

Domestic Employment

Household Help Wanted—Female

CHAMBERMAID-WAITRESS, white, over 30, experienced; private home; references; \$45. ESplanade 7-5180.

COOK-HOUSEWORKER, permanent position for settled woman; Winter city, Summer country; references. ENdicoct 2-3936.

GIRL, general houseworker, children, 7, 4 years; sleep in; \$43-\$50. Call Saturday, 1 West 47th (1229).

GIRL, white, light housework, baby's laundry only; sleep in. FOrdham 7-1215.

HOUSEKEEPER-NURSE, pleasant disposition, experienced; charge twin baby, past 2; light housekeeping; sleep in; attractive salary. Tivoli 2-1372.

HOUSEKEEPER, white, take charge house and 3-year child, business couple; sleep in; \$35 monthly; references. BAYSide 9-5284.

HOUSEWORKER, white, sleep out; experience necessary; good cook and laundress; reference required; one adult. M 223 Times.

HOUSEWORKER, white, young; children 12-8 months; sleep in; room bath; \$50. ATwater 9-4215, 9-10:30, all week.

HOUSEWORKER-COOK, sleep in; experienced; references; fond of children; \$45. Kingsbridge 6-2463.

HOUSEWORKER, general, 6-room house, 2 children; good salary. M 254 Times.

NURSE for 2-year girl; experience; city references; state age and full qualifications; salary \$40 per month. M 278 Times.

WOMAN, white, assist semi-invalid lady, light housework, plain cooking, no laundry; 3 adults; references; permanent; \$40-\$45. Call 9-12 ENdicoct 2-2498.

WOMAN, white, housework, light cooking; sleep in; new small apartment; 3 adults. After 7 evenings, DEWey 9-1882.

LIGHT housekeeping, cooking, afternoons. 40 Monroe St., Manhattan (BB6), Saturday, after 2.

Household Situations Wanted-Female

CHAMBERMAID, assist other servants, care children; references. Call TRemont 2-4326.

COMPANION, ladies' housekeeper, practical nursing experience; refined American woman; 9 years in present position. L. M. D., Postoffice Box T., Montclair, N. J.

COMPANION to lady, practical nurse, refined, cheerful; go anywhere; references. RAVenswood 8-2708.

GIRL, refined colored, light housework, child's nurse. Rosabelle Hall, AUdubon 3-2265.

GIRL, colored, experienced houseworker; full or part time; references. UNiversity 4-9535.

GOVERNESS, companion, young, exceptionally educated, languages, music; refuge, now here; sleep out; references. EDgecombe 4-1916 (9-12 mornings).

HOUSEKEEPER, Christian, refined, educated mother and daughter together; accept small salary; position without child, \$50-\$60. H 16 Times.

HOUSEKEEPER, practical nurse, middle-aged, English, cooking, sewing, musical; references. WEstchester 7-3571.

HOUSEKEEPER, young German woman; part time. Call ACademy 2-9552, Apt. 1.

HOUSEWORKER, colored, Southern, neat appearance, competent, experienced, refined; excellent references. MOnument 2-4963.

HOUSEWORKER, general, excellent cook, experienced girl; evenings, full time; references. EDgecombe 4-9613.

NURSE, practical, efficient; full, part; slight housekeeping; references. SUsquehanna 7-8882, 1-A.

NURSE, refined, cheerful; any case; light housekeeping; part-full time. SUsquehanna 7-9484.

WOMAN, light colored, desires morning work; excellent references. Call ACademy 2-0445.

WOMAN, colored; whole, part time. laundress, general housework; references. EDgecombe 4-0190.

WOMAN wants work, cleaning or laundry; \$3.10 day; no cooking. MEIrose 6-5576.

GERMAN-Jewish, excellent housekeeper, cook; sleep out; full, part-time. RIVerside 9-1469.

Employment Agencies

HOUSEWORKERS FREE TO EMPLOYERS

331.78(73)

HELP WANTED!

Pamphlet

By

CARA COOK, *Secretary*

New York Women's Trade Union League

331.
204
164
046
0973
C00

Published by

Women's Trade Union League

1939

FOREWORD

LIKE many activities of the Women's Trade Union League, this pamphlet is a cooperative undertaking to which many members and friends have given advice, information and time. We gratefully acknowledge the many sources from which we have borrowed in putting this material together. The variety of groups interested in the domestic workers' problem and the constant stirring of these same troubled waters is a healthy indication that many people are thinking along the same lines. The more, the better!

"HELP WANTED!" is intended to focus some of this thinking and discussion on one of several proposed solutions to this question, namely, the legislative.

ROSE SCHNEIDERMAN, *President,*
Women's Trade Union League

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Not a New Problem.....	2
Some Facts About Domestic Service.....	3
Voluntary Agreements	6
Training Domestic Workers.....	8
Mutual Benefit	9
Kinds of Employers.....	10
"Select Servants"	12
Trade Union Efforts.....	15
The Proposed Legislation.....	17
What To Do.....	21
Standard Voluntary Agreement.....	22
Reading Suggestions	23

Additional copies from the Women's Trade Union League
247 Lexington Avenue, N. Y. C. CAledonia 5-0684

5¢ per copy; 25 copies, \$1; 50 copies, \$2; 100 copies, \$3

331.2041640460973 C00

HELP WANTED!

1. No person shall be employed as a domestic worker in New York State for more than sixty hours in any week.
2. Where there are two or more domestic workers in one household, they shall be assured compensation for injuries or death arising out of their employment.
3. Domestic workers shall be included under the state law providing for the establishment of minimum wages for women and minors.

T

the St
Trade
last se
the fi
explai
In
recogn
approa
think
believe
regulat
have fa
for son
there is

TO THE READER: The legislation described in this pamphlet was presented to the 1938-39 New York State Legislature. None of the bills was passed.

Substantially the same measures will be re-introduced in the 1939-40 Legislature. They will be referred to the same committees (see inside back cover) which will be headed by the same Chairmen.

SUPPORTERS OF SUCH LEGISLATION ARE URGED TO TAKE THE SAME ACTION THIS YEAR AS THAT RECOMMENDED ON PAGE 21.

Other
the ra
of domestic service through training, the establishment of voluntary agreements between the household employer and her employee, the organization of domestic workers into voluntary groups, or trade unions, for their own protection. But here our primary purpose is twofold:

- (a) to present and explain the particular bills for which we hope to enlist broad support, and
- (b) by summarizing briefly the main facts about household employment, to stimulate further thinking on the whole

3820115027

FOREWORD

LIKE many activities of the Women's Trade Union League, this pamphlet is a cooperative undertaking to which many members and friends have given advice, information and time. We gratefully acknowledge the many sources from which we have borrowed in putting this material together. The variety of groups interested in the domestic workers' problem and the constant stirring of these same troubled waters is a healthy indication that many people are thinking along the same lines. The more, the better!

"HELP WANTED!" is intended to focus some of this thinking and discussion on one of several proposed solutions to this question, namely, the legislative.

