

INTERNATIONAL LABOUR OFFICE



INTERNATIONAL LABOUR REVIEW

VOL. II. No. 1



APRIL 1921



GENEVA
1921

09602

CONTENTS

	Pages
Special Article	
Co-operation in Industry, by John D. Rockefeller jr.	3
Industrial Relations	
The Trade Union Movement	17
Control of Industry	
Works Councils in the Czecho-Slovakian Mining Industry	26
Production, Prices, and Cost of Living	
Retail Price Fluctuations	32
Employment and Unemployment	
Employment in the British Building Trade	48
Labour Conditions	
Industrial Arbitration and Conciliation in Italy	56
Social Insurance	
Old Age Pensions Legislation in France	67
Co-operation	
Consumers' Co-operative Societies in Poland	89
Agriculture	
Agricultural Conditions and Labour Agreements in Denmark and Sweden	97
The Financing of Food Production in the U. S. A.	119
Book Notes	122



12
INTERNATIONAL LABOUR OFFICE

INTERNATIONAL LABOUR REVIEW



VOLUME II

April - June 1921



INTERNATIONAL LABOUR OFFICE
CENTRAL LIBRARY AND
DOCUMENTATION BRANCH



GENEVA
1921

09602



INTERNATIONAL LABOUR REVIEW

VOL. II, No. 1

MARCH 1921

Co-operation in Industry

by John D. ROCKEFELLER jr. (1)

I

Today the world is passing through a period of reconstruction. As we address ourselves to the grave problems which confront us, problems both national and international, we may look for success in their solution just in so far as we continue to be animated by the spirit of co-operation and brotherhood. The hope of the future lies in the perpetuation of this spirit, and unless increasingly it is made the foundation of the political, social, and industrial life of the world, there will not be permanent peace and goodwill among men, either nationally or internationally.

In no one of these spheres of human relations is the spirit of co-operation more essential than in industry, since industry touches almost every department of life. Moreover, there is no problem pressing more urgently upon the attention of the world today than the industrial problem, none more important, none more difficult of solution. There are pessimists who say that there is no solution short of revolution and the overturn of the existing social order. Surely the nations which have shown themselves capable of such lofty sacrifice, which have given themselves so freely, gladly, unreservedly, during these past years of struggle, will bring to bear in the solution of this great problem powers of head and heart, not less wise and unselfish than those exhibited in dealing with the problems of the war; surely a way out of the impenetrable maze will be found.

Almost countless are the suggested solutions of the industrial problem, which have been brought forth since industry first began to be a problem. Most of these are impracticable; some are unjust; some are selfish and

(1) Director of the Colorado Fuel and Iron Co., Manhattan Railway Co., The Merchants' Fire Assurance Corporation; Chairman of the Board of the Rockefeller Foundation; Trustee of the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research; Director of the General Education Board, Bureau of Social Hygiene, and of the International Health Board.

therefore unworthy ; some have merit and should be carefully studied. None can be looked to as a panacea. There are those who believe that legislation is the cure-all for every political, social, and industrial ill. Much can be done by legislation to prevent injustice and encourage right tendencies, but legislation of itself will never solve the industrial problem. Its solution can be brought about only by the introduction of a new spirit into the relationship between the parties to industry—the spirit of co-operation and brotherhood.

It is this theme, *co-operation in industry*, that I desire to develop.

We must ask ourselves at the outset certain fundamental questions. First, what is the purpose of industry ? Shall we cling to the conception of industry as an institution, primarily of private interest, which enables certain individuals to accumulate wealth, too often irrespective of the well-being, the health, and the happiness of those engaged in its production ? Or shall we adopt the modern viewpoint and regard industry as being a form of social service, quite as much as a revenue-producing process ? Is it not true that any industry, to be permanently successful, must ensure to labour adequately remunerative employment under proper working and living conditions, to capital a fair return upon the money invested, and to the community a useful service ? The soundest industrial policy is that which has constantly in mind the welfare of the employees as well as the making of profits, and which, when human considerations demand it, subordinates profits to welfare. Industrial relations are essentially human relations. It is therefore the duty of everyone entrusted with industrial leadership to do all in his power to improve the conditions under which men work and live. The day has passed when the conception of industry as chiefly a revenue-producing process can be maintained. To cling to such a conception is only to arouse antagonisms and to court trouble. In the light of the present every thoughtful man must concede that the purpose of industry is quite as much the advancement of social well-being as the production of wealth. It remains none the less true, however, that to be successful industry must not only serve the community and the workers adequately, but must also realise a just return on capital invested.

