization? Is there any woman who can leave here without feeling that her organization is going to be benefited by her coming here? And if that is true, is not the organization of the working girl, too, worth while, where she, too, may have a say? We are here speaking of the working girl who has no say. We have not heard from her. We have heard the people in charge of the mill just the same as we have our forewomen or the superintendent speak for us. But where we have the girl permitted to organize and speak and protest for herself, isn't then her statement and her idea the real idea of the whole situation worth hearing, and worth considering?

I do hope that when future conferences of this kind are held that we will have more women who have been given the opportunity to organize. What we need is to have more women—industrial women—organized at this particular time. Will you not demand that no matter how efficient, no matter on how high a standard are the conditions under which the girl works, or how valuable she may be to any establishment, should she be so unfortunate as to conceive the idea that organization of her fellow workers may be worth while, that she is not ousted immediately from the establishment. Now, these are the things we must consider, and I am pleased that we have been able to get together and exchange ideas and hear all sorts of views from all sections of the country, and I think it is going to occur again.

I have profited, and I am glad to have this opportunity, Madam Chairman, to bring my point of view before the women who represent so many different organizations that we feel that the organization of the working women into organizations of their particular industry and crafts is just as valuable as the organizations they may represent.

MISS ANDERSON. The hour of adjournment is here, and so many of the delegates represented are asking for the floor that it seems to me that we ought to continue this discussion this afternoon.

MISS MARY McDOWELL. Are we not going to hear Miss Gilson's reply to some of the statements that have been made here?

MISS ANDERSON. We will hear Miss Gilson this afternoon. Indeed, we do want to hear her.

(Whereupon an adjournment was taken until 2 o'clock p. m.)

SATURDAY, JANUARY 13.—AFTERNOON SESSION.

MISS ANDERSON. You will see that I am using another gavel at this time, and I am going to ask Mrs. Taylor to explain why.

Mrs. C. F. TAYLOR, representing the Daughters of 1812 of North Carolina. I have something else that I want to give to Miss Anderson. The gavel which Miss Anderson uses at this time is made from a piece of the victory arch which was erected at the time of the conference for the Limitation of Armaments and which was first illuminated on the night of November 11, 1921, in honor of our unknown soldier, and it gives me great pleasure to present it to Miss Anderson at this time to use at the closing session of our first woman's industrial conference ever called, so far as we know. This is a piece of one of the victory jewels from the jeweled arch which was erected at that time. I was present for two or three days during the time when the jewels were being taken down, and, of course, always a few were dropped and broken, so I have several pieces. I am going to give this also to Miss Anderson, characteristic of her personally, because I think in Miss Anderson we have a jewel. I would also like you to know that it comes from the State president of the United States Daughters of 1812 of North Carolina.

MISS ANDERSON. I am particularly pleased to receive this gift in behalf of the Women's Bureau. It is with great pleasure that we come into so close a connection with that great honored conference that was held in Washington. That was a wonderful time. It was a history-making episode, and for that reason I am particularly pleased that this conference is tied up with that event. I think that we as women are looking forward to the time when our civilization will be so organized that we need not go to war for settling our disputes with other nations; that we will do what a great many countries are doing at this time. I can not refrain from speaking of that wonderful monument that is standing on Seventeenth Street just across from where this jeweled arch was, the Pan American Building. Perhaps some of you do not know the origin of this building. It is the building where the South American Nations, with the United States, meet and settle their disputes in conference around the table. By following this method Doctor Rowe, the director general of the Pan American Union, says many disputes between the United States and South American countries and between South American countries have been settled amicably. Now, we hope that that system eventually will be extended the world over. I am particularly

pleased, Mrs. Taylor, with your gift, and I thank you and your organization with all my heart.

Who was on the floor last when we stopped this morning? Mrs. Cox, I think, was the first, and then there was some lady in front; but if they are not present, we will hear from Miss Gilson now. Won't you come forward, Miss Gilson, so the stenographer can hear?

MISS MARY GILSON. Just before luncheon I was about to approach the question which Miss Neary brought up in the spirit of debate. Now, since I have had my luncheon, I hope I can approach it in the way of discussion. All I have to do is to present a viewpoint. Miss Neary asked a question, and I thank her for asking it, because I know it is in the minds of many of you here to-day. I am also glad that Miss Neary expressed it in the form of a question.

One thing we must all learn, and that is that we must discriminate between good and bad. I have heard so many generalizations in all these years on the part of employers and employees that I am beginning to think that we can not get anywhere unless we learn to deal with individual cases and not with generalizations. I have heard employers say, "All right, give workers this; they do so and so. They will get by with anything they can." I have heard workers say, "All employers are a rotten lot!" So much depends upon our individual experience. I do not blame many workers for talking as they do about employers. I know many firms, because my experience has not been limited to my 10 years' experience in Cleveland. In fact, some years ago, when I was vocational councilor in Boston, I was told I should not be so much interested as I was in a certain situation in a large carpet mill near there. I used to stand on Boston Common and I have heard certain employers pointed out derisively by the workers; and I do not blame many labor leaders nor workers for using the terms they do when they have had the kind of experiences they have had in many organizations of this country. But I do want you to keep in mind this fact, that we must not think in terms of stereotyped phrases, and we must not think in terms of generalizations. We must not think of the unwise employment manager, but we must remember that there are managers in this country who claim to be independent figures. I know there are many managers who are not mere puppets. I know that I am not, and I do not like to be accused of being one.

What Miss Neary said is absolutely true as to organization of the workers who have experience as to group representation. I have no patience with the old theory that some of us held years ago that individual contract was sufficient. It is not. And there is leadership involved. There is a growing sense of contact with your fellowmen that is necessary if we are to get anywhere.

I maintain that there are different forms of organizations. I do not believe all the shop councils and shop units which have been installed in the various plants in this country have been put in with the idea of fighting unionism. I think that some have been installed with honest motives. Gradually those things have been evolved until the shop councils are now handling important questions of wages, hours, and so on, and we can not afford to make a generalization and say that only the I. W. W. or the American Federation of Labor or any other form of organization is the entire story. It's an experimental world, as I say, and the industrial world is experimental as well as the big world outside. We must be broad and tolerant. We must see that people who are attempting to put things in with honest motives are given credit, and that we are not suspicious.

When you get inside the plant and work shoulder to shoulder with plant executives, you have a great opportunity to work out needed problems of industry. And so I beg of you to keep your eyes and minds open.

I do not believe what Miss Neary argues, and that is that union people are discriminated against in all of our plants. I am afraid they are in many plants. I think there is nothing more rotten—excuse my expression—than for people to be discriminated against because they belong to any sort of an organization, whether it is the Red Cross or the Catholic Church, or whatever it may be. Until that is eliminated from industry we shall have still a great deal of unrest. But there are organizations in this country where there is no discrimination against the union workers. Frankly we do not think at present the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America or the American Federation of Labor or any other organization can handle our internal shop problems so adequately as our present shop counsel can, because we have a very advanced method of management. We feel that the unions have not yet set up an organization to handle work of our kind. There are people who belong to the infant and the high-school grades in industry, but we think we belong to the college class. I thank you.

MISS ANDERSON. Who is the next person desiring to discuss this question?

MISS ROSE SCHNEIDERMAN, representing the Women's Trade Union League of New York. The discussion so far has been very valuable, and I hope that I am going to be able to make one or two points which will contribute to it. I feel, of course, as a trade-unionist, with Miss Scott that the trade-union movement is the best way through which to get shop regulation, because we are there on the spot and are able to enforce it through the solidarity of the people in the shop. But, unfortunately, there are thousands of women out

of trade-unions who have not as yet seen fit to enter them. I hope that some day it will be different. If the mothers of union girls will give them the message that through organization conditions can be made so much better than through individual action, some day in America that condition will be eliminated. But right now if we realize that the great mass of girls leave the factory when they are 25 or 26 years old, that the period of work in industry is short, and that they therefore do not see the need of bothering with organization, we have got to come to one conclusion, and that is that we have somehow got to get for that girl or that young woman the standards of work, wages, and hours which will not hamper her after life either as wife or mother. Somehow society, or, if you please, the community—our Governor of New York who has just gone into power makes this suggestion: The State is not the forests or the rivers or the lakes, or any of the natural resources of the State, but the people of the State. And so I feel that when we decide that we are going to demand minimum standards of hours and wages that that is a step in the right direction. By no means will a minimum wage come to permit the full expression of life. As I have seen the schedule, the budgets, they designate so many pairs of stockings, a hat, a coat, so many pairs of shoes, etc. And there does come a time when one wants a red dress, like Miss Scott said; but the minimum-wage decisions so far are not so marvelous that we can think that a minimum wage will stop all other aspirations. You needn't fear about that.

As a trade-unionist, I may say we of course stand for the American standard of living—not a minimum standard, but an American standard—which will afford the individual, whether man or woman, the kind of life that will give expression to all her creative or his creative impulses and that will enable the woman to live independently, if you please, from family or relations of any kind if she so chooses. But, as trade-unionists, we have learned to get what we can for the fellow lower down on the ladder and try to raise him up to the fellow who is on top, whom we are pleased to call the man; but I do not think men are on top by any means. If you remember the railroad strike, you will know that the men working on the railroads have not by any means got a living wage—a lot of them—and that women's equality with those men would mean very poor equality indeed. So let's not forget that. But we take legislation, if we can get it. We take an 8-hour day through legislation, if we can get it. So that if any employer who employs 500 girls in New York decides to move out to Oswego, N. Y., a little bit of a town, and in that way escape the standards the union has set, he can not do it, because there is an 8-hour day following him wherever he is going and the people of New York State will say, "You can not pay this girl any less than

so much a week." That is why, as trade-unionists, we believe in legislation, because the standardized industry is a great step.

And even the Joseph & Feiss Co., wonderful as they are, could not possibly do all the wonderful things they are doing if there was not a strong organization in that field which is raising the standards upward. Not that they would not want to do them. They could not, because competition would be so dreadful that they could not possibly do it with other employers not so socially minded.

So you see that after all, bringing standards into industry means a help to every fellow in it, and, therefore, I say here, one must so arrange industry that we take the girl and say, "Now, my daughter, you are not fitted for this job; we will put you in the other shop"; and take the boy and do likewise, thus fitting people for industry. I believe in it. But right now we are thrown into industry pell mell. We might make excellent artists if given a chance, or teachers, or great scholars, or scientists, or any one of many other things. But the first thing we know is that we must help ourselves or help the family, and, therefore, the first thing is to earn \$5, \$10, or \$12 a week, and never mind what we are fitted for. And until that time comes when America and the rest of the world will be so socially minded as to see in its citizens the great resources of the country, we have to have legislation which will safeguard them. We must rely on so-called protective legislation.

I do not call it protective legislation, however. I call it labor legislation. And you know labor legislation is a thing of the present. It has taken hold everywhere. I thank you.

MISS MATILDA F. KOESTER, representing the International Printing Pressmen and Assistants' Union. Ladies, this is my first experience, so please have mercy! I agree with Miss Scott and Miss Hoagland on the practical side and the scientific side. If you get the practical experience, you get near to human nature, which will lead up to wisdom, which will bring you to science, and then you will get the fundamental things which we are looking for.

Now, as far as organization goes, I believe in organization. Of course we are broad minded, for without constructive criticism we can not do anything, and I hope that you will leave destructive criticism outside of that door. We were organized in 1919 in the Government Printing Office and composed of nonunion people and union people. I believe that all nonunion people are running around in a circle. If you are nonunion, you do not know where you are going. But if you have a union you feel that you can go to somebody and speak your grievance to some one who knows all about the subject. I have had foremen and assistant foremen come to me from time to time and say, "Well, what does that woman want, or this

woman?" Now, understand I am under the Government, and lots of you here are in the same position. The Government is something that we can not say anything about, and we can not do what we would like. But we can have a feeling that we are protecting our sisters, and brothers, too.

But I want to give credit where credit is due. Maj. George L. Berry, of Tennessee, told a few of us if we wanted equal wage for equal work we must organize, and by organizing we can demand the salaries on the outside—not demand, but try to work up to it. Of course there are things that we can not get. Well, since organizing—at first, in 1919, we were receiving the lowest scale of wages that anybody could receive for our work—after that we kept going higher and higher until now we almost get the pay equivalent to that on the outside. Hon. George H. Carter believes in equal pay for men and women, for equal work, and God bless him for it, and he is the only one who is authorized to set our salary in the Government Printing Office. We have now made appeal to him, and I believe we are going to be successful.

And I want to say here that Maj. George L. Berry, in Tennessee, works, and has brought the city unto the mountain. Has anybody been down to Rogersville, Tenn.? Then you know that pretty home town there. I was a delegate to a convention there two or three years ago. Our organization sent delegates two years ago, and last year, and everyone who comes back from that place tells us what a beautiful place it is, and how Mr. Berry has brought the city unto the mountain, and how he has brought the moving pictures and the little post office where the country people can come from miles and miles around in the country. And if you could see those poor women and men standing there with eyes open, who never knew what an electric light bulb looked like—well, it was pitiful. And you could not stand there and see those people hanging over the fences with that look as much as to say, "Well, I never knew!" Well, anyway, to make a long story short, I believe in a practical side, and I believe in the scientific side, because by the scientific side we can help the practical side and know how it should work. We can get down to the fundamental things, and straighten out what these girls want, as we have heard it from time to time. In every one of these speeches I have found lots of things that we like, and, as I say, we want to be right minded and understand that constructive criticism. You can give me all you want of destructive criticism. We will put you out the door!

The sanitary condition in the Government Printing Office is 100 per cent, and I hope you can all see the Government Printing Office

and see how we Government people can work. I am sorry I could not tell you more about it.

Mrs. LUELLA COX, of the Industrial Board of Indiana. I think the delegates to this conference were very much gratified to find how nearly Miss Hoagland and Miss Scott agreed on the things which are essential to the welfare of the women wage earners. The difference seems only to be in the way those results shall be attained, and I can clearly see why Miss Hoagland would not agree with Miss Scott as to the best methods of obtaining these results. They differ simply because of their difference in viewpoints, the point from which they view the whole situation of women wage earners. Miss Hoagland presented the facts from the standpoint of an up-to-date employer, and I imagine all the time she was talking she had in her mind much the same thing I have, the plant in which she works. But because Miss Hoagland has given you simply the viewpoint of a forward-looking employer in the State of Indiana I feel that, coming from the same State, the picture of Indiana will not be complete unless I give you a few facts from another side. I regret being forced into this position, and I do not wish to underestimate the good work that is being done by a group of forward-looking employers in the State of Indiana; but because Miss Hoagland has presented that side so ably I am forced into the position of telling you a few things in regard to the employers in Indiana who are not doing so well. But I am doing that with a full sense of the splendid work that is being done by a certain group of employers in the State.