ROSE SCHNEIDERMAN, *President,*
Women's Trade Union League

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Not a New Problem.....	2
Some Facts About Domestic Service.....	3
Voluntary Agreements	6
Training Domestic Workers.....	8
Mutual Benefit	9
Kinds of Employers.....	10
"Select Servants"	12
Trade Union Efforts.....	15
The Proposed Legislation.....	17
What To Do.....	21
Standard Voluntary Agreement.....	22
Reading Suggestions	23

Additional copies from the Women's Trade Union League
247 Lexington Avenue, N. Y. C. CAledonia 5-0684

5¢ per copy; 25 copies, \$1; 50 copies, \$2; 100 copies, \$3

331.2041640460973 C00

HELP WANTED!

1. No person shall be employed as a domestic worker in New York State for more than sixty hours in any week.
2. Where there are two or more domestic workers in one household, they shall be assured compensation for injuries or death arising out of their employment.
3. Domestic workers shall be included under the state law providing for the establishment of minimum wages for women and minors.

THREE bills, summarized in the above sentences, have been introduced into the 1939 session of the New York State legislature by the State Federation of Labor, at the request of the New York Women's Trade Union League. The first two bills were also introduced at the last session. The third, relating to minimum wages, is introduced for the first time this year. The exact wording of the bills is given and explained on page 17 of this pamphlet.

In initiating these measures, the Women's Trade Union League recognizes that the legislative is by no means the only method of approaching this troublesome question. There are even some who think it is an unworkable method. But there are many more who believe strongly that it is the right and duty of the state to attempt to regulate certain social problems which the parties directly involved have failed to solve satisfactorily. And concerning the imperative need for some kind of improvement in the conditions of domestic service, there is practically unanimous agreement!

Other proposed solutions will be treated briefly in this pamphlet,—the raising of standards of domestic service through training, the establishment of voluntary agreements between the household employer and her employee, the organization of domestic workers into voluntary groups, or trade unions, for their own protection. But here our primary purpose is twofold:

- (a) to present and explain the particular bills for which we hope to enlist broad support, and
- (b) by summarizing briefly the main facts about household employment, to stimulate further thinking on the whole

3800115027

subject. Perhaps by focussing on one of several proposed solutions the widespread discussion forever raging around this ancient controversy, we may move a step further towards improving the admittedly shameful conditions of a large group of our fellow men and women.

Not a New Problem

For over a hundred years, a steady stream of books and articles has been turned out on this subject: "The complete servant;" "My station and its duties; a narrative for girls going to service;" "On the care of domestics;" "The servant girl of the period,—the greatest plague of life." These writings and many others describe much the same difficulties which harass both housewife and employee today, though we may claim to have abandoned to *some* extent the proprietary attitude implied in these titles!

Interesting similarities in the conditions and complaints of household employment could be traced down through history from ancient times. But the Roman slave, the feudal retainer, the colonial bond servant and even the "hired help" of our grandmothers' days, functioned in economic systems so unlike the modern industrial era that their lives and working conditions are scarcely comparable, and certainly of little help, when we come to consider possible solutions today. Therefore, we only suggest that "the servant problem," in some form, is a very old one, which many housewives in many times have been unable to solve successfully. This should make the task the more challenging to us!

The significance of the question in present-day American life is attested to by the number of books and articles which continue to appear currently. The list on page 23 is but a small sample. The 17-page bibliography published in 1938 by the Women's Bureau of the U. S. Department of Labor lists over 200 publications and articles. The output ranges from government documents to popular magazines, from journals of business and finance to the leaflets of trade unions. Writings on this subject, be they confessional stories or statistical analyses, are always popular reading. And the crop of college students currently writing term papers on "The Domestic Worker" seems to have reached an all-time high! The fact is that a very large percentage of our population is concerned, directly or indirectly, with the relation of domestic workers to their jobs, and at a point where that relation is felt most intimately—*within the family unit*. There are nearly 2,000,000 domestic workers in the country, or one to about every 15 families. When the several members of a family are counted, we get some idea of how many people are interested in this problem.

The League's Concern

To the Women's Trade Union League, the most important characteristic of this occupational group is the preponderance of women employed therein. The 1930 census showed that a million and a half of all the domestic workers in this country were women. Since then, the total number has increased, though the growth is not steady, for this occupation varies directly with general economic conditions. Domestic help is a marginal necessity or a slight luxury for a very large group of housewives, and the maid-of-all-work is one of the first items to be slashed from a shrinking budget.

The Women's Trade Union League has always been concerned with the standards and conditions affecting working women, both organized and unorganized. Especially has the League in its thirty-five years championed the needs of those less skilled, more exploited groups of women workers whom legislative or trade union protection have not reached. In supporting or initiating efforts of such workers to procure improved conditions, the League is motivated by the conviction that *low standards for one group of workers tend to undermine the standards for all*, and that the hard-won gains of the trade union movement are menaced by such marginal or "last resort" occupations as household work, into which inexperienced girls drift when jobs are scarce, and which they give up readily for somewhat better paid factory work when employment improves. To raise domestic service at least to the level of desirability and to the service standards of unskilled factory work would seem a modest aim, and one to enlist the support of housewives, employees and general public alike.

Some Facts About Domestic Service

There is overwhelming evidence that the employment conditions of most of these million and a half women domestic workers are unsatisfactory, not only to them, but to their employers. This brief pamphlet does not present new factual material on this point, however, for we have made no intensive study of any particular group of domestic workers. To do a thorough research job involves resources greater than any available to us, and indeed, there is some question as to whether the complicated human relationships involved in this field are statistically measurable.

But numerous surveys have been made which check one another and confirm our own observations. We gratefully make use of such material in presenting arguments for our proposed legislation. Considerable data was gathered by FORTUNE magazine in 1938; the Women's Bureau of the United States Department of Labor has long been at work on this subject; the Y.W.C.A. and the National Committee on Household

Employment are constantly adding to their extensive fund of information on this subject. Special groups in several cities have made local studies and experiments. Some of these are mentioned in the bibliography. In New York City, the Women's City Club, the League of Women Voters, the Consumers League and the League of Women Shoppers have all been concerned with this problem. And out of all the discussion have come certain conclusions generally accepted by intelligent observers, and relevant to our argument for particular legislation. These we list briefly as follows:

1. **Numbers:** There are nearly 2,000,000 domestic workers in this country, of whom 1,500,000 are women.

There are about a quarter of a million (250,000) domestic workers in New York State, three-fourths of whom are women.

2. **Hours of work** for all but a small minority are from 70 to 80 a week.

3. **Wages** vary from \$20 to \$100 per month for general houseworkers living in, and the majority receive from \$30-\$35 a month, including room and meals.

In the nation-wide FORTUNE survey, three-fourths of those studied received less than \$50 per month, and the average wage was \$40. The higher wages were found in the largest cities and the northeastern industrial area, lower wages in towns and smaller cities and in the south. The average wages in the south and west generally are nearer to \$25 a month. A large group, mainly Negro women, earn scarcely more than living expenses.

4. **The rate of labor turnover** in domestic service is extremely high. In the FORTUNE survey, 61% of the workers had been in the particular household studied less than two years; 27% less than six months.

5. **Domestic workers are generally excluded from the benefits of social security laws:**

All household workers are excluded from Federal unemployment insurance, although extension of the Social Security Act to include them has been suggested, and approved by the President.*

New Jersey includes them under Workmen's Compensation; Ohio where there are three or more in one household; Connecticut where there are four.

New York's unemployment insurance covers them only where there are four or more in a household. Employers may voluntarily insure fewer than four employees under the act in New York, as well as in several other states, but a very small number choose to do so.