Next we must ask ourselves: who are the parties to industry ? The parties to industry are four in number: capital, management, labour, and the community. I am, of course, well aware of the social theories and experiments that seek to merge capital and labour, either through ownership of capital by the state or by the workers themselves. But the difficulties that confront the realisation of these plans are vast and the objection to many of them fundamental.

The first number of the International Labour Review, dated January 1921, appeared at the beginning of April. This discrepancy between date of issue and date of publication has since been reduced, and it is hoped that the July and subsequent numbers will appear regularly in the course of their month of issue.

Geneva, 12 June 1921.

Under our present system, capital is represented by the stockholders, and is usually regarded as embracing management. Management is, however, an entirely separate and distinct party to industry ; its function is essentially administrative ; it comprises the executive officers, who bring to industry technical skill and managerial experience. Labour consists of the employees. Labour, like capital, is an investor in industry, but labour's contribution, unlike that of capital, is not detachable from the one who makes it, since it is in the nature of physical effort and is a part of the worker's strength and life.

Here the list usually ends. The fourth party, namely, the community, whose interest is vital and in the last analysis controlling, is too often ignored. The community's right to representation in the control of industry and in the shaping of industrial policies is similar to that of the other parties. Were it not for the community's contribution, in maintaining law and order, in providing agencies of transportation and communication, in furnishing systems of money and credit and in rendering other services, all involving continuous outlays, the operation of capital, management, and labour would be enormously hampered, if not rendered wellnigh impossible. The community, furthermore, is the consumer of the product of industry, and the money which it pays for the product re-imburses capital for its advances and ultimately provides the wages, salaries, and profits that are distributed among the other parties.

Finally we must inquire : what are the relations between the parties to industry ? It is frequently maintained that the parties to industry must necessarily be hostile and antagonistic ; that each must arm itself to wrest from the others its share of the product of their common toil. This is unthinkable ; it is not true ; the parties to industry are in reality not enemies, but partners ; they have a common interest, no one can get on without the others. Labour must look to capital to supply the tools, machinery, and working capital, without which it cannot make its vital contribution to industry ; and capital is equally powerless to turn a wheel in industry without labour. Management is essential to supply the directing force, while without the community as the consumer, the services of the other three parties would have no outlet. Just what the relative importance of the contribution made to the success of industry by the several factors is, and what their relative rewards should be, are debatable questions. But however views may differ on these questions, it is clear that the common interest cannot be advanced by the effort of any one party to dominate the others, arbitrarily to dictate the terms on which alone it will co-operate, to threaten to withdraw if any attempt is made to thwart the enforcement of its will. Success is

dependent upon the co-operation of all four. Partnership, not enmity, is the watchword.

II

If co-operation between the parties to industry is sound business and good social economics, why then is antagonism so often found in its stead? The answer is revealed in a survey of the development of industry. In the early days of industry, as we know, the functions of capital and management were not infrequently combined in the one individual, who was the employer. He in turn was in constant touch with his employees. Together they formed a vital part of the community. Personal relations were frequent and mutual confidence existed. When differences arose they were quickly adjusted. As industry developed, aggregations of capital larger than a single individual could provide were required. In answer to this demand, the corporation with its many stockholders was evolved. Countless workers took the place of the handful of employees of earlier days. Plants under a single management scattered all over the country superseded the single plant in a given community. Obviously, this development rendered impossible the personal relations which had existed in industry, and lessened the spirit of common interest and understanding. Thus the door was opened to suspicion and distrust; enmity crept in; antagonisms developed. Capital not infrequently used its power to enforce long hours and low wages; labour likewise retaliated with such strength as it had, and gradually the parties to industry came to view each other as enemies instead of as friends and to think of their interests as antagonistic rather than common. Where men are strangers and have no contact, misunderstanding is apt to arise. On the other hand, where men meet frequently about a table, rub elbows, exchange views, and discuss matters of common interest, almost invariably it happens that the vast majority of their differences quickly disappear and friendly relations are established.

