

**Gokhale Institute of Politics  
and Economics, Poona 4.**

**Dhananjayrao Gadgil Library**



**GIPE-PUNE-009913**

**THE WHITLEY COUNCILS SCHEME**

THE  
WHITLEY COUNCILS  
SCHEME

BY  
JOHN BARTON SEYMOUR

LONDON  
P. S. KING & SON, LTD.  
ORCHARD HOUSE, WESTMINSTER

1932

X : 981.3

G 2

9913.

## FOREWORD TO BOOK

By RT. HON. J. H. WHITLEY

THE call to write a few words about Mr. Seymour's book on Joint Industrial Councils opens the opportunity for a gentle protest.

It is the way of the world to catch the name of the Chairman of a Committee or Commission and to use it as a convenient label for the emergency Report, forgetting the colleagues whose knowledge and experience often far exceeds that of the man who happens to have presided over their deliberations.

It was my privilege to be associated with a number of eminent employers and leaders of Trade Unions, and to them is due in the main the credit for the ideas and ideals which have been too much linked with my name.

Having so far relieved my conscience, I must pay a warm tribute to Mr. Seymour for his very valuable review of the facts which have come from the experience in varied countries over the last twelve years.

The pages of the press inevitably give space to stories of conflict and dispute in industry, ignoring for the most part the records of harmony and co-operation. Here, for the first time, is a taking and impartial examination of the various successes and the failures, together with a reasoned estimate of the causes contributing to the one or the other.

As a chapter of industrial history this work should find a permanent place. Perhaps it is not too much to hope that it may do more. It may help the recapture of the spirit with which the pioneers launched their ventures; it may reinvigorate those who are carrying the torch; and it may bring new faith to those who have been disheartened by human frailty in the stress of difficult conditions.

(Signed) J. H. WHITLEY.

X : 981.3

G 2

9913.

## FOREWORD TO BOOK

By RT. HON. J. H. WHITLEY

THE call to write a few words about Mr. Seymour's book on Joint Industrial Councils opens the opportunity for a gentle protest.

It is the way of the world to catch the name of the Chairman of a Committee or Commission and to use it as a convenient label for the emergency Report, forgetting the colleagues whose knowledge and experience often far exceeds that of the man who happens to have presided over their deliberations.

It was my privilege to be associated with a number of eminent employers and leaders of Trade Unions, and to them is due in the main the credit for the ideas and ideals which have been too much linked with my name.

Having so far relieved my conscience, I must pay a warm tribute to Mr. Seymour for his very valuable review of the results which have come from the experience in varied industries over the last twelve years.

The pages of the press inevitably give space to stories of strife and dispute in industry, ignoring for the most part the records of harmony and co-operation. Here, for the first time, is a taking and impartial examination of the successes and the failures, together with a reasoned estimate of the causes contributing to the one or the other.

As a chapter of industrial history this work should find a permanent place. Perhaps it is not too much to hope that it may do more. It may help the recapture of the spirit with which the pioneers launched their ventures; it may reinvigorate those who are carrying the torch; and it may bring new faith to those who have been disheartened by human frailty in the stress of difficult conditions.

(Signed) J. H. WHITLEY.

# CONTENTS

CHAP.	PAGE
PART I	
THE HISTORY OF THE WHITLEY SCHEME.	
I. PRECEDING CONDITIONS AND INFLUENCES . . . . .	3
II. THE REPORTS OF THE WHITLEY COMMITTEE . . . . .	13
III. ESTABLISHING THE COUNCILS . . . . .	18
IV. COUNCILS UNDER GOVERNMENT AUTHORITIES . . . . .	24
V. GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT . . . . .	33
PART II	
THE SCHEME AT WORK	
VI. MACHINERY AND MEETINGS . . . . .	47
VII. THE WORK OF THE COUNCILS . . . . .	55
VIII. VARIATIONS IN SCOPE . . . . .	69
IX. WORKS COMMITTEES . . . . .	81
X. DEFECTS AND FAILURES . . . . .	94
XI. THE INDUSTRIAL COUNCILS BILL . . . . .	106
PART III	
THE VALUE OF THE SCHEME	
XII. SOME RESULTS OF WHITLEYISM . . . . .	123
XIII. THE COUNCILS AND INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES . . . . .	136
XIV. THE SCHEME AND MODERN PROBLEMS . . . . .	154
XV. CRITICISMS AND SUGGESTIONS . . . . .	168
XVI. INDIFFERENCE AND OPPOSITION . . . . .	184
XVII. THE FUTURE . . . . .	193



	PAGE
<b>APPENDICES :</b>	
I. List of Whitley Councils Established . . . . .	199
II. List of Councils which have Ceased to Function . . . . .	202
III. Directory of Whitley Councils . . . . .	204
IV. List as regards Council Meetings . . . . .	213
V. List as regards Committees . . . . .	215
VI. List as regards District Councils . . . . .	218
VII. List as regards Works Committees . . . . .	220
VIII. List as regards Negotiation of Wages . . . . .	222
IX. Sample Constitution of a Joint Industrial Council . . . . .	225
X. Sample Constitution of Works Committees . . . . .	228
XI. The First Report of the Whitley Committee . . . . .	232
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .</b>	<b>239</b>
<b>INDEX . . . . .</b>	<b>249</b>

**PART I**  
**THE HISTORY OF THE WHITLEY SCHEME**

## CHAPTER I

### PRECEDING CONDITIONS AND INFLUENCES

WHAT is generally known as the "Whitley" Committee was a sub-committee of the Cabinet Committee on Reconstruction established by the Prime Minister, Mr. Asquith, 1916. Its title became "The Committee on Relations between Employers and Employed," and the period of its Sessions covered about two years. Its personnel comprised well-known economists and social workers, prominent employers, and leading trade union officials, with the Rt. Hon. J. H. Whitley, M.P. (afterwards Speaker of the House of Commons), as its chairman.

The terms of reference to the Whitley Committee were :

"(1) To make and consider suggestions for securing a permanent improvement in the relations between employers and workmen.

(2) To recommend means for securing that industrial conditions affecting the relations between employers and workmen shall be systematically reviewed by those concerned, with a view to improving conditions in the future."

The Committee's task was a work of reconstruction—the planning of an industrial scheme, to be carried out at the close of the war, for what it was hoped would be a great advance in industrial harmony.

In addition to the then existing conditions, there had been industrial changes and growths which had a direct bearing upon the subject matter of the relations between employers and employed, and which must have influenced the Committee in the formation of their scheme. It is the purpose of this chapter to mention briefly some of those underlying conditions and influences.

#### 4 THE WHITLEY COUNCILS SCHEME

First should be noticed the marked changes that had taken place in the organisation of business. The old system of the small private employer, with direct personal relations with his workpeople, was fast disappearing. Large-scale enterprise had taken its place, much of it directly or indirectly under public control. Joint-stock companies and corporations accounted for the greater portion of British business; and the tendency towards consolidation and "trustification" was very noticeable.

Side by side with this business growth had come a remarkable development in industrial organisation. The trade unions, from being local societies, had grown into national bodies. At the date the Whitley Committee began its work, the total of trade unionists was the largest yet recorded. The employers also were organised into associations to an equally unprecedented extent. Many of the organisations, both of employers and of trade unions, had undergone a process of amalgamation. Moreover, co-operation between the different sections of an industry, and between the various organised industries, had developed as never before.

As a natural result of the great advance in organisation, there had followed a wide extension of collective bargaining. Employers had turned from their original attitude of hostility to a more general recognition of the value of trade unionism in modern industry; and agreements between the two sides as to wages, hours and conditions of labour were general. Collective bargaining, which had been put on a national basis in many industries, had become a firmly established institution in Great Britain.

From this had followed a widespread development of the machinery for industrial peace. In most cases, agreements were carefully regulated, and carried out with almost automatic precision. Still, there arose occasions when the two sides found themselves unable to reach a decision. To prevent stoppage of business through strikes and lock-outs, a system of conciliation boards or joint committees had been established throughout the country. Hundreds of permanent boards of conciliation, composed of equal

numbers of employers and employees, had been set up in the various industries. If these failed to agree, the peace machinery had been carried a step further by the establishment of boards of arbitration, to pass judgment upon the disputed points after the evidence had been fully weighed. As prevalent opinion was opposed to compulsory arbitration, the basis of the arbitration boards was the voluntary acceptance of their decisions. Such acceptance had been the rule throughout British industry.<sup>1</sup> This established joint machinery was nation-wide, and in full activity when the Whitley Committee first met on November 9, 1916.

Another marked feature of the period was the extent to which Government intervention in industrial affairs had developed. Organisation among both the employers and the workpeople had reached such a status of efficiency that State machinery could be adequately employed; and the State had been called upon more and more to regulate the conditions of employment. Its activities covered health and safety in all occupations, hours in most, and wages in a few. Every advancing year saw the Government carrying out a more detailed system of public industrial regulation.

Numerous Acts had been passed during this period, not only with regard to collective bargaining and the prevention of disputes, but also to permit the Government to intervene in industry for the protection and assistance of the workpeople. Among these Acts may be named:

- Trade Union Acts, 1871 and 1876;
- Masters' and Workmen's Conciliation Act, 1872;
- Factory Acts, 1878 and 1901;
- Employers' Liability Acts, 1880 and 1906;
- Coal Mines Regulation Act, 1887;
- The 1886 Act to amend the Truck Act of 1831;
- Arbitration Act, 1889;
- Conciliation Act, 1896,

and the many Statutes of social and protective legislation for workpeople that followed the advent of a Liberal Government in 1906.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Cd. 6952, Section II.

## 6 THE WHITLEY COUNCILS SCHEME

Possibly, the most striking of the latter Acts was the Trade Boards Act, 1909, by which the Government was empowered to establish trade boards in several of the "sweated" industries for carrying out the novel experiment of prescribing for those industries minimum wage rates enforceable by law.

The appropriate Ministries became responsible for the administration of these Statutes. For example, the Home Office had the supervision of factories and mines, and the administration of the Factory Acts; the Ministry of Health dealt with health insurance; and the Board of Trade with the trade boards, the labour exchanges and unemployment insurance. Later, the Ministry of Labour, created during the first year of the Whitley Committee, was to relieve the Board of Trade of many of its duties.

The advent of war in 1914 ushered in a great acceleration of the recent industrial growths, especially in the direction of Government intervention.

At such a time private interests became submerged in the infinitely more important public welfare. "Everybody recognised that in the face of great danger, disunity in our midst meant national defeat."<sup>1</sup>

The war tremendously speeded up industrial organisation. Associations sprang into being in many trades where they had not previously existed. Trade unions doubled their numbers, and amalgamations became prevalent. Both employers and workers realised the necessity of the unanimity resulting from thorough organisation. Certain prejudices against trade unionism were overcome, and relations between masters and men grew far more amicable. The exigencies of war brought urgent demands for fraternisation, and, as a result, the improved relationships between the two sides of industry allowed joint consideration of many problems which would have been ruled out of the sphere of discussion in pre-war days. The Government, also, entered into a much closer relationship with the trade unions. The unions were, to a large extent,

<sup>1</sup> Speech of the Minister of Labour, Mr. Roberts, at the inauguration of the Pottery J.I.C., Jan. 11, 1918.

## PRECEDING CONDITIONS AND INFLUENCES 7

temporarily absorbed into the State administrative machinery. A trade unionist was a member of the War Cabinet ; and prominent members of trade unions served as representatives on the war-time boards of control. The position of trade unionism had advanced to one of responsibility and respect.

While in certain industries contributing war supplies and services collective bargaining was, for the time being, necessarily suspended, the war gave a great impetus in other directions to the development of negotiations. A steadily increasing use was made of joint committees of employers and employed, and new joint bodies were formed in many industries, to assist in technical matters, and to ensure the smooth development of war-time industry. Control boards were established, for the allocation of raw materials, the apportionment of fuel, the assignment of labour, and like duties. During the war, wages in practically all the British industries tended towards a uniform basis. There came a marked increase in wage-rates, especially in the case of semi-skilled labour. Often the increase was 100 per cent., or more, over pre-war standards. From a district basis, the wage-making tendency was towards a national basis, with a legal fixation in certain cases, as, for example, for seamen and for women in munition trades.

The state of war made the rapid settlement of differences a matter of the utmost national importance. Nothing was left undone in the way of mediation and conciliation ; and the war crisis eventually forced upon the nation temporary compulsory arbitration. The compulsory machinery, combined with public sentiment, had such a marked effect on the industrial situation that the period from August to November, 1916 (the latter month being the one when the Whitley Committee held its first meeting) was the period when the least difficulty arose in the settlement of industrial differences.<sup>1</sup>

It was in the direction of Government intervention, however, that the most startling industrial changes occurred. Great industries like the railways and the manufacture of

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Lord Askwith, *Industrial Problems and Disputes*, p. 412.

munitions were nationalised for the duration of the war. The numerous war boards of control have already been mentioned. Patriotism caused the trade union leaders to agree to a suspension of those customs and privileges which they had gained after years of hard struggle, and to subordinate their interests to the common interest of the nation. As the war years advanced, Government interference in industry increased in strength. Regulations were multiplied, and Statutes increased the severity of State control. The Treasury Agreement of 1915 was followed by the Munitions of War Acts of that and the following years. The first Munitions of War Act gave the Government compulsory powers for the introduction of dilution on any scale they deemed fit. In industries necessary for the prosecution of the war, the right to strike was abolished and compulsory arbitration established. Over-time restrictions and regulations against the employment of women were done away with. In short, neither law nor custom was allowed to hinder the supremely important necessity of furnishing, to the fullest extent possible, every supply and service essential to the successful termination of the nation's struggle for victory.

The Whitley Committee first met during the pressure of these war developments. What they thought about them is revealed in a speech of their Chairman: "I think it not too much to say the war has done in five years what might have taken twenty-five years to do under other circumstances. I venture also the view that in that sense it is all to the good that it has been so. For is it not true that the war opened up the opportunity for capacity which up to that time was unrevealed both to the individual and to the mass?"<sup>1</sup>

There was probably also in the minds of the Committee a new inspiration—the thought of reconstruction. In 1916, men were beginning to consider the return to a peacetime basis, and the careful plans that must be formulated if the country, after the war, was to be placed in a higher and better state of industrial unity. It may be that their

<sup>1</sup> Oct. 17, 1919. Speech of Rt. Hon. J. H. Whitley, M.P.



conceptions were too strongly tinged with idealism ; but an optimistic outlook was necessary if " a permanent improvement in the relations between employers and workmen " was to be secured.

With reconstruction " in the air," and under the unusually severe restrictions of war-time control, it is not strange that the time was one of considerable industrial unrest.

The war had interrupted a prolific strike period. The three years preceding its outbreak had been one of the most disturbed epochs in British industry ; and, at the commencement of war, 100 strikes were known to the Board of Trade to be in progress.<sup>1</sup> Although considerably lessened in numbers, strikes occurred at intervals throughout the war. In 1915, 2,000,000 working days were lost by strikes. The figures are 2,500,000 for 1916, and 5,500,000 for 1917. The first Munitions of War Act came into force on the 2nd of July, 1915 ; and on the 15th of that month 200,000 miners were on strike in the South Wales coal-field.<sup>2</sup> One of the fiercest struggles of the period was the strike of the engineers of the Clyde district, involving twenty firms and 8,000 highly paid employees. Despite war restrictions, strikes were of frequent occurrence during the sessions of the Whitley Committee.

Shortly after the issuance of the Committee's first Report, a series of Commissions for various parts of the country was set up under the general chairmanship of the Rt. Hon. G. M. Barnes, M.P., to inquire into the prevalent industrial unrest. Among the causes of unrest named by this Commission were :

1. The severe restriction of the liberty of the workpeople, especially through the operation of the Munitions of War Acts ;
2. The growing distaste for Government and Departmental interference ;
3. High food prices in relation to wages, and unequal distribution of food ;
4. Delay in the settlement of disputes ;

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Lord Amulree, *Industrial Arbitration in Great Britain*, pp. 119 and 121.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Wolfe, *Labour Supply and Regulation*, p. 122.

5. Lack of confidence in the Government, and the fear that customs and privileges surrendered would not be restored;
6. A general psychological uncertainty and discontent among the workers.<sup>1</sup>

One observation of the Commission for South Wales seems to have a particularly direct bearing upon the deliberations of the Whitley Committee: "We are convinced that frequent meetings between employers and employed is an essential condition for the establishment of good relations between both parties."<sup>2</sup>

Arising out of the industrial turbulence at this time came one of the strangest labour movements of the period, and one which must have had a strong influence upon the trade union members of the Committee—the shop stewards movement.

Shop stewards existed before the war. They were minor officials appointed by the union from the men in a workshop to see that trade union contributions were paid and newcomers organised, and with certain lesser duties. But they had no power to negotiate on grievances, nor were they officially recognised by the management. The war brought an increase in their importance. While in certain instances, like the Glasgow engineers' strike of 1912, they had assumed greater prominence, the beginning of the shop stewards movement took place in connection with the Clyde engineers' strike, early in 1915.<sup>3</sup>

In the Clyde strike, the central executives of the unions were relegated to the background, and vigorous local shop stewards took over the authority, and the leadership of the dispute. They formed a Central Withdrawal of Labour Committee, and, disregarding their superior union officials, directed the strike. This committee boldly claimed that it alone represented the strikers, and that direct negotiations should be carried on with it, and not with the central executives of the unions. They stated: "We hold the view that the trade union officials are the servants, not the masters, of the rank and file, and that they require

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Cd. 8668 and Cd. 8696.

<sup>2</sup> Cd. 8668.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. G. D. H. Cole, *Workshop Organisation*, p. 3.

## PRECEDING CONDITIONS AND INFLUENCES. 11

some pressure at times to move them in the path the rank and file desire them to tread." <sup>1</sup>

Their success was startling. They were recognised by Mr. Lloyd George, who personally visited the strike area to discuss the position with them, and many of their proposals on behalf of the men were agreed to.

The Clyde example was quickly followed. Shop steward committees sprang up all over the country, and, although not officially recognised by the trade unions, became the spokesmen of the employees for the time being. They negotiated wage rates, dealt with grievances, and even declared strikes. One reason for their usurpation of the authority of the trade union leaders was that those leaders had voluntarily pledged themselves, under the Treasury Agreement of 1915, not to sanction strikes during the war. <sup>2</sup>

To this movement were attracted many advanced elements of the labour world—communists, syndicalists, guild socialists, and industrial unionists. Elaborate plans were formulated for remodelling trade unionism, with an outlined scheme for works committees of shop stewards, district committees, and a national council to direct the movement. <sup>3</sup> "Workshop Control" became their slogan, and many extreme proposals were advocated.

This agitation was naturally very embarrassing to the orthodox trade union leaders. Temporarily crippled by war pledges, they were unable to reply by effective active leadership. Their carefully built-up organisation was threatened by the extremists among their opponents, who advocated "industrial unionism" with a more advanced policy. Their hitherto recognised supremacy had been challenged, and, for a time, supplanted. Fortunately for them, the close of the war lessened the influence of the shop stewards movement. The war organisation of labour was reduced to normal proportions, the freedom of union officials was restored, and the loyalty of their followers, which had withstood the test of the shop stewards' challenge,

<sup>1</sup> H. Wolfe, *Labour Regulation and Supply*, p. 131.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. G. Williams, *Social Aspects of Industrial Problems*, p. 109.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. C. M. Lloyd, *Trade Unionism*, p. 151.

gave an unqualified recognition of their value and services. The shop stewards movement was quietened.

Nevertheless, the prominence given by the movement to workshop organisation must have placed that feature of labour structure distinctively in the minds of the Whitley Committee, as their plan for works committees bears witness.

One interesting development in a large industry at this time exerted a strong influence upon the Chairman of the Committee. Mr. Whitley's attention was attracted to an article on the Building Industrial Parliament scheme published in *The Venturer* for December, 1916. At his request, the author, Mr. Malcolm Sparkes, prepared a special "Memorandum on Industrial Self Government" for the Whitley Committee, in which his views and the progress of the scheme to date were stated.<sup>1</sup>

The above are some of the Industrial conditions and influences preceding the meetings of the Whitley Committee which concerned, more or less directly, the subject matter of their deliberations. That they were considered and, to an appreciable extent, utilised by the Committee, will appear evident from a perusal of the following chapter, on the Reports of the Whitley Committee and their scheme for industrial relationships.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Garton Foundation; *The Industrial Councils for the Building Industry*, pp. 42-3.

## CHAPTER II

### THE REPORTS OF THE WHITLEY COMMITTEE

THE Whitley Committee presented five valuable and instructive Reports. The dates of their signing are as follows: Report I, March 8, 1917; Reports II and III, October 18, 1917; Report IV, January 31, 1918; Report V, July 1, 1918.

The First Report, which is generally known as the "Whitley Report," recognised the value of adequate organisation in industry; of the acceptance of trade unionism; of conciliation and arbitration schemes; and of representative machinery, covering the entire industry, to deal with wages, hours, conditions and all other matters concerning the progress and welfare of the industry. It referred more particularly to the well-organised industries; and chiefly upon its recommendations is founded the present scheme of Whitley Councils.

This Report proposed a tripartite machine for each organised industry—first, a national joint industrial council, composed of representatives of the associations of both sides, meeting regularly and often to consider matters affecting the trade; secondly, district councils, similarly composed, to handle district questions, and with their decisions subject to the approval of the national body; lastly, works committees, to be set up in the individual establishments, for dealing with local matters, and subordinated to the district and national councils.

As to the respective functions of these bodies, and the methods of their correlation, the Committee thought these should "be determined separately in accordance with the

varying conditions of different industries." <sup>1</sup> But the Reports mentioned eleven subjects which it suggested the national councils might allocate to their subordinate bodies.

The Report took a wider view of the possibilities of joint action than had previously been accepted. It emphasised the vital necessity of co-operation after the war; the importance of the restoration of trade union customs; the value of the State's assistance in the formation of the councils, and of its presence, in an advisory capacity, at a council's preliminary meetings; and the need of the workpeople for greater opportunities of discussion about industrial matters which concerned them.

A feature which the Report especially stressed was the importance of the regularity of the meetings. In the twenty-six paragraphs of the Report, this regularity is mentioned five times—in paragraphs 5, 9, 14, 16 and 25. Paragraph 14 states a reason for the Committee's belief that such regularity was essential to the Scheme:

"The object is to secure co-operation by granting to workpeople a greater share in the consideration of matters affecting their industry, and this can only be achieved by keeping employers and workpeople in constant touch."

The First Report was chiefly confined to the highly organised industries of the country. The Committee's Second Report dealt with the less organised and the unorganised industries. It classified British industry into three groups—"A," those in which organisation was sufficiently developed to represent "the great majority of those engaged in the industry"; "B," those with considerable organisation, but less marked than in Group "A"; and "C," those in which "no associations can be said adequately to represent those engaged in the industry."

The Second Report was concerned with Groups "B" and "C." For them, it recommended the use of the trade boards system as a complementary part of a complete plan designed to cover, as far as possible, all the industries

<sup>1</sup> Cd. 8606, Par. 15.

of the country.<sup>1</sup> It suggested a larger measure of Government assistance for the less organised trades; and it expressed confidence that there existed in each industry a sufficiently large body of opinion willing to adopt the proposals of the Whitley Scheme.

Report III was a "Supplementary Report on Works Committees." It considered such committees necessary to the establishment and maintenance of co-operation in workshop matters.

The Committee left to the respective industries the settlement of the constitutions and functions of their works committees. They deprecated the idea that such committees would be used in opposition to trade unionism, and urged the co-operation of both sides in their formation. The Committee stressed the necessity of "regular meetings at fixed times, and, as a general rule, not less frequently than once a fortnight." They urged the discussion at the meetings of "suggestions of all kinds tending to improvement." In view of past experience with works committees, the Report suggested that the Ministry of Labour should issue a memorandum upon the subject.

The Report ended with an expression of the Committee's confidence that the nature of the organisation necessary for the various cases would be easily settled by the exercise of goodwill on both sides.

The Fourth Report was a "Report on Conciliation and Arbitration." It opposed any system of compulsory arbitration; monetary penalties to enforce awards or agreements; and any scheme to prevent by compulsion strikes or lockouts pending inquiry. Instead, it recommended the continuance of the existing voluntary system, but suggested that the Ministry of Labour should be authorised to hold an inquiry about the dispute, when desirable.

The Committee mentioned the possibility that existing

<sup>1</sup> As the suggestions of making the trade board system complementary to the industrial councils system were not accepted by the Government, it is unnecessary to give here further details of Report II. The Government's non-acceptance of this part of the Whitley Scheme is discussed in Chap. X, pp. 94-7.

conciliation and arbitration boards might become merged in, or correlated with, the joint councils to be established.

The most important feature of the Report was its recommendation that there should be a standing arbitration council, on the lines of the existing Committee on Production, so that differences which the councils could not solve might be referred to this standing tribunal for settlement. As a direct result of this recommendation, came the establishment, under the Industrial Courts Act, 1919, of the Industrial Court—the first permanent arbitration court set up in Great Britain. In addition to creating the Industrial Court, the Act empowered the Minister of Labour to appoint a conciliator at the request of either side in a dispute, and also decreed that the Minister might hold a court of inquiry into the causes of a dispute whenever he considered such action expedient.

The Final Report of the Whitley Committee summed up the recommendations of the preceding reports, and affirmed the Committee's conviction of the urgency of the matter, and of the usefulness of the proposed joint councils and works committees.

The Report also contained a minority note, signed by five Socialist members of the Committee, which, while recognising the value of the Committee's suggestions, stated that the Whitley Scheme could not be expected to settle the conflict of interests existing under "an economic system primarily governed by motives of private profit."

The Whitley Reports aroused great interest, not only in Great Britain, but also abroad. Much attention was given to the recommendations of the Committee, and a widespread circulation of the Whitley Scheme followed.

The First Report was considered by the War Cabinet on June 7, 1917, when it was decided that the Minister of Labour should circulate it to trade unions and employers' associations. Accordingly, the Report was sent out by the Ministry to 146 trade unions, 37 trade union federations, and 107 employers' associations and federations; also to the Parliamentary Committee of the Trades Union Congress, the General Federation of Trade Unions and the Federation



## REPORTS OF THE WHITLEY COMMITTEE 17

of British Industries. Of the replies received, none directly opposed the Whitley Scheme ; 86 stated conditions which they considered essential to the formation of Whitley councils ; and 5 expressed opinions that the Scheme was not applicable to their respective industries. After receiving this generally favourable reply, the War Cabinet, in October, 1917, adopted the policy of the First Whitley Report, and the Ministry of Labour set to work to further the establishment of national joint industrial councils in the industries of the country.

## CHAPTER III

### ESTABLISHING THE COUNCILS

As detailed particulars about the formation of the earlier Whitley councils are given in the Report of the Ministry of Labour on the Establishment and Progress of Joint Industrial Councils, published in 1923, it is not necessary to repeat them in this book. However, it may be stated that both the industries and the Ministry, during the first wave of enthusiasm over the new Scheme, had much success with their endeavours in this movement.

The establishment of an industrial council demanded considerable work, in completing and harmonising the organisation of both sides ; in reaching agreement as to the proportion of representation to be assigned to each association concerned ; and in perfecting the machinery for collective bargaining and conciliation, to meet the anticipated change of conditions and the widening area of negotiations. The success of these preliminary efforts is evidenced by the rapidity with which the new councils were formed.

While the Pottery J.I.C. was the first industrial council to be set up under the Whitley Scheme, one council was actually established before the publication of the First Report. The Painters' and Decorators' Industrial Joint Council of Great Britain was inaugurated in February, 1917. There was an international branch, representing the employers' and operatives' organisations in England, Wales, Scotland and Ireland, which confined itself mainly to the relations of the trade with Government Departments ; a national council, acting chiefly in an advisory capacity ; and area and local joint councils, which were

largely concerned with negotiations on wages and conditions and with the administration of working rules. This council did much excellent joint work, especially in craft education and in lessening unemployment, and continued in existence up to a few years ago, when it broke down owing to difficulties between the two sides.

The section of the Ministry of Labour which was active in stimulating the formation of Whitley councils was the Joint Industrial Councils Division.<sup>1</sup> This section had officers stationed in the principal industrial centres of the country, who rendered effective assistance. The Ministry attacked the problem with vigour in those early days. On October 20, 1917, it sent a letter to the leading employers' associations and trade unions, pointing out that, instead of increasing State interference, the creation of a council would offer an industry a larger degree of self-government than before. The letter announced the desire of the Government to recognise the councils as "the official standing consultative committee to the Government in all future questions affecting the industries which they represent."

Travelling officers of the Ministry of Labour went about the country instigating the establishment of the councils. Prominent individuals in the various trades were interviewed, particulars as to organisation and other problems were obtained, and advice was given. Members of the Whitley Committee, especially the Chairman, rendered valuable assistance to the Ministry in these efforts.

The general method followed by the Ministry in this work was :

- (1) Gradual pressure to get the two sides organised and in shape, by urging a more complete organisation of each side, and harmony and co-operation between a side's separate associations.
- (2) Calling a conference of the two sides of the industry at which prominent members of the Ministry attended.
- (3) Persuading the conference to pass a resolution in favour of the Whitley Scheme.

<sup>1</sup> Later amalgamated with the Industrial Relations Department of the Ministry of Labour.

- (4) Arranging for the sides to meet, to agree upon a constitution for the Council and upon the apportionment of representation.
- (5) The actual formation of the National Joint Council, which was often carried out with much ceremony.

Two conditions were suggested by the Ministry as essential to the constitution of an industrial council: (a) that the Council should consist exclusively of representatives of the organisations of the industry, and (b) that the Council should work through decentralised machinery distributed over the country—the district councils and works committees of the Whitley Scheme.

With regard to the percentage of representation which should exist before a council could be formed, no actual figure was mentioned officially, although it was generally understood that a minimum of 75 per cent. of those engaged in the trade was desirable. The formation of a national joint council was far less difficult in certain industries than in others. Where an industry was localised, there was the least trouble; but where many small establishments were scattered over the country, the task was extremely difficult, and took a long time and much hard work. Some of the largest industries, e.g. Cotton, Shipbuilding, Coal Mining, which already possessed ample methods of settling wage problems, were not approached by the Ministry; and several of the lesser industries, e.g. Soap and Candles; Chemicals; Paint, Colour and Varnish, established Whitley councils without the direct co-operation of the Ministry of Labour.

The Ministry attempted to form a joint industrial council for the Banking Industry, but found the task impossible, owing to vigorous opposition of leading bankers and bank officials. However, in the great majority of the industries interviewed, the efforts of the Ministry met with an appreciative response, and often with considerable enthusiasm.

In their efforts to carry out the recommendations of the Whitley Report, both the Ministry and the industries encountered serious obstacles. Among the difficulties mentioned in the 1923 Report of the Ministry of Labour<sup>1</sup> were:

<sup>1</sup> Report on the Establishment and Progress of Joint Industrial Councils.

- (1) The defective condition of organisation in the industry, especially among the employers.
- (2) The multiplicity of associations. For example, in the Wool Textile Industries, on the employers' side there were 28 associations and federations.
- (3) Difficult questions of definition, especially as to the definition of an industry where the workpeople's organisation was not co-terminous with the organisation of the employers.
- (4) The difficulty of securing joint action between craft unions and general labour unions.
- (5) The fact that in certain industries there was only a partial acceptance of trade unionism.
- (6) Rivalry between the commercial section and the private section of the industry.
- (7) The difficulty of securing the association of the English and the Scottish branches of the industry.
- (8) Obstacles arising out of marked differences of practice between sections of the industry.

While a few of the larger industries, such as Building, Road Transport, and Wool, established Whitley councils, it must be remembered that the majority of the biggest industries, among them, Coal Mining, Engineering, Railways, Ship-Building, the Cotton Trade, and Agriculture, refused to consider the Whitley Scheme. With the exception of Agriculture, these industries were highly organised, and were so well satisfied with their existing machinery for negotiation and conciliation that they were opposed to the addition of a new element to that machinery. Moreover, in certain cases, the leaders of the powerful trade unions were loth to surrender their powers to any superseding machine.<sup>1</sup>

There was one of this group of large industries in which the Ministry made special efforts to bring about the adoption of the Whitley Scheme—the Engineering Industry. The inequality and sectionalism of trade union organisation in this industry seemed reasons for the establishment of a national council, in order to smooth such differences out. But the shop stewards movement had left its mark upon Engineering; and the extreme element strongly opposed

<sup>1</sup> B. G. de Montgomery, *British and Continental Labour Policy*, p. 470.

the Whitley idea, as contrary to "the workers' control of industry," which, it was still hoped, might become an accomplished fact. This opposition, added to that of many of the employers, defeated the Ministry's efforts.

Nationalisation of the railways and the coal mines had long been the demand of the operatives in those industries. That question dominated the minds of the workpeople. They paid scant attention to the new scheme of the Whitley Report, especially since they were satisfied with their existing machinery. In this latter attitude, the employers, as a rule, concurred; and the result was a general apathy to the proposals for setting up Whitley councils in the Railway and the Coal-Mining Industries.

Although so many of the large, well-organised industries ignored or rejected the Whitley Scheme, the smaller industries, in this early period, took up the idea with enthusiasm, and, guided by the Ministry of Labour, held preliminary meetings, drafted constitutions, and established joint industrial councils with a speed that was remarkable, considering the many difficulties encountered.

In considering the statistics of the establishment of national joint industrial councils, it appears convenient to separate the history of the Whitley Scheme into three progressive eras: the first, to cover the establishment of industrial councils for private industries only; the second, to include, in addition, the time occupied during the establishment of councils connected with Government authorities, both national and local; and the third, to extend to the present date. According to this arrangement, the first era would extend to April 3, 1919, when the earliest Whitley council on which a Government authority had membership representation was inaugurated. This was the Waterworks Undertakings Industry Joint Industrial Council, composed of representatives of the trade unions, the private companies and the local authorities concerned.

In the first era, there were set up 31 national councils, covering about 2,500,000 workpeople. The names of these councils, and their order of establishment, are given in Appendix I.

In addition, for industries whose proportion of organisation did not allow the immediate establishment of Whitley councils, the Government, chiefly through the Ministry of Reconstruction, set up 32 "interim industrial reconstruction committees," to deal with urgent trade questions involved in the transition from war to peace conditions. These committees were joint bodies similar in nature and functions to the Whitley councils; and the hope was expressed by the Government that they would lead to the establishment of permanent joint industrial councils.<sup>1</sup> The Memorandum of the Ministry on the subject<sup>2</sup> specified as the most urgent questions to which the attention of the committees should be given:

- "1. The promotion of industrial organisation.
2. Demobilisation and employment.
3. Raw materials.
4. Priority.
5. Financial facilities.
6. New industries.
7. The disposal of surplus Government stores."

The figures for the total number of councils established by the close of the second era of the Whitley Scheme are given at the end of the following chapter, which deals with the formation of councils in connection with local and municipal authorities and with the National Government.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the Ministry of Reconstruction's Memorandum of July 7, 1918, on Interim Industrial Reconstruction Committees.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

## CHAPTER IV

### COUNCILS UNDER GOVERNMENT AUTHORITIES

ALTHOUGH many joint industrial councils had been established, over a year passed before the Whitley Scheme was applied to other industrial spheres than those of private enterprise. There remained the industries and services in which the local and municipal authorities of the country were interested, the great Government Departments, and the Civil Service.

In its second Report, the Whitley Committee said :

“ We understand that the Ministry of Labour has up to the present circulated our first Report only to employers' and workpeople's associations in the ordinary private industries. We think, however, that both it and the present Report should also be brought to the notice of State Departments and Municipal Authorities employing labour.”<sup>1</sup>

In response to this appeal, Ministerial efforts were directed towards the extension of the Whitley Scheme to industries in which the local and municipal authorities were engaged. The application of Whitley principles to these involved problems of considerable interest. Some of the chief difficulties arose in the cases of the four trading services of Waterworks, Gas, Tramways and Electricity Supply. While certain of these services were exclusively municipal, many of them included undertakings owned by private companies. It was a question whether, or not, to separate the company-owned services from the authority-owned services. The final decision arrived at was to have a single national joint industrial council for each of these groups of services.

<sup>1</sup> Cd. 9002, Section 24.



The remaining manual occupations with which modern local authorities have to deal were grouped under two national councils, the Local Authorities Non-Trading Services (Manual Workers) J.I.C. for England and Wales, and the Local Authorities Non-Trading Services (Manual Workers) J.I.C. for Scotland. These councils cover the manual employees of the Authorities in such services as the upkeep of parks, highways and public buildings, and in establishments like sewage works and dust destructor works.

Preparation for the inauguration of these councils involved much work in correspondence, interviews, and the calling of conferences between private employers, trade unionists and representatives of the local authorities. The Whitley Scheme was endorsed by those concerned in each instance, and draft constitutions were adopted. It was agreed that the national councils for the four public utility services should include Scotland, as well as England and Wales; and the work of forming the councils was carried out so energetically that all were established before the end of 1919.

The Joint Industrial Council for the Waterworks Industry was the first of these councils to be inaugurated. It speedily set up district councils, and has had a most satisfactory career. As one of its present secretaries testifies: "I think I may claim that excellent work has been accomplished with a minimum of discord or acrimony. There has been a whole-hearted endeavour by all concerned to make the Whitley Scheme work satisfactorily in the Waterworks Industry, with a very large measure of success."

In the Gas Industry, the workpeople were highly organised; but it was considered advisable, as a preliminary, to establish an association of the employers—the Federation of Gas Employers—whose representatives should serve on the national council. There are 12 district councils, and the Secretary reports no difficulties encountered by the Industry in its application of the Whitley Scheme.

The Electricity Supply Industry J.I.C. held its first meeting on May 8, 1919. Later, one of the largest

employers' associations withdrew from the Council, necessitating a reconstruction of the employers' side. The Council now has 13 district councils, and work committees in 26 undertakings. It has established a national schedule of wages and conditions, with a sliding wage scale dependent upon the cost-of-living figures. This industry also set up in 1920 a separate joint body to consider questions affecting its higher staff—the National Joint Board for the Electricity Supply Industry.

The Tramway Industry was the last of the public utility services to adopt the Whitley Scheme. After about two years' negotiations, it established a joint industrial council, whose first meeting was on September 5, 1919. The membership of this council is 44, 14 representing the municipalities, 8 representing the private companies, and 22 representing the employees. It has 9 district councils and about 50 works committees. The council has held over 80 meetings since its formation.

Much difficulty was encountered in establishing the two councils for the manual workers in the non-trading services of the local authorities, partly owing to the wide diversity both of areas and occupations. The laws and customs of these services in England and in Scotland differ greatly; and it was finally decided that two separate councils would be more practicable and more acceptable. Although the council for England and Wales was founded early in 1919, it was not until October 29, 1920, that the Scottish council held its first meeting. This council has since disbanded; and the council for England and Wales, at the present time, only covers a little more than one-half of the authorities concerned. A considerable amount of indifference or prejudice has been found among many of the local authorities, especially in the areas where there is lack of trade union organisation.

Lack of interest and hostility have brought even more startling results to the two national councils for the Local Authorities Administrative, Technical and Clerical Services. The council for England and Wales was set up early in 1920, and the council for Scotland towards the end of

that year. Both councils have now broken down; but, although the national council for England and Wales has disbanded, there remain 3 Whitley councils for Local Authorities Administrative Services in three most important areas of England, which function with considerable success. Those are the Lancashire and Cheshire Provincial Joint Council, the West Riding Provincial Joint Council, and the London District Council for Local Authorities Administrative, Technical and Clerical Services.<sup>1</sup>

If opposition to the adoption of the Whitley Scheme was manifested by certain of the local authorities, it was still more strikingly apparent on the part of some of the high officials of H.M. Government. Shortly after the publication of the Whitley Report, a number of questions were asked in the House of Commons as to whether it was the intention of the Government to put the Whitley recommendations into force in the Civil Service and the Government Departments. The Press also brought up the subject frequently, and various Government staff associations, especially in the Post Office and the Civil Service, sent delegates to urge the Government to take action in the matter.<sup>2</sup>

There was an obstinate resistance on the part of the heads of nearly all the Departments,<sup>3</sup> and the serious delay resulting caused considerable unrest among Government employees.<sup>4</sup>

It may seem strange that the Government was so unwilling to set an example to the outside industries in this regard; but it must be remembered that this was an unprecedented step it was asked to take. Government Departments had always been conservative in their views of labour questions. Up to the war, they had not recognised trade unions; and collective bargaining had been to them an unknown practice.<sup>5</sup> It is true that war expansion of Government employment had begun to indicate

<sup>1</sup> A discussion of the reasons for the breakdown of so many Whitley councils has been reserved for Chapter X, pp. 103-5.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Labour Year Book for 1919*, p. 253.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. S. and B. Webb, *History of Trade Unionism*, footnote on p. 647.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Cmd. 501, Appendix I.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. E. C. Shepherd, *The Fixing of Wages in Government Employ*, p. 87.

the necessity for conforming to modern industrial methods, but several of the heads of the Departments appeared reluctant to make the change.<sup>1</sup>

There were some grounds for such reluctance. Heads of Government Departments are not so free to take action in regard to their subordinates as private employers are: they are responsible to Parliament, and any change made by them is subject to Parliamentary inquiry. They are themselves public servants, not independent employers. The taxpayers can call them to account. This difference is recognised at the present time: "The Government has not surrendered, and cannot surrender its liberty of action in the exercise of its authority and the discharge of its responsibility."<sup>2</sup>

Nevertheless, the Government yielded, though somewhat grudgingly, to the general demand that Whitley councils be established for its employees. On July 4, 1918, Mr. Bonar Law announced in the House of Commons the decision of the Government to apply the recommendations of the Whitley Committee to its own services. Accordingly, an Inter-Departmental Committee, whose Chairman was the Minister of Labour, Mr. Roberts, was appointed to consider the adaptation of the Whitley Scheme to Government establishments and the Civil Service. The Roberts Committee appointed a Sub-Committee, under the Chairmanship of Sir T. Heath, to draft a scheme for setting up Whitley councils in the Civil Service. The report of the Sub-Committee was accepted by the Government.

The Civil Service National Whitley Council held its first meeting on July 23, 1919. It appointed a committee to draft a constitution, and to issue a memorandum for the guidance of Departments in the setting up of Whitley councils.

The National Council for the Civil Service covers nearly 200 associations of civil servants in the British Isles. It has, at the present time, 72 Departmental councils, and a large number of committees.<sup>3</sup> In 1922, the Government

<sup>1</sup> Cf. H. Clay, *The Problem of Industrial Relations*, p. 162.

<sup>2</sup> Memoranda of the Royal Commission on the Civil Service, 1929, p. 89.

<sup>3</sup> Appendix Q of the 1929 Memoranda of the Royal Commission on the Civil Service names 2 standing committees and 19 other committees.

appointed three Members of Parliament to serve on the official side of the National Council. The general objects of this council are stated in Paragraph 21 of its constitution ; and they apply as well to the other councils of the Government Administrative Departments :

“ The objects of the National Council shall be to secure the greatest measure of co-operation between the State in its capacity as employer, and the general body of civil servants in matters affecting the Civil Service, with a view to increased efficiency in the public services combined with the well-being of those employed ; to provide machinery for dealing with grievances, and generally to bring together the experience and different points of view of representatives of the administrative, clerical and manipulative Civil Service.”

The Heath Committee had proposed that the functions of a Government Whitley council should be advisory only. It was finally decided that decisions of the council, after being reported to the Government, should become operative ; but it was stated in the clearest terms that such decisions would not derogate from the authority and responsibility of the Government.<sup>1</sup> So the council's agreements are not merely recommendations, but actual decisions, subject always to their possible veto by the Government on the ground of “ public interest.”

After the foundation of the Civil Service National Council, the Government took immediate steps for setting up Whitley councils in its great employing Departments. It was decided to have a double system of central councils : Department joint councils to represent the separate State Departments, and trade joint councils to deal with wages and other matters customarily settled on a trade basis. The trade councils were set up for four main labour groups : Engineering, Ship-building, Building, and Miscellaneous Labour, each council representing all the Departments employing the particular kind of labour concerned.

To correspond with the subsidiary Whitley bodies in general industry, local committees of the following types were established, as circumstances required : Department

<sup>1</sup> Cf. 1929 Memoranda of Royal Commission on the Civil Service, p. 88.

committees for the various branches of a Department ; trade committees for a trade, or group of trades acting together ; works or yard committees ; and shop committees.

The Departmental national councils were necessarily organised first ; and, after their establishment had cleared the way for the trade joint councils, the latter were established as rapidly as possible. The dates of the first meetings are as follows :

Office of Works Departmental Joint Council : September 24, 1919.

Admiralty Departmental J.C. : October 10, 1919.

Ministry of Munitions Departmental Joint Council :<sup>1</sup> February 18, 1920.

Air Ministry Departmental Joint Council : March 23, 1920.

War Office Departmental Joint Council : May 12, 1920.

Stationery Office Departmental Joint Council : June 28, 1920.

Miscellaneous Trade Joint Council : October 12, 1920.

Engineering Trade Joint Council : October 13, 1920.

Shipbuilding Trade Joint Council : October 13, 1920.

Building Trade Joint Council : October 14, 1920.

