The Commission appointed to set standards in the cutting rooms has this day made a partial report through its Chairman. It has arrived at findings for the Special Order houses with one exception. In most cases the decisions were reached by mutual agreement. The specific standards agreed upon will be communicated to each house and a record of the whole is filed with the Board. The Commission expects to be able to complete its work in the cutting rooms for all houses in about two weeks.

The Board hereby approves these standards as set by the Commission.

The standards set by the Commission are group standards. It is not the plan of the Commission that each individual cutter will necessarily reach the standard. The production of the group as a whole must reach the average. This will mean that some must do more, and the motive of group loyalty is to be relied upon to secure the average production.

Two principal questions were raised before the Board in connection with this report. (1) How can the standards be made effective? (2) At what date should the increase in the minimum wage for cutters, which the Chairman announced informally last December would be granted, take effect?

As to (1), the Commission recommends, and the Board endorses, four points. (a) Each house should have proper records in order that there may be no disputes or uncertainty as to facts. General opinions as to efficiency are not sufficient. (b) In case there is a failure on the part of the cutters to maintain the standard, the labor manager should take the matter up with the Union deputy. (c) In case (b) is not successful, take the case before the Trade Board. (d) Foremen who may observe what they regard as slowed-up production should not make a practice of nagging the individual men but should rather take the matter up through the labor manager with the group representative, that is, with the Union deputy.

As to the second question, namely, when shall the award be effective, it was urged by the Union that since the investigation has required so long a time it is no more than fair that the award should be effective February 1 for all houses, although back pay would not be actually given to cutters in a ready-made house until their standards should have been set.

The representative of the Special Order houses contended that the increase to $45 should go into effect with the setting of standards or else with the evidence that the standards were actually being observed.

- 1 -
BOARD OF ARBITRATION CASE # I D. SUPPLEMENTARY TO THE GENERAL AWARD.

The Board decides that these standards should be effective immediately on notification to the several houses. It further announces that beginning with Monday, March 8, the minimum standard for cutters will be $45. This same date will be regarded as the date for the whole Chicago Industry, but no increase shall be actually paid to the cutters of any house until standards have been set in that house. The reason for fixing this date for all houses before some of them have actually had standards fixed by the Commission is to avoid unfairness due to delay in the case of the houses visited last.

JAMES H. TUFTS.

Chairman.
Status of the investigation for improving efficiency in the Trimming Room.

The Company filed a petition for relief from the restricted output in the Trimming Room and request for information as to the proper procedure to correct this condition. The Board of Arbitration announced that it would proceed through a joint commission including representatives of the Company and the Union and the chairman of the Trade Board and Board of Arbitration. It was the purpose that this commission should proceed not in the manner of a judicial body hearing a contested case, but rather in the manner of an inquirer. This hope has not been fulfilled; at least, the commission has not been able thus far to agree.

Two different kinds of questions were brought before the Commission. The Union members believed that the conditions of ventilation and lighting were distinctly bad; in particular, they alleged that no provision is made to carry off the dust and lint from the operation of the band saw, and further, that the working conditions in the assembling section are not favorable to good work.

Chief attention, however, has been given to the question of fixing standards for body lining cutters, as the Company had made certain studies preliminary to an estimate of what in the Company's view is a fair standard of production.

The Company asks that the Board of Arbitration fix a fair day's work.

It claims that this should be done by time studies. It will offer inducements for higher production. But it limits such inducements to excess production over and above the standard previously fixed by the Board for a "fair day's work."

It claims that such a standard is about six cuts per hour, for 1) The cutter does six cuts; the trimmers' task is easier. 2) Testimony of men from other shops is that they do eight. 3) Time studies show that six is a fair production, allowing a suitable margin for necessary delays, trips to wash room, etc.

It asserts four grounds for its contention that output is being restricted; it urges that such restriction of output is contrary to the preamble of the Agreement which states that "It is the intention and expectation that this compact of peace will result in the establishment and maintenance of a high order of discipline and efficiency by the willing co-operation of Union and workers rather than by the old method of surveillance and coercion."
The four grounds alleged by the Company that output has fallen off since 1916 are:

1) The records of suit equivalents produced.
2) Records of individual men who produced more in 1916.
3) The number of trimmers now employed is greater in proportion to the number of cutters than it was in 1916.
4) Men are overheard cautioning other men, particularly new men, against working too rapidly, and men themselves state that they are so cautioned by union representatives.

The Union claims that it sold its labor January 1919 at a certain price. It claims that what the output was at that date was known to the Company. It refuses to discuss or to submit to arbitration any question as to whether the output then contracted for was a "fair day's work."

The Union is willing to discuss the question of higher standards of efficiency in return for increased pay, but refused to discuss any other standard for present pay than that which it has already fixed, namely, the average output, January 1919.

The Chairman had intended to avoid the deadlock between the position of the Company and that of the Union by seeking to set certain grades of production and prices which would be mutually advantageous. They would reduce the cost per cut to the Company as compared with present output, and make maximum increase the wage week of all workmen who were willing to produce the higher output.

This intention of the Chairman has not thus far commanded the acceptance of either side, at least, neither side seems willing to give to the Chairman of the Trade Board and of the Board of Arbitration very much freedom:

The Company does not wish to give a free hand in setting compensation corresponding to different standards of output.

The Union refuses to give a free hand as to what shall be set as the standard. In particular, it absolutely objects to any observation or study of the work of the men in order to arrive at any basis of "fair day's work."

No test has yet been made of the conditions of ventilation. The question has not been definitely raised as to whether the Union objects to a test of ventilation, as the Union objects to a test of output.
consider demands of the union as over against supposed claims of
the public, at the present time, it would not be able to
speak so confidently.

As regards the question of remedy, the Board is frankly
in doubt. If it were a matter of a few individuals or if were
a matter of external conformity the case would be simpler.
The case seems rather to be one of concerted and wide-spread
policy. There is no adequate remedy except the change of mind.
Suspension or discharge under existing conditions is
likely to injure the company more than the workers. The fine
provided in the Agreement is so trivial as to be ridiculous
for a case of this sort. Five dollars might have meant some-
thing at the time the agreement was originally framed. A fine
of five dollars under present conditions would be doubtless
regarded by the worker as a joke.

If therefore the men who have adopted and carried out
this plan feel satisfied because they have successfully shorn
contempt for the Board, have deprived the Company of increased
production and have so far as was in their power given the
lie to the union's public stand of efficiency, it is difficult
to know what will change this attitude. Probably the main
relief for any change must be the attitude of the union
toward this action. Probably of all the reasons for a
different course the desire for the approval of the union as
a whole would be the strongest. The Board would therefore
urge upon the union officials the necessity of full discussion
of this policy of this restriction of output. If the
union organization does not represent the attitude of the
workers and if it is therefore unable to assure the
keeping of the Agreement, it is important that this should be
known. If the attitude of the cutters is merely the survival
of a policy originating under very different conditions,
and now decisively abandoned by intelligent and
progressive labor, then a full and thorough discussion may take
out the mistake of the policy. The Board hopes that
it may rely upon the union officials to carry out this
suggestion in a broad way.

JAMES N. TUFTS
Chairman