Several years ago I was one of a number of men who were asked two questions by a Commission, appointed by the President of the United States to deal with certain labour difficulties. The first was: "What do you regard as the underlying cause of industrial unrest?" The second: "What remedy do you suggest?" I stated that in my judgment the chief cause of industrial unrest is that capital does not strive to look at questions at issue from labour's point of view, and labour does not seek to get capital's angle of vision. My answer to the second question was that when employers put themselves in the employee's place and the employees put themselves in the employer's place, the remedy for industrial unrest will have been found. In other words, when the principle adopted

by both parties in interest is: "Do as you would be done by," there will be no industrial unrest, no industrial problem.

It is to be regretted that there are capitalists who regard labour as their legitimate prey, from whom they are justified in getting all they can for as little as may be. It is equally to be deplored that on the part of labour there is often a feeling that it is justified in wresting everything possible from capital. Where such attitudes have been assumed, a gulf has been opened between capital and labour which has continually widened. Thus the two forces have come to work against each other, each seeking solely to promote its own selfish ends. As a consequence have come all too frequently the strike, the lock-out, and other incidents of industrial warfare.

A man, who recently devoted some months to studying the industrial problem and who came into contact with thousands in various industries throughout the United States, has said that it was obvious to him from the outset that the working men were seeking for something, which at first he thought to be higher wages. As his touch with them extended, he came to the conclusion, however, that not higher wages, but recognition as men, was what they really sought. What joy can there be in life, what interest can a man take in his work, what enthusiasm can he be expected to develop on behalf of his employer, when he is regarded as a number on a pay-roll, a cog in a wheel, a mere "hand"? Who would not earnestly seek to gain recognition of his manhood and the right to be heard and treated as a human being, not as a machine?

Then, too, as industry has become increasingly specialised, the workman of today, instead of following the product through from start to finish and being stimulated by the feeling that he is the sole creator of a useful article, as was more or less the case in early days, now devotes his energies for the most part to countless repetitions of a single act or process, which is but one of perhaps a hundred operations necessary to transform the raw material into the finished product. Thus the worker loses sight of the significance of the part he plays in industry and feels himself to be merely one of many cogs in a wheel. All the more, therefore, is it necessary that he should have contact with men engaged in other processes and fulfilling other functions in industry, that he may still realise he is a part, and a necessary, though it may be an inconspicuous, part of a great enterprise. In modern warfare, those who man the large guns find the range, not by training the gun on the object which they are seeking to reach, but in obedience to a mechanical formula which is worked out for them. Stationed behind a hill or mound, they seldom see the object at which their deadly fire is directed. One can readily imagine the sense of detachment and ineffectiveness which must come over these men. But when the airplane, circling overhead, gets into communication with the gunner beneath and describes the thing to be accomplished and the

effectiveness of the shot, a new meaning comes into his life. In a second he has become a part of the great struggle. He knows that his efforts are counting, that he is helping to bring success to his comrades. There comes to him a new enthusiasm and interest in his work. The sense of isolation and detachment from the accomplishments of industry, which too often comes to the workers of today, can be overcome only by contact with the other contributing parties. In this way only can common purpose be kept alive, individual interests safeguarded, and the general welfare promoted.