* Report of the Advisory Council on Social Security: *N. Y. Times*, December 19, 1938: "Farm and domestic employees are in general among those wage earners most in need of protection against dependent old age and premature death. Low wages and intermittent employment frequently combine to make individual savings difficult . . . (Their) coverage (by the Social Security Act) . . . is socially desirable and should take effect, if administratively possible, by January 1, 1940."

6. **Maximum hours and minimum wage legislation** for this group of workers is still almost unknown. The Federal Wage-Hour law does not affect domestic service, which is not an interstate industry.

Wisconsin was the first state to pass a wage law covering domestic workers. There, in 1925, they were included under a minimum wage law, and weekly and hourly rates specified. There is, however, no limitation on hours for domestic workers in Wisconsin. (See also page 20.)

Washington State in 1937 passed a law limiting the hours of domestic workers to 60 per week, but here, on the other hand, they are not protected by any minimum wage regulations. The brief experience in these two states indicates that both of these loopholes—hours and wages—need to be plugged before adequate protection is assured.

7. **Trade union organization** of domestic workers has made little headway in proportion to the numbers involved.

Small union groups exist in several cities and have grown during the recent upswing of unionism, but such factors as high labor turnover, the unstandardized nature of the work, and the wide distribution of the workers in individual homes, explain the failure to build continuing and effective unions in this occupation. (See also page 15.)

8. **The bargaining power** between the domestic worker, the seller, and the employment agency, the buyer, is almost entirely on the side of the agency.

The New York City telephone directory lists nearly 500 private employment agencies, the majority of which place domestic workers. At least 35 of these are devoted exclusively to household placement. Obviously the competition between agencies is terrific. The statutory restrictions on these agencies deal with licensing, fee-charging, record-keeping and use of the agencies for other purposes. Aside from such provisions, the methods of the agencies are unrestricted and unstandardized.

A few are operated with some desire for social service as well as commercial profit. The practices of the others depend on many variable factors which leave the applicant completely at the mercy of the agency and the client. The only checks to exploitation other than legal regulations are the competition of non-fee-charging public agencies, the improved placement methods of certain social agencies, schools and Y.W.C.A. bureaus, and whatever enlightened attitude the individual employer may bring to bear.

The immediate concern of the typical employment agency is placement, or turnover. Few care what happens after that. Of course, in the long run, the success of the agency depends on the satisfaction of its customers, but with a huge reservoir of unemployed, cheap labor, it is easy to satisfy the client *at the expense of the applicant*, and the agency can plausibly argue that adjustment and standards on a particular job are matters outside its province. Thus the vicious circle persists.

9. **This occupation is still cursed by the stigma of its class origins.**

The owner-slave, lord-vassal, master-servant tradition remains, as FORTUNE points out, the chief reason on the one hand "why housewives have failed to be realistic in their handling of servants . . . and on the other, why domestic work is unpopular and domestic workers difficult to obtain."

As the economic basis of this relationship slowly changes, so will the psychological attitude surrounding it. The service-value which the domestic worker gives to modern society, like the use-value given a commodity by

the industrial worker, is a recognized and important part of our national wealth. And domestic workers cannot long remain exempt from the same privileges, and responsibilities, which affect other kinds of producers.

Meanwhile, there is no denying that in contrast with even the poorest factory and office jobs household service suffers from this hangover of its undemocratic and not so "respectable" past.

10. Finally, there is a **lack of standardization** about housework which makes it easy for prejudice, misunderstanding and personal opinion to enter into and seriously affect the job.

The variety of conditions in homes, the differences between people, the complications caused by children in the household, the unexpected things which inevitably occur, above all the personal intimacy of those involved, make this an infinitely difficult and complex problem. All the more reason why the easy, obvious things which may be done to standardize housework and eliminate some of these frictions, should be taken for granted.

There is not space here to give details about the conditions of which both housewife and worker complain bitterly. Our bibliography refers to other reading on this point. Many women who have little trouble with their own employees are amazingly ignorant of how bad conditions are for the vast majority. There are unbelievable tales of pettiness, unreasonable demands and disregard of the simplest principles of human consideration and common sense. But in the end, we find that all these complaints fall into the categories already mentioned in our factual summary, with the blanket indictment "lack of standardization" thrown over them all. And it is here, at the point of personal contact, that some people feel the heart of the problem is reached, and here that its solution should be tackled.

Mary Anderson, Director of the Women's Bureau, has defined household employment as "a *relationship* between individual employers and individual employees," and a human relationship is a pretty difficult kind of job to define—just the opposite of a mechanical factory process which can be analyzed, measured, speeded up, slowed down, changed and, at the ringing of a bell, forgotten until the next day! Even under the best of conditions, domestic service involves the addition of an outside person or persons into the home, the intimate inner circle of our lives. That means an adjustment for everyone concerned, and one which should have the full benefit of mutual understanding, cooperation, system,—in other words, the most favorable environment possible. Accordingly,

Voluntary Agreements,

preferably written and signed, are being advocated by an increasing number of persons. These agreements are specific and sometimes detailed statements of the working arrangements made between the em-

ployer and employee. They correspond roughly to the collective bargaining contracts agreed to by organized groups of industrial workers and their employers. A voluntary agreement formalizes and clarifies an understanding which is otherwise verbal and vague. It makes both housewife and employee think through more definitely what each expects of the other, and in so doing gain a more intelligent perspective on the whole job. When these agreements are supplemented by definite though flexible time schedules of weekly work, often drawn up by both parties jointly after several weeks experimenting, the entire job is put on a systematic basis more nearly comparable to professional and industrial work.

A voluntary agreement is now being tried out by some members of the New York Women's City Club for a six months' period. The agreement, prepared by their Committee on Labor and Industry, suggests a 60-hour week, to be divided into five days of ten hours and two days of five hours, or, if more convenient, six ten hour days with one full day off. Overtime work should be paid for either in cash or by extra time off within the month. A week's vacation with pay is recommended after the first year of service. An understanding is urged *at the beginning* as to what holidays will be given during the year and what is the basic period of employment.

Recommendations are made about duties and what constitute actual working hours and time "on call." For instance, two hours of call duty during the day count as one hour of full work, and three hours of call duty in the evening, or remaining with a child, count as one hour of working time. Recommendations as to wages are \$40 to \$50 a month for employees living in, and for those living out from \$12 to \$14 per week. A worker living in should be assured of privacy in her room and ready access to a bathroom. Wages should be paid at regular times. Those cooperating in the experiment are urged to reach a definite understanding with their employees at the beginning. It is their belief that "these standards will result in attracting a higher type of employee and of creating a better cooperation in the maintenance of work habits and professional standards."

There are almost as many kinds of voluntary agreements as there are housewives who have tried them out, for a degree of flexibility must be maintained to meet varying home conditions and personal conveniences. Experience shows, however, that certain items should be included in all such agreements. After numerous experiments, a standard voluntary agreement has been proposed by the National Committee on Household Employment. Data by which this agreement was worked out came mainly through contacts of the Y.W.C.A. with both employers and domestic workers throughout the country. This standard voluntary agreement is reprinted on page 22.