Miss Hoagland spoke of her method of securing the desired results for women, and she spoke of that under the head of cooperation with employers and letting the women, now that they have the vote, work out their own salvation. I wish to speak just on those two points briefly. I believe thoroughly in obtaining results through cooperation with the employers and industrial boards, but since the factory act in Indiana was passed in 1899 I would like to give you briefly what we have been able to accomplish in the State in the matter of wages and in the matter of hours through "cooperation with employers" and through "letting women work out their own salvation."

Miss Hoagland says that inspection does not inspect. I am responsible for the inspection in the State of Indiana, so far as the problems of the women and children are concerned, and I am willing to agree with Miss Hoagland that inspection does not inspect in all instances. I have one woman assistant and part time of another woman, and we recently figured out if we did not stop to sleep or eat we could cover our territory in 15 years. So I agree with Miss Hoagland that, so far as Indiana is concerned, inspection does not

inspect, but it does inspect so far as it goes; and, briefly, I want to give you some studies that have been made by this one woman and the half time of another woman.

First, with regard to wages. The only source of information is from women who are injured in industry and whose wage is computed for the purpose of obtaining compensation. For the group of women in the fiscal year 1920-21 injured in industry and for whom we have wage schedules ranging from \$2 a week to \$70 a week, and that does not include domestic service or farm labor, so there is no group or trade neglected in any of this, the percentages receiving these different wages—I will not read all of them, but a few of the high lights are:

On the basis of these figures which I hold here, 74 per cent of the women in Indiana were receiving less than the minimum wage in California for the same period. The reason I compare the two States is that they rank about the same in the value of their manufactured products. For the fiscal year ended September 30, 1922, the figures are now in the hands of the printer. During this period 81.2 per cent of the women received less than the minimum wage in California. The average wage for the first period of time I am speaking of was \$13.56. Now, that means 50 per cent of the women, of course, were getting less than that; and for the last period, ending September 30, 1922, \$12.88 was the average wage. You see, our average wage is going down. So much for what we have been able to accomplish in the matter of wages "through cooperation" and "letting women work out their own salvation."

I want to tell you just as briefly as I can something about the hours for these same two periods. I have here the report starting in with an 8-hour day—well, with less than eight hours, a very small number; then over eight hours, but not nine, and so on. For the first yearly period of which I speak we find that in 502 plants employing 10,705 women, 13 per cent were on an 8-hour day or less, which would leave 74.6 per cent of our women working over eight hours for the first period of which I speak. For the year just closed we find 14.8 per cent working on an 8-hour day. There's a little increase there.

In the first year there were 26 per cent of the women working on an 8 plus day, for the second year only 8.8 per cent. Skipping over to the 10-hour day we have found for the first year 14 per cent of our women working on a 10-hour day; for the period closing just last September, and I want you to notice this increase, 25 per cent of the women employed—and this includes women in 570 plants, employing 18,574 women—25 per cent of those women were working on a 10-hour day.

In summing up we find that in the first period, 8.3 per cent of our women were working 10 hours a day or more. For the period just closing, that has crept up to 39.9 per cent who are working 10 and more hours a day. For the first period, the longest day was 12 hours. For the period closing September 30, the longest day was 13 plus hours—over 13 hours a day. And this takes no account of overtime, in a State which has no law, and where women may work 24 hours if the Lord gives them strength, in every occupation except manufacturing. They may work 16 hours out of 24 in manufacturing, where there are 185,137 women employed according to the United States census, and perhaps less than—I do not know the number, but a very small number comparatively, probably 150 or 200, it may be more than that; Miss Hoagland can give you the exact figures—are employed in this forward-looking plant. I feel that we can no longer wait for cooperation with employers, with all employers, and to allow these women to work out their own salvation.

The factory act was passed in 1889. We have tried education; we have tried cooperation; we have tried organization; and these are the results after those years of experience and trial. And so I think there is nothing left until we get on this high plane that has been set up for us but legislation.

MISS ANDERSON. Who is next to discuss this question?

MISS LINNA E. BRESSETTE, representing the National Catholic Welfare Council. Madam Chairman and delegates, I want to bring you just another little story which was gleaned from my experience as director of women's work of the industrial commission in the State of Kansas. It simply emphasizes the thing which Mrs. Cox and others have said to you this afternoon. Some one mentioned something about the American standard of living, and I want to think just a minute about that, for the reason that I know so many people who mention the American standard of living think about the standard of living which we should find in communities that are thoroughly American, where there are no congested districts and we do not find foreigners. I came from just such a district. I think Miss Anderson will bear me out when I tell you that the figures shown by the study made by the Women's Bureau in the State of Kansas show that the women workers in the State of Kansas are 95 per cent American born, and yet in the wage study made by the Women's Bureau 50 per cent of these women were getting less than \$11.95 a week. Before I can tell you whether they were living under an American standard of living some one would have to define to me what that standard is. Because certainly in that thoroughly American State there was not a very desirable standard that had been established for the women workers.

We talk about leaving the establishment of a proper standard to the cooperation of employers and the workers themselves. From the study that came out as to the hours that women work there, it was very easy for any one to conclude that they had not very much time left to discuss their affairs or to get together.

Now, it has been practically conceded, I believe, by everyone, that there are three ways to bring about these standards—voluntary action on the part of the employers, organization of the workers, and legislation. Some people have tried to show here, I think, that the legislation did not bring about just the standards which we always desired. I was interested this morning when the delegate from California told of the woman who came from Kansas and got so much better wages under the minimum wage commission in California than in Kansas. I know that's true. The first minimum wage set in Kansas was \$8.50. That was before the war. Yet I know of one company, operating at different places in the State, that increased their pay rolls \$63,000 to bring the wage of the women workers up to \$8.50 a week. I know more than one organization in that State where every single girl on the pay roll had to have her wage increased—every single girl—to reach that very low minimum of \$8.50 a week. So you can see that while perhaps it was not the wage which we would like to have, yet you can tell from that just how much it did accomplish.

Now, just one other point I want to make about which not very much has been said in the meeting: Going back to the statement "inspection does not inspect." It would if we interested ourselves as much in the enforcement and the administration of a law as we do in getting the law enacted. I often like to quote from the bishop's letter concerning the reconstruction program which was issued after the armistice was signed. There is a little passage in there something like this: "The efficacy of legislation is not in the number of laws but in the wisdom of them." And then a further statement: "And the just and proper administration of those laws." So, therefore, I would like to have you just think about this a minute, that we stop too soon when we get the law enacted on our statute books. I know a few child-labor inspectors who go into a plant and say, "Well, I do not believe in this law myself, but it's my job." I know other inspectors who go and do their work because they believe in it. They are educating other people to believe in it. So I think we must make more progress toward getting enforcement for this kind of legislation which is going to bring about a new condition for our workers.

I think we have to have some proper selection of the people to administer those laws. I know that there was some very good work

done in Kansas, but yet I couldn't help but believe that there could have been a great deal more done if we did not have to change every time a new governor came in. Not always the subordinates in the office, but the people to whom the subordinates were responsible for doing the work had to answer.

I would also like to see in Kansas civil service that is really civil service. We have a civil-service law, but there's no appropriation for its enforcement, so, of course, you know we can not do very much with it.

I would like to see promotion of the workers and certain tenure of office so the people who are subordinate may finally climb to the top in the departments.

MISS AGNES NESTOR, representing the International Glove Workers of America. I think we have all seen this little leaflet that has been published by the Women's Bureau. We know that picture with the words "America will be as strong as her women," and somehow these words rang through my ears this morning as Melinda Scott was talking. I couldn't help but see that picture. And somehow, if we think of legislation in the terms of this picture, I do not think that we could doubt very much the need of this particular legislation. It is true America will be as strong as her women.

Now, those of us who live in the Middle West and those who come from the far West somehow do not see the picture as those that live in the East, and those who visit the East, where they have the second and third generation of workers. Out in the Middle West we practically have the first generation of workers. Industry is new. And I suppose in these sections of the country we do not see the problem as we do looking at it in the old industrial centers.

It was very interesting only a few years ago, and it is so recent that it is fresh in our minds, when the figures were published with regard to the percentages of those rejected by the several States—the men who couldn't measure up to the physical requirements of the Army. We had at that time the opportunity to have all the youths of our country examined for military service. And when those figures were published I think it was rather striking to see that the highest per cent of those who were rejected because they couldn't measure up to the physical requirements of the Army were those coming from the old industrial States. And that was because, I reason, in these States we had the second generation of workers. We had there the problems of the long hours and of child labor as we do not have them in the Middle West and the Western States.

We had at the very top of the list Pennsylvania, and Pennsylvania, of course, was one of the last of the old industrial States to pass legislation limiting the hours of women's work, and down at the bottom of that particular group was Massachusetts, and it does

seem that Massachusetts did not belong there, because Massachusetts was the first of these States to put up that safeguard and to say, so long as around 40 years ago, "We will not permit our women to work more than 10 hours a day." Now, if we can only think in terms of those conditions, and see then that the Southern States were next, and then the Middle West came with as low a per cent as 25 and 26, as against the 46 and 45, and some percentages of the old industrial States. I know I have visited an old mill town in New York State, and it was interesting there to talk to a woman who worked in the mills, and who said, rather without thinking it through, of course, but because it was quite reasonable, "I don't know what's the matter with the girls nowadays. They can't stand anything." And I felt I knew what was the matter. The mother worked the 12-hour day, and of course her daughter couldn't stand anything. She couldn't stand the strain of industry as the mother had when she went into the mills in those days of fresh, vigorous womanhood, perhaps from the old country, or from the farm. Now, I think that that is so evident that we in the newer industrial States should say, "We are not going to wait for that cost." We are going to say now that we are going to put up the safeguards, and we are not going to permit our women to work such long hours that they will so exhaust their strength that it is going to leave its mark on the children who come in the next generation.

And we know, too, that we have the added problem to-day of modern industry. The strain of industry to-day is so great that it is hard to compare it with the strain in industry of a generation ago, when the mothers ran five looms. Where the mothers ran 5 looms the daughters are running 10 looms in certain mills. The speed has been doubled. We are working in places where we have to keep pace with the machinery. It is not a question of going at this old gait that we did perhaps in times when there was no machinery and much of the work was done by hand. We are working at such a terrific pace that we can not even stop between operations. While feeding the machinery we have to have the next article ready. We are just constantly going at that terrific rate, so that under the strain under which we are working to-day we can't keep up, and it is for that reason that I am interested in every State in making a fight for the 8-hour day and the larger protective legislation that is so much needed.

It is all right to talk about the joy of work. I know the "joy of work." When I began to work I did not want to hear the whistle blow. But that was before I had worked a long enough number of years to feel the strain of the 10-hour day that I did eventually feel and under which I broke.

Now, those are the things that count. We ought not to work such long hours and under such conditions that we can not feel the joy of work. We ought to feel that certain joy in our toil. But it is because of the low wage and the long day and all the other conditions that contribute to the drudgery of this work that our work has been no longer joyous.

Mrs. W. E. SIMONDS, representing the Illinois State Federation of Women's Clubs. It takes more courage than any of you can conceive of for me to speak for Illinois, with Miss Anderson in the chair, with Miss Breckinridge present, with Julia Lathrop here, with Miss Mary McDowell and Mrs. Raymond Robins, and many more. In fact I feel that I should not dare, but I am under orders. My chief left this noon on the train, and she demanded that if I could add a word I should.

Why are the social organizations, such as the General Federation of Women's Clubs, taking up this question of protective work? It is for no honor that may accrue to them. It is because it has not been taken up in an effective way by the employers and by the women who need our help and for no other reason. We founded a committee to offer this help.

I have nothing further to say except that I want you to see a little picture that we had in Illinois last week. We have 70,000 women in the organization that I represent, every one of them through their federation indorsing every one of the bills that we now have pending in the legislature for protective work for women. A little more than a week ago through the Illinois League of Women Voters and the federation and other State organizations we decided to try a conference plan of this sort. Miss Hoagland advised a round table and a conference, and we are several of us here fresh from that. Miss Nestor was there and spoke. Miss Lathrop was our honored chairman. And this is the sort of conference we held: We went to Springfield 1,000 strong, the women representing the State organizations who wished to foster certain legislative acts in our State for the good of the women workers and the children. We went there to listen, also to do honor to our first women legislators, and we went there to give our various senators and representatives an opportunity to sit at the table with us and hear us explain to them what we want and why we want it. We have 51 congressional districts. Each congressional district had a table, and each representative there from her congressional district was a hostess to her senator and to her representative, and we sat down to that table with them. Miss Lathrop was our very fine toastmistress, and very quietly and effectively she called upon the speakers representing the different bills that we wished to have our senators and representatives know about, be enlightened about, and talk over

with us in a friendly way during the lobbying, so that they might know we were there, that we were not simply a hysterical group of women out to do something and to have the public eye. It was very effective, and if you never tried it you try it. I stayed the next day for some time and part of the next day just for the purpose of overhearing what effect this had upon the men in the various congressional districts. Naturally I found ways of introduction through their wives and made friends with many of them, and I heard most favorable comment from men who had taken absolutely no interest in our bills before, men who had not voted against them but in some way or other were absent when the roll call came. And I think Miss Nestor, who has just spoken to you and has tried valiantly to get us an 8-hour day, will see great results from this little round-table conference.