While obviously under present conditions those who invest their capital in an industry, often numbered by the thousand, cannot have personal acquaintance with the thousands and tens of thousands of those who invest their labour, contact between those two parties in interest can and must be established, if not directly, then through their respective representatives. The resumption of such personal relations through frequent conferences and current meetings, held for the consideration of matters of common interest, such as terms of employment and working and living conditions, is essential in order to restore a spirit of mutual confidence, goodwill, and co-operation. Personal relations can be revived under modern conditions only through the adequate representation of the employees. Representation is a principle which is fundamentally just and vital to the successful conduct of industry. It means, broadly speaking, democracy through co-operation, as contrasted with autocracy.

It is not for me or anyone else to undertake to determine for industry at large what specific form representation shall take. Once having adopted the principle, it is obviously wise that the method to be employed should be left in each specific instance to be determined by the parties interested. If there is to be peace and goodwill between the several parties in industry, it will surely not be brought about by the enforcement upon unwilling groups of a method which in their judgment is not adapted to their peculiar needs. In this, as in all else, persuasion is an essential element in bringing about conviction. With the developments in industry what they are today, there is sure to come a progressive evolution from the autocratic single control, whether by capital, management, labour, or the community, to some form of democratic co-operative control participated in by all four. The whole movement is evolutionary. That which is fundamental is the idea of co-operation, and that idea must find expression in those forms which will serve it best, with conditions, forces, and times what they are.

In the United States, the co-operation in war service of labour, capital, management, and Government afforded a striking and most gratifying illustration of this tendency.

After all, the basic principles governing the relations between the parties to industry are as applicable in the successful

conduct of industry today as in earlier times. The question which now confronts us is how to re-establish personal relations and co-operation in spite of changed conditions. The answer is not doubtful or questionable, but absolutely clear and unmistakable: it is, through adequate representation of the four parties in the councils of industry.

III

Various methods of representation in industry have been developed, conspicuous among which are those of labour unions and employers' associations. As regards the organisation of labour, it is just as proper and advantageous for labour to associate itself into organised groups for the advancement of its legitimate interests as for capital to combine for the same object. Such associations of labour manifest themselves in collective bargaining, in an effort to secure better working and living conditions, in providing machinery whereby grievances may easily and without prejudice to the individual be taken up with the management. Sometimes they provide benefit features, sometimes they seek to increase wages, but whatever their specific purpose, so long as it is to promote the well-being of the employees, having always due regard for the just interests of the employer and the public, leaving every worker free to associate himself with such groups or to work independently, as he may choose, they are to be encouraged.

But organisation is not without its dangers. Organised capital sometimes conducts itself in an unworthy manner, contrary to law and in disregard of the interest of both labour and the public. Such organisations cannot be too strongly condemned or too vigorously dealt with. Although they are the exception, such publicity is generally given to their unsocial acts that all organisations of capital, however rightly managed or broadly beneficent, are thereby brought under suspicion. Likewise it sometimes happens that organisations of labour are conducted without just regard for the rights of the employer or of the public; methods and practices are adopted which, because unworthy or unlawful, are deserving of public censure. Such organisations of labour bring discredit and suspicion upon other organisations which are legitimate and useful, just as is the case with improper organisations of capital, and they should be similarly dealt with. We ought not, however, to allow the occasional failure in the working of the principle of the organisation of labour to prejudice us against the principle itself, for the principle is fundamentally sound.

In the further development of the organisation of labour and of large business, the public interest as well as the interest of labour and of capital will be furthest advanced by whatever

stimulates every man to do the best work of which he is capable and to render useful service, by a fuller recognition of the common interests of employers and employed, and by an earnest effort to dispel distrust and hatred and to promote goodwill.

Labour unions have secured for labour in general many advantages in hours, wages, and standards of working conditions. A large proportion of the workers of the world, however, are outside of these organisations, and unless somehow represented are not in a position to bargain collectively. Therefore representation of labour to be adequate must be more comprehensive and all inclusive than anything thus far attained.

Representation on the employers' side has been developed through the establishment of trade associations, the purpose of which is to discuss matters of common interest and to act, in so far as is legally permissible and to the common advantage, along lines that are generally similar. But here also representation is inadequate. Many employers do not belong to employers' associations .

