

ten the name of the volume, but the author's name is Pratt. I had that book on my desk a few days ago and looked it over. Not one word from cover to cover about the Lancashire cotton industry, which is the most completely unionized industry in Great Britain. Anti-union employers in this country talk much about how unionism will choke production. It has had just the opposite effect in the British cotton industry. In that industry the unions have got the employers so sewed up with respect to competing by means of debasing labor standards, that the employers' managers have to be efficient. And they are efficient. As every one here well knows, they export their products all over the world in successful competition with everybody else in the business, and with their chief raw material coming from distant parts of the earth.

THOMAS W. MITCHELL¹: I think perhaps I can contribute best to this discussion by formulating a problem, the importance of which has dawned upon me in the last few months as a result of the operation of a joint industrial council in this city. In the men's and boys' clothing industry we have an association of employers and also a union, and an agreement between the two whereby a joint industrial council has been formed which is presided over by an impartial chairman selected by both sides. During the spring and summer we have made, I believe, four adjustments and every one of them thus far has been broken.

The problem of importance which has dawned upon me exists because of this condition, namely: that there is in the ranks of the workers, and of the minor union officials, a lack of responsibility for the agreements which they enter into or which are entered into for them by their representatives, and also a similar lack of responsibility on the part of employers whereby both sides after making an agreement go out and promptly break it.

To illustrate, early in August the union government made a demand upon the association for a general increase in wages which was refused by the employers and thrown into arbitration. The impartial chairman granted a general \$5 increase to all the tailors in the market and attached certain conditions to his grant, namely; that this settlement was to endure until December first; that no employee or union representative was to make any demand upon his employer for a further increase until that time; that no employer was to grant such an increase or even discuss the subject with an employee or a representative of the union; that if any worker had any demand to make he should

present it through the joint board of his union upon the association representative.

The impartial chairman made his wage increase award about 11:30 A. M., Friday, August 14th, and in spite of the fact that the managers of the union had agreed to the arbitration proceeding and to abide by the decision of the impartial chairman, before 6:00 P. M. that afternoon the manager of a local union had obtained an additional \$1 increase from six shops. Not only did many of the minor union officials repudiate the authority of their managers to make agreements for them, but workers themselves do not seem to appreciate that when their elected representatives have made an agreement for them they have a moral obligation to live up to that agreement.

It would be unfair to make this criticism of the union officials and the workers without at the same time putting the proper responsibility upon the employers, for they also have failed to realize their moral obligations under the agreement and have broken them with the same facility as the other side. Therefore, I say that there is the problem of educating both sides so as to instill into both workers and employers a proper sense of responsibility to their obligations.

MRS. JEAN HOSKINS¹: I attended every session of the President's Conference, and feel that there were a number of important things that occurred which have not been emphasized enough by any of the previous speakers.

To me there was a great deal of significance in the fact that almost every real employer—and by that I mean the man who owns and operates his own plant—did indorse collective bargaining and came out openly for it in his discussions, even to the extent of condemning the Employers' Group for their lack of cooperation and for their attitude of approach to the serious situation confronting industry. Mr. Endicott's fearless denouncement of the so-called Employers' Group and his unwillingness to have their action announced to the country as an expression of the opinion of the real employers, was upheld by such men as Mr. Dennison, Mr. Landon and Mr. Titus. The action of these men, the real employers, was to a great extent obscured by their being members of the Public Group; and Mr. Endicott seemed to regret that the employers in the Employers' Group were held responsible for decisions made by lawyers, bankers and men remote from industrial situations, by whom the so-called Employers' Group was largely represented.

Within the Employers' Group itself the farmers rose to announce their sympathy with the views of the Labor and Public Groups, and to protest against the action of their own body.

Mr. Lee of the Railroad Trainmen, Labor Group, in voicing his regret at the failure of the conference, turned on the Employers' Group and denounced them for dragging in controversial questions, particularly that of the open shop. He announced that for the first time in his life he and his fellows in the Railroad Brotherhoods were being driven to an understanding of, and sympathy with, the position of the A. F. of L. on the question of the open shop, to the extent of indorsing it themselves, a question upon which until this time they had been at variance.

It seems to me that at this meeting the reviewing of various resolutions that were merely presented to the conference without being accepted or even discussed at the open sessions, is of much less importance than an understanding of the facts I have mentioned and which have not been generally known by the public.

The suppression and distortion of the news of the conference is to be deplored, and should be counteracted in some way.

I think it makes a difference to have every one know the opinion of the real representative men and women at the conference. As I say, the real employers took a very admirable stand which is apparently not known throughout the country. Mr. Endicott's attitude, his whole discussion of the approach and action of the so-called Employers' Group and their lack of cooperation, ought to be made generally known; people ought to know how the real employers honestly feel.

MORRIS L. COOKE¹: One can recognize that there are a large number of high-minded, public-spirited, sincere people who do not believe in collective bargaining, and yet hold to the theory that the intelligent opinion of this country today is unreservedly for some fair form of collective bargaining. As to the kind of collective bargaining there is ample room for debate. But as between the individual as contrasted with the collective bargain American public opinion supports the latter.

Granted this as a theory the argument is apt to take this form: on the one hand you have the trade union movement and on the other hand the shop union movement, but you don't have to make final acceptance of either one of them. Where the objectives of the trade union movement are wrong they will be checked

by the development of the shop union movement, and if, as some people believe, the shop union movement is to afford an ultimate solution, then the trade union movement will die out. In either event society will be happy and things will go forward.

I believe that it is necessary for this Society to recognize a further and what seems to me an incontrovertible fact, which proves the fallacy of this line of thought, and that is, that any grouping of the workers of this country which will be ultimately satisfactory and give the efficiency and the economies which society will ultimately demand, must be on a national basis; shop unions unaffiliated on a national basis will not suffice. Personally, I have reached that conclusion with a good deal of reluctance. I am not by any means in sympathy with all the objectives of the trade union movement in this country. I have frequently taken occasion to say that in some respects their practices are immoral and their policies short-sighted. I should like to feel that in the shop union movement we have a mechanism by which society can force the trade union movement to rectify its course where that course is wrong. A protracted strike early in the textile industry gave a clothing establishment with which I am associated a record of about forty per cent of employment during the first six months of this year simply because we could not get our cloth. As a result of our experience and the experience of other establishments in this country, the national organization of employers cooperating with the national organization of employees have notified the textile industry that hereafter we are not without interest in labor disputes and the causes of interruption in the industry that provides us with our raw material.

Now if we are going to be able to bargain and plan on a great big national basis and ultimately on an international basis, the shop union will afford no ultimate relief. The members of this Society must in the end address themselves to the organization of a national labor movement and a national organization of the employers and a national organization of the industries—otherwise we shall fail.

WALTER POLAKOV¹: It may not be out of place to supplement the statements made by the two distinguished speakers, members of the President's Industrial Conference, by a few comments of an outsider. The thing that is most striking in the accounts of that failure to accomplish a real work in the face of the "danger," using the words of President Wilson, which

¹Clothing Manufacturers' Industrial Exchange, New York.

¹Consultant in Labor Management, New York.

¹Consulting Engineer in Management, Philadelphia.

¹Consulting Engineer, New York.