Trade Joint Council of Co-ordination Committee for Government Industrial Establishments :<sup>2</sup> December 1, 1920.

The Whitley councils under Government Authorities have been found to fit smoothly into the Whitley Scheme. While there are minor differences between their machinery and procedure and the structure and methods of the councils of private industry, there are no differences so striking as to cause serious difficulty. The main limitation on the Government councils is as to the matter of costs. Where costs are concerned, a Government Whitley council has a more restricted field of operation than an industrial council. The Treasury is always in the background, with an ultimate

<sup>1</sup> This was later taken over by the War Office on the termination of the Ministry.

<sup>2</sup> For dealing with questions affecting more than one of the trade councils.

veto power. It may send an official to the council meeting, and it keeps a careful watch over the policy and expenditure of the council.

At first glance, there might seem to be danger of a conflict of decisions in the dual system of councils. However, the Departmental council and the trade council do not really divide the discussion of wages and conditions into two sections. Many of the representatives of the Departmental council are also representatives of the trade council; and the transactions of both types of councils become parts of a single process.<sup>1</sup>

The various branches of the Government have built up their Whitley machinery to meet the circumstances of each case. Consequently, there has been considerable variation of the machinery, depending upon the size of the Department, the nature of its organisation, and the scope and numbers of its establishments. The most extensive machine is that of the Civil Service. Its 72 Departmental councils have been mentioned. The National Council deals with questions affecting the whole Civil Service; the Departmental council handles matters pertaining to it alone. Where a Department has scattered provincial staffs, local committees have been set up. For example, the Post Office section has two councils, the Post Office Administrative Whitley Council and the Post Office Engineering and Stores Department Whitley Council. The latter represents some 70,000 workers, and has 13 district committees, with a regular system of office or works committees.

Since their establishment, the Government councils have dealt with an enormous amount of work, and have been, on the whole, very successful. During the critical period of reconstruction, they gave material assistance to the Government Departments. They have brought the high State officials into close contact with their subordinates to an extent that would have been thought impossible before their existence. The conservative aloofness of the old days has disappeared. This is especially noticeable with regard

<sup>1</sup> Cf. E. C. Shepherd, *The Fixing of Wages in Government Employment*, p. 139.

to the Treasury.<sup>1</sup> Moreover, they have firmly established in Government spheres the recognition of trade unionism and the appreciation of the value of collective bargaining.

The advantage of the system is not confined to the formal council meetings. Especially, in the frank discussion among officers and committee members, has there been an informal interchange of ideas and points of view that has greatly facilitated the settlement of difficulties and moderated the attitude of both sides. In the words of a prominent staff secretary: "A new spirit of friendliness has come about."

The last Government Whitley council was inaugurated at the end of 1920, which concludes the second era of the Whitley Scheme. At this date, there had been set up in all 75 national joint industrial councils, covering about 3,500,000 workpeople. In addition, the Government had established 33 interim industrial reconstruction committees. Probably, at this time the Whitley council machinery was at its strongest, so far as the actual number of councils and the total of employees covered by them are concerned. Even then, however, there were signs of instability. Several of the councils had disbanded by the end of 1920; and, in addition to other causes, the disastrous depression of the period following hastened the termination of many others. But the growth of the movement was not stopped; it was to continue, and to be extended to a certain extent. Chapter V will describe this development.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. E. C. Shepherd, *The Fixing of Wages in Government Employment*, p. 140.



## CHAPTER V

### GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT

THE 14 years that have passed since the publication of the Whitley Reports have provided ample time for the application of the Whitley Scheme to British industry, and for the development of the Whitley concept. Perhaps it will be advisable to define here what the Whitley concept is. In the author's opinion, it is the idea of the co-operation of employers and workpeople in an industry through regular joint meetings of representatives of their associations, to provide for the well-being of the industry and of all engaged in it. "Whitleyism" may be said to be the activity or spirit behind this concept—the spirit of mutual confidence which is necessary to carry out the concept, and which is itself directly increased by the application of the Whitley idea.

The number of additional national councils formed after the year 1920 is small. Possibly, an explanation of this lies in the fact that by that time British industry had been thoroughly canvassed by the Ministry of Labour, in its efforts to advance the application of the Whitley Scheme. Moreover, a period of business stagnation was not conducive to any further expansion of industrial organisation ; it even curtailed the expenditure and work of the Ministry itself.

Appendix I gives a list of all the central Whitley councils established up to the present time. Appendix II names those now disbanded or moribund. These lists may be summarised as follows :

Total of joint industrial councils established . . . . .	94
Councils not functioning at present . . . . .	<u>30</u>
Remainder of councils still active . . . . .	<u>64</u>

## 34 THE WHITLEY COUNCILS SCHEME

The 94 established councils may be grouped into :

Councils set up for industries . . . . .	74
Councils set up for Local Authorities . . . . .	8
Councils set up for the Central Government . . . . .	12

Of the 74 councils established for industries :

- 60 covered the whole of the industry in question ;
- 3 covered a part of the industry, but were national ;
- 6 covered a part of the industry, and were local ;
- 5 covered industries and Local Governments.

To date, 30 councils have been disbanded, or are moribund. This figure includes 26 councils for industries ; 3 for Local Authorities ; and 1 council for the Government—the Council for the extinct Ministry of Munitions.

Certain councils have disbanded, but, in their place, the industry concerned has sectional or local councils still functioning. The Whitley Council for the Building Industry has expired ; but instead two sectional councils have been set up—the National Joint Council for the Plastering Industry, and the National Joint Council for the Plumbing Trade. Although the Road Transport National Council has disbanded, there remain the North Midland Road Transport Joint Board, and the Road Transport (Scotland) Joint Industrial Council. The Carpet Industry J.I.C. has broken down, but several of its district councils are still active.

The National Council of the Local Authorities Administrative, Technical and Clerical Services for England and Wales had disbanded, but 3 important local councils of these services still function.<sup>1</sup>

Of the 33 interim industrial reconstruction committees set up by the Ministry of Reconstruction, 17 were reconstituted as joint industrial councils, 13 are no longer functioning, and 3 are still active—the committees for the Clay Industry ; the Envelope and Manufactured Stationery Industry ; and the Cocoa, Chocolate, Sugar Confectionery and Jam Industry. Of the 17 which were reconstituted as

<sup>1</sup> See page 27.

joint industrial councils, 7 have since disbanded, and 10 are still functioning. Of these 10, the Whitley Council for the Making-up and Packing of Textiles for Export is for the London district only, the national body having ceased to function.

An extension of Whitleyism occurred when the Association of Joint Industrial Councils and Interim Industrial Reconstruction Committees was established. Among the reasons advanced for its formation were :

1. To strengthen and develop the Whitley Scheme.
2. To give greater authority to Whitley bodies.
3. To co-ordinate the work of councils and committees.
4. To present united action with regard to important measures.
5. To assist in standardisation of wages and conditions.

There was considerable opposition to this proposal on the part of certain of the councils, owing to the fear that such a step might lessen the freedom and activity of individual councils.

This movement was inaugurated by the Pottery Industry J.I.C., which sent out letters and circulars. As a result of these, a conference was held in January, 1920, and a provisional committee was appointed to draw up a scheme. At a later conference in March, 1921, it was resolved to form the Association (*a*) for the purpose of taking joint action when it was desired to make representations to the Government ; and (*b*) for the interchange of ideas and the discussion of matters of common interest.

The Association has held many meetings. It has been especially active in urging the support of the Industrial Councils Bill. Among other matters which have received its attention are the Merchandise Marks Act, postal rates, unemployment insurance, taxation and rating, publicity, and the provision of statistics.

There has been an increased development by the councils in the creation of appellate machinery. Conciliation and arbitration schemes have been instituted by many of them. Conciliation committees are in general use ; panels of umpires and of members of arbitration bodies have been chosen ; and much care has been taken to provide for a

settlement of differences as speedily as possible, and for the avoidance of strikes and lockouts.<sup>1</sup>

Certain instances occur where questions arise which directly concern more than one industry, though not of common interest to all the industries. In such cases, conferences of representatives of the industries concerned, with or without representatives of outside bodies, may provide satisfactory methods of discussion. For example, in the autumn of 1921, a joint conference of representatives of the Councils of the Electrical Cable Making Industry, the Electricity Supply Industry, and the Electrical Contracting Industry, with representatives of two electrical associations and of the Electrical Wholesale Federation, met to discuss questions of mutual interest.

There is a standing conference for the three existing councils for Local Authorities' Administrative, etc., Services, which meets regularly. Its functions are :

- “ (a) to encourage the establishment of Provincial Councils ;
- (b) to consider questions on which a collective decision is desired— ; and
- (c) to consider any matters of interest to the Local Government Service.”

The few joint conferences of this kind that have been organised have succeeded in their objects, and have tended to bring the bodies concerned into a closer relationship. It should be beneficial if greater use were made in the future of this form of Whitley council expansion.

The Whitley Report contemplated that a national council should be first established, and that, thereafter, this council should set up, as soon as possible, its district councils.<sup>2</sup> Accordingly, the Ministry steadily devoted its attention to this second phase of the Whitley Scheme.

The procedure generally adopted has been for the national council to appoint a drafting committee, to divide the industry into district areas, and, upon the approval of the committee's report, to arrange inaugural meetings for the respective district councils.

<sup>1</sup> A further discussion of this work will be found in Chapter XIII.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Ministry of Labour, Industrial Report No. 4.

The work of establishing district councils has progressed to some extent. Appendix VI gives a list of the number of existing district councils of the various industries. A comparison of this with the 1923 Report of the Ministry of Labour,<sup>1</sup> gives the following figures : By the end of 1922, not less than 150 district councils had been established. At the present time, about 350 district councils and district committees, or their equivalents, are in active existence in the industries and services which have national Whitley councils.<sup>2</sup>

The membership of these councils is made up of representatives of the employers' associations and trade unions of the district, with members of the national council who reside in the district acting as *ex-officio* members. In certain localised industries, like the Pottery Industry, it has been unnecessary to set up district councils.

There has been some difficulty in finding work for certain of these councils ; and their meetings have not been as regular as was contemplated in the Whitley Report. Nevertheless, the district councils have, on the whole, been of considerable assistance to the parent councils in relieving them of business and in settling local differences.<sup>3</sup>

The establishment of works committees has not been a success. The Whitley Report laid great stress upon the importance of works committees to the proposed organisation. They are an essential section of the tripartite scheme ; and it seems unfortunate that this part of the scheme has not been developed with the enthusiasm that was desired.

However, the blame does not rest on the Ministry of Labour. It formed a special staff to take up the suggestion of the Committee with employers and trade unions all over the country and in every industry ; and it sent out officials to help in the organisation of works committees. Direct opposition was encountered on the part of many employers ;

<sup>1</sup> Report on the Establishment and Progress of Joint Industrial Councils, p. 64.

<sup>2</sup> Of the 350 existing district councils, about 100 are under Government national councils ; and of these three-fourths belong to the Civil Service J.I.C.

<sup>3</sup> The functions of these councils are discussed in Chap. VII.

and most employers and trade unionists appeared indifferent, if not hostile, to the idea.

Exact particulars as to the existing number of works committees are not available. The secretaries of several of the councils are themselves uninformed as to the precise figures. The Ministry of Labour Report of 1923<sup>1</sup> states: "It is probable that considerably over one thousand works committees have been established." Appendix VII of this book gives lists of councils having no works committees, councils having works committees under them, and those whose industries have works committees which are not under the Whitley councils. A perusal of the figures of the Appendix will find evidence that the number of works committees under the Whitley Scheme to-day is far less than one thousand. It is probably nearer five hundred.<sup>2</sup>

In spite of certain acknowledged failures and breakdowns, Whitleyism has extended its influence as the years have advanced. Some of the suggestions of the Whitley Committee have been used to the benefit of industry in a number of directions.

One of these directions was towards the development of the trade boards system. The trade boards preceded the joint industrial councils. The Whitley Reports urged their expansion and the extension of their functions. While these recommendations were not completely followed by the Government the application of the Trade Boards Acts was largely extended during the years 1919 and 1920, with the object of their assistance in the harmonious settlement of industrial differences—an object stressed by the Whitley Committee.<sup>3</sup> Therefore, to this extent, Whitleyism may be said to have made a contribution to the advancement of the British trade boards.

Under the Trade Boards Act, 1909, trade boards had been set up in certain "sweated" industries, to secure a

<sup>1</sup> Report on the Establishment and Progress of Joint Industrial Councils, p. 81.

<sup>2</sup> See Chap. IX for a further discussion of works committees, their constitution and functions, and the difficulties and failures connected with their establishment.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Committee on Industry and Trade, *Survey of Industrial Relations*, p. 291.

legal minimum wage. A trade board consists of equal numbers of representatives of employers and employed in the trade, with an additional three or five "outside" members appointed by the Minister of Labour. Its decision is published, and left open for revision during a certain period, at the end of which time the board makes its final decision, which is subject to the approval of the Minister. When the Minister's Order confirms the decision, it is obligatory upon all the employers in the trade, and is enforceable by law.

The machinery and objects of a trade board in many ways resemble those of a joint industrial council. As a rule, the following similarities occur in both bodies: joint membership taken from the organised bodies of employers and employees; equality of representation on the sides; a calm atmosphere for discussion; the power of fixing wages by negotiation; the discussion of industrial conditions in the industry; and the privilege of making recommendations to the Government. In both bodies two chief objects of the Whitley Scheme have been accomplished—the organisation has been strengthened, and the two sides of industry have been brought into a forum for peaceful discussion.

Yet the powers of a trade board are much greater than those of a joint industrial council. Its decisions are enforceable by law; all in the trade must recognise it and conform to it, whereas the industrial council may represent a part of the trade only, and often encounters opposition to its authority, with occasional open disregard of its rulings. Moreover, the trade board, through its Appointed Members, can obtain satisfactory results where like circumstances in an industrial council would produce a deadlock, necessitating reference to outside arbitration. In the trade board the arbitration occurs at its meetings. With its Appointed Members it forms a combination of collective bargaining, conciliation and arbitration. This novel feature shows the harmonious settlement desired by Whitleyism carried a step farther than could be reached by a Whitley council.

The Whitley Committee fully grasped the possibilities of

industrial co-operation offered by the trade boards system. They pointed out that it would be desirable to provide by legislation that trade boards should have power to deal with hours of work and questions cognate to wages and hours; also "to initiate and conduct inquiries on all matters affecting the industry or the section of the industry concerned."<sup>1</sup>

Such an enlargement of the functions of the trade boards would have provided many additional subjects for discussion at their meetings; and the result should have been a greater frequency of the meetings—a feature constantly stressed in the Whitley Reports.

Effect was not fully given to these recommendations of the Committee; but there has been an extension of the functions of the trade boards, and a great increase in their number. The Act of 1918 authorised the Minister of Labour to set up trade boards when convinced that no organised machinery for collective bargaining existed in an industry. It also gave the trade boards a wider scope with regard to wage fixing, and access to all Government Departments for purposes of consultation and recommendation. It seems fair to give some of the credit for this extension to the suggestions of the Whitley Reports.

Eight trade boards were established under the original Act. After the passage of the Trade Boards Act, 1918, over 50 additional boards were set up. A separate Act was passed for Northern Ireland (The Trade Boards Act (Northern Ireland), 1923). In that country 18 boards have been established. In all, the number of workpeople covered by trade boards in Great Britain is about 1,250,000.

After the slump of 1921, the Government set up a committee to report on the working of the Trade Boards Acts—the "Cave Committee." This committee proposed drastic modifications, but no action has yet been taken upon its recommendations. However, its Report, issued in 1922, though it was hotly criticised, fortified the opponents of the further extension of the trade boards system.

The Whitley Scheme has been adapted to one of the most

<sup>1</sup> Cd. 9002, Par. 11.



essential industries of the country—the Railway Industry, embracing over 650,000 workpeople. A very complete system of joint machinery, modelled on the Whitley councils system, has been established under the Railways Act of 1921. This Act provides for local, departmental and sectional railway joint councils in each railway group. In addition it established a Central Wages Board for questions of wider interest, and for overcoming differences occurring in the councils. Over the whole system is set up a National Wages Board, composed of equal numbers of representative members, with five persons from outside added, to represent the “railway users.”

Section 63 of the Act, on “the Establishment of Councils,” directly refers to the First Whitley Report, stating “that the functions of the council shall generally be such as are mentioned in Paragraph (16) of the Report.”

Based, as it admittedly is, on the Whitley Scheme, the railway system sets up councils which are practically Whitley councils in many particulars. Both groups of councils have the same general machinery and functions. In both cases, council decisions depend solely upon the good faith of the two sides for fulfilment, and are not enforceable by law, as in the case of trade board decisions.

Nevertheless, there are marked differences between the Whitley councils system and that for the railway councils and boards. The most prominent are with regard to the representation and the methods of adjusting disagreements. In these matters the railway plan has copied the trade board system. The railway councils cover the whole industry compulsorily. On the railways’ National Wages Board, there is a group of “outside” representatives, as on a trade board, but with this difference—for the latter, all these representatives are chosen by the Minister of Labour, whereas, for the railways the chairman only is appointed by the Minister. As in the case of the trade board, conciliation and arbitration take place within the established machinery, and not without, as often occurs with the Whitley councils.

The application of the Whitley Scheme to the railways

has so far met with noticeable success. It has considerably widened the area of discussion, and has brought into the joint meetings an atmosphere of mutual goodwill, and methods of amicable argument. The findings of its boards have been treated with as much respect as are arbitration awards.<sup>1</sup>

Three years after the passage of the Railways Act, the system of joint bodies of representatives was extended to the oldest of all industries, Agriculture.

The Agricultural Wages (Regulation) Act, 1924, empowered the Minister of Agriculture to establish an agricultural wages joint committee in each county of England and Wales, and a central Agricultural Wages Board.<sup>2</sup> The Committees and the Board, are organised along the lines of trade boards, with equal numbers of representatives of employers and workpeople, and with "impartial" members appointed by the Ministry and an appointed chairman. Again, like the trade boards, their decisions are enforceable by law.

The functions of the agricultural wages committees are limited to the fixing and regulation of minimum rates of wages, and of a weekly half-holiday for workers. The committees are expected to take the initiative. They state the wage rates; and the Central Board, on being notified, makes the necessary orders for carrying out their decisions. If the Committee fails to fix the wage, the Board may do so.

There are to-day nearly fifty agricultural wages committees, and, with the Agricultural Wages Board, their jurisdiction covers about 770,000 workpeople. They seem to have functioned as smoothly as the trade boards; and, during the present low ebb of the industry, their pacific value in smoothing out difficulties should be recognised.

The Coal Mining Industry, with nearly a million employees, was almost persuaded to adopt the Whitley Scheme. The Coal Industry Commission, in 1919, recommended that

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Lord Amulree, *Industrial Arbitration in Great Britain*, p. 166.

<sup>2</sup> A National Agricultural Wages Board was first established by the Corn Production Act, 1917, and continued in existence until it was abolished by the Corn Production Acts (Repeal) Act of 1921.

the Industry should immediately proceed to discuss a scheme "on the basis of the terms of the Interim Report" of the Whitley Committee.<sup>1</sup>

The Mining Industry Act, 1920, in Part II, proposed to establish a system of joint councils upon the Whitley principle, with pit committees, district and area boards, and a national board. However, Part II of the Act never came into operation. The Miners' Federation were at first unwilling to accept anything short of nationalisation of the mines; and when, at the close of 1921, they signified their willingness to accept the proposed scheme, the mine owners, who had previously given their assent, refused to go on with the plan.<sup>2</sup>

Despite the failure to extend the Whitley Scheme to cover the Coal Mining Industry, we find that at the present time an appreciable portion of the workpeople of Great Britain—about one-fifth of the total occupied persons—are under joint machinery in accordance with the Whitley concept. The figures are as follows:

Existing Machinery.	Workpeople Covered. <sup>3</sup>
The joint industrial councils. . . . .	3,000,000
Interim reconstruction committees . . . . .	150,000
The railway joint bodies . . . . .	650,000
<b>TOTAL . . . . .</b>	<b><u>3,800,000</u></b>

In this connection, it should be remembered that the great industries of Coal Mining, Engineering, Cotton, Building, and Shipbuilding, including nearly three and a half million workpeople, also have their joint bodies. But there is this marked difference in their cases; their bodies are only *ad hoc* bodies, meeting during times of industrial strife, and not councils meeting during times of peace, like the Whitley councils.

The growth and development of the Whitley concept was not confined to the British industrial field alone. The idea was taken up in other occupations, and was widely circulated and, in many cases, utilised abroad.

<sup>1</sup> Cmd. 210.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Cmd. 2600, p. 213.

<sup>3</sup> The figures given are estimates.

For instance, Viscount Burnham said at the Conference on Industrial Peace organised by the League of Nations Union in 1927 :

"Since the year 1919 I have been Chairman of the Joint Committee on Salaries in different classes of schools, and the school teachers embraced by these committees number no fewer than 160,000. These committees were formed, on the analogy of the Whitley Committees, of equal panels representing the Local Education Authorities on the one hand ; in one case the National Union of Teachers, and in others the different bodies of school teachers on the other."<sup>1</sup>

A joint industrial council was established for the Growing Industry in the island of Guernsey, and applied to the Minister of Labour for recognition. Requests for advice on how to establish a Whitley council were received from South Africa and New South Wales. Inquiries on the subject were sent to the Ministry of Labour from Belgium, Holland, Norway, Canada, the United States, China and Japan. A Civil Service joint council has been organised in Saskatchewan. The Japanese Shipping Industry has established machinery closely following that of the British Maritime Board.

Enough has been written to picture the virility of the Whitley idea, and to offer evidence that the Whitley Scheme was not merely a temporary expedient to tide over the reconstruction period. It still retains a useful place in the industrial field ; and its benefits ought to be recognised. If the Scheme were valued at its proper worth, it might yet be extended to a wider sphere of usefulness.

<sup>1</sup> *Towards Industrial Peace*, p. 251.

**PART II**  
**THE SCHEME AT WORK**

## CHAPTER VI

### MACHINERY AND MEETINGS

THE expressed intention of the Whitley Committee was to allow much freedom to each industry with regard to the constitution and machinery of the Whitley council system. "It may therefore be the best policy to leave it to the trades themselves to formulate schemes suitable to their special circumstances."<sup>1</sup>

There were many good reasons for this attitude. The exact shape of the machine was not essential ; the important need was the formation along Whitley lines of a scheme for industrial co-operation. Again, the industry itself would best know its own limitations and requirements. Precise specifications made by the Committee might be an infringement upon the liberty of the industry, and might be resented, thereby endangering the success of the Whitley idea. An important factor was that in many industries joint machinery was already in existence ; and the possible merging of this into the new Whitley machine could be best accomplished by those in the industry. Detailed limitations made by the Committee might hinder such a merger. Lastly, the wide variations of location and character in the different industries made freedom of action almost a necessity. As the Committee put it "different circumstances and conditions call for different treatment."<sup>2</sup>

Even the tripartite plan for national and district councils and works committees could not be made universal. Some industries were so localised that district councils were unnecessary ; other groups had no works, and therefore could have no works committees.

<sup>1</sup> Cd. 8606, Par. 17.

<sup>2</sup> Cd. 8606, Par. 12.

Accordingly, the industries which have established Whitley councils have set up machines differing widely from each other. But there are certain limitations that apply to all. Among these are :

- (a) Council membership must be made up of representatives of the organised societies in the industry ;
- (b) There must be two sides to a council, one for employers and one for employees ;
- (c) Voting is by sides ; and to carry a resolution, the voting must show a majority in its favour on each side of the council ;
- (d) The costs are borne by the industry.

**CONSTITUTIONS.**—Nearly all the councils have written constitutions.<sup>1</sup> This constitution usually includes : the objects of the council ; membership ; committees ; officers ; meetings ; voting ; quorum ; finance ; and rules. There may also be separate constitutions for the district councils and for the works committees. The distribution of the business between the national council and its subordinate bodies varies according to circumstances. Usually the works committees handle local matters only ; and the district councils consider questions confined to their areas, and subjects referred to them by the national council. They also, in many cases, deal with disputes occurring within their districts.

**SIZE OF COUNCIL.**—The size of the council depends largely upon the size of the industry and its number of organisations. Among the largest are the National Maritime Board, with 120 members ; the Printing Council, with 72 ; and the Welsh Tinplate Council, with 64. Among the smallest are the Government Co-ordination Committee Trade Council, with 8 members ; the Cast Stone Council, with "about 8" ; and the Asbestos, Wallpaper, and Printing Ink Councils, with 12 members each.

**MEMBERSHIP.**—As the voting is by sides only, the sides need not be equal in numbers. The Asbestos Council of 12 members has 5 on the employers' side and 7 on the workers' side. The Boot and Shoe Council has 17 repre-

<sup>1</sup> The Dock Labour J.I.C. has no formal constitution.

sentatives of employers, and only 12 representatives of workpeople. Still, the sides are generally equal in numbers. Most of the constitutions have a provision allowing the co-option of other persons of experience, who shall attend only in a consultative capacity. Fifteen of the councils report the use of such co-option on their main bodies or committees. The Pottery Council states that it finds the attendance of honorary members from outside the industry most helpful, especially in cases of deadlocks. New associations are admitted to membership on the approval of the side of the council of which the association would form a part.<sup>1</sup>

**OFFICERS.**—The Officers of a council are generally a chairman, a vice-chairman, and one or more secretaries. In certain cases a treasurer is elected; and sometimes additional clerical service is appointed. As a general rule, the secretary receives an honorarium. In the councils where a single secretary represents both sides, he is thus actually an official of both the employers' and the employees' organisations—evidence of the close relationship existing between the sides.

**COMMITTEES.**—There is generally an executive committee for the council; and there are other standing or *ad hoc* committees as required. A large part of the work of the joint industrial councils is done through their committees.<sup>2</sup> In some instances the committee takes executive action, subject to the confirmation of the council.

**EXPENSES.**—These are generally shared equally by the two sides. Certain constitutions stipulate that the trade union or association shall be responsible for the expenses of its representatives attending council or committee meetings. In most cases the expense is comparatively small; but the cost will depend largely upon the size of the council and the frequency of the meetings of it and its committees.

<sup>1</sup> This procedure occasionally causes difficulties, owing to association rivalry. In the case of some Government councils official interference has resulted from this. Cf. 1929 Memoranda of Royal Commission on the Civil Service, p. 101.

<sup>2</sup> Chapter VII gives in some detail a description of work done by the committees.



MEETINGS.—Paragraph 9 of the Whitley Report reads: "The Council should meet at regular and frequent intervals."<sup>1</sup> In that short sentence is contained the pith of the entire Whitley Scheme. It was not an original idea. As far back as 1860, a joint board was set up in Nottingham for the Hosiery Trade, to hold regular meetings for the discussion between employers and their workmen of trade matters of common interest. But this holding of meetings during times of industrial peace, for preventive rather than remedial purposes, was not continued during later years.<sup>2</sup>

How the councils observe this recommendation of the Committee is shown in Appendix IV, which gives the frequency of the meetings of certain national councils, and a list of the councils which do not hold regular meetings.<sup>3</sup>

The *Ministry of Labour Gazette*, up to the second half of the year 1925, reported the number of meetings which were notified each month to the Ministry of Labour. The meetings reported were those of the National Whitley councils and the interim reconstruction committees, at first given separately, but grouped together after March, 1924. A summary of the reports is as follows:

	No. of Meetings of Whitley Councils.	No. of Meetings of Reconstruction Committees
In 1919 . . . . .	21	6
„ 1920 . . . . .	304	58
„ 1921 . . . . .	170	27
„ 1922 . . . . .	161	24
„ 1923 . . . . .	197	13
„ 1924 . . . . .	154	—
„ the first half of 1925 . . . . .	52 <sup>4</sup>	—

The procedure for Whitley council meetings is generally along the following lines; the Secretary sends out in

<sup>1</sup> Cd. 8606, Par. 9.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Lord Amulree, *Industrial Arbitration in Great Britain*, p. 150.

<sup>3</sup> A discussion of the failure of councils in this respect occurs in Chap. X, pp. 98-100.

<sup>4</sup> The Ministry of Labour Report on the Establishment and Progress of Joint Industrial Councils gives larger figures for the first three years; 308 meetings for 1920; 291 meetings for 1921; and 201 meetings for 1922. Possibly, the additional meetings were reported to the Ministry the *Labour Gazette* went to press.

advance, or distributes before the meeting, an agenda of the business of the meeting. Before the joint meeting, there are preliminary meetings of each of the sides, to talk over controversial matters and to arrange for side unanimity of action. The Chairman, or in his absence the Vice-Chairman, presides over the council meeting. He has no casting vote in case of a deadlock. In many cases, if a member is unable to attend the meeting, he may appoint a deputy from his organisation.<sup>1</sup> While the quorum, as prescribed by the constitution, is generally one-half of the members of each side, that is not an invariable requirement. For example, the Insurance Committees' Council requires one-third of the representatives on each side for a quorum. The voting, as already mentioned, must show a majority on each side to carry a resolution. In other matters the procedure follows the recognised rules for such bodies. The Council determines which of its meetings shall be the annual meeting.

One interesting feature of the Whitley council meeting is the attendance of a liaison officer. When any industrial council desires it, the Minister of Labour will send to its meeting a civil servant with necessary experience, to attend in an advisory capacity only.<sup>2</sup> Undoubtedly, the presence of a liaison officer at a meeting is of much value to the council. It forms a close link between the industry and the Government; it furnishes the council with much information as to the attitude of the Government, and the action of other industries, on the subject under discussion; and it tends to keep the whole Whitley movement uniform. The liaison officer need not be from the Ministry of Labour alone. The Treasury is often represented by an official at the meetings of Government Whitley councils. The Silk Industry has four liaison officers at its council meetings: from the Ministry of Labour, the Board of Trade, the Board of Education, and the Industrial Research Board.

Another service rendered by the Government is its

<sup>1</sup> Generally, the deputy has previously been agreed upon by the Council as a body.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Minister of Labour's letter of Oct. 20, 1927.

permission to the councils to make use of Government buildings for their meetings. The employment exchanges throughout the country are often utilised by local councils for this purpose ; and many of the national councils meet at Montagu House, in Whitehall. This practice is an excellent one. It gives a sense of importance to the meetings, helps to secure attendance, and brings members into closer touch with the Government.

The subjects for discussion which are brought before the Whitley council meetings cover a very wide area, ranging from an individual wage-case to the most extensive industrial policy.<sup>1</sup> The secretaries of the various councils have been interrogated as to this ; and an examination of their replies has shown a wide range of topics. In all, over two hundred distinct subject matters are reported as having been brought up for discussion at the various council meetings.

Perhaps it may be apropos to insert here, as an example, an account of a meeting of the Printing and Allied Trades Industrial Council which it was the author's privilege to attend.

The meeting was held at Montagu House, with about 60 members present. Absentees were allowed to nominate substitutes to take their places.

After confirming the minutes of the last meeting, the question of the application for penny postage rates for sample printed matter was taken up. An unpromising reply from the Postmaster-General was read ; and the meeting expressed its dissatisfaction with this. The matter was left to the Joint Secretaries to use all efforts for " the restoration of the sample post and the removal of anomalies."

There followed an exciting and interesting discussion over the difficulty that had arisen between the National Union of Journalists and the Newspaper Society, concerning a proposed agreement for a five-and-a-half-days' week and a three weeks' yearly holiday for journalists.

<sup>1</sup> A further discussion of some of the subjects dealt with by the councils will be found in Chap. VII, which mentions certain features of the work accomplished by Whitley councils.

The spokesman of the Union made a very moderate and appealing speech for the journalists, in which he gave the history of the movement, and asked for assistance from the industrial council. The question had been in existence since pre-war days, and the Union seemed to have reached an *impasse*. It stood ready to try any further conciliatory course, but retained its right to direct action whenever it thought best. The speaker told how the question had been twice referred to the Conciliation Committee of the Trade with no satisfactory results. He claimed that his union had been recommended by the Newspaper Society to approach the matter locally, and that when the Union had directly approached many local newspapers and had attempted to get them to sign agreements along the lines desired by the Union, the local firms had asserted their willingness to grant the terms as to holidays and the length of the week, but had stated that they were forbidden by the Newspaper Society to sign any agreement. A copy of the order of the Newspaper Society to that effect was read at the meeting.

The President of the Newspaper Society then rose in the council meeting and replied. He claimed that there were grave difficulties confronting the signing of agreements to meet the wishes of the Union of Journalists; that many of the newspapers already gave the terms named; and that it was better to have each paper act for itself, instead of having a national agreement. His society was not opposed to the three weeks' holiday, nor to the five-and-a-half-days' week; and it was still willing to deal with the Union to help to extend these terms; but it did not favour a national agreement, because of the great difficulties connected with it.

Following this speech, several representatives of other unions in the Printing Trade spoke. They pointed out that this was a matter that directly concerned the whole of the printing trade of the country. One of the representatives on the trade union side stated that, while recognising the freedom of the Journalists' Union to go to the extreme measure of a strike, if that were found necessary,

## 54 THE WHITLEY COUNCILS SCHEME

every effort should be made to arrive at a peaceful solution of the difficulty. He therefore moved that this matter should be again referred to the Conciliation Committee, to which should be added the officers of the Council and four other Council members, two chosen to represent each side. This motion was carried.

During the whole discussion, the interesting feature was the absence of recrimination and abusive language. The utmost courtesy was shown, and, despite the provocative nature of the subject, the arguments were moderately put, and no ill temper was displayed.

It seemed an excellent illustration of the advantages of a joint industrial council for a moderate discussion of difficult matters concerning wages or conditions of work. Where, without a joint council, there might have been ill temper, ending, possibly, in an open breach, here was exhibited an open-minded discussion in an atmosphere of moderation and apparent goodwill. The spirit of Whitleyism seemed to control the contesting parties; and one could not help believing that the result would be a continuance of amicable relations.

## CHAPTER VII

### THE WORK OF THE COUNCILS

WHAT the Whitley councils have achieved can perhaps be most clearly recognised through an examination, in some detail, of the work done by them.

The Whitley Committee apparently intended that the new joint bodies proposed by them should have a very broad field of discussion. Their idea was, to some extent, exceptional; for the *ad hoc* bodies of the past had usually been restricted in their deliberations to the subject matter for which they were created. As this was generally the negotiations of wages or conditions of work, an extension to the additional consideration of less provocative matters was a movement towards a more tranquil forum of discussion. Councils at which many questions of mutual benefit are talked over, as well as the inflammatory topic of wages, can be conducted with less friction than those where the wage question is the only subject of discussion.

In January, 1919, the Ministry of Labour published suggestions on the constitution and functions of a Whitley council. As the National Council is the dominant unit of the Whitley machinery, the Ministry's idea of the functions of a national joint industrial council is given here:<sup>1</sup>

“ 1. To secure the largest possible measure of joint action between employers and workpeople for the development of the industry as a part of national life, and for the improvement of the conditions of all engaged in that industry.

2. Regular considerations of wages, hours and working conditions in the industry as a whole.

3. The consideration of measures for regularising production and employment.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Ministry of Labour, Industrial Report Number 4, pp. 4-12.

4. The consideration of the existing machinery for the settlement of differences between different parties and sections in the industry, and the establishment of machinery for this purpose where it does not already exist, with the object of securing the speedy settlement of difficulties.

5. The consideration of measures for securing the inclusion of all employers and workpeople in their respective associations.

6. The collection of statistics and information on matters appertaining to the industry.

7. The encouragement of the study of processes and designs and of research, with a view to perfecting the products of the industry.

8. The provision of facilities for the full consideration and utilisation of inventions and any improvement in machinery or method, and for the adequate safeguarding of the rights of the designers of such improvements, and to secure that such improvement in method or invention shall give to each party an equitable share of the benefits financially or otherwise arising therefrom.

9. Inquiries into special problems of the industry, including the comparative study of the organisation and methods of the industry in this and other countries, and, where desirable, the publication of reports. The arrangement of lectures and the holding of conferences on subjects of general interest to the industry.

10. The improvement of the health conditions obtaining in the industry, and the provision of special treatment where necessary for workers in the industry.

11. The supervision of entry into, and training for, the industry, and co-operation with the educational authorities in arranging education in all its branches for the industry.

12. The issue to the Press of authoritative statements upon matters affecting the industry of general interest to the community.

13. Representation of the needs and opinions of the industry to the Government, Government Departments and other authorities.

14. The consideration of any other matters that may be referred to it by the Government or any Government Department.

15. The consideration of the proposals for District Councils and Works Committees, put forward in the Whitley Report.

16. Co-operation with Joint Industrial Councils for other industries to deal with problems of common interest."

With such a varied list of functions, a Whitley council's scope of work seems almost unlimited. Yet many of the councils have confined their work to the negotiation of

wages and conditions only. At first glance, this may appear strange ; but when one considers the unusual times through which the Whitley Scheme has so far lived, it is not so surprising. Most of the councils were created at the close of the war, when constant changes were occurring in the rates of wages. Their primary duty of aiding in reconstruction put wages, hours and conditions in the foreground. Moreover, the abnormal circumstances of the post-war period have kept the wage question in the most prominent place ; and that one question has often filled the time of the council meetings with work enough and to spare.

Nevertheless, a large number of councils have been active in other directions as well. In this connection, much depends upon the officers, especially upon the secretaries. A secretary with originality, and who takes an interest in his work, should be able to accomplish much towards making his council a success. Such a secretary can generally provide full agendas for council meetings ; it is he who, with the aid of the chairman, chiefly plans the agenda. It is the secretary's task to be well informed as to the Acts relating to his industry ; to keep in touch with Government Departments and other official bodies ; and, especially, to obtain information as to local grievances. Sometimes the secretary can save his council work by himself acting to prevent differences from causing trouble in the industry. One secretary, as soon as he hears about an impending difference, takes an early train to the factory involved ; and he claims that his prompt assistance in reconciling such disagreements has often prevented a costly dispute.

Much of the work of the councils is done through their committees. The advantages of a committee system seem obvious. Among these are the time saved the council ; greater freedom of discussion in a less formal body ; the closer intimacy of the members ; the gain resulting from the apportionment of members to subjects that most interest them ; the opportunity offered for extensive discussion ; and the fact that more business can be transacted by this method than could be accomplished through



council meetings alone. The majority of the national industrial councils have, as a standing committee, a General Purposes or Executive Committee. Its work usually includes the consideration of the agenda ; supervision of the correspondence ; arranging data for important questions coming under discussion ; the inspection of accounts ; and the drafting of rules of procedure.

A wide variety of committees exists ; many of them are confined to some important feature of the industry. The committees of the Printing and Allied Trades Joint Industrial Council may be cited as an example of the extent to which the committee system can be developed. This council's committees are those for General Purposes ; Health ; Apprenticeship ; Unemployment ; Organisation ; Conciliation ; Betterment ; Costing and Finance. The Health Committee has collected and circulated information contributing to better health conditions in the trade. The Apprenticeship Committee has as its subject one of the chief problems of the industry. It has developed an apprenticeship scheme, with education and training, and has made special efforts in the direction of the selection of apprentices, the standardisation of training, and the giving full publicity to the advantages and requirements of its scheme. The Unemployment Committee has especially interested itself in short-time arrangements to spread employment over the industry during slack times. The Organisation Committee has worked hard to encourage the organisation of district committees and works advisory committees, and has often advised and assisted them after their organisation. The Costing Committee has been busy over a costing system ; and the other committees named have carried on work along the lines their titles imply.

To describe in detail all of the work done by the Whitley councils, in its multifarious variety, would occupy too much space in a single volume. Here will be given merely the main divisions of such work, with a few striking examples as illustrations.

The work of the councils may be divided into the following

sections : Wages and conditions of employment ; conciliation and arbitration ; industrial and commercial problems ; welfare, health and safety ; education and apprenticeship ; statistics, research and inventions ; organisation and dealings with subsidiary bodies ; and co-operation with the Government or with other bodies.

WAGES AND CONDITIONS.<sup>1</sup>—The methods of negotiating wages changes vary considerably. Many councils deal with wages on the basis of cost-of-living sliding scales. In some, the grading of labour and the zoning of districts have developed systematised wage schedules. Other national councils have left the fixing of wage rates entirely to their district councils. But the wage problem is of vital importance to them all.

“ Conditions of employment ” is a very comprehensive term. In this case it may be taken to apply primarily to the matters usually dealt with by collective bargaining, such as holidays, overtime, and allowances for out-working or walking time.

The question of holidays is a subject that often comes up at council meetings. What the workpeople generally desire is an annual holiday with pay. Although their sides have not always succeeded in attaining this object through the Whitley councils, in quite a number of cases it has been agreed upon. It remains a pressing claim in the other councils. About forty of the existing councils report having had discussions upon the subject.

Altogether, the Whitley councils can justly claim to have assisted in the improvement of wages and work conditions for the employees in their industries. As an example, the Match Manufacturing Industry J.I.C. have carried through the following measures among others :

1. Fixed minimum rates of wages.
2. A 47 hours' week.
3. An annual week's holiday.
4. Payment for statutory holidays, and for May Day.
5. An addition to the statutory workmen's compensation.
6. A supplementary voluntary unemployment fund.

<sup>1</sup> For a further discussion of this subject, see pages 126 and 178.

CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION.<sup>1</sup>—The Whitley system is primarily one for the settlement of industrial differences ; so we invariably find much time devoted by the councils to matters of conciliation and arbitration. Most of them have schemes directed towards this end. There are conciliation committees ; and in certain industries arbitration panels have been set up. Instances follow.

In the Tramway Industry, when an application is submitted, unless immediate agreement is reached, the question is automatically referred to the Wages Committee of the Whitley Council. If no settlement is reached there, the matter is then referred to a tribunal of 14 persons—5 elected by each side of the Council from amongst their members, and 2 by each side from parties who are not members—with a chairman mutually agreed upon.

The 1928 Report of the Printing and Allied Trades J.I.C. states :

“ The Conciliation Committee has sat on four occasions. In every case it has reached a finding which has led to a practical solution (although in one case only with the help of the full Council). Nothing is more encouraging or more satisfactory than this work of the Conciliation Committee, which has been called the keystone of the whole structure.”

The Memorandum sent in 1925 by the Pottery Industry J.I.C. to the Committee on Industry and Trade contains this statement :

“ Twice only during the seven and a half years of existence have the services of the Council been requested on wage questions—in 1920, when its recommendations were adopted by both sides, and during the past year, 1924. On this latter occasion when negotiations came to a deadlock, a Special Meeting of the Council was convened and after a long session a Special Committee was appointed consisting of 6 representatives from each side, together with three of the honorary members who had power to decide in case agreement could not be arrived at, each party agreeing to abide by the result of the Committee's findings. The annual notices were exchanged in the middle of February, 1924 ; the Report of the Special Committee of Inquiry was not

<sup>1</sup> This subject is elaborated in Chapter XIII.

received until July 16, 1924; but work was not interfered with in the meantime and there was no indication of trouble or unrest."<sup>1</sup>

**INDUSTRIAL AND COMMERCIAL PROBLEMS.**—Many of these come before the councils for discussion, and executory action. Among them are questions relating to unemployment; bonus schemes; seasonal and casual employment; labour recruitment; regularising production; salesmanship; betterment of industry; commercial legislation; customs and excise; railway rates; and foreign trade.

Questions relating to employment or unemployment often arise in council meetings. Such matters coming before the Pottery Council have included the selection of men for war service; replacements during demobilisation; disabled ex-Service men; workmen's compensation; unemployment insurance; short-time; the termination of engagements; the employment of women and juveniles; and a census of workers.

In 1928, a sub-committee of the Flour Milling Council made an inquiry into the administration of the Unemployment Insurance Acts in connection with short-time working; and, as the result of their deliberations, certain agreed findings were circulated for purposes of information throughout the industry.

Commercial legislation is an important feature at the meetings of most of the councils. Those of the Glove, Needles and Fish Hooks, Hosiery, Match Manufacturing and Wallpaper Makers' Industries have been especially active with regard to the safeguarding of industry and the Merchandise Marks Act.

In 1929, schemes in connection with the production of power at low cost and the economic use of exhaust and live steam were submitted by the Pottery Research Committee, in the hope that benefit might be derived therefrom by manufacturers whose power and heating installations were not working to the best advantage. Particulars were given of cases where enormous savings in fuel had been

<sup>1</sup> In April, 1931, rival wage claims in the Pottery Industry were again referred to the outside industry, whose decision was accepted.

CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION.<sup>1</sup>—The Whitley system is primarily one for the settlement of industrial differences ; so we invariably find much time devoted by the councils to matters of conciliation and arbitration. Most of them have schemes directed towards this end. There are conciliation committees ; and in certain industries arbitration panels have been set up. Instances follow.

In the Tramway Industry, when an application is submitted, unless immediate agreement is reached, the question is automatically referred to the Wages Committee of the Whitley Council. If no settlement is reached there, the matter is then referred to a tribunal of 14 persons—5 elected by each side of the Council from amongst their members, and 2 by each side from parties who are not members—with a chairman mutually agreed upon.

The 1928 Report of the Printing and Allied Trades J.I.C. states :

“ The Conciliation Committee has sat on four occasions. In every case it has reached a finding which has led to a practical solution (although in one case only with the help of the full Council). Nothing is more encouraging or more satisfactory than this work of the Conciliation Committee, which has been called the keystone of the whole structure.”

