CODE AUTHORITY MEETING

New York, N. Y. August 20, 1934.

A meeting of the Code Authority for the Lead Industry was held on Monday, August 20, 1934 at 10:00 A.M., in the Board Room of the Reynolds Metals Company, 19 Rector Street, New York, N. Y.

PRESENT

MEMBERS	ALTERNATES
Clinton H. Crane, Chairman	C. H. C[illegible], Jr.
F. Y. C. Hunt	D. A. Callahan
John A. McCarthy	F. B. Mulock
P. E. Sprague	H. M. Brush (accompanied by S. H. Levison)
	W. C. Beschorman
	Harold Rowe

George W. Farny, Administration Member

F. E. Wormser, Secretary.

The minutes of the Third Code Authority meeting of July 27 were approved.

EIGHT HOUR DAY REPORT

The Secretary called the attention of the Code Authority to the fact that the provisions of the Code required a report to the Administrator on the eight-hour day in the Mining Division by September 4 and stated that a report was now being prepared and that he expected to have it ready for submission to the Code Authority in ample time for it to be submitted to the National Recovery Administration.

It was moved and seconded that the Secretary, after concluding the report on the eight hour day, submit his report to the Code Authority by mail and so that action might be expedited in the dispatch of the report to the Administrator, he be authorized to mail it, after consulting Code Authority Members, upon receipt of the approval of the majority. Motion carried.

SAFETY AND HEALTH STANDARDS

With respect to the Safety and Health program, the Secretary reported progress and the accumulation of a large amount of material for the guidance of the Code Authority.

[illegible]

As the Lead Code provided for the submission of a plan for an Industrial Relations Board by September 4, the Secretary reported that he had not yet received a clarification of the question which had troubled the Code Authority at its Third Meeting [illegible] in [illegible] of the new [illegible] the Labor Board to be set up by [illegible] a letter from [illegible] Administrator [illegible], dated August 14, 1934, ([illegible] attached), together with a copy of Administrative Order X-63.

In view of the existing uncertainty with respect to the status of Code Industrial Relations Board, it was moved and seconded that the Secretary, on behalf of the Code Authority, request the Administrator for an extension of time to November 6, 1934 for the submission of a plan for Regional Industrial Relations Boards to serve the Lead Industry as required by Article VI, Section 6 (b).

Motion carried.

OVERTIME AND HANDICAPPED EMPLOYEES DATA

The Chairman called attention to the receipt of data from members covering overtime and handicapped employees, supplied on Forms 1, 2 and 3 of the Code Authority, which are now available for the scrutiny of the Code Authority.

It was moved and seconded that the returned forms and similar data submitted in the future by members with respect to overtime and handicapped employees under Article III, Section3 (b) and (g) and Article IV, Section 6, be submitted to the Government representative on the Code Authority for his examination, subsequently filing them and that the Secretary notify Deputy Administrator Janssen of this action.

Motion carried.

BUDGET

The Chairman called attention of the Code Authority to the unfinished business with respect to making subscriptions to the budget upon a voluntary or mandatory basis.

It was moved and seconded that the Code Authority for the Lead Industry, until further notice adopt a voluntary basis of making subscriptions to the Code Authority for the

Lead Industry, in accordance with the budget submitted on June 8, 1934 and filed with the minutes of the Second Code Authority meeting.

Motion carried.

TRADE PRACTICE COMPLAINTS COMMITTEE

The Chairman presented the next item of business which was the consideration of a plan for a Trade Practice Complaints Committee. The Secretary having drafted a tentative plan in cooperation with the National Recovery Administration officials and trade practice complaints being of immediate importance to the Lead Pigments, Metallic Lead Products and Foil Divisions

It was regularly moved and seconded that the tentative plan for a Trade Practice Complaints Committee drafted by the Secretary be referred to the attention of the Chairmen of the Lead Pigments, Metallic Lead Products and Metallic Foil Products Divisions, who are to cooperate with the Secretary in making a revision for submission by the Secretary to Code Authority Members prior to the next meeting.

Motion carried.

In reply to a suggestion that members of the other two divisions might be interested in this matter since fair trade practice provisions might be adopted by those divisions at some later date, the Chairman stated that there was no objection to interested members of those divisions cooperating in the preparation of the revised draft.