Training Domestic Workers

In trying to solve the problem of household employment, one step leads to another. Agreements presuppose qualified parties to the agreements; qualified implies standards, and standards involve training. Therefore, closely connected with proposals for voluntary agreements are various experiments in the training of domestic workers. These schools are based on the theory that domestic work is not, as many carelessly think, an unskilled occupation. "Anybody can make a bed," has been said, but there is a right and wrong way even to making a bed. Who can deny that cooking, laundering, marketing and child care demand certain high types of skill and experience, *if properly done*, and why should anyone pay for such services if they are not properly done?

Perhaps the most notable of the training centers is the Philadelphia Institute on Household Occupations, established in February 1937. A detailed report of its first year of work can be obtained by writing the Institute, 2005 Pine Street, Philadelphia. Their experience indicates:

a. "Whenever the job of houseworker is organized by employers to offer working conditions comparable to those of other jobs in industry, to afford the worker an opportunity to live some life of her own, and to permit her to maintain her self-respect as an individual, it will not be difficult to find workers willing to take the training.

b. "Whenever this standardization is accomplished, the high type of girl going into the work will change the world's attitude toward her and the job, thereby removing the present social stigma from the job.

c. "There really is not at the present time, a shortage of *willing* workers whenever the employer finds it possible to advertise a job offering hours and wages comparable to those offered by jobs in industry.

d. "At the same time that there is no shortage of willing workers, the number of trained and desirable workers (desirable from the standpoint of health, personal habits and attitude) are so much in demand that the placement possibilities of a school training such workers are 100 per cent."

Much the same opinion is expressed by leaders of the Household Training Program, a project of the W. P. A. Adult Education program, under the jurisdiction of the New York City Board of Education. At the training centers (347 East 116th Street, Manhattan, Tel.: Le 4-4552, and 386 Vanderbilt Avenue, Brooklyn) young women 18 years or over, who may or may not be from families on relief, are given a three months' course covering the fundamentals of household care, cooking, laundry work, child care and table service. In rooms equipped as nearly as possible with the furnishings of an average home, and under the supervision of trained home economists, the girls receive a brief but comprehensive course adequate to start them off into domestic service with some degree of confidence and skill.

The center places workers and attempts follow-up adjustments, even to taking a girl back for additional training in some special task.

Students are not placed for less than \$40 a month. Employers are urged to visit the center and discuss their needs with the staff. Similar W. P. A. schools are operated in other parts of the country, but these are the only ones in New York State. A wealth of information has been collected in the New York centers which would be invaluable to groups desiring to start such schools elsewhere.

The Harlem Branch of the Y.W.C.A., at 179 West 137th Street, in New York City, runs a similar training course for Negro women only. It has an excellent record of satisfactory placements.

Another and older center, placing its emphasis on training *employers* to be capable household managers, is Scientific Housekeeping, Inc., at 133 East 65th Street, which operates the Dorcas Boardman Schools for debutantes, brides and matrons, as well as courses for household employees. It also has an employment department. This group is of special interest because it coordinates under one roof all the activities and personnel involved in running a household. Scientific Housekeeping, Inc. emphasizes the educational and individual adjustment approaches to the domestic workers' problem. Were its services many times multiplied, other methods of improvement might be unnecessary, but they reach only a small fraction of the households, and those of the more well-to-do families.

Housewives looking for good employees, and unemployed domestic workers looking for desirable places, should first find out how such training centers may help them get together.

From its experience with groups in many cities, the Y.W.C.A. comments that the best training projects will in the long run be wasted effort, if placement and follow-up work are not conducted simultaneously with training. In other words, if the problem is to be tackled from the angle of improving standards, this will best be done by projects which have a planned continuity, starting from the housewife's need for a good worker, and the employee's need for a decent job, and going right on through training, placement and follow-up.

Mutual Benefit

The points of view of both enlightened employer and intelligent employee are implied in the foregoing. The mutuality of the problem is self-evident. Surely there are few occupations where the satisfaction of either party is more likely to benefit the other than in domestic service.

The complaints are often heard, "The average housewife wants as much work for as little pay as possible," or "The typical domestic worker wants an easy job for as much as she can get." Obviously these are no answers to our problem, but a dogmatic deadlock which only

the most unintelligent would declare impossible of compromise. In essence this is the same attitude which marked the early relations between labor and management on the industrial field, when each said "The other side is to blame," and "We'll fight it out to the end." But over a hundred years, organizations of both groups have grown up for the purposes of bargaining over their problems. When the two parties have accorded each other genuine recognition and respect, then mutually satisfactory agreements have resulted, *to the benefit of both*.

Similarly in the field of domestic service, it doesn't greatly matter at which point the problem is tackled—through better-trained workers, voluntary agreements, the organization of employees into unions, scientific home studies, legislation, public opinion—by some combination or all of these methods, that self-defeating antagonism must be broken down, if domestic employment is to become a respected occupation, and housewives a satisfied group of employers.

More and more housewives are coming to recognize the truth of this. They realize that managing a home is a responsibility involving serious and constant attention. The notion that having a domestic assistant permits one to shift onto her all the work and worry about household affairs, is exactly the wrong attitude to adopt. The intelligent housewife has found that the more thought she gives to the smooth execution of the housework, especially at the beginning of employment, the greater is the final return on her investment. If she can afford help at decent wages—and she should never try to stretch the family budget thin at this particularly delicate point—she has a right to expect an experienced or trained worker who will not need to be taught the fundamentals of housekeeping. But the adjustment of a total stranger to a new household cannot be expected to take place automatically and without guidance and foreplanning. Similarly the domestic employee must remember she is a new and outside element in the family circle, and that in the home, just as in any office or shop, there is a point where privileges for her become impositions on her employer.

To find that magic point of balance at which the job is done efficiently, with maximum satisfaction and minimum imposition *both* ways, is the exciting challenge in household employment!

Kinds of Employers

Now there are employers and employers—in homes as well as industry! For the purposes of our discussion, may we classify them loosely in three categories: first,

The enlightened minority,—those thoughtful, considerate housewives who have come to accept and act upon the general conclusions

above-outlined. Many of them are motivated originally by social consciences which cannot ignore the worst evils of domestic service. In the end, however, they all find that "it pays to be progressive." This group is steadily increasing as that realization spreads. Then there is

The marginal majority. Their employment of domestic help varies with "the times," and their standards are equally variable. This group includes many of those who employ only one general houseworker, or part-time helper, and who take them on and lay them off according to the current state of the family finances and their own personal activities. Included here too are many professional women who maintain one or a part-time domestic employee fairly steadily and under "fairly satisfactory" conditions. If their standards are not experimental and progressive, neither are they shockingly bad, but it is safe to say that conditions of domestic service will never be noticeably improved until large numbers of this group are stimulated to join the ranks of the enlightened minority.

A large percentage of this group may further be characterized as the "kindly, but indifferent" type, those perfectly well-intentioned housewives who simply do not appreciate how the hours of housework add up and the little extra tasks multiply to the point of exhausting the worker and encroaching unreasonably on her private life. The mistress who said, when her employee came down ready for the afternoon off, "Do you mind running the dog around the block as you start out?" illustrates just that important shade of difference between a feeling of merited leisure and of imposition.