The Memorandum sent in 1925 by the Pottery Industry J.I.C. to the Committee on Industry and Trade contains this statement :

“ Twice only during the seven and a half years of existence have the services of the Council been requested on wage questions—in 1920, when its recommendations were adopted by both sides, and during the past year, 1924. On this latter occasion when negotiations came to a deadlock, a Special Meeting of the Council was convened and after a long session a Special Committee was appointed consisting of 6 representatives from each side, together with three of the honorary members who had power to decide in case agreement could not be arrived at, each party agreeing to abide by the result of the Committee's findings. The annual notices were exchanged in the middle of February, 1924 ; the Report of the Special Committee of Inquiry was not

<sup>1</sup> This subject is elaborated in Chapter XIII.

received until July 16, 1924; but work was not interfered with in the meantime and there was no indication of trouble or unrest."<sup>1</sup>

**INDUSTRIAL AND COMMERCIAL PROBLEMS.**—Many of these come before the councils for discussion, and executory action. Among them are questions relating to unemployment; bonus schemes; seasonal and casual employment; labour recruitment; regularising production; salesmanship; betterment of industry; commercial legislation; customs and excise; railway rates; and foreign trade.

Questions relating to employment or unemployment often arise in council meetings. Such matters coming before the Pottery Council have included the selection of men for war service; replacements during demobilisation; disabled ex-Service men; workmen's compensation; unemployment insurance; short-time; the termination of engagements; the employment of women and juveniles; and a census of workers.

In 1928, a sub-committee of the Flour Milling Council made an inquiry into the administration of the Unemployment Insurance Acts in connection with short-time working; and, as the result of their deliberations, certain agreed findings were circulated for purposes of information throughout the industry.

Commercial legislation is an important feature at the meetings of most of the councils. Those of the Glove, Needles and Fish Hooks, Hosiery, Match Manufacturing and Wallpaper Makers' Industries have been especially active with regard to the safeguarding of industry and the Merchandise Marks Act.

In 1929, schemes in connection with the production of power at low cost and the economic use of exhaust and live steam were submitted by the Pottery Research Committee, in the hope that benefit might be derived therefrom by manufacturers whose power and heating installations were not working to the best advantage. Particulars were given of cases where enormous savings in fuel had been

<sup>1</sup> In April, 1931, rival wage claims in the Pottery Industry were again referred to the outside industry, whose decision was accepted.

effected through conversion of existing systems. Instances were cited where it had been found that less fuel had been used for combined power and heating than was formerly used for heating alone. The Council decided to circulate the Committee's report to all affiliated firms.

The youngest committee of the Printing and Allied Trades Council is the Betterment Committee. The Council's Report of 1928 states that this committee has been investigating problems whose solution should lead to the greater prosperity of the trade, and has adopted the following recommendations :

1. Employers should be urged to improve the efficiency of their works, by scrapping old and installing new machinery, and adopting improved methods. . . .
2. Modern time-saving machinery, the costing system, paper standardisation, and other methods of simplification . . . should be generally adopted.
3. Employers are recommended, when machinery of a new type is introduced, to endeavour to retain all their employees by transfer to other duties. . . .
4. A works advisory committee should be formed in all large offices.
5. Employees should be encouraged to make suggestions for improvements of methods.
6. Additional labour should be engaged . . . to avoid overtime, etc.
7. Large consumers should place orders early to counteract the seasonal trade.
8. Classes should be arranged for unemployed workers to increase their efficiency and instruct them in latest trade developments.

**WELFARE, HEALTH AND SAFETY.**—This division of council work covers the various measures for the preservation of the health and safety, as well as the welfare, of the work-people. Among the subjects connected with them are industrial diseases; first aid and hospital service; the Factory Acts; "safety first"; industrial fatigue; the heating and lighting of works; protective clothing; and pensions and superannuation.

In this division of work, also, the councils of the Printing Trades and the Pottery Industry have successful records.

Both councils have issued and circulated many health leaflets. Among the recorded improvements in the welfare and working conditions of the operatives, the Memorandum of the Pottery Council names the following :<sup>1</sup> ventilation, etc., of pottery stoves ; treatment of back draughts ; ventilation of workshops ; efficient collection of flint dust ; compensation for silicosis ; prevention and collection of dust in potters' shops ; reduction of risks of lead poisoning ; lighting of workshops ; instruction in health conditions ; welfare work ; medical supervision and examination of juveniles ; Particulars Clause for pieceworkers ; placing according to suitability of occupation ; and first-aid and nursing classes.

A number of councils have superannuation schemes ; and the subject has often been brought before the council meetings. With regard to the superannuation scheme of the Insurance Committees' J.I.C., by October, 1930, 145 out of the 146 committees eligible for participation had notified their decision to take part in the scheme. The Wallpaper Council had, in August, 1930, in connection with its scheme, 3,389 contributing members and 54 pensioners. One of its rules provided that an actuary shall, once at least in every five years, make a complete valuation of the general pension fund, to enable the submission of a report as to its financial condition.

The Flour Milling Council, among others, has been active in the provision of protective clothing for its workers. The Factories Committee designed the garments, and made the necessary arrangements with a clothing firm for their manufacture. About 4,500 protective garments have been supplied to the workers, who pay for the clothing themselves, in the cases where the employer is not required by law to do so.

EDUCATION AND APPRENTICESHIP.—This division includes the training of future employees, and their placing and supervision after training ; the selection, training and placing of apprentices and journeymen ; the removal of

<sup>1</sup> Memorandum of July, 1925, submitted to the Committee on Industry and Trade by the Pottery J.I.C.



"blind alley" occupations; technical education; lectures and special courses; scholarships; day and evening classes; examination programmes; and facilities leading to craftsmanship.

Here again the work of the Whitley councils has been, and is, praiseworthy. They have made use of co-operation with the education authorities and others interested in the subject. For example, the Heating and Domestic Engineering J.I.C. has, in addition to its Education and Apprenticeship Committee, an Advisory Committee, which deals with technical education matters, and to which co-opted members from the City and Guilds of London Institute belong.

After the Armistice, the Government called upon all existing Whitley councils to give their aid in furthering the Ministry of Labour's scheme for assisting apprentices whose apprenticeships had been interrupted by the war. Practically all of the councils responded to this appeal, and 12 proposed special schemes for the purpose, which were accepted by the Ministry.<sup>1</sup>

At present, many of the councils have apprenticeship schemes. In some cases, the Council or the Committee is made a party to the indenture of the apprentice. Much care is taken with the indentures, to protect both sides. The regulation of the supply of apprentices is a controversial question that often arises at council meetings. For example, the 1928 Report of the Glove Making J.I.C. states:

"The Council has given a good deal of time to this matter, and at the moment the trade has 145 apprentices to the Cutting Branch of the Leather Glove Section; this is equal to one apprentice to every 6.5 journeymen. The employers are of opinion that the trade is still insufficiently supplied with apprentices, but the workers are very reluctant to agree to more until they are assured that the present prosperity of the industry will continue."

Other educational matters are subjects of like interest and council activity. Two illustrations follow: The Council of the Flour Milling Industry spent much time in

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Ministry of Labour 1923 Report on Establishment and Progress of Joint Industrial Councils, p. 141.

remodelling the education syllabus, and has published pamphlets and arranged for lectures in the various centres. By June, 1929, the attendance at the classes had nearly doubled within a year; and the national committee had launched a scheme for part-time day education, to be put into operation in the September following.<sup>1</sup> It is reported of the Printing J.I.C. that :

“ Technical education in the Printing Industry in Bristol has commenced with new departures. For the first time, a full-time instructor has been appointed for the classes held under the auspices of the Merchant Venturers' Technical College. Additional classes have, with the co-operation of the Bristol Education Committee, been opened for boys in the industry between 14 and 16 years of age, attendance at such classes being in preparation for the full technical courses after 16. A class in the costing system of the Master Printers' Federation has also made a most auspicious commencement.”<sup>2</sup>

STATISTICS, RESEARCH AND INVENTIONS.—Eighteen of the existing councils report the collection of statistics. Although in most cases such statistics have been connected with a particular subject only, like the Match Council's statistics of the imports of matches, and the Boot and Shoe Council's census of ex-Service men employed in the industry, one council, that of the Pottery Industry, has carried out, and continues to carry out, the collection of full statistics for the entire industry covering wages, average earnings, average percentages of profits on turnover, and average percentage of wages to turnover. This information is furnished, from time to time, by the Manufacturers' Federation to the National Council through its Statistical Committee. The possibility that such information can be voluntarily obtained is evidence of the value of Whitleyism in breaking down antagonism and suspicion.

In the Pottery Council, also, its Research Committee has been one of the most active and important bodies. Its work for the betterment of industrial conditions has been mentioned under the preceding section. Among its recent pamphlets covering processes and inventions are: “ Improperly Pugged Clay ”; “ Faults in Alkaline Slip Cast-

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Unity*, June, 1929.

<sup>2</sup> *Unity*, November, 1930.

ing"; "The Potters' Drying Stove"; "Leadless and Low Solubility Glaze"; "The Removal and Prevention of Dust"; "Combined Power and Heating"; and "Information relating to the Pottery Industry in Japan."

**ORGANISATION, AND WORK CONNECTED WITH SUBSIDIARY BODIES.**—An important form of council work is the effort to improve the organisation of the industry, with the object of getting all of its employers and workpeople to become members of their respective associations. Posters urging this are designed, for display in the various establishments; local campaigns are planned and carried out; and personal efforts are exerted towards the accomplishment of this desirable end. The matter of organisation is often brought up for discussion at council meetings.

There is much work for the national councils in connection with their subsidiary bodies. An important function of every council which has such bodies is that of keeping in close touch with them, and of stimulating their activities. The reports of the district council meetings are usually brought before the national council for rectification; and communications from both district councils and works committees which require central action are often received. In addition, there is appellate work, when unsettled differences are referred to the parent council for determination.

Again, there is always the question of setting up such bodies in industries where they are not in existence, or of adding to those already existing. These are subjects being constantly brought by members to the notice of the councils; and several councils have conducted energetic campaigns in these directions.

**CO-OPERATION WITH GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS AND OTHER BODIES :—**

"It is desirable that there should be intimate and continuous touch between the Industrial Councils and the various Government Departments interested, not only to secure prompt attention from the right officials, but also to obtain information as to what other Councils are doing."<sup>1</sup>

Co-operation with the Government may operate in either

<sup>1</sup> Ministry of Labour Industrial Report, No. 4.

direction : it may take the form of representations to the Government by a council of the needs and opinions of the industry, or the Government may refer certain industrial matters to a council for consideration and action. Government Departments and Whitley councils are frequently keeping in touch about such trade matters as factory regulations, the safeguarding of industry, customs duties, merchandise marks, and unemployment or health insurance.

In like manner, the councils have frequent co-operation with each other, and with outside bodies.<sup>1</sup> For example, the Tin Mining and the China Clay Councils in 1923 took joint action with a view to the reduction of freight rates to Cornwall. The Chalk Sectional Council drew up working rules on the basis of those operating under the Cement Industry Council. Representatives of the Building and the Quarrying Councils conferred together on the subject of silicosis among stonemasons. The Lead Industry J.I.C. has several times consulted with the Coopers and the Plumbing Councils over the subject of sheet lead. These are a few instances, of the many occurring, of inter-communication between Whitley councils on industrial matters of joint interest.

**DISTRICT COUNCILS.**—These councils can take executive action on matters that affect their particular districts only. Generally, the main functions of district councils are :

1. To consider matters referred to them by the National Council, and to take action within their districts in connection with decisions of the National Council, on matters deputed to them by it.
2. To make recommendations to the National Council.
3. To consider matters of interest to their districts, including subjects referred to them by their works committees.
4. To co-operate in problems of common interest with other district councils.
5. To consider unsettled differences arising within their districts, when other arrangements for their settlement are not provided ; and to refer such matters to the National Council when they fail to reach a decision.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> For cases of co-operation with outside bodies, see p. 129.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Ministry of Labour Industrial Report, No. 4.

The district councils vary widely as to their status and powers. This variation is described in the following chapter.

**WORKS COMMITTEES.**—The activities of these are limited to their respective establishments. Their duties will not be named here, as Chapter IX on "Works Committees" gives a description and examples. It is sufficient to say at this juncture that they form an important branch of the Whitley Scheme, and that, although under the control of the national councils, the performance of their many functions relieves the parent councils from much pressure of work.

The foregoing descriptions apply to the work of the Whitley Councils as usually carried out by them. Nevertheless, there are instances where some councils have distinguished themselves by performing certain individual and original items of work. Examples of these are given in the following chapter, the second section of which deals with some differences in the range of council work.

## CHAPTER VIII

### VARIATIONS IN SCOPE

THE Whitley Committee purposely made allowances for wide variations in the machinery and functions of its joint council system. The result has been a variety of councils, with broad diversity in their procedure and work. The present chapter will endeavour to give some account of these differences, and to show in simple figures the extent to which the various councils have participated in them. This should include the variation in the councils themselves ; diversities in machinery and procedure ; different customs with regard to meetings ; and the wide scope of the work done. As the last feature has been generally discussed in Chapter VII, it may be sufficient here merely to mention a few unique items of work, hitherto unnoticed, which certain of the councils are carrying out.

As regards the variation in machinery, each industry or service appears to have established the machinery which it considers best adapted to the Whitley Scheme, so far as it is concerned, and to its particular problems.

The councils themselves present a variety of classes, according to the extent to which they represent their occupations, and according to the personnel of their membership. Of the 64 active councils, 35 represent entire industries, but have private employers only on the employers' side of the council ; 5, representing whole industries, have local authorities, as well as private employers, represented on the employers' side ; 2 are national councils for a section of an industry ; 6 are national industrial councils for districts only ; 5 are public administration councils for local authorities ; 6 are administrative councils for Govern-

ment Departments; and 5 are administration councils for Government trade. Three of the 64 bodies are "boards," although, judging from their powers and the work they do, there appears to be no marked difference for Whitley purposes between a "board" and a "council."

Again, there is much diversity as to the extent of area covered. We have already seen<sup>1</sup> that the first council established had jurisdiction extending over Great Britain and Ireland. Only a very few of the present councils cover Northern Ireland, as well as the island of Great Britain—the Printing Trades Council is an example. Less than one-third of the councils cover the whole of Great Britain; about one-third include England and Wales; and the remainder represent England alone, with the exception of two for Scotland solely, and one for Wales. A number of the councils, like the China Clay Council, and the six independent district councils, are more or less localised to particular sections of the country.<sup>2</sup>

Also, the composition and procedure of the councils have differed widely from industry to industry, as the circumstances and needs of the individual industries have shown requirements. Only after actual experience, derived from the working of the machine, could more suitable expansion and development be achieved. To illustrate, in the Tramway Industry, from 1919 to 1927, the machinery of the Council was operated in the usual manner of joint industrial councils. At the latter date, the constitution was modified to conform with the requirements of the Industry, and to allow the establishment of a tribunal system of appeal.

In like manner, there have arisen alterations and diversities with regard to membership, and to the number of representatives on a side. These appear to have come largely from respective variations in the degree of organisation, and in the number of associations in the industry or service. Some industries are very thoroughly organised, and their councils represent practically all of the employers

<sup>1</sup> Page 18.

<sup>2</sup> No geographical division is fixed: the area of the industry decides the area of the council.

and workpeople in the industry. Such a case is that of the Match Industry, with a 95 per cent. organisation for the employers, and with 90 per cent. for the workers. Again, there are cases where one or the other side is poorly organised. The Furniture Warehousing and Removing Industry and the Paint, Colour and Varnish Trades have not more than 50 per cent. of their workers in trade unions. The Cast Stone Industry and the Plastering Industry report much lack of organisation on the employers' side. If an industry has a few associations only, its Whitley Council is apt to be small ; where many organisations occur, and all desire representation, the size of the council increases. The result is a wide range of difference in the size of the councils.

In one group of councils, those connected with local authorities, membership on the employers' side is constantly changing, as election changes affect the personnel of the authorities. In certain cases, methods of selecting the members have been altered through constitutional amendment, to meet changed circumstances. For example, originally the employers' side of the Electricity Supply J.I.C. consisted of representatives of the Municipal Electrical Association and of the private company associations. Since the formation of district councils for the industry, the Constitution has been altered to allow the employers' representatives on the National Council to be directly elected from the district councils. In Government councils, the official members are appointed by the Government.

In the matter of the sides of the council, the question arises as to which side the foremen or the higher grade employees shall occupy. Sometimes the matter is decided one way, sometimes the other. In the Pottery J.I.C. the Managers' and Officials' Association was granted seats on the employers' side ; in the Woollen Trade, the powerloom overlookers were represented on the employers' side of the Council.

With regard to the Officers, the Committee again left to the councils much freedom of choice on their selection and numbers. They did, however, suggest certain ways in



which the presiding officer might be chosen—viz. from council membership; from independent persons outside the industry, either nominated by an outside authority or by the Government.<sup>1</sup> In this instance, the councils have not followed the range of choice suggested by the Committee. In almost every case, the presiding officer is selected from among the members of the council. The exceptions are in the case of Government councils and in the National Maritime Board. The latter has had for its chairman and secretary persons appointed by the Shipping Controller.<sup>2</sup> The chairmen of the Government trade councils are appointed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer.<sup>3</sup>

A Whitley council presiding officer may hold his office for a long period. The Chairman and Vice-Chairmen of the Cement Council held their offices for eight consecutive years.<sup>4</sup> The chairmanship of the Civil Service Council has always been held by the Controller of Establishments Department of the Treasury.<sup>5</sup> In some councils, the chairman is selected from the employers' side and the vice-chairman from the workers' side; in others the presiding officer is chosen alternatively. The Wool Council and the Waterworks Council have two chairmen each.

The greatest diversity exists in the case of the secretaries. Although the position of secretary is generally a permanent one, we often find one person holding the secretaryships of two or more councils. An officer of the Treasury is secretary on the official side of four of the Government trade councils. The employees' secretary of the Printing Trades Council is also the employees' secretary of the council for H.M. Stationery Office. The single secretary of the Electricity Supply J.I.C., which has three parties, workers, private employers and public authorities, is also the private employers' Secretary of the Tramways J.I.C., which has three parties and three secretaries. Twenty-six of the councils

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Cd. 8606, Par. 8.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Cmd. 545.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Memoranda of Royal Commission on the Civil Service (1929), p. 86.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. *Unity*, December, 1927.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Memoranda of Royal Commission on the Civil Service (1929), p. 88.

have a single secretary; 36 have two secretaries; and 2 have three secretaries. The Pottery Council retains a full-time secretary and staff, with council offices. Perhaps the strangest feature of all is the fact that in three cases firms of chartered accountants act as secretaries. For the Lead Industry Council, and for the Making-up and Packing of Textiles for Export (London) Council, the firms act as sole secretaries. In the Asbestos Council, the firm is secretary for the employers' side only. One reason given for the employment of an outside firm as secretary is that the use of an independent body helps to promote peace in the council.

With regard to committees, 16 of the existing national councils have no committees; 8 have *ad hoc* committees only; and 40 have standing committees, varying in size, and often with functions of considerable importance. Generally, the councils with strong committees are the ones which have accomplished the most satisfactory work. With small councils, there is less need of committees; in such cases the council does not require dividing up, for it can easily act as a whole. Again, the expense of a committee system is of considerable moment to a small industry. The Secretary of the China Clay Council writes: "During the life of the Council in previous years we had a great number of committees, which did very much useful work, but owing to a settlement of our wages we have found that it was only spending money unnecessarily in calling various committees together." So the China Clay Council, which at its first yearly meeting appointed eight committees, has to-day no committee at all.

The subsidiary bodies under the Whitley Scheme show an equally noticeable variation. The names suggested for them by the Committee were "district councils" and "works committees." Actually, they have many different titles, especially in the case of the district bodies.<sup>1</sup> For example, the local bodies of the Heating and Domestic Engineering Council are known as "local education committees."

<sup>1</sup> The titles of these are given in Appendix VI.

In order of importance the district bodies may be classified as follows :

1. District councils which themselves are national councils.
2. The great departmental councils of the Civil Service.
3. The sectional councils of the Quarrying Industry.
4. Government departmental and trade committees.
5. The district boards of the National Maritime Board.
6. The port committees of the Dock Labour J.I.C.<sup>1</sup>
7. The usual district councils of the industries.
8. Other local bodies for towns or areas.

In the first rank are the great local councils, like the North Midland Road Transport Board and the three councils of the Local Authorities Administrative Services, which are national and may perform any of the duties of a national council.

Many of the district councils have extensive powers allotted to them by their parent councils. In such a class are the district committees of the Printing and Allied Trades. These may function as conciliation committees; they plan and carry out programmes of education and apprenticeship; and local health matters are entrusted to them. The Manchester District Committee of the Printing Trade has held lectures on health, and has distributed health leaflets throughout its area. It has formed a series of first-aid and ambulance classes, and has secured the establishment of day classes for apprentices in the district.

Again, there are district councils whose duty is chiefly the negotiation of wages and conditions for their localities. An illustration of this is the case of the Local Authorities (Manual Workers) Services. That national council leaves all the negotiation of wages to its representative localities. The same custom applies to the 13 district councils of the Electricity Supply Industry; but in their case the National Council retains the responsibility for the general scheme of wage fixing.

Lastly, come district councils whose parent councils assign them little, or no, special work, and whose activities

<sup>1</sup> These committees are in 20 ports of the country; and some of them have sub-committees.

are chiefly confined to local matters as they arise. Such councils have less to do, and only meet as the occasion demands.

The great sectional councils should really not be considered as district councils at all, for they cover the entire country. They may have no parent council, as in the case of the Plumbing J.I.C., or there may be a national council to which they are subordinated, as with the departmental councils of the Civil Service, and the sectional councils of the Quarrying Industry.<sup>1</sup> Their duties are almost as extensive as those of the ordinary national council. For example, the Granite and Roadstone Sectional Council of the Quarrying Trade has dealt with wages and conditions of employment, health and welfare, unemployment, raw materials, foreign imports, and various Government measures. The Cement district councils, in addition to wages and conditions, deal with health and welfare, training and placing in work, lectures and conferences, and special district matters of general interest.

Twenty-nine of the national councils report themselves as having no district bodies ; and in the councils which have them, the number per council varies from 2 for the Electric Cable-Making Industry to 72 for the Civil Service.

A like diversity occurs with regard to works committees. Twenty-eight of the existing national councils have no such committees ; fourteen have works committees in some of their establishments, but not under the national councils. Only eighteen Whitley councils report that they have works committees under them. The secretaries of four councils have not information enough to allow a definite report ; and many are unable to give exact totals of their works committees now in existence.<sup>2</sup>

The arrangements as to council meetings present a wide scale of differences. The suggestion of the Whitley Committee that the meetings should be quarterly has been followed by a minority only of the existing councils. The

<sup>1</sup> The Quarrying sectional councils are nearly autonomous, and have their own local district councils.

<sup>2</sup> See Chapter IX for a fuller discussion of works committees, and their importance.

figures are these : 26 councils do not meet regularly, but only "as required"; 4 councils meet monthly; 3 meet every two months; 21 meet quarterly; 7 meet half-yearly; and 3 meet annually. Of the 26 councils which meet "as required," 8 are Government councils, and 3 are national district councils. Of the 4 meeting monthly, 3 are councils of electricity industries, and the fourth is the Match Manufacturing Council. The majority of the district councils meet only when some business arises which requires a council meeting.

Several of the councils have held no meeting for a considerable period, although they have not disbanded. They are the Needle, Fishhook, Fishing Tackle and Allied Trades Council, which has not met for over two years; the Government Building Trade Council, which "has not had a meeting for several years"; and the North Midland Brewers' District Council, which has not met since January, 1926. The explanation offered by the Secretary of the last-named council is that "there has been no wage alteration since February, 1925." There seems to be a tendency to refrain from holding meetings when wage matters have been settled for a definite period.

Many councils permit visitors to attend their meetings. The Secretary of the Wallpaper Council reports that its meetings are often attended by persons in the industry who are not members of the council. The attendance of members at council meetings seems, on the whole, very satisfactory. Cases in which there occurs a lack of a quorum are rare.

The work done by the councils is equally diversified; and there are wide variations in the effectiveness of their activities.

Some of the councils have from the outset been limited to the functions of wage-negotiating bodies only; others confine their activities to wages and conditions of employment. In a number of cases, including some of the most efficient joint industrial councils, industries which already had successful wage-fixing machinery excluded the subject of the negotiation of wages from their council deliberations.

For example, the Pottery Council, although it had a provision for the consideration of wages in its constitution, decided to leave that matter with its existing organisations, and to devote the whole of its time "to improving and uplifting the status of the industry, and to the bettering of the conditions for all associated with it."<sup>1</sup> Again, in certain cases, the district councils have been charged with the responsibilities of dealing with wages, the central councils generally retaining the power of confirming their decisions.

Of the 64 existing national councils, 19 do not deal with the negotiation of wages; 7 deal only on occasion with that subject; and 38 regularly discuss and fix wages in their respective industries.

Despite the wide variation in the activities, only a comparatively few councils show marked originality in certain features of their work.

Perhaps the most conspicuous in this connection is the Pottery Joint Industrial Council. Its efforts in procuring regular statistics have been mentioned.<sup>2</sup> An interesting explanation of how the employers in this industry were induced to disclose their private statistics is given by one of them, Mr. T. B. Johnston in a lecture on "Industrial Councils and their Possibilities," delivered by him in Manchester in 1920:

"Now I may say at once that in my opinion we should never have got the agreement to disclose our profits through the various Associations in the industry if it had not been for the American Government. In 1913, when the Democrats came into power in America, they reduced the tariff on Pottery into the United States from 60 per cent. to 40 per cent. The American manufacturers complained that they could not possibly compete with the low-priced labour of Europe with such a reduction. The reply was: 'That may be so, but we should want more than your word for it; are you willing to throw the whole of your industry open for investigation, in order that we may ascertain all the facts, and what the costs of production are? If you agree to this we will appoint a Commission to inquire into all the facts, and having ascertained them we will send the Commission to Europe to find out the costs of production in the European countries.' The American manufacturers agreed to this; a

<sup>1</sup> Report of the Secretary.

<sup>2</sup> See page 65.

Commission was appointed. . . . They probed the industry thoroughly, and ascertained the average cost of production, and having done this they came to England and desired to make a similar investigation into our industry. We naturally demurred at showing them all our figures and results. Their reply was to this effect: 'Of course we have no power to compel you, and if you refuse to give us what we ask for, you are entirely within your rights. The facts, however, are these; the American manufacturers complain that they cannot compete with your low-priced labour compared to theirs with a 40 per cent. tariff. The only way by which we can ascertain whether their contention is right or not is by knowing your cost of production. If you refuse to give us the figures, we have no answer to make to the American manufacturers' contention, and the result will be that the tariff will go back to 60.' Well, gentlemen, we were thus between the devil and the deep sea, and the result was we had to let them make their investigations."<sup>1</sup>

After this disclosure to outside foreigners, it was not so difficult to persuade the employers to furnish particulars to the industrial council.

Perhaps the most unique feature of the Pottery Council's work is their convocation of conferences of works inspectors engaged in the Industry:

"The object of the Conference is to give opportunities for the friendly and informal discussion of the duties which, under the Pottery Regulations, fall upon Works Inspectors, and there is no doubt that by this means Works Inspectors and Managers are greatly assisted in getting a fuller knowledge of the Factory Acts and of the Pottery Regulations, and a guidance as to the manner in which perplexing incidents should be treated."<sup>2</sup>

These conferences have been attended by a Superintending Inspector of Factories and several of H.M. District Inspectors, who have responded at length to the large number of questions and suggestions presented.

Other striking activities of the Pottery Council are the arrangement of lecture courses for commercial travellers; the notification of vacancies to employment exchanges; and an exhibition of manufactured products. A unique instance is the Pottery Joint Industrial Scholarship. The

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Lectures on Industrial Administration*, pp. 146-7.

<sup>2</sup> Press Report of Pottery J.I.C. Meeting of July 15, 1931.

Council, since 1922, has awarded an open scholarship of £50 per annum, tenable for three years, to the candidate over sixteen years of age who has been selected after due examination. This scholarship requires attendance at the Stoke-on-Trent Central School of Pottery, and also practical work in a pottery. The Council has induced the Local Education Authority to offer a similar scholarship to young persons resident in Stoke-on-Trent.

The Printing and Allied Trades J.I.C. in 1923 organised a Special Flag Day for the raising of funds to assist, during school age, the orphans of printers who fell in the war. Through these yearly Flag Days, over £29,000 has been contributed to the War Orphans' Fund, and hundreds of orphans have been assisted during their educational careers.

Other unusual work of the Printing Council is in connection with postal rates. For some time the Council has been agitating for a return to the penny post; for the restoration of the sample post; and for the removal of postal anomalies relating to regulations about printed matter. Danger to the eyesight of those engaged in the Printing Trade has long been a matter of much concern to the Printing Council. The sight of all the students of the London School of Printing is examined upon their entrance, and periodically during their stay at the institution. The Council's Health Committee has been making careful and comprehensive investigations to discover to what extent the trade seriously affects the eyesight of the workers, and to devise the best system of illumination for printers' shops.

In addition to a library, organised and kept up with success, the Wallpaper Makers' Joint Industrial Council holds an annual Arts and Crafts Exhibition, confined to employees in the trade. At the exhibition of 1930, there were 411 exhibits of a high standard, covering many subjects, among the most interesting of which were some fine oil paintings, a model of a cannon, curtains made of wallpaper beads, and miniatures on ivory.

This comparatively small council has a unique feature in the written statement upon the state of trade which the



Commission was appointed. . . . They probed the industry thoroughly, and ascertained the average cost of production, and having done this they came to England and desired to make a similar investigation into our industry. We naturally demurred at showing them all our figures and results. Their reply was to this effect: 'Of course we have no power to compel you, and if you refuse to give us what we ask for, you are entirely within your rights. The facts, however, are these; the American manufacturers complain that they cannot compete with your low-priced labour compared to theirs with a 40 per cent. tariff. The only way by which we can ascertain whether their contention is right or not is by knowing your cost of production. If you refuse to give us the figures, we have no answer to make to the American manufacturers' contention, and the result will be that the tariff will go back to 60.' Well, gentlemen, we were thus between the devil and the deep sea, and the result was we had to let them make their investigations."<sup>1</sup>

After this disclosure to outside foreigners, it was not so difficult to persuade the employers to furnish particulars to the industrial council.

Perhaps the most unique feature of the Pottery Council's work is their convocation of conferences of works inspectors engaged in the Industry:

"The object of the Conference is to give opportunities for the friendly and informal discussion of the duties which, under the Pottery Regulations, fall upon Works Inspectors, and there is no doubt that by this means Works Inspectors and Managers are greatly assisted in getting a fuller knowledge of the Factory Acts and of the Pottery Regulations, and a guidance as to the manner in which perplexing incidents should be treated."<sup>2</sup>

These conferences have been attended by a Superintending Inspector of Factories and several of H.M. District Inspectors, who have responded at length to the large number of questions and suggestions presented.

Other striking activities of the Pottery Council are the arrangement of lecture courses for commercial travellers; the notification of vacancies to employment exchanges; and an exhibition of manufactured products. A unique instance is the Pottery Joint Industrial Scholarship. The

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Lectures on Industrial Administration*, pp. 146-7.

<sup>2</sup> Press Report of Pottery J.I.C. Meeting of July 15, 1931.

Council, since 1922, has awarded an open scholarship of £50 per annum, tenable for three years, to the candidate over sixteen years of age who has been selected after due examination. This scholarship requires attendance at the Stoke-on-Trent Central School of Pottery, and also practical work in a pottery. The Council has induced the Local Education Authority to offer a similar scholarship to young persons resident in Stoke-on-Trent.

The Printing and Allied Trades J.I.C. in 1923 organised a Special Flag Day for the raising of funds to assist, during school age, the orphans of printers who fell in the war. Through these yearly Flag Days, over £29,000 has been contributed to the War Orphans' Fund, and hundreds of orphans have been assisted during their educational careers.

Other unusual work of the Printing Council is in connection with postal rates. For some time the Council has been agitating for a return to the penny post; for the restoration of the sample post; and for the removal of postal anomalies relating to regulations about printed matter. Danger to the eyesight of those engaged in the Printing Trade has long been a matter of much concern to the Printing Council. The sight of all the students of the London School of Printing is examined upon their entrance, and periodically during their stay at the institution. The Council's Health Committee has been making careful and comprehensive investigations to discover to what extent the trade seriously affects the eyesight of the workers, and to devise the best system of illumination for printers' shops.

In addition to a library, organised and kept up with success, the Wallpaper Makers' Joint Industrial Council holds an annual Arts and Crafts Exhibition, confined to employees in the trade. At the exhibition of 1930, there were 411 exhibits of a high standard, covering many subjects, among the most interesting of which were some fine oil paintings, a model of a cannon, curtains made of wallpaper beads, and miniatures on ivory.

This comparatively small council has a unique feature in the written statement upon the state of trade which the

Chairman reads at the opening of each meeting. Such matters as the fluctuation of the franc, changes in stock-market prices, and recent examples of rationalisation have been brought up, and, at the conclusion of the statement, an interesting discussion by the Council often follows.

Noticeable activities of the Industrial Council for the Glove Making Industry are those connected with the Council's co-operation with the Government in certain matters affecting the industry. The Council has supplied the Government with information concerning apprenticeship, for the Report on Apprenticeship recently prepared by the Ministry of Labour. It has been consulted by, and has supplied information to, H.M. Customs and Excise on the value of gloves imported into the United Kingdom. As a result of the Council's application to the Board of Trade, an Order in Council under the Merchandise Marks Act, 1926, requires all imported gloves to bear a mark of origin. The Council has recently been urging the Government to enlarge the scope of the British Empire Marketing Board, so as to enable it to advertise British manufactured goods in Great Britain. Safeguarding has also occupied much attention on the part of the Council. In short, as the Secretary expresses it "we deal with everything affecting the industry, from the making of gloves to the watching of shop windows to see that they are not misdescribed when offered for sale."

The above are some of the instances of striking variations in the scope of work which have occurred in a few Whitley Councils. It seems a matter for regret that their example has not been more widely followed.

## CHAPTER IX

### WORKS COMMITTEES

IN the minds of the Whitley Committee, a thorough development of a system of local works committees formed a very important part of the Whitley Scheme. In their reports, the Committee constantly referred to works committees; and they actually published one report, the third, exclusively devoted to that subject.

The problem of providing an active and efficient connection between the higher branches of the Whitley machine and the individual establishments was one to which the Committee devoted their close attention. The great changes in industry which the war had produced emphasised the need of a closer relationship between the employer and his workpeople during the period to follow, if industrial concord were to be preserved. The trade union machinery had become increasingly occupied with problems and policies of national importance, and the necessity for local bodies, to relieve the central organisation of many questions which concerned local establishments alone, was recognised. Consequently, the efforts of both the Whitley Committee and the Government were directed with intensity towards a thorough development of works committees throughout the country, and in all the industries, in order to relieve the higher organisations from over-pressure of work, and to provide a speedier settlement of local difficulties.

The idea of works committees did not originate with the Whitley Committee. Such organisations had been in existence for a long time; they were as old as trade unionism itself. They had usually been organised by the individual employers, with a number of officials appointed by the

management.<sup>1</sup> In other cases they consisted wholly of employees. They dealt chiefly with complaints, welfare work, and conditions of employment, and they were generally consultative and advisory in their functions, the management reserving the power of making the final decision. The works bodies of pre-war days had many different titles and a varying range of activities. On the whole, they were fairly successful in their operation.<sup>2</sup>

The war period gave an impetus to the works committee movement. The need for co-operation and harmony, to obtain the highest possible production of war supplies, brought about a wide extension of local organisation. A less patriotic motive was the fact that the restricted trade unions were working under great difficulties, and often found themselves unable to act promptly in local matters. The shop stewards movement<sup>3</sup> brought works committees to a high point of development. The committees of this period took upon themselves more extended duties, and sometimes assumed an independence unknown in former days. This attitude, coupled with the published expressions of some of the more radical leaders of the movement, made the committees in certain instances objects of distrust and suspicion on the part of some employers and trade unionists. However, on the whole, their development contributed towards efficiency and greater production under less disturbed conditions of industry.<sup>4</sup>

Although the Whitley plan of works committees was indefinite as to their form and constitution, it laid down certain clear-cut proposals as to their powers and position in the composite Whitley machine. The works committee recommended was of the joint type, representative of management and workpeople. It was to be established on lines agreed upon by the employers and trade unionists of the industry; and was to be so constituted as not to offer opportunity for using it in opposition to trade unionism. It was to be linked up with the national and district councils,

<sup>1</sup> Cf. G. D. H. Cole, *Workshop Organization*, p. 22.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. H. Wolfe, *Labour Supply and Regulation*, p. 189.

<sup>3</sup> See pages 10-12.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. H. Wolfe, *Labour Supply and Regulation*, pp. 186-8.

and to be kept off of touch with them. Its functions were intended to cover local questions affecting the life and comfort of the workers; but it should not interfere with questions of wages and hours, which should be settled by national agreement. Its purpose should be to establish a system of co-operation in all workshop matters. It should exist not only to deal with local grievances, but also to discuss constructive ideas for the improvement of the establishment and the industry. It should hold regular meetings; and the suggestion was that such meetings should not be less frequent than once a fortnight. The Third Report states: "We look upon successful Works Committees as the broad base of the Industrial Structure which we have recommended. . . ." <sup>1</sup>

The importance of having the works committees composed jointly of representatives of the management and the employees was emphasised in the Whitley Reports. Joint representation was an essential to all sections of the Whitley machinery. The Whitley Scheme was directed towards the erection of a status of harmony, as a result of the association of the members of both sides in an interchange of views and suggestions for the advancement of the business. Continued intercourse should bring about intimacy and a better understanding, and discussions over contested matters should thus result in friendly compromise. Equally important was the frequency of the meetings, to assure that constant association which tends to build up friendships.

Equality in the numbers on a side was not insisted upon, as the Whitley Committee thought it wiser "not to indicate any specified form of Works Committees." <sup>2</sup> So long as the representation of each side was sufficient to enable every important group in the business to participate, the result should be satisfactory. As the powers of the committee were to be consultative and advisory, rather than executive and administrative, an equality in voting units was wholly unnecessary. Moreover, as in all Whitley bodies, the voting was to be by sides only, and not by the counting of heads.

<sup>1</sup> Cd. 9001, Par. 5.

<sup>2</sup> Cd. 9001, Par. 11.

Most of the national councils they consist of works committees under them have drawn up their constitutions for their government. A copy of such a constitution will be found in Appendix X. The functions of the works committees are generally limited by their constitutions. They vary according to the different circumstances of the industries; but in general the work of such a committee should cover the following matters :

1. Questions (other than about wages) referred to it by management or employees.
2. The settlement of grievances.
3. Questions relating to the health, safety, and welfare of the workers.
4. Works rules and questions of discipline and conduct.
5. Local educational matters and the training of employees.
6. Suggestions as to working conditions, efficiency, and improvement of processes.
7. Local methods of paying wages, engaging workpeople, and holidays.
8. Charities and social life in the factory.

Many proposals have, from time to time, been made for the extension of the activities of the works committees, from their present rather limited area to a wider approach towards workshop control.<sup>1</sup> However, until the existing unsatisfactory status of the movement has been bettered, and works committees have been established and developed throughout British industry questions of the extension of their functions may preferably be kept in the background.

One of the chief failures of the endeavour to carry into effect the full programme of the Whitley Scheme is the lack of success in the establishment of works committees. This is not due to want of effort on the part of the Government, or of many enthusiasts in the industries concerned. The subject has been constantly brought up at council meetings. The Ministry of Labour, in addition to publishing a valuable report of suggestions and examples,<sup>2</sup> has been

<sup>1</sup> One of the most rational outlines of such an extension can be found in Chapter IV of *Industry and Finance*—A. W. Kirkaldy—which contains the suggestions of Mr. C. G. Renold, a pioneer of modern workshop organisation, and an authority on the subject.

<sup>2</sup> Industrial Report No. 2 on Works Committees.

generous with offers of assistance in the drafting of constitutions and the setting up of committees.

To be successful with the organisation of works committees, it appears essential that there should be a definite desire, on the part of both management and workpeople, for their establishment. At present, this desire is not generally evidenced. It does not seem probable that the committees can be effectually superimposed from without, no matter how strenuous are the efforts from that direction. The need for such committees should be felt in the establishments themselves. Until there is a clearly defined field of work, and proof of efficacy can be shown in many instances where such committees have been active, there seems but little hope that works committees, as suggested by the Whitley Reports, will become an important factor in British Industrial organisation.

Lack of interest has been shown in cases where certain Whitley councils have attempted to carry out a works committee campaign. For example, in the Printing Industry, the Manchester District Committee in 1924 endeavoured to arouse interest in works advisory committees by sending a delegation of union members and employers to several large plants in an effort to secure their establishment. The Delegation met with no success.<sup>1</sup>

The Pottery J.I.C. has made, perhaps, the most strenuous efforts of all the Whitley councils to organise works committees. It not only inaugurated special campaigns for that purpose, but also set up quarterly conferences of representatives of existing committees, to keep alive an interest in the subject, and to allow the interchange of experiences. While for a time there resulted an increase of interest and the formation of new committees, by the middle of 1929 the 100 committees mentioned in the Ministry of Labour's Report<sup>2</sup> as having been formed in the Industry had dwindled to about half that number.<sup>3</sup>

Possibly the chief cause of the failure to develop a works

<sup>1</sup> Cf. U.S. *Bureau of Labor Bulletin*, No. 481, p. 153.

<sup>2</sup> Report on the Establishment and Progress of Joint Industrial Councils, p. 74.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *Ministry of Labour Gazette*, Aug., 1929, p. 276.



committee movement can be found in the opposition of many leading employers and trade unionists to the idea. Employers seem to fear that works committees may offer opportunities for a wider discussion of grievances, and may thus bring trouble to the establishments. Trade union leaders appear to be apprehensive of the opposition of anti-union individuals, brought into prominence by the new movement. As one of them expressed himself at an interview: "Why give the firebrands a chance? The Union works all right as things are; it has its representatives at the works now, who can handle all questions without interference by outsiders. A works committee wouldn't bring peace; it would only stir up trouble for the Union. The shop stewards movement taught us that." An employer interviewed was more guarded in his opinion: "Yes, it might have good results at some works; but at mine things are running smoothly as they are. About the only thing a works committee would discuss would be fancied grievances; and these would be manufactured, just to give the meeting subjects to talk about. However, I am not opposed to work committees, provided they are under careful guidance and control."

There are other grounds of objection besides those just mentioned. In addition to a natural reluctance to exchange a traditional policy for a new one, employers are inclined to fear that works committees may encroach upon the management; may, through extremist leaders, demand executive control; may interfere with trade secrecy; and may use up valuable time without beneficial returns. Trade unionists apparently think that works committees may too greatly decentralise their unions; may interfere with collective bargaining; may weaken loyalty of union members; and may remove inducements for joining the union.

Undoubtedly there are scintillas of truth in some of these arguments against works committees. The Whitley Committee itself recognised the possibility of using works committees to damage trade unionism.<sup>1</sup> Yet, possibilities

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Cd. 9001, Par. 5.

need not become probabilities. Surely it might be left to the supervising and controlling Whitley councils to see that their works committees were not misused in these or other ways.

Lack of space forbids a lengthy discussion of the arguments against works committees. Many of them have been offered, and most of them could be advanced, against the Whitley councils themselves. Nevertheless, the history of the Whitley councils would seem to dispel the force of such arguments. The councils have not, to any degree, increased industrial differences and complaints; they have in many cases succeeded in moderating the attitude of the extremists; they have generally strengthened trade unionism, instead of lessening inducements to join the unions; and they have brought other benefits in industrial goodwill which should compensate for the time their meetings have exacted from busy employers and employees. If satisfactory results have come from the establishment of the higher Whitley bodies, it does not appear unreasonable to expect equal benefits from the erection of a system of works committees in an industry, under a proper safeguarding constitution and with strong supervisory control.

There are other difficulties besides the opposition of some employers and trade unionists in the way of organising works committees throughout British Industry. Certain industries are not so constituted as to permit the formation of works committees. The Coir Mat and Matting Industry, for example, has too small works to allow formally constituted works committees. Trades like those of the coopers, the plumbers and the plasterers have only a few of their workpeople in any one establishment. Where an industry is working on short-time, one cannot expect attendance at meetings of men off work. One of the plants in the Printing Industry reports that its business is seasonal, and that committee meetings are very irregular in consequence.<sup>1</sup> Another difficulty lies in the fact that in many shops there are workers of several different trades and unions, and the fear of increased friction in such cases tends to prevent the formation of workshop committees.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. U.S. *Bureau of Labor Bulletin*, No. 481, p. 157.

The subjects for discussion have also presented obstacles. Under the present abnormal economic conditions, wage adjustments chiefly occupy the attention of the employees, and questions which ordinarily would be brought up at works committees' meetings are not at present considered to any marked extent. There has been difficulty at many works in finding subjects for the agendas. Even in instances of a personal grievance, the aggrieved party may prefer to have his case adjusted personally, rather than to make use of the more lengthy committee process. With regard to complaints, there appears to be a considerable basis for the fear of some employers that works committees would become primarily grievance committees. However, it seems better that grievances should be discussed and their sources eliminated, rather than that they should continue disregarded. A Committee whose main task is the elimination of grievances should have a chance to become a powerful factor in the promotion of concord in a works.