Mrs. CLARA MORTENSON BEYER, of the Consumers' League of New York. I feel that there are few, if any, who are not convinced of the efficacy of protective legislation for women or, as Miss Schneiderman said, labor legislation for women. But the question has been raised here by various speakers why we should restrict this to women. Why not extend its benefits to men? I feel sure that we are not opposed to labor legislation for men. We would welcome it. But we have a Constitution—a written Constitution—and there seem to be legal difficulties involved in getting such legislation for men. The National Woman's Party has as its industrial plan to amend all existing labor laws for women, inserting the word "persons" for "women." I know they are going to do that in New York State, or try it in New York State. We have opposed them and are going to oppose them on such a program. Before we did oppose them, though, we wrote to the leading constitutional lawyers of the country asking their opinion as to the effect of such an amendment to the labor laws for women. Without exception the answers came back that there was almost a certainty that the United States Supreme Court would not uphold such legislation for a minute. Dean Roscoe Pound, of Harvard Law School, said: "There is no surer way of repealing all protective legislation for women than by inserting the word 'persons' for 'women.'" And other expressions backed up that opinion. Therefore when you hear these people bringing forth the argument that this legislation is good for women, and therefore it should be extended to men, remind them that we want this legislation for men if the men want it, but they are quite able to speak for themselves; and that we want to hold what legislation we have for women and are not willing to jeopardize it in that way. I am surprised to have heard in the halls this afternoon that the National Woman's Party had not been invited to this conference. Is that true. Miss Anderson?

MISS ANDERSON. No; it is not true. They were all invited.

Mrs. BEYER. I was sure they had been, but I heard that.

MISS ANDERSON. In order that everyone will understand, and because I thought perhaps this question might be brought up or spoken of in the hall, I brought with me the correspondence between the Women's Bureau and the Woman's Party, and with your permission I am going to read it.

We sent first and asked the Woman's Party, as we did all other organizations that are represented here that have State organizations—we asked them for a list of their State chairmen. We received no reply to that. I then sent the general invitation to Mrs. Belmont, president of the Woman's Party, just as we sent them to all other national organizations. And I sent a little note along with it which said that we had asked for the State list, but up to that date we had had no reply. We got a reply from Miss Pollitzer, saying:

NATIONAL WOMAN'S PARTY,
NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,
WASHINGTON, D. C., December 3, 1922.

DEAR MISS ANDERSON: In answer to your letter of November 27, advising us of the conference called by the Woman's Bureau, January 11, 12, and 13, and inviting the Woman's Party to send a representative, I am writing on behalf of the Woman's Party to say that we will be glad to be represented at the conference provided a place on the program is given to the Woman's Party, so that we may have an opportunity to present our views to the same extent as is given organizations holding a different view on the question of protective legislation for women, which we see will be discussed at the conference.

Please let us know if this is satisfactory.

Sincerely,

ANITA POLLITZER,
National Secretary.

MISS MARY ANDERSON, *Director,*
Women's Bureau, Department of Labor,
Washington, D. C.

I want to say that the speakers on the program were not invited from organizations. You can see that if you follow the program closely. As I said at the beginning of this conference, we invited men and women to participate and to speak on this program from the field of industry. We invited employers; we invited employees; and we asked men and women who were expert in this field to present the questions to the delegation here. We did not invite organizations to participate in the program; we invited people in the field of industry. Miss Agnes Peterson, the Assistant Director, answered this letter during my absence from the city in this way:

DECEMBER 6, 1922.

MY DEAR MISS POLLITZER: I wish to thank you for your prompt reply to the invitation extended by Miss Mary Anderson, Director of the Women's Bureau, to the Woman's Party to send a representative to attend the conference called for January 11, 12, and 13.

A hundred or more organizations have been invited to send representatives to the conference referred to. I think you will readily understand that it is impossible to include with the invitation to attend the conference an invitation to be represented on the program. Furthermore, this would seem unnecessary inasmuch as all persons delegated by an organization to represent that organization in the conference will be given the full privileges of the floor and will be encouraged to take part in discussions.

Very truly yours,

AGNES L. PETERSON,
Assistant Director.

MISS ANITA POLLITZER, *National Secretary,*
National Woman's Party, 25 First Street NE.,
Washington, D. C.

After that, I had a conversation over the telephone with a second person who said that Miss Paul felt that we did not give a chance for their point of view to be heard; and I said that whether or not it was presented by the Woman's Party, I was sure that at this conference the point of view that the Woman's Party held would not only be given but would be well discussed. I also said that the tentative program we had sent out was not final, and that when the full program, which was the program of the conference, was formulated, I would be very glad to send that to Miss Paul, asking her again to reconsider her first thought and send a delegate. I did so, and here is the letter:

DECEMBER 26, 1922.

MY DEAR MISS PAUL: Following the conversation which I had with Miss Constance Drexel in regard to the point of view which is to be represented at the coming conference called by the Women's Bureau, I am inclosing the news release which is just being sent out to-day and also the copy of the program in its final form.

I hope that you can see your way clear to reconsider your decision and send a delegate.

Sincerely yours,

MARY ANDERSON, *Director.*

MISS ALICE PAUL,
Vice President, National Woman's Party,
25 First Street NE., Washington, D. C.

And this is the reply that I received from Miss Paul:

NATIONAL WOMAN'S PARTY
NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,
Washington, D. C., Dec. 28, 1922.

DEAR MISS ANDERSON: We have received your letter containing the final program of the Women's Industrial Conference and your invitation to the Woman's Party to send a delegate.

The Woman's Party stands for equality of women with men in industrial opportunity and industrial legislation, and we do not therefore wish to attend any conference at which that point of view is refused a hearing while the views of those who oppose such equality are presented at length. Since you

still insist that only one side of this question be presented, we do not wish to be connected with the conference.

Sincerely,

Alice Paul, *Vice President.*

Miss MARY ANDERSON,
Director Women's Bureau,
Department of Labor, Washington, D. C.

It seems to me that I simply could not do any more and that I had done all that was necessary. It was impossible to have the Woman's Party represented on the program without having all the other organizations represented there, too. I think the letters speak for themselves, and I am glad I had a chance to read them to the delegates, so that they will know.

Miss LAURA GRADDICK, representing the International Brotherhood of Bookbinders. I want to say this: That I come from an organization that believes and practices the 8-hour day, equal pay for equal work, and protective legislation. That is what we stand for. And so, as a matter of form, we are in great sympathy with much that has been said here. And I want to say this: That when coming to this meeting I was afraid we would have too much from the employees and not enough from the employers' side; and I am delighted that we have met here for this exchange, this idea of "Come and let us reason together," fulfilling that scriptural demand, and I think it will prove most helpful to everyone of us.

I was impressed with Mr. Cheney's thought, that it was not good for a man to be alone, but that there be created for him a helpmeet. It emphasized what organized labor stands for—cooperation. And I believe to-day that this conference is due to the work of organized labor.

Now, I can say that, for the reason that when I came into organized labor 22 years ago I came from a part of the country that was not a bit favorable to organized labor, and it has been one of the greatest educational powers of my life. I have learned not only to think of myself but I have learned to think of the other men and the other women. That is what labor organization stands for. It stands for those who are timid and afraid for themselves. I think because of what organized labor has accomplished in that way that it has led to the other organizations joined here who are to-day discussing the great questions relating to industrial welfare of the country.

Now, friends, we have talked a great deal about the minimum wage. I want to say this: If we talk so much and visualize the minimum wage, we will never get above the minimum wage. Why not call it the "living wage"? That will give us a chance to build higher and work for higher things. Let's aim for something better.

What is a minimum wage to-day, next year perhaps will not be. That's why I say let's call it a "living wage."

Several years ago when we were working for a minimum wage for the Government workers I filed a paper with the committee in the Senate in which I advocated a commission, if necessary, each year, to fix a living wage, and if necessary to fix it for Congressmen. Even the Cabinet members we understand have the minimum wage, but not a living wage, because we find them resigning to go back into private work because their present position does not give them sufficient money to meet the needs of the occasion.

And there is another thing: While I am glad I belong to a labor organization that believes in equal pay, many of these Government positions get equal pay. We find, of course, we have not yet a woman as President or Vice President, but we have them coming into the courts, we have them coming into Congress, and they are getting identically the same pay as men, although I remember at the same time I speak of when we were trying for the minimum wage for the Government worker there was a Congressman who brought up the idea whether an inexperienced person coming into the Government was worth as much as one who had experience. Later on, when I was called to speak before the committee, I reminded him of that, and also that I noticed that Congressman who came from the remotest districts were inexperienced before coming into Congress, and drew identically the same salaries as those who had been here for some time and were experienced.

And so I say for that reason I am glad that I belong to an organization that believes in equal pay for equal work. And I will say here that we have some women in the Government Printing Office drawing the same salary that the men drew when holding those positions. So we feel much encouraged. Our organization is working for a 44-hour week and we have it in many instances. And this was started through the employers. I want to assure you we have employers who more than 15 years ago were giving us a 44-hour week. And that's why some of us are working for that. I did want to touch on protective laws, because I stand for protective laws because it must be based on the divine plan. And when we violate that we run up against trouble. And so I go on record as favoring protective laws for women.

MISS ANDERSON. I think we will have to close the discussion pretty soon. We want Mr. Henning to say a few words to us and then see the pictures.

Mrs. G. W. B. CUSHING, representing the Consumers' League of New Jersey. I think that Miss Hoagland will be glad that some one will advocate what she advocated in her paper this morning. One of the things she spoke of was that in getting statistics we should have

human statistics as well as others. I have a friend, a miner, who had an accident which killed the mule he was driving, and he lost his arm a short time after that. It was necessary to get statistics with regard to that accident. They went to the mine office. They could find statistics with regard to the loss of the mule and the injury to the machinery but no statistics whatever with regard to the loss of the arm of the miner. So that I beg that hereafter in gathering statistics they get human statistics as well as all the others with regard to overhead expenses and machinery and everything else.

Mrs. RAYMOND ROBINS. May I ask for the privilege of introducing a resolution regarding the death of Miss Florence Simms? I do not know whether it should come now.

MISS ANDERSON. I think it should come now, Mrs. Robins. Will you come forward?

MISS HOAGLAND. Madam Chairman, may I have one moment?

Mrs. ROBINS. I will be glad to give way.

MISS ANDERSON. You may have the time now, Miss Hoagland—five minutes.

MISS HOAGLAND. I was not aware when I came onto the platform or into this meeting that Mrs. Cox was coming from Indiana with her well-known set of statistics. Otherwise I think I would have prepared myself with another group of statistics that were recently gathered from a smaller number of organizations but employing a larger per cent proportionately of workers. Our research was taken with 15 organizations in which the workers from Indiana University spent from 1 to 10 hours within the industry introduced by the manufacturers' association. They were given entire freedom of the plants in which they visited. I have a set of statistics that would have been very interesting to this organization. I wish to say that I very much appreciate the courtesy that has been accorded some of my views. I did not expect when I came here and found the large number of trade organizations that what I would say would be entirely in accordance with the thought that had been inevitably advanced. But I believe enough has been said for you to go home and try out my plan as well as your own in States where my plan may be tried, and that is to spend the same energy that you are trying to get legislation in seeking the cooperation of employers. Take your groups and create public opinion that will force those who are not willing to meet you halfway. Do it in all sorts of publicity, and let the publicity get into a crystallization of legislation but not a manufactured crystallization of legislation. There is a sort of public opinion that is crystallized through artificial standards. I would say let's grow up through a public consciousness, and then we can enforce the laws that we would enforce on the statute books.

Mrs. LUELLA COX. I took the figures from the Twentieth Census that I think are pertinent. I appreciate what manufacturers like those Miss Hoagland represents have done, but I do not think we can expect the voluntary action of such manufacturers to take the place of protective legislation. Only 5 per cent of the manufacturing establishments in the country employ more than 100 wage earners. Eighty-one per cent employ 20 or less. We know that installing an elaborate, careful employment management is rarely undertaken by employers of less than a thousand people. We can not expect voluntary action to take the place of protective legislation.

Mrs. G. S. RAFTER. I just wanted one minute to speak for our poor old District of Columbia! When I heard Miss Scott talking this morning about the deplorable—the awful—things of a factory in which there is no rest room, in case of anything happening to a woman and she had to be stretched upon the floor, friends, I wanted to tell you that here in your Nation's Capital those conditions obtain in your public schools. Now, what are you going to do about it? I wanted to tell you one more thing. I wanted to appeal to you to pity these poor jurymen, these poor lawyers in this District of Columbia, in your Nation's Capital, who have thrown out our minimum wage law. Imagine men who live and breathe and have their being and legislate in a city where there are no decent schools—and so please have pity on employers that have thrown out our laws.

Mrs. FORRESTER, representing the Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks. I was very much interested this afternoon to hear the expression used "labor legislation." Believing in labor legislation rather than in protective legislation for women, because I think that the latter phrase gives us the idea that men in industry never asked for protective legislation, and those of us who are in the labor world and working with labor people all the time know that men do ask for protective legislation and do spend a great deal of their time and thought in trying to obtain it. I think that some of the best organized crafts in the country have been the most astonished in asking for their legislation and in obtaining it. I speak especially for the railroad crafts, of whom, of course, I know more. We got our 8-hour day through legislation, and I think that men agree that suffrage is not enough and their organizations not enough, that they have to get things through legislation as well, and it has been just a little confusing to a simple-minded person like myself. I must be simple-minded or I wouldn't be a clerk! When I was working for suffrage in New England, numbers of women of a more spectacular turn of mind used to come to us and say, "You working women are never going to get suffrage working along so quietly; you will have to get out and make more noise about it to get it, and you have

got to get it. Nobody needs it any more than the working woman. The reason that laws are not made for working women is because they have not the right of suffrage, and the men lawmakers do not pay any attention to us. You must be more strenuous in the work for suffrage." And so I am just a bit confused when these same women come to me now and say, "You have suffrage, and so you do not need legislation!"

Mrs. MAUD SWARTZ, representing the National Women's Trade Union League. It seems to me that there is one point in this whole quarrel which we must recognize. When I ask our friends on the opposition—and I have quite a few acquaintances and even a couple of friends among them—just what is it that labor legislation is going to do to women that is so damning they say it's going to deprive us of a career, that if you limit the hours of labor for women they are not going to be able to climb up or be men's equal in the industrial field. Well, right here and now I want to tell you as an industrial worker of many years that there is no such thing as "career" for the ordinary working woman. The labor legislation that we are seeking we do not seek to extend to these women with careers. They are especially excluded, I hope. No woman who can hope for a career is going to come under this labor legislation. I wish you could understand what the ordinary industrial worker is. She is the girl who comes out of school at 14 or 15 and comes into the factory and does a monotonous piece of work for the rest of her life until she gets married. If she does not get married, she is still worse off for the next 40 years. What's the use of talking about careers for working women? The careers are for special women. There will be geniuses, of course, everywhere, but we do not worry about geniuses, we are talking about the common men and women of life. The girl that has got the special intelligence, the wonderful dependability, the great intellect, she is going to climb out of industry, of course she is. She will go to night school and kill herself to take a law-school course; but is that industry? Of course not. What would happen to you all if we all stepped out of industry and became lawyers and doctors? I would like to see the world for 24 hours under such conditions. Who will bake all the bread and carry all the laundry and carry all the parcels and turn off those cheap little jobs in department stores? They must be done or the world could not go on, and if there were not so many hundreds of thousands of us working you would be in a fine stew all the time! For heaven's sake let us forget all this chitter-chatter about careers for working women. We are not looking for careers. We know we have not got a chance for a career unless we are born with a special genius. The thing we want is a chance to get through life with some decency, and whoever is going to give it to us, you can bet we are going to take it.