CODE STATUS OF BARYTES INDUSTRY

The Chairman reported the receipt by the Secretary of correspondence from Mr. Pearce of the National Barytes Producers Association and National Recovery Administration officials with respect to the code status of Barytes, (Exhibit "B" attached), the impression being gained from this correspondence that Barytes was to be placed under the Lead Code. There being strong objections on the part of Code Authority Members to the inclusion of Barytes in the Lead Code

It was resolved that the Code Authority for the Lead Industry is opposed to including Barytes in the Code of Fair Competition for the Lead Industry inasmuch as the definitions in the Lead Code do not provide for this inclusion and

It was further resolved that the Secretary be authorized to notify the Administrator of the opposition of the Code Authority to the inclusion of Barytes in the Lead Code.

Motion carried.

PETITION FROM AMERICAN METAL CO. LTD.

A petition from the American Metal Co. Ltd., as of July 17, 1934, having been received for the exemption of the United States Metals Refining Company at Carteret, New Jersey, from the labor provisions of the Lead Code, action upon which had been deferred at the Third Meeting of the Code Authority, and the Deputy Administrator urging action upon the petition, irrespective of other pending petitions

It was moved and seconded that the petition of the American Metal Co. Ltd., dated July 17, 1934 for exemption from the labor provisions of the Lead Code for the Plant of the United States Metals Refining Company at Carteret, New Jersey be and is hereby approved and the Secretary be instructed to forward the petition with the endorsement of the Code Authority for the Lead Industry for the approval of the Administrator.

Motion was carried with the voting as follows:

Affirmative	Negative
Messrs. Brush	Messrs. Beachorman
Callahan	Sprague
Hunt	
McCarthy	
Mulock	

In opposing this motion Mr. Sprague stated that while the American Metal Company, or others similarly situated, clearly suffered an annoying and difficult situation and were entitled to relief, it was incorrect in principle for the Lead Code Authority to approve any petition from any member which would result in giving that member an operating advantage which could not be equally available to all others engaged in competitive lead operations. The question of minimum wage rates, as the American Metal Company pointed out, is not involved. The result of the petition, if granted, would enable the petitioner and its employees to enjoy the definite practical advantage in operations of the averaging provision which could not be asked for by the other Lead smelters who are not engaged likewise in copper operations. A prime responsibility of the Code Authority is to maintain equal requirements in competitive operations and a mistake was made, in his opinion, by the Code Authority in approving [illegible] of the American Smelting & Refining Company. The proper remedy [illegible] to be to initiate the steps [illegible] to obtain the averaging provision for the entire Lead Industry and it is becoming more evident that this is [illegible] desired by labor and management alike.

DAZEY MANUFACTURING COMPANY

The Chairman presented a request from the Code Authority for the Non-Ferrous Foundry Industry dated August 3, 1934 to determine the status of the Dazey Manufacturing Company (Exhibit "C" attached).

It was moved and seconded that the Secretary be instructed to inform the Code Authority for the Non-Ferrous Foundry Industry that the Lead Code Authority did not desire to include the manufacturing operations of the type represented by the Dazey Manufacturing Company in its field, and that the Secretary be and is hereby appointed to confer with the Code Authority for the Non-Ferrous Foundry Industry in any related cases involving code classification between the Lead Industry and the Non-Ferrous Foundry Industry.

Motion carried.

NASSAU SMELTING AND REFINING COMPANY

A request from the Nassau Smelting and Refining Company as of July 30, 1934, having been received, (Exhibit "D" attached) requesting enlightenment as to its status with respect to the support of codes to which its operations are subject

It was moved and seconded that inasmuch as the Code Authority for the Lead Industry had adopted the voluntary system of support that the Nassau Smelting and Refining Company be requested to subscribe to the support of the Code Authority for the Lead Industry on a man-shift basis.

Motion carried.

INTERPRETATION OF ARTICLE VIII, SECTION 1 (i)

The Chairman of the Metallic Lead Products Division submitted the following interpretation of Article VIII, Section 1 (i) as adopted by the Solder Section of the Metallic Lead Products Division on July 11, 1934

> "Resolved that a contract entered into in accordance with the tender of the New York Edison Company to the American Metal Company as of May 21, 1934, as noted in these minutes, is a violation of Article VIII, Section 1 (i) of the Lead Code."