Despite the many obstacles in the way of organising works committees, they appear to be even more needed now than they were during and before the war. The critical period through which industry is passing is crowded with discontent among the workers, and full of possibilities of industrial conflicts. Low wages and the fear of still further reductions, or of unemployment, threaten social unrest and trade disputes. The growth of modern business has widened the gap between employers and their workpeople. Unless some form of workshop organisation can be developed to allow the discussion of the difficulties between the sides of the individual establishments, there may be danger of serious outbreaks.

Almost equally important is the linking up of the workshop machinery, when organised, with the trade unions and the associations of employers. The Whitley plan of a system of representative bodies, to include the local factories and the district and national organisations in each industry, appears to be a suitable administrative measure. As the Balfour Committee has expressed it: "It is desirable to see some form of Works Committee established as a normal

part of the administration of great industrial establishments." <sup>1</sup>

The benefits to be gained seem satisfactory. Prominent among them are : a better spirit of co-operation, as a result of direct intercourse between labour and management, the avoidance of misunderstanding, and the creation of goodwill. There is evidence of the value along these lines of works committees, meeting regularly. The Wallpaper Makers' J.I.C., in its report of 1928, says :

" When the works committees meet regularly a better spirit exists. Even if there is no formal business to settle, it is desirable that the committees should meet, as, frequently, misunderstandings may be avoided and a spirit of interest in the factory engendered."

The Ministry of Labour reports :

" Sometimes introduced with difficulty and amid suspicion, committees have established themselves and done service which is acknowledged even by their original opponents. By providing a channel for the ventilation of grievances at an early stage, and before they become acute, they have prevented disputes and strikes, and they have improved timekeeping and increased output. . . . Far from hampering the management, it obviously does the reverse and relieves the management of difficulties and grievances it would otherwise have to face." <sup>2</sup>

Strong testimony is offered by Sir Lynden Macassey, whose work as Chairman of the Government Commission for Dilution was so successful during the dangerous war-workers' strike on the Clyde in 1916, when the trade union leaders declared themselves helpless :

" We, as a Commission, found the Clyde District Committees willing to assist, but powerless. It then occurred to us that the best way to achieve our purpose of introducing women was to establish in each workshop a workshop committee consisting of an equal number of workers and management. . . . The result was truly amazing. . . . Hostility softened into suspicion, suspicion melted into confidence, and confidence in time begat co-operation. . . . In the course of 6 months the Clyde Commission established nearly 200 workshop committees which met

<sup>1</sup> Cmd. 3282, p. 121.

<sup>2</sup> Ministry of Labour, Industrial Report No. 2., pp. 46-7.

each week, and had the satisfaction of seeing them dispose of workshop grievances and other trade disputes in a harmonious, business-like and efficient manner. It produced the best possible feeling among the men."<sup>1</sup>

There are certain features in connection with works committees which might be noticed here. A period of time is generally required to establish a committee, and to allow it to produce the best results. The first year should, perhaps, be regarded as instructive and preparatory; later the work may become more properly allocated. The most successful bodies are said to be those in which the employer takes a direct interest, and meetings should, therefore, be attended by the head or a member of the firm. One of the advisable features is the attendance of foremen and higher officials; this tends to encourage a better feeling throughout the establishment. In large works, there may be several separate committees, or one central committee with sub-committees; both methods have produced good results.

Works committees have been of value in assisting factory inspectors. Mr. Garrett, Inspector of Factories, at the Conference of Work Inspectors at Hanley, May 12, 1927, said that the anxieties of a works inspector would be greatly minimised if he were aware of the existence of a works committee in the shop visited.

Some employers and managers are beginning to realise that it is a wise policy to take the works committee into their confidence with regard to certain business conditions and problems of management, and that loyal co-operation is the usual result.<sup>2</sup> Discipline is a subject that appears especially suitable for reference to works committees. In certain cases it has been found that time-keeping and discipline have been improved after works committee discussion and action.<sup>3</sup>

The cost of a works committee naturally falls chiefly upon the management. This cost is principally the loss of working time involved. The general policy in the

<sup>1</sup> Sir Lynden Macassey, *Labour Policy—False and True*, pp. 267-8.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Cmd. 3282, p. 123.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. G. Williams, *Social Aspects of Industrial Problems*, p. 114.

Pottery Industry in this regard is for every employee to pay 1*d.* per month to a fund, out of which piece-workers are paid 2*s.* for every attendance, while the time-workers are allowed by the employers to attend without any wage reductions.<sup>1</sup> The costs seem very trifling in comparison with the returns gained. Four reported instances may serve to illustrate this :

“ A works committee carried out an investigation into foundry costs and presented a memorandum which the works manager described as the best memorandum on the subject he had ever seen.”

“ A works committee brought about better time-keeping. In six months the hours lost were reduced from 2·4 to 1·4 per week per man.”<sup>2</sup>

“ Another, again, acted on the complaint of the firm's officials that the carelessness of employees resulted in an unnecessary amount of scrap material. The workers' representatives pointed out that for certain technical reasons the remedy lay with the firm, and proposed an experiment which had been successful at another mill. The management agreed, and the waste was considerably reduced.”<sup>3</sup>

“ Very great things have been accomplished by the elimination of waste, £100 being saved in a single department in 12 months at one works through reduction in breakage.”<sup>4</sup>

Such examples seem to substantiate the claim of the utility of works committees in saving factory costs, and in obtaining satisfactory results in production. There is hardly a dissentient voice in the testimony in this regard. With these results in view, the speedy development of works committees in the near future, if carried out, would appear to promise valuable contributions towards better industrial returns in Great Britain.

The problem of the reluctance of employers and trade unionists to form local works organisations has been met in other countries by statutory enactment. In Germany,

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Report of Conference of Representatives of Works Committees, March 10, 1922.

<sup>2</sup> Report on the Establishment and Progress of Joint Industrial Councils, p. 82.

<sup>3</sup> E. and S. Selekman, *British Industry To-day*, p. 115.

<sup>4</sup> Memorandum of Pottery J.I.C. for Committee on Industry and Trade, p. 10.

Luxemburg, Sweden, Czecho-Slovakia and Austria, the introduction of works councils has been made mandatory by law. The works councils statutes give to the workers a larger share in the control of their establishments. The German Works Councils Act of 1920, among other things, abolishes arbitrary dismissals; gives the employees access to information about the conduct of the business; secures to them rights of interfering in strike questions that had hitherto been reserved for the trade unions; allows them the power of co-operation in all questions of a social order; and sets up an arbitration board as a final court of appeal. The German scheme has not so far been an unqualified success, owing, possibly, to lack of co-operation by the employers. The trade unions, however, have given it their support, and have originated one feature that might profitably be copied by England—the formation of training courses on subjects connected with works government, so that the employees may be better fitted to discuss and handle such questions.<sup>1</sup>

A Works Councils Bill for the establishment of consultative works councils in Great Britain has been presented to Parliament.<sup>2</sup> It provides a works council for every undertaking, within the meaning of the Factories and Workshops Acts, employing 50 or more persons. It follows the German precedent in abolishing arbitrary dismissals and in requiring the submission by the management of commercial and financial statements; it also gives schedules of 28 subjects for discussion at council meetings.

The Liberal party has expressed itself in favour of a works councils Bill;<sup>3</sup> but there is opposition elsewhere. The Association of Joint Industrial Councils, at its meeting of August 28, 1930, passed a resolution against the proposed Bill. Among the reasons given for this opposition were the facts that the Bill does not provide for joint bodies, and that the Association favours a voluntary, rather than a compulsory, basis of workshop organisation.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Walter Meakin, *The New Industrial Revolution*, p. 278.

<sup>2</sup> Works Councils (No. 2) Bill — No. 138 of 1930.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Liberal Industrial Inquiry Committee, *Britains Industrial Future*, p. 472.

If the Works Councils Bill is passed by Parliament, the question of the establishment of workshop committees will have been settled. Still, to create compulsory bodies, without management representation, and with no plan to connect them with other like organisations, would be a measure quite different from the Whitley concept of joint committees, with regular meetings and made a concrete part of the Whitley machinery. The recommendations of the Whitley Committee seem preferable to the proposal to form a large number of independent workshop bodies. These might bring strife instead of the harmony desired.

One thing appears evident—there is a need at the present time for some development of workshop organisations, whatever their form and functions. The Whitley Reports have given emphasis to the importance of works committees for securing better relations between employers and employed. It may, perhaps, be a fit conclusion to this chapter to quote their words :

“ We think that in every case one of the partners or directors, or some other responsible representative of the management, would be well advised to devote a substantial part of his time and thought to the good working and development of such a committee.”<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cd. 9001, Sec. 8.



## CHAPTER X

### DEFECTS AND FAILURES

WHILE no vital flaw in the complete scheme outlined by the Whitley Reports has been conclusively shown by its many critics, there have undoubtedly been mistakes and failures in the establishment of the Scheme. Moreover, the machinery finally accepted by the Government has two striking defects.

The chief of these is the councils' lack of power to enforce their agreements. This handicap is so heavy that it deserves a chapter to itself; and it will be discussed at some length later.<sup>1</sup>

The second marked defect of the existing scheme has resulted from the Government's omission of that part of the Committee's programme, embodied in their Second Report, which suggested the application of the machinery of the Trade Boards Act, 1909, to the Whitley council system.

The success of the trade boards<sup>2</sup> established under this Act was recognised by the Committee; and they recommended their use as complementary machinery to the joint industrial Councils.

The Committee's proposals in this regard are summarised in Paragraph 20 of the Second Report:<sup>3</sup>

"(a) In the more highly organised industries (Group A) we propose a triple organisation of national, district and workshop bodies, as outlined in our first Report.

(b) In industries where there are representative associations of employers and employed, which, however, do not possess the

<sup>1</sup> See Chap. XI.

<sup>2</sup> See page 39 for a description of the trade boards and their duties.

<sup>3</sup> Cd. 9002.

authority of those in Group A. industries, we propose that the triple organisation should be modified by attaching to each National Industrial Council one or at most two representatives of the Ministry of Labour to act in an advisory capacity.

(c) In industries in both Groups A and B, we propose that unorganised areas or branches of an industry should be provided, on the application of the National Industrial Council, and with the approval of the Ministry of Labour, with Trade Boards for such areas or branches, the Trade Boards being linked with the Industrial Councils.

(d) In industries having no adequate organisation of employers or employed, we recommend that Trade Boards should be continued or established, and that these should, with the approval of the Ministry of Labour, be enabled to formulate a scheme for an Industrial Council, which might include in an advisory capacity the 'appointed members' of the Trade Board."

The Committee did not appear to regard as important the fact that they suggested measures which involved the anomaly of securing the legal enforcement, under the Trade Boards Act, of agreements made by the less organised sections of their proposed machinery, while no such provision would apply to the agreements of the industrial councils of the better organised industries. Possibly the Committee thought that a short lapse of time would bring legal enforcement to all sections of their proposed system.

If the Whitley Scheme had been carried out in its entirety, the chief industries of the country would have been covered, to a large extent, by a series of industrial councils and trade boards. These trade boards were visualised by the Committee as bodies which would function temporarily, "pending the development of such degree of organisation as would render feasible the establishment of" industrial councils.<sup>1</sup> When the proper status of organisation in their industries was reached, permanent Whitley councils were expected to succeed the temporary trade boards.

However, the Government rejected the greater portion of these suggestions of the Second Report. The first proposal of triplicate machinery for highly organised industries had already been accepted. The idea of a second type of industrial councils for the Group "B" less organ-

<sup>1</sup> Cd. 9002, Par. 10.

ised industries, with permanent Government representatives attached, was definitely rejected. Equally decisive refusals were given to the plans of complementary trade boards for unorganised areas or branches of industries having Whitley councils, and of the use of trade boards in unorganised industries for the purpose of establishing in due course joint industrial councils.

The Minister of Labour stated in this connection :<sup>1</sup> " Industrial Councils must be kept distinct from Trade Boards, and the latter, owing to their constitution, cannot be created into the former." Among the reasons advanced for this attitude were that the purpose, structure and functions of the two bodies were fundamentally different ; that their respective areas of operation were determined by different considerations ; that statutory powers to enforce agreements were given to trade boards and not to Whitley councils ; that the whole area of a trade was covered by a trade board, which was not true of an industrial council ; and that Whitley councils should be independent and free from all State control.

The Government's reply was a strong one ; and they may have been right in their refusal to accept the trade boards proposed by the Second Report. Nevertheless, this refusal has lessened, to a considerable extent, the area and effectiveness of the original Whitley Scheme. The Report's proposals, if accepted, would have merged the trade boards system and the joint industrial councils system into one harmonious scheme, applicable to the whole of British industry. The official decision has tended to perpetuate two schemes, covering two permanent groups, and with a more or less complete separation of the well organised industries from the weakly organised and unorganised industries.

The result appears to be an increase of obstacles to the association and co-ordination of the two systems. There is little connection to-day between the trade boards and the joint industrial councils. The Committee's idea of making use of the organisation developed by a trade board

<sup>1</sup> Industrial Reports, No. 3, p. 8.

to establish a Whitley council for the trade seems unlikely of realisation. As an employer in an industry under a trade board remarked at an interview: "What's the use of a Whitley council to us? Our trade board works well; its decisions are bound to be followed. A Whitley council would not be certain of that; it would not even represent all in the trade, while our trade board has every employer under its authority."

In addition to the two chief defects of inability to enforce council agreements and inability to link together the trade boards and the joint industrial councils, certain failures in regard to the Scheme's establishment and operation should be recorded.

It seems evident that there is at present a lessening of Government effort to extend the Scheme. Their energy in organising the movement for the establishment of Whitley councils, which was so general in 1918, 1919 and 1920, is no longer noticeable. The one-time enthusiasm in Government circles appears to have dwindled. This change of attitude may be regarded as a strong contributive factor in the failure to spread Whitleyism to additional industries. Other factors are the unresponsiveness on the part of both employers and trade unionists. There is, in addition, actual hostility on the part of certain business heads and trade union leaders. Interference with their business is feared by the former; and the latter seem to dread opposition to their unions. The Secretary of one of the largest councils stated that there was a feeling among the organised workers in his industry that the Whitley Scheme would tend to reduce the necessity for membership in the union, and, therefore, would injure its organisation.

Whatever the reasons, there is no doubt that the present decline in the extension of Whitleyism is largely the result of a lack of interest in the Scheme.

The example of the Local Authorities Services illustrates this. In their case, all sixteen of the provincial areas in England and Wales were canvassed thoroughly, but the result was that only a small proportion of the authorities took interest enough in the idea to reply to the communica-

tions sent to them. In most instances where councils were established, the apathetic attitude of the local authorities concerned "did not permit of a continuance of the Council."<sup>1</sup> To-day only three out of the sixteen areas have joint industrial councils.

In addition to these failures connected with the establishment of Whitley councils, there have been certain deficiencies in their functioning. The most glaring failure in this respect is the neglect on the part of many councils to hold frequent and regular meetings. We have seen<sup>2</sup> that less than half of the existing national councils meet as frequently as the Committee suggested, and that twenty-six of them meet only "as required." We have also seen<sup>3</sup> that, as the years have passed, there has been a series of declines in the total number of meetings held per annum by Whitley councils.

Some of the secretaries have frankly called attention to this defect; and some have offered explanations for the falling off in meetings. The Secretaries of the Lead Manufacturing, the Government Engineering Trade and the Government Miscellaneous Trade Councils report that up to 1925 or 1926, meetings were held regularly, but since then only "when required." The Secretary of the Cast Stone Council said that his council used to meet regularly, but now meets only when some question of importance arises. "Some of the members had to travel far to attend, and certain of the trade union members objected to meetings when there was nothing of importance to meet about." The Secretary of the Packing of Textiles for Export Council said that they found when they met with nothing of importance to talk about, some of the members would bring up a comparatively trifling matter, like a claim without any basis, and that trouble followed. So they decided to have meetings only when matters of importance arose. The Secretary of the Paint, Colour and Varnish Trades Council said that a lot of meetings with nothing to meet about would

<sup>1</sup> 1922 Resolution of the Joint Industrial Council for the North-East Division of Local Authorities Services.

<sup>2</sup> Page 75.

<sup>3</sup> Page 50.

discredit the importance of the Council. The Secretary of the Chemical J.I.C. pointed out that, with live secretaries, irregularity of meetings was not a drawback, as the secretaries would keep up the interest in the council.

Nevertheless, in spite of such admissions and explanations, it is suggested here that the Whitley Committees were right when they insisted upon the importance of regular and frequent meetings of the industrial councils. Without this regularity, the intercourse between the sides that is essential to preserve the spirit of Whitleyism is lacking ; and the result may be to nullify the harmony and co-operation so necessary for the successful operation of the whole system.

It may be true that where there is nothing of importance to discuss a meeting is valueless. Still, with a wise chairman and ingenious secretaries it should not be impossible to provide within three months' time some questions of common trade interest important enough to offer good material for discussion. The *Labour Gazette* of January, 1922, points out the way :

“ An interesting proposal was made at the meeting of the Waterworks J.I.C. on December 16 that should the business to come before the next meeting of the Council be unimportant, the Chairman of the employers' side should raise some subject of mutual interest to the Industry as a whole for debate. The Proposal was agreed to.”

Moreover, there are subjects which are always of importance to those engaged in an industry. The Chairman of Cammell Laird & Co., Mr. W. L. Hichins, said at the Conference of the League of Nations Union, held in London in February, 1927 :

“ It would be a great advantage if, say regular monthly meetings were held between representatives of the Association of Employers and Employed, at which the general conditions of the industry were discussed and financial returns affecting the industry were considered.”<sup>1</sup>

In connection with this subject, it must be remembered that even with few and irregular council meetings, oppor-

<sup>1</sup> *Towards Industrial Peace*, p. 286.

tunities for joint discussion between certain members of the two sides are not lacking. There are generally frequent meetings of the committees and the subsidiary bodies; and the officers of the councils are constantly in communication. For example, the Wool Council Report of 1928 gives the following total number of meetings held during the year: The National Council, 1; the Northern Counties District Council, 11; the West of England District Council, 5; the Welsh District Council, 3; the Emergency Committee, 30; the Education Sub-Committee, 2; Joint Sub-Committees temporarily set up, 10—a total of 62 meetings.

Still, it is the national council meeting that chiefly matters. It has the larger number of members; and they are the important personages in the industry. To ensure a friendly intercourse between them and to secure a spirit of goodwill, a Whitley council meeting should offer a satisfactory medium. To fail to use that medium to a conspicuous extent is to lose the benefits the Whitley Scheme can bring to an industry; and the failure to hold frequent council meetings may be said to have kept more than one Whitley council from assets in goodwill and industrial concord that might have been its due.

Another failure in operation that must be recorded against the Whitley councils is their failure to set up subordinate bodies to the extent expected of them. While there has been some progression in the number of district councils established, far less has been done in this direction than was contemplated by the originators of the Whitley Scheme.

In spite of successful efforts in certain industries, many of the national bodies have made no attempt to set up district councils. In some cases the employers have hesitated, and in others the opposition has come from the trade union leaders. An unwillingness to decentralise the authority seems to be the main motive for this disinclination. In some industries, district councils which have been set up were dropped. For example, the Chemical J.I.C. used to have three or four district councils, but gave them up. The reason offered for such a step was that "they only

delayed the settlement of questions: . . . their tendency was to discuss general matters unnecessarily." In other cases, district councils have become, to a greater or a less extent, moribund, as in the Granite and Roadstone Trade, where several of the ten district councils have become inactive.

Even in the case of as efficient a J.I.C. as that of the Printing Industry, the district councils have not been made an unqualified success. We are told that, "from the reports received, it is evident that the number of committees that are very active is comparatively small."<sup>1</sup>

One of the most alert and successful secretaries, Capt. L. H. Green, of the Flour Milling Industry, has publicly stated that "it may be necessary in reorganising one's Whitley machinery to drop Joint Industrial District Councils for a while."<sup>2</sup>

The failure to establish works committees has already been discussed.<sup>3</sup> One point in this connection, not yet mentioned, may be dealt with here. It is sometimes claimed that if the machinery of the works committees had been fully developed before that of the national councils, the Whitley Scheme would have been made more of a success. The argument is that the natural and proper growth of industrial organisation is "from the bottom upwards."<sup>4</sup> The reply to this suggestion seems to be that if the industry had waited for the development of works committees before putting the Whitley Scheme into practice, it would have had few, if any, Whitley councils as the result. The effort to set up works committees has signally failed, and success cannot be built up on a foundation of failure.

It must not be forgotten that the tripartite machinery of the Whitley Scheme has not been fully developed in any British industry. A national council is a central body, far removed from a district and its individual establishments. Local and works matters do not reach the central council

<sup>1</sup> U.S. *Bureau of Labor Bulletin*, No. 481, p. 153.

<sup>2</sup> *Towards Industrial Peace*, p. 162.

<sup>3</sup> See Chap. IX.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. *Towards Industrial Peace*, p. 233.



quickly nor do they have the weight they might carry if discussed in a local council or committee. The result of the present situation is often a deficiency in the application of Whitleyism locally. This may mean an enormous loss to the industries concerned, for it is in precisely these local matters that there is the greatest need of development. The regulation of wages and conditions is generally fairly well handled by the national bodies ; the crying necessity is for an equally satisfactory settlement of local matters like training, health measures, local conciliation and social questions. If the district councils and the works committees were brought to a fuller development, a considerable advance could be made towards the completer growth of the whole Whitley Scheme.

Again, there have been failures on the part of the Whitley councils to function smoothly, and to extend their activities.

The first function of a joint industrial council prescribed in the Ministry of Labour's Paper on Industrial Councils, of June, 1919 (H.Q.T.7.A.) is :

" 1. To secure the largest possible measure of joint action between employers and workpeople for the development of the industry as a part of national life and for the improvement of the condition of all engaged in that industry."

This seems to be an expression of an ideal of the reconstruction period, rather than an exact definition of what a council is expected to do. Still, it is an ideal to be striven towards, and councils would do well to keep it in mind.

It cannot be denied that in many instances the activities of the industrial councils have had disappointing results, and that they have been too limited in scope. There are several reasons for this. The speed with which the councils were formed in the earlier days created many bodies without past experience and too hastily equipped in personnel to carry out successfully their new duties. Such inexperienced organisations took reverses badly, and lacked enthusiasm and resolution to bring them through crises. Then came the depression, with its attendant obstacle and difficulties. With prices and wages falling, there was little possibility of extending council work beyond bargaining over wages

and conditions. The costs of meetings and other council business weighed heavily in such times, and limited work to only what was necessary. Failures to keep council agreements, and, above all, failures to make agreements apply throughout the industry, were large contributors to the disappointing results. With all these obstacles, the wonder is, not that the activities often failed to function smoothly, but that so much work was done despite all difficulties. A recognition of the weakness of past council work, and of the reasons for that weakness, should help to put the councils on their guard, and to point out the way to better results in the future.

The greatest calamity in connection with the Whitley Scheme has been the total breakdown of so many national joint industrial councils. There seems to have been no one dominant cause of this ; but numerous contributory factors have combined to bring about the collapse of Whitleyism in many industries.

The following reasons have been given for the breakdown of the various extinct councils :

1. Too extensive an area covered by the industry.
2. The period of depression.
3. Friction over the negotiation of wages.
4. Ineffective organisation of the industry.
5. Rivalries between organisations, or demarcation difficulties.
6. Lack of support throughout the industry.
7. The idea that there was no need for a Whitley council.
8. Failure to arouse interest in the Scheme.
9. Lack of faith in keeping agreements.
10. Inability to enforce decisions.
11. Divergence of local interest.
12. Impossibility of adjusting representation.
13. Local negotiations preferred.
14. Lack of ability in the personnel.
15. Failure of the parties to work energetically for success.
16. Distrust of the Scheme on the part of the trade unions.
17. Distrust between the sides.
18. Selfishness of the sides.

19. Failure to hold council meetings.
  20. Lack of time to prove the value of the Scheme.
  21. The disbandment of an employers' federation.
  22. Lack of statistical information.
  23. Lack of guidance by some central body.
  24. Expense and inefficient financial support.
  25. Personal antipathies.
  26. Employers' opposition to the betterment of the workers' conditions.
  27. Radicalism of the labour side.
  28. Using the Scheme for personal ends.
- The chief causes of the breakdown may be given as :
- (a) Inefficient organisation of the council ;
  - (b) Difficulties over wage adjustments ;
  - (c) Inability to enforce agreements ;
  - (d) Failure to hold frequent and regular meetings.

The Ministry of Labour's Report on the Establishment and Progress of Joint Industrial Councils gives, in Chapter VII of Part 3, individual cases of many of the councils which have ceased to function, with details of the causes of the breakdowns. There is no necessity to repeat those particulars here. However, since the publication of their report, the most important of all the councils which have gone out of existence, the Building Trades J.I.C., has expired ; and it may be of interest to give some details here.

This council, which was one of the earliest and most enthusiastic of the Whitley bodies, was generally known as "the Building Trades' Parliament," and represented about 750,000 workpeople. Its debacle came principally from the distrust and fear aroused by a very advanced report of its Management and Costs Committee, known as "the Foster Committee," which was presented at the close of 1920. The Report recommended, among other things, a regulation of the wages of management, a limitation of the rate of interest on capital, and the disposal of the industry's surplus earnings, by the Industrial Council, to certain named common services. Such revolutionary proposals of a "new system of industrial control" proved

too strong a dose for the employers to swallow ; and notices of their decision to withdraw from the Council followed. In May, 1922, the following bodies signified their unalterable intention to resign from the J.I.C. :

The National Association of Master Plasterers ;

The London Constructional Engineers' Association ;

The National Association of Operative Plasterers ; and

The National Federation of Building Trades Employers.

At the quarterly meeting of the Council in the same month, Mr. Foster moved that "the Council shall be held in a state of suspense" ; and there has been no meeting since that date. This does not mean that Whitleyism no longer exists in the building trades. The plumbers and the plasterers have their respective councils. The building industry as a whole has a joint council to deal with wages and conditions only ; but it is not a Whitley council.<sup>1</sup>

To date, the number of Whitley councils which have broken down is thirty.<sup>2</sup> It is a matter of deep regret that the list should be so large ; but they are not a total loss. The existence of those councils, even for so brief a period, has accomplished beneficial results. It has, in certain instances, accustomed the industry to the idea of joint negotiations, which are still carried on to a large extent ; it has emphasised the value of friendly intercourse between the two sides ; it has helped to guide British industry through many difficulties of reconstruction ; and it has pointed out a way to better industrial relations.

<sup>1</sup> "In September, 1930, the unions decided to end their affiliation to the National Joint Council for the Building Industry."—*The Times*, September 27, 1930.

<sup>2</sup> The Names are given in Appendix II.

## CHAPTER XI

### THE INDUSTRIAL COUNCILS BILL

SECTION 21 of the First Whitley Report states: "It appears to us that it may be desirable at some later stage for the State to give the sanction of law to agreements made by the Councils, but the initiative in this direction should come from the Councils themselves."<sup>1</sup> This paragraph apparently indicates that the Whitley Committee were impressed by the expediency of the legal enforcement of Whitley council agreements. As a memorandum of the Ministries of Labour and of Reconstruction points out, the suggestion was designed to meet cases in which a minority in the industry were outside the wage agreements of the council.\* By this means, such agreements could be made binding on the whole trade, as is now the case of minimum wage determinations of trade boards.

The proviso of the Committee that the movement for legalising council agreements should be made by the councils themselves was the subject of action at an early date. During 1918 and 1919, many of the councils expressed themselves in favour of the statutory extension of such agreements. In January, 1920, at a conference representing 45 joint industrial councils and interim industrial reconstruction committees, a resolution was passed urging that legislation should at once be commenced, to give the necessary powers to the Minister of Labour to make binding upon the whole of an industry any wage awards, or agreements as to hours and conditions, which were made by the councils or the reconstruction committees. The *Labour Gazette* of October, 1921 (p. 518), reported that 25 councils

<sup>1</sup> Cd. 8606, Par. 21.

\* Cf. Cd. 9085.

were in favour of legislation to make their agreements legally binding, while 2 councils were opposed to such a measure.

After the formation of the Association of Joint Industrial Councils and Interim Industrial Reconstruction Committees in 1921, the Association directed its energies to the furtherance of an "Industrial Councils Bill," to encourage the promotion of industrial councils, to establish a central industrial board, and to secure the legal enforcement of council agreements. This Bill passed its second reading in the House of Commons in May, 1924, by a large majority, but did not proceed further, owing to the dissolution of the Government.

There have naturally been obstacles encountered. One of the chief ones has been the trade union position. Until 1925, the Trades Union Congress would take no action in the matter; but, at its fifty-seventh annual meeting in that year, it passed a resolution in favour of the proposal by a very large majority. Since that date, however, the T.U.C. General Council, until recently, delayed further action. Fear that trade union members might be penalised, or that unwelcome clauses might be inserted in the Bill, and indignation over the Trade Disputes and Trade Unions Act of 1927, have been mentioned as reasons for trade union opposition. Whatever the cause, there is no doubt that trade unionism for a time altered its position, from a hearty support of the measure to an attitude of indifference. And as long as the trade union leaders were directly or indirectly antagonistic, there was little hope of an active campaign in favour of the Industrial Councils Bill on the part of those trade union members who comprised the workers' side of the various Whitley councils.

However, the trade unions later modified their attitude. The situation in the first half of 1931 was as follows: A Bill was introduced in the House of Commons on December 2, 1930, by Mr. G. le Mander, M.P., "to legalise voluntary agreements when so desired."<sup>1</sup> Among other things it provides that upon application of an industrial

<sup>1</sup> Bill 57 of 1930.

council for an Order of the Minister of Labour to make legally effective a specified decision of the council, such Order, after a due time allowance for appeal or discussion, shall be made by the Minister. The Order may apply to the whole industry or any part thereof, as the Minister may determine, and shall have effect as if it were an Act of Parliament. There is a penal clause, to apply in the case of evasion or non-compliance on the part of any employer in the industry, and the Minister is given power to make regulations necessary to give full effect to the Act.

After repeated conferences between committees of the Association of Joint Industrial Councils and the Trades Union Congress, it was announced in December, 1929, that the T.U.C. General Council approved the principles of the legalisation of voluntary agreements, and that, in accordance with the terms of the report adopted by Congress, they proposed to promote a Bill, trusting that the Association would give its co-operation. This led to further conferences, as a result of which the "Rates of Wages Bill"<sup>1</sup> to provide for the sanctioning and enforcement of rates of wages was finally agreed to by the two organisations. This Bill embodies the principle of the enforcement of rates of wages where associations of employers and employees representing a majority in the trade concerned make joint application to the Minister of Labour for a Special Order to legalise such rates. There is no penalty clause, the onus lying upon any employee, to whom his employer fails to pay the rate of wages to which he is entitled, to recover such sum by proceedings under the Employers' and Workmen's Act or otherwise. This Bill was presented to Parliament in June, 1931, by Mr. Hayday, M.P., Chairman of the T.U.C. General Council.

There were, therefore, in 1931, two Bills awaiting second reading in the House, each containing the principle of the legalisation of agreements, but varying in certain particulars.

There has been some difficulty in ascertaining the present attitude of the existing Whitley councils towards the

<sup>1</sup> Bill 80 of 1931.

subject. Many of them have been reticent about expressing an opinion upon the proposed legislation of council agreements, owing, possibly, to past trade union opposition to the measure. A recent canvass of the present 64 councils gave the following figures : 27 councils expressed themselves as in favour of the principles of the Industrial Councils Bill ; 5 expressed themselves as in opposition ; and the remainder gave no definite opinion on the subject. Therefore where direct replies have been received, the majority in favour is a large one.

The idea of the statutory enforcement of agreements is not a novel one. It has been adopted in Great Britain for many years. The Government " fair wages clause " to ensure proper conditions of employment on Government contracts is an example.<sup>1</sup> The Committee of Production from 1915 onwards imposed on non-federated firms, which were in the minority in any district, awards made in respect of the federated majority.<sup>2</sup> The Munitions of War Acts of 1915 and 1917 authorised the Minister of Munitions to order that agreements as to wages, hours of work, and employment made between the majority of employers and workmen engaged in munition work in any trade should be binding on all other employers similarly engaged. Like power was taken by the Minister of Labour under the Wages (Temporary Regulation) Act, which in November, 1918, superseded the Munitions of War Acts. The Trade Boards Acts of 1909 and 1918 provided for compulsory collective bargaining, with statutory enforcement of the resulting rates. The Corn Production Acts (Repeal) Act, 1921, and the Agricultural Wages (Regulation) Act, 1924, gave statutory force to the decisions of agricultural committees. From these instances, it will be seen that there is precedence for the proposal of legalising agreements made by joint industrial councils.

Nor does there seem to be lack of support of the principle by statesmen or public bodies. As far back as 1912 a Bill was introduced into the House of Commons by Mr. Ramsay

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Cd. 6952.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. H. Wolfe, *Labour Supply and Regulation*, p. 250.



MacDonald (later Prime Minister) to make voluntary agreements between employers and workmen in the Port of London legally enforceable over the whole trade.<sup>1</sup> The Industrial Council of 1913 came to the conclusion that,

“subject to an inquiry made by an authority appointed by the Board of Trade, an agreement entered into between associations of employers and of workmen representing a substantial body of those in the trade or district should, on the application of the parties to the agreement, be made applicable to the whole of the trade or district concerned.”<sup>2</sup>

The Commission of Inquiry into Industrial Unrest recommended that—“when an agreement has been drawn up between representatives of employers’ federations and trade unions, that agreement should be binding on all in the trade concerned.”<sup>3</sup> We have seen<sup>4</sup> that the Trades Union Congress, at its Scarborough Conference in 1925, endorsed the legalising of voluntary agreements of joint industrial councils and other similar bodies. The principle has also had the support of a considerable number of organisations.<sup>5</sup> The Liberal Industrial Committee of 1928 has approved the idea,<sup>6</sup> and Lord Askwith and Lord Islington in 1919 spoke in favour of granting statutory powers to industrial councils at some future date.<sup>7</sup>

On the other side, there has been much frankly expressed opposition to the movement. Although the various Governments have maintained a neutral attitude, many prominent statesmen, economists, and industrial leaders have declared their antagonism.

A leading motive for such opposition will be found in the widespread feeling against compulsion in industry. The claim is that a voluntary system of wage-bargaining is far preferable to legislative enforcement. In reply, it is pointed out that under the Industrial Councils Bill the voluntary principle would still, to a large extent, be retained.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. B. G. de Montgomery, *British and Continental Labour Policy*, p. 340.

<sup>2</sup> Cd. 6952. <sup>3</sup> Cd. 8696. <sup>4</sup> Page 107.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Report of Meeting of the Association of Joint Industrial Councils, etc., on June 2, 1927.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. *Britain's Industrial Future*, p. 468.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. H. L. Debates, Dec. 3, 1919.

The agreements are made voluntarily between the two sides of the council. Moreover, the Bill does not impose the power of enforcement upon all councils, but leaves each council free to apply for, or not to apply for, a Ministerial Order. Being optional, the power would be granted only to industries whose joint sides asked for it, and would only apply to particular specified agreements. There is, of course, an element of compulsion in the proposed measure ; but is there not an element of compulsion in most agreements ? The forming of associations of employers or trade unions is largely motivated by the fact that an organised side can compel better agreements than can an unorganised side. In fact, it is the compulsory powers they possess that give to such associations their weight and influence.

Some opponents contend that the Industrial Councils Bill in operation might lead to compulsory arbitration. It is difficult to see how that could follow. In the case of the Whitley councils, the subject matter would have been settled by an arrangement between the two sides. In that case there should be little left for arbitration. Where there were differences between the sides, the Bill would not apply, as such a measure could only be called into force by joint action of both the sides represented on the council.

Again, there is the claim that legislative interference with industry should be avoided. Such a claim looks too comprehensive ; all legislative interference is not harmful, and much of it may be both beneficial and necessary. The benefits which should result from this proposed Act are enumerated later.

It has been said that if the Industrial Councils Bill became law it would create industrial ill-will and discontent. On the contrary, it is the present existence of a minority of unreasonable or reactionary employers in a business that may cause industrial bad feeling. The refusal of this minority to join their Whitley councils, and their undercutting of the wage-rates agreed upon by the councils, have at times hampered the work of the councils and brought about bitter enmities. Evidence of the value of statutory control of a discordant minority is found in the case of the

trade board industries, where such employers are under control. The record of industrial peace in trade board industries is even better than that of the industrial councils.<sup>1</sup>

There is a supposition that statutory enforcement of council agreements might allow an industry to take measures that would have unsocial reactions. An example given is the possibility of an agreed rate of wages that would unnecessarily force up the price of the produced commodity, to the detriment of the purchasing public. In reply to this argument, it may be pointed out that the control of the Ministry should prevent such a contingency. The Bill provides that consultation with, and agreement by, the Ministry shall precede the granting of the Order.<sup>2</sup>

Another claim is that a joint industrial council has no proper machinery for framing agreements enforceable by law. This argument might have more weight, were it not for the fact that such agreements are constantly being drawn up by both the agricultural committees and the trade boards. The differences between the machinery of these bodies and that of the Whitley councils do not seem so vital as to preclude the councils from drawing up proper agreements. Moreover, the supervision and advice of the Ministry of Labour is always at the council's service, for assistance in framing agreements that can be enforced in the Courts.

A similar answer applies to the objection that lack of definiteness as to council areas, or lack of "sharp definition and precise statement" in council agreements, would offer loopholes for the avoidance of compliance.<sup>3</sup> The Ministry, which would draw up the Order, would attend to its clarity, and would see that correct definitions and statements were included. No such difficulty occurs in the case of the trade boards; why anticipate a different result in the case of Whitley councils?

Mention is also made of the difficulties that would be encountered over questions of demarcation and trade

<sup>1</sup> Cf. H. Clay, *The Problem of Industrial Relations*, p. 177.

<sup>2</sup> Section 3 (2) of Bill 57 of 1930.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. H. Clay, *The Problem of Industrial Relations*, p. 170.

definition.<sup>1</sup> Such obstacles often arise between different trades and sections; but they have been successfully handled in the trade board Orders, and there is no reason to doubt that an equal success would follow the extension of statutory enforcement to joint industrial council agreements.<sup>2</sup>

It is suggested that, if a Whitley council found itself inadequate, under its present powers, to regulate wages throughout the trade, a trade board should be set up for the trade, rather than change the character of the council by giving it statutory powers.<sup>3</sup>

Such a procedure would unnecessarily force two bodies upon an industry, in order to bring about a result the Industrial Councils Bill alone could bring if passed.

There is a feeling that the passage of such a Bill might do away with the spirit of co-operation now existing in the councils—that their voluntary system engenders a spontaneity and adaptability, which would be lost if they became statutory bodies.<sup>4</sup> Yet there has been little evidence of lack of co-operation among the existing statutory bodies. Under legal control, the decisions would still be the result of compromise and adaptability. Only after an agreement had been reached, need legal enforcement be used; and even then it would chiefly be applicable to employers who possessed so little of the spirit of co-operation that they had rejected membership on the council.

One objection offered to the Industrial Councils Bill is that it provides for one-sided legislation, and imposes a legal penalty upon employers only, while employees who do not keep the agreements are not liable.<sup>5</sup> In reply it may be said that trade unions are closely organised; their members almost unfailingly carry out union agreements. Employers, on the other hand, are often loosely organised, and individualists among them can feel more free to dis-

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Report of the Establishment and Progress of Joint Industrial Councils, p. 168.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Britain's Industrial Future*, p. 170.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. H. Clay, *The Problem of Industrial Relations*, p. 203.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 171.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. B. G. de Montgomery, *British and Continental Labour Policy*, p. 341.

sociate themselves from a general agreement made by their associations ; so there seems to be a greater need for compulsion in their case than with the trade unions. Moreover, an employer's refusal to keep an agreement usually affects a large number of workers ; a workman's affects himself alone. To penalise an individual worker because he demands a higher wage and refuses to work at an agreed rate, would be a startling innovation.

These are some of the arguments advanced against the passage of the Industrial Councils Bill. Almost every one of them is answered by the admitted success of the Trade Boards Scheme. Since that scheme has stood the test of time with such satisfactory results, surely it does not appear too much to expect that a like success would follow the granting to the Whitley councils the power to have certain of their agreements legally enforced through Orders of the Government.

There are several arguments in favour of the passage of such a Bill. It has already been pointed out <sup>1</sup> that this is not a new proposal, and that the Trade Board Acts followed by the Agricultural Wages (Regulation) Act, have led the way. The case seems even stronger for Whitley council agreements than for trade board decisions, for the former are voluntarily arrived at by majorities of each side of an organised industry, while trade board decisions are compulsorily forced upon unorganised industries, where the voluntary element is, to a considerable extent, lacking.

Inability to enforce agreements has been the cause of the breakdown of many joint industrial councils. At the Meeting of the Association of Joint Industrial Councils, etc., on June 2, 1927, it was pointed out that eight of the councils and reconstruction committees which had pressed for statutory powers had ceased to exist, and that other councils were in a moribund condition, chiefly owing to the lack of such powers. The passage of the Bill should help to protect certain weaker councils which seem in need of being rescued from the dissolution threatening them. How a council is jeopardised by lack of power to enforce its

<sup>1</sup> See page 109.

decisions is illustrated by an example reported at the Conference of the League of Nations Union in 1927 :

“ In the case of one of the Textile Joint Industrial Councils, that of the Woollen and Worsted Trades, I am informed that an important member of the employers' organisation refused to be bound by a new wage arrangement and nearly wrecked the Council as a consequence through the serious competition he was able to put up on the basis of a lower wage rate than was paid by employers loyal to the Joint Industrial Council decisions.”<sup>1</sup>

To meet a situation like this, the statutory enforcement of its agreements would greatly strengthen the entire Whitley system. As the Liberal Industrial Committee have pointed out, some of the most highly organised industries which lack this legal power are strong enough to enforce their decisions without it ; but the Whitley council industries are not so strong as these, and their council system “ will not make much progress unless such powers are obtainable.”<sup>2</sup>

An Act to enforce by law the agreements of joint industrial councils might prevent many possible disputes in the industries concerned. There are local disputes as to wages, hours, and overtime, which perhaps would never have occurred had the employers been bound by law to respect their association agreements, and had they thus been prevented from refusing to put into operation rates and terms adjusted voluntarily between the two sides of their industry.

One of the chief industrial obstacles of the present time is the lack of sufficient organisation among both employers and workers. The legalisation of their voluntary agreements would tend to bring an impetus to a more complete organisation. The passage of the Bill should give a more powerful status to employers' associations and trade unions ; and, as a result, their membership might be largely increased.

In the same manner, collective bargaining should be strengthened. If agreements reached by the authoritative bodies in a trade could be made to apply to all engaged in

<sup>1</sup> Mr. F. Murrell in *Towards Industrial Peace*, p. 170.

<sup>2</sup> *Britain's Industrial Future*, p. 211.

the trade, more stability might be ensured. At present, members of the employers' associations represented on a Whitley council are at a distinct disadvantage, as compared with non-associated firms. The former are bound by collective bargains, which are often not honoured by outside minority employers, and the non-complying and competitive minority can make wage rates which undermine the value of the whole system of collective bargaining. The passage of the Industrial Councils Bill ought to bring order out of this wage-fixing chaos. The result should be a greater uniformity of wages, and better wages should follow with the development of the system.

It is the recalcitrant employers who constitute the difficulty. An illustration of this occurred in the Road Transport Industry. The Whitley council considered an application for an advance made by the workers' side. The employers' side replied that they would grant an advance, provided they had a guarantee that non-federated firms would also give the same advance, but that without that guarantee they were not prepared to submit to the undercutting which was certain to arise. A deadlock in the Council was the result.<sup>1</sup> Under an Act like the one proposed, recalcitrant employers could be effectively dealt with, just as they are at present dealt with under the Trade Boards Act.

The results which have been pointed out should tend to bring a more centralised power to the Whitley industries. With local differences over wages and conditions averted, with industrial organisation promoted, with collective bargaining strengthened, and with the prevention of the possibility of undercutting by unscrupulous employers, the central Whitley machine might be made a great representative force in its industry. Recognised and honoured agreements, drawn up at joint meetings of employers and workpeople, could then regulate wages and conditions in the industry. The decisions of the various councils should contribute to the standardisation of wages for similar classes of work, and should tend to bring about common rules

<sup>1</sup> Cf. F. Tillyard, *The Worker and The State*, p. 34.

dealing with price regulations, wage rates and conditions of work. Socially undesirable practices, like "cut-throat competition" and beating down wages, might, through this means, be eliminated. Without a centralisation of industrial control, the benefits named may be long delayed, and the evils may continue.

Possibly, it will be claimed that a Whitley council is not sufficiently representative of its industry to be entrusted with these great and far-reaching powers. Such a body, however, represents a large majority of its industry; and it would seem just that, in this strong position, it be given much responsibility. Moreover, the granting to Whitley councils the power of having their agreements legalised should tend to increase the representation on each council. Even if no such change occurred, it seems far more equitable that a majority of a trade should be permitted to make enforceable decisions for the welfare of the trade and those engaged in it, than that a few unassociated employers should be left free to block wage-rates and conditions which all others in the trade desired.

