

The whole problem of unemployment, which we certainly would have had to consider in some very serious way, received but little attention. Labor said nothing at all about it in its propositions, and the employers made a general statement that each establishment should study the subject. Miss Barnum, of the Public Group, put in a resolution asking that a national employment agency be established by Congress. It was a foregone conclusion, however, that with Mr. Dennison on the floor this matter of unemployment would have been pushed if we had gone on with our work.

One thing that did come before us sufficiently to have a committee formed to consider it, was the high cost of living. This subject was attacked by Mr. Russell, who brought in a resolution with a good preamble: "Resolved, that in the judgment of the Conference attempts to better the existing industrial situation should begin with a reduction in the prevailing cost of living." The absurdity of merely increasing wages when such increase is almost at once absorbed by an increase in the prices of the necessities of life is sufficiently apparent. "It is the opinion of the Conference that as a beginning the Congress of the United States should pass an anti-profiteering act like that of Great Britain, and provide also as a necessary accompaniment a measure of public accountability for corporations." The British anti-profiteering bill was attached to his resolution.

Another attack on the high cost of living which would have been developed was through cooperation. A resolution presented by a farmer member called attention to the fact that in the present development of trade and commerce it has become necessary in many instances for producers of farm products to form cooperative marketing organizations in order to secure a money return from the sale of the product to the producers thereof sufficient to justify the continuance of the industry, and it asked that the conference recognize this as a sound and justifiable policy, which of course, would have been done.

Social insurance came up, but not in any very definite way. Mr. Dennison put in a resolution providing for insurance in the case of unemployment; and there was an interesting resolution put in by Mr. Loree of the Employers' Group, for a sort of a blanket insurance covering sickness, unemployment, old age, and death. He had it all in one. Considerable material found its way to the general committee on arbitration and conciliation.

The Labor Group in its set of propositions had one;

this suggested a national conference board, which certainly would work for the prevention of trouble. "There should be established by an agreement between the organized workers and associated employers in each industry a National Conference Board, consisting of an equal number of representatives of employers and workers, having due regard to the various sections of the industry and the various classes of workmen engaged, to have for its object the consideration of all subjects affecting the progress and well-being of the trade, to promote efficiency of production from the view-point of those engaged in the industry, and to protect life and limb as well as to safe-guard and promote the rights of all concerned within the industry."

"With the further view of providing means for carrying out this policy, the Federal Government, through its Department of Labor, should encourage and promote the formation of national conference boards in several industries where they do not already exist; to still further encourage the establishment of these national conference boards in each industry, these conference boards should be urged whenever required to meet jointly to consider any proposed legislation affecting industry in order that employers and workers may voluntarily adopt and establish such conditions as are needful; and may also counsel and advise with the Government in all industrial matters whatever, wherever needful legislation is required."

Resolutions concerning arbitration and conciliation came from the Public Group, the first from Mr. McNab of the Pacific Coast. Mr. McNab wanted something similar to the late War Labor Board; a sort of a supreme court in industry made up of at least five members; one member should be a woman, appointed by the President; two members should be appointed by the Senate; two selected by the House, and the remainder of the board should be made up of ex-presidents of the United States and the Secretary of the Department of Labor.

The second resolution on arbitration was one of the most valuable and carefully thought out that came before the conference. It originated with Secretary Wilson and was turned over to the Public Group to present.

Secretary Wilson's proposition was this "That there shall be created a board of equal number of employers and employees in each of the principal industries and a board to deal with miscellaneous industries not having separate boards. The labor representatives on those boards shall be selected in such manner as the workmen in the industry may determine. The repre-

sentatives of the employers shall be selected in such manner as the employers may determine. Whenever disputes arise in any plant or series of plants that cannot be adjusted locally, the question or questions in dispute should be referred to the board created to represent that industry for adjustment. The board shall also take jurisdiction wherever in the judgment of one-half of its members a strike or lock-out is imminent. The decisions of the board on wages, hours of labor, or working conditions must be arrived at by unanimous vote. If the board shall fail to come to a unanimous determination of any such questions, the question in dispute shall be referred to a general board appointed by the President of the United States in the following manner: one-third of the number is to be appointed in agreement with the organization or organizations of labor most representative of labor; one-third of the number to be appointed by the President direct. Any question in dispute submitted to the general board for adjudication shall be decided by the unanimous vote of the board. If the general board fails to arrive at a decision by unanimous vote the question or questions at issue shall be submitted to an umpire for determination. The umpire shall be selected by one of the two following processes; first, by unanimous selection of the general board; failing of such selections, then the umpire shall be drawn by lots from a standing list of twenty persons named by the President of the United States as competent umpires in labor disputes. Naturally in the disputes that may be pending locally or before the industrial board or before the general board or before the umpire, the employers and employees shall each have the right to select counsel of their own choice to represent them in presenting the matter in conference.

"Whenever an agreement is reached locally or by the unanimous vote of the industrial board or general board or the decision of the umpire, the conclusion arrived at shall have all the force and effect of a trade agreement with the employers and employees, which employers and employees shall be morally bound to accept and abide by. It is understood that this plan would not interfere with any system of joint wage conferences now in existence unless the failure to agree in such a conference made a strike or lock-out imminent."

Although there were many more resolutions presented, these alone are enough, I think, to show that the conference had something in mind which, if it could have gone on, might have been developed into

an interesting plan for the future conduct of industry.

If such a plan could be worked out—a plan simple, clear and logical, one that the man in the street could understand—it might be a very useful thing for the industry of the country. It might be wise for this Society to keep in mind the formulation of some such plan in case the present industrial conference does not put out anything which you can accept.

III

DISCUSSION

ROBERT W. BRUÈRE¹: Permit me to open the discussion by focussing attention upon what seems to me the salient single fact in the reports of the two speakers tonight. Miss Tarbell said in opening her address that the Public Group was not sufficiently coherent to have any plans of its own, and both she and Mr. Dennison stressed the fact that the scientific managers were not recognized by the conference. These two facts seem to me to be a challenge to the Taylor Society and to all men who are interested in science in industry. Why were the scientific managers not recognized, and why was the Public Group so incoherent that it had no plans?

The challenge which these two statements offer to the Taylor Society, composed largely of engineers in management, seems to me to be this: that the industrial engineers of the country must so organize themselves that they may function as the mind of the public on problems of scientific management in industry. Why do they not now function as the mind of the public on the problems of science in industry? As individuals they have the necessary information; they have the necessary technique; within their own field they are as expert as any analogous body in the country. As individuals they are eager to serve not only industry but the nation. Many were in Washington ready to serve the President's Conference. Why were they not recognized? To me it seems that the necessary inference—(possibly the superficial inference)—is that they are not properly organized to function as the mind of the public and that they are not, in a sense, free men. If they had been so organized as to be able to function as the mind of the public on the problems of industrial management, and if they had been free men, they would not only have been there but they would have been recognized. So at least it seems to me.

¹Bureau of Industrial Research, New York.