The tender referred to in the above resolution appears as Exhibit "E" attached.

Mr. Sprague stated that the voting had not been unanimous on this interpretation of the Solder Section and that one negative vote had been recorded.

It was thereupon regularly moved and seconded that the interpretation of Article VIII, Section 1 (i) submitted by the Solder Section of the Metallic Lead Products Division, as noted in the foregoing resolution be approved.

Motion carried.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

The Chairman presented an Unemployment Insurance questionnaire addressed to the Code Authority for the Lead Industry by the Business Advisory and Planning Council (Exhibit "F" attached) and in view of the newness of this important problem and the fact that many members have not yet had an opportunity to give it thorough study, it was moved, seconded and carried that the questionnaire be tabled for later consideration.

COORDINATION COMMITTEE

In anticipation of the time when it might be necessary to comply with Article XI of the Lead Code - "Application of Code to Operations Wherein Other Metals are Produced",

It was regularly moved and seconded that the Chairman be granted authority to appoint two members of the Lead Code Authority to serve on the Coordination Committee provided for in Article XI of the Lead Code after consulting other Code Authorities also appointing members of the Coordination Committee.

Motion carried.

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

The Chairman requested the Secretary to report on the status of the Certificate of Compliance which he had been requested to prepare in consultation with Messrs. Earl, Fleming and [illegible], Counsel for three Code Authority Members respectively. The Secretary reported that two members of counsel suggested using the short form specified by the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department but that one member had prepared a still shorter form. The Chairman thereupon requested the Secretary to circulate among members of the Code Authority both Certificates of Compliance for subsequent consideration.

OXIDITE BATTERY MANUFACTURING CO.

The Chairman presented a letter from the Oxidite Battery Manufacturing Company of July 27, 1934 (Exhibit "C" attached), in criticism of Schedule A of the Lead Code. The Secretary was authorized to refer the letter of the Oxidite Battery Manufacturing Company to the Lead Pigments Division, calling their attention to the fact that Schedule A of the Lead Code had been suspended for three months.

STANDARD WEEK

Mr. Mulock pointed out that some differences of opinion exists as to the exact meaning of Article III, Section 4 of the Lead Code and requested an interpretation of this Section by the Code Authority

Whereupon it was regularly moved and seconded that Article III, Section 4 - STANDARD WEEK - "No employee shall be permitted to work more than six days in any seven day period" is hereby interpreted to mean that any employer may select any period of seven consecutive days to be his standard week and that he is not permitted to work any employee more than six days in any such standard week and that such standard week be selected to conform with pay periods, plant usages, etc., and when selected by a member is not to be changed without good and sufficient reason.

Motion carried.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned after setting the date provisionally for the next meeting as Tuesday, September 25, 1934.

Secretary.

LIA09316

[illegible]
C.A.Meeting 8-20-34

COPY

[illegible]

Washington, D. C.

August 16, 1934.

Mr. F. E. Wormser,
Secretary and Treasurer,
Code Authority of the Lead Industry,
420 Lexington Avenue,
New York, N. Y.

Dear Mr. Wormser:

In regard to your inquiry concerning labor complaints and labor disputes, I am enclosing a copy of Administrative Order X-69.

A suggested procedure for handling labor complaints or disputes has not yet been worked out in detail. Some suggestions however, are contained in the enclosed Bulletin No. 7.

I suggest nevertheless, that you conform with the provisions of your Code, Section 6 (h), and submit a plan for the establishment of a National Industrial Relations Board for the Lead Industry.

Very truly yours,

W. A. JANSSEN (SIGNED)

Deputy Administrator
Mining and Metals Section.

N 3006.01

COPY

ADMINISTRATIVE ORDER X-69
July 27, 1934.

LABOR COMPLAINTS AND DISPUTES

By virtue of the authority vested in me under the National Industrial Recovery Act, I hereby prescribe the following regulations, superseding Administrative Order X-12.