An inducement for granting the power of statutory enforcement proposed by the Industrial Councils Bill, is that such action should bring about closer co-operation and association between the trade boards and the joint industrial councils. The plan of the Whitley Committee was that the trade boards might, after sufficient industrial organisation to allow the change, in due time be formed into Whitley councils, thereby obtaining extended functions and powers. This plan should be furthered through the passage of the Bill. Mr. David Little, at the 1927 Conference of the League of Nations Union, said :

"As employers, when the Industrial Council came into being, we very carefully considered whether we would be better under an Industrial Council than under a Trade Board. We came to the conclusion that an industry like ours (clothing) was better covered by the Trade Boards Act, as the determination of the Trade Boards Act has a legal force which does not follow the decisions of an Industrial Council."<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Towards Industrial Peace*, p. 49.



So the present situation appears to have forced industrial councils and trade boards into an unconnected and independent existence, whereas the granting of statutory powers of enforcement to the councils might bring the two groups into a closer relationship.<sup>1</sup>

It is true that a few of the councils are opposed to the passage of the Industrial Councils Bill. Five councils in all out of the 64 in active existence have indicated their disapproval. Three of them are councils for local authorities' services, where, perhaps, modern ideas as to the value of organisation and collective agreements are not as universal as they are in industry, and the other dissentient councils are the China Clay Industry Whitley Council and the North Midland Road Transport Joint Board. Yet the Secretary of one of the dissenting local authorities' councils complains of the difficulty of "no obligation on the constituent Authority to adopt the findings of the Council"; and the Secretary of the Road Transport (Scotland) Whitley Councils says: "Chief difficulty is the employer who is outside the Employers' Federation holding he is not bound by agreement." Notwithstanding the fact that the vote of the councils in favour of the Bill is not unanimous, that seems to be no reason why the proposal could not be put on trial by those councils which are eager for the Bill's adoption. Any council unwilling to make use of the powers granted, would only have to refrain from applying for the Ministerial Orders to remain outside the Act.

Limitations and conditions with regard to the proposed Bill have been suggested by certain great national bodies.

The Balfour Committee on Industry and Trade agree that the Act might be of value if it were "strictly limited to the fixing of minimum rates of wages for the lowest paid grade of persons employed in the industry, in cases where such rates are 'exceptionally low' within the meaning of the Trade Boards Act, 1909."<sup>2</sup> The reasons given for such limitations are:

"The enforcement of such minimum wages would involve no liability to legal proceedings against trade unions, and no sub-

<sup>1</sup> Cf. W. A. Ellis, *Trade Boards at Work*, p. 7.    <sup>2</sup> Cmd. 3582, p. 125.

stantial threat to the present voluntary machinery for negotiation in the industry."

But the proposed Bill does not involve proceedings against trade unions ; and under the Act, if passed, the voluntary machinery should function much as before.

The Trades Union Congress also has declared itself in favour of the principle, so far as the enforcement of minimum rates of wages is concerned. Although this does not embody all that the Bill asks for, it may be considered a recognition of the principle of the Bill, and a step in the right direction.

The Liberal Industrial Committee has carefully particularised the conditions under which they agree with the Bill :

" Joint Industrial Councils should be empowered to obtain legal sanction for their agreements subject to the following conditions :

(a) the proposal for which legal sanction is sought should have been supported by a majority of both sides.

(b) any section of the industry not represented on the Council should have been given an opportunity of representing their views.

(c) neutral members should have taken part in the discussion and voting.

(d) the Council should be able to show, in making applications for the enforcement of wage-rates or conditions, that undesirably low wages or bad conditions are prevalent in some sections of the industry ; and that rates or conditions proposed are not markedly above or below those ruling for occupations of corresponding skill in other industries." <sup>1</sup>

There seems to be nothing in these conditions to disturb the supporters of the Bill. Most of the conditions could be dealt with by the Minister of Labour, who would have the supervision of all the agreements before issuing Orders under the Act.

In view of the opposition shown, and of the limitations recommended by such strong organisations, it might, perhaps, be good policy to make the legalisation of agreements of joint industrial councils apply, for the present, to

<sup>1</sup> *Britain's Industrial Future*, p. 168.

wage-rates only. This power is all that is given to the trade boards ; and it is all that is necessary to prevent an unscrupulous employer from wrecking a Whitley council by undercutting wages agreed on by the council. The Balfour Committee has recommended the application of the measure to minimum wages. The Act might go a step farther and apply the power to all wages. Such a statute should suffice to place the standing of the Whitley councils on a par with that of the trade boards, thus removing a bar to a trade board's transformation to a Whitley council after sufficient organisation.

The passage of the Industrial Councils Bill is needed ; the general prejudice against compulsion in industry should not be allowed to block it. Compulsion is now recognised as often necessary in industry. It occurs to-day in the prevention of "sweated wages," in social insurance, in "fair wage clauses," in the Factory Acts, and in many other protective forms of legislation. Certain humane and social standards are recognised in the industrial world, and, where a voluntary system fails to secure them, they are established by law. The protection of wage agreements, jointly reached by large majorities, appears to deserve equal consideration.

**PART III**  
**THE VALUE OF THE SCHEME**

## CHAPTER XII

### SOME RESULTS OF WHITLEYISM

IN this section of the book there will be a discussion of the value of the Whitley Scheme to British industry, with criticism and suggestions as to its future. In the present chapter, some of the beneficial results of Whitleyism will be pointed out, and the chapter following will be allocated to a discussion of the assistance of Whitley councils in the prevention or settlement of industrial disputes.

“Whitleyism” has been defined as the activity or spirit behind the concept of the Whitley Scheme. The community of interests and the co-operation of all concerned with an industry are the central ideas of the Scheme, which, with Whitleyism—the living spirit behind the Scheme—have produced certain beneficial results.

In the first place, the Whitley Scheme has assisted in the advancement of industrial organisation. The establishment of the industrial councils, in many cases, necessitated a thorough organisation of the industry.<sup>1</sup> Whitleyism is based upon organisation; before it can be applied, the industry must have both sides organised to a large majority percentage. Many of the trades now having Whitley councils had little comprehensive organisation until their determination to set up industrial councils aroused active efforts, which eventually produced the required percentage of organisation and the desired councils. The Glove-making Industry is an example, selected from many possible instances. Its Whitley council has been in existence for over a decade. An interim industrial reconstruction com-

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Report on the Establishment and Progress of Joint Industrial Councils, pp. 34, 37, 40 and 41.

mittee was first set up for the trade, as the result of a meeting held in June, 1918.

"Prior to this date, organisation among the employers and workers was very poor, but by dint of hard work, it was improved so much that by the end of 1920 it was possible to form a Joint Industrial Council, which has grown into a real live body and is now in a position to voice the opinion of the trade on any matters affecting it."<sup>1</sup>

One of the objects generally stated in the constitution of a Whitley council is "the consideration of measures for securing the inclusion of all employers and workpeople in their respective organisations."<sup>2</sup> So, although the effort may not be as intensive as during the formation of the council, this object is constantly being kept in view. Personal appeals are made, leaflets are distributed, and in many industries posters are periodically issued and displayed urging all operatives to join their union, and all employers to become members of their association.<sup>3</sup>

The creation of a central council, composed of representatives of all the organised negotiating bodies in the industry, has inevitably brought about a closer association of those bodies. For example, in the case of the Local Authorities Non-trading Service, eleven organisations of employers were represented on its joint industrial council at its first meeting.<sup>4</sup> Where a number of competing trade unions were organising the workers of an industry and the industry established a Whitley council, there generally arose a much better feeling between the respective unions. "The result has been to break down unnecessary barriers between unions, and to hasten the very desirable process of amalgamation."<sup>5</sup> In the case of the employers, the same consequences are reported.

"In the industries covered by the Joint Industrial Councils we found the employing organisations coming much closer to-

<sup>1</sup> *Unity*, May, 1928.

<sup>2</sup> Constitution of Match Manufacturing Joint Industrial Council.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *Unity*, Sept., 1926.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Report of the Establishment and Progress of Joint Industrial Councils, p. 52.

<sup>5</sup> G. Williams, *Social Aspects of Industrial Problems*, p. 72.

gether than they would have done had they been drawn together under the auspices of other well-meaning bodies." <sup>1</sup>

Besides advancing industrial organisation, the Whitley Scheme has done its share in extending collective bargaining. The formation of joint industrial councils, with their centralised bargaining power, has opened a much wider area of opportunities for collective bargaining than was available before.<sup>2</sup> In place of the *ad hoc* methods which existed before the publication of the Whitley Report, there has been established a new system of permanent representative joint bodies, able to effect national agreements about wages and conditions, which cover the majority of the employers and workpeople of their respective industries. Under a system like this, satisfactory national negotiations can usually be assured.<sup>3</sup>

Again, where the Whitley Scheme has developed organisation in formerly unorganised, or poorly organised, industries, it has helped to extend collective bargaining to new fields. The 1927 Annual Report of the Lancashire and Cheshire Whitley Council for Administrative, Technical and Clerical Services of Local Authorities emphasises this :

"Prior to 1921 (the date of establishment of the Council), no attempt had been made to operate the principle of collective negotiation in matters affecting the remuneration and service conditions of local authority officials. . . . To-day it is generally recognised that the present method of dealing with important principles affecting local authorities and their officials on a collective and scientific basis is infinitely better than the old method. . . ."

It is largely on account of its efforts in advancing organisation, and of its success in the extension of collective bargaining, that the Whitley Scheme has tended to put trade unionism on a sounder basis and a better standing. The Scheme gave a recognised status to the trade unions ; it provided that the workers' sides of its councils should be

<sup>1</sup> Mr. C. R. Flynn in *Towards Industrial Peace*, p. 112.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Report on the Establishment and Progress of Joint Industrial Councils, p. 25.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Sir Lyndon Macassey, *Labour Policy—False and True*, p. 175.

exclusively trade unionist.<sup>1</sup> It is more than that; it offered the industrial council as a bridge between two opposing sides, and as a means of reconstruction by peaceful methods, instead of by industrial conflicts. The result has usually been that, wherever the Whitley system has been adopted, trade unionism in that industry has been benefited and has gained prestige. Whitley Council agreements, made through successful trade unionist representation, are reported to have added to the value of trade unionism in the minds of non-unionist workers, and to have induced them to join their unions. Through Whitleyism, the trade union sides can obtain benefits without the costs of expensive strikes.

The services that Whitleyism has rendered to the cause of conciliation, arbitration and industrial concord will be discussed at length in the next chapter. It will only be briefly stated here that the regular meetings of the councils have helped to prevent the formation of grievances, and to eliminate those delays which do so much to add to industrial discontent. They have assisted in the promotion of the harmony and goodwill between the sides which permit the amicable negotiation of differences and their eventual satisfactory settlement.

The joint industrial council system has contributed to the standardisation of wages and conditions of employment. As the Committee on Industry and Trade states about the Councils :

"In a large number of cases steps have been taken for the standardisation of wage rates and hours throughout the industry. Various principles have been adopted, including the grading and classification of establishments and localities, and the adjustment of wages on cost-of-living scales, in some cases based on the rates of wages already in operation in the various districts. Various other working conditions have been discussed and settled on a more comprehensive scale than was the case previously."<sup>2</sup>

One of the first results of the establishment of the councils was the standardisation of wage-rates throughout many of

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Cd. 8606, Appendix. Answer to Question 3.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Committee on Industry and Trade, *Survey of Industrial Relations*, p. 298.



the industries concerned. In the end of 1922, minimum or standard rates of wages were approved by 30 of the joint industrial councils.<sup>1</sup> By the same date, 25 of the councils had standardised the working week of their employees, which in most cases meant a reduction of the working time,<sup>2</sup> and 16 of the councils had adopted the principle of an annual holiday with pay.<sup>3</sup> Other employment conditions which have been systematically adjusted by various councils include overtime; shifts; walking-time, out-walking and subsistence allowances; fines for late arrival; and notice of termination of engagements.<sup>4</sup> This work of systematising wages and conditions still continues among the most important functions of the Whitley councils. The reports of the councils often refer to it. For example, the tenth annual report of the Council for the Gas Industry, issued in 1929, states (page 5):

"It is of interest to note that there has been no National Adjustment of Wages since January, 1925, when there was an increase under the Sliding Scale of  $\frac{1}{4}$ d. per hour. The average cost of living figure at that time upon which the adjustment was made was 79 per cent. over the corresponding figure for 1914. Wages have since that date, by mutual arrangement, remained stabilized."

When one realises that in poorly organised industries, as many of these industries were before their councils were formed, wage-rates and conditions were constantly varying from time to time and place to place, the achievement of the Whitley councils in bringing order out of chaos by methods of systematisation and standardisation is striking. It is even more to be wondered at, when one remembers that the period under notice was that after the war, when reconstruction and the following depression added greatly to the complication and confusion of wages and conditions of work.

Co-operation may, perhaps, be designated the "quint-essence of the Whitley Scheme." Therefore, it is not

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Report on the Establishment and Progress of Joint Industrial Councils, pp. 87-94.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 95-6.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 96.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 97.

surprising that the Scheme. It brought about an extension of industrial co-operation in several directions.

In the first place, it has contributed to an increased co-operation between the Government and the industries of the country. We have seen that, at the outset, the Government agreed to regard a joint industrial council as the official consultative committee for its industry;<sup>1</sup> and that, in addition, the Government sends liaison officers to the council meetings, and offers the use of Government buildings for those meetings.<sup>2</sup> By methods like these the industries having Whitley councils and the Government are kept in close touch with each other, to the benefit of both, and of the country at large.

Valuable assistance through consultation with Government Departments has been rendered by joint industrial councils.<sup>3</sup> There is space here for a few illustrations only. In *Labour and Industry*, Mr. G. Bellhouse (now Sir Gerald Bellhouse), Deputy Chief Inspector of Factories, says:

"It is the practice of the Factory Department to get into touch with each Council as it is formed, and to seek to co-operate with them on safety, health and welfare matters. . . . Our experience thus far has certainly emphasised the advantage of joint consideration of these subjects. . . . I welcome most cordially, therefore, the opportunity that is afforded us by the Whitley Councils of consulting with the duly accredited representatives of both sides of industry in our efforts to reduce accidents."<sup>4</sup>

The Wool and Allied Trades Council has assisted the Home Office in the classification of factory illumination processes, and in the examination of methods of lifting heavy pieces of cloth.<sup>5</sup> The Pottery Council has assisted the Board of Trade with regard to census particulars of output, and with the classification of imports and exports.<sup>6</sup>

The councils, in their turn, have made proposals and suggestions to the Government with regard to matters

<sup>1</sup> See page 19.

<sup>2</sup> See pages 51 and 52.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Ministry of Labour Report, 1928, p. 9.

<sup>4</sup> *Labour and Industry*, p. 152.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. 1923 Report of Wool and Allied Textiles Joint Industrial Council.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. *Unity*, November, 1929.

affecting their respective industries. Among the principal subjects of such representations are foreign importations; enforcement of the Merchandise Marks Act; the safeguarding of industry; and transport facilities. For example, the Match Manufacturing Council, through its appeal to the Government with regard to the importation of chlorate of potash, succeeded in obtaining a reclassification of that article, so that the qualities used in the manufacture of matches would be free from duty.<sup>1</sup> While, naturally, some of the proposals advanced have not been acceptable, a considerable number of them have been agreed to by the Government, with much benefit to the industries concerned.

The Scheme has also brought about joint work among the councils themselves, and, in addition, their co-operation with other bodies. Mention has been made of the mutual aid councils have given each other,<sup>2</sup> of their holding joint conferences<sup>3</sup> and of the formation of the Association of Joint Industrial Councils and Reconstruction Committees,<sup>4</sup> to bring closer intercourse and a mutual knowledge of the work done. Therefore, a description of the co-operation of the councils with other bodies will suffice here.

In certain instances, Whitley councils send out representatives or deputations to press for measures of benefit to the trade, as when the Electric Cable Making Council sent a deputation to a large railway company to discuss the possibility of the electrification of its lines; and when representatives of the Silk Council obtained a rates classification of silk goods from the Railway Rates Advisory Committee.<sup>5</sup> Again, councils, through representatives or communications, have supplied valuable evidence to investigating bodies, as when the Pottery Council in 1925 submitted a comprehensive memorandum on the Whitley Scheme to the Committee on Industry and Trade, and likewise furnished oral evidence through five of its leading members. Councils have also supplied individual members to outside bodies, and have participated in joint meetings

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Report on the Establishment and Progress of Joint Industrial Councils, pp. 153-4.

<sup>2</sup> See page 67.

<sup>4</sup> See page 35.

<sup>3</sup> See page 36.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. *Labour Gazette*, May, 1922.

with other organisations. For example, representatives of many Whitley councils have been appointed as panel members to investigating bodies of the Industrial Fatigue Research Board;<sup>1</sup> and the Waterworks Council has arranged joint meetings with the British Waterworks Association, for the consideration of water questions other than wages.<sup>2</sup>

Such cases of co-operation between the councils, and between Whitley councils and other organisations, have brought benefits of value, as a direct result of Whitleyism.<sup>3</sup> Possibly, even greater contributions to industrial welfare may be attributed to the co-operation between the sides of the councils themselves—the central idea of the Whitley system. Some of the ensuing benefits of this idea will be briefly mentioned and commented upon.

In the first place, the co-operation between the sides of a Whitley council tends to remove distrust and suspicion from the sides, and to introduce a better atmosphere for negotiation. The change wrought by Whitleyism is strikingly described by Mr. Hazell, of the Printing and Allied Trades Council :

“Fifteen years ago representatives of the employers and workers met only occasionally to discuss wages and conditions of employment. The atmosphere was often heated and the attitude of the two sides was often hostile. There was little co-operation, and no recognition of the fact that there were joint interests which could have been discussed and considered with advantage. The opinion was often expressed that the two sides were, and must always be unalterably in opposition. If anyone had then prophesied that we should be meeting regularly and frequently to discuss such questions as education, health in the factories, legislation affecting our interests, and betterment, I think the visionary of those days would have been called . . . ‘a prophet of the utterly absurd’ . . .”<sup>4</sup>

Frank discussion at council meetings has helped to remove class consciousness, and to modify the attitude of officialism. Frequent personal contact can do much to

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Report on the Establishment and Progress of Joint Industrial Councils, p. 125.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Unity*, July, 1927.

<sup>3</sup> There is still need of greater efforts along these lines.

<sup>4</sup> Report of 1928 Convention of the Joint Industrial Council of Printing and Allied Trades.

dispel the bitterness of class feeling.<sup>1</sup> Especially in the councils for Government bodies has the official attitude been softened by Whitleyism. As an enthusiastic secretary of one of the Civil Service Councils expressed it at an interview :

“ Under Whitleyism a new spirit has come in the Civil Service. The old attitude of superiority and aloofness on the official side has been moderated ; and the former attitude of humbleness and reluctance to speak frankly on the staff side has been changed to a greater freedom of speech. An honest interchange of opinions and ideas has followed. The change has been all to the good.”

Failure on the part of either side to appreciate the problems of the other side has often, in the past, been an obstacle to the peaceful settlement of differences between employers and workpeople. The Whitley Scheme has helped to overcome this obstacle. Frequent meetings of the councils have given insight to both sides of the difficulties on the opposite side, and the appreciation of such difficulties has tended to moderate demands, and to bring about agreements that might otherwise have failed to materialise. As a prominent employer in the Wallpaper Making Industry puts it :

“ We know now, as never before, some of the internal difficulties of the trade union movement. . . . We welcome such disclosures. We are glad to believe that advice from another angle may sometimes be helpful. Failure to understand our respective problems has in the past been an obstacle to progress. . . .”<sup>2</sup>

The joint industrial councils appear to have exerted considerable educative influence upon the members of the councils as to the benefits of joint discussion. The constant contact between employers and operatives on the various committees, and the friendly talking over of points which might cause irritation, offer evidence to possible doubters of the reasonableness of members on the opposite side.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. B. G. de Montgomerie, *British and Continental Labour Policy*, p. 468.

<sup>2</sup> 1925-6 Report of the Wallpaper Makers' Joint Industrial Council.

Common interests can thus secure a stronger hold than points of difference, and the value of joint discussion is emphasised. The "fire-brands" in the industry have often been restrained in this way. One secretary, at an interview, gave an account of a very advanced labour agitator, who, after his first attendance as a member of the council meeting, exclaimed: "It has opened my eyes! I would never have believed you fellows could be so reasonable." Another secretary spoke of two "Bolshies" who were put on the council, and said: "You wouldn't know them; they are so tame." Probably one feature of Whitleyism which helps to "tame" unruly members is the custom of holding preliminary meetings of the sides before the general council meeting. By the time the unruly individual has reached the joint meeting, he has already "worked off steam," and has, perhaps, been enlightened or mollified by his "mates."

By bringing a better atmosphere for discussion, by lessening class feeling and officialism, by inducing disclosures of the internal difficulties of the sides, and by teaching its members the value of joint discussions, the Whitley Scheme may be said to have created a satisfactory clearing-house system for the spreading of ideas and the pooling of opinions in industry. This might be described as a system of organised voluntariness, under which representatives of both sides can meet and frankly discuss industrial proposals on their merits, not in a spirit of badgering or antipathy, but with a mutual tolerance, reasonableness, and a common desire for a "square deal."

With regard to the work accomplished by the Whitley councils, gratifying results are reported.<sup>1</sup> Much testimony of the value of the work done is available, both in the reports of the different councils, and from other sources. A few witnesses are cited in the following paragraphs.

There is evidence that the work of the councils has benefited the health, welfare and safety of the workpeople concerned.

<sup>1</sup> Description of the work, and some of its particulars, have been given. See Chaps. VII and VIII.

"The welfare of the worker has been kept under close review and Recommendations have been made by the Council and approved by the Manufacturers' Federation, providing for arrangements for the preparation of heating and taking of meals; the supply of protective clothing at cost prices to the workers; ambulance and first-aid arrangements, and seats in workshops for women and young persons where desired. These have to a large extent been voluntarily complied with by manufacturers, many of whom have also established canteens and provided other amenities."<sup>1</sup>

"The Safety of the Workers. This kind of voluntary movement has recently received considerable impetus from the formation of Joint Industrial Councils under the Whitley Scheme."<sup>2</sup>

"As regards Regulations for Dangerous Trades, the method of consulting with associations of employers and employed has been steadily continued, and it is notable that two of the codes, those for woodworking and for the lifting of weights in the woollen trade, are based on detailed proposals by Joint Industrial Councils."<sup>3</sup>

"While it is impossible to measure the actual degree to which the work of the committee (Health Committee of the Printing Council) has affected workshop conditions throughout the country, opinion on the part of both union leaders and employers is that a substantial improvement in the health conditions of the industry has resulted and that the educational effects of the committee's work will continue to grow."<sup>4</sup>

Again, there is the claim that joint industrial councils have, in many cases, advanced training and education in their industries.<sup>5</sup>

"Certain councils have interested themselves in recruiting and training of labour for the industry, which has brought them into contact with the Employment Exchanges of the Ministry of Labour and the technical division of the Board of Education."<sup>6</sup>

"The Apprenticeship Scheme of the Joint Industrial Council is making slow but sure progress in most parts of the country where the printing industry is well organised. The more the

<sup>1</sup> Memorandum submitted to the Committee on Industry and Trade by the National Council of the Pottery Industry.

<sup>2</sup> F. Tillyard, *The Worker and the State*, p. 162.

<sup>3</sup> Committee on Industry and Trade, *Survey of Industrial Relations*, p. 187.

<sup>4</sup> U.S. Bureau of Labour Statistics, *Bulletin No. 481*, p. 148.

<sup>5</sup> For examples already given, see pages 63-5 and page 78.

<sup>6</sup> H. Clay, *The Problem of Industrial Relations*, p. 167.

Scheme is discussed the greater is the appreciation of its provisions for looking after the interests of future journey men and journey women."<sup>1</sup>

Whitleyism is said to have brought a tendency towards industrial improvement and better processes.<sup>2</sup>

"The co-operative regulation of industry through the application of the Whitley Scheme to industry has undoubtedly helped to advance processes and reduce costs of production. Specific instances of this result must be sought chiefly in the reports of the Committees of the individual establishments. However, there are cases where the Councils have accomplished certain commercial reforms benefiting their industries. . . . When one turns to the records of the Whitley Works Committees, one finds numerous cases where processes have been improved and costs saved."<sup>3</sup>

Naturally, the work of the councils has been more or less diversified, according to the individual council, and the benefits have been more pronounced in some industries than in others. Still, on the whole, it may be fairly claimed that the Whitley system has tended to bring a greater uniformity of methodical progress throughout industry. There are certain features of the Scheme that should make for uniformity. The constitutions of the councils were modelled largely upon the same pattern, and the same functions were named in many of the constitutions. Reports and notices of the work of the various councils have helped to disseminate ideas and to bring uniformity. Like results have followed from intercourse and communications between officials and committees of the different councils, from joint conferences among them, and from the formation of the Association of Joint Industrial Councils, etc., which is a standing incentive to inter-communication and uniformity of action. The Government, also, has assisted with its consultation and advice; and is, perhaps, the chief agency for bringing about a uniformity of ideas and action among the industries which have adopted the Whitley Scheme.

<sup>1</sup> *Unity*, January, 1929.

<sup>2</sup> See page 91 for examples.

<sup>3</sup> Examples are given. Report on the Establishment and Progress of Joint Industrial Councils, Chapter VI.



W Some of the claimed results of Whitley here had been a given above. To recapitulate, they are machinery for the

1. The advancement of organisation.
2. The extension of collective bargaining.
3. Assistance to the cause of trade unionism.
4. The promotion of conciliation, arbitration and industrial peace.
5. Aid in the standardisation of wages and conditions of employment.
6. A closer relationship between the Government and Whitley industries.
7. Co-operation among the councils, and between the councils and other bodies.
8. Co-operation between the sides, which has brought
  - (a) a better atmosphere for discussion, and the removal of distrust and suspicion ;
  - (b) the lessening of class feeling and officialism ;
  - (c) the disclosure of the internal difficulties of each side ;
  - (d) education as to the benefits of joint discussion ; and
  - (e) a clearing-house for ideas and for the pooling of opinions.
9. Valuable work done by the councils, which has
  - (a) increased industrial health, safety and welfare ;
  - (b) advanced training and industrial education ; and
  - (c) brought a tendency towards industrial improvements and better processes.
10. A movement towards greater uniformity of methods in industry.

With these results in view, it seems an exaggeration to claim, as some do, that the Whitley Scheme has been a failure. It may not have accomplished all that its originators, meeting during the confident early days of the reconstruction period, hoped for. It has, undoubtedly, its defects and weaknesses ; but those defects do not appear to be vital ones, and its lack of strength is hardly surprising when one considers the abnormal economic conditions of the period through which the Scheme has lived.

## CHAPTER XIII

### THE COUNCILS AND INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES

THE year 1931 was born during a period of much industrial unrest. During the month of January, about 280,000 employees were thrown out of work by trade disputes, and the aggregate duration of all the disputes in January was about 3,400,000 working days.<sup>1</sup> Possibly these huge figures are not surprising when one considers the existence of so many great organised industrial bodies prepared for action, and of the numerous subject matters of dissension, which thus far have failed of settlement. A powerful factor for unrest is the long period of depression, with its continued low prices, stagnant business, and the apparent necessity of curtailment of all costs, especially of wages. The fact remains, however, that strikes and lockouts are still widespread in Great Britain.

It is the purport of this chapter to deal with the subject of industrial disputes and the part the Whitley Scheme takes in their prevention or settlement.

The term "trade dispute" is now officially confined to those dissensions in an industry which result in stoppage of work. It is the stoppage of work which so greatly injures a country's prosperity, bringing dislocation of business, reduced production, financial loss, and the lowering of existing standards of living. A great lockout or strike, even when it is successful, is usually a loss to the nation. Therefore, it follows naturally that "the feeling against recourse to a stoppage of work as an ordinary means of adjusting industrial relations is spreading and deepening in this country."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Labour Gazette*, February, 1931.

<sup>2</sup> Cmd. 2382, p. 119.

We have seen how even before the war there had been a large increase in the development of machinery for the prevention and settlement of industrial disputes. Extensions of collective bargaining, of conciliation bodies, of voluntary arbitration, and of Government mediation were prevalent in the years that followed. Then towards the close of the war period came the appointment of the Whitley Committee, to deal with problems of industrial relations, and, especially, to make suggestions for the improvement of the methods of negotiation between employers and employed.

The Committee evidently realised that trade differences and disputes were chief subject-matters for their deliberations. They said :

“ It is clear that industrial conditions will need careful handling if grave difficulties and strained relations are to be avoided after the war has ended.”<sup>1</sup>

The product of the Committee's efforts, the Whitley Scheme, had as its central motive the establishment of better industrial relations, through a system which they thought would help to prevent the outbreak of trade disputes. Paragraph 25 of their First Report states :

“ The schemes recommended in this Report are intended not merely for the treatment of industrial problems when they have become acute, but also, and more especially, to prevent their becoming acute. We believe that regular meetings to discuss industrial questions, apart from and prior to any differences with regard to them that may have begun to cause friction, will materially reduce the number of occasions on which, in the view of either employers or employed, it is necessary to contemplate recourse to a stoppage of work.”

The present chapter will endeavour to show that this opinion of the Committee has, to a considerable extent, been justified by the record of the Whitley Council system. Its work in the negotiation of wages and its treatment of industrial differences appears, in many cases, to have assisted in bringing about a reduction of the friction that leads to trade disputes.

A statement of the methods by which the councils deal

<sup>1</sup> Cd. 8606, Par. 6.

with wages and conditions, and with differences between the sides, should first be given. As has been stated,<sup>1</sup> some of the Whitley councils do not deal directly with wage negotiations, because in their industries there already exist other bodies which successfully handle these matters. However, a majority of the councils make the consideration of wages and conditions of employment their chief function. All the councils make provision for special meetings at short notice to deal with differences which have become critical. Many councils provide machinery for undertaking conciliation duties, or for dealing with disputes by arbitration. Often the method adopted is that such questions shall first be dealt with by the local works committees, later by the district councils or conciliation committees, where necessary and, lastly, by the National Council. For example, in the Printing Trade the system is to have a difference first taken up locally, and if that method fails to obtain an agreement the difference is referred to the conciliation committee of the council. In rare cases there is a further appeal to the council. If this produces negative results, either party is free to proclaim a strike or lockout, according to the side.

The constitutions of a large number of councils provide that no stoppage of work shall take place until the matter in dispute has been considered by the council. This applies also to the councils which do not include the settlement of wages among their functions.<sup>2</sup> In certain industries, the councils, in association with the Ministry of Labour, appoint tribunals to inquire into and make recommendations on differences which have arisen.<sup>3</sup>

In some councils, permanent conciliation committees are retained, to avert the possibility of stoppage; in others conciliation bodies are formed as the need arises. Many councils act in full session as a conciliatory body. This is usually the case where councils do not include the negotiation of wages among their functions; such councils are available as mediators when the sides at difference desire

<sup>1</sup> See page 76.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Committee on Industry and Trade, *Survey of Industrial Relations*, p. 298.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *Ibid.*, p. 299.

their assistance. Even where one of the parties to the contested question are not represented on the council, councils have agreed to undertake conciliation duties on request. By these means, voluntary conciliation within the industry can be established, and the possibility of a serious stoppage lessened.

Again, valuable work is done by arbitration boards set up by the councils. While the increased use of conciliation machinery has considerably reduced the number of cases requiring arbitration,<sup>1</sup> most of the Whitley councils have made further provisions for arbitration, where a voluntary settlement of differences fails to be reached. For example, in the Wool Council, if a settlement is not effected, an arbitration court, appointed from representative panels, hears and decides the disputed question within seven days. The court's award must be followed for at least 42 days, and, if this proves unsatisfactory, 14 days' notice must be given by the dissatisfied side, upon which an umpire is chosen from a panel of four.<sup>2</sup> Such arbitration schemes, adopted by the respective councils, can be constituted to meet any special requirements of the industry concerned. They generally provide machinery for the settlement of differences within the industry, instead of necessitating reference to outside machinery set up under the Industrial Courts Act of 1919.

Councils have been prompt in urging their rights to apply their function of arbitration. In 1929, the National Council of the Local Authorities' Non-Trading Services made a representation to the Ministry of Labour, in regard to the request for reference to the Industrial Court of a difference between the London County Council and the National Amalgamated Union of Shop Assistants, Warehousemen and Clerks. The Council held strongly that such reference without first exhausting the Whitley Council machinery cut right across the functions of the National Council. Accordingly, members were appointed to discuss the matter and to form a court of arbitration.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Cmd. 3333, p. 8.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Rules of the Council, Sec. 12.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *Unity*, September, 1929.

It must not be forgotten that much "spade work" in the cause of industrial peace is constantly being done by works committees and district councils under the Whitley Scheme. While the activities of the National Council are often brought before the public notice, the valuable work of the subordinate bodies is sometimes overlooked. Works committees, especially, "are the most effective lightning conductors for the discharge of petty irritations."<sup>1</sup> Especially effective is the work of the secretaries and other officers of the councils. They are quick to notice local disturbances, and, by written communications or personal intervention, may often accomplish satisfactory reconciliations. For example, the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Printing Council visited Dublin to mediate in a prolonged dispute in Ireland, this action being agreed to by both sides of the Irish trade. Again, at a meeting of the Chemical Trades Council, the secretaries reported that they had visited an establishment where allegations of victimisation were causing trouble, and that, as a result of their visit, a satisfactory settlement had ensued.<sup>2</sup>

In carrying out their activities of conciliation and arbitration, the Whitley councils have often been enabled to make use of Government aid. The Ministry of Labour, through its Industrial Relations Department, is always ready to assist the joint industrial councils in these matters. In addition to its London staff, the Department has a local conciliation officer in each of certain large towns, and this officer keeps in touch with the Whitley councils, and can often help them when in difficulties over industrial dissensions.

These are some of the working methods of the Whitley Scheme, as applied to industrial differences, for the preservation of harmony in industry. The results of their application seem to indicate that they have exerted considerable influence towards the betterment of relations between the conflicting sides.

In the first place, there is much testimony offered to

<sup>1</sup> H. Clay, *The Problem of Industrial Relations*, p. 166.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Ministry of Labour Gazette*, December, 1922.

show that the Whitley Council system has been instrumental in preventing strikes and lockouts in the trades to which it has been applied. All of the council secretaries interviewed have, without exception, made this claim. As one of them put it, "many matters of difference would have developed into strikes had there been no joint industrial council, to allow the working off of steam and the gradual smoothing out of the difficulty through mutual intercourse and conciliation."

The time taken over the discussion of a difference under the Whitley system tends to prevent a hasty severance of relations, to allow opportunity for the removal of animosities between the sides, and to result in the re-establishment of mutual confidence. Recognition of such possible benefits was largely the reason for the deliberate arrangements in the past, like the "Brooklands Agreement" of the Cotton Industry, which enforced the lapse of time before actual stoppage of work could be possible.

Under the Whitley Scheme, there is a recognised sequence in the treatment of dissensions. First come the initial efforts of the secretaries or other council members, immediately a disturbance is reported. This is followed by the treatment of the question by existing subordinate bodies. Then comes the consideration of the difficulty separately at the preliminary meetings of the sides of the council. Lastly, there is the full discussion of the matter at the meeting of the National Council. Such a thorough treatment of the problem should give assurance that little has been left undone for the preservation of peace.

This practice of full discussions, and these cumulative efforts, tend to create an atmosphere of goodwill and reasonableness within the council itself; and the calmer atmosphere of the council chamber, where others beside the immediate disputants are present, should be helpful towards reaching a settlement. Through the systematic processes of the methods employed, any lack of mutual understanding—a fruitful source of dissensions—can be removed. The constant association of members of the council over non-controversial matters also helps to build

up personal relationships of a friendly and lasting kind. The result is that, when critical dissensions are brought before the council for settlement, satisfactory agreements are often attained. This may even be accomplished informally :

“ Cases very frequently arise in individual firms or localities where an informal discussion between the representatives of the trade unions and the employers' associations on the occasion of the meeting of the council, suffices to secure that the necessary steps towards an adjustment of the matter are taken.”<sup>1</sup>

The system helps to bring fuller publicity on the subject matters of discussion. The Government liaison officer, and through him the Government, can obtain full particulars about the difference, and the attitudes taken by the parties concerned. Other Whitley councils may acquire much information, useful to them when like differences arise in their industries, and the general public, through the Press, and through the reports of the council should be better informed as to the points of view of the opposing sides and all the “ *pros* and *cons.*” of the controversy than it was under the old private methods of dealing with trade differences.

Again, the Whitley method of handling industrial disagreements is said to have had a preventive effect on possible sympathetic strikes. Workpeople who might strike in sympathy, even though they had no primary concern in the matter, can thus be stopped from taking action until the final decision of the Whitley council is rendered.<sup>2</sup>

One of the most important claims as to the results of the system is that, because a trade difference is generally confined within the trade itself, outside interference is thereby avoided. The council is in this way put on its mettle to reach an agreement by consent, instead of having to submit the case to outsiders. The outcome may be a peaceful settlement by mutual agreement, instead of a forced settlement through outside dictation. It is con-

<sup>1</sup> Report on the Establishment and Progress of Joint Industrial Councils, p. 105.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Lord Askwith, *Industrial Problems and Relations*, p. 249.



sidered a recognised benefit when, with a minimum of formality and delay, the task of conciliation is successfully accomplished by the members of the industry alone.

The Whitley methods of mediation and conciliation can be made to establish precedents for industrial problems which would have a marked influence upon difficult questions arising later. A gradual formulation of principles may be built up, and a system of "case law" established for the industry.<sup>1</sup> An illustration of the strength of such a precedent is given in the *Labour Gazette* for May, 1922 :

"The National Council for the Electricity Supply Industry considered a dispute resulting from the refusal of a joiner employed by a Supply Corporation to connect up with the main an installation made by non-union labour. The Trade Union side of the Council intimated their intention of suggesting to the National Executive of the Union of which the man was a member that their policy of refusing to connect up with non-union instalments should be discontinued."

Some testimonies to the success of the Whitley Scheme in preventing disputes should suffice to demonstrate the value of the joint industrial councils for the preservation of concord in industry.

At an interview in March, 1930, the Secretary of the National Maritime Board stated :

"The Whitley Scheme has undoubtedly been a great benefit to the industry in preserving peace and settling wage disputes. Since the Council was founded, there have been in all, up to date, 1,031 meetings under the Scheme, and 500 wage disputes have been settled. In addition to these, 10,000 wage disputes have been settled by the local Port Consultants. These disputes cover the largest dispute, affecting the whole industry, down to a local question about the wage of a single individual."

"Waterworks Undertakings Joint Industrial Council.—The help of the National Council has been sought with a view to the solution of difficulties in various districts. It has been the practice of the National Council, upon the request of each party to a difference, to appoint an arbitration panel. There have been nine such arbitrations during the life of the Council, and awards have been readily accepted and conscientiously applied.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Unity*, February, 1927.

If the National Council had performed no other function, its existence would have been justified by this feature of its work alone." <sup>1</sup>

"In May, 1919, a National Joint Industrial Council was established for the Flour Milling Industry. Since its inception, the Council has made 12 national agreements, has settled, through its Executive Committee, 55 disputes, has made a large number of interpretations of the Agreement, and has dealt with a large number of other relevant matters." <sup>2</sup>

"Glove-Making Industry.—The Council has been well occupied and can look back upon another very useful year. It has now been established for approximately eleven years, and, notwithstanding the fact that a Disputes Committee has been in existence during the whole of this period, it has not yet been called upon." <sup>3</sup>

"It would be unseemly to allow this Report to go to print without noting that it closes the first decade of our council. A period of ten disturbed and stormy years for industrial England, but happily for our industry one of steady progression. During that time there has been less unemployment and more contentment among the employees than in any other decade of the trade." <sup>4</sup>

An illustration of an industrial controversy, and how it was dealt with under the Whitley Council system, is given in the pamphlet of the U.S. Bureau of Labour Statistics on "Joint Industrial Control in the Book and Job Printing Industry" : <sup>5</sup>

"The most important dispute handled by the conciliation committee was one in 1925 involving the London members of the National Union of Printing, Bookbinding, Machine Ruling, and Paper Workers and threatening to affect the entire industry. After long negotiations on rates for certain machines, the union attempted to enforce on one house rates which the employers claimed applied only to periodical houses. The conciliation committee ruling, that these rates should apply to only part of the work in the house in question, was unacceptable to the union and a stoppage ensued. The council was unable to secure a settlement. To support their member the employers then issued lockout notices, while the union issued strike notices to all members of the London Master Printers' Association. The

<sup>1</sup> *Unity*, July, 1927.

<sup>2</sup> *Labour Gazette*, March, 1927.

<sup>3</sup> *Unity*, May, 1929.

<sup>4</sup> 1928 Report of Wallpaper Making Industry Joint Industrial Council.

<sup>5</sup> *Bulletin* No. 481, p. 141.

stoppage involved 15,000 members of the union. The conciliation committee, however, secured the renewal of conferences, and on the second day, in a lengthy conference under the presidency of the chairman of the council, one of the union leaders, an agreement was reached which was acceptable to both sides. Both groups agreed also in the future to respect the constitution of the council and take no aggressive action until the conciliation machinery has been fully used. That so serious an issue could be settled through the council is striking evidence of the increasing prestige and influence of the council."

Sufficient illustrations have, perhaps, been given of the work of the Whitley councils with regard to industrial disputes, and of the success of that work, to indicate that the Committee on Industry and Trade were justified in saying :

"Experience has shown that the existence of a Joint Industrial Council, on which the organisation on both sides are constantly in touch, and on which there is regular intercourse between the employers' and workpeople's representatives, has enabled differences to be dealt with at an early stage, and has diminished the opportunity for disputes to arise through lack of understanding."<sup>1</sup>

Nevertheless, it does not follow that Whitley councils invariably succeed in preventing strikes or lockouts when they deal with industrial differences. There have been occasions when, despite all the efforts of the councils, stoppages of work have resulted from disputes in their industries. The same trade whose success has just been quoted—the Printing Trade—has also had its failure, where its Whitley council was apparently unable to prevent a strike :

"In 1922 . . . the printing industry was still seriously depressed, and unemployment was severe. The Master Printers' Federation asked a wage reduction. Certain unions acted independently. In April, when no agreement had been reached, the employers reported to the council their intention to take the necessary steps to enforce the reductions. The unions agreed to ballot their members, and again the reductions were decisively refused. . . . A joint industrial council meeting called on suggestion of the Ministry led to an offer of a slightly

<sup>1</sup> *Survey of Industrial Relations*, p. 298.

smaller reduction. . . . The Typographical Association agreed to refer the matter to the Industrial Court. . . . The union, nevertheless, turned down the award. The council was then helpless to prevent developments. The employers put the reduction into effect, and 12,000 men struck, crippling both newspaper and job offices over the country."<sup>1</sup>

A recent instance is that of the Wool Textile Industry, whose Whitley council in 1930 endeavoured many times to bring about some agreement between the contesting sides, and failed utterly in those attempts. The stoppage, which involved about 40,000 workpeople, began early in April of that year, and lasted over two months. The dispute cost the operatives about a million pounds in wages, brought some of the trade unions to a state of bankruptcy, and lost directly between two and three millions in trade to the West Riding.<sup>2</sup> A letter of May 19 from the National Association of Unions in the Textile Trade says in this connection :

"In our judgment, a most critical stage in the history of the Wool Textile Industry has been reached, and it would appear that the life of the Industrial Council is imperilled."<sup>3</sup>

The general strike of 1926 has furnished the most conspicuous example of the inability of the Whitley Scheme to avert industrial stoppages under certain circumstances. This strike directly involved industries with strong Whitley councils, owing to the restrictions of the Trades Union Congress Committee, who ordered their employees to strike, regardless of any agreements made by their councils. Great industries like the Tramways, Electricity, Flour Milling, and Printing Industries, were thus forced to participate in the strike, and their Whitley councils found themselves powerless to take mediatory or preventive steps. They practically ceased to function during the strike.

Although the general strike may have furnished proof of the fact that Whitleyism cannot always prevent industrial disputes, it seems reasonable to claim that it also offered a test to the industrial councils system which

<sup>1</sup> U.S. Bureau of Labour Statistics. *Bulletin* No. 481, pp. 137-8.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Daily Mail*, June 8, 1930.

<sup>3</sup> *Labour Gazette*, June, 1930.

displayed the Whitley councils in a favourable light. Certainly the councils concerned were strong enough to survive the unexpected shock of the strike, and they have been recognised as having contributed materially toward the re-establishment of business after the strike was over.