At the lower end of the majority group are those "newly rich" housewives, who feel ostentatious about their improved economic conditions. One way to express this urge is by taking on a "servant" or two whom they treat "like the scum of the earth," as one houseworker put it. At this point in the scale, our marginal majority merges into what may be termed

The "die-hard fringe." This is composed of employers with old-fashioned ideas about domestic service as an occupation stemming from chattel slavery. They maintain an inflexible class attitude toward their "servants," and many, though financially well off, do indeed expect "the most for the least."

To this group goes a large share of credit for the numerous writings on the domestic situation and for various attempts at regulation, legislation and trade unions. Laws are proposed and labor organizations spring up when conditions are so bad that protection is imperative. If they but realize it, these "die-hards" would do more to forestall the laws and unions which they oppose by correcting some of their employees' grievances than by shouting hysterically about "regimenting the

home," "bringing the state into the kitchen," "menacing our constitutional liberties," etc.

At this point, may we emphasize that unsatisfactory conditions in household employment do *not* vary consistently with the size of the family pocketbook. There are examples of each type of employer above-mentioned in every income group. Indeed one hopeful factor in the attempt to improve conditions is that the problem has broken through its original class boundaries and become the concern of both Mrs. O'Grady, who has Annie in twice a week to spruce up her crowded household, and the Colonel's Lady with her staff of several specialists.

"Select Servants"

Often more conservative in their attitude than the employers, are some of the employees in the wealthier homes, where they are paid comparatively high wages and work reasonable hours, particularly if service is divided into specialized categories. These employees, like highly-paid, specialized industrial workers, have been indifferent or even hostile towards efforts to improve conditions for the vast majority of domestic workers. They are "craft" rather than "industrial" conscious. They often form social clubs or associations similar in effect to the "company unions" of the industrial world. If their employers do not establish or directly influence these clubs, neither do they encourage nor expect them to become independent "trade" unions.

In New York City the magazine STAFF, an expensive, monthly publication—in its own words, "The official and only magazine for the Better Household Staffs of Homes, Estates and Yachts,"—serves as the mouthpiece of such a group of "upper class" domestic employees, and also an opponent of unionism and legislation. "We're opposed to a 60-hour bill," says its Editor, "because it is in many ways against the welfare of a great number of persons employed on household staffs. At present there is little to complain of."

The group connected with this magazine and the Staff Club run the annual Staff Ball for employees of wealthy New York families—an elaborate affair patronized by many employers, to which only "select servants" are admitted. No doubt if these highly-paid domestics can be encouraged to regard themselves as superior to ordinary household workers, the patronage to which they, in turn, are subjected will seem more bearable! Industrial workers recognize this as a time-honored trick of the reactionary employer—dividing the workers against themselves.

It is true, of course, that many of the wealthier employers encourage such clubs solely to provide social centers for their employees, and

with no thought of their being used to oppose legislation or groups concerned more directly with working conditions. But such disinterested motives will have to be expressed far more vigorously if our "die-hard" group of housewives is to acquire a better reputation than it now has. And the "upper class staffs" will have to learn the sad lesson that unemployment, speed-up, lay-offs, wage cuts and insecurity are not unimaginable evils even on Park Avenue, and that social clubs can do little to combat them. The fact that butlers and governesses are among those active in promoting union organization among domestic workers shows that there *are* real grievances even in "our better households." Intelligent employees realize the truth of our original premise,—that low standards for some threaten the standards of all.

Because the opposition of the "die-hard fringe," though numerically small is vocally the loudest, we want to emphasize the method of its attack. One of its most sympathetic allies is the reactionary type of employment agency to which we have already referred. The chief fear of the agency is regulation of its practices, and hence curtailment of its income. The bogey of the old-fashioned housewife is legislation and union pressure, which would tend to standardize her household management and increase the wages she pays for domestic help. Such misery loves company!

An example of this type of agency is the Jessie M. Brinkley Registry in New York City. For a time last year this organization operated a high-class placement bureau with one hand and a stock-selling scheme with the other, the main purpose of the latter being to mobilize opinion against legislative measures to protect domestic workers. The sale of stock fell through when the Department of Licenses ruled that the license laws were being violated.

The propaganda issued by the Registry at the time indicates the kind of misinformation and false assertions which becloud this issue. We quote from a leaflet advertising the stock-selling plan:

"HOME CONTROL VS. LABOR UNIONISM. Which do you desire? "Every year the State Labor Commission comes closer to forcing you to deal with Public Labor Bureaus. If successful, what would result?"

1. 'Freezing' out the private registries and agencies
2. Only public bureaus for servant placement
3. Labor unionization of servants
4. Labor dictation as to hours of service
5. Labor dictation as to class of service
6. Labor dictation as to wages and fitness
7. Strikes and picketing of your home."

This would be a good example for the Institute of Propaganda Analysis! First it implies that the goal of the "State Labor Commission" (by which presumably is meant the State Department of Labor, headed by the Industrial Commissioner) is elimination of all private

employment agencies. Secondly it states that the inevitable result of "Public Labor Bureaus" would be certain *alleged* practices of labor unions. Neither the first nor second assumption is true, but it is hoped the reader will swallow both implications, and therefore oppose any further regulation of private agencies. "An exclusive membership" at \$10 a share was sought "in order that its influence may be felt when opposition to oppression and unfair measures becomes necessary."

In an accompanying leaflet headed "Labor Unions in the Home?" the following appears:

"Reduced to simple terms, the character of this organization is similar to that of a club. Stockholders may or may not receive dividends on their investment, *but they will be reasonably assured of protection against the inroads of organized labor in the home.*" (Italics ours.)

(Simple indeed! Insurance against unionism.)

But that isn't all. Worse sufferers from regulation than the employers would be—guess who—household workers!

This message is addressed to anxious applicants:

". . . A political drive is being made to put private employment agencies out of business which, if successful, means that household servants will be the heaviest losers. You would be forced to go to public labor bureaus for a job, and you would be obliged to take what you could get, at any wage, in or out of town. Public agencies would not protect you in the matter of wages and homes as does this and other select Registries."

". . . You cannot expect the care and consideration from a Labor Bureau that you receive in this office, nor can you secure positions in the best families, for these will not patronize public agencies. Your cooperation is requested so that no applicant may fail to find a good home and good pay." (In other words, our primary concern is all for you, dear employee!)

The conclusions herein drawn are utterly gratuitous. Competition between public and private agencies will continue to depend on the respective services they offer. Private agencies with decent standards and practices have nothing to fear from regulations. These are made necessary only by sub-standard agencies. Private registries, moreover, have certainly *not* been concerned about protecting employees in the matter of wages and hours. Their notable failure in this respect was one reason for regulation and the organization of independent groups. The reference to "best families" is an obvious appeal to snobbery.

Finally, to indicate the hysterical attitude of this type of opposition, we quote from a letter which has no address on it, but is headed "New York Household Placement Association." The same Miss Jessie M. Brinkley is Chairman of its Legislative Committee:

"A warning to every employer of Domestic Help. Certain so-called 'Organizers' are now at work to unionize all domestic servants in this state. Riding the wave of popular acceptance of all social legislation, good or bad, they feel that the present time offers an opportunity to do this . . .

"Do you want the peace of your home disrupted by 'sitdown' or other strikes? And further—do you want your servant exploited by interests

which have shamefully betrayed workers in other trades here in New York? Only a united stand by Employer, Employee and Agent can stave off this fate . . ."