Now, as far as the business and professional women are concerned, I was glad to hear the young lady from one of the clubs say she was not with this new gang, but there are many in this country. Let the business and professional women climb to the Senate. We will give them a push. If they do not want labor legislation, they shall not have it, but we want it for the woman who has no future, if you please, that is exploited, except one in 10,000. As Mrs. Robins, I think it was, said, "Suppose they all become managers, whom would they manage?"

Now, really the working woman must have a sense of humor. If she didn't have one, how could she live?

My five minutes are up. You take up all my time laughing.

I am talking to those two ladies back there, the two that applauded something that somebody said. I looked at them and know where they are, and I want to tell them we do not want careers and there are no careers for the ordinary working woman in industry, because we have no chance, and when Miss Hoagland tells us we should go out for an individual contract—why, it's a joke. You go to an employer and ask for a job, and then he says, "Yes, I have one; how much do you want," and I say, "Dare I ask for \$30"? If you have something behind you, you do not have to ask for \$30 because it will fight for you. It's not sentimentality but good common sense we ask you to use, and if you do you will be on our side.

MISS REGAN, of the Catholic Council of Women. I was moved by the last speaker perhaps a little more than I have been through the conference, the value of which I wish to testify to. I think it is one of the greatest movements in the history of women in this country. One point I want to bring up is why can not the employer, manager, and the prime industries of this country be high-minded enough to say, "We set the standard for the rest of the country," and if in their laboratories where they have every possible advantage they can study conditions in industry and show the world that it's an economic experiment and that they can succeed by giving these things that should go to the working women; why not say to the rest of the world, "We will give that to the people who are not able to make the experiment." I think it would be a splendid thing if the employers would come together and set the standards for working women. With regard to the segregation of the women in industry from the professional women: I was myself a so-called professional woman, a teacher, at one time. We all know that the teachers of this country are asking an increase in salary—the teachers here in Washington are asking the support of all the women in the country, they do not need that support as much as the women in industry, of course, but they are asking for it.

Mrs. TERESA M. MOLAMPHY, representing the National Council of Catholic Women. I am only going to take a couple of minutes, but I have been waiting patiently until I thought you were all through the discussion on the papers to-day, and I want to allude to a paper that was read the other day, and I want to explain my reason for doing so. It is Doctor Spaeth's paper. I am here as a national director of the National Council of Catholic Women. That means a membership of at least a half million women, and we have our standards. I want to say, too, that at our convention in November, which was held in your city, we indorsed everything that the Women's Bureau wanted to do and has done. We are in favor not only of the minimum wage law but of the living wage. We are in favor of every good law that can be passed against child labor, and we are in the foremost ranks in everything which will benefit women, particularly women and children.

The paper which Doctor Spaeth read the other day was an excellent one and contained many points I could heartily approve of. There was just one part of it that I felt would be passed over, because there was but little stress put on the reading of it, and that was his expression that, until there could be legislation enacted, he advocated the dissemination of birth-control literature. That is the stand I must protest against, and I can not leave this conference and go home to the women of my faith without saying a word in protest—not to enter into any debate on it; it is not necessary. We all understand the doctrine. You understand the position the women of the Catholic church take, and consequently I would have passed it over only that the papers seem to have laid stress on it. Now, in last night's paper and this morning's paper that point was stressed strongly, and in the article it was stated that Miss Lathrop indorsed his recommendation. I did not hear that indorsement. Therefore I want here to say that I simply want to go on record as representing the National Council of Catholic Women and that we do not indorse that one recommendation of Doctor Spaeth's. We believe that the fundamental foundation of married life is to bring children into the world. We have lived for that faith and died for that faith; and, consequently, I only want to call your attention to the fact if that doctrine was promulgated among our immigrants would we have such beautiful examples of home and family life as we saw at Mrs. Davis's home yesterday? The prettiest sight there was the sight of her little children playing in the hall. Mr. Davis himself told that he was the child of an immigrant, and how they worked long hours and hard hours, and his mother did not understand, or, if she did, did not practice the doctrine of birth control. And therefore I want to stand here on record as representing the Catholic women. We are in sympathy with everything that is good for women and children

but we do not indorse that one recommendation of Doctor Spaeth's. I thank you.

MISS ANDERSON. I think that was not a recommendation, but simply an expression of Doctor Spaeth's opinion.

MISS ETHEL SMITH. I want to call attention to Mrs. Molamphy's statement about Miss Lathrop. She did not express any indorsement of that statement of Doctor Spaeth's whatsoever. The point that Miss Lathrop indorsed was his recommendation for a living wage for the husband in order that the wife and children might be at home and not have to go into the factory.

MRS. MOLAMPHY. I understood that, but the papers made a wrong statement.

MISS LOUISE ODENCRANTZ, employment manager of Smith & Kaufman (Inc.), of New York City. During these three days, I have been very much interested in hearing the discussions about the need of limiting hours of work for women. I thought that was a rather archaic subject to be discussing, because I had a feeling that years ago, when I was particularly interested in research work, that question had been settled, that we did need regulation for limiting the number of hours of work for women. For many years in this country, there have been progressive employers who have been interested in their own establishments in limiting the hours of work; but looking over the conditions in this country at the present time, we realize that however much effort they may have put into their work they have not accomplished the limitation of hours to a decent limit. Nor have the trade-unions done it, with all the effort that they have put into it. And I myself represent, although I am employment manager, a group of employers and a group of trade-union people who believe in settling the difficulties of industry by joint collective bargaining. Often through their efforts they are not able to settle this important question, because outside of this large group of people that these progressive employers and the trade-union people may reach, there are the vast crowds of people who are not reached through any of these means, but who must be reached through legislation. Therefore, I believe that we must have legal limitation of the hours of work for women.

Another question that I want to touch on is the question of setting wages on the basis of production rather than on the basis of an economic wage. I believe we do need wages set on production, because our abilities vary. But there is a minimum below which no person should work, irrespective of his productive ability, and it is that minimum wage which we are fighting for.

The question also came up as to whether the task system might not be a possible way of limiting the hours of work for women. Irre-

spective of whether we have the task system or the hour system, there is a maximum number of hours in which that task can be performed, and therefore, we can have a task system, if it's advisable, running side by side with a legal limitation of hours.

Mrs. Devitt, representing the Iowa Federation of Women's Clubs. There are only two points that I wanted to try to make, merely as a layman. I think they have been a bit overlooked. One of them has grown out of the long habit of referring to the employed woman, and then with a bit of a supercilious smile to the domestic woman or the home woman. How can we differentiate? I was amused when a woman in very high estate asked the other day that the employed women rise, and then that the women who represented organizations rise. Is the thought that the employed woman represents an organization, and that no woman who represents an organization is ever unemployed? Or is it in the back of your minds that no woman who was a wage earner ever went into a home? And that no woman who manages a home was ever a wage earner? I beg of you women, let's not talk about the employed woman and the home woman as though they were different species. Yesterday we were employed women. To-day we happen to be domestic women.

I come from the State of Iowa where we raise magnificent hogs. We follow Indiana's example and let the women take care of themselves. The disgrace that we are one of the two black States of the North with regard to legislation for women is on us. We started at the wrong end. We believed—especially those of us who had been in the old suffrage struggle—that after we won the vote we could go to these gentlemen and we could say to them, "We sat in your national convention; we campaigned for your candidates. Now, we are going to be perfectly reasonable and ask a reasonable bill for women in industry. We are not asking for an 8-hour day, and 48-hour week, but for something that you will be glad to give us." And the man from the candy factory said, "Cut out our candy factory, and we will pass your bill." And so it went with regard to other lines of industry, until there was not anything at all left.

Now, there is one other little point. We realize we have no large factories. Miss Anderson, in her bureau, made a magnificent survey of the conditions in our State. Unquestionably Miss Hoagland's factory is in a condition, perhaps, that does not need improvement. We all know that the Illinois silk mills are almost an example in their own line. But what are you going to do with the little town? We are farmers in Iowa, and we live in little towns. What are you going to do with the laundry where the girls work 84 hours a week, and nobody ever says anything about hours or regulations, or knows they exist? What are you going to do in the case of stores in the towns under 10,000 population, where a girl said to me, "I was so

tired when Christmas Day came that I wanted to curse the thought of Christmas, and my mother cried because I couldn't eat my Christmas dinner." Why, the very agitation in our State for the hour law in that community, and the fact that every girl in every store signed a petition for shorter hours, caused our merchants this year to publish in the little local paper the statement: "No stores will be open during the evenings the week before Christmas."

I do not know what you need in the big factories, but I do know that a member of our legislature said to us last session, "I come from a town where the stores are open every evening," but he said the merchants employ their own daughters and wives and nieces, and "I guess it's the man's business how long his own family works."

Now, please, we are going to try to begin at the other end. We are considered cowardly, perhaps, that we are not pressing a bill in the coming legislature, but we are going to begin by asking every women's club in every county in the State to put in an industrial program. We are going to try to begin by getting a survey in every little village, made locally, not officially, by getting the women to know how many hours the girls work in the hotels and laundries.

And just one other thing, the case of our "elevator girls" in the hotels. When we had bell girls, a hotel manager, when asked whether he liked the girls who worked, said, "Yes; I do. These boys nearly all belong to the union, and you can only work 'em eight hours; but you can work a girl in Iowa as long as you want to, and she can't say anything."

Mrs. GERHARDT DIETRICHSON, representing the Minnesota League of Women Voters, the W. C. T. U., the Y. W. C. A., and the business and professional women's club of Minneapolis. We are a long way off and can not afford to send many of our representatives, so I represent four organizations—the State League of Women Voters, the State W. C. T. U., the local Y. W. C. A. of Minneapolis, and the local Business and Professional Women's Club of Minneapolis. I want to speak as a representative of the local women's club, because I think that their investigations have rather led them to take the side against protective legislation; so I want to let you know what we did in our club in Minneapolis. You know, something over a year ago the national organization asked each local club to make an investigation on this very subject so as to be able to apprise the national organization what they thought about taking some stand on this question.

Now, we claim at Minneapolis that we are the largest business and professional women's club in the country. Perhaps we will be challenged, but we have now about 1,300 active members. A quite sufficient investigation was made. At least we studied the subject for

some time, and we got material from the Equal Opportunity League of New York and wrote to Miss Hoagland, who was working on that sort of thing in her own club, and to our State women's bureau; and the conclusion that we came to as a committee—and I was on that committee—was that until we had something else ready to put in the place of protective legislation, we had better look at things as they were, and as they are, rather than as perhaps some of us would like to see them be, and keep the good things that we have. And our report was to the effect that for the present at least we wanted to uphold protective legislation.

Mrs. LAURA MILLER, representing the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union. I thought perhaps as I have been sitting here and absorbing all sorts of new and old ideas and new balances between new and old, maybe the experience of an organization that has had a statement of equality between men and women for a period of nearly 50 years might be of some use to this conference.

Forty-nine years ago this spring the National W. C. T. U., at its second annual convention, drew up what has been known ever since as a "Statement of principles." I will not quote it all. It includes the right of women and men to hold their own opinions and to express the same with equal freedom, which has, of course, worked out into support of suffrage. It includes an industrial creed, which starts out, "We believe in a living wage, in an 8-hour day," and goes on to a statement which will include all of the "programs" which have been presented here, in two phrases; one of them "Justice as opposed to greed or gain" and the other, "Peace on earth, good will to men." I do not think of any program developed through direct relations that is not included in those two phrases; and not one blessed word in all that statement as to how much of it's men and how much of it's women. And yet we stand as an organization to-day, Miss Anderson, committed in practically every State—in every State, I think, where our law enforcement program permits us—for protective legislation for women workers. Why? Because in these 49 years it has worked out as a practical thing to stand for well-developed, well-written, enforceable legislation for women who work. It has worked out as a practical thing, as Mrs. Beyer pointed out, not only in New York State, or some other State, to stand for these principles. It has worked out in any State of the United States.

Miss ANDERSON. We would like to, but we can not continue this discussion much longer because we have a tea at 4.30. It seems to me the discussion is practically all one way anyway, and that, by further discussion we can only add more and more facts. It is true that these facts ought to be added, but at the same time, in view of

our other engagements, it seems to me we can not go along much longer.

(Mrs. G. J. Robey, a visitor to the conference, in the rear of the hall, sought recognition.)

MISS ANDERSON. This is a delegated body. Discussion is open to all delegates, but no hearing can be granted to a visitor. Most visitors here are represented by delegates, anyway. Will you please sit down?

Mrs. ROBAY (the party seeking recognition). Thank you.

Mrs. I. R. BLUMENTHAL, representing the Rhode Island and Connecticut Interstate Council of Jewish Women. I represent the Rhode Island and Connecticut Council of Jewish Women. After listening to these splendid addresses during this conference, which is a very constructive one, I know that I can go back to my organization, which has always stood for the highest standards, with many helpful messages; and we shall undertake to carry forward all these nice problems that have been discussed here this afternoon.

MISS ANDERSON. Mrs. Robins desires to present a resolution.

Mrs. RAYMOND ROBINS. I have asked for permission to introduce a resolution regarding the death of Florence Simms. All of us here—all of us who have had the great opportunity to come as delegates and visitors to this conference—must realize what an immense step forward toward a civilized social order is this getting together of the women representing so many different points of view. There has been during these past years one woman whose outstanding personality has made possible the understanding, the bringing together of different groups, and their understanding of one another. That person is Florence Simms, the industrial secretary of the National Young Women's Christian Association. She was delegated to come here to sit with us. I can not put into words what is in my heart, because her death has touched me too nearly. But I wish to all of you there might be given a picture of Florence Simms as coming as a delegate from the great women's Christian organization to the convention of the National Women's Trade Union League, and bringing there the message of fellowship and kinship; and I wish you could have seen and known the barriers of mind and heart that disappeared as if by magic under her touch.