In the United States during the war, the representation of both labour and capital in common councils was brought about through the War Labor Board, composed equally of men from the ranks of labour and capital, together with representatives of the public. When differences arose in industries where there was no machinery to deal with such matters, the War Labor Board stepped in and made its findings and recommendations. In this way, relatively continuous operation was made possible and the resort to the strike and lock-out was less frequent.

In England there have been made during the past few years various important Government investigations and reports, looking toward a more complete programme of representation and co-operation on the part of labour and capital. One is the well-known Whitley Report, which owes its distinction to a single outstanding feature, namely, that it applies to the whole of industry the principle of representative government. The Whitley Plan seeks to unite the organisations of labour and capital by a bond of common interest in a common venture; it changes at a single stroke the attitude of these powerful aggregations of class interest from one of militancy to one of social service; it establishes a new relation in industry. "Problems old and new", says the report, "will find their solution in a frank partnership of knowledge, experience, and goodwill".

Another investigation and report was made by a Commission on Industrial Unrest, appointed by the Prime Minister. This Commission made, among others, the following interesting recommendations :—

- (1) that the principle of the Whitley Report as regards industrial councils be adopted ;
- (2) that each trade should have a constitution ;
- (3) that labour should take part in the affairs of industry as partners rather than as employees in the narrow sense of the term ;
- (4) that closer contact should be set up between employers and employed.

A third report was prepared by the Ministry of Labour. This report deals with the constitution and operation of works committees in a number of industries. It is a valuable treatise on the objects, functions, and methods of procedure of joint committees.

Light has been thrown on the general questions treated by these inquiries in an able report by the Garton Foundation on *The Industrial Situation after the War*. This report is a study of the more permanent causes of industrial friction and inefficiency, and of the means by which they may be removed or their action circumscribed.

Mention of these several reports, taken at random, is made simply as indicative of the extent and variety of the study which has been given to the great problem of industrial reconstruction in England. All point toward the need of more adequate representation of labour in the conduct of industry and the importance of closer relations between labour and capital.

IV

A method of representation similar to the Whitley plan, though less comprehensive, and which is constructed from the bottom up, has been in operation for varying periods of time in an ever increasing number of industries in the United States. This plan of representation is worthy of serious consideration. It begins with the election of representatives in a single plant and is capable of indefinite development, to meet the complex needs of any industry, and of wide extension, so as to include all industries. Equally applicable in industries where union or non-union labour or both are employed, it seeks to provide full and fair representation to labour, capital, and management, also taking cognizance of the community. Thus far it has developed a spirit of co-operation and goodwill which commends it to both employer and employee. The outstanding features of this plan of industrial representation, varied to meet the special needs of each plant or company in which it has been adopted, are as follows.

Representatives chosen by the employees in proportion to their number, from their fellow workers in each plant, form the basis of the plan. Joint committees, composed of equal numbers of employees or their representatives and of

officers of the company, are found in each plant or district. These committees deal with all matters pertaining to employment and working and living conditions, including questions of co-operation and conciliation, safety and accident, sanitation, health and housing, recreation and education. Joint conferences of representatives of employees and officers of the company are held in the various districts several times each year. There is also an annual joint conference, at which reports from all districts are received and considered. Another important feature of the plan is an officer known as the President's Industrial Representative, whose duty it is to visit the plants currently and confer with the employees' representatives, as well as to be available always for conference at the request of the representatives.

Thus the employees, though their representatives chosen from among themselves, are in constant touch and conference with management and representatives of the stockholders in regard to matters pertaining to their common interest.