The implied net-work of domestic service organizers covering the state is flattering, though scarcely credible, to the struggling little domestic workers' groups. The Union, moreover, does not advocate the "sit-down" or any other kind of strike. To the charges of "exploiting" and "betraying" workers "in other trades," the reply is "Where, when, who?"

These documents speak most strongly against themselves. Such attacks are similar in tone and method to those which have faced every piece of progressive social legislation that was ever introduced. While representing a minority group, such opposition is well organized and financed. Its propaganda confuses the partially informed, and raises imaginary bogeys for the uninformed. That is the reason for pamphlets like this. That is why it is imperative for those who see the betterment of domestic service as an important link in the chain of social progress to make their wishes known to their friends, to their employees, to their legislators.

Trade Union Efforts

This pamphlet is primarily concerned with legislation, and is in no way a spokesman or organizer for any particular group of domestic workers. However, the Women's Trade Union League, itself composed of trade union affiliates and organized industrial workers, as well as allied members, would be remiss if it did not again assert its belief that domestic workers, like any others, will be able to help solve their problem only when they organize to improve their working conditions. Granted all the peculiar obstacles to unionism in this field, the fact remains that no one else can *give* household employees a ready-made remedy. When eight out of ten domestic workers, to give a liberal estimate, have a long list of complaints to make, there is obviously a basis for organization. Letters like the following, selected at random, are typical:

"It is about time something was done about conditions of household workers, one way or another. I do not know of any other work where the workers are NEGLECTED as much as these are. It seems that we have no rights whatsoever, and can be used and abused to suit anybody's fancy. In most cases the work is very hard, plus the long hours and conditions under which many must live. I often work from around 7 in the a. m. to 11 or 12 at night, on my feet running up and down stairs, and not an hour's rest during the day . . .

"What I can't understand is: most people who hire domestics are either wealthy or well able to hire two people, where they get the work out of one because of no hour restrictions . . .

"About the free time—will say many do not get even two half days, for by the time you get your work through, plus all the extras everybody

seems to pile on you just when it is your time off, it sums up to only a few hours per week. As for workmen's compensation, it is a JOKE for domestics! No social security yet that I know of. And yet this work is sadly in need of a DOCTOR, as it has many ills.

"Well, we shall have to grow WINGS to put up with the conditions under which we must work. Perhaps we shall get our reward when we get to HEAVEN, I haven't seen any here yet! Anyway God Bless you and GOOD LUCK to your bills on behalf of this line of working people, as I think in most cases they are very deserving and conscientious.—Astoria, L. I."

From time to time, groups of domestic workers have come together in New York City and elsewhere in the state. A description of groups in other parts of the country is given in a mimeographed "Brief on Household Employment in Relation to Trade Union Organization," published by the National Board of the Y. W. C. A. These associations are often vague in purpose, unstable in membership and shortlived. Some are the creations of individuals ambitious for leadership and aware of the great unrest among household employees. Others are primarily social centers. It is sometimes difficult to tell when such a group is a *union*, and when it is just a social club. It seems to us, however, that connection with some established trade union organization is one earmark of any bona fide union, and the failure of many of these groups to tie themselves up with the existing labor movement indicates they do not yet understand the basic economic unity of all workers.

For this reason, the Women's Trade Union League believes that the Domestic Workers' Union in New York City, Local No. 149 of the Building Service Employees International Union, which is an affiliate of the American Federation of Labor, is the legitimate organization in this area through which domestic workers should express their needs. The Union, with headquarters at 241 East 84th Street, Manhattan, carries on regular organization activities, although on a limited scale for lack of funds, and because of the extraordinary handicaps to organization in this field, i.e. high turnover of members, irregularity in their free time, fatigue at the end of a working day, and the variety of their occupational problems and racial backgrounds. Experience in other groups has been similar. With less than a dozen really functioning domestic workers' unions in the country, the hue and cry raised by some about the "danger" of unionism is amusing. However, to them we say:

"The principle of voluntary association of workers to improve working conditions has long been accepted as desirable and efficient in modern American society. This applies quite as truly to domestic workers. Raising false bogeys about it only makes you ridiculous in the eyes of intelligent people. *For the sake of your own household*, learn from industry's experience the elementary lesson of employer-employee relationships. Come out of the middle ages and assume a responsible

share in solving this, your own particular economic problem of 1939!"

To the domestic worker, we say: "In spite of the unique characteristics of your 'trade' and special obstacles to getting together with others in the same work, the need for such organization is obviously great. It is to your own interest to do what you can to forward that organization. One reason workers in other trades have more desirable jobs than you, is just because they have trade unions to stand up for them. If you will help build the union, others will help establish training centers and laws and standards, until, all working together, the job will be done—and domestic service will become the honored and honorable profession it should be."

The Proposed Legislation

We come now to the bills mentioned at the beginning, through which the Women's Trade Union League is attempting to crystallize action on the domestic workers' problem. The following analyses were prepared by the lawyer who helped to draft the bills, and who has given invaluable advice on the entire pamphlet.

BY BLANCH FREEDMAN

I Wicks-Wagner 60-Hour Bill for Domestic Workers

Senate #75

Int. #75

Assembly #66

Int. #66

(Referred to the Committees on Labor and Industry)

This proposed legislation limits the number of hours of labor per week a domestic worker may be employed. The act provides:

"Sec. 185A. Employment of persons as domestic workers. 1. No person shall be employed as a domestic worker for more than sixty hours in any week."

By thus limiting only the total number of hours *per week* in household employment, the number of hours worked per day, as well as the day or half days of rest each week, are left to the mutual arrangement of the employer with the domestic worker. The bill does not control the daily working hours or the number of days a week a domestic may work. On the contrary, it is recognized that in the management of a household some days may require more hours of work than others. Similarly, in some homes it may be more satisfactory to provide for two afternoons off a week rather than a single day of 24 consecutive hours. The elasticity of the section permits a voluntary agreement between the parties with adjustments to the needs of the particular household. The one requisite imposed is that the total number of working hours required each week of the domestic worker shall not exceed sixty. Compared with the statutory limitation of 48

hours a week for industrial and mercantile workers, the proposal for a maximum 60-hour week is modest.

Subdivision 2 of the section specifies who is a domestic worker and states:

"2. When used in this section 'domestic worker' shall mean a person employed in any occupation commonly known as domestic service or household employment."

Under this provision the household cook and waitress (as distinguished from cooks and waitresses employed in commercial establishments) would be covered as well as the gardener, chauffeur, general house worker, governess, mother's helper or similar worker.

The third and last subdivision of the section defines what constitutes a working hour in household employment as follows:

"3. Actual working hours shall be defined as hours of duty during which the worker is not free to follow his or her own pursuit, nor is not free from any and all responsibility for the employer's person, property, children or any other person in the household, except that the time spent by a domestic worker who lives in the premises of the employer, in ministering to a child, children or other person in the household of such employer, during the sleeping hours of such domestic worker, shall not be a part of such hours of duty."

Although anyone is in actual effect working whose hours of sleep may be interrupted by the needs of another, nevertheless the proposed legislation makes liberal exception with respect to this, on the grounds of the nature of the personal service involved.

In all other respects the definition is substantially the same as that employed in the Washington 60-hour law for Domestic Workers and in the proposed voluntary agreement advocated by the National Committee on Household Employment.