Florence Simms dared the adventure of living in everyday life, of living the faith of her Lord and Master, Jesus Christ. Florence Simms dared the adventure of faith, and I think that one of the greatest tributes to her gift of bringing about understanding is this conference which was called by the Women's Bureau of the United

States Department of Labor. And with your permission, I will read the resolution I would like to present to this convention:

Whereas in the death of Miss Florence Simms, industrial secretary of the National Board of the Young Women's Christian Association, a great loss has been sustained by the forces seeking to solve the problems of women and girls in industry, and one of the outstanding workers for social justice and righteousness taken from us: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this conference record its deep regret for the death of Florence Simms, and its appreciation of her consistent stand for the full application of the social gospel; her fearless endeavor to have women recognize their responsibility for a better industrial order; her vision of the divine potentiality of every human soul; her desire that conditions should develop and not dwarf personality; her selfless giving of the best years of her life to serving industrial women and girls; for her broad and understanding outlook which contributed so greatly to the growing understanding of various women's organizations; and for the inspiration and challenge which her perfection of spirit brought to all who came in touch with her; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the National Young Women's Christian Association and to the parents of Miss Simms.

Madam Chairman, I present the resolution for your consideration and action.

MISS LUCY MASON. May I say, in seconding this resolution, I can not add anything except this: Many of you may not know that Florence Simms was the one who brought the Young Women's Christian Association in convention to adopt the social creed, and did that over the threat of the manufacturers' association that if we did it the Young Women's Christian Association would suffer for it. And Florence Simms asked why the objection when other organizations had done it. And they answered, "Because women convey a sentimental appeal which men do not, and you will get what you go after." And I would like to say that of all the women of America there is no other mind which has more fully interpreted the social gospel in her living. The National Catholic Council, and the Jewish Council, and all the great religious bodies have embodied a social creed saying that these principles of religion must be carried out in the economic development of society. To my mind, Florence Simms, together with Mrs. Raymond Robins, stands preeminent among the women of our generation in this important respect. They have been leaders in the religious instinct of this Nation for the divine potentiality of the human soul and for the uplifting and furtherance of the trade-union movement, that women shall have full opportunity realizing that the spirit can not develop if the body is denied. I second the resolution.

MISS LINNA BRESSETTE. Being one who appreciated the work of Florence Simms, the cooperating spirit in which she did her work, I should also like the honor of seconding the adoption of those resolutions.

MISS SCHNEIDERMAN. Madam President, I want to testify to the great character and kindness and social vision of Florence Simms. I knew Florence Simms personally, and I deem it a great privilege to have know so beautiful and wonderful a character.

MRS. AMOS G. DRAPER. Madam Chairman, may we not all second these resolutions by rising?

(Whereupon the conference rose.)

MISS ANDERSON. The resolution is adopted.

I have a little message here that I want to read. The lady that applauded from the rear of this convention hall some time ago, applauded because I read the entire correspondence between the National Woman's Party and the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor. She wishes you to know that fact, and wishes me to know. She says:

MISS ANDERSON: I applauded because I approved of your reading both sides of the correspondence. I still thank you, and would like for you to know even if the audience does not understand.

MRS. G. J. ROBESY.

Now we are about to close the sessions in this hall and reconvene this evening after dinner at Rauscher's. But before we close I want the Assistant Secretary of Labor to say a word of benediction to us.

HON. EDWARD J. HENNING, assistant secretary of the United States Department of Labor. Some few months ago one of America's successful and best-known manufacturers announced in a very definite and dogmatic way that "History is all bunk." Very promptly a large number of eminent gentlemen, college professors who had specialized in history, came back with the retort courteous that this American manufacturer was an unmitigated fool. The truth probably lay somewhere halfway between. That American manufacturer is not an unmitigated fool and history is not all bunk. The incident typifies the tendency of the human mind to jump at extremes and to feel that one particular attitude or impression upon our individual soul represents the real issue that affects our people. We gain so much by meeting together and getting the attitude and the standpoint of the other fellow, because it tends to modify our own extreme views and to give us an angle that we have not thought of.

The Department of Labor represents all the wage earners of America. The statute creating the department says its purpose shall be "to foster, promote, and develop the welfare of the wage earners of the United States, to improve their working conditions, and to advance their opportunities for profitable employment." And so we take no sides in disputes between factions and groups and angles of the American people who may be classified as part of the great wage-earning section of our population. We are always glad to get the views of all. We always want to be helpful.

One of the main purposes for the calling of this conference of women was to give to us here in the Department of Labor, as well as to you in a concrete and intelligent way, the varying angles of the problem of women in industry.

Sometimes we are disappointed at the results of legislation. I recall a few years ago there were those who believed that unless we had the eighteenth amendment the country would go to the demnition bow wows. And there were those who believed honestly that if we did have the eighteenth amendment they would die of thirst. Now, the country has not been saved of all the ills by the passage of the act, nor yet have the thirsty ones died of thirst! But this is the thing that, as it appeals to me, we often overlook: The effects of legislation are often disappointing. Often the agitation for legislation is more valuable in its final results than the legislation itself, because of the educational value of the agitation. In the final analysis no law can be enforced in America or in any free government, unless at least 51 per cent of the people believe in it. In a free government public opinion alone can enforce a law. And so I say, often those who are disappointed at the immediate results of legislation, or, rather, want of results, forget that the educational value of the discussion and the agitation has brought us to a little higher level in the thing we are trying to accomplish.

There is no question about the wrongs in this world. There is no question about the evils that should be and must be corrected. "Man's inhumanity to man makes countless thousands mourn." That was true when the population of the world consisted of but one family. Greed, and avarice, and anger, and jealousy, and unfair competition induced one of the brothers of the first family in the world to commit murder by killing his brother. But those are the extremes. Those are the 2 per cent. Some one has figured it out that two people out of every hundred are wrong fundamentally and radically, and are the cause of 98 per cent of all of our troubles. Ninety-eight per cent of the people are either right or nearly right. I hate to paraphrase a much overworked quotation, but I desire to say that I believe with all my heart that "Every day in every way the world is growing better and better."

Every day in every way the condition of the industrial worker, thank God, is growing better. Every day in every way this great Nation of ours will grow better and better, because of the place—the larger place—of women in our work. There's no question about that.

I made a number of notes as I sat and listened to the discussion, but I am not going to make use of them. I am thinking of the case of my own secretary. I have a young woman as a secretary. When you speak of the equal wage, unfortunately I can pay her only the

same wage that I paid to the man who was my secretary. She is worth vastly more. And there is the other angle of the problem.

I want to thank you women on behalf of the Department of Labor for coming here, for helping us in this great work of trying to solve the problems of the race, the problems of the Nation, and the problems of the wage earner. I think it a proud thing to know that in this very gathering a member of Phi Beta Kappa qualifies as a wage-earning woman. It means she is a college woman.

Somebody spoke of the Secretary of Labor as being born from immigrants. Bless your heart, he was an immigrant himself. He was 8 years old when he stood in Castle Garden with one little hand holding the skirt of his mother and with the other little hand holding the hand of his sister, and she in turn holding on to the little brothers down the line. He saw the things that we have discussed here as a practical factor in his life, and yet, here is the diverting factor. We speak of the evils of child labor and its blights. He saw child labor, but the saving grace of his life was that he lived in a home presided over by a father in whose life religion was the guide. That he lived in a home where there was a praying mother; that he toiled in his youth only alongside his own good father, under the guidance and leadership of his father, at the furnace over which his father was the boss. And there is all the difference in the world between *that* child in industry and the poor babe who has no one to protect it.

I listened to the arguments and discussions and suggestions of the national amendment to give Congress the power to legislate against child labor, and yet I remember that when we had the child labor law, which so recently was declared unconstitutional, there were a million and a half babies in industry in spite of that law. I want to say that I believe the greatest factor in American civilization to stamp out child labor—and comparatively we have eliminated it—were the women and men of the trade organizations. Thank God, it is the by-law of many that I know, and I know it's the moral code of all trade-unions, that no man or woman in the trade-union will labor alongside of a baby; and it is that sort of education and agitation which has brought more effective remedies for the evil of child labor than even the national law, which was supposed to be at that time a constitutional act.

Friends, we are glad you came. We know that much good will come from your coming, not only to us but to all of you, and through you to all the wage-earning women of this land. The world is passing through a tremendous crisis. The last eight years have been the most awful in modern times and under modern civilization. The psychology of the world all went wrong in 1914. The world went crazy, and we are suffering now the results of the spree. Half the

nations of the world are facing a situation worse than they have gone through. Unemployment in Europe is something horrible at this time. God bless America and its people. We have recovered more rapidly than any single nation in the world, and I want to say to you that among the factors that have brought about this result was the fact, for example, that there was at the head of the Department of Labor in that crisis a man who has lived the life of a wage earner and who also understands the life and the problems and the perplexities of an employer of labor and of a public officer.

I can not close without giving expression to the thought that a great measure of credit for the blessings which have come to us in the material way in the last two years is due to the fact that we have had during that period in the White House a real man and a real American. He quickly comprehended the situation, with all its appalling possibilities. He soon learned that our working people must share the fate of the working people of the Old World unless heroic and drastic methods were employed. He approached the tangled situation from the standpoint of one who once himself was a wage earner and who understood, and so, with the infinite patience of a Lincoln, with the sturdy independence and determination of a Grover Cleveland, with the kindness and courtesy and diplomacy of a McKinley, and with the insistence upon civic righteousness and a square deal for all of a Roosevelt, he faced these problems. Courageously he trod the path that he knew meant misunderstanding and criticism, but he also knew that the course he was pursuing was the only course which could lead to industrial salvation. He was not intimidated by the threats of selfish interests nor diverted from his purpose by the sweet whisperings of political advisers and political expediency. He understood what was necessary and chose the path of duty and high-minded statesmanship.

Mr. Cheney, in his address the other day, took as his text the biblical words: "It is not well for man to be alone, and He, therefore, made him a helpmeet." Among all the stories of history, the stories of ancient Athens and Rome, and legends of mythology, there never was one more beautiful on the subject of the effective help of a helpmeet than the story of Florence Harding, the first lady of the land, as she stood at the side of her distinguished husband during those dark days of the industrial crisis and giving him the sympathy of womanhood and of wifehood in his great labors. The heart of America goes out to this wonderful woman, and when recently she went down into the valley of the shadow of death, and her work as the President's helpmeet was interrupted, the great hearts of America went out to her in sympathy and prayer, and thus the influence of this good wife silently but powerfully still continued to influence the heart and soul and mind of that great man,

our Chief Executive. The women of America and of the world owe much to the first lady of our land.

We are mighty proud of our Women's Bureau in the Department of Labor—never so proud before as to-day, after the completion of this conference. I want to say that I have watched it closely, with the eyes of an expert, and I can not help but admire the perfect organization of it by Miss Anderson. Organization is the difference between efficiency and chaos. This conference was wonderfully conceived, wonderfully organized, and wonderfully carried forward. We have many effective assistants among the women in our department, but to-day is Miss Anderson's day. Miss Anderson, I congratulate you.

Now, in all fairness I should not have talked at all, because a lot of you were prevented from talking, and it is not right that a man should talk and the women not have a chance. I just want to leave this parting thought: Responsibility sobers us. Leaving to the other fellow a little of our problem will tend to make him more conservative and more thoughtful. I am often asked who is the boss in our family, and I reply that my wife used to be, but since the daughter has been 10 years of age a commission form of government has been established there, and the "old man" practically is disfranchised. I have learned to leave matters of responsibility and leadership of my family to the wife. She often chides me and says, "My goodness, you leave everything for me to decide that involves heavy responsibilities! Won't you please help?" Now, don't forget that angle in the nature of the people you deal with. Ninety-eight per cent of them are right-thinking. The men and women of this Nation are right and want to do the right thing, so just let us remember that as we deal with them. Some one has said, "If you could know the innermost secret sorrow in the life of your worst enemy it would tend to soften your rancor toward him." That's the thought I want to leave with you as I say good night. I hope you will come again soon; hope you will call upon us in the department after you have gone, for all of these various things that are near and dear to you and that you might feel would be of help to you. I know Miss Anderson and the rest of us will be glad to be of service to you. I thank you very much.

MISS ANDERSON. We stand adjourned until the dinner to-night.

SATURDAY JANUARY 13, 1923.—BANQUET SESSION.

THE NEED FOR WOMEN TO ENFORCE WOMEN'S LABOR LAWS.

MISS ANDERSON, the chairman of the conference. I have the very great honor and pleasure of introducing the toastmistress to-night, and I am perfectly at a loss what to say about Miss Lathrop.

I do not imagine that there is anyone here tonight who does not know Miss Lathrop, know all that I could possibly say about her. I am particularly happy to introduce Miss Lathrop to-night. When I first came to Washington, and after Miss Van Kleeck left as the first director of the Women's Bureau, I very often went to Miss Lathrop for help and counsel in the work, and I never went to her without finding her eager and helpful and willing to help me. She had so much more experience, she had done so much more work in the department, and I know I can say with all the assurance possible that what Miss Lathrop has done in her work in the Children's Bureau had made our path infinitely easier since we started in the Women's Bureau, and it is with very great pleasure indeed that I have the honor to introduce Miss Lathrop.

MISS JULIA LATHROP, former chief of Children's Bureau of the United States Department of Labor. I have my own doubts about deserving all this introduction, but I am very glad the chairman did give it to me and put me on a certain parity with those presiding officers who have been regularly introduced throughout the sessions, because she has been seriously threatening not to introduce me at all, but just to let me go ahead in any anonymous way that I could. And I insisted that if it were not due to me that it was due to the assembly that I be introduced, and so, whether the introduction is entirely effectual or not we are not certain, only I am very much obliged to you. I know it was an effort that you desired to avoid.

Now, there is something else about this meeting that I am going to call your attention to in a moment before we begin on the real joy of this occasion. In all seriousness, I fancy that none of us, however experienced and hardened we are as attenders upon meetings and as professional delegates, have ever attended a meeting in which there was so genuine a spirit of fairness and courtesy and desire to be mutually understood by people who approached great questions from very divergent and often historically and traditionally opposite points of view as there has been here in the last few days. I think none of us will ever forget the inspiration that has come to us from these meetings. People have come from all parts of this country, and young people have come up with a great deal of assurance and vigor to add a new note to those of us who have, so to speak, sung our songs a long time. All of us who have been here longer—we especially welcome that young element.