The employees' right of appeal is the third outstanding feature of the plan. Any employee with a grievance, real or imaginary, may go with it at once to his representative. The representatives not infrequently find there is no ground for the grievance and are able so to convince the employee. But if a grievance does exist, or dissatisfaction on the part of the employee continues, the matter is carried to the local boss, foreman, or superintendent, with whom in the majority of cases it is amicably and satisfactorily settled. Further appeal is open to the aggrieved employee, either in person or through his representative, to the higher officers and to the president. If satisfaction is not to be had from the company, the court of last appeal may be the Industrial Commission of the State, the State Labour Board, or a committee of arbitration.

Experience shows that the vast majority of difficulties which occur in an industry arise between the workmen and the foremen who are in daily contact with them. Foremen are sometimes arbitrary, and it is by their attitude and action that the higher officers and the stockholders are judged. Obviously the right of appeal from the decisions of foremen and superintendents is important, even if seldom availed of, because it tends of itself to modify their attitude.

A further feature of the plan is what may be termed the employee's Bill of Rights. This covers such matters as the right to caution and suspension before discharge, except for such serious offences as are posted; the right to hold meetings at appropriate places outside of working hours; the right without discrimination to membership or non-membership in any society, fraternity, or union; and the right of appeal.

Where this plan has been in operation for a considerable length of time, some of the results obtained are :-

First, more continuous operation of the plants and less interruption in the employment of the workers, resulting in larger returns for both capital and labour ;

Second, improved working and living conditions ;

Third, frequent and close contact between employees and officers ;

Fourth, the elimination of grievances as disturbing factors ;

Fifth, goodwill developed to a high degree ;

Sixth, the creation of a community spirit.

Furthermore, the plan has proved an effective means of enlisting the interest of all parties to industry, of reproducing the contacts of earlier days between employer and employee, of lessening misunderstanding, distrust, and enmity, and securing co-operation and the spirit of brotherhood. Under its operation, the participants in industry are being convinced of the soundness of the proposition that they are fundamentally friends and not enemies, that their interests are common, not opposed. Based as the plan is upon principles of justice to all, its success can be counted on so long as it is carried out in a spirit of sincerity and fair play.

Here, then, would seem to be a method of providing representation which is just, which is effective, which is applicable to all employees whether organised or unorganised, to all employers whether in associations or not, which does not interfere with existing organisations or associations, and which, while developed in a single industrial corporation as a unit, may be expanded to include all corporations in the same industry and ultimately all industries.

Just what part labour organisations and employers' associations can best take in such a plan remains to be worked out, but certain it is that some method should be devised which will profit to the fullest extent by the experience, the strength, and the leadership of these groups. While doubtless defects will appear in this plan and other methods more successfully accomplishing the same end may be developed, at least it is proving that in unity there is strength and that co-operation in industry is not only idealistically right, but practically workable.

If the points which I have endeavoured to make are sound, might not the four parties to industry subscribe to an Industrial Creed somewhat as follows :—

(1) I believe that labour and capital are partners, not enemies ; that their interests are common, not opposed ; and that neither can attain the fullest measure of prosperity at the expense of the other, but only in association with the other.

(2) I believe that the community is an essential party to industry and that it should have adequate representation with the other parties.

(3) I believe that the purpose of industry is quite as much to advance social well-being as material prosperity ; that in the pursuit of that purpose, the interests of the community should be carefully considered, the well-being of employees fully guarded, management adequately recognised, and capital justly compensated, and that failure in any of these particulars means loss to all four parties.

(4) I believe that every man is entitled to an opportunity to earn a living, to fair wages, to reasonable hours of work and proper working conditions, to a decent home, to the opportunity to play, to learn, to worship, and to love, as well as to toil, and that the responsibility rests as heavily upon industry as upon government or society, to see that these conditions and opportunities prevail.

(5) I believe that diligence, initiative, and efficiency, wherever found, should be encouraged and adequately rewarded ; that indolence, indifference, and restriction of production should be discountenanced ; and that service is the only justification for the possession of power.

(6) I believe that the provision of adequate means of uncovering grievances and promptly adjusting them is of fundamental importance to the successful conduct of industry.

