

told a number of years ago by the then president of the Glass Workers' Union that when they entered into an agreement with the manufacturers as to wages they tendered certain suggestions as to management. They were told that this was none of their business in considerably stronger language than I dare use.

At more than one conference I can remember Sidney Hillman's making the same kind of statement. When questions of management were put up to him he said in effect that they were not the job of labor. But I have seen Sidney Hillman change and I would have supposed that Professor Young would have observed the beginnings of such a change not only in the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, but in a considerable percentage of labor unions the country over. Certainly if you were to ask Mr. Willard of the B. & O. Railroad whether he had ever called on the workers to help him on questions of management, he could not give you a positive "No." Yet I recall his calling the union leaders together, at a time when his company was going to have to meet some heavy bond payments, to ask their co-operation in putting over a particularly difficult task. An extreme example of this forward movement is the Sheet Metal Workers Union of Salem, Massachusetts, whose last agreement provides that in return for being permitted to set up certain machinery for studying and economizing on machine operations, the employers agreed to a study of sales techniques. This union has further made some very valuable suggestions as to budgeting and cost-keeping.

This Society does not care, except indirectly, what the attitude of labor unions is with regard to this Code. We are trying to set up standards of human relations which will make for the most effective productive machine. Up to the death of Taylor the labor unions were 100 per cent wrong in the matter of limiting industrial production. Now we have seen them change, not completely, I am thankful to say, because I think a slow development is much safer. What the labor movement thinks on a subject, however, will, I hope, have only an indirect bearing on what we shall say about it; likewise with respect to what the average manufacturer thinks. I do want to say, however, that there is plenty of evidence that labor unions are changing their positions and that the drift is very promising.

Mary van Kleeck.* I am very much interested in Professor Young's having selected that particular incident in the history of the United Mine Workers to illustrate his point. He selected the sickest industry in the country and an incident in the career of President Lewis which some labor leaders at least would consider to be indicative of poor leadership. So much is known to most of you. What is not known is that while Mr. Lewis was taking the attitude that management was the responsibility of the coal operators and that the miners were interested only in keeping up wages whether the mines earned anything or not, the union itself in the State of Illinois was party to a scheme of day-to-day negotiations between miners and operators beginning with the Pit Committee and carrying through to arbitration machinery. The miners themselves would say that they are not participating in management, but they are agreeing as to exactly how the wage scale is to be applied to different situations, how hours of work are to be scheduled, how turns of cars are to be arranged, and so on—all phases of mine management. When Mr. Lewis' administration failed to make a new contract for the miners' national organization at the expiration of the Jacksonville agreement, just one district of the United Mine Workers was able to make a contract and that was the Illinois field where this co-operative, participating relationship had been in effect.

If Professor Young had stated that to get labor's interest and co-operation the accepted objective of industry must be large enough to include the interests and relationships of all groups in industry, those of employer and employe, of management and of labor, and finally of consumers, he would have been in agreement with the Code. In other words, the Code does not propose to ask labor to co-operate in an enterprise which has not considered its broad relationships in the whole economic community; what is suggested is that labor function in an enterprise which has an objective worthy of our present economic possibilities.

May I turn for a moment to Mr. Young's other point? The Code does not say that an employer who has an unsatisfactory contract with a union may not make one with another union. It does not leave him "defenseless" against the practices

*Director, Department of Industrial Studies, Russell Sage Foundation, New York, N. Y.

of a given union; on the contrary, it sets up standards for a new functioning unionism. But it recognizes that the individual employe is in a weak position when he presents himself for employment, and it is, therefore, to be deprecated that he be required to sign on a dotted line that he will or will not join any kind of an organization, or else forego the job. And it seems to me that we are pretty well "jacketed" in our industrial-relations policy in this country if we are going to consider the Hitchman and Red Jacket cases as the last word in Supreme Court decisions. The Interborough Rapid Transit case in New York brought out the reasons why these same "yellow dog contracts" are not good public policy, and growing experience with constructive trade unionism, which functions in relation to management, is likely to modify court decisions.

Earl S. Sparks.⁹ I am speaking personally and not in my capacity as Secretary of the Metal Manufacturers' Association of Philadelphia. Mention is made in the Code of the worker's right to bargain collectively. I take it that this means the right of individual contract is recognized. In my experience with union contracts in force in Philadelphia I have found that in practical effect they abridge the right of the individual worker not to join a union. In other words he cannot obtain employment in plants where union contracts are in force unless he agrees to join within a specified time the union holding that contract. In operating an employment department in connection with the metal trades of this city we cannot send a non-union man to a union shop unless he will agree to join the union. I think if you are establishing the right of individual contract you should change your phrasing so that it reads, "any condition of the work contract binding the workman not to join or to join an independent (standard) labor union is to be deprecated."

Gladys L. Palmer.¹⁰ I should like to quote from the history of the Full Fashioned Hosiery Workers' Union, with which Mr. Edelman is connected and in which I have conducted some research. Fifteen years ago they had production standards

⁹Secretary, The Metal Manufacturers' Association, Philadelphia, Pa.

¹⁰Research Associate, Industrial Research Department, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

in practically every mill in Philadelphia; that is, they restricted output in a given week in an effort to save work on the old "lump of work" theory.

Now they jointly hire engineers to set up production standards so that they may give a fair day's work under their wage scale. Not only do they accept the necessity for production standards and the responsibility for securing them but they have gone in for an extensive program of waste elimination. During the past six years the union has in all its meetings, shop, local and national, preached the doctrine of waste elimination on every score and has not supported workers discharged for bad work or damage to their machinery when they have attempted to be reinstated. Throughout its history the union has assumed that the workers were craftsmen and that they must accept responsibility for doing a good job. As their union has progressed, they have enlarged upon that concept until it actually does mean an assumption of responsibility for production standards, quality workmanship, and the economic welfare of the industry in which they work.

Mr. Edelman. May I just add for the record, and not as a representative of the hosiery workers' organization, that, no matter what protective professions certain labor leaders may have made concerning their refusal to accept responsibility for difficulties of industries over which they have had practically no control, the fact remains that no alert member of a labor union today fails to be aware that labor must not only accept, but militantly seek, a share in problems of management. If this is not done both industry and labor will presently be seriously handicapped, and these problems will no longer be subject to an orderly solution.

I should like also to make one other suggestion. Little attention seems to have been given in the Code to the possibility of setting up arbitration machinery. Such an agreement between management and employe, where organization exists, certainly is most helpful from the standpoint of efficiency.

Mr. Cooke. A great deal has been said here about the individual's right to do as he pleases about union membership. I want to emphasize the fact that our whole thought has been to recognize group organization because of the protection