The 1926 Report of the Ministry of Labour refers to the effect of the general strike on the joint industrial councils. It states that those bodies "showed their value in providing a meeting-ground for the discussion of the situation arising out of the strike, and still more in the spirit of reasonableness in which those discussions were almost invariably conducted." The Report adds :

"In general it may be said that the effect of the strike had been definitely to strengthen the position of the Industrial Councils and their power for good. Some of those affected by the strike have added to their constitution provisions designed to ensure at least an interval for discussion and negotiation before a stoppage of work takes place ; others which already had such machinery took the opportunity to overhaul or to extend it. On the whole there is every ground for satisfaction at the way in which the Whitley Council system has stood the severe test to which the general strike exposed it."<sup>1</sup>

The stability of Whitleyism, despite the calamitous blow of the general strike, is also attested by Captain Green, the Secretary of the Flour Milling Council :

"To the industry with which the writer is connected . . . the general strike came as a great shock, not merely owing to the dislocation of business, but even more perhaps because it suggested the bankruptcy of that confidence upon which our dealings had been based. . . . Immediately following the strike, the Employers' Federation set up a special committee to investigate the work of the Whitley Council during the preceding seven years and to make suggestions for the future. . . . The Committee's report states that . . . 'the continuance of these joint relations is best secured by the maintenance and extension of the Whitley organisation.' The report of the Committee was unanimous, as was its acceptance by the whole industry."<sup>2</sup>

If the general strike was a calamity to Whitleyism, as

<sup>1</sup> Cmd. 2856, p. 7.

<sup>2</sup> L. H. Green, "A Success of Whitleyism," *Manchester Guardian Supplement*, November 30, 1927.

well as to Great Britain, an additional shock came in the passage of the Trade Disputes and Trade Unions Act of 1927. This was aimed directly at certain privileges of the unions, and has done much to prolong their bitterness.

With the faith of many employers shaken by the general strike, and with the goodwill of trade unionists almost as strongly affected by the Trade Disputes and Trade Unions Act, it seems encouraging to find that Whitleyism has recovered to such an extent from this trying situation. The fact that the industrial councils involved have successfully survived two such tremendous shocks is evidence of the strength of the foundations of goodwill and common sense upon which the Whitley Scheme is based.

There are certain aspects of industrial disagreements, and the Whitley method of dealing with them, which may be commented upon here.

In the first place, the Whitley method is optional and not compulsory. It is based upon the friendship and co-operation of the sides, and upon their willingness to respond to the need for an adjustment of mutual interests. The Committee accepted the voluntary conciliation and arbitration machinery already existing in industry, and emphasised the advisability of a continuance of the system "whereby industries make their own agreements and settle their differences themselves."<sup>1</sup>

It should be kept in mind that the Whitley councils' share in the fixing of wages, by conciliation or otherwise, is a small one, when all the methods of wage settlement are taken into consideration. The great bulk of wage changes are arranged by direct negotiation, or in accordance with agreed sliding scales, and the Whitley Council agreements account for only a small proportion of the total.<sup>2</sup>

Some councils encounter more difficulties than others when they deal with the adjustment of wages. The degree of organisation in the industry is a strong factor, and councils of trades with a high percentage of organisation generally meet but little opposition to their wage decisions. Again, the proportion of wages costs to total costs is an important

<sup>1</sup> Cd. 9099, Sec. 4.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Labour Gazette*, April, 1927, p. 131.

feature. For example, it is far easier for the Flour Milling Council to come to an agreement over wages, which constitute a small part of the costs of the business, than it is for the Quarrying Council, in whose industry wages are a large proportion of the total costs of production. If the industry is monopolistic, or if its product is one for which the demand is inelastic, it is possible for its council to increase wages and pass the additional cost on to the consumer, who is apt to pay the extra price. This applies also to "sheltered industries in which a downward movement of wages can be much longer resisted, because the excess can, at least for a time, be transferred to the consumer."<sup>1</sup>

Much will depend upon the continuous use of the Whitley machinery. If, 'as visualised by the Whitley Committee, the machinery is kept in constant operation, through frequent meetings of committees and councils, lasting results ought to be secured. On the other hand, if a council only functions when there is a crisis in the industry, mutual goodwill may be found lacking, and the disagreements of the crisis may overpower the efforts of the council for reconciliation and concord.

Trade unionists sometimes complain that employers make use of negotiating machinery for the purpose of delaying the settlement of industrial demands.<sup>2</sup> If such unfair tactics were employed by either side of a Whitley council this conduct would injure the usefulness of the council, for goodwill and co-operation, the essentials of Whitleyism, would thereby have been imperilled.

One of the thorniest of present-day industrial problems is the question of arbitration. The Whitley system does not provide any definite method to be adopted when the two sides reach an absolute deadlock on a matter of major importance. Government interference and arbitration courts have been resorted to in many such cases; but the general dislike of anything approaching compulsion is apt to react against a ready acceptance of such methods.

Nevertheless, there have been instances under the Whitley

<sup>1</sup> Cd. 3282, p. 94.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Cmd. 501, Sec. 11.

Scheme where both sides have voluntarily gone far to avoid strikes and lockouts. The Boot and Shoe Manufacturing Industry furnishes an extreme example in this regard. It has established a guarantee trust fund of £2,000, contributed by both sides, to afford a monetary penalty for stoppage of work. Its National Conference agreement of 1928 provides that where any strike or lockout continues beyond three days, the side responsible shall be held liable for a forfeiture from the fund, in the shape of fine or damages, assessed by a joint committee. Due application must be made to a "national umpire," who shall decide the amount in case of disagreement of the committee.<sup>1</sup>

The Liberal Industrial Committee gives the results of this arrangement :

"Practically speaking, there has been no strike nor lockout in the 32<sup>3</sup> years since the agreement was made, and it is clear that there has been a steady increase of co-operation between the two sides throughout the whole of this period, in spite of the extraordinary difficulties caused by war conditions. This is all the more important and reassuring in view of the fact that the boot and shoe trade is a highly competitive industry, subject to the full blasts of foreign competition."<sup>2</sup>

A comparison of the record of industrial peace in the industries which have adopted the Whitley Scheme, as against the record in the organised industries which have not set up joint industrial councils, presents a contrast that appears favourable to the former.<sup>4</sup> Some comments upon this follow :

"Perhaps the strongest argument in favour of the Whitley method of organisation is that in the 54 industries which possess these joint councils, employing 3,000,000 workpeople, hardly any strike or lock-out (apart from the general strike) has taken place on a national or even on a large scale during the whole of the post-war period—a period of exceptional difficulty in industrial relations."<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Boot and Shoe Manufacturers' National Conference Agreement, September, 1928.

<sup>2</sup> 35 years at the date of this writing.

<sup>3</sup> *Britain's Industrial Future*, pp. 163-4.

<sup>4</sup> For the less-organised industries, the trade boards have an even better record than the joint industrial councils.

<sup>5</sup> L. H. Green, "A Success of Whitleyism," *Manchester Guardian Supplement*, November 30, 1927.



"The industrial troubles of the past several years have almost entirely occurred in those industries which have not set up joint industrial councils."<sup>1</sup>

"Even the organised trades with elaborate conciliation machinery, but no Whitley councils, have no such freedom from industrial strife as have the industries under the joint industrial council system. This is largely because their conciliation machinery is only called into use after the trouble has begun, a procedure which results in conferences being held under an atmosphere of suspicion and ill-temper, instead of under the intimate influence of friendliness and moderation built up by Whitleyism."<sup>2</sup>

However, it should be pointed out in this connection that comparative figures of the numbers of disputes in the different industries are apt to be misleading, and may provoke criticism unfair to the industries concerned. It is far easier for some trades to avoid strikes and lockouts than it is for others. The Coal Mining Industry is a conspicuous illustration of how causes of differences can accumulate in certain trades. The fact that industrial strife in that industry has been more serious and more costly than in all the other industries put together<sup>3</sup> should not be credited exclusively to the obstinacy of the coal owners or the radicalism of the miners. There are other weighty causes. Among them are the fact that coal-mining wages constitute more than half the total costs; the rapid growth of substitutes for coal; the vigorous foreign competition; and the lure of nationalisation. Some of these, or like, causes are prevalent in other great British trades which have suffered much from trade disputes since the war. Nevertheless, the contrast between the organised industries which have rejected the Whitley Scheme and the industries which have established joint industrial councils appears too striking to be fortuitous.

It may be useful to cite some statistics, in order to emphasise the record of the industries under the Whitley Scheme in the avoidance of industrial conflicts.

The latest annual figures of labour disputes published

<sup>1</sup> *Unity*, May-June, 1926.

<sup>2</sup> *Towards Industrial Peace*, p. 212.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *Britain's Industrial Future*, p. 144.

by the Ministry of Labour and available at the time of this writing are those for 1929.<sup>1</sup> There were 431 labour disputes, covering stoppages of work in Great Britain and Northern Ireland, beginning in 1929. The workpeople directly and indirectly involved in them were 533,800. Of these, 5,268 were in industries having joint industrial councils. This gives less than one in every hundred of the workers implicated who were under the Whitley Scheme. When we remember that the Whitley Scheme covers over one-seventh of the total occupied persons, the very small proportion of workers under the Scheme who were victims of industrial stoppages offers evidence of the effectiveness of the Scheme in preserving industrial harmony in its industries, and in protecting its employers and employees from the loss and inconvenience of strikes and lockouts.

From what has been written, it would appear that there is evidence to substantiate, to a considerable degree, the opinion expressed by the Whitley Committee that their joint industrial councils system should materially reduce the necessity of stoppages of work. The reasons given as supporting this claim may be summarised as follows :

(a) There are features of the Whitley councils' procedure of negotiation and conciliation which help to provide against stoppages. These include :

1. Special methods and meetings for dealing with differences ;
2. The use of conciliation machinery ;
3. Constitutional provisions against stoppages ;
4. The arbitration work of the councils ;
5. "Spade work" of council officials ; and
6. The use of Government mediatory aid.

(b) There are indications that the system has had an influence towards the betterment of negotiatory relations. These comprise :

1. The testimony of members that councils have helped to prevent strikes and lockouts ;
2. The opportunity for the removal of animosity, afforded by the time taken in discussions ;
3. The calmer atmosphere and constant association offered by the councils ;

<sup>1</sup> *Labour Gazette*, May, 1930.

4. The publicity brought about by the system ;
5. The preventive effect on possible sympathetic strikes ;
6. Advantages of settling differences without outside interference .
7. Precedents for negotiation established by Whitley methods ;
8. Illustrations of instances where strikes have been avoided by Whitleyism ;
9. The favourable comparison between Whitley industries and organised industries not under the Scheme ; and
10. Comparative figures as to the proportion of workers under the Scheme who have been involved in stoppages.

The above reasons seem to offer a justification for the claim that the Whitley Scheme has assisted in reducing the friction that leads to industrial disputes.

## CHAPTER XIV

### THE SCHEME AND MODERN PROBLEMS

THE value of Whitleyism and some of its results have been commented upon, and the usefulness of the Whitley councils in helping to prevent or settle industrial disputes has been emphasised. There are many modern problems which are frequently under discussion at the council meetings, and in the solution of which the Whitley Scheme might be found helpful. Some of these problems, and their possible connection with the Scheme, will be considered in this chapter.

Probably the most discussed problem of the present time is unemployment. During the whole of the life of the Whitley system, this problem has occupied the industrial foreground, and it has naturally been brought up often at council meetings. From time to time, the councils have attempted in various ways to ease the burden of unemployment. Systematic short-time working has been adopted in many of the industries. The joint council machinery offers a convenient forum for regulating short-time, used as a method of preventing unemployment. Several councils have laid down rules limiting the working of overtime during periods of depression. For instance, the Printing Council Report of 1928 states, with regard to unemployment and the avoidance of periods of slackness,

“when possible, additional day labour, double shifts or night shifts, should be engaged instead of working available persistent overtime; all public authorities should be persuaded to place their orders earlier and, so far as practicable, in slack seasons; wherever possible, the Education Authorities, the employers and the trade unions should jointly arrange classes for unemployed workers.”

The Printing Council has also a special Unemployment Committee which handles the migration of labour in the trade, and, through the speedy transference of men from town to town, assists in relieving local unemployment.

The three councils of the Electrical Industry held a joint conference with other groups in the industry to consider schemes for the improvement of trade and for the alleviation of unemployment. The suggestions of the Conference include the expedition of schemes of electrification; the speeding up of the work of the Electricity Commissioners; the immediate extension of the Government telephone system; and the rewiring of obsolete electrical installations in public buildings.<sup>1</sup>

With regard to unemployment insurance, several councils have considered the possibility of providing supplementary insurance schemes for their trades. The most successful instance has been that of the Match Industry Joint Industrial Council, whose supplementary voluntary unemployment insurance fund, by the close of 1925, amounted to £19,000.<sup>2</sup>

The problem of the trade cycle would seem one with which the Whitley councils might be especially fitted to deal. The reduction of fluctuations by carefully regulating production; pressure upon individual firms to prevent unwise expansion during booms; joint action for increasing efficiency of administration; mutual publicity as to contracts, costs and methods, and many other joint measures for anticipating depressions, and providing for common action when they come—these are some of the ways in which the Whitley councils system could be used in this connection.

In many matters of employment and unemployment, there should be close and constant association between the Whitley councils and the State employment exchanges. Each might be of valuable service to the other. For example, in the question of migration of labour, the employment exchanges possess the information as to local demands

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Report on the Establishment and Progress of Joint Industrial Councils, pp. 108-9.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Labour Gazette*, October, 1925.

for workers, while the industrial council for a trade should be able to procure valuable information as to unemployed workpeople in the trade who are able and willing to migrate. Like interchangeable assistance might be applied to other phases of employment, such as the decasualisation of labour; emigration cases; Government training classes; work for disabled men; the King's National Roll; and juvenile unemployment centres. The Pottery Council has, to a considerable extent, realised the value of co-operation with the State Employment Exchange. It has called the attention of its employers to the advantage, under the existing abnormal conditions of employment, of acquainting the exchanges with their vacancies and the days on which their factories are working, so that the "dove-tailing" of available labour with the requirements of the firms may be expedited.<sup>1</sup> From October, 1924, to June, 1931, the Pottery Industry placed 6,510 juveniles in pottery occupations through the agency of the local employment bureaux.

The Report of the Provincial Joint Committee presented to the Industrial Conference of 1919 states:

"Efficacy of Industrial Councils. The Committee feel that in regard to unemployment . . . the institution of Industrial Councils . . . will develop a sense of common responsibility among employers and employed, and that it will provide machinery through which the trade, acting as a whole, can in many ways minimise or prevent unemployment. In particular, such Councils would be in a position to collect information and make necessary adjustments in an organised way to meet the ebb and flow of trade."<sup>2</sup>

This opinion has been confirmed, to a considerable extent, by the records of the work of the Whitley councils. Nevertheless, there are still many opportunities, which are constantly occurring, for the promotion of council activities in matters connected with unemployment.

Rationalisation<sup>3</sup> is another prominent movement of the present time. It has been defined by the World Economic Conference at Geneva in May, 1927, as

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Report of Pottery Joint Industrial Council Meeting of January 6, 1926.

<sup>2</sup> Cmd. 501.

"the methods of technique and of organisation designed to secure the minimum waste of either effort or material. It includes the scientific organisation of labour, standardisation both of material and of products, simplification of processes, and improvements in the system of transport and marketing."

Rationalisation endeavours to create the highest efficiency in an industry; and it implies the reorganisation of the industry along cost-saving lines.

The idea of the rationalisation of industry is now prevalent throughout Great Britain. Recent examples of its application are found in the creation, in 1930, of the United Shipbuilders Security, Ltd., under the auspices of the Bank of England, to rationalise the shipyards, and also in the Lancashire Cotton Corporation, whose total capital in April, 1931, was about £5,000,000. Labour has not thus far, to any marked extent, opposed the idea. The resolutions of the World Conference were endorsed by all the leaders of organised labour present at the Conference.<sup>1</sup> The General Council of the Trades Union Congress decided that the interest of the workers would be best secured, not by opposing rationalisation, but by striving to influence its development.<sup>2</sup>

Organisation is an initial requirement of the movement. Therefore, the creation of a Whitley council, which can only follow the organisation of an industry, may be considered a first step towards rationalisation. The thorough co-operation of the two sides of industry is one of the essentials of both rationalisation and Whitleyism. Again, minimum waste can best be secured when avoidable friction in an industry has been eliminated; here, too, the Whitley Scheme, devised to prevent industrial friction, should be a direct contributing factor. The success of rationalisation seems to depend largely upon the growth of productivity in proportion to costs; therefore, any activities of the Whitley councils which make for increased productivity should add their value to the new movement.

Undoubtedly rationalisation will bring a certain amount

<sup>1</sup> Cf. L. Urwick, *The Meaning of Rationalisation*, p. 74.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. W. Meakin, *The New Industrial Revolution*, p. 26.

of temporary unemployment.<sup>1</sup> Its elimination of redundant or obsolete plants will displace the labour of such plants; its introduction of labour-saving machinery will effect an additional labour displacement. Moreover, rationalisation may involve other labour problems, whose solution should require the fullest exercise of the Whitley spirit. In Germany, the new movement has brought many claims for higher wages, and for a reduction of working hours; the question of the levelling up of wages of unskilled workers of automatic machines; pay rates for piece workers; factory improvements; and matters relating to betterment in the physique and morale of the workpeople.<sup>2</sup> Questions like these might be well handled at meetings of joint representative bodies like Whitley councils, where frank discussion should tend to preserve harmony and to result in satisfactory agreements. The inevitable displacement of labour may require the utmost combined efforts of employers and workers to minimise the results, by methods like the re-training and re-classification of the superseded labour. Possibly, supplementary unemployment insurance to cover such cases would be the remedy, or a fund levied upon the increased profits. Whatever the answers to the problems of rationalisation, it appears probable that, unless the spirit of Whitleyism is employed in their solution, industrial disturbances are apt to occur.

The Whitley councils appear aroused to the fact that their best efforts are required to help to carry out this new movement with a minimum of strained relations between the sides. Interviews with their secretaries seem to have disclosed this. One secretary expressed his opinion as follows:

"These things will cause unrest, and there will be need for a joint body like the J.I.C. to help keep the peace and to smooth out the many troubles that will arise. Rationalisation should help to consolidate industry. This consolidation will mean a closer association of the different bodies. This should result in a closer association of the Whitley councils, linked up to the

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Prof. T. E. Gregory's Presidential Address, reported in *The Times*, September 9, 1930.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. W. Meakin, *The New Industrial Revolution*, pp. 168-71.



whole scheme of rationalisation in some carefully planned system."

Examples of some work done by Whitley councils with regard to rationalisation follow :

"Pottery Industry. . . . After careful consideration of the Statistics Committee as to the possibility of effecting economies in the industry by simplification and standardisation, the conclusion has been reached that it would not be feasible or politic to attempt standardisation of shapes or decoration, and inquiries and attention are therefore being confined to the practicability or otherwise of achieving economies through limitation of the sizes of various specified articles."<sup>1</sup>

"Displaced Workers. Compensation Scheme in the Gas Industry. It was announced yesterday that important agreement has been reached between the employers and the trade unions in the gas industry for the compensation of gas workers who may be displaced by rationalisation and amalgamation. . . . The Secretary of the National Joint Industrial Council . . . states that only men who have been in continuous service of one of the amalgamated undertakings for at least three years will be eligible for compensation. . . . Special provision is made for men displaced from one job who secure another at a lower rate of wages. . . ."<sup>2</sup>

"Rationalisation of Flour Milling. . . . The flour milling industry, through its Joint Industrial Council, is putting into operation two notable schemes, one for the assistance and re-settlement of men displaced by rationalisation. . . . By means of the assistance and re-settlement fund the displaced workmen are also being provided with what is really a form of compensation. . . . An account of the working of the scheme in its first period . . . shows that in re-settling men in other jobs large sums have been paid where businesses were acquired. One man was set up in a general shop, the stock of which was bought. For another a baker's oven was bought. For a third, who with his father was taking a public-house, there was part-payment of the deposit. Two men were established in partnership in a drapery business. A horse and cart required for a greengrocery business were bought for another man. An emigrant had his fare paid. Several men were provided with tools, and in various other ways help was provided for the opening up of new careers."<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Unity*, September, 1929.

<sup>2</sup> *The Times*, May 1, 1930.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, November 11, 1930.

The Melchett-Turner movement for the further co-operation between the two sides of industry began in 1927. A joint conference was held between a group of individual employers, under the leadership of the late Lord Melchett, and the General Council of the Trades Union Congress. Its chief proposal was the establishment of a National Industrial Council, consisting of an equal number of representatives of employers and employees, chosen from their respective organisations. The functions suggested for the Council were: (a) regular meetings for consultation on questions concerning industry; (b) the establishment of a committee for the appointment of conciliation boards; and (c) the establishment of machinery for continuous investigation into industrial problems.<sup>1</sup>

The Melchett-Turner proposals have had a mixed reception. In September, 1928, the Trades Union Congress endorsed the scheme by a large majority. Later, the two national organisations of the employers refused their assent to the proposals; but the subject is still being kept open for further discussion. Many difficulties have been encountered. The chief cause of a possible failure may be that the movement has endeavoured to accomplish too much at the outset. British industry does not seem to be sufficiently persuaded as to its value to allow the immediate creation of a successful National Industrial Council. Yet there would appear to be a need for some such organisation, as, at present, there is no central organised body with which the Government can deal with regard to matters concerning industry as a whole.

The main idea of a national joint organisation to meet regularly and deal with industrial problems apparently follows the lead of the Whitley Scheme. It should advance the Scheme to a further stage—the consolidation of industrial machinery through the establishment of a central national body to represent all industry. Nevertheless, the attitude

<sup>1</sup> This is a more ambitious scheme than was the Industrial Council established in 1911, which applied to trade disputes only. That council, now defunct, was not a success as differences of opinion and outlook between the sides were too marked to allow harmonious results. Cf. Lord Amulree, *Industrial Arbitration in Great Britain*, p. 118.

of many of the Whitley councils seems to be that the accomplishment of this programme would be preferably carried out through a gradual extension of the Whitley system, rather than through the abrupt creation of so powerful and comprehensive a body. A letter of January 30, 1929, sent by the Pottery Whitley Council to the secretaries of the Melchett-Turner Conference, says :

“ In the opinion of my council, your Joint Conference cannot advocate better and more effective means for the promotion of peace and progress in industry than the establishment of a Joint Industrial Council in every industry where such a Council is not already in existence.”

If this could be done, and if the membership of the present Association of Joint Industrial Councils could be increased to cover all the existing councils, the Association might then become an industrial Parliament closely approaching the status of the Industrial Council advocated by the Melchett-Turner plan.

Whether such an extension of the Whitley Scheme can be brought about seems doubtful. Some other proposal of a like nature may be accepted instead. The Liberal Committee of Industrial Inquiry has recommended the establishment of a representative Council of Industry of workable size, in close association with the Government.<sup>1</sup> Such a council, or the National Council of the Melchett-Turner group, or a central Whitley Council for the whole of British industry might, possibly, be able to accomplish much towards a further development of the Whitley Scheme. In any case, there should be nothing about such a central council to conflict with Whitleyism ; it seems, rather, an extension of Whitleyism to a logical and desirable position.

The proposal to impose a tariff on foreign imported goods is one of the most discussed questions of the present time. There seems to be a decided movement towards a tariff, either for revenue purposes, or for the protection of British industry. The prohibition of, or restriction upon, imports

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Britain's Industrial Future*, p. 471.

during the war gave to industry a decided impulse towards protection, and of late there has been evidence that Labour does not take a united stand against a change of tariff policy.

"One of the most potent events which has taken place recently has been the swing over of the Trades Union Congress towards the policy of protection. The days of free trade are gone."<sup>1</sup>

Many Whitley councils have, in the past, taken a keen interest in tariff changes. Various councils have made representations to the Government to have their industries included under the Safeguarding of Industries Act of 1921. For example, the Gas Mantle Council, in 1921, registered a formal protest with the Board of Trade against the exclusion of gas mantles from the schedule of articles coming under the Act, and, as a result, it was decided that gas mantles should be liable for duty.<sup>2</sup> The Glove Making Council prepared and presented to the Board of Trade, in 1926, a claim for the application to their industry of the safeguarding of industries procedure, and the result was the imposition for a period of five years of a duty of 32½ per cent. on all leather and fabric goods imported into the country.<sup>3</sup> This duty has now been removed, and the Council has consequently been active in the matter. At a recent council meeting, the Secretary was instructed to send the figures of output for January and February, 1931, and corresponding figures for the previous five years, to all Members of Parliament and to the Press, "in order to draw attention to the state of the industry now that the safeguarding duty on imported gloves has been allowed to lapse."<sup>4</sup> Other instances, not connected with the Safeguarding of Industries Act, but having to do with foreign importation, could be cited. Protection against foreign "dumping" is, perhaps, the most prominent of these problems. In November, 1920, an Anti-Dumping Sub-Committee was set up in the Glass Joint Industrial Council,

<sup>1</sup> Statement of Sir William Morris in *The Times*, Sept. 20, 1930.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Report on the Establishment and Progress of Joint Industrial Councils, p. 151.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *Labour Gazette*, May, 1926.

<sup>4</sup> *The Times*, April 7, 1931.

to urge upon the Government the necessity of introducing legislation to protect the industry from dumping.<sup>1</sup> The Pottery Council has urged the Government to appoint a committee to make inquiry into the question of the effect of foreign competition upon the pottery industry, especially from the point of view of dumping.<sup>2</sup>

These are some of the ways in which Whitley councils might be expected to participate in tariff changes of the future. Provided a system of protective tariffs is adopted as the policy of the country, there will be need of much information about each of the industries to allow a satisfactory application of that system. The joint industrial council of an industry might prove to be a valuable source of such information as applied to its industry. Instances of unemployment attributable to unfair foreign competition; foreign shipments of "sweated" labour products dumped in British markets; comparative figures of wages and hours for the trade at home and abroad; export difficulties encountered by the industry; opportunities for preferential concessions; difficulties over obtaining raw materials; the extent of competition in other countries; and statistics of importations—these are some of the questions connected with proposed tariff measures to which the Government may require answers, and in the solution of which the councils established under the Whitley Scheme might prove of considerable potential value.

Another important modern problem is Empire development. The organisation of the economic entity of the Empire, and the formation of an imperial policy, appear to be in the process of evolution. How its products can be best interchanged through the active co-operation of the industrialists of all its sections is one of the greatest questions confronting the British Empire to-day. In September, 1930, the Trades Union Congress and the Federation of British Industries sent to the Prime Minister suggestions for the better economic organisation of the

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Report on the Establishment and Progress of Joint Industrial Councils, p. 151.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Pottery Joint Industrial Council's Memorandum to the Committee on Industry and Trade, 1925.

British Commonwealth of Nations. Among their recommendations were :

“ That a Commonwealth Trade Conference be held at an early date. . . . At this Conference every question affecting inter-Commonwealth trade should be brought under review. . . . That a Commonwealth Economic Secretariat should be established . . . to act as a permanent Secretariat for all Imperial Conferences on economic questions.”<sup>1</sup>

During recent years, the Department of Overseas Trade and the British Empire Marketing Board have played important parts in Empire development. Such development should require not only the collaboration of the Government, but also vigorous assistance on the part of all connected with British industry. In this respect, the Whitley councils might prove of much help.

As in many other matters, the Pottery Council was a pioneer in this movement. In 1929, the subject of Empire marketing came frequently under discussion at their meetings. *Unity* for November, 1929, tells us, about a current meeting of the Council, that there was

“ a very enlightening and instructive discussion on what is admittedly a difficult subject. These covered various points such as the appointment of Overseas Agents ; the intimacy of the relations of firms with their Commercial Travellers ; personal visits of the heads of firms to overseas markets ; the importance of sound advertising and display and the study of markets and salesmanship.”

Towards the close of 1930, the Association of Joint Industrial Councils, etc., passed a resolution with regard to Empire development. It was resolved to urge H.M. Government to enlarge the scope of the British Empire Marketing Board, so as to enable it to advertise British manufactured goods on the same lines and the same scale as the Board now advertises Empire goods in this country ; also to make provision for the extension of the marketing scheme, to permit of goods of British manufacture being advertised in foreign countries. The Government was urged to restore the Empire penny post and the half-penny

<sup>1</sup> *The Times*, September 25, 1930.

post-card, as measures for stimulating overseas commerce.<sup>1</sup>

These may seem but small contributions towards the policy of Empire development, but they offer evidence that the Whitley bodies are taking an interest in the subject. From such beginnings, the share taken by the Whitley system in imperial development might be extended to larger proportions. With the requisite patience and goodwill, many councils could work out overseas marketing schemes for their industries. Questions like emigration and Empire settlement; the exchange of statistics with the Dominions and Colonies; a co-ordination of research work; the formation of a code of commercial relations between the countries; and effective imperial advertising are matters in which the Whitley councils should be deeply concerned; and their co-operation in the years ahead may tend to bring considerable assistance in the development of the British Economic Commonwealth of the future.

A question which is by no means a new one, but which still occupies much attention of the industrialists of the country, is the workers' share in management.

"There can be no question at all that the whole movement of modern life is in favour of the workmen being allowed some share in the control of industry in the future. When that time of joint control takes place, and you have given to the operatives of any industry a responsible share in determining the conditions under which the industry is to work and the rates of pay which can be afforded from the industry to the workmen, then I think we shall have advanced a long way towards the prevention of disputes in the future."<sup>2</sup>

Just what is meant by "a share in the management" is by no means agreed upon. The average employer's idea of the phrase seems to be the workers' privilege of offering advice, with the ultimate decision left in the hands of the employer. At the other extreme is the interpretation of the advanced labour leader, whose idea of the workers' share is the whole of the management, acquired through "encroaching control." The application of the idea under

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Unity*, September, 1930.

<sup>2</sup> Sir Robert Horne at the National Industrial Conference, February 27, 1919.

the Whitley Scheme would appear to be a joint control by both sides of the industry, through their representatives on the industrial council. Under this system, the actual administrative control would largely be left with the individual employers. Management is a highly specialised business and its success is principally dependent upon the manager, who is a specialist selected by the employer, and trained for this part of the undertaking. Financial and commercial administration of the business is generally excluded from the discussions of a Whitley council. Under the Whitley system, the usual joint participation in the control of the undertaking is now included under four main heads, viz. (1) the application of wages agreements made by the council; (2) the improvement of processes and organisations; (3) questions of works discipline; and (4) questions of welfare and of working conditions.

Some members of Whitley councils have gone much further than this and have claimed for the workers a predominating share in the government of the business in which they are employed. The extreme case was that of the Building Industry Council, which was broken up mainly because of the claims of the Foster Committee for a dominating part in the policy and management of their industry.<sup>1</sup> Still, such cases are exceptions, and the general trend of the Whitley Scheme in operation is towards allowing the workers a larger joint share in the development of the industry along the lines named.

The chief usefulness of the Whitley system, as regards the question of the control of industry, may be found in the fact that it offers forums for frank discussion as to just what the workers' share in the management should be. Whitley council meetings can serve to clarify the issue, and to give publicity to the various suggestions as to joint control, without forcing the two sides into actual conflict, and without creating violent antagonism and ill-will. Moreover, after continued discussions and presentation of arguments, the way might gradually be opened to more generous concessions to the workers and to the bestowal of

<sup>1</sup> See page 104.



a share in control that would tend to satisfy all except the most extreme radicals on the workers' side.

There is one feature connected with control in which it is sometimes conceded that the employees should have a joint responsibility; that is, a voice in the decision as to dismissals. This is a matter which might be satisfactorily handled under the Whitley system. The workmen could be ensured against arbitrary dismissals by entrusting the supervision of dismissals to the Whitley works committees, with the power of referring disputed cases to the district council or the national body. Committing this highly important duty to the Whitley machinery would add responsibility and status to that machinery.

As far back as 1917, the South Wales Report of the Commission of Inquiry into Industrial Unrest enumerated principles which seem to apply to the position of the Whitley Scheme with regard to the subject under discussion :

“A new spirit of partnership is therefore essential. The precise mechanism of that partnership, especially its details, can be left to be invented and developed at a later stage. . . . But there should be a clear perception at the start of at least the leading principles on which that partnership or co-operation of the parties engaged in industry is to be based. Two such principles appear to us to be fundamental: (a) that the present system should be modified in such a way as to identify the worker more clearly with the control of the industry in which he is engaged; (b) That every employee should be guaranteed what we may call ‘security of tenure’—that is that no workman should be liable to be dismissed except with the consent of his fellow-workmen as well as his employer.”<sup>1</sup>

While there are other present-day problems which directly concern the Whitley Scheme, the ones that have been mentioned appear to be those of primary importance. The Whitley system might prove a factor of much assistance towards their treatment and solution.

<sup>1</sup> Cd. 8668, pp. 28-9.

## CHAPTER XV

### CRITICISMS AND SUGGESTIONS

ANY system designed for the betterment of conditions is certain to have its weaknesses. The value of the system should depend largely upon the extent to which these weaknesses are recognised and remedied. Therefore, criticisms of the Whitley system, and suggestions for its improvement, are pertinent, and should be of assistance in increasing the usefulness of the Scheme. This chapter discusses some general criticisms of the Scheme as a whole, and contains other criticisms and suggestions relating to the machinery and functions of the joint industrial council system.<sup>1</sup>

One of the criticisms of the Whitley Scheme is that it is not different from any other scheme of collective bargaining—that it has no unique feature to recommend it, as superior to other systems.<sup>2</sup> This is not a very condemnatory criticism; it is rather directed towards asserting the mediocrity of the Scheme, than towards claiming its harmfulness. Still, it is an unfair criticism, because it is not justified by the facts. The usual idea of collective bargaining is vitally different from the mutual co-operation of the Whitley Scheme. Most of the other bodies used for collective bargaining, and for conciliation, are *ad hoc* bodies, while a Whitley council is a *permanent* body, with all the amicable relations that such a body possesses. The Whitley Scheme was the first national scheme to utilise the

<sup>1</sup> Several criticisms of the Scheme, or of certain features of it, have already been noticed. For example, in Chapter X, reference was made to the omission of the Committee's proposals as to trade boards; the lessening of Government efforts; neglect to hold regular meetings; failure to establish subordinate bodies; and deficiencies in extending the functions of the councils.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. G. D. H. Cole, *Chaos and Order in Industry*, p. 120.

idea of regular fixed meetings of joint representative bodies in industries, and it should be given credit for the inauguration of this advanced step in industrial bargaining.

There is a claim that Whitley councils are not truly democratic, because their authority is located in central bodies, and the rank-and-file interests are kept in the background.<sup>1</sup> This is a criticism of the application of the Whitley Scheme, rather than of the Scheme itself. The Whitley Reports emphasised the value of democratic control through local councils and works committees.<sup>2</sup> Although, for most of the industries concerned, the application of Whitleyism was a forward movement towards a greater democracy, it is true that the development has not been altogether satisfactory. The suggestion that this part of the Whitley programme be "speeded up," if carried out, should add much to the usefulness of the Scheme. An extension of district councils and works committees should tend to check autocratic tendencies, to bring a broader self-government and to greatly increase the value of the Whitley system.

"The feeling of ineffectiveness . . . undoubtedly is felt in connection with many councils."<sup>3</sup> This, again, is a criticism of the application of the Scheme. It is, to a certain extent, warranted by the facts. The Whitley Scheme has not made any great strides during the past ten years. Yet it does not seem fair to ascribe the blame for the ineffectiveness of certain councils to defects in the Scheme itself. The past ten years have not been conducive to the development of industrial welfare. A period of economic stagnation is hardly the time when proposal for a broad co-operative development of the functions of the councils could be expected to enthuse either workers or employers. The vital points of interest at such a time are: for the employer, the risk of a total loss of profits; for the working man, the danger of losing his job; other questions sink into comparative insignificance. Therefore,

<sup>1</sup> Cf. W. Woodings, *Democratic Control the Key to Industrial Progress*, p. 21.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. G. D. H. Cole, *Chaos and Order in Industry*, p. 124.

<sup>3</sup> Towards Industrial Peace, p. 165.

the present continued depression would appear to be one of the chief reasons for a certain amount of inactivity among Whitley councils to-day.

A like reply may be given to the complaint that Whitley councils have become mere bargaining agencies, instead of the progressive factors for increasing industrial efficiency intended by the Whitley Committee. When questions of reducing costs of production, including the necessity of lowering wages, occupy the greater part of the industrial foreground, what other result could be generally expected? However, it is not true that the Whitley system is now used only for the purpose of negotiating about wages. Current reports of the majority of the national councils have only to be read to correct this misinformed attitude. The Whitley Scheme, even during these trying times, should be recognised as a potent factor in assisting in preventing trade disputes, improving industrial welfare, and advancing efficiency of management and labour.

There is a suggestion that joint representation is bad for executive control, and that full-time experts, with power to arrive at decisions, would bring better results than the Whitley system of joint councils for deciding matters of concern to the industries.<sup>1</sup> There is nothing in the Whitley Scheme to prevent the use of the advice and assistance of experts in the industry. Councils already utilise such assistance through their powers of co-option. Nevertheless, the suggestion that more use of expert advice be made by the councils seems a good one and well worth adopting.

One often encounters a complaint about the time taken over arriving at joint council decisions. In November, 1930, Sir Russell Scott, Controller of the Treasury, told the Royal Commission on Civil Service that, "while the National Council had been productive of a good deal of useful work, in practice its proceedings were very protracted, and that it took a long time to reach agreement or disagreement about anything."<sup>2</sup> There appears to be

<sup>1</sup> Cf. G. D. H. Cole, *Chaos and Order in Industry*, p. 268.

<sup>2</sup> *The Times*, November 14, 1930.

another side to this question. It has been pointed out<sup>1</sup> that the time factor may be helpful in discussions of trade differences. Greater haste often brings more heat into industrial arguments. To rush a settlement through, before all the points of difference have been thoroughly examined and discussed, might prove more costly in future disturbances than is the time lost through a more lengthy method of arriving at decisions. The criterion to be sought should be the settlement of a question as quickly as possible without creating ill-feeling between the sides, and without curtailing discussion to an extent that will provoke resentment.

With regard to the Whitley machinery, the importance of a discriminating choice of officials seems evident. The success of a Whitley council should very largely depend upon the selection of its officials.<sup>2</sup> As one Whitley secretary put it :

“ Good secretaries or a good Chairman can make a council a power in the industry. Our Council has been especially fortunate in its Chairman, an employer greatly respected by all, and one who has a gift at handling meetings. That is one reason the Council has been such a success.”

A full-time secretary might prove a good investment for any Whitley council. His time could be fully occupied with valuable work. In addition to the routine duties of preparing agendas, keeping minutes, and correspondence, there should be much to be done in supervising the work of committees and subordinate bodies, in keeping in touch with impending differences, and in organising and helping to carry out the various programmes of council work. The practice of having a joint secretary for both sides, which some councils adopt, seems a satisfactory arrangement. It allows the secretary to attend separate meetings of either side, to go anywhere in the industry, and yet to keep free from antagonism. Moreover, it precludes differences of opinion between secretaries, which, when they arise, may cause serious trouble and delay. The advisability

<sup>1</sup> See page 141.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. H. Clay, *The Problem of Industrial Relations*, p. 167.

of having a firm of chartered accountants to undertake the secretarial duties appears more doubtful. This might offer a possibility of suspicion as to the impartiality of such a firm, and entrusting the intimate relationships of a secretary to persons not members of the industry might appear questionable.

The custom of requiring a 75 per cent. organisation of each side before the establishment of a Whitley council, although not a fixed rule, has been largely followed under the Whitley Scheme. There does not seem to be any weighty reason for making this high percentage invariable. The suggestion that a lower percentage be adopted seems worth consideration. So long as a majority of the trade is represented on its industrial council, nothing is likely to be done by the council against majority interests. If the requisite percentage were lowered, this change might permit the organisation of Whitley councils for certain less organised trades. It may be argued that such trades can have trade boards, which will suffice to guard their interests. But trade boards do not possess the scope for their activities which is allowed to the councils, and it would seem an advantage to the trades to have the wider scope. Moreover, with this broader area of functions, especially if the passage of the Industrial Councils Bill brought legal enforcement of council agreements, it appears possible that an increase in organisation would follow the establishment of the council, automatically bringing a higher proportion of representation.

A number of suggestions with regard to the membership of the councils have been offered. One of them is that membership be made obligatory. The Secretary of the Whitley Council for one of the local authority services when asked "what should be done to improve the Whitley Scheme?" wrote in reply: "By membership of such bodies being obligatory on all parties." This seems a radical proposal, involving the substitution of a compulsory system of representation for the present voluntary system. It might be difficult of application. It does not appear wise, nor does it seem necessary, to make such a startling

change. Parties in the trade or service, who were forced against their inclination to become members of the council, would make neither enthusiastic nor loyal supporters of the Whitley Scheme; they would merely be a handicap upon the activities of the council. Moreover, with the passage of a measure making Whitley Council decisions enforceable upon the trade, the motive for obligatory council membership should disappear. Probably, all in the trade would in that case be anxious to secure representation on the councils, in order to take a share in decisions of such moment and authority.

Again, there have been complaints about the unwieldy size of some councils, and suggestions of limitation of membership. Sir Russell Scott said, about the Civil Service Whitley Council, that there were 27 members on each side, which "impaired the success of the Council as a deliberate body."<sup>1</sup> It might be difficult to make a strict general limitation as to the number of members. Some industries with many associations require a larger council membership than do other industries with few organisations. The important feature seems to be a thorough representation of all bodies connected with the trade; to sacrifice that for the sake of the ease with which a council might be conducted, would appear to be a mistake. Complete representation should be far more desirable than a membership restriction to ensure smoothness of procedure. The former should help to prevent subsequent difficulties over carrying out council decisions; the latter might alienate an unrepresented section of the industry, and thereby hamper the fulfilment of council programmes.

There is something to be said in favour of the suggestion that a council's membership should include a neutral element of persons not connected with the trade, to act as a medium between the two sides.<sup>2</sup> This idea has been proven a success elsewhere. The "appointed members" of the trade boards have been most helpful in the trade boards system, and the neutral members on the railway

<sup>1</sup> *The Times*, November 14, 1930.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Towards Industrial Peace*, p. 64.

National Wages Board have been quite successful in the settlement of obstinate difficulties.<sup>1</sup> One great advantage of such neutral membership should manifest itself in cases of obstinate disagreements between the sides. If the neutral members had voting powers, they could decide the question, and so prevent a deadlock. If they acted as consulting members only, their efforts as mediators might succeed in averting the deadlock, while, if a deadlock actually resulted, they could be made use of as arbitrators. As in the case of the trade boards, these members would not be a species of arbitrators merely.<sup>2</sup> Their influence should act as a restraint in discussions. Their knowledge should help to enlighten those discussions. Moreover, if, as consultative members, they were appointed arbitrators, they could decide the question, not as strangers but as intimates of the council, who had followed the facts and contentions from the beginning, and who were thoroughly versed in the technicalities of the trade.

Whether such members should be chosen by the trade or appointed by the Government, and whether they should be consultative members only or full active members, are questions which might be left to the individual trade. So long as the trade could be persuaded to include them, in some way, in its council, the really important question would have been settled. As a matter of fact, the idea has already been carried out to some extent in certain Whitley councils. The Pottery Council co-opts members who are not in its industry.<sup>3</sup> Other councils use such co-option for their committees. The Civil Service Council has three Members of Parliament appointed by the Government on its official side. The start has been made, and it would probably add to the value of the Whitley system if

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Britain's Industrial Future*, p. 164.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Prof. Hobhouse's Introduction to *Trade Boards at Work*, by W. A. Ellis.

<sup>3</sup> It has six honorary members, and its custom is, when agreements cannot be arrived at by the joint body on wage questions, to refer the matter to a joint committee, together with the honorary members for consideration and with power to arrive at agreement. If agreement is not reached by this committee, the honorary members hear the parties and give a decision which is binding.



the inclusion of a neutral element in council membership were to become the general practice.

Of considerable importance is the representation of foremen, supervisors, and technical and scientific workers on Whitley councils and committees. To leave such useful factors in the industry outside the council, is apparently to refuse the aid of elements which might make contributions of high value. The question was brought up by the National Confederation of Foremen's and Managers' and Supervisory Associations, whose deputations to the Ministry of Labour and to the Association of Joint Industrial Councils proposed that the supervisory workers be represented on the councils in a consultative capacity.<sup>1</sup> The general attitude of the trade union representatives has been opposed to the inclusion of supervisors and technical workers as members of the councils.<sup>2</sup> This would seem to be a mistaken attitude, for, in a consultative capacity only, such members could do little to interfere with the interests of the workers' side, and they ought to be of much assistance to the councils. To state an instance, that a research chemist, whose work may be of the utmost value to the future of an industry, should be excluded from representation on the industry's Whitley council appears like a disregard of educative opportunity. While provision is now made in certain councils for the co-option of specially qualified persons when needed, this procedure cannot be said to be general enough to secure the full possibilities of industrial development that might follow were it a recognised feature of the Whitley Scheme.