(7) I believe that the most potent measure in bringing about industrial harmony and prosperity is adequate representation of the parties in interest ; that existing forms of representation should be carefully studied and availed of, in so far as they may be found to have merit and are adaptable to conditions peculiar to the various industries.

(8) I believe that the most effective structure of representation is that which is built from the bottom up, which includes all employees, which starts with the election of representatives and the formation of joint committees in each industrial plant, proceeds to the formation of joint district councils and annual joint conferences in a single industrial corporation, and admits of extension to all corporations in the same industry, as well as to all industries in a community, in a nation, and in the various nations.

(9) I believe that to "do unto others as you would that they should do unto you" is as sound business as it is good religion ; that the application of right principles never fails to effect right relations ; that "the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life" ; that forms are wholly secondary, while attitude and spirit are all important ; and that only as the parties in industry are animated by the spirit of fair play, justice to all, and brotherhood, will any plan which they may mutually work out succeed.

(10) I believe that that man renders the greatest social service who so co-operates in the organisation of industry

as to afford to the largest number of men the greatest opportunity for self-development and the enjoyment of those benefits which their united efforts add to the wealth of civilisation.

VI

In these days the selfish pursuit of personal ends at the expense of the group can and will no longer be tolerated. The reign of autocracy has passed. Men are rapidly coming to see that human life is of infinitely greater value than material wealth; that the health, happiness, and well-being of the individual, however humble, is not to be sacrificed to the selfish aggrandizement of the more fortunate or more powerful. Modern thought is placing less emphasis on material considerations. It is recognising that the basis of national progress, whether industrial or social, is the health, efficiency, and spiritual development of the people. Never was there a more profound belief in human life than today. Whether men work with brain or brawn, they are human beings, and are much alike in their cravings, their aspirations, their hatreds, and their capacity for suffering and for enjoyment.

What is the attitude of the leaders in industry as they face this critical period of reconstruction? Is it that of the standpatters, who ignore the extraordinary changes which have come over the face of the civilised world and have taken place in the minds of men, who, arming themselves to the teeth, attempt stubbornly to resist the inevitable and invite open warfare with the other parties in industry, and who say: "What has been and is, must continue to be; with our backs to the wall we will fight it out along the old lines or go down in defeat"? Those who take such an attitude are wilfully heedless of the fact that its certain outcome will be financial loss, general inconvenience and suffering, the development of bitterness and hatred, and in the end submission to far more drastic and radical conditions imposed by legislation, if not by force, than could now be amicably arrived at through mutual concession in friendly conference.

Or is their attitude one in which I myself profoundly believe, which takes cognizance of the inherent right and justice of the co-operative principle underlying the new order, which recognises that mighty changes are inevitable, many of them desirable, and which does not wait until forced to adopt new methods, but takes the lead in calling together the parties to industry for a round-table conference to be held in a spirit of justice, fair play, and brotherhood, with a view to working out some plan of co-operation, which will ensure to all those concerned adequate representation, will afford to labour a voice in the forming of industrial policy, and an opportunity to earn a fair wage under such conditions as shall leave time,

not alone for food and sleep, but also for recreation and the development of the higher things of life ?

Never was there such an opportunity as exists today for the industrial leader with clear vision and broad sympathy permanently to bridge the chasm that is daily gaping wider between the parties to industry, and to establish a solid foundation for industrial prosperity, social improvement, and national solidarity. Future generations will rise up and call those men blessed who have the courage of their convictions, a proper appreciation of the value of human life as contrasted with material gain, and who, imbued with the spirit of co-operation, will lay hold of the great opportunity for leadership which is open to them today.

In conclusion, let it be said that upon the heads of those leaders—it matters not to which of the four parties they belong—who refuse to re-organise their industrial households in the light of the modern spirit, will rest the responsibility for such radical and drastic measures as may later be forced upon industry, if the highest interests of all are not shortly considered and dealt with in a spirit of fairness.

Who, then, will dare to block the wheels of progress and to let pass the present opportunity of helping to usher in a new era of peace and prosperity throughout the world, brought about through co-operation in industry ?