The experience of the National Board of the Y. W. C. A., the State of Washington and other interested groups demonstrates that a 60-hour week is workable and beneficial to both employer and employee, "as more maids accomplish more work in less hours, if they have regular hours."

The law would be administered by the State Department of Labor, as are all laws pertaining to hours and conditions of labor. That its administration would be a large task, is neither denied nor minimized, BUT SUCH A TASK IS NOT INSURMOUNTABLE. Our Department of Labor has developed methods of enforcing laws regulating homework, which are also difficult of administration. Enforcement of the income tax law is not easy, but it is being carried out to the best ability of those charged with this duty.

However, there are other factors which would operate to make the proposed 60-hour legislation effective. Laws carry with them a moral persuasion to obey, and most people are naturally reluctant to violate

them. On the other hand, the employee with the strength of law to rest on has a right to expect compliance. An employer who discharged a worker because she insisted upon the statutory limitation of 60 hours per week would soon be confronted again with the same problem, so that she too would eventually come to accept this standard. Thus we could count on the educational and moral value of such legislation to improve working standards. To the enlightened employer the proposed legislation raises no issue. In fact, she welcomes it because she knows that its effect will be to standardize conditions of work to the benefit of her household.

Where charges or complaints are registered with the Labor Department by an aggrieved worker, the Department may, after verifying the complaint, and a refusal by the employer to comply with the statute, invoke section 1275 of the Penal Law which provides:

Section 1275: ". . . Any person who violates or does not comply with any provision of the labor law . . . is guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction shall be punished, except as in this chapter otherwise provided, for a first offense by a fine of not more than \$50; for a second offense by a fine of not less than \$50 nor more than \$250, or by imprisonment for not more than 30 days or by such fine and imprisonment; for a third offense by a fine of not less than \$250, or by imprisonment for not more than 60 days, or by such fine and imprisonment."

II Howard-Wagner Bill to include Domestic Workers in the Minimum Wage Law

Senate #141

Int. #140

Assembly #149

Int. #149

(Referred to the Committees on Labor and Industry)

The present minimum wage law excludes from its provisions two categories of workers; domestic employees and farm laborers. The above-proposed amendment deletes the first exclusion, thus bringing female domestic workers within the protection of the statute. The bill states:

"Section 552 Definitions: Subdivision 1: 6. 'Occupations' shall mean an industry, trade, business or class of work in which women are gainfully employed, but shall not include [domestic service in the home of the employer or] labor on a farm." The phrase in brackets is the part of the present law which this bill proposes to omit.

This proposal makes all the provisions of the minimum wage law applicable to household employment. It does not make mandatory minimum wage regulations for domestic workers. It enables the Department of Labor to determine in the prescribed manner what the minimum rates for the occupation shall be, *if necessary*.

The minimum wage procedure has already been demonstrated in the establishment of rates for the laundry, beauty parlor, candy, and cleaning and dyeing industries. A board of nine persons is formed, three

members representing the public at large, three the employees, and three the employers. The board examines evidence relevant to working conditions in the occupation. It then recommends to the Industrial Commissioner the minimum wage it believes constitutes "an amount sufficient to provide adequate maintenance and to protect health," and which is commensurate with "the value of the service rendered." The Commissioner receives the board's report and holds public hearings thereon, after which the recommendations may be declared in effect by a Directory Order of the Commissioner.

The Women's Trade Union League believes that minimum wage rates for domestic workers would unquestionably improve standards in this occupation. While the proposal for the 60-hour week law and the amendment to the minimum wage law are independent measures, in a broad sense they supplement each other. By enacting both bills, the dual problem of long hours and low wages in household employment can be dealt with adequately to the mutual advantage of employee and employer.

Wisconsin offers an excellent precedent for such action in New York. That state has administered minimum wage regulations for domestic service since 1933. In response to a recent inquiry, the Industrial Commissioner of Wisconsin declares that enforcement of the law has become increasingly less of a problem "because housewives are beginning to know there is such a regulation," and also "We are receiving the cooperation of public employment offices which do not send maids to employers who will not agree to pay the minimum . . . The private employment agencies . . . have also cooperated in not making placements at less than the minimum."

Since the present proposal fixes no rates, but is merely an enabling act, detailed discussion on rates is unnecessary here. That question, including whether any rate is necessary, would be determined later, and only after public hearings.

The Department of Labor would also administer this law, and the arguments concerning its enforcement are similar to those for the 60-hour law. In addition, an underpaid worker could resort to civil action to collect wages due her. To continue to exclude domestic workers from the humane principles of the Minimum Wage Act is an unjustifiable discrimination against the largest single group of women workers in this state.

III Wicks-Breitbart Bill providing Workmen's Compensation for Domestic Workers where two or more are employed

Senate #76

Int. #76

Assembly #26

Int. #26

(Referred to the Committees on Labor and Industry)

The hazard of accidental injury involved in household employment is self-evident. It is roughly estimated that 50% of all accidents which are reported occur in the home. Yet under the present law in this state no compensation need be provided for injuries sustained by domestic workers in the course of their employment or for their dependents in the event of death.

The proposed amendment makes a beginning towards correcting this situation. It includes in the Workmen's Compensation law, under group 12 of section 3, which enumerates the various occupations or groups for which compensation is mandatory, the phrase "work as . . . domestic workers, provided at least two or more are regularly employed on the premises by a single employer."

The need of extending the protection of this law to *all* workers is conceded. However, the gigantic administrative problem involved were all domestic workers, including part-time employees, to be included in the first extension of the bill, justifies applying it to only two or more. This will at once bring within the protection of the compensation law a large number of domestic workers. The bill could readily be administered by the Department of Labor with its existing facilities, and the basis would be laid for efficient administration of complete coverage later on.

What To Do

These three measures, therefore, are presented to the legislators of New York State and to its thinking citizens for their earnest consideration and, we hope, their support. If you favor these measures, the Women's Trade Union League would appreciate hearing from you to that effect. If you do not, we should equally appreciate knowing your objections.

To make your opinion known where it will count most, will you please write to the Committee Chairmen and members, whose names are given on the inside back cover.

In closing we repeat, the legislative is not the only, perhaps not the ideal solution, but, alas, we do not live in an ideal world and we have to spend a considerable part of our time patching up its weak spots. Fortunately, that is still our privilege in a democracy. And it may be that failure to mend weak links now will contribute to a possible breakage of the chain, in which event more drastic reformers will have a better excuse for entering in with wholly undemocratic proposals. That is something else to think about!

Proposals for a Voluntary Agreement in Household Employment

National Committee on Household Employment
MRS. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, *Honorary Chairman*
MISS DOROTHY WELLS, *Chairman*

Written Agreement

A definite working agreement between employer and employee should be made at time of employment. This should be reviewed periodically and anticipated variations should be considered. It is recommended that this agreement be a written one, and a copy be kept by both the employer and employee.

Duties

Regular duties should be clearly defined, with provisions made for the possibility of emergencies.

Hours

Actual working hours shall be defined as hours of duty during which the worker is not free to follow his own pursuits.

Time on call is that time when he is not free to leave the house but may rest or follow his own pursuits. Two hours on call shall be considered equivalent to one hour of working time.

