result of historical development, for attempts have been made in the past to broaden the scope and function of joint machinery to include broad questions concerning the welfare of industry. These efforts are represented by: (1) the joint industrial councils or Whitley Councils, as we term them in this country; (2) works councils or shop committees functioning in individual establishments; (3) co-operative schemes undertaken in certain industries to further their efficiency and prosperity; (4) joint fact finding and (5) the increasing acceptance of piece work and technical improvements by British unions.

Perhaps the most important of the precursors of the present move toward better labor relations have been the joint industrial councils. At present forty-seven Joint Industrial Councils exist in Britain, covering industries employing in the neighborhood of three million persons. They are found in such important trades as wool textiles, pottery, Welsh plate and sheet, hosiery, printing, heavy chemicals, flour milling, the docks, government employment and various public utility services.

A joint industrial council presupposes effective organization on both sides, and consists of equal representatives from the employers' associations and the trade unions concerned. Usually they serve as negotiating bodies for their industries, draft national agreements and determine local differentials. They are also courts for the settlement of grievances. But beyond these usual duties, they are charged with the responsibility of co-operating to promote the welfare of industry as a whole.

Now many people in Britain are dissatisfied with the results achieved by these councils. The councils, they say, have in practice been little more than negotiating machinery for the settlement of wages, hours and working conditions; and few, if any, have pursued their broader objectives of promoting "the progress and well-being of the trade."

Opinions of this type undoubtedly arise from memories of the high idealism with which the councils were created. Formulated in the midst of the war period, they were hailed as one instrument of that "new world" for which men everywhere were seeking. But confronted from the beginning with grave problems of demobilization and transition to peace time industry, and overwhelmed by the depression and disillusion of the post-war years, the reality of the councils has thus far proved very different from the eager hopes with which they were launched. To an American observer, however, viewing the councils from the perspective of practices in the United States, they appear a significant advance in industrial relations.

The great advantage in joint industrial councils over old types of joint relations machinery is that they meet not only when difficulties have already arisen or a new agreement must be negotiated, but regularly, whether it be monthly, quarterly, or within some other period. Thus they really constitute parliaments for the various industries. Frequent and regular meetings result in better acquaintance among representatives of both sides. Out of this greater familiarity grows a realization on each side that the men on the other are also people of integrity. Before a Council has operated a very long time, discussion generally assumes a calmer tone. Regular meetings, again, enable Councils to deal with difficulties in their early stage. Indeed, continuous contact helps eliminate many of the delays that often vex usual industrial negotiation and makes possible a more sensitive realization of changes in opinion. Consequently the Councils have frequently been able to prevent the crystallization of grievances which otherwise might have assumed formidable and dangerous proportions.

It is true that the vast majority of Councils have thus far made the regular consideration of wages, hours and working conditions their most important activity. But even here they have accomplished significant things—the standardization of wages, reductions of hours, institutions of vacation schemes, improvement of factory conditions, promotion of health, welfare and safety schemes. But the Councils have also brought within the compass of collective dealing many matters that were hitherto excluded. Thus councils now engage in the furtherance of fact finding, welfare and legislation. Certainly much still remains to be done toward the full realization of larger objectives; but that at least beginnings have been made can hardly be doubted. Increasingly it is being recognized in Britain now that the joint councils offer a promising basis for furthering the new type of collective relations which is so much to the fore in present discussions of ways out of the protracted economic stagnation in the export trades.

Works councils have also played their part in leading to the present emphasis on co-operation and efficiency. On the whole the shop committee movement has not so far become widespread in Britain. Neither employers nor trade union officials appear generally to have given serious consideration to the importance of this type of employes' representation. However, a number of progressive and pioneering employers in Britain have succeeded in launching works committees which are functioning successfully. In practically every case these councils operate with the full co-operation of the unions concerned. Company unions in the American sense are, with few scattered exceptions, non-existent in Britain.

In general the plants possessing successful works councils stand among the most progressive and efficient firms in Britain. Just as we in the United States possess our "show places" to which all industrial investigators from Europe point—Dennison's, Filene's, Hart, Schaffner and Marx, Dutchess Bleachery, etc.—so Britain, too, has her pioneering employers. I could not help but be impressed with the fine organization, progressive spirit, and good will to be found in such plants as the repair shops of the London General Omnibus Company, Cadbury's, Metropolitan Vickers', Hans Renold's, Mather and Platt's, and Rowntree's Chocolate and Cocoa Works. Works committees have on the whole been a real help in bringing about a healthy spirit of co-operation in these companies.

Efforts here and there to tackle jointly problems of industry have also played a large role. During the summer of 1927, for instance, the London, Midland and Scottish Railway and the National Union of Railwaymen launched a program of co-operation between management and men analogous in principle to the Baltimore and Ohio plan in this country. It was devised to help meet the serious competition of motor transport. By eliminating waste, by reducing pilferage, by rendering better service to the travelling public, it was hoped to hold the business which motor buses were gradually taking away from the railroads. The union co-operated whole-heartedly. Similarly in the ports of England, the Transport Workers' Union and employers have been discussing and working out programs for the decasualization of dock labor as well as for making it efficient. Again, in 1925 the Transport Workers' Union co-operated with the London General Omnibus Company in a picturesque war of propaganda and legislation against the "pirate buses" which small owners had sent in alarming number into the streets of London. Various joint industrial councils—the potteries, printing, tramways, boot and shoe and others—have given attention to such matters as cost accounting, factory organization and employe training.

It was inevitable that such a long development of joint machinery and relationships should have gradually brought both sides to a realization of the importance of facts as a basis for negotiation and discussion. The new trend toward co-operative concern with problems of industry has given it added impetus. The instances of joint fact finding and joint research make an interesting index of what has been quietly taking place in this realm. The use of sliding scales as a basis of wage setting is a notable example. Thus for decades the iron and steel trades have hired joint-accountants to determine the selling price of products, which determines wage rates. Altogether eighty sliding scales based on fluctuation in the cost of living are in existence. In the cotton industry the application of standard wage rates to specific cases is so complex a matter that both sides choose officials according to their knowledge of the technical issues involved.

Joint industrial councils have launched several significant essays in joint research and fact finding. Ten councils have experimented with the possibility of deciding questions of wages and conditions by jointly determined fact rather than by mere tug-of-war. Joint inquiries have been made into broad questions such as welfare, education, factory design, costing systems, sanitation and safety, and the state of the industry. The council for the pottery industry has appointed two special committees for purposes of research. The first, known as the Research, Inventions and Designs Committee, has devoted itself to investigating questions of safety, sanitation, education, processes and inventions. The second committee, the "Statistical and Enquiries Committee," has devoted itself to the collection of industrial statistics—wages, costs, costing systems and so forth—and to related inquiries into industrial problems. Important joint research has been carried on by the Printing Council on matters of workers' health and safety.

Finally, beginnings have been made toward instituting joint inquiries and investigations into the factors underlying the present depression and the