But, now, there is something very curious about this evening's program. Perhaps you have not noticed it. This is rather a big country that we have from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Between the Alleghenies and the Rockies there lies a great region unknown to many of you, especially on the Atlantic seaboard. It is called the

Middle West. I mean a small and especially selected area of the Middle West, selected particularly by Providence, by the Great Geographer—if we may so describe the powers that made the Middle West—and selected particularly by politicians and statesmen, the States of Wisconsin and Iowa and Illinois, unquestionably the crown jewel of our land. And in those States you will find by an irresistible tendency an assembling of every speaker this evening, an unconscious selection, but a selection, in the words of the Civil Service Commission, “for merit only.”

Well, then, having made this general introduction, I relieve myself of all these individual compliments which Miss Anderson finds so burdensome and I now introduce the first speaker of our program, Miss Tracy Copp, formerly of Wisconsin, and now an ornament of Washington.

MISS TRACY COPP of the Federal Board for Vocational Education, representing the Wisconsin Industrial Commission and League of Women Voters. During the growth of our industrial system from the simple home industry to the more complex quantity production of to-day a certain philosophy of protection has followed the women workers from the home to the factory. In the home there were safeguards thrown about the women. Those safeguards were developed on the basis of the need seen by the family unit, but when the women followed the industrial processes into the factories their safety and protection became a matter of public concern. As a result our State laws have attempted to set minimum standards of protection for women, guaranteeing them safety against obvious and recognized hazards in the shops. I think those laws should be an expression of a need. I think they should show the way to the elimination of recognized hazards that are possible though not necessarily general in our industrial system. I think they should always show the philosophy of protection as seen by workers themselves. They should be the result of careful, thoughtful, scientific consideration by students of labor problems. They should contain the experiences of the advanced employers. In the shops of the progressive employers, where scientific means have been introduced to reconcile the needs of protecting workers with the needs of industry, will be found potential State laws. Difficulties face us in our attempts to get this kind of legislation. Labor legislation is sometimes opposed by managers of industry, sometimes even by friends of the workers. Strange alliances develop to defeat labor legislation among a variety of agencies engaged in different types of endeavor. Some of the apprehension regarding the effect of women's labor laws on the business of this country is due to the possibility of inefficiency and ineffective administration. The possibility of inefficient administration must be admitted. I sometimes

think that the chances that labor laws will not be passed or that they will be repealed after passage are due not alone to the inherent hazards of the laws but to the chances that the administration will be prejudiced and limited. I think it is not enough that the administrators of these labor laws should understand clearly their application to factory conditions. I think there is a constant need of heroic efforts in interpreting to people the why of labor legislation. This work requires a social point of view, a social education and experience, and I believe that no amount of technical knowledge could be considered as their equivalent.

These labor laws are not administered by big executives in private offices, by records and office practices, by inspector's reports and prosecutions, although all are necessary. I would like to draw your attention to the department in the State machinery upon which depends the success of the administration of the labor laws. I refer to the inspection department. I believe that factory inspectors should be chosen because they appreciate the why of labor legislation. I think it is not enough for them to be able to understand the application of the laws to factory conditions. That, of course, requires a social education and a social point of view. Political patronage should play no part in their selection. They should be selected by a merit system, and they should be given the kind of authority and support that will make it possible for them to do a professional piece of work.

With you for a few minutes I would like to analyze very briefly the things that I think would make it possible for a factory inspector to do a professional job. I do not conceive her duty to be simply that of checking the physical conditions in a shop with the requirements of the law. She will inspect in that capacity certain physical equipment, which may be classed in three groups—the equipment that is used directly in production, the equipment that is used indirectly in production, and the sanitation equipment.

I submit that a checking of that equipment against the requirements of the law is more or less a mechanical process for which certain records and follow-up schemes can be easily developed. But in the laws relating to women's work will be found another kind of inspection which is the difficult part of her work and about which most of the controversy arises; that is the inspection of what we may call the factory supervision, the arrangement that management makes, the provision that management makes for complying with the laws which limit the hours of labor and provide for a minimum wage. In the inspection of the factory supervision it is frequently necessary to go through a mass of records very carefully and very painstakingly. That inspection very often requires interviewing the women workers in their homes and in the factories.

I would like to draw your attention to the difference in these two kinds of inspection. It is conceivable that in the inspection of factory equipment a shop may at some time comply with the law. If the law requires certain mechanical appliances, when those mechanical appliances have been provided, the law, in so far as that is concerned, has been complied with. It will not be so easy in the inspection for factory supervision which involves the hours of labor and wages of the women. Changes in the managerial staff and personnel occur much more frequently than changes and deterioration in the shop equipment. Therefore, if all laws are to be enforced with the same degree of faithfulness, one would provide for factory inspectors in sufficient number to do the work in the most approved way.

I would like to see the factory inspectors do another kind of work. I would like to see them engage in the investigational work of the department, studying the shops of the advanced employer for the purpose of listing such new equipment as is found there and such new and better schemes of factory supervision as are found there, for the purpose of using this with the backward employers to show them the way to better conditions and also to use it for the purpose of making State standards. What the progressive employer is able to do and stay in business is what eventually should be considered a possibility for State standards.

I would like to see the factory inspector engaged in all of the educational work promoted by the department, teaching employers how to comply with the laws, teaching them how to improve upon them, and engaging in the general educational work which should be carried on by a department, in order that supporting sentiment be maintained for the laws and in order to inform the public relative to the way in which the laws operate and the difficulties which occur in their administration. There is no school for factory inspectors. Those who have been successful have succeeded in other lines. There is, however, great opportunity for training in the work itself. There should be a provision made for that. I would like to say that this is a profession by itself. It is a profession in which people become expert after they get to work and then attend to business. Every opportunity should be given to the people doing this kind of work for self-improvement, and it should be made possible for them to see some promotional opportunities in the work.

In closing, may I remind you who are engaged in assisting in securing labor legislation in this country that after the laws are passed your work has just begun; that you never will see your dreams come true until you have something to say about the kind of administration that is put on. See to it that persons of high faith and purpose are chosen to administer these laws. A frank, unprejudiced, impartial administration of labor laws should bring to the depart-

ment the support and approval of the whole citizenship of a State, and it is only with that kind of administration that the support of the workers whose untiring efforts have made these laws possible can be secured, and also the assistance and support of the employers, without whom no real progress can be made.

MISS LATHROP. The next speaker upon our program will be Mrs. James J. Devitt, who is obliged to take an early train and therefore will speak before Miss Nestor. Now, Mrs. Devitt has asked me to explain that she is not a technical person. I have told her that that would be a very pretty beginning for her speech herself, and as she is fully described on the list of speakers, and as we know from her geographical location and some other things upon which we are informed how competent and able a coadjutor she is, we will just ask Mrs. Devitt to speak for herself.

Mrs. JAMES J. DEVITT, chairman of the department of social and industrial relations of the Iowa State Federation of Women's Clubs and member of the board of education of the State of Iowa. The speaker is not going to speak for herself but for something of much more importance.

They tell me that a representative of the press, still surcharged with his war-time vocabulary, spoke of this conference as "A congress of reds." When we look at our chairman of the evening, when we think of the other women who have been the leaders of this conference—of Mrs. Raymond Robins and the three Marys who have been our guides in work for women—I only wish that every woman voter in the United States might become just their particular shade of red. It is the shade in the American flag that stands for courage and loyalty, not alone to country but to ideals. It is the red of the blood that courses through their veins warm with human sympathy and understanding. I was asked to speak for the woman voter. May she get redder all of the time with this kind of red.

There has been a great deal of discussion these last few days with regard to the equality of men and women. At times the storm of words has seemed to the layman little more than a "tempest in a teapot." Men and women are equal politically and intellectually—at least we believe they are—but are they equal physically and industrially? One may deprive the clerk of her stool; one may take away the short day from the girl in the factory; may deprive the expectant mother of her legal protection; one might reach the unfortunate time when every piece of protective legislation is erased from the statute books of every nation; but there would yet remain a law not made by men. Men and women are not alike physiologically, psychologically, or functionally, although I believe a very eminent physician did tell us that the only difference is in the trifling one of the maternal function.

Some of you may have the pleasure—although you do not any of you look old enough, of course—of being the mother of an 18-year-old son. If you are, you know that he might work at a machine 10 hours a day 7 days a week and not suffer very particularly. It might be good for his morale, whatever that may be. Surely if he did it for a little while it would not be much harder on him than the very popular sport of high-school foot ball. But what about your 16-year-old or your 18-year-old daughter? If you think it's just the same thing, bring it home. Would you just as soon your 16-year-old daughter worked the same number of hours as your 18-year-old son? Personally I have both, and I would not. The fact remains that a very large proportion of the girls employed are between the ages of 16 and 22. I believe the Secretary of Labor tells us that between one-fourth and one-fifth of the persons employed are women, and almost 90 per cent of those women are between the ages of 16 and 22. These women go out—or these girls go out—from their places of employment to become the mothers of the future generations. They go out to become the mothers of your grandchildren and mine. It is then not only the duty but the deep personal interest of every woman voter to see that the vitality of the future generation is protected through these prospective mothers.

Women have served and are serving very successfully on boards, commissions, and especially bureaus. They do bring a new point of view that may differ from man's. It may be only tradition or it may be this psychological and physiological difference, but we must face the fact that men of to-day are better informed perhaps on finance and political history, and the women of to-day know more about homes and babies, boys and girls, because they care more about them, and because whatever the conditions may be in the future, that has, in the past, been their job.

A member of the State board of education—or rather a member of the State university board in a State even farther west and less well known than my own, was building a home for his sweetheart, a bungalow, and when it was nearly built he asked one of the high-school teachers of the community to come and look at it. She said, "My goodness, you haven't any closets!" And he said, "My Lord, closets! I never thought of closets!" A few years later a committee of a country club was building a clubhouse. The committee was composed all of men, and when they had it almost completed, it was discovered they had no locker rooms, no shower baths, no parlors for the women. They said the same thing—"My Lord, we never thought about those things!" Even here in the District of Columbia, only a few short years ago, the Women's Bureau was asked to go and see a marvelous new factory building, and when

they got there, there were no lunch rooms or rest rooms or cloak rooms for the women at all, and nearly 50 per cent of the employees were women! The man said just exactly the same thing, "My Lord, I never thought of the women!" It is because they haven't been in the habit of thinking of women that we must get the women's point of view, and we must have women on our boards and commissions.

The voter knows that it would be a very lovely thing if, where a man and wife are employed together in a factory, they might go home in the evening, as has been suggested, and together get the supper, wash the supper dishes, and put the babies to bed. We have heard a good deal of it during this conference. We think that the time will come—I believe some one figured it would take at least 135 years—but the time may come when every man earns enough wage to support his own family.

There was a great deal of discussion about not employing married women because their husbands should support the family. I did not hear a thing here about the three D's that the social workers discuss so seriously. We have been told that the causes of poverty remain. The things that compel the married women to work are disease, divorce, and desertion. And where are your men that are going to earn, even under Utopian conditions, the wages to support the families in the homes that are stricken by disease, divorce, and desertion?

In a board of education of one of the largest agricultural schools of the nation little more than a decade ago forbidding vocational education to the girls was discussed very seriously. Now woman is interested in the education of girls and the advancement of girls, but she does not consider it paramount to that of the boys. Did you ever hear of a mother who was more interested in the education of her daughter than she was in the education of her son? And yet they do say that there are even to-day men who feel that the daughter does not need quite the education, the vocational training, that he gives to his son. In this school, then, an old man asked to be heard before the board, and being interested in the education of women he made this proposition; he said, "This school educates the farmers of our commonwealth, and our farmers deserve trained home keepers and housekeepers. So I think you had better let the girls have the training!" And they got it.

Now, there must be in every community a woman, more than one woman, with vision sufficiently broad to understand that not only must girls have the training that will fit them to become better home keepers for the sake of their families, but they must have the training that will fit them for a vocation for the sake of themselves, so that they may know the joy of work, and for the sake of their State that they be no longer of necessity economic parasites.

Until such a time comes that every man does make a living wage and supports his family, until Utopia is reached in industry, or until such a time as man and woman, turn and turn about, bring forth the future race, we can not seriously, honestly, have equality—perfect equality—in industry.

Miss LATHROP. Now we can understand how one of the chief industries of Iowa for some years has been to furnish a very high grade of social workers to the New York social market.

We are going to make a slight change in the program, and to have a statement read, and it is to be read, I am genuinely glad to state, by a Virginian who bears a name as noble as that of one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence—Miss Lucy Mason.

Miss LUCY MASON. I want to tell you that I did not prepare this resolution, and the very modest preparers of the resolution request that I do not reveal their names; so I will take no credit for it. I will say this, that in their minds is the thought that this great conference represents so much to those of us here that our ideas and purposes should crystallize in some definite shape. We should make our sentiments really a vehicle to carry them away from here. All through the conference there has been a oneness of thought, a unity of program and of purpose, and so this resolution has been drawn with the idea of embodying that underlying thought, as you will see it. I am sure you will be more than ready to adopt the resolution:

RESOLUTION, WOMEN'S INDUSTRIAL CONFERENCE, JANUARY 13, 1923.

The members of the Women's Industrial Conference assembled in Washington, D. C., January 11 to 13, 1923, representing 67 organizations in 42 different States, believe that the work of women in industry must be made truly an opportunity to develop to the fullest their powers as workers, both for their own happiness and for the service of society. To this end they must have adequate schooling before entrance into industry, and be free to choose their occupations, to secure training for them to enlarge their opportunities as their experience grows, to receive fair compensation, and to work under safe and wholesome conditions.

But it should not be forgotten that industry includes both skilled and unskilled tasks, and without the unskilled worker no opportunity would be possible for the skilled. A large number of wage earners are in unskilled and semiskilled occupations, and the training and promotion which are possible in more intricate processes have no meaning for them. The conditions of employment of those who do the hardest and most unskilled work, which is a necessary part of our whole industrial system, should be our first concern.

We recognize with appreciation the standards already established by progressive management and urge their more general adoption. We recognize also the important influence of constructive agreement between employers and wage earners, which has played so large a part in establishing standards. By these means and by the action of the community we ask freedom of choice of occupation, and that provision for training and wage rates be determined

without prejudice because of sex. These things we ask in justice to women and because we believe that upon them depend the health, happiness, and spiritual development of women themselves, and through them the development of children and the protection of the life of the family.