Hours entirely free for worker's own personal or business life, is the time when the worker is entirely free from any responsibility to the employer or the job.

Total actual working hours shall not exceed a maximum of sixty working hours a week, or less as agreed upon.

Time off: Two half days a week, beginning not later than two p.m. on the weekday and three p.m. on Sunday, or one whole day a week should be scheduled.

Vacations: One week with pay after the first year's service.

Wages

Local Councils on Household Employment, in working out fair minimum wage rates, should take into account prevailing wage rates in household employment, changes in the cost of living and advancement in business recovery in the community concerned. No full-time worker should receive a wage less than the minimum. Wages above the minimum should not be decreased and a rising scale should accompany increasing skill and experience.

Payment

Payment should be made preferably weekly or bi-weekly and if paid monthly four and one-third weeks should be calculated to the month. Wages should be paid on the day due.

Overtime

Overtime should be compensated for by extra time off within one month, say for example, a weekend, or by extra pay on basis of "rates per hour for more than fifty hours." Overtime should not exceed twelve hours in any week.

Living Conditions

Comfortable living conditions should include: (a) adequate food; (b) private bedroom, possibly shared with another employee; (c) access to bath; (d) space for personal possessions; (e) adequate heat.

Notice

Employer shall give one week's notice, or week's pay for termination of employee's services, after the trial period is passed. Trial period should be two weeks. Employee should give one week's notice after the trial period.

(Copies of the entire Voluntary Agreement, including suggested wage scales, may be secured from the NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON HOUSEHOLD EMPLOYMENT, Y.W.C.A., 600 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y. A revised Agreement is now under consideration by the Committee.)

READING SUGGESTIONS

General

- Bibliography: Reading List of References on Household Employment.* Women's Bureau, U. S. Dept. of Labor, Bulletin #154.
- The Servant Problem:* FORTUNE Magazine. March, 1938. Simple statistics gathered from 17,000 FORTUNE readers on distribution of servants, wages, hours, race and nationality, length of service, etc.
- Fair and Clear in the Home:* A symposium on household employment, The Women's Press (Y.W.C.A.) N. Y. C. \$1.00. Chapters on standards, agreements, legislation, work schedules, interviews, personal relationships.
- Findings of Household Employees' Group, Bryn Mawr Summer School, 1937.* From B.M.S.S. Office, 302 East 35th St., N. Y. C. What a group of employees has to say about conditions, education, legislation, unions.
- Household Employment:* Occasional Paper No. 9. Social and Industrial Section of the World. Y.W.C.A. 2 Rue Daniel Colladon, Geneva, Switzerland. 18 pp., mimeogfd. Valuable for its international point of view and data.
- Articles* on many aspects of domestic service may be found by referring to files of *The Woman's Press*, (Y.W.C.A. magazine), *The Federationist* (A. F. of L. monthly), the *Monthly Labor Review* (of the Bureau of Labor Statistics) and the *Journal of Home Economics*.

Standards and Training

- The Philadelphia Institute on Household Occupations:* Progress report on the first year's work (1937). 2005 Pine St., Philadelphia, Pa. Gives history, method and analysis of work, with individual case histories of students.
- An Educational Program for Household Employment.* U. S. Dept. of Interior, Vocational Div., Office of Education. Misc. No. 1717. 55 pp., mimeogfd. 1936. Comprehensive and factual. Includes chapters on training centers, sample schedules. Valuable for teachers in household training courses.
- Household Employment Problems:* A handbook for round-table discussions among household employers. Dept. of Interior. Ibid. Misc. No. 1971. 55 pp., mimeogfd. 1937. Describes actual experiments in training domestic workers.

Standards of Placement Agencies for Household Employees. Bulletin No. 112, Women's Bureau, 1934. Summarizes requirements of public employment offices and certain private and social agencies.

Occupational Guide: Material describing tasks connected with household employment, written from a vocational point of view in editions suited to both younger and older readers, has been prepared by the W.P.A. for the Dept. of Placement and Guidance of the Board of Education of N. Y. C. Inquiries about this may be made from Director of the Bureau, Charles M. Smith, 131 Livingston St., Brooklyn, N. Y.

Legislation

Washington State, 60-hour Bill. I.W.C. Order No. 33. From the Industrial Welfare Committee, Tacoma, Wash.

Wisconsin Minimum Wage Regulation. Form C-5a. From the Industrial Commission of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, Wisc.

Injuries to Women in Personal Service Occupations in Ohio. Bulletin No. 151 of the Women's Bureau, U. S. Dept. of Labor, 1937. Statistical data on accidents in the home. Interesting because probably typical.

Trade Unions

Brief on Household Employment in Relation to Trade Union Organization. Leadership Div., National Board, Y.W.C.A. 1938. 17 pp. Two-thirds of this mimeographed brief is devoted to general discussion of domestic service.

Useful Addresses

Domestic Workers' Union, Local #149, B.S.E.I.U., 241 East 84th St., N. Y. C.
National Committee on Household Employment, Y.W.C.A., 600 Lexington Ave., N. Y. C.

New York Women's Trade Union League, 247 Lexington Ave., N. Y. C.

Scientific Housekeeping, Inc., 133 East 65th St., N. Y. C.

W.P.A. Training Program:

347 East 116th St., Manhattan, N. Y. C.

386 Vanderbilt Ave., Brooklyn, N. Y.

Y.W.C.A. National Board, 600 Lexington Ave., N. Y. C.; Uptown Branch for Colored Women, and Training Center, 179 West 137th St., N. Y. C.

WOULD YOU LIKE INFORMATION ABOUT THE WOMEN'S TRADE UNION LEAGUE, and its activities in

Workers' Education

Legislation

Organizing

Classes for industrial workers are held throughout the winter. Monthly meetings report to our members important events in the labor movement and outside. Committees meet regularly to discuss legislation, both state and national, to plan organizing work, to be constantly vigilant on behalf of industrial women. Many prominent citizens help to maintain this work as allied members.

Membership in the League offers you participation in the above activities, and brings you the monthly BULLETIN of news. For trade union members, the League dues are \$2 a year; for allied members, \$5 or over.

Write if you are interested to 247 Lexington Avenue, New York City

Committees on Labor and Industry

N. Y. State Legislature—1939

<i>Senate</i>	<i>Assembly</i>	<i>County</i>
William F. Condon, <i>Chairman</i>	Fred A. Washburn, <i>Chairman</i>	Columbia
William Bewley	Elisha T. Barrett	Suffolk
Edward J. Coughlin	Charles H. Breitbart	Kings
Mrs. Rhoda Fox Graves	Anthony J. Canney	Erie
Joe R. Hanley	Meyer Goldberg	New York
John J. Howard	Fred S. Hollowell	Yates
Allan A. Ryan, Jr.	William Kirnan	Kings
Walter W. Stokes	Francis J. McCaffrey, Jr.	New York
Arthur H. Wicks	Harold C. Ostertag	Wyoming
Stephen J. Wojtkowiak	Herbert A. Rapp	Genesee
	Ralph Schwartz	Kings
	Stanley C. Shaw	Tompkins
	Sheldon F. Wickes	Essex
	William R. Williams	Oneida
	Malcolm Wilson	Westchester

Address all communications:

Hon.....
Senate (or Assembly) Chamber
Albany, New York