1. Administrative Order X-12 is hereby abrogated.

2. With respect to labor complaints:

   a. Code Authorities that have not already done so, are requested to submit to the Administrator for approval, plans for the handling of labor complaints. Until such plan has been approved, a Code Authority is not authorized to handle labor complaints, with the exception of complaints voluntarily registered with the Code Authority.
   b. Complaints may be handled by a bi-partisan committee, if desired; or, if such method is not deemed practicable or desirable, by a committee composed of impartial members. In either event, the plan of organization and the personnel of the committee are subject to approval by the Administrator.
   c. In many instances, it will be found practical for groups of related trades or industries to cooperate in establishing a single committee. In view of the potential resulting economy, efficiency, and elimination of overlapping, serious consideration of this type of plan is urged.
   d. If an industry, due to small size or other good cause, prefers that labor complaints should be handled by the Compliance Division, a request to that effect will be considered and a decision reached in the light of the particular facts involved.

3. With respect to labor disputes:

   a. This Administrative Order does not affect boards heretofore authorized to deal with labor disputes.
   b. Industries are not required by NRA to set up boards under codes, for the handling of labor disputes. Any industry contemplating such a board should study Public Resolution 44 of the Seventy-Third Congress and the subsequent Executive Order No. 6763 of June 29, 1934, creating the National Labor Relations Board and should consult said Board and the Administrator.
   c. Cases heard by boards heretofore or hereafter authorized to deal with labor disputes may be reviewed by the National Labor Relations Board in the manner provided in said Executive Order No. 6763. Moreover, such boards may be designated as special boards or otherwise affected by the President acting pursuant to the authority conferred by said Public Resolution 44.

HUGH A. JOHNSON

Administrator for Industrial Recovery.
99.

LIA09318

[illegible] -C.A.Meeting 8-29-34

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible], D. C.

August [illegible], 1934.

Mr. F. E. Wormser, [illegible],
Code Authority for [illegible] Industry,
420 [illegible],
New York City.

Dear Mr. Wormser:

I am attaching copy of a letter from Mr. Rose to Mr. Pearce which is self-explanatory.

On the basis of this letter I think you are now in position to answer his letter to you under date of July 28th.

Yours very truly,

(Signed) W. A. Janssen
Deputy Administrator
Metals and Mining Section

N 3006.03

LIA09319

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible], Washington County, Missouri,
[illegible]

Dear Mr. [illegible]:

We are [illegible] of a copy of your letter of July [illegible] [illegible] F. E. [illegible], Secretary of the Code Authority [illegible] Industry, in which you ask for [illegible] for the Barytes Producers to come under the Code for the Lead Industry.

May I correct an impression which you evidently gained from my letter to you under date of July [illegible], from which you might have inferred that you are a part of the Lead Industry and, therefore, governed by the provisions of the Code for the Lead Industry. My statement was based on the fact that you operate in the same territory as the Lead Industries and that the provisions of the labor provisions of the Lead Code would be applicable to your Industry. The Code Authority for the Lead Industry also feel that you are not a part of their Industry, and also from the nature of your Industry that you cannot conform to the wage provisions of the Lead Code.

Subsequent investigation discloses that you are not a part of the Lead Industry by definition even though certain divisions of that Industry may use your product. Any indication that you are definitely a part of the Lead Industry, however, is further abrogated due to the fact that the product of the majority of the Barytes Producers represents the product of their own manual labor which is not governed by the National Industrial Recovery Act, nor can any provisions be made to cover such activity.

Yours very truly,

M. Dean,
Chief, Code Record Section.

N 3006.04

LIA09320

COPY

NATIONAL BARYTES PRODUCERS ASS'N.

Potosi, Missouri.

July 23, 1934.

Mr. F. E. Wormser, Secretary,
Lead Industry,
420 Lexington Avenue,
New York City.

My dear Sir:

I enclose letters from Mr. E. Rose, Chief, Code Record Section as explanation for my communication with you. I enclose also a copy of the bylaws of the National Barytes Producers Association. (Note: These Bylaws are available in the Secretary's office)

I would greatly appreciate whatever information you may give me relative to the next steps that we must take to come under the code of the Lead Industry. We are anxious particularly to get this work completed without delay and would appreciate an early reply from you.

Very truly yours,

ERNEST PEARCE (SIGNED)
President,
National Barytes Producers Ass'n.

N 3006.05

C O P Y

NATIONAL RECOVERY ADMINISTRATION
Washington, D.C.

July 6, 1934.
In reply refer to 1218/11

Mr. [illegible] F. Pearce, President,
[illegible],
[illegible], Washington County, Mo.,
[illegible]

Dear Mr. Pearce:

The code which you submitted for the Barytes Ore Producers, has been carefully considered by the Administration.

