

regardless of the fact that the employers involved were perfectly willing to employ only union workers and to employ them under union conditions.

It should, moreover, be recalled that the experience in England, where closed shop conditions prevail to a much larger extent than in this country, has not been such as to justify a belief that the general prevalence of unionism or closed shop agreements in American industry would conduce to national prosperity. If time permitted evidence could be introduced to demonstrate conclusively the disastrous result on British trade and prosperity of the closed shop conditions in her industries.

We have had reference here tonight to the necessity of rigid observance of contracts in industry and to this I fully agree. It may be pointed out, however, that while the American Federation of Labor at one time demanded that unions should be allowed to incorporate they now oppose vigorously any proposals for incorporation and any other proposals to make the unions which sign contracts responsible for their observance. We may even point out that the late president of the American Federation of Labor, Mr. Gompers, in his testimony before the Lockwood Committee declared that employers should be compelled to observe contracts they sign with labor organizations but that the latter should not be compelled to abide by them strictly.

Explanations or professions as to the willingness of organized labor to use or rather to permit the use of so-called scientific management in industry will continue to be taken "cum grano salis" by most of the manufacturers of the country. The reasons for this doubt I shall briefly set forth.

In private industry the record is, on the whole, one of dislike by organized labor of any form of "scientific" management; many people, both employees and employers, it may be remarked, at the present time "shy" at any suggestions of "scientific" or "efficiency" schemes or proposals. In the first place, it should be noted that really "scientific" management implies the most economic use, with the least waste, of the labor, machinery, and materials available, including within this the elimination or prevention of health-impairing methods or practices. That is to say, management of a truly "scientific" character embraces, as we all realize, much more than studies of the best methods of using available labor or of the best tools to use.

Plans, systems, devices, or rules, written or unwritten, impairing or impeding the efficiency of manage-

ment increase operating costs, which President Green of the A. F. of L. assures us are passed on to the consumer, and are in their results most unscientific and wasteful.

I am well aware that Mr. Gompers declared for public consumption in 1921²² "Trade-unionism . . . rejects wholly the false doctrine of restriction of output as a means of helping the worker." Yet I submit that the evidence does not at all show that it "rejects wholly" either that doctrine or other practices of "unscientific" production.

Particularly in Illinois and Indiana the United Mine Workers prevent where possible, or at least delay as long as possible, the use of loading machinery in coal mines.

The International Typographical Union has a number of obnoxious and unscientific rules. It provides, for example²³

The interchanging, exchanging, borrowing, lending, or buying of matter previously used, either in the form of type or matrices, between newspapers, between job-offices, or between newspapers and job-offices, or vice versa, not owned by the same individual, firm or corporation, and published in the same establishment, is unlawful, and shall not be allowed, unless such type or matrices are reset as nearly like the original as possible, made up, read and corrected and a proof submitted to the chairman of the office. Transfer of matter between a newspaper office and a job-office, or a job-office and a newspaper office, where conducted as separate institutions, and from separate composing rooms, owned by the same individual, firm or corporation, is not permissible unless such matter is reset.

The International Association of Machinists provides²⁴

In shops where it is not now a practice no member of this Association shall be permitted to accept piecework or accept work under the following conditions: operation of more than one machine, piecework, premium, merit, task or contract systems Where these systems are established they shall be entirely abolished as soon as possible, date to be set by the General Executive Board.

To a New York audience it is not necessary to recall the large number of methods uncovered by the Lockwood Committee which are used in the building trades to increase production costs.

In the garment trades, in certain centers, it is true, the unions appear to have made some efforts to join

²²"Union Labor and the Enlightened Employer," *Industrial Management*, Vol. 61, No. 7, April, 1921, pages 234-9.

²³Laws, page 93.

²⁴Constitution, page 71.

with employers in basing wages on efficiency. Yet this is coupled with other practices which restrict the managerial functions in industry and, as in Cleveland, have driven out of existence a large part of the business. In New York city it is now provided in the ladies garment industry that plants cannot even exist under union contracts unless they can afford to operate a minimum number of machines—an attempt to dictate the minimum amount of capital which shall be used.

Now let us consider an even clearer instance of opposition to "science" or "efficiency" in industry—and one about which we can do something.

The present Appropriation Acts for the support of the Navy and War Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926, carry riders denying pay to any officer, manager, superintendent, foreman or other person having charge of the work of any United States employee who makes or causes to be made "with a stop watch or other time-measuring device a time study of any job of any such employee between the starting and completion thereof, or the movements of any such employee while engaged upon such work." The rider also forbids the payment of any premium, bonus or cash reward to any employee in addition to his regular wages except for suggestions resulting in improvements or economy in the operation of any government plant.

There we have the real—not a professed—attitude of organized labor towards scientific management in bills preventing extra pay for extra efficiency and preventing studies as to the most economical ways of performing work. These bills have for years been enacted at the request of organized labor.

The same bills specifically provide for construction, repairs, and maintenance in government navy yards to the value of at least \$88,000,000, and indirectly provide for far larger amounts—and upon all this work "scientific" management is prohibited at the request and demand of organized labor. It goes without saying that on Government work, supported by the taxpayers, work should be done as economically as possible.

You are, of course, aware that formerly time studies and bonuses were permitted on government work. At the Watertown Arsenal following their installation workers produced from two to two and one-half times as much work in a day as before, and received increased compensation. The 1912 report of the Chief of Ordnance to the Secretary of War relates "the benefits which accrue to the workman from the Taylor

system as applied at the Watertown Arsenal" and also the advantages "secured for the Government."²⁵ Acts of 1915 and 1916 prevented the continuance of these practices.

It is economically wrong and politically outrageous that efficiency in government work should be so interfered with at the expense of the taxpayers—and at the demand of a comparatively small group. Why should Government plants be denied those aids to efficient production indispensable to the progress of private manufacture?

Will organized labor join in an effort to oppose such anti-efficiency riders at the next session of Congress? Unless they do so what shall be said of the attitude of organized labor towards scientific management?

Closure

Geoffrey C. Brown. Mr. Sargent has introduced a few points to which, in closure, I will give brief attention.

He states that "there could be a serious and perhaps worth-while discussion as to what collective bargaining is, and whether any form of organization can justly claim to have a monopoly upon the type of collective bargaining that should exist in industry." I agree with Mr. Sargent that such a discussion—impartially conducted and with a fair representation from the labor movement which has been responsible, directly or indirectly, for the entire development of collective bargaining—would be both interesting and instructive. President Johnston of the Machinists' Union, at the last Silver Bay conference of the Y. M. C. A., in reply to Mr. J. Parke Channing, gave the following quite adequate definition of collective bargaining.

Briefly, you have collective bargaining when the workers are organized and recognized as having a right to a voice in determining the wages, the hours, and the conditions under which they shall work, and when they may sit down with the employer and negotiate a standard or working agreement.

It is interesting to trace the gradual evolution during the past fifty years of the attitude of industry toward collective bargaining. Fifty years ago, to quote an eminent economist, "the old-fashioned employer would no more have dreamed of negotiating with a Trade Union official claiming to represent the

²⁵Page 17.