Industrial problems are realities. No permanent improvement can be achieved except through knowledge of facts about industry and understanding of their meaning for human lives. Therefore, in response to this call of the National Government to us as citizens to counsel together about women in industry, we pledge ourselves to earnest and thorough study of conditions in our own communities. We look to the Women's Bureau of the United States Department of Labor for leadership in describing the realities of industrial life as women have seen and experienced them and in formulating policies and standards.

We urge that organizations represented here give support to the Federal and State agencies through which facts are collected and given to the public, and that on the basis of these facts we build up a program for the intelligent share of women in humanizing industrial processes.

MISS ELISABETH CHRISTMAN. Madam Chairman, I want to second most heartily the resolution presented by Miss Mason.

MISS LATHEROP. This resolution has been moved by Miss Mason and seconded by Miss Christman. Does any one wish to speak to it? Are you ready for the question? Those who are in favor of this resolution—which is not made of soft words nor intended for a cushion, but is a hard and serious pledge to duty and hard work—all those in favor of this resolution will please say “aye.”

(Whereupon a unanimous vote in approval of the resolution was expressed.)

MISS LATHEROP. There are now left upon our program two speakers, both from the State of Illinois. Both old friends who should need no introduction, and both, perhaps, would rather I shouldn't introduce them. Miss Agnes Nestor, I have introduced you once within a week; I couldn't do better again. And as I tried to say then, I would say now, “Here is Agnes Nestor, and you all know her.”

MISS AGNES NESTOR, vice president of the National Glove Workers of America. There has been much said about how beneficial this conference has been, how successful we all feel it has been, how much good we have derived from coming here and listening to the other person's point of view, exchanging information; but those of us that look back over a period of years to the beginnings of our coming together as we are here to-night, I think really appreciate what this conference means. I am thinking, and I was talking here this evening with Miss McDowell and Mrs. Robins about a matter away back in 1905—I suppose I shouldn't be giving those dates. But nevertheless so many here have known me so long that I don't mind—when the Illinois Federation of Women's Clubs planned to have the industrial story put on their program. I remember sitting in at a committee meeting when it was decided, and it was somewhat with

fear and trembling that some of the members really agreed to it, because they weren't certain whether the time was ripe to have anything like the subject of trade-unionism presented by a working woman; but the splendid woman who was presiding at that little meeting said, "Well, we have to do it some time; they have to get it; and they might as well get it now!" And they decided then and there to do that. And I was selected as that particular speaker. They were all very eager that I would have fair sledding. They didn't have any idea of how I might be received. And it was a new venture for us in Illinois. I remember planning for that particular meeting and getting a new blouse to wear that day. I got a rather pretty one. It was white, and it was not all silk, but it was mercerized silk, as we call it, and it was trimmed with pink, and I thought it was very pretty. Well, the next morning after the meeting I read in the paper the account of the meeting, and it said that as this part of the program was announced, "a little figure dressed in black, with a touch of white around her neck, stepped to the platform." That was my beautiful blouse!

But there's more to the statement than that. Those were the terms in which they really thought of the factory girl, as "a little figure dressed in black, with a touch of white around her neck." They thought of us all of that kind. Somehow that was the color that we were supposed to wear. It was the conditions, I think, that surrounded our work in those days before we had any limitation of hours, before we had the little protection that we have now set up in Illinois. And the club women did not know us. So that was one of the earliest meetings of the club women and the working women.

Then I remember the General Federation of Women's Clubs, following that meeting, arranging a similar program; and I have been trying to check up the date with Miss McDowell and Mrs. Robins, and I am not certain whether it was six or eight years later. Certain things happened there that make me think it was eight, but the fact that I wore the same blouse makes me think it might be six, because I distinctly remembered wearing it, and of a club woman coming up and feeling of it, and telling me "I wasn't really a working woman, because I had a very nice blouse on." Now, I know no club woman would approach us to-day and say anything as ingenuous as we thought that was at that time. And she did not know a working woman. I suppose she thought of a working woman "dressed in black, with a little touch of white around the neck." I mean that was the way in which we were pictured at that time. They did not know us at all. The idea of meeting together and conferring together—it hadn't happened. So that that was the begin-

ning of the meeting of the working women and the club women; and I am glad we had that.

We are all meeting here. We are on the same program. We are sitting in the same assembly. We are discussing problems; and when we talk to you about these things we are not talking to you about something in terms that you can not understand until you know enough about the industrial story to understand what we are talking about. Why, you all have in your organizations—the State Federation of Women's Clubs, the Illinois League of Women Voters, all the other various organizations that are represented here both by State organizations and national—you have committees, some of them are committees on women in industry, as the League of Women Voters call their committee which deals with this particular subject; others are committees on social and industrial affairs, and other such names. But they are dealing with this particular subject of women in industry. Not only are you having on your programs speakers that are telling you of these things, but you are actively backing it up by your work and your efforts in the several States. So I think that as we meet here we can feel that real progress has been made over these years. And it is sometimes, as we look back and somehow go back over that length of years and think of the beginning, that we are heartened, and that we can see the progress that has been made. There are times that somehow the work is so hard and the road seems so rough and the journey so long that we wonder whether we are getting anywhere or whether progress is being made. It is this kind of an occasion that really makes us think and makes us realize that real progress has been made.

Now, the subject to-night is a general subject for all the speakers. Miss Copp had the advantage of talking as an inspector on this subject of women inspectors. I represent the women workers, the group that is eager to have laws enforced after we go through the very difficult work of getting them passed; and, as has been said several times, it isn't only getting laws passed and put on the statute books but it is getting the enforcement of those laws.

I remember when the 10-hour law was passed in Illinois. Of course, we have not a number of inspectors like some other States. Illinois is the third industrial State, and the number of factory inspectors should be increased considerably. So we felt it was up to us, the Women's Trade Union League, to see to it that the women workers should know that there was a 10-hour law that had been passed and the provisions of it. So we had printed thousands and thousands of leaflets in all languages, on one side printing the law and on the other side explaining the terms of the law, telling them what a mechanical establishment was, telling them about some other terms that were more or less technical in the phraseology of that

law; and we went around to establishment after establishment. We spent Sunday morning at the various churches, so that we might reach those thousands of girls in Chicago that were working long hours in the hotels and restaurants. And we distributed these leaflets, until within a short time I think almost every working woman in Chicago knew that there was a 10-hour law enacted for their protection. We told her how to report a violation. We said, "You don't need to give your name." We told her that she could call up our office or the factory inspector's office and merely tell where the violation occurred and such facts as were necessary in order to have the inspection on it. Now, it was that kind of cooperation in the early days that really made possible the enforcement of that law, considering the size of the staff of inspectors at the very beginning. And that is the thing that we want known. If the workers could only know the laws that are on the books for their protection they could help to a large degree in the enforcement of them, because, after all, it's the person in the shop that knows what's going on. The inspector can not be around there every week, nor every month; and, as one speaker said in the conference, they do well to get around once a year, and sometimes not as often as that. So we made that a particular piece of work that we felt was very well worth while. Of course, the group that can enforce the labor laws is the organized group, because they do not need to be afraid of losing their jobs if they report a violation of the law.

We had for a considerable period of time in Chicago and in Illinois a great difficulty. It was shortly after that law was passed, because the girls, especially in the laundries, who would report a violation or who went into court to testify were dismissed. But we carried on a campaign. We tried to arouse enough of public opinion so that the employers would feel the pressure of that even if in the law we couldn't protect them to that extent. And it did serve as something that helped to protect those unorganized girls. But that, of course, is the weakness we find when we are trying to get law enforcement—if a girl has to come in to testify she may lose her job because of that; so that if we can have a public backing for that girl, if we can have the sentiment back of that law, it's going to do a great deal in helping the enforcement.

Now, why women inspectors? Well, I would say, Why women school teachers, why women anything? It does not seem to me there should be any question as to why there should be women inspectors; and I do not think anyone in this audience questions why there should be; but we know that there has been the difficulty, and one of the things that the Women's Trade Union League asked was that we have some women inspectors in proportion to the women em-

ployed. Now, I do not know when we will get that, but it's nice to have something as a goal toward which we are going.

I remember when the factory inspectors in Illinois were put under civil service, when they were taken out of just the political arena that they had been in, that all the inspectors on the force, as well as any others who desired to become inspectors, had to take the civil service; and I want to say that that examination is not only for women inspectors but for the kind of women inspectors that are going to be nonpolitical, that are going to be the type that the woman inspector should be for the job she has to perform, and that is one of the most important pieces of work to do.

Now, we had a great fuss after the 10-hour law had passed about the enforcement of it, and one day the chief factory inspector, calling us in, said: "All right; you pick out a woman and I will appoint her." Well, with very great care we did pick out a woman, because we did want somebody we could back, and then the burden had been put on us. We picked out a woman, and she went into the department and did some very good work. It was after her appointment that this law went under civil service, and she wanted to take the examination, and, of course, other women were eager to take it, too. She received a very polite letter saying that she could not take this particular examination, and she came over to our office, and we said, "Well, we will see about it," and we went over to the civil-service office, and the chairman of the office was very much surprised when we showed him the letter. He knew nothing about it. We found it was a ruling made by the secretary and not by the commission, and in explanation they said the reason they were ruling women out from taking the examination was that they were so certain that a woman couldn't pass that they proposed to make a separate examination for the women, so that same woman could be passed and be appointed. We said, "We do not want any such arrangement. We want the women to qualify under the examination that you propose to hold for inspectors," and with our demand for this the women were allowed to take it, and I want to say that this particular woman and one other came out on top. And that was the stiff examination that they were afraid to let any of these women take. So that we have to be pushing all the time in order even to have the chance. There, if we had let that drop it would have gone back into having a little group of women that they would push into one corner, and I do not know what would have happened. But we do stand for a certain type of inspector, and I think that's one of the things that we have to be watching in the several States—to see that we do keep that job nonpolitical.

I presume you are all familiar with the maps issued by the Women's Bureau, and it is always interesting to look at those maps

because with all the colors you can see at a glance how the country looks with regard to legislation or whatever else they are picturing to us by coloring each State according to the particular status of that State, whether as to legislation or whatever else it's supposed to show. On the map that has been drawn and painted showing the officials in labor departments in the States it is quite interesting to see how evenly they are divided. I find there are 15 States where there are no women officials, and there are 17 States where there are women with authority, and then there are 16 States where the women have minor positions. Now, we do want women in positions of authority. We want to have a women's bureau in every State so that we can get from each State what the whole country is getting through the Women's Bureau here in Washington.

I can remember the 1909 convention, when the Women's Trade Union League passed a resolution asking that there should be a Women's Bureau in the United States Department of Commerce and Labor. There was a women's bureau set up, not by statute but by the good will of the chief. That chief changed later. Then the bureau went. There was nothing to keep it there. And then we made the fight later on to have the Women's Bureau established by statute in the Department of Labor. And so we want to have in the several States some sort of an agency, so that we can have some authority there that will see to it that the women in that State can get the information necessary, whether it is for law enforcement or for legislation, or whatever thing the people of that State may want.

Mention has been made by our friend and delegate from Iowa about the difficulty of getting certain things where women were not in positions to give opinions. I think we all had experience during the war when various committees were set up here in Washington, where they would forget, because they planned everything so hurriedly, and men planned so much of it, they forgot to appoint women on certain commissions and in certain positions, and then they found after they began to work out this whole problem that they couldn't quite find their way through, because no matter what sort of a proposition they were considering there was some question in it that had to do with women workers or with the women. And so they had to, in a haphazard sort of way, get the women in. They were usually sort of side committees, but the fact that they resorted to getting women appointed in some way so that they could have their advice and judgment, I think, proved the need for having women on all the committees and on commissions or any other positions that had to do with the work of women or the consideration of women's problems. So we must be insistent all the time; we must be on guard all the time, because it's so easy to forget. It isn't that they want to leave us out, it isn't that they don't want to have women. In some cases that

may be true, but I am speaking generally. It is because they forget. So it's for all of us to be on guard. It's for the women's organizations represented here to-night to see to it that women are not forgotten and that they do have a chance to function in the positions where they can best serve, and in all the positions where they are needed.

MISS ROSE SCHNEIDERMAN. I feel that we are in a sense the guests of the United States Government, and as it has been called to our attention since we have been here that the President's wife, Mrs. Harding, has been in very bad health lately, in fact, is ill at present, I think it would be fitting on our part to send an expression of sympathy for Mrs. Harding's illness and hope for her speedy recovery and express our appreciation for the hospitality we have received.

MISS LATHROP. I know there can be but one feeling as to this motion. Would we not all like to rise in indication of our approval and desire?

(Whereupon the entire assembly arose.)

MISS LATHROP. We will ask Miss Anderson to be responsible for the transmission, in due form, of this expression to the White House.

Now, the next speaker on our program is very well known to you all. If there is anybody in Illinois more courageous than Agnes Nestor, probably it's Mary McDowell, and they have a good deal of Irish blood between them; also if there is anybody more courageous than Mary McDowell it is undoubtedly Agnes Nestor. Miss Mary McDowell.

MISS MCDOWELL, University Settlement, Chicago, Ill. It takes a good deal of courage to talk to you. It takes more courage to talk after all the other sisters have talked. All of them said what I supposed I would say perhaps, and I have been sitting here like all the other old ladies you ever knew, reminiscing. Agnes isn't an old lady, but she had to reminisce because she sat next to me. And so Agnes and Mrs. Robins and I have been going over the past. It's very interesting, and it's one of the compensations of getting white haired and growing older—you do know something rather continuously. You young folks don't know that yet. You don't always have the faith that some of the older ones have who have seen those things come to pass which we were told could never come to pass. We see them working now, and it's very interesting to watch them. I much prefer to reminisce with you than to talk about factory inspectors, but I would like to begin by saying that the gathering at this table here, friends, is so suggestive and so historic.

The first woman factory inspector in Illinois, who set up such a standard that we can never forget her, is with us to-night, Mrs. Kelley. I do not think we have maintained that standard since, but

that does not make any difference. That standard is there, and when a standard is set up, even if it's in a resolution—they make a great deal of fun of our resolutions sometimes; they are much embarrassed by the resolutions that are passed by organizations—but, after all, if it's a sincere expression of enough people in a group, you have done something in setting up a standard, and you have done something more by creating public opinion. I think Mrs. Kelley not only set up the standard but she helped us start public opinion. It has wavered; it's gone up and it's gone down, but when we have done what we ought to do we are ever willing to begin anew.