Although it appears a desirable arrangement that the representation on the workers' side be placed in the hands of the trade unions, the suggestion that the unorganised workers in an industry might, in some way, be given a closer connection with the Whitley council of the industry seems worthy of consideration. For it is apparently possible that a council may make a distinction between

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Report on the Establishment and Progress of Joint Industrial Councils, p. 171.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Committee on Industry and Trade, *Survey of Industrial Relations*, p. 296.

the trade unionists and the unorganised workers, to the disadvantage of the latter. The Council for the Match Industry, in 1925, directed the attention of all employed in the industry to the fact that employees who were not members of their trade unions were not represented on the Council, and were not, therefore, entitled to share in the benefits arranged by the Council.<sup>1</sup>

It is possible that if some method could be devised to better the status of the non-unionists as to their relationship with the Whitley Council, without in any way hindering organisation in the industry, the result might be an extension of the usefulness of the Whitley Scheme to more of the parties concerned. Two changes which have already been mentioned should considerably strengthen the position of the unorganised workpeople in trades having joint industrial councils. The statutory enforcement of council agreements should offer protection to non-unionist workers against unscrupulous employers, who at present are free to disregard the decisions of the councils. The inclusion of persons outside the trade as council members should bring to the meetings a disinterested element, one of whose chief duties might be to look after the interests of the unorganised workpeople. Neither of these changes should act as a hindrance to organisation.

Perhaps it will be claimed that any recognition by the council of the non-union workers makes it easier for such workers to resist the call to join the unions, and that the more protection is given to them in their independent position, the less will be the inducements for them to "unionise." But the Whitley Scheme was devised for the "well-being of the trade from the point of view of all those engaged in it,"<sup>2</sup> not of the members of trade unions only. And no evidence seems to have been produced to show that the Whitley Scheme has been a check on organisation or a hindrance to the growth of trade unionism. The evidence apparently points to the opposite conclusion.<sup>3</sup> Therefore, the extension of a scheme helping organisation and trade

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Labour Gazette*, October, 1925.

<sup>2</sup> Cd. 8606, Sec. 5.      <sup>3</sup> See pages 123 and 125.

## CRITICISMS AND SUGGESTIONS 177AS

unionism, in order to be experts on many of the unorganised workpeople, might prove of aid in all three directions.

The advisability of a greater protection for the consumer has frequently been stressed by critics of the Whitley Scheme.

In the future, the chief antagonism may be, not between capital and labour, but between producers and consumers over the prices of goods and services. The Constitution of the Industrial Council for the Pottery Industry contains the following clause among the objects of the Council: "to assist the respective associations in the maintenance of such selling prices as will afford a reasonable remuneration to both employers and employed." Such an object could be misused for anti-social purposes,<sup>1</sup> and might result in the exploitation of the community by means of a tariff, or price agreements, or some similar measure. One of the *Daily Herald's* "Hymns of Reconstruction" emphasises this danger:

"Whitley Councils.  
Two opposite sides,  
Two opposite sides,  
See how they agree;  
They both are after protection for trade;  
That is the way that profits are made!  
No better example of mutual aid  
Than two opposite sides."

It seems desirable that, in some way, the consumer should be protected against acts of a possible unscrupulous council, functioning under the Whitley Scheme. At present, one industry alone, the Railway Industry, guards the interests of the consumer by direct representation on its joint body. The trade boards offer the consumer a less-pronounced protection, through their "appointed members." Possibly, as time advances, the interests of the consuming community may require a greater defence against possible anti-social measures under the Whitley Scheme. The first step in this direction might be through the inclusion of an element of members not connected with the trade. That measure

<sup>1</sup> Cf. C. M. Lloyd, *Trade Unionism*, p. 126.

## 18 THE WHITLEY COUNCILS SCHEME

in itself should assist and the unorganised guard the consumer.

From the foregoing it appears that with regard to membership, it seems possible that future alterations of the Whitley councils machinery might, in due time, result in the adequate protection, through representation, of the following interested sections :

- (a) employers, represented as at present ;
- (b) trade unions, represented as at present ;
- (c) technical and supervisory personnel, given consultative representation on the council ;
- (d) unorganised workers, with interests guarded by the neutral members from without the trade ; and
- (e) consumers, either given some form of membership, or represented by the neutral members.

Professor Clay has offered a suggestion that the councils incur the expense of specialised aid for detailed executive work. He claims that such aid is needed for the development of council activities now more or less dormant. He gives as examples,

“ the compilation of statistical returns, the drafting of schemes of industrial training, the elaboration of rules to govern the conditions of work, the systematisation of a confused mass of wage rates or trade customs.”<sup>1</sup>

He adds :

“ What the Councils have achieved so far is no indication of what a Council might achieve, that was prepared to incur the expense of maintaining a trained statistician, a lawyer, and a secretarial staff on the scale that a Parliamentary Commission would employ for equivalent work, an expense that is trifling compared with the cost of a single stoppage in an industry.”<sup>2</sup>

This suggestion is a valuable one ; but it can hardly be expected to be followed during the present abnormal period, when costs must be kept at a minimum, and council work is to a certain extent confined to wages negotiations. In this connection, it should be remembered that more assistance in these matters could be obtained from officials of the Ministry of Labour and other Government Depart-

<sup>1</sup> H. Clay, *The Problem of Industrial Relations*, p. 166.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 168.

ments, who are trained experts on many of these subjects. The tender and utilisation of such Government aid might suffice for the present, with the more costly programme of hired specialists for industrial councils left to follow in a period of better business and increased revenues.

As there is general agreement that a wide extension of the functions of the councils would greatly increase the value of the Whitley Scheme it is unnecessary to set apart much space here for a discussion of this phase of the subject. The Whitley Committee visioned "matters affecting the welfare of the industry"<sup>1</sup> as constituting the area of council activity. This area has thus far been entered only to a very limited extent. Such subjects as education, health and welfare, industrial fatigue, research, problems of employment, and improvement of processes ought to be common topics of investigation and discussion in practically every Whitley council.

The question whether, or not, a Whitley council should deal with the negotiations of wages has been widely discussed. The existing national councils which have excluded that subject from their functions claim that this course allows more time for the consideration of other important problems in the industry; that it makes for harmony and a less controversial atmosphere; and that it gives the district councils, and other wage-fixing bodies, important work to do. Certainly, much valuable time is now spent on wages negotiations in many council meetings, with a resulting tendency towards limiting opportunities for discussion of other matters affecting the well-being of the trade. If wages were, in the first instance, settled by the district councils, time would be conserved to the national councils for the development of their other functions. There is some trade union opposition to this method of procedure, on the ground that it might interfere with the standardisation of wages. It is difficult to see how that danger would follow, provided the parent council fixed a national wage standard. Moreover, the procedure advocated should provide weighty duties for the district

<sup>1</sup> Cd. 9153, Sec. 2.

councils, and should thereby tend to encourage the organisation of a full system of district councils in each "Whitleyised" industry.

Again, there is the suggestion that highly controversial matters should be excluded from consideration by Whitley councils, at least until the whole system becomes more firmly established. Mr. H. Corsar said at the London Conference of the League of Nations Union in 1927 :

"We have not been able, even in our Whitley Council, to do many things we ought to have done . . . for this reason, that had we made recommendations on subjects on which we ought to have made recommendations, it would have led to the withdrawal of still more councillors, and we have been very anxious to keep the councillors in by ourselves putting on the soft pedal. I am certain that unless we now lie fallow, absolutely dormant, councillors will continue to disappear."<sup>1</sup>

Such a policy would, perhaps, be advisable in certain instances, where a Whitley council is newly formed, or has not yet acquired the proper peace atmosphere. Still, the Whitley Scheme was devised for the treatment of "complicated problems," involving "grave difficulties and strained relations." Once the members of the council have learned to recognise the value of open discussion under the Whitley Scheme, any problem of interest to the industry ought to have access to a council meeting. To permanently rule out controversial matters would be to reject settlement of obstinate differences through joint discussions at Whitley council meetings.

The desirability that more statistics should be made available for consideration by both sides of an industrial council has frequently been urged by students of the Whitley Scheme. This seems especially to apply to business statistics, now generally kept secret. As Mr. W. L. Hichins, of Cammell Laird & Co., has expressed it,

"workers should be well informed with regard to the profits or losses made by the industry with which they are associated. . . . It is important that each industry should study in joint session problems affecting output, and statistics should be available to

<sup>1</sup> *Towards Industrial Peace*, p. 173.

show how far the output per head of the workers is increasing or falling off." <sup>1</sup>

If a frank revelation of statistics were more general, much suspicion on the part of the workpeople might be eliminated, with the probable result that fewer industrial disputes would occur. <sup>2</sup>

There would seem to be the need of a wider publicity of Whitley council work, in order to give the country a realisation of its value. If a joint industrial council is to be thoroughly effective, it appears essential that all engaged in the industry, whether employers or workpeople, should have an adequate understanding of its activities. Members of the industry especially need informative education as to Whitley objects and methods. As an intelligent secretary has phrased it,

"the primary difficulty with all Councils at the beginning is to educate the backwoodsmen of both sides. The extreme individualist among the employers objects to any kind of negotiation with trade unions; the extreme left-wing trade unionist abhors a Council because he thinks it leads to compromise with capitalism."

Other industries, and the general public, should be equally benefited by the publication of Whitley council decisions and records. These often concern questions of relevance to all industry, and offer valuable ideas which could be applied to other trades as well.

An example of effective publicity is given in *Unity* for August, 1928:

"Flour Milling Industry—the report of the Factories Committee of the Council has been given world-wide publicity by reason of a long and detailed summary thereof appearing in the April number of the 'Industrial Safety Survey' issued by the International Labour Office. . . . Specimens of the protective clothing recommended by the Committee are being displayed in the Home Office Industrial Museum and by the International Labour Office at Geneva."

More propaganda of this kind might advantageously be

<sup>1</sup> *Towards Industrial Peace*, pp. 183 and 187.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. D. H. Robertson, *The Control of Industry*, p. 126.

done. The British Press might be induced to include reports of Whitley councils in their industrial news. The *Ministry of Labour Gazette*, in particular, ought to allow space each month for recording the activities of industrial councils throughout the country.

Although there has been considerable co-operation among the various joint industrial councils, a still more extensive liaison between the councils seems needed. Evidence of this may be found in the fact that a minority only of the existing national councils are members of the Association of Joint Industrial Councils and Interim Industrial Reconstruction Committees. The interdependence of all industries is recognised to-day as a factor of much importance to national welfare. Unless there is a close relationship between the joint bodies of the trades and services, there may be danger from conflicting policies or acts. No Whitley council can afford complete aloofness. It appears important that all the councils should have membership in the Association; that all should make extended use of consultations and conferences as required; and that all should participate in joint action with regard to mutual interests. In these ways, there should develop, from the council's pooling of ideas and experiences, a tendency towards a more uniform industrial system.

In like manner, the existing co-operation between the councils and other organisations might, with advantage, be extended to an increased degree. If outside bodies were to form the habit of referring trade questions to the Whitley councils for consideration and advice, some difficult problems might be solved more easily, with a greater industrial harmony as the result.

The value of co-operation between the Government and the Whitley councils has been mentioned.<sup>1</sup> Yet even here there seems to be need of increased effort. Cases have occurred where such co-operation was lacking. The *Labour Gazette* of March, 1921, reported :

"In connection with the application of short-time working to Government Industrial establishments, the trade unions repre-

<sup>1</sup> See page 128.



sented on the Joint Industrial Councils concerned decided, at a conference held on January 19, to withdraw their representatives from those bodies, as a protest against the alleged failure of the Government to consult the Councils before taking action.”<sup>1</sup>

Intimate and continuous touch between the Whitley councils and the Government seems essential, if the full value of the Whitley ideas of co-operation is to be developed.

The above are some of the criticisms and suggestions concerning the Whitley Scheme which, apparently, ought to be carefully considered and acted upon. The extent to which Whitleyism might be developed would seem to depend, to a considerable extent, upon the effective solution of these, and like, problems.

<sup>1</sup> This difficulty was smoothed out at a later interview with the Treasury.

## CHAPTER XVI

### INDIFFERENCE AND OPPOSITION

A CERTAIN amount of evidence has been given to substantiate the value of the Whitley Scheme for improving industrial relations and maintaining harmony in industry. The importance of the Scheme may be considerably affected by the attitude towards Whitleyism taken by the various parties concerned. Unless this attitude is generally favourable, no matter how valuable the Scheme may be, the total beneficial results from it are apt to be small, because of the lack of enthusiasm for the development of industrial co-operation along the lines suggested by the Whitley Reports.

In view of the indications of the possible usefulness of the joint industrial councils system which have been pointed out in the preceding chapters, it seems singular that there should have been much indifference, and considerable opposition, to the system in the past, and that, even at the present time, the general attitude towards it cannot be said to be favourable. A short account of this attitude, past and present, will be given here.

At first there was the enthusiastic reception of the Whitley proposals in 1917. As the Commission of Inquiry into Industrial Unrest stated at that time: "Broadly speaking, the principles laid down appear to have met with general approval."<sup>1</sup> The Press and the general public were generous with their praise. However, the parties directly concerned—the employers and trade unionists—were more guarded in their opinions, and apparently did

<sup>1</sup> Cd. 8696, Sec. 7.

not see in the proposals of the Reports a solution of their problems. This attitude is possibly not surprising. It is far easier for parties not directly concerned to pass a general approval on a specific scheme of reform, than it is for those whose personal interests are vitally affected to give a whole-hearted support to substantial changes in their methods of operation. Even on the part of the outside public, fears were expressed by some that the Whitley proposals, if carried too far, might become a menace to the consumer through the increased prices of products resulting from a joint effort of employers and workers to secure higher profits and higher wages.<sup>1</sup>

After the first wave of public enthusiasm had passed, it became evident that the employers, in the majority of cases, were far from enthusiastic. Many of them appeared alarmed at the lengths to which they considered the recommendations had gone.<sup>2</sup> The Employers' Parliamentary Council held that further sacrifices should be made by the trade unions, in return for the great concessions asked of the masters. The 1917 Memorandum of the Federation of British Industries, while it gave a cautious general approval of the Whitley Report, stated that it regarded the idea of extending constructive work to the district councils and works committees as dangerous.

The trade union attitude was a mixed one. Some of the unions connected with the smaller and less-organised industries, and certain members of the general labour unions, welcomed the Report; but the Trades Union Congress, and the leaders of the older skilled unions, held themselves aloof.<sup>3</sup> The Whitley Report was definitely rejected by unions of some of the greatest industries, such as those of mining, railways, and engineering. Advanced labour leaders, especially those engaged in the shop stewards movement, were openly hostile. One of these entitled his article against the Report "Whitleying away our Strength."<sup>4</sup> Possibly, behind the trade unionist opposition,

<sup>1</sup> Cf. G. Williams, *Social Aspects of Industrial Problems*, p. 121.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 119.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *Labour Year Book*, 1919.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. G. D. H. Cole, *Chaos and Order in Industry*, p. 121.

lay the fear of Government compulsion, and the desire for labour self-government.<sup>1</sup>

No political party adopted Whitleyism as part of its programme. The Government, at the time of the publication of the Reports, gave them its official blessing; but when the Conservatives came into power later, they appeared strongly opposed to Government interference with industry. The following Labour Government might have made efforts to extend the Whitley system; but they did not seem interested. They may have feared opposition from their extreme left section. On the other hand, certain official bodies have strongly endorsed the Whitley Scheme. For example, the Report of the Court of Inquiry concerning the Dispute in the Tramway Industry, said:

"We have been deeply impressed by the immense value of the work done by the Industrial Council for the Tramway Industry in which both parties have participated. Industrial Councils appear to have great possibilities for the betterment of the work-people and the advancement of industries as a whole."<sup>2</sup>

Thus, we find that, in the past, the proposals of the Whitley Committee, after the first interest and enthusiasm following the publication of the Reports had waned, did not receive universal approval. On the contrary, there was much indifference and considerable opposition displayed on all sides. Let us now examine the attitude of the different interests towards the Whitley Scheme at the present time.

So far as the public is concerned, its position may be expressed in one word—"indifference." Its dream of an industrial millennium through Whitleyism has passed away. Other exciting topics have arisen, and, apparently in its opinion, a joint industrial council system for co-operative advancement is a dead issue. It seems to view the Whitley Scheme as a harmless proposal, which can accomplish but little towards bettering industrial efficiency and advancing the prosperity of the country. To a

<sup>1</sup> Cf. G. Williams, *Social Aspects of Industrial Problems*, pp. 120-1.

<sup>2</sup> *S.O. Paper 37* of 1921.

appearances, the position of the public towards Whitleyism has changed from one of intense interest to one of tolerant disregard.

It cannot be correctly asserted that a majority of British employers are now in favour of the extension of the Whitley Scheme. The bulk of the employers do not appear interested in the subject. Some, especially, fear the establishment of works committees, as offering extremists opportunities to cause trouble, and others complain about the time wasted in useless discussions at joint meetings. Perhaps they have not yet realised that, in these days of modern industrial bargaining, time spent on questions of wages and conditions should be regarded as a necessity, and that it is often safer to allow the extremists to "work off steam" at joint meetings, than to have them agitating in secret among the employees.<sup>1</sup>

Even among employers who are members of Whitley councils, severe criticisms and discouraging points of view can be found. One of them has expressed his opinion as follows :

"The scheme outlined was quite theoretical, and appears to have been based on the comforting belief in the soothing power of debate. The creation of District Councils and Works Committees on an organised basis is little more than the multiplication of talking institutions, and the collective common-sense has not, I imagine, seen sufficient advantage to adopt them generally. So far as my experience goes, the majority of workers and the majority of employers are really decent people, and if both would think a little less of their imagined hardships, work a little harder and talk a little less, our difficulties would be minimised, or at any rate become bearable. The Whitley and other systems would all be improved if a potent virus which was deadly to hot gossippers could be found and administered."

Nevertheless, there are many instances, which might be cited, where prominent employers have expressed emphatic approval of the Whitley Scheme in operation. Sir Alfred Mond (later Lord Melchett) said in 1927 :

"Let us extend, by compulsion if necessary, all these Whitley councils. Many do not like them. I have seen them installed

<sup>1</sup> Cf. J. F. W. Rowe, *Wages in Practice and Theory*, pp. 228-31.

and work very well. I remember when at the Office of Works we started one, it was feared that it would subvert discipline and lead to chaos. As a matter of fact, it led to the cessation of a great deal of friction by the friendly talking over of matters causing irritation, and even the most fire-eating K<sup>1</sup> who came there were much more reasonable than you would have expected when you got them to the table."<sup>1</sup>

Viscount Burnham contributes his testimony:

"It is the habit of mind and the habit of action which spring from the Joint Industrial Councils, if they are on sufficiently broad a scale, that make them, to my mind, the best expedient we have yet devised for the future of our industrial relations."<sup>2</sup>

Despite these expressions of approval, it must be admitted that the majority of the employers have not endorsed the Whitley Scheme, and are apathetic towards the movement. Still, there are indications that, among those who have become members of Whitley councils, many look with more favour upon the Scheme than they did in its earlier days of operation.<sup>3</sup> Some, who thought there were dangers in applying the Scheme to their establishments, have apparently learned from experience under the Whitley council system that these dangers were overestimated.

The present situation, therefore, shows indifference on the part of most employers, hostility on the side of some, and a growing approval in the case of a majority of those who have taken part in the application of the Scheme to their business.

Conflicting experiences and points of view have made the present attitude of labour towards Whitleyism a confusing one. On the one hand are the labour representatives who have been connected with joint industrial councils. Those who are still members of councils are almost unanimous in agreeing that the Scheme is of much value to the work-people, and should be extended. They testify to its assistance in organising labour and its importance in preventing disputes. One of them exclaimed at an interview: "Whitleyism has saved my union many thousands of

<sup>1</sup> Sir Alfred Mond, *Industry and Politics*, p. 65.

<sup>2</sup> *Towards Industrial Peace*, p. 249.

<sup>3</sup> Numerous interviews with individual employers have confirmed this.

pounds, that would have gone out in strikes if our trade had had no Whitley council." To the contrary, some of the bitterest criticisms have come from trade unionists, who were once members of councils now defunct. Such labour leaders seem disillusioned and resentful; their experiences have apparently led them to the view that there is no way out of the industrial deadlock through a joint council system, or any other peaceful method.

When we turn to the great mass of labour, not identified in any way with the Whitley Scheme, we find distrust, and, in cases, strong antagonism. By extreme socialists, Whitleyism is anathematised, as a conspiracy to preserve the accursed system of capitalism. What such workers desire is nationalisation; they hold that joint industrial councils are palliatives, working against the advent of the Socialist State. Guild socialists, whose fetish was the encroaching control of industry by the workers, were equally denunciatory of Whitleyism, as a capitalist trick to prevent what they desired.<sup>1</sup>

Trade unionism, on the whole, either stands aloof or is distrustful. It seems to fear that the co-operation involved in the Whitley Scheme may undermine the fighting spirit of labour.<sup>2</sup> Again, there is the claim that the joint industrial council system might become a source of weakness in the trade union movement through lessening inducements to join the unions, or through bringing about action by separate industries, contrary to the general trade union policy.<sup>3</sup>

Some of the antagonism to the Whitley Scheme on the part of organised labour has now been lessened by the evidence which has been given by trade unionists, who, as members of Whitley councils, have come to realise the usefulness of the Scheme to labour. In addition, prominent labour leaders, like Ramsay MacDonald, Ben Turner, and Arthur Henderson, have publicly expressed their approval of Whitley council work. The present stand of the Labour

<sup>1</sup> Cf. G. D. H. Cole, *Chaos and Order in Industry*, p. 127.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. J. F. W. Rowe, *Wages in Practice and Theory*, p. 232.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. B. G. de Montgomery, *British and Continental Labour Policy*, p. 469.

and work very well. I remember when at the Office of Works we started one, it was feared that it would subvert discipline and lead to chaos. As a matter of fact, it led to the cessation of a great deal of friction by the friendly talking over of matters points causing irritation, and even the most fire-eating R.F. who came there were much more reasonable than you would have expected when you got them to the table."<sup>1</sup>

Viscount Burnham contributes his testimony:

"It is the habit of mind and the habit of action which spring from the Joint Industrial Councils, if they are on sufficiently broad a scale, that make them, to my mind, the best expedient we have yet devised for the future of our industrial relations."<sup>2</sup>

Despite these expressions of approval, it must be admitted that the majority of the employers have not endorsed the Whitley Scheme, and are apathetic towards the movement. Still, there are indications that, among those who have become members of Whitley councils, many look with more favour upon the Scheme than they did in its earlier days of operation.<sup>3</sup> Some, who thought there were dangers in applying the Scheme to their establishments, have apparently learned from experience under the Whitley council system that these dangers were overestimated.

The present situation, therefore, shows indifference on the part of most employers, hostility on the side of some, and a growing approval in the case of a majority of those who have taken part in the application of the Scheme to their business.

Conflicting experiences and points of view have made the present attitude of labour towards Whitleyism a confusing one. On the one hand are the labour representatives who have been connected with joint industrial councils. Those who are still members of councils are almost unanimous in agreeing that the Scheme is of much value to the workpeople, and should be extended. They testify to its assistance in organising labour and its importance in preventing disputes. One of them exclaimed at an interview: "Whitleyism has saved my union many thousands of

<sup>1</sup> Sir Alfred Mond, *Industry and Politics*, p. 65.

<sup>2</sup> *Towards Industrial Peace*, p. 249.

<sup>3</sup> Numerous interviews with individual employers have confirmed this.



pounds, that would have gone out in strikes if our trade had had no Whitley council." To the contrary, some of the bitterest criticisms have come from trade unionists, who were once members of councils now defunct. Such labour leaders seem disillusioned and resentful; their experiences have apparently led them to the view that there is no way out of the industrial deadlock through a joint council system, or any other peaceful method.

When we turn to the great mass of labour, not identified in any way with the Whitley Scheme, we find distrust, and, in cases, strong antagonism. By extreme socialists, Whitleyism is anathematised, as a conspiracy to preserve the accursed system of capitalism. What such workers desire is nationalisation; they hold that joint industrial councils are palliatives, working against the advent of the Socialist State. Guild socialists, whose fetish was the encroaching control of industry by the workers, were equally denunciatory of Whitleyism, as a capitalist trick to prevent what they desired.<sup>1</sup>

Trade unionism, on the whole, either stands aloof or is distrustful. It seems to fear that the co-operation involved in the Whitley Scheme may undermine the fighting spirit of labour.<sup>2</sup> Again, there is the claim that the joint industrial council system might become a source of weakness in the trade union movement through lessening inducements to join the unions, or through bringing about action by separate industries, contrary to the general trade union policy.<sup>3</sup>

Some of the antagonism to the Whitley Scheme on the part of organised labour has now been lessened by the evidence which has been given by trade unionists, who, as members of Whitley councils, have come to realise the usefulness of the Scheme to labour. In addition, prominent labour leaders, like Ramsay MacDonald, Ben Turner, and Arthur Henderson, have publicly expressed their approval of Whitley council work. The present stand of the Labour

<sup>1</sup> Cf. G. D. H. Cole, *Chaos and Order in Industry*, p. 127.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. J. F. W. Rowe, *Wages in Practice and Theory*, p. 232.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. B. G. de Montgomery, *British and Continental Labour Policy*, p. 469.

party seems to favour industrial co-operation, rather than trade conflicts.<sup>1</sup> Therefore, some improvement in the general position of Labour towards the Whitley Scheme can be recorded.

Nevertheless, it would be difficult to show that, at the present time, the attitude of labour and the trade unions is definitely in favour of Whitleyism. Rather, it seems that, while a minority approve of the joint council system, a considerable majority regard it as of little importance, and see in the councils a duplication of the old conciliation boards and conferences with no difference important enough to show any superiority. A smaller advanced labour group still maintain an undiminished hostility to the Whitley system.

The Government seems actuated by the attitude that it is advisable at present to take no lead in advancing the Whitley movement. It may be that the antagonistic stand of some employers and trade unionists has convinced the Government that the subject is best left in the background, in view of possible political complications.

The Ministry of Labour makes only a brief reference to the work of the Whitley Councils in each of its yearly Reports. In 1923, the Ministry published a Report on the Establishment and Progress of Joint Industrial Councils; and in 1925 it included a list of the existing Whitley councils in its Directory of Employers' Associations, Trade Unions and Joint Organisations. Nothing of outstanding importance with reference to the Whitley Scheme has been published by the Government since 1925. The *Ministry of Labour Gazette* has occasionally the briefest of references to the councils.<sup>2</sup> No record of Whitley council meetings is now given regularly in it, nor any description of work done by Whitley bodies. One might, at least, have expected the Ministry to publish a list of the councils functioning at date, and the names of councils that have ceased to function,

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Towards Industrial Peace*, p. 171.

<sup>2</sup> For 1926, the *Labour Gazette* gave three references to Reports of Proceedings of Joint Industrial Councils; for 1927, one reference; for 1928, two references; for 1929, three references. From 1919-24, those references were given monthly.

with explanations as to their breakdown. It appears unfortunate that publicity, which might be given to Whitleyism in the Ministry's annual Reports and monthly *Labour Gazettes*, is lacking. This lack of attention seems to illustrate the present attitude of the Government towards the Whitley Scheme—an attitude which may be characterised as a passive one.

To sum up the positions, past and present, taken by the three parties vitally concerned in the Whitley Scheme, the following résumé is given :

The Government, while making an effort at the beginning to assist the Scheme, apparently made use of it as an expedient to prevent trouble during the critical reconstruction period. The Government had to be forced before it would adopt the Scheme for its own Departments. It supported the programme of the Whitley Committee so far as the organised industries were concerned, but, in the case of the unorganised industries, it definitely rejected the Committee's proposals for them. At present, the Government appears to avoid stimulating the formation of new joint industrial councils ; and it seems to take a cautious attitude as regards its dealings with existing councils. Apparently it believes that the less interference it offers, the better it will be for its relationship with the industries of the country.

The employers, as a body, have never favoured the Scheme. The organised employers appeared satisfied with their relationships with the trade unions, and to see no advantages in the new proposals. The unorganised employers were constitutionally opposed to national wages bargaining, and to interference with their individual establishments. Advanced suggestions of some of the new councils also alarmed many employers. The opinion seems to exist among them at the present time that the Whitley system might be used to claim control of management, to force disclosure of business secrets, and to give political power to labour extremists.

The trade unionists, frightened by the shop stewards movement, appear to shrink from giving authority to any

rank-and-file movement, and away from the central organisations. The unions established their present status after years of struggle, and they are very jealous of it. Most of the trade unions seem inclined to leave the Whitley Scheme alone and to avoid complications which might result from a wider joint control of industrial affairs. Many unions seem to be at present opposed to the Industrial Councils Bill, as taking away from the power and prestige of trade unionism. In fact, the labour world, as a whole, takes little interest in the Whitley Scheme, and appears to consider it of trifling importance, as compared with other industrial schemes and problems.

## CHAPTER XVII

### THE FUTURE

THE Whitley Scheme, after its rapid development during the first three years of its existence, has made little further headway. It is true that the idea of Whitleyism has spread to a limited degree ; but it must be frankly admitted that there appears to be slight evidence to show that in the future the joint industrial councils system will be extended much further over British industry.

Apparently the blame for this lack of progress cannot justly be ascribed to a failure of the Whitley Committee to offer material suggestions for the improvement of industrial relations, nor to the incompetence of the system they recommended. Claims of the potential value of the Whitley concept have been advanced in this book. Some evidence has been offered to show that the industries which have adopted the Whitley Scheme have been benefited by it. Cases of useful work done by the industrial councils have been cited, and possibilities of future usefulness have been suggested. Nevertheless, the fact remains that the outlook for the future of the Whitley Scheme appears anything but rosy.

While the industrial depression may have had its share in producing this check to the growth of Whitleyism, and a certain amount of active opposition may have contributed, the chief reason for the lack of assurance of its future success will probably be found in the indifference displayed by many of those concerned. This indifference threatens danger to the continued success of the Whitley Scheme. Lack of interest tends to dampen the enthusiasm of ardent

supporters of the Scheme, and to weaken the whole movement. Under it, council meetings may become lessened in numbers, and council work may be carried out in a merely perfunctory manner. Unless the existing apathy can, in some way, be changed into interest, to be followed by an active support, the fulfilment of the hope for the further extension of Whitleyism appears improbable.

However, it does not seem certain that it is impossible to find some measure by means of which the present state of stagnation may be transformed into activity. Among the various suggestions offered, three proposals have been made, any one of which appears to offer a possible solution of the problem.

As has been indicated elsewhere, the passage of the Industrial Councils Bill, or of some corresponding measure, might give the fillip needed to stimulate industry into a forward movement towards the spread of Whitleyism. The enactment of such a measure should remove one great disability now handicapping the councils—the knowledge that their decisions may not be carried out by all in the industry. Added prestige, resulting from an Act to correct this, might considerably increase the incentive for the adoption of the Scheme. It may, perhaps, be urged that, in view of the feeling against compulsion, an Act for the enforcement of council decisions would militate against the popularity of the councils, instead of adding to their prestige. But, as has been pointed out,<sup>1</sup> under the proposed Bill, the voluntary principle is, to a large extent, retained. The added power given to the councils should more than compensate for any feeling that their voluntary status had been impinged upon. The granting of this power might prove to be the one reform necessary for the further development of the Whitley Scheme.

Again, the formation of some national joint body representing all industry might be the essential needed. The National Industrial Council proposed by the Melchett-Turner Conference would be such a body. A central Parliament, provided with a competent staff of experts

<sup>1</sup> See page 110.

and investigators, could make a thorough investigation of the Whitley Scheme and its value.

Their report, if favourable, might provide the impetus required for the extension of Whitleyism.

The importance of a centralised body is recognised by the present Whitley councils. The industrial Councils Bill of 1924, originated by the Association of Joint Industrial Councils, provided for the establishment by the Minister of Labour of a "central industrial board," to give assistance and advice in the general work of the councils, to act as an arbitration board when requested, and to be the recognised adviser to the Government on industrial and economic questions. If such a board were established, its extent of representation might be made wide enough to link up all industrial joint bodies with each other, and with the Government, in such a manner as to ensure uniform policies and a permanent improvement in industrial relations, through a widespread application of the principles of the Whitley Scheme.

A third suggested measure for the spread of Whitleyism is a Government campaign for the development of the Whitley Scheme, with aggressive action for the formation of new industrial councils and the revival of defunct ones.

The central Government is a suitable organising agent to conduct a Whitley councils campaign. A great deal of knowledge about the working of the Scheme could be collected from the records of the various Government Departments. The Ministry of Labour has had much experience in the organisation of industrial bodies, and its past work for Whitley councils should prove invaluable for future activities along the same lines. The Government statistical machinery is well constituted to collect, co-ordinate and make available the data required. Small groups of employers or trade unionists, enthusiastic for the spread of Whitleyism, would be far more likely to arouse suspicion as to their motives than a neutral body like the Government. This seems especially true in the case of the councils which have been disbanded; members of a trade who attempted to revive the defunct Whitley

council of that trade might not be considered impartial, and might incur distrust and suspicion from the outset. Provided a State Department undertook the responsibility, suspicion as to its ulterior motives could not reasonably be entertained. If the Ministry of Labour would take up the responsibility of conducting a campaign for the extension of the Whitley system, more industrial councils might be established, and the Whitley Scheme might obtain an extension to some of the larger industries which have thus far refused its application.

The present councils realise the importance of State assistance for expansion. The Report of the meeting of the Association of Joint Industrial Councils, Etc., for June, 1927, records the following resolution :

“That with a view of securing the co-operation, unity and stability in industry, the Association . . . strongly urges upon the Minister of Labour to recirculate to the various Trade Organisation in industries in which Industrial Councils are not in existence, the Reports of the Whitley Committee and the various explanatory covering letters from the Ministry in which the establishment of such Councils is advocated by H.M. Government.”

Any movement for the spread of Whitleyism will apparently depend for its success upon an awakened interest in the Scheme. To arouse general interest, there seems to be the need of greater publicity, and of education as to the advantages that might be obtained from an extension of the system of joint industrial councils.

Although Whitley councils are functioning in many industries and services, there is considerable lack of knowledge about the objects and achievements of these bodies. Even in industries where the councils exist, there are still many who are ignorant of the capabilities of the movement. Their enlightenment seems essential.

In Germany, after the passage of the Works Councils Act, one of the chief obstacles encountered was the inadequate intellectual equipment of the workers as to social and economic questions which concerned their councils. To overcome this difficulty, the trade unions set up special



works councils schools, for training those responsible for the guidance of the councils.<sup>1</sup> Some such measure in Great Britain might prove well worth while. Valuable assistance might be found in lectures, or classes, or even pamphlets, explaining the Whitley Scheme, commenting on the intentions of its authors, and giving examples of the application of the Scheme to many social and economic questions which have arisen. Education in the better appreciation of inter-industrial problems, and of the broad questions that concern all industry, seems very desirable. Its spread throughout the country, and its application to the Whitley Scheme, should help towards arousing the general interest which is required before a forward movement for Whitleyism can be made with any decisive returns.

The foregoing suggestions as to a possible extension of the Whitley Scheme brings us to the end of this chapter, and of the book. In closing, it may be pointed out that the Whitley councils system has had fourteen years of life. The fact that a large proportion of its councils are still functioning offers evidence of the vitality of the Scheme. Even if some of the councils may be little more than useful conciliation agencies, many of these are active in industries which had no permanent conciliatory bodies before their creation.

It is urged that the joint industrial councils have the following features to their credit :

(a) They are agencies for their industries which are recognised by the Government and by the industry itself.

(b) They hold joint meetings during periods of peace—not merely *ad hoc* meetings in times of industrial unrest.

(c) They have assisted in advancing organisation and collective bargaining.

(d) Their records offer evidence that they have helped to lessen strife in their industries.

From this list it seems apparent that a considerable part of the design of the originators of the Whitley Scheme has been carried out with beneficial results.

The Scheme was a conception of co-operation between

<sup>1</sup> Cf. M. Barthelot, *Works Councils in Germany*, p. 60.

employers and workpeople, and its main object was industrial harmony, without which national progress seems unlikely. To secure such harmony, some joint representative system appears essential. It is difficult to believe that the two sides of industry will prefer industrial strife to a joint co-operation for the advancement of mutual interests. The Whitley Committee has offered them a useful system for the development of such co-operation. If they fail to make use of this system, or of some corresponding method of preserving harmony, the blame for the disaster which may follow should be theirs.

## APPENDIX I

### LIST OF WHITLEY COUNCILS ESTABLISHED

NATIONAL COUNCILS		Established in :
1.	Painters and Decorators . . . . .	1917
2.	Pottery . . . . .	1918
3.	Building . . . . .	"
4.	Rubber . . . . .	"
5.	Gold, Silver, Horological, etc. . . . .	"
6.	Match Manufacture . . . . .	"
7.	Silk . . . . .	"
8.	Furniture Manufacture . . . . .	"
9.	Heavy Chemicals . . . . .	"
10.	Bread Baking, etc. (England and Wales) . . . . .	"
11.	Paint, Colour and Varnish . . . . .	"
12.	Vehicle Building . . . . .	"
13.	China Clay . . . . .	"
14.	Hosiery (England) . . . . .	"
15.	Metallic Bedsteads . . . . .	"
16.	Bobbin and Shuttle Making . . . . .	"
17.	Made-up Leather Goods . . . . .	"
18.	Baking (Scotland) . . . . .	"
19.	Woollen and Worsted (Scotland) . . . . .	"
20.	Hosiery (Scotland) . . . . .	"
21.	Sawmilling . . . . .	1919
22.	Wallpaper . . . . .	"
23.	Wool and Allied Textile . . . . .	"
24.	Tin Mining . . . . .	"
25.	Electrical Contracting . . . . .	"
26.	Packing Case Making . . . . .	"
27.	Elastic Web, Cord, etc. . . . .	"
28.	Welsh Plate and Sheet . . . . .	"
29.	Road Transport . . . . .	"
30.	Asbestos . . . . .	"
31.	Coir Mat and Matting . . . . .	"

		Established in :
32.	Local Authorities Non-Trading Services (Manual Workers) (England and Wales)	1919
33.	Waterworks	"
34.	Gas	"
35.	Electricity Supply	"
36.	Heating and Domestic Engineering	"
37.	Spelter Trade	"
38.	Flour Milling	"
39.	Boot and Shoe Manufacture	"
40.	Iron and Steel Wire Manufacture	"
41.	Music Trades	"
42.	Printing and Allied Trades	"
43.	Needle, Fish Hooks, etc.	"
44.	Carpets	"
45.	Wrought Hollow-Ware	"
46.	Civil Service	"
47.	Electrical Cable Making	"
48.	Tramways	"
49.	Quarrying	"
50.	H.M. Office of Works	"
51.	Admiralty	"
52.	Cement	"
53.	Maritime Service	"
54.	Ministry of Munitions	1920
55.	Local Authorities, Administrative, etc., Services (England and Wales)	"
56.	Glass	"
57.	Entertainments	"
58.	Air Ministry	"
59.	Surgical Instruments	"
60.	Soap and Candles	"
61.	Cooperage	"
62.	War Office	"
63.	Process Engraving	"
64.	H.M. Stationery Office	"
65.	Electricity Supply Joint Board (Staff)	"
66.	Insurance Committees	"
67.	Local Authorities Administrative, etc., Services (Scotland)	"
68.	Local Authorities Non-Trading Services (Scotland)	"
69.	Government Miscellaneous Trade	"
70.	Government Engineering Trade	"
71.	Government Shipbuilding Trade	"
72.	Government Building Trade	"
73.	Co-ordination Committee for Government Industrial Establishments	"

**WHITLEY COUNCILS ESTABLISHED 201**

		Established in :
74.	Lock, Latch and Key . . . . .	1920
75.	Dock Labour . . . . .	"
76.	Gas Mantles . . . . .	1921
77.	Seed Crushing and Compound Cake . . . . .	"
78.	Glove Manufacture . . . . .	"
79.	Papermaking . . . . .	"
80.	Lead Manufacture . . . . .	"
81.	Furniture Warehousing and Removing . . . . .	1925
82.	Cast Stone.. . . .	1928
83.	Printing Ink and Roller Making . . . . .	1929

**SECTIONAL TRADE COUNCILS**

- 84. Plastering Industry.
- 85. Plumbing Trade.

**LOCAL COUNCILS**

- 86. Lancashire and Cheshire Local Authorities Administrative, etc., Services.
- 87. London Area Making up and Packing of Textiles for Export.
- 88. London Local Authorities Administrative, etc., Services.
- 89. Midland Hosiery Bleaching, Dyeing and Finishing.
- 90. North Midland Brewery Workers.
- 91. North Midland Road Transport.
- 92. Scotland Road Transport.
- 93. West of Scotland Textiles.
- 94. West Riding Local Authorities Administrative, etc., Services.

## APPENDIX II

### LIST OF WHITLEY COUNCILS WHICH HAVE CEASED TO FUNCTION

1. Baking (Scotland).
2. Bread Baking and Flour Confectionery (England and Wales).
3. Building Trade.<sup>1</sup>
4. Carpet Industry.<sup>2</sup>
5. Elastic Web, Cord and Smallware Fabric.
6. Entertainments.
7. Furniture Manufacture.
8. Gas Mantles.
9. Gold, Silver, Horological, etc.
10. Glass.
11. Hosiery (Scotland).
12. Iron and Steel Wire Manufacture.
13. Local Authorities Administrative, etc., Services (England and Wales).<sup>3</sup>
14. Local Authorities Administrative, etc., Services (Scotland).
15. Local Authorities Non-Trading Services (Scotland).
16. Made-Up Leather Goods.
17. Ministry of Munitions.<sup>4</sup>
18. Music Trades.
19. Packing Case Making.
20. Painters and Decorators.
21. Paper Making.
22. Road Transport.<sup>5</sup>
23. Rubber.
24. Sawmilling.
25. Spelter Trade.
26. Surgical Instruments.

<sup>1</sup> The Plumbing and Plastering Sectional Councils are still active.

<sup>2</sup> Three of its district councils still functioning.

<sup>3</sup> Councils exist for three local areas.

<sup>4</sup> Incorporated with the War Department.

<sup>5</sup> The local councils for Scotland and North Midlands are still active.

COUNCILS WHICH HAVE CEASED 203

27. Tin Mining.
28. Vehicle Building.
29. Woollen and Worsted (Scotland).
30. Wrought Hollow Ware.

(The Making-up and Packing of Textiles for Export J.I.C., which was formed in 1922 from the Industrial Reconstruction Committee of that industry, while given up as a national body, still continues for the London Area.)

## APPENDIX III

### DIRECTORY OF WHITLEY COUNCILS

(As at September, 1931)

#### ASSOCIATION OF JOINT INDUSTRIAL COUNCILS AND INTERIM RECONSTRUCTION COMMITTEES

*Hon. Sec.* : Fred. H. Hand (Pottery J.I.C.),  
6, Glebe Street, Stoke-on-Trent

Founded  
in :

#### NATIONAL COUNCILS

- 1919 ASBESTOS INDUSTRY J.I.C.  
*Employers' Sec.* : C. W. Rooke & Co., 2, Norfolk Street,  
Strand, W.C.2.  
*Workpeople's Sec.* : J. Lund, 57, Ardwick Green,  
N. Ardwick, Manchester.
- 1918 BOBBIN AND SHUTTLE MAKING INDUSTRY J.I.C.  
*Employers' Sec.* : L. D. Kidson, F.C.A., 1, Booth Street,  
Manchester.  
*Workpeople's Sec.* : T. Hurley, 28, Beryl Street, Roe Lee,  
Blackburn, Lancs.
- 1919 BOOT AND SHOE MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY J.I.C.  
*Employers' Sec.* : Miss R. Tomlinson, M.B.E., 7, Tavistock  
Square, W.C.1.  
*Workpeople's Sec.* : George Chester, 34, Guilford Street,  
W.C.1.
- 1928 CAST STONE INDUSTRY J.I.C.  
*Sec.* : C. E. New, 20, Bucklersbury, E.C.4.
- 1919 CEMENT MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY J.I.C.  
*Sec.* : H. M. Brabant, 4, Southampton Row, Kings-  
way, W.C.1.
- 1918 CHEMICAL TRADE J.I.C.  
*Employers' Sec.* : R. Lloyd Roberts, Imperial Chemical  
House, Millbank, S.W.1.  
*Workpeople's Sec.* : W. T. Kelly, M.P., Workers' Union,  
26, Crofton Road, S.E.5.