In view of the fact that the provisions of the Code for the Lead Industry, which were approved on May 24, cover the proposals set forth in your submitted code, further action on your code has been suspended.

Accordingly, members of your organization will be governed by the provisions of the Code for the Lead Industry.

We thank you for your cooperation in the work of the National Recovery Administration.

Yours very truly,

K. ROSE (SIGNED)
Chief, Code Record Section.

C O P Y

NATIONAL RECOVERY ADMINISTRATION
WASHINGTON, D. C.

July 13, 1934.
In reply refer to 1218/11

Mr. Ernest Pearce, President,
National Barytes Producers Association,
Potosi, Missouri.

Dear Mr. Pearce:

This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of July 10, 1934.

The contact man for the Lead Industry is Mr. F. E. Wormser, Secretary, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York City.

Yours very truly,

K. ROSE (SIGNED)
Chief, Code Record Section.

15

LIA09322

89

[illegible] LEAD INDUSTRY
[illegible] Avenue,
[illegible] Y.

August 1, 1934.

Mr. Ernest Pearce, President,
[illegible] Barytes Producers Association,
[illegible]

Dear Mr. Pearce:

I did not know until I received your letter of July 28 that the members of your organization are to be governed by the Code for the Lead Industry.

I am immediately making inquiries from Washington as to the status of your industry with respect to ours and hope to communicate with you as soon as I receive advice from Washington.

Very truly yours,

F. E. Wormser (Signed)

Secretary.

CODE AUTHORITY FOR THE LEAD INDUSTRY
420 Lexington Avenue,
New York, N. Y.

August 1, 1934.

Mr. Walter A. Janssen,
Deputy Administrator,
National Recovery Administration,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Janssen:

We have a letter dated July 28, from Mr. Ernest Pearce, President of the National Barytes Producers Association, enclosing two letters from Mr. Rose, from which it appears that members of the National Barytes Producers Association will be governed by the provisions of the Code of Fair Competition for the Lead Industry. Copies of these letters are attached.

This is a subject with which I am unfamiliar and I would appreciate some enlightenment.

Discussing the situation with Mr. Crane, who is quite familiar with barytes production in Missouri, he tells me that he feels it would be impossible for the barytes industry to pay the wages specified by the Lead Code and that the policing or administration problems would be almost impossible to handle owing to the fact that there are so many small gopher-like barytes mining operations in Missouri in which entire families participate and cannot very well be policed.

At any rate, please let me know how the matter stands so I may inform the Code Authority members.

Very truly yours,
F. E. Wormser (Signed)
Secretary.

/6

N 3006.07

LIA09323

[illegible]

CODE AUTHORITY

August 3, 1934.

Mr. [illegible], Secretary,
Lead Industries Code Authority,
420 Lexington Avenue,
New York City.

Dear Mr. [illegible]:

A question has come up regarding the proper classification of the Dazey Manufacturing Company of Los Angeles, California.

This company report between 5 and 6 employees during 1933 with total [illegible] of slightly over $21,000. Their product is primarily Flower Holders in the form of castings from a lead antimony alloy of the nature of Britannia metal. Their casting process consists primarily of casting in bronze molds. Some of the castings after being first cast are annealed and shaped. In the finished shape some are further finished by polishing and plating or enamelling.

In the Non-Ferrous Foundry Code #165, art. I paragraph C, the term "Non-Ferrous Castings" is defined and covers castings of tin, lead, antimony and their alloys as produced by any process.

In the Lead Industry Code #442 "Mettalic Lead Products" is defined to cover cast lead or lead alloy products and kindred products of metallic tin and tin alloy.

It is our belief that it was not the intent of the Lead Industry to cover such plants as the Dazey Manufacturing Co., and we shall be pleased to discuss the matter with you or some authorized representative or Committee of your Code Authority and arrive at some mutually satisfactory decision on this case and, if possible, some determination of general policy as applied to all cases of this nature which might arise due to the apparent overlap in definitions.

Awaiting your advice, I remain,

Yours very truly,

FOR THE CODE AUTHORITY.

(Signed) Sam Tour
Executive Secretary.

