

the employer discharge help or give an equal distribution of work to all? Can the union compel an employer to discipline the violation of the union rule by a disobedient union worker? How shall women be paid on jobs ordinarily held by men? Has the employer a right to introduce a new machine or cause a change in the method of production in an operation? All of these questions and many more have been met satisfactorily by our machinery.

One of the outstanding virtues of the functioning of our machinery is the fact that those who are operating it are in close touch on both sides with the rank and file of the industry. There is practically none of that red tape so evident in a bureaucratic organization. I have described thus far the basic principles that underlie the agreement and the machinery established for carrying out these basic principles. Is it a success? Is this particular form of collective bargaining actually producing results? I will attack this question from three angles.

First, our democratic plan of cooperation is succeeding to the extent that it is building up a capable, efficient and constructive leadership on both sides; and when you get that you have an element of safety in representative government in industry.

Let me indicate what I mean by that. Fifteen thousand employees elect representatives known as shop chairmen in each plant. Those leaders elected by the rank and file have to make good or they get out. The inefficient are quickly deposed. The workers make effective use of the recall in their organization. They don't have to wait for a four-year election period to remove a man from office. They can recall him at any time. There is a wholesome degree of labor turn-over among leadership in this industry that makes for security and responsibility.

Let me give you some illustrations. About eighteen months ago there was a machine operator earning twenty-five dollars a week sewing in sleeves in a certain factory. That man is today general manager of the union. He is receiving today about fifty dollars a week. He is at least a ten thousand dollar a year man. In eighteen months this worker has developed a remarkable capacity for seeing the labor problem from the employer's point of view without losing his own, the worker's viewpoint. Conservative, and yet progressive, he has the confidence of the workers and the utmost confidence of the employers.

Another leader in our market is a man who came to us with a reputation as a dangerous radical. This man has shown a rare capacity for meeting the daily problems in the industry in a very sensible, practical, constructive fashion. He is a splendid advocate for the workers and defends his position with brilliant oratorical power. Responsibility has sobered his judgment and toned down his methods of attack.

We have another man who has a shrewd, keen analytical mind and fights for his end very doggedly and persistently. He is struggling constantly to hold in check a strong class-conscious feeling in order to be fair to the employer's side. When you get a worker who is capable of doing that, you have a valuable leader in the movement just because he has come up from the ranks, retains the confidence of the workers and is able to see the point of view of the employer sufficiently to be fair to both sides, although always fighting for his constituents.

This leadership works itself out in curious ways. In the very first case we had before the Impartial Chairman, there was a young Italian leader, the most radical in the group, representing the workers. Later he became a business agent and then his troubles began; instead of merely delivering keen, sarcastic tirades he had to put things across for his workers, consistent with the principles laid down in our agreement. He found that somehow or other his own convictions and his own temperament couldn't enable him to represent his people and be fair to the employers. He became unhappy in the situation and felt he would not make good. He therefore resigned. He deposed himself because of his incapacity to make good under the circumstances.

The safety of this leadership arises from the fact that it is coming up from the ranks. This makes for a self-perpetuating leadership within the union, not superimposed from without. Of course there is an educational influence emanating from the national organization, but all the time the leadership is developing from within and from below which makes for safety in the industry.

I want to read a statement which was made by Professor Howard, speaking of the Hart, Schaffner & Marx situation, which I think adequately expresses the Rochester situation. "We have had some experience with misinformed and self-seeking men who secured temporary influence over the people, but some-

how they failed to thrive in the atmosphere of our arrangement. The system seems to work out a selection of the fittest candidates and trains them to become efficient leaders and executives, skilled in negotiation and in pleading and cross-examination before the judicial boards; skillful and efficient in organization and in disciplining and leading the people."

But leadership alone is futile. A leader, however competent, must have back of him the force of enlightened public opinion. He must have the citizenship of the industry brought up to a level where it will appreciate the highest standards of leadership. Otherwise we shall get demagogues.

Not only is the democracy of Rochester developing leaders who make for safety, but in the second place, it is developing trained citizens,—trained citizens who are informed, enlightened and disciplined.

The very fact that the workers elect their own representatives makes them interested, watchful and careful. They learn from experience that the actions of their elected representatives affect their daily welfare in a very concrete way. Therefore, the workers are watchfully studying the acts and record of every leader. They insist on being informed in order to select the right leaders. In fact, the safety of our entire arrangement lies in the fact that the rank and file is continuously clamoring for information and knowledge regarding those problems that effect their own welfare. The more enlightened they become, the more they realize the importance of selecting proper leaders to represent them.

I wonder whether you can appreciate the discipline that comes to the worker when he appears before the Impartial Chairman to present and defend his unreasonable demands. He is a member of an organized group now and is cocky. He has the backing of his own group who have come to support him in his request for some extravagant increase in wages for himself and for his group. Before the case has gone very far he discovers that facts count for more than emotion; reason is more persuasive than passion; that individual or group demands must be considered in the light of the requirements of the industry; and when the Impartial Chairman renders the decision, whether it be for him or against him, he and his group leave the courtroom better citizens in the industry.

Let me give you one concrete illustration of how this industrial court is operating to bring law and or-

der into the industry. In the plant I represent, the Stein-Bloch Company, we have been attempting to establish production standards for week workers in the cutting room. It was our desire to pay men on the basis of production, a minimum production standard for a minimum wage and then a sliding scale of wages for varying standards of performance. The workers on their side wanted to establish an arbitrary maximum, that a man shall not earn more than fifty dollars a week. We said that was unfair and unreasonable; and our sixty-five cutters carried their case into court and we had a four-hour argument on the subject. We presented all the facts, with the utmost friendliness on both sides, although we fought as though our lives depended on it. The union had a very able leader. Those cutters were perfectly satisfied that their case had been ably presented, and they were satisfied that any decision which would come from an impartial judge on the basis of the facts presented must be a fair decision.

The decision was handed down recently. The judge said: "No maximum." He graded the men according to production. He agreed with the employers' side of the case in this particular instance. The employees are good sports. They said "All right, if that is what the judge says, it is fair, we will stand by it." And they have.

There is a tremendous amount of educational, disciplinary value that comes from a decision like that, and what is true of the sixty-five cutters in this particular case is true of the fifteen thousand workers who are affected by every other decision that is being made.

One of the most wholesome things in the industry is the manner in which employees are disciplined by their fellow workers for violation of some principle mutually agreed upon by both parties. For instance, a worker will sometimes attempt to secure an advantage for himself, perhaps at the expense of his group, through individual bargaining,—a violation of the rule that calls for collective bargaining. That self-seeking individual is taken to task and duly impressed with the fact that in this industry one is not permitted to get something for one's self at the expense of the larger group of which one is but a part. This develops a social consciousness in the industry. When that idea gets planted in a worker's mind you have made him a more social-minded individual, better