And then here's Miss Lathrop. She was the first university woman I knew who actually came to live in and offer her service to the city or to the county—Cook County—and they were awfully afraid to have her. Why, to have a woman go and visit the poor, do you know what they said? I remember the day she came home when they had refused her service at first because she was a woman. Why, they said, to have a woman going around visiting the poor for the county, she would be like a coal chute, just giving coal away all the time.

Then I remember 15 years ago when I came down to Washington—Mrs. Robins couldn't come; Jane Addams couldn't come, and there was that investigation we wanted of women and children in industry. Miss Breckinridge and Miss Edith Abbott had said: "We have no body of facts in this country on the question of women in industry, and the Government ought to make such an investigation." I had been eating dinner with them, and I said, "Why not?" As I walked home I thought it over. I recalled that Mr. Charles P. Neill, whom I knew when a student, who had helped back of the stockyards when he was taking his degree at the University of Chicago, had been made Commissioner of Labor Statistics by Mr. Roosevelt. I said: "Why, he would listen to me, I believe. I never knew of anybody in Washington who would listen to me before, and it was awfully interesting to think there was some one now who would; so I called up Miss Jane Addams and said: "I believe Mr. Roosevelt knows you." "Well," she said, "I believe he does." "Well, would you ask him to have an investigation made of women and children in industry?" "Well, why not?" That's what she always says, "Well, why not?" And I said, "Very well," and that was the way it began. We went to the National Women's Trade Union League meeting in New York. They made me, of course, the chairman of the committee. That was lovely; in fact, I do not know whether I asked for it or not, but I was made chairman of the committee. Then things began to move in the right direction, and after a while Mr. Roosevelt said: "You will have to get all the sisters after this." So we got all the sisters after it. It was a long time before we made any impression on certain gentlemen up on the top of the hill, and we never made sufficient

impression; in fact, we never really and truly got what we asked for, in spite of the fact that all these nonvoting ladies asked for it, until all the men's unions asked for it. And I must say, too, that the railroad men were my right-hand men all the way through; also the miners and the butchers—because I was an honorary member then of the butchers' union—they all helped, but that was what made the impression, and it also made a keen suffragist out of me.

Now, we come down here, voters—this is a very interesting meeting to me; I haven't said a word, because I did not think I had to, and I was having a perfectly beautiful, lazy time—we are here now as voters; we have stood for certain things, certain principles, I think, though we haven't "resolved" about them. On the whole, we all want a shorter working day for women. We know the reasons why, and we have got plenty of facts to-day—not all we want, but we have got many—and we were told in a marvelous way, I think, by Mary Van Kleeck how necessary it was to get those facts, and how to use them.

Now, we are going out from here, I hope, to see that every State may some day have the 8-hour day for women. May our Nation speak out on this subject and not wait and wait and wait for the 127 years, I believe, that I have heard we will have to wait, until every State gets it, or the working women get it for themselves.

Now, we will get legislation. We have got it now, a lot of it. We have got more legislation than we know how to enforce, I am afraid. That may be too strong; Miss Copp will know better than I. At least I do not think we know how to enforce it the way Mrs. Kelley and Miss Copp would tell us to. It is our business now not only to get legislation but again to "stir up the sisters" to create public opinion, and intelligent public opinion. We must have back of this legislation a public opinion so intelligent that we can go back to that standard Mrs. Kelley set up so long ago for factory inspection. England has it. University women do not feel it at all beneath them to train and prepare themselves for this piece of work, and we need not only the university women for their understanding and human sympathy—we want that, too—but we want the working women trained to be factory inspectors. We want the women's point of view, not only on boards and commissions and in women's bureaus but we want it in the profession of factory inspection. The very fact is that, as Miss Copp says, we want an interpretive factory inspector. I am so glad she told us that. We want a woman who can come in and understand the whole needs of the women, so that the men who hire them will understand all those needs. We want women who can go not only on boards and commissions but into the factory—women who will understand the double burden that most

working women have. Now, we must create public opinion to substantiate our needs.

Well, in one State, I recall, it was said that they not only would create public opinion but they would have a woman appointed as factory inspector; and they went out in that serious, earnest way. It was just before they got the vote. They raised the money for the salary for a woman factory inspector just to try it out. The governor said he would appoint a woman. Now, those foolish women did not advise him about the woman to be appointed, I am sorry to say. They should have given that governor at least three women from whom to make the appointment. He appointed the daughter of one of his political henchmen in that important factory, and that dear young girl was only 17, and her name was Maude. I hate to tell this about the poor little girl, because she wasn't to blame—the governor was to blame, and the State was to blame, that permitted such things to happen. The women were so hurt and so indignant, they began to resolve and to speak their minds very freely about the governor and the father. Then the press took it up, and throughout that State went the slogan, “Maude won't do for a factory inspector.” And the women learned a great lesson from that.

In another State near by a woman took a certain civil-service examination, and passed at the top of the list by training, experience, and all. She was fitted for the position on the industrial board, and yet every time there was a vacancy she was not appointed to the place; and we couldn't understand it; and again the time came when there was a vacancy and the women took it up—the League of Women Voters and all the other women's organizations took it up, and in a few days we had started public opinion on this matter. We were given a hearing, which we asked for, by the industrial board, to find out why this woman could not be on that board. And what do you think those men said to us? It sounded exactly as if we were back in the days of Florence Nightingale. These men said, “You know, it's no place for a woman!” And they were just as earnest and serious about it as they could be. So we women brought into the hearing a trained nurse, and a woman physician, and a woman lawyer, and we had each of them tell what was a woman's place, or at least tell what a woman nurse was able to do and what the woman physician was able to do, and what the general opinion about their work was. And the men got so warm and so embarrassed that they said at last, “Well, we hope you ladies do not think badly of us. Our hearts are all right.” And the presiding officer said, “Dear brothers, it isn't your hearts that worry us at all, its your heads!” Now after this public opinion making, and the women getting back of this woman who had a right to that position, we were able to have her

given her rightful place on that board. I won't go into all the details. It was politics that kept her out, of course. It was not that she was not fitted for the place.

Now, those two stories seem to be duplicate stories of many of our States, and we not only want to raise the standard and have labor legislation enacted but we must make intelligent public opinion, and we must not forget that. We must create it wherever we can, and not take it for granted that the people, and especially the women, understand and really know about labor legislation and feel as they should about it.

I am very sure after this wonderful meeting that our dear Mary Anderson has had, of course they will say the United States Government did it! I have a notion that it was suggested to them that it would be good to ask us all down here, and we are here; I am sure we shall all want to come again, Mary Anderson, and we shall also want to talk over this subject which is of so much interest to every one of us.

MISS LATHROP. I know that all of you who are here will agree with me that we are not ready to go home, that we are going to stay until the person who created this perfect conference has spoken to us and taken it back into her own hands, and I know that she has something very big and very serious to say to us, and I know we all want to hear from Miss Anderson.

MISS MARY ANDERSON. I may be pardoned if I reminisce a little bit to-night. When Miss Van Kleeck left the bureau after being its director for one year, you can readily understand what we had to live up to. Miss Van Kleeck's standards, Miss Van Kleeck's knowledge of the subject, and her great sympathy with the working women, gave us the highest standards possible to live up to in the bureau; and it was only because so many of the women, in fact all of them that were then in the bureau, stayed on with me that I felt I could proceed with that great work. And I want you to know here that if we have in any way measured up to the standard set for us in the beginning, it is because of the splendid staff, and all of the forty-two workers that are now in the bureau. I also want to say here that it was possible through the generous support and help and cooperation of the Secretary, the Assistant Secretary, and all down the line in the Department of Labor.

Not alone that, but the fact that a bill was passed creating the Women's Bureau a permanent bureau in the Department of Labor, and that from year to year, a little and sometimes a very considerable amount has been added to our appropriation, so that we have been able to develop the work, has been due in great measure to the mag-

nificent and generous support of men's and women's organizations throughout the country.

I am particularly glad that you responded so generously when we called you to come to this conference. We knew that we could not pay your way, we could not help you to come here; but you came, through your organizations and individually, to sit with us in a three days' conference, to consider what we think is one of the most important questions before the country, before the whole world, to-day—the industrial question.

I am thinking, as I stand here to-night, of our sisters on the other side of the Atlantic, and I remember well just after the war was over, when Miss Schneiderman and I were asked to go to Paris by the National Women's Trade Union League to see if there were anything we could do to help formulate standards and policies for the creation of an international labor bureau—I remember visiting one night, in London, a meeting of the trade-union women in the east side of that city. Perhaps many of you have been in that part of London as I was that night. I remember well those girls talking, many of them saying that they had received no increase in wages during the war and that the minimum-wage commission had just decreed that the minimum wage in a laundry should be raised from between 9 and 11 shillings a week to 28 shillings a week with an 8-hour day. When we translate that into terms of our money it isn't a great deal, and I felt so keenly as I sat and listened to all this that there was a great difference between the working women of Europe and the working women of America. There was this difference: That the working women of America and all the women and workers of America have a better chance than they have on the other side. I talked with those women, and I was told that once a worker on the east side—of course there are exceptions to this and more exceptions now even than then—that you remained one for generations and that there had not been any great change from that condition from generation to generation. But when we consider that we have our East Side in New York, our West Side in Chicago, and the congested parts of the other cities that we have in this country we know, too, that the same familiar aims and aspirations are to get away from those sections and those parts of the cities. Our people do it and move up, and another generation comes in there and they move up, and we know that there is some hope and some chance of the family moving into better standards and moving away from that part of the city. But we have not wiped out those parts of the cities, and that's what we want to do. And while we do that we want to give, and we want to keep what chance we have, and we want to give a better chance to everyone. Now, that is, I think, the difference between the workers of Europe and the workers of America.

To-day I understand from people who have been abroad that our friends really are in a very bad condition over there. I think we can read our daily newspapers and know that that is so, and I take it, while we are discussing our problems on this side of the water, that we want to think in terms of the world and the workers of the world. We want, if possible, to do what we can for the workers of this country, but we want also to lend at least our sympathy and understanding to the workers of the world.

I am exceedingly happy that we are all gathered here together, and I am sorry that this conference is nearly over and that you are all so soon going back to your homes. I hope, if I am to stay in the Women's Bureau for any time, that before I leave at least we can have another conference of this kind, so that we can meet again and hear what we have accomplished in the meantime, check up what we have done, and make plans for the future. And I say again that from the bottom of my heart I thank you all for coming. You have been a great inspiration, and I know you are going to be of great and continuing assistance in helping us do our work in the bureau.

Miss LATHROP. The meeting stands adjourned.

ADDITIONAL COPIES
 OF THIS PUBLICATION MAY BE PROCURED FROM
 THE SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS
 GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
 WASHINGTON, D. C.
 AT
 20 CENTS PER COPY

PURCHASER AGREES NOT TO RESELL OR DISTRIBUTE THIS
 COPY FOR PROFIT.—PUB. RES. 57, APPROVED MAY 11, 1922



PUBLICATIONS OF THE WOMEN'S BUREAU.

BULLETINS.

- No. 1. Proposed Employment of Women During the War in the Industries of Niagara Falls, N. Y. 16 pp. 1918.
 - No. 2. Labor Laws for Women in Industry in Indiana. 29 pp. 1918.
 - No. 3. Standards for the Employment of Women in Industry. 7 pp. 1919.
 - No. 4. Wages of Candy Makers in Philadelphia in 1919. 46 pp. 1919.
 - No. 5. The Eight-Hour Day in Federal and State Legislation. 19 pp. 1919.
 - No. 6. The Employment of Women in Hazardous Industries in the United States. 8 pp. 1919.
 - No. 7. Night-Work Laws in the United States. 4 pp. 1919.
 - No. 8. Women in the Government Service. 37 pp. 1920.
 - No. 9. Home Work in Bridgeport, Connecticut. 35 pp. 1920.
 - No. 10. Hours and Conditions of Work for Women in Industry in Virginia. 32 pp. 1920.
 - No. 11. Women Street Car Conductors and Ticket Agents. 90 pp. 1920.
 - No. 12. The New Position of Women in American Industry. 158 pp. 1920.
 - No. 13. Industrial Opportunities and Training for Women and Girls. 48 pp. 1920.
 - No. 14. A Physiological Basis for the Shorter Working Day for Women. 20 pp. 1921.
 - No. 15. Some Effects of Legislation Limiting Hours of Work for Women. 26 pp. 1921.
 - No. 16. State Laws Affecting Working Women. (Illustrated by colored maps.) 51 pp. 1921. [Supplement, 1923.]
 - No. 17. Women's Wages in Kansas. 104 pp. 1921.
 - No. 18. Health Problems of Women in Industry. (Reprint of paper published in the Nation's Health, May, 1921.) 11 pp. 1921.
 - No. 19. Iowa Women in Industry. 73 pp. 1922.
 - No. 20. Negro Women in Industry. 65 pp. 1922.
 - No. 21. Women in Rhode Island Industries. 73 pp. 1922.
 - No. 22. Women in Georgia Industries. 89 pp. 1922.
 - No. 23. The Family Status of Breadwinning Women. 43 pp. 1922.
 - No. 24. Women in Maryland Industries. 96 pp. 1922.
 - No. 25. Women in the Candy Industry in Chicago and St. Louis. 72 pp. 1923.
 - No. 26. Women in Arkansas Industries. 85 pp. 1923.
 - No. 27. The Occupational Progress of Women. 37 pp. 1922.
 - No. 28. Women's Contributions in the Field of Invention. 51 pp. 1923.
 - No. 29. Women in Kentucky Industries. 114 pp. 1923.
 - No. 30. The Share of Wage-earning Women in Family Support. 170 pp. 1923.
 - No. 31. What Industry Means to Women Workers. 10 pp. 1923.
 - No. 32. Women in South Carolina Industries. 128 pp. 1923.
 - No. 33. Proceedings of the Women's Industrial Conference. 190 pp. 1923.
 - No. 34. State Laws Affecting Working Women. Supplement to Bulletin 16. (In press.)
 - No. 35. Women in Alabama Industries. (In press.)
- First Annual Report of the Director. 1919. (Out of print.)
- Second Annual Report of the Director. 1920.
- Third Annual Report of the Director. 1921.
- Fourth Annual Report of the Director. 1922.
- Fifth Annual Report of the Director. 1923.