N 3006.08

[illegible]

[illegible] SMELTING & [illegible] COMPANY
[illegible]
[illegible]
NEW [illegible]

July [illegible], 1934.

Mr. [illegible], Secretary
[illegible] Authority for the Lead Industry
[illegible] Avenue
New [illegible], N. Y.

Dear Sir:

The Hassam Smelting & Refining Company has subscribed to and is complying with the requirements of the following codes of fair competition [illegible] Brass and Bronze Ingot Industry, the Copper Industry, [illegible] Industry. In addition, it has had a part in the preparation of the Code of Fair Competition for the Zinc Industry, which I understand has been submitted but has not yet been approved.

Pursuant to Administrative Order X36, Release 5360, May 26, 1934, by Hugh S. Johnson, Administrator for Industrial Recovery, as executive officer of the Hassam Smelting & Refining Company I respectfully request determination of the status of the Hassam Smelting & Refining Company in respect of payment of assessments for support of code authority or code authorities to which it is subject. To this end, I submit the following data with respect to the division of the Company's business as between the classes of products which it manufactures and sells covered respectively by the four industries in which it is currently operating. These data cover the percentage of tonnage, the percentage of dollar value at selling prices and the percentage of direct labor hours involved in the four industries above mentioned for the calendar year of 1933, and separately for the five months of 1934 ending May 31st.

	Year 1933			5 Mos. 1934		
		Selling	Direct		Selling	Direct
	Tonnage	Prices	Labor	Tonnage	Prices	Labor
Copper	33.0%	32.1%	26.6%	32.3%	34.0%	26.6%
Lead	36.8	36.4	25.2	43.5	41.5	27.4
Non-Ferrous Ingot Metal	23.4	24.9	37.6	17.7	19.3	35.2
Zinc	7.8	6.6	10.6	6.5	5.2	10.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

The Hassam Smelting & Refining Company has currently met and paid all assessments presented to it by the Code Authorities of the approved codes to which it is subject and will continue to do so until decision is rendered in accordance with the terms of the Administrative Order above cited.

This request in identical form is being sent to each code authority of approved codes to which the Hassam Company is subject, and a copy is being sent to the Secretary of the American Zinc Institute.

Yours very truly,

(Signed) F. E. [illegible]
Executive Vice President

17

N 3006.09

[illegible]

THE [illegible] COMPANY
4 [illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] Metal Company,
[illegible]
New York, N. Y.

Gentlemen: Attention: Mr. [illegible]

We invite your quotation for [illegible] our requirements of solder for the six months period [illegible] 1934 and ending December 12-1934, in the [illegible]

Bar Solder in 1/2 lb Bars		Class	A,	Grade	1
Wiping Solder in 2 lb Pigs		"	A,	"	3
" " in 1 lb "	(Approx. 7" long)	"	A,	"	3
Wire Solder 3/16"		"	A,	"	3
" " 1/8"		"	A,	"	3
" " "		"	A,	"	1

Wiping Solder to be moulded with markings as specified by the Company ordering. Material must conform to our Specification E-12-29.

The Companies to be included in this contract are the New York Edison Company, The United Electric Light & Power Company, and the Bronx Gas and Electric Company. Your price is to include delivery to the various storerooms in Manhattan and Bronx of the companies mentioned above, with cash discount payable on or before the 10th of the month following the date of invoice.

Your quotation is to be in the form of a manufacturing charge per 100 pounds, above the cost of the ingredients. The base price of Straits Tin and Pig Lead is to be the average price published in the "American Metal Market" for the month previous to that in which Solder is delivered.

Vendor must furnish copies of his analysis of Solder delivered when requested.

The successful bidder is to carry sufficient stock of bars and pigs at all times to take care of any emergency that may arise.

For further information, if required, communicate with Mr. W. C. Gay, Room 1215-S, 4 Irving Place, New York City.

19

N 3006.1

EXHIBIT "E"

THE NEW YORK EDISON COMPANY
4 Irving Place,
American Metal Company, NEW YORK. May 31, 1934.

Your quotation covering the above shall be mailed in the enclosed self-addressed envelope and forwarded to this office so that it will be in the hands of the undersigned not later than 12 o'clock noon, June 7-1934.

Very truly yours,
(Signed) P. C. Savage
Purchasing Agent

[illegible]

Similarly, [illegible] for the Department of Commerce, [illegible] gestion of its [illegible] submission of an [illegible] inquiry in order to [illegible] from various Code Authorities, and the attached form has been prepared with a view of being sufficiently general to be comparable yet reasonably comprehensive.

In preparing this questionnaire, the Council has had the advice of its Industrial Relations Committee. It has also benefited greatly from the services of A. P. Greensfelder, one of its members, who drew up the original memorandum upon which the attached list of questions was based.

It is hoped that each Code Authority will direct its research agency to send the Chairman of the Business Advisory and Planning Council, Room 7529 Commerce Building, Washington, by September 15, 1934, its answers to the questionnaire, duplicate copies of which are enclosed.

In return for such courtesy, it is proposed that the Council will reciprocate by sending its summarized statement of all returns to each Industrial Authority who complies with this request.

Respectfully submitted,

[illegible]

Enclosures

[illegible]

Q. 1. [illegible] the principle of unemployment reserves for the protection of involuntarily unemployed workers?

A.1. ____________________

____

Q. 2. If [illegible]ment reserves are found necessary or expedient, [illegible] be built up and administered voluntarily by industry or enforced by law?

A.2. ____________________

____

Q. 3. If you favor voluntary plans, do you believe laws also are necessary in order to enforce uniformity and competitive equality?

A.3. ____________________

____

Q. 4. Should industry adopt the principle of voluntary unemployment reserves in advance of legislation?

A.4. ____________________

____

II. Questions Applicable to Voluntary Plans

Q. 1. Should reserves be built up by separate companies or by entire industries?

A.1. ____________________

____

Q. 2. If reserves are built up by industries, should the initiative in adopting them be taken by code authorities?

A.2. ____________________

____

[illegible] (Continued)

III. Questions Applicable to Legislative Plans

Q. 1. Should the legislative unit be the state, or (if constitutional) the federal government?

A.1. ______________________________

Q. 2. If a direct federal plan is held to be unconstitutional, do you favor federal legislation (for example, something like the Wagner-Lewis bill introduced at the last session of Congress) to encourage the enactment of relatively uniform laws in the states?

A.2. ______________________________

Q. 3. Should the reserves of all companies be pooled in a common fund (insurance principle) or maintained separately for each company?

A.3. ______________________________

Q. 4. Should there be a punitive additional premium for overtime employment?

A.4. ______________________________

Q. 5. Is a system of public employment offices an essential supplement to a reserve plan?

A.5. ______________________________

[illegible] ON UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE (Continued)

IV. Questions Applicable to Either Voluntary or Legislative Plans

Q. 1. Should reserves be built up from:

(a) Contributions of employer alone?

A. 1(a)________________

(b) Contributions of employer and employees?

A. 1(b)________________

(c) Contributions of employer, employees, and government?

A. 1(c)________________

Q. 2. Should unemployment compensation be paid for seasonal or other short time layoffs?

A.2.________________________________

Q. 3. Should there be a limit to the periods for which compensation is paid?

A.3.________________________________

Q. 4. Should there be a "means" test for receiving compensation?

A.4.________________________________

Q. 5. In the case of contributory plans, should there be individual reserves for each employee, to be used only for his benefit, and with the employee retaining an equity to the extent of his own contributions?

A.5.________________________________

[illegible] -C.A. Meeting 8-20- [illegible]
[illegible] Co. 34

[illegible] Avenue

[illegible]

July [illegible], 1934

Mr. [illegible]
[illegible] Code Authority
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
New York, New York

Dear Sirs

We wish to comment on one of the terms of the Lead Industries Code which is a big hardship to us, a small manufacturer of batteries. Prior to this Code having been put into effect, it was possible for us to contract for a carload of oxides at the carload price and draw from it to meet our requirements. Under the terms of this Code, we are now compelled to buy this carload in one shipment or pay a penalty of approximately 20%. We maintain that this 20% differential is too large. It is impossible for us and hundreds of other small battery manufacturers to buy these oxides in carload lots, and to pay the 20% differential makes it impossible for us to compete with the larger manufacturers. We realize that there should be a differential between carload and less than carload but maintain that the 20% differential is too much. We believe that some steps should be taken to either eliminate or reduce this large differential.

Yours very truly,

OXIDITE BATTERY MFG. COMPANY

(Signed) M. L. Kline
President.

25