Founded

in :

- 1918 CHINA CLAY INDUSTRY J.I.C.  
*Sec.* : Samuel Benson, The Old House, St. Austell, Cornwall.
- 1919 COIR MAT AND MATTING INDUSTRY J.I.C.  
*Employers' Sec.* : A. W. Cooper, Blind Employment Factory, 246-50, Waterloo Road, S.E.1.  
*Workpeople's Sec.* : W. J. Shingfield, 2, Victoria Chambers, 8, High Street, Colchester.
- 1920 COOPERAGE INDUSTRY J.I.C.  
*Sec.* : T. C. Jones, 7, Bromley Street, Commercial Road, E.1.
- 1920 DOCK LABOUR J.I.C.  
*Sec.* : Chas. Cullen, P.L.A. Building, Savage Gardens, E.C.3.
- 1919 ELECTRICAL CABLE MAKING INDUSTRY J.I.C.  
*Employers' Sec.* : Chas. Pipkin, Hamilton House, Victoria Embankment, E.C.4.  
*Workpeople's Sec.* : H. McCale, 27, Kemble Street, Prescott, Lancs.
- 1919 ELECTRICAL CONTRACTING INDUSTRY J.I.C.  
*Employers' Sec.* : L. C. Penwill, 23, Bedford Square, W.C.1.  
*Workpeople's Sec.* : J. Rowan, 11, Macaulay Road, Clapham Common, S.W.4.
- 1919 ELECTRICITY SUPPLY INDUSTRY J.I.C.  
*Sec.* : A. de Turkheim, 58, Abbey House, Victoria Street, S.W.1.
- 1920 ELECTRICITY SUPPLY INDUSTRY NATIONAL JOINT BOARD : EMPLOYERS AND STAFF.  
*Sec.* : H. B. Keeping, F.C.A., 18 and 19, Ironmonger Lane, E.C.2.
- 1919 FLOUR MILLING INDUSTRY J.I.C.  
*Sec.* : Capt. L. H. Green, 26-28, Kings Road, Chelsea, S.W.3.
- 1925 FURNITURE WAREHOUSING AND REMOVING INDUSTRY J.I.C.  
*Employers' Sec.* : E. A. Harris, Howard House, 4, Arundel Street, Strand, W.C.2.  
*Workpeople's Sec.* : J. E. Corrin, Transport House, Smith Square, S.W.1.
- 1919 GAS INDUSTRY J.I.C.  
*Employers' Sec.* : W. J. Smith, 30, Grosvenor Gardens, S.W.1.  
*Workpeople's Sec.* : Arthur Hayday, M.P., 1, St. James's Street, Nottingham.

Founded  
in:

- 1921 GLOVE MAKING INDUSTRY J.I.C.  
*Sec.*: J. C. Mason, Court Chambers, 180, Corporation Street, Birmingham.
- 1919 HEATING AND DOMESTIC ENGINEERING J.I.C.  
*Sec.*: J. Watson, 22, Broadway, Westminster, S.W.1.
- 1918 HOSIERY TRADE J.I.C.  
*Sec.*: M. R. Allard, 13, Welford Road, Leicester.
- 1921 LEAD MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY J.I.C.  
*Sec.*: J. C. Burleigh, 71, Queen Street, E.C.4.
- 1920 LOCK, LATCH AND KEY INDUSTRY J.I.C.  
*Employers' Sec.*: V. B. Beaumont, Chamber of Commerce, Metropolitan Chambers, Lichfield Street, Wolverhampton.  
*Workpeople's Sec.*: Samuel Penzer, 45, Market Place, Willenhall, Staffs.
- 1918 MATCH MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY J.I.C.  
*Sec.*: Miss E. Broad, Bryant & May, Ltd., Fairfield Works, Bow, E.3.
- 1918 METALLIC BEDSTEAD INDUSTRY J.I.C.  
*Employers' Sec.*: C. F. Oakley, City Works, Hertford Street, Balsall Heath, Birmingham.  
*Workpeople's Sec.*: Wm. Palmer, 17, Stafford Street, Birmingham.
- 1919 NATIONAL MARITIME BOARD J.I.C.  
*Sec.*: G. A. Vallance, 3 and 4, Clements Inn, W.C.2.
- 1919 NATIONAL WOOL (& ALLIED) TEXTILE INDUSTRIAL COUNCIL.  
*Employers' Sec.*: E. J. Martin, Commerce House, Bradford, Yorks.  
*Workpeople's Sec.*: Arthur Shaw, J.P., 84, Godwin Street, Bradford.
- 1919 NEEDLE, FISHHOOK, FISHING TACKLE AND ALLIED TRADES J.I.C.  
*Sec.*: C. E. Knight, 99, Rectory Road, Redditch, Worcestershire.
- 1918 PAINT, COLOUR AND VARNISH INDUSTRY J.I.C.  
*Sec.*: J. B. Graham, M.C., Tavistock House North, Tavistock Square, W.C.1.
- 1918 POTTERY INDUSTRY J.I.C.  
*Sec.*: F. H. Hand, 6, Glebe Street, Stoke-on-Trent.
- 1919 PRINTING AND ALLIED TRADES OF THE UNITED KINGDOM J.I.C.  
*Employers' Sec.*: F. H. Bisset, 7-10, Old Bailey, E.C.4.  
*Workpeople's Sec.*: A. E. Holmes, 60, Doughty Street, W.C.1.

Founded

in :

- 1929 PRINTING INK AND ROLLER MAKING INDUSTRY J.I.C.  
*Employers' Sec.* : J. F. Hudson, Dacre House, 5, Arundel Street, Strand, W.C.2.  
*Workpeople's Sec.* : J. Hobday, Natsopa House, 46, Blackfriars Road, S.E.1.
- 1920 PROCESS ENGRAVING TRADE J.I.C.  
*Employers' Sec.* : A. E. Dent, Room 268, Bank Chambers, 329, High Holborn, W.C.1.  
*Workpeople's Sec.* : R. Kneale, 54, Doughty Street, W.C.1.
- 1919 QUARRYING INDUSTRY J.I.C.  
*Sec.* : A. E. Dalzell, 52, Prescott Street, Halifax, Yorks.
- 1921 SEED CRUSHING AND COMPOUND CAKE MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY J.I.C.  
*Employers' Sec.* : A. E. Shears, India House, 84, Leadenhall Street, E.C.3.  
*Workpeople's Sec.* : Ald. L. Hogan, Spekeland Buildings, 2, Coopers' Row, Liverpool.
- 1918 SILK INDUSTRY J.I.C.  
*Employers' Sec.* : W. T. Butterfield, 9, Market Street, Bradford, Yorks.  
*Workpeople's Sec.* : T. Birch, "Foxlowe," Market Place, Leek, Staffs.
- 1920 SOAP AND CANDLE TRADES J.I.C.  
*Employers' Sec.* : J. Findlater, Belmont Works, Battersea, S.W.11.  
*Workpeople's Sec.* : W. Jones, "Oakley," Wilmslow Road, Fallowfield, Manchester.
- 1919 TRAMWAY INDUSTRY J.I.C.  
*Employers' Sec.* : J. Becket, 3 and 4, Clement's Inn, Strand, W.C.2.  
A. De Turkheim, 58, Abbey House, Victoria Street, Westminster, S.W.1.  
*Workpeople's Sec.* : H. E. Clay, Transport House, Smith Square, Westminster, S.W.1.
- 1919 WALL PAPER MAKERS' INDUSTRIAL COUNCIL.  
*Employers' Sec.* : J. T. Chasney, Wallpaper Mfrs., Ltd., 125, High Holborn, W.C.1.  
*Workpeople's Sec.* : Chas. Keen, J.P., 5, Regent Street, Salford, Lancs.
- 1919 WATERWORKS UNDERTAKINGS INDUSTRY J.I.C.  
*Employers' Sec.* : R. P. Morgan, British Waterworks Association, 173, Rosebery Avenue, E.C.1.  
*Workpeople's Sec.* : A. Winfield, J.P., 59, Kennington Road, S.W.1.

Founded  
in:

- 1919 WELSH TINPLATE AND SHEET TRADES J.I.C.  
*Employers' Sec.*: H. C. Thomas, 23-29, Royal Metal Exchange, Swansea.  
*Workpeople's Sec.*: T. W. Hughes, Transport House, 19, Northampton Place, St. Helen's Road, Swansea.

#### SECTIONAL TRADE COUNCILS (NATIONAL)

- 1918 NATIONAL JOINT COUNCIL FOR THE PLASTERING INDUSTRY.  
*Employers' Sec.*: W. Hill, 13, Hartington Road, Spital, Chesterfield.  
*Workpeople's Sec.*: A. H. Telling, 37, Albert Street, Mornington Crescent, N.W.1.
- 1918 NATIONAL JOINT INDUSTRIAL COUNCIL FOR THE PLUMBING TRADE.  
*Sec.*: H. Blackman, 81, Gower Street, W.C.1.

#### PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION COUNCILS

- 1919 NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR THE ADMINISTRATIVE AND LEGAL DEPARTMENTS OF THE CIVIL SERVICE.  
*Sec. (Official Side)*: B. W. Gilbert, Treasury, Whitehall, S.W.1.  
*Secs. (Staff Side)*: G. Chase, Parliament Mansions, Victoria Street, S.W.1.  
 A. C. Winyard, Parliament Mansions, Victoria Street, S.W.1.

#### GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTAL INDUSTRIAL COUNCILS

- 1919 ADMIRALTY DEPARTMENTAL INDUSTRIAL COUNCIL.  
*Sec. (Official Side)*: N. Macleod, Admiralty, S.W.1.  
*Sec. (Employees' Side)*: Counc. A. G. Gourd, 43, Fratton Road, Portsmouth, Hants.
- 1920 AIR MINISTRY INDUSTRIAL WHITLEY COUNCIL.  
*Sec. (Official Side)*: J. T. Cotton, Air Ministry, Adastral House, Kingsway, W.C.4.  
*Sec. (Employees' Side)*: S. Bradley, Amalgamated Engineering Union, 110, Peckham Road, S.E.15.
- 1919 H.M. OFFICE OF WORKS JOINT INDUSTRIAL COUNCIL.  
*Sec. (Official Side)*: H. W. Spencer, H.M. Office of Works, Whitehall, S.W.1.  
*Sec. (Employees' Side)*: H. P. Boulton, Elect. Trades Union, 7, Kilburn Square, N.W.6.

Founded  
in:

- 1920 H.M. STATIONERY OFFICE DEPARTMENTAL INDUSTRIAL COUNCIL.  
*Sec. (Official Side)*: W. Broadbent, H.M. Stationery Office, Princes Street, Westminster, S.W.1.  
*Sec. (Employees' Side)*: A. E. Holmes, 60, Doughty Street, W.C.1.
- 1920 WAR DEPARTMENT GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL COUNCIL.  
*Sec. (Official Side)*: H. Wilson, War Office, Whitehall, S.W.1.  
*Sec. (Employees' Side)*: B. Russell, J.P., 78A, King's Road, Reading.

GOVERNMENT TRADE JOINT COUNCILS.

- 1920 GOVERNMENT BUILDING TRADE JOINT COUNCIL.  
*Sec. (Official Side)*: H. Parker, M.C., Treasury, Whitehall, S.W.1.  
*Sec. (Staff Side)*: G. C. West, 4, Czar Street, Deptford, S.E.8.
- 1920 GOVERNMENT ENGINEERING TRADE JOINT COUNCIL.  
*Sec. (Official Side)*: H. Parker, M.C., Treasury, Whitehall, S.W.1.  
*Sec. (Staff Side)*: Major A. G. Church, 25, Victoria Street, Westminster, S.W.1.
- 1920 GOVERNMENT SHIPBUILDING TRADE JOINT COUNCIL.  
*Sec. (Official Side)*: N. Macleod, Admiralty, S.W.1.  
*Sec. (Staff Side)*: M. T. Greenwell, Electrical Trades Union, 11, Macaulay Road, S.W.4.
- 1920 GOVERNMENT MISCELLANEOUS TRADE JOINT COUNCIL.  
*Sec. (Official Side)*: H. Parker, M.C., Treasury, Whitehall, S.W.1.  
*Sec. (Staff Side)*: A. G. Gourd, J.P., 45, Fratton Road, Portsmouth.
- 1920 TRADE JOINT COUNCIL OF THE CO-ORDINATION COMMITTEE FOR GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL ESTABLISHMENTS.  
*Sec. (Official Side)*: H. Parker, M.C., Treasury, Whitehall, S.W.1.  
*Sec. (Staff Side)*: Miss M. J. Symons, Nat. Union of General Workers, 28, Tavistock Square, W.C.1.

LOCAL AUTHORITY SERVICES

NATIONAL COUNCILS.

- 1920 NATIONAL JOINT COUNCIL FOR INSURANCE COMMITTEES' ADMINISTRATIVE, TECHNICAL AND CLERICAL SERVICES.  
*Sec.*: E. Potts, 20, New Elvet, Durham.

Founded  
in :

- 1919 NATIONAL J.I.C. FOR LOCAL AUTHORITIES NON-TRADING SERVICES (MANUAL WORKERS).  
*Sec.* : G. B. Cottier, Stone House, Bishopsgate, E.C.2.

PROVINCIAL COUNCILS.

- 1921 LONDON DISTRICT COUNCIL FOR LOCAL AUTHORITIES ADMINISTRATIVE, TECHNICAL AND CLERICAL SERVICES.  
*Hon. Sec.* : W. Rowarth, Town Hall, Pancras Road, N.W.1.
- 1921 PROVINCIAL WHITLEY COUNCIL FOR LANCASHIRE AND CHESHIRE LOCAL AUTHORITIES ADMINISTRATIVE, TECHNICAL AND CLERICAL SERVICES.  
*Employers' Sec.* : Edw. Bishop, Town Hall, Manchester.  
*Staff Side Sec.* : H. Corser, Atlantic Chambers, Brazenose Street, Manchester.
- 1920 WEST RIDING JOINT COUNCIL FOR LOCAL AUTHORITIES ADMINISTRATIVE TECHNICAL AND CLERICAL SERVICES.  
*Sec.* : W. Donnan, Parkland Drive, Meanwood, Leeds.

DISTRICT (ONLY) COUNCILS.

- DISTRICT INDUSTRIAL COUNCIL FOR THE WEST OF SCOTLAND TEXTILE INDUSTRY.  
*Sec.* : N. Carrick Anderson, 34, West George Street, Glasgow.
- JOINT INDUSTRIAL (DISTRICT) COUNCIL FOR THE INDUSTRIES OF MAKING-UP AND PACKING OF TEXTILES FOR EXPORT, AND OF CLOTH WORKING IN TRUST AND/OR ON COMMISSION, LONDON AREA.  
*Sec.* : Toy, Campbell & Co., 16 and 17, South Street, E.C.2.
- MIDLAND JOINT INDUSTRIAL COUNCIL OF THE HOSIERY BLEACHING, DYEING AND FINISHING INDUSTRY.  
*Sec.* : R. B. Baggaley, Armitage Chambers, Victoria Street, Nottingham.
- NORTH MIDLAND AREA INDOOR BREWERY WORKERS J.I.C.  
*Employers' Sec.* : Capt. P. T. W. Adams, 6, Byron Chambers, Beast Market Hill, Nottingham.  
*Workpeople's Sec.* : Counc. J. T. Edlin, Newstead House, 76, St. James' Street, Nottingham.
- NORTH MIDLAND ROAD TRANSPORT JOINT BOARD.  
*Employers' Sec.* : J. H. Trease, Bank Chambers, Pelham Street, Nottingham.  
*Workpeople's Sec.* : W. Habgood, Trinity Buildings, Trinity Street, Nottingham.

DIRECTORY OF WHITLEY COUNCILS 211

ROAD TRANSPORT, SCOTLAND, J.I.C.

*Employers' Sec.* : D. MacKay, 190, West George Street, Glasgow.

*Workpeople's Sec.* : Hugh Lyon, 108, West Regent Street, Glasgow.

MISCELLANEOUS ADDRESSES

ACTIVE INDUSTRIAL RECONSTRUCTION COMMITTEES

CLAY I.I.R.C.

*Secs.* : H. Halliday, Drayton House, 30, Gordon Street, W.C.1.

J. C. Mason, Court Chambers, 180, Corporation Street, Manchester.

COCOA, CHOCOLATE, SUGAR CONFECTIONERY AND JAM I.I.R.C.

*Sec.* : R. M. Leonard, 22, Buckingham Gate, S.W.1.

ENVELOPE AND MANUFACTURES STATIONERY I.I.R.C.

*Secs.* : B. Claydon, 69, Fleet Street, E.C.4.

T. G. Newland, 88, Nightingale Lane, S.W.12.

INACTIVE RECONSTRUCTION COMMITTEES WHOSE SECRETARIES ANSWER CORRESPONDENCE OFFICIALLY

FERTILISING I.I.R.C.

*Sec.* : I. King Stewart, 68-70, Fenchurch Street, E.C.3.

NON-FERROUS MINES I.I.R.C.

*Sec.* : A. N. D. Smith, F.C.A., 80, Finsbury Pavement, E.C.2.

OPTICAL INSTRUMENTS I.I.R.C.

*Sec.* : Miss M. J. Symons, National Union of General Workers (Women's Section), 28, Tavistock Square, W.C.1.

NATIONAL J.I.C.'s ABOUT WHOSE DISBANDMENT THERE IS DOUBT

CARPET INDUSTRY J.I.C.

*Secs.* : R. S. Brinton, Messrs. Brinton, Ltd., Kidderminster.

Ellis Crowther, Palatine Chambers, Halifax, Yorks.

GLASS (EXCLUSIVE OF PLATE AND SHEET GLASS) J.I.C.

*Secs.* : F. Redfern, Dunster House, 12, Mark Lane, E.C.3.

R. Fenton, 2, Wesley Street, Castleford.

**GLASS (SHEET AND PLATE) J.I.C.**

*Secs.* : J. Dickinson, Grove St., St. Helens, Lancs.  
T. Williamson, National Union of General Workers,  
99, Edge Lane, Liverpool.

**PAINTERS AND DECORATORS J.I.C. OF GREAT BRITAIN.**

*Sec.* : W. Mellor, 19, Brazenose St., Manchester.

**SURGICAL INSTRUMENTS J.I.C.**

*Secs.* : A. W. Down, 21-23, St. Thomas Street, S.E.1.  
Miss L. M. Emberton, 6, Holborn Viaduct, S.E.1.  
E. Cruse, Amalgamated Engineering Union, Premier  
House, 150, Southampton Row, W.C.1.

**ZINC AND SPELTER J.I.C.**

*Sec.* : C. Taylor, 1, Oxford Court, Cannon Street,  
E.C.3.



## APPENDIX IV

### LIST AS TO MEETINGS OF THE JOINT INDUSTRIAL COUNCIL

#### COUNCILS MEETING MONTHLY

Electrical Cable Making Industry.  
Electricity Supply Industry J.I.C.  
Electricity Supply Joint Board.  
Match Manufacturing Industry.

#### COUNCILS MEETING EVERY TWO MONTHS

Admiralty Industrial Joint Council.  
Government Shipbuilding Trade.  
Local Authorities Non-Trading Services (Manual Workers).

#### COUNCILS MEETING QUARTERLY

Cement Manufacturing Industry.  
Civil Service National Council.  
Cooperage Industry.  
Furniture Warehousing and Removing.  
Gas Industry.  
Glove Making Industry.  
Hosiery Trade.  
Insurance Committees' Services.  
Lancs. and Cheshire Local Authorities Administrative Services.  
Midland Hosiery Bleaching, Dyeing and Finishing Industry.  
North Midland Road Transport.  
Plumbing Trade.  
Pottery Industry.  
Printing and Allied Trades.  
Printing Ink and Roller Making.  
Quarrying Industry.  
Road Transport, Scotland.  
Seed Crushing and Compound Cake Manufacturing.  
Silk Industry.  
Wallpaper Makers' Industry.  
Waterworks Undertakings.

## APPENDIX IV

## COUNCILS MEETING HALF-YEARLY

Asbestos Industry.  
 Electrical Contracting Industry.  
 Heating and Domestic Engineers.  
 Paint, Colour and Varnish Trades.  
 Plastering Trade.  
 Process Engraving Trade.  
 West Riding Local Authorities Administrative, etc., Services.

## COUNCILS MEETING YEARLY

Cast Stone Industry.  
 Welsh Tin Plate and Sheet Trade.  
 West of Scotland Textile Council.

## COUNCILS NOT MEETING REGULARLY

## COUNCILS MEETING "QUARTERLY WHEN NECESSARY"

Air Ministry Industrial Council.  
 H.M. Stationery Office Departmental Council.  
 Making Up and Packing of Textiles for Export : (London Area).  
 London District J.C. for Local Authorities Services.

COUNCILS WHICH DO NOT MEET REGULARLY, BUT AS  
REQUIRED

Bobbin and Shuttle Making Industry.  
 Boot and Shoe Manufacturing Industry.  
 Cast Stone Industry.  
 Chemical Trade.  
 China Clay Industry.  
 Coir Mat and Matting Industry.  
 Dock Labour.  
 Flour Milling Industry.  
 Government Building Trade.  
 Government Co-ordination Committee.  
 Government Engineering Trade.  
 Government Miscellaneous Trade.  
 H.M. Office of Works.  
 Lead Manufacturing.  
 Lock, Latch and Key Industry.  
 Metallic Bedstead Industry.  
 National Maritime Board.  
 National Wool and Allied Textile.  
 Needle, Fishhook, Fishing Tackle and Allied Trades.  
 Soap and Candle Industry.  
 Tramway Industry.  
 War Department Industrial Council.

## APPENDIX V

### LIST AS TO COMMITTEES

#### JOINT INDUSTRIAL COUNCILS HAVING NO COMMITTEES

Asbestos Industry.  
Cast Stone Industry.  
Cement Manufacturing Industry.  
China Clay Industry.  
Co-ordination Committee for Government Establishments.  
Furniture Warehousing and Removing.  
Gas Industry.  
Government Building Trade.  
Government Engineering Trade.  
H.M. Office of Works.  
H.M. Stationery Office.  
Hosiery Trade.  
Metallic Bedstead Industry.  
Midland Hosiery Bleaching, Dyeing and Finishing.  
Plastering Trade.  
Road Transport, Scotland.

#### COUNCILS HAVING SPECIAL COMMITTEES ONLY "FOR MATTERS ARISING"

Boot and Shoe Manufacturing Industry.  
Chemical Trade.  
Electrical Contracting Industry.  
Government Miscellaneous Trade.  
Lock, Latch and Key Industry.  
Making up and Packing of Textiles for Export (London Area).  
Paint, Colour and Varnish Trades.  
Plumbing Trade.

#### COUNCILS HAVING COMMITTEES, AND TITLES OF COMMITTEES

Admiralty Departmental J.C. has a Yard Craft Sub-Committee ;  
an Alternative Work Committee, and "Others as Required."  
Bobbin and Shuttle Making Industry has Separate Committees  
for the Bobbin Making Section ; Shuttle Making Section ;  
and General Labouring Section.

Chemical Trade has an Executive Committee.

Civil Service National Council has these Committees :

1. General Purpose; 2. Reorganisation; 3. Superannuation; 4. Subsistence; 5. Machine Operators; 6. Typing Grades; 7. Writing Assistants. (1 and 2 are Standing Committees.)

Coir Mat and Matting Industry has an Executive Committee.

Cooperage Industry has a Standing Committee.

Dock Labour has an Executive Committee; National Conciliation Committee; and Local Registration Committees.

Electrical Cable Making has a Negotiating Committee.

Electricity Supply J.I.C. has Negotiation Joint Committee.

Electricity Supply Joint Board has a Negotiating Committee and a Training Scheme Committee.

Flour Milling Industry has Executive Committee; Technical Education Committee; Factories Committee; Dermatitis Committee.

Glove Making Industry has Vigilance, Disputes and Areas Committees.

Government Shipbuilding Trade has these Committees: Allowance; Demarcation; Piece Work; Skilled Labour.

Heating and Domestic Engineering has: Education Committee; Advisory Committee to London Institute; and Various Sub-Committees.

Lancs. and Cheshire Local Authorities Services has a Conditions of Service Committee.

Lead Manufacturing has a General Purposes Sub-Committee.

Local Authorities Non-Trading Services has a National Executive Committee and a Publicity Committee.

London D.C. for Local Authorities Services has a General Purposes Committee, who appoint Sub-Committees as needed.

Match Manufacturing has a General Purposes Committee and an Unemployment Sub-Committee.

National Maritime Board has these panels: Navigating Officers; Engineers Officers; Sailors' and Firemen's; Catering Department.

National Wool and Allied Textiles has Emergency; Finance; Education; and Legislation Committees.

Needle, Fishhook, etc., has an Executive Committee and a Wages and Conditions Committee.

N. Midland Road Transport has a Standing Sub-Committee.

Pottery Industry has these: Executive, General Purposes and Finance; Wages and Conditions; Research, Inventions and Designs; Organisation; Apprenticeship; Statistical and Inquiries; with Several Standing Sub-Committees.

Printing Ink and Roller Making has General Purposes; Health.

Printing and Allied Trades has these : General Purposes ; Health ; Apprenticeship ; Unemployment ; Organisation ; Conciliation ; Betterment ; Costing ; Finance.

Process Engraving has these : Apprenticeship ; Complaint.

Quarrying Industry has Executive Committee and Special Committees as needed.

Seed Crushing, etc., has an Executive Committee.

Silk Industry has Executive Committee and Emergency Committee.

Soap and Candles Industry has an Executive Committee.

Tramways Industry has a Standing Committee and a Wages Committee.

Wallpaper Makers has a Wages Sub-Committee.

Waterworks Undertakings has an Executive Committee.

Welsh Tin Plate and Sheet has a Joint Standing Committee.

West Riding Local Authorities Services has Executive Committee and Sub-Committees as needed.

West Scotland Textile has these Committees : Executive ; Finance ; Wages ; Welfare ; Apprenticeship.

## APPENDIX VI

### LIST AS TO DISTRICT COUNCILS

#### NATIONAL COUNCILS WHICH HAVE NO DISTRICT COUNCILS

Air Ministry Departmental Council.  
Asbestos Industry.  
Bobbin and Shuttle Making Industry.  
Cast Stone Industry.  
Chemical Trade.  
Co-ordination Committee for Government Establishments.  
Furniture Warehousing and Removing.  
Glove Making Industry.  
Government Engineering Trade.  
Government Miscellaneous Trade.  
Government Shipbuilding Trade.  
H.M. Stationery Office Departmental Council.  
Hosiery Trade.  
Lancs. and Cheshire Local Authorities Official Staffs.  
Lead Manufacturing Industry.  
Lock, Latch and Key Industry.  
London D.C. for Local Authorities Official Staffs.  
Match Manufacturing Industry.  
Metallic Bedstead Industry.  
Needle, Fishhook, Fishing Tackle and Allied Trades.  
Pottery Industry.  
Printing Ink and Roller Making Trade.  
Process Engraving Trade.  
Silk Industry.  
Soap and Candles Industry.  
Wallpaper Makers' Industry.  
War Department Industrial Council.  
Welsh Tin Plate and Sheet Trade.  
West Riding Local Authorities Official Staffs.

#### WHITLEY COUNCILS HAVING DISTRICT COUNCILS

Cement Industry has 8 District Councils.  
Coir Mat and Matting Industry has 4 District Councils.

Cooperage Industry has 7 District Councils.  
 Electric Cable Making Industry has 2 District Councils.  
 Electrical Contracting has "About 20 in Important Centres."  
 Electricity Supply J.I.C. has 13 District Councils.  
 Electricity Supply Joint Board has 12 District Councils.  
 Flour Milling Industry has 17 District Councils.  
 Gas Industry has 12 District Councils.  
 Government Building Trade has 16 District Councils.  
 Local Authorities Non-Trading Services has 12 "Provincial Councils."  
 National Maritime Board has 21 "District Boards" under Two of Four "Sectional Committees."  
 National Wool and Allied Textiles has 4 District Councils.  
 Paint, Colour and Varnish Trades has 7 District Councils.  
 Plastering Trade has 5 "Local Councils."  
 Plumbing Trade has 5 "Area Joint Committees."<sup>1</sup>  
 Printing and Allied Trades has 33 District Committees.  
 Quarrying Industry has 5 "Sectional Councils," which have their own Separate District Councils.  
 Tramway Industry has 9 District Councils.  
 Waterworks Undertaking has 8 District Councils.

#### WITH LOCAL ORGANISATIONS, NOT DISTRICT COUNCILS.

Admiralty Council has 6 Department Committees.  
 Civil Service Council has 72 Departmental Committees.  
 Dock Labour has "about 20 Local Port Committees," some of which have Area Sub-Committees.  
 Heating and Domestic Engineering has 7 Local Education Committees.  
 H.M. Office of Works has 3 Central Department Committees.  
 Insurance Committees' Services has 3 Local Committees.  
 Seed Crushing and Compound Cake has 5 District Committees.

(Although the Carpet Trade National Council is not functioning, there are 3 Carpet Trade District Councils still active.)

<sup>1</sup> The Plumbing Trade J.I.C. has also "A Number of Local Councils for the Principal Towns in the Areas," also "7 Town Councils outside the Areas."

## APPENDIX VII

### LIST AS TO WORKS COMMITTEES

#### COUNCILS REPORTED AS HAVING NO WORKS COMMITTEES

Asbestos Industry.  
Cast Stone Industry.  
Civil Service National Council.  
Coir Mat and Matting Industry.  
Cooperage Industry.  
Co-ordination Committee for Government Establishments.  
Dock Labour.  
Electrical Contracting Industry.  
Electricity Supply Joint Board.  
Furniture Warehousing and Removing.  
Government Building Trade.  
Government Engineering Trade.  
Heating and Domestic Engineers.  
Insurance Committees' Services.  
Lancs. and Cheshire Local Authorities Services.  
Lock, Latch and Key Industry.  
London District Local Authorities Services.  
Metallic Bedstead Industry.  
Midland Hosiery, Bleaching, Dyeing and Finishing.  
North Midland Road Transport Joint Board.  
Paint, Colour and Varnish Trades.  
Plastering Industry.  
Plumbing Trade.  
Process Engraving Trade.  
Road Transport for Scotland.  
Silk Industry.  
Waterworks Undertakings.  
West of Scotland Textile.

#### INDUSTRIES WITH WORKS COMMITTEES NOT UNDER THE J.I.C.

Boot and Shoe Manufacturing Industry.  
Chemical Trade.



Glove Making Industry.  
 Government Shipbuilding Trade.  
 Hosiery Trade.  
 Lead Manufacturing Industry.  
 National Wool and Allied Textile Industry.  
 Printing Ink and Roller Making Industry.  
 Process Engraving Trade.  
 Quarrying Industry.  
 Seed Crushing and Compound Cake Manufacturing Industry.  
 Soap and Candles Industry.  
 Textiles Packing and Making Up for Export (London Area).  
 West Riding Local Authorities Services.

#### COUNCILS HAVING WORKS COMMITTEES UNDER THEM

Admiralty Industrial Council has "Many," "Most of the Shops and Factories have a Works Committee."  
 Air Ministry Industrial Council has 6.  
 Bobbin and Shuttle Industry has 4.  
 Cement Manufacturing Industry has "Many."  
 Electricity Supply: "Works Committees in the Various Undertakings in each District."  
 Flour Milling: "Number of Works Committees Unknown."  
 Government Miscellaneous Trade has "Over 15."  
 H.M. Office of Works has 30 "Shop Committees."  
 H.M. Stationery Office has "About 8 Shop Committees."  
 Local Authorities Non-Trading Services: "Works Committees have been set up by a Number of Local Authorities."  
 Match Manufacturing has 8 Works Committees.  
 Needle, Fishhook, etc., has "A Few Works Committees in Active Operation."  
 Pottery Industry has "About 50 Works Committees."  
 Printing and Allied Trades: "Works Advisory Committees, Number Unknown."  
 Tramways Industry: "About 50 Works Organisations Corresponding to the Works Committees."  
 Wallpaper Making Industry has 8 Works Committees.  
 War Department: "Probably 16 to 20 may be described as Regularly Functioning."  
 Welsh Tin Plate and Sheet: "Works Committees have been appointed at a large Number of the Works."

## APPENDIX VIII

### LIST AS TO NEGOTIATION OF WAGES

#### COUNCILS WHICH DEAL WITH THE NEGOTIATION OF WAGES

Asbestos Industry.  
Bobbin and Shuttle Making Industry.  
Brewery Workers (North Midland Area).  
Cast Stone Industry.  
Cement Manufacturing Industry.  
Chemical Trade.  
China Clay Industry.  
Coir Mat and Matting Industry.  
Cooperage Industry.  
Dock Labour.  
Electrical Cable Making Industry.  
Electrical Contracting Industry.  
Electricity Supply Joint Industrial Council.  
Electricity Supply Joint Board.  
Flour Milling Industry.  
Furniture Warehousing and Removing.  
Gas Industry.  
Glove Making Industry.  
Government Engineering Trade.  
Government Miscellaneous Trade.  
Government Shipbuilding Trade.  
Hosiery Trade.  
Lancs. and Cheshire Local Authorities Services.  
Lead Manufacturing Industry.  
Lock, Latch and Key Industry.  
Match Manufacturing Industry.  
Midland Hosiery Bleaching, Dyeing and Finishing.  
Needle, Fishhook, Fishing Tackle and Allied Trades.  
North Midland Road Transport Joint Board.  
Paint, Colour and Varnish Trades.  
Plastering Trade.  
Road Transport (Scotland).  
Seed Crushing and Compound Cake Manufacturing.

Soap and Candles Industry.  
 Tramways Industry.  
 Wallpaper Makers Industry.  
 Welsh Tinplate and Sheet Trade.  
 West of Scotland Textile Industry.

#### COUNCILS DEALING OCCASIONALLY WITH WAGE NEGOTIATIONS

Civil Service Council is "connected only with the Salary Scales of Classes Common to the Civil Service, and normally would conduct Negotiations concerning these matters. The cost-of-living bonus is also dealt with by the National Councils."  
 Insurance Committees' Services "is consulted by Government Authorities as to Wages."  
 Local Authorities non-trading Services (Manual Workers) "has appellate jurisdiction over the Provincial Councils which fix Maximum Rates."  
 Making up and Packing of Textiles for Export J.I.C. "can only enter into Negotiations about Wages when either of the Masters' Associations have come to a deadlock with the Workers' Union."  
 Quarrying Industry "approves of the decisions of the Sectional Councils."  
 Waterworks Undertaking Industry. "The basic wages are determined by the District Councils, but the National Council have adopted a Revision of Wages Scheme. The District Councils are not compelled to adopt the Scheme."  
 Wool and Allied Textile Industry "adopted the agreements of the District Councils who have practical autonomy over Wage Negotiations."

#### COUNCILS WHICH DO NOT DEAL WITH THE NEGOTIATION OF WAGES

Admiralty Departmental Council.  
 Air Ministry Departmental Council.  
 Boot and Shoe Manufacturing Industry.  
 Co-ordination Committee for Government Establishments.  
 Government Building Trade.  
 Heating and Domestic Engineering.  
 H.M. Office of Works.  
 H.M. Stationery Office.  
 London District Council for Local Authorities Services.  
 Metallic Bedstead Industry.  
 National Maritime Board.  
 Plumbing Trade.  
 Pottery Industry.  
 Printing and Allied Trades.  
 Printing Ink and Roller Making.

Process Engraving Trade.

Silk Industry.

War Department Industrial Council.

West Riding Local Authorities Service.

(The above Council may be appealed to or called in to arbitrate in cases of wage disputes.)

## APPENDIX IX

### SAMPLE CONSTITUTION OF A JOINT INDUSTRIAL COUNCIL

#### JOINT INDUSTRIAL COUNCIL OF THE MATCH MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY

##### OBJECTS

##### *General Object.*

The advancement and development of the industry, especially by means of joint action and deliberation between employers and workpeople engaged therein.

It will be open to the Council to take any action which falls within the general scope of the foregoing general objects. Among its more specific objects will be the following :

- (1) The formation of such District Councils and Works Committees as may be considered desirable on the lines suggested in the Whitley Report, and the consideration of proposals and resolutions submitted by such Councils and Committees from time to time.
- (2) The consideration of measures for securing the inclusion of all employers and workpeople in their respective organisations.
- (3) The consideration of methods for securing the satisfactory settlement of differences between various parties and sections of the industry.
- (4) The consideration of minimum rates of wages, hours and working conditions in the industry as a whole.
- (5) The encouragement of study and research with a view to the improvement and perfection of the quality of the product, and of machinery and methods for economical manufacture in all branches of the industry.
- (6) The consideration of methods of training for young people entering the industry, and the provision of educational facilities for them.
- (7) The preparation and consideration of statistics and reports relating to the industry throughout the world, and the effect on the industry of Customs and Excise Duties.

- (8) Representation of the opinions and needs of the industry and those engaged in it to the Government, Government Departments and other authorities.
- (9) To establish and maintain such relations with the Government, Government Departments and other authorities, and to take such steps as shall ensure that the industry is consulted before the introduction of legislative or administrative measures which effect or may effect the industry.
- (10) The consideration of such matters as may be referred to the Council by the Government, Government Departments or other authorities.
- (11) The issue to the Press of authoritative statements upon matters affecting the industry.
- (12) The consideration, with a view to action where necessary or desirable, of any matters affecting, directly or indirectly, the industry or the welfare of those engaged therein.

## CONSTITUTION

### I.—*Members*

The Council shall consist of sixteen members, of whom one-half, viz. eight, shall be appointed by the Society of British Match Manufacturers, hereinafter called the Society. The remaining half, viz. eight, shall be appointed jointly by the National Union of General Workers, and the Workers' Union, hereinafter called the Unions.

### 2.—*Re-appointment*

Four representatives of the Society and of the Unions shall retire annually after the December meeting in each year, but shall be eligible for re-appointment. Such representatives shall retire in rotation, either as agreed among themselves or as determined by lot.

When any member is unable to attend a meeting of the Council, a deputy may be sent to take his place for that meeting by the Society or by the Unions by whom he was appointed. Casual vacancies occurring during the year may be filled by the Society or by the Unions in the same manner and for the same period as in the case of the retiring member.

### 3.—*Co-opted Members*

The Council shall have power to co-opt, by a unanimous vote of the Council, representatives of Government Departments and other persons having special knowledge and experience which may be of value to the Council, but such co-opted members shall attend only in a consultative capacity.

#### 4.—*Committees*

The Council may appoint such Committees as it may consider necessary or desirable, and may delegate such powers as it may think fit to such Committees. The reports of all Committees shall be submitted to the Council for confirmation except in cases where special powers have been delegated to a Committee.

#### 5.—*Officers*

The Officers of the Council shall consist of a Chairman, a Vice-Chairman, a Treasurer and a Secretary or Secretaries. All Officers shall retire at the December meeting of the Council in each year, but shall be eligible for re-election at the next meeting.

The Council shall have power to pay to the Secretary or Secretaries such remuneration as it may think fit.

#### 6.—*Meetings*

The Council shall meet as often as necessary, but not less than once a Quarter. A meeting shall be held in the month of December of each year.

A Special Meeting shall be called on the requisition of six members of the Council addressed to the Secretary, stating the business to be brought forward. Not less than seven days' notice of all meetings shall be given and the business of the meeting shall be stated in the notice.

#### 7.—*Voting*

At all meetings of the Council or of Committees, voting shall be by show of hands, or by ballot as the Chairman of the meeting may determine.

No resolution shall be regarded as carried unless it has been approved by two-thirds of the representatives present of the Society and of the Unions respectively.

The Chairman shall not have the casting vote.

#### 8.—*Quorum*

The quorum shall be not less than three representatives of the Society and four representatives of the Unions.

#### 9.—*Finance*

The expenses of the Council shall be met in equal proportions, viz. one-half by the Society, and one-half jointly by the Unions, according to the number of representatives from each on the Council.

## APPENDIX X

### SAMPLE CONSTITUTION OF WORKS COMMITTEES

#### NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE POTTERY INDUSTRY

##### WORKS COMMITTEES

OBJECTS, FUNCTIONS and CONSTITUTION of WORKS COMMITTEES, as adopted by the National Council at a meeting held January 8, 1920.

Company : \_\_\_\_\_

Works : \_\_\_\_\_

##### OBJECTS

1. The main objects are :
  - (a) The securing of a better utilisation of the practical knowledge and experience of the workpeople, and the establishment and maintenance of a system of co-operation in the workshops as between employers and employees, so that the workpeople be given a wider interest in, and greater responsibility for, the conditions under which their work is performed.
  - (b) The enforcement in works of the regulations contained in collective agreements of Employers and Operatives.
  - (c) The prevention of friction and misunderstanding.

##### RULES AND REGULATIONS

###### *Functions*

2. The Functions of the Committee shall be advisory or consultative, and shall cover the following matters :
  - (a) To consider any matters other than general questions of wages which may be referred to it either by the Management or by the Employees of the works.
  - (b) To inquire into grievances reported by workpeople.



## CONSTITUTION OF WORKS COMMITTEES 229

- (c) To bring before, and discuss with the Management, grievances that it considers genuine.
- (d) To consider questions relating to the health and safety of the workpeople on the factory.
- (e) To consult with the management on the interpretation of awards, orders and circulars.
- (f) To consider suggestions from any employee upon questions closely affecting daily life and comfort on the factory, the efficiency of its working, or improvements of methods and processes.
- (g) To consider generally the conditions of work on the factory.
- (h) To assist in maintaining discipline and regulating conduct as between management and workpeople (inattention to work, bullying, bad language, timekeeping).
- (i) To promote the social life in the factory ; to make necessary arrangements for collections for Infirmaries and Hospitals, Charities, etc. ; and to organise entertainments and sports.

### *Constitution*

3. Each Works Committee shall consist of representatives of the management and of the workers selected from each department, or group of departments.

4. The number of representatives shall be agreed upon at each factory—and each party shall appoint its own representatives.

5. Only those persons shall be eligible for membership of the Committee who are 21 years of age or over, are actually working in the factory and have a service qualification of one year with the firm.

6. Only Trade Unionists shall be eligible to serve on the Operatives' Section of the Committee.

7. Each worker on the factory, irrespective of age, shall be entitled to vote in the election of representatives.

8. The workers on each factory shall arrange terms and remunerate such operatives as they elect on the Committee for loss of time when engaged on the business of the Committee.

9. The representatives of the Management on the Committee shall be appointed by the Firm, and shall consist of Employers, Managers or Officials.

10. The period for which Employee members shall hold office shall be 12 months ending on the 31st day of December in each year, but all serving members of the Committee shall be eligible for re-election.

11. Casual vacancies may be filled either by ballot or otherwise as the Committee may determine.

*Officers*

12. The Officers shall consist of a Chairman, Vice-Chairman (one from either side who may be elected to these respective positions in alternate years), two Secretaries (one appointed by the Management and the other by the Operative members of the Committee), and a Treasurer.

*Meetings*

13. The Committee shall meet once a month, at a date and time to be fixed by the Firm, but special meetings may be held when necessary on the requisition of four members, who shall state the special object for which the meeting is to be held. The Agenda of business to be transacted at each meeting, together with the notice convening the meeting, shall be submitted by the Secretaries to each member of the Committee at least 48 hours before the meeting, except in the case of Special Meetings, which may be summoned informally by verbal notice to the members.

14. The presence of one-half of the members from each side of the Committee shall be necessary to form a quorum.

15. Any matter which it is desired to bring forward for discussion at the regular monthly meeting shall be notified to the Secretaries at least three days before the date of the meeting. Accommodation should be provided for the workers' side of the Committee to enable it to conduct its own work.

16. Any matters arising in a particular department must be first discussed by that Department prior to being brought before the Works Committee.

17. No recommendation shall be regarded as made, or resolution passed, unless it is approved by a majority of each side of the Committee.

18. Duplicate books of Minutes of the proceedings of the Committee shall be kept, one by the Secretary of each side.

19. A copy of the minutes of any meeting, signed by both Secretaries, shall be furnished to the Secretary of the National Council on a request for same being made.

20. In the event of any matter arising which the Committee cannot agree upon, the officials of the Trade Union or Unions concerned shall negotiate with the firm, or, if desired, with the officials of the Employers' Association. The question may thereafter be referred by either side to the National Council.

21. The Works Committee shall not have any power to come to an agreement inconsistent with the powers or decisions of the National Council, or with any agreement between the Trade Union and the Employers' Association. Further, any agreement come to by the Works Committee may at any time be superseded by the National Council, or by agreement between the

## CONSTITUTION OF WORKS COMMITTEES 231

Trade Union and the Employers' Association (through the National Council).

22. The Works Committee shall respect any decisions of the National Council of the Pottery Industry as to the functions and work which may be properly undertaken by the Works Committee.

In the course of his duties the Secretary of the workers' side shall have reasonable opportunities afforded him for consulting with the employees in any department on the Works, and the representatives of Departments shall have reasonable opportunities afforded to confer with the operatives' Secretary.

### *Representation of Operatives*

In the division of Works into Constituencies for the representation of operatives, it is suggested that the following points be taken into consideration :

- (a) The number of workpeople employed in each department.
- (b) Whether a representative should be appointed from each department or group of departments.

For example :

Enamellers', Gilders' and Lithographers' Departments on Factories where large numbers are employed may each have a representative, or on smaller factories they may be grouped for the appointment of only one representative. Other departments may be grouped as follows :

Flat Pressers, Dishmakers, Saucermakers and Cupmakers.  
Hollow-ware Jiggerers, Pressers and Casters.  
Throwers, Turners and Handlers.  
Dippers, Ovenmen and Firemen (Bis. and Glost) and Saggarmakers.  
Slipmakers, Enginemen, Fitters and Joiners.  
Packers, Glost Warehouse and Clerks.  
Printers and Transferers and Biscuit Warehouse.  
Larger or smaller groupings may be arranged at the discretion of the Committee.

### QUESTIONS RELATING TO THE HEALTH AND SAFETY OR WORK-PEOPLE REFERRED TO IN FUNCTION 2 (d).

Questions of physical welfare (provision of meals ; drinking water ; canteen management ; cleanliness ; lavatories and washing accommodation ; protective clothing, cloakrooms ; ventilation ; heating ; lighting and sanitation ; prevention of accidents ; labour-saving appliances ; safety appliances ; first aid, ambulance ; facilities for sitting and rest ; rest period, etc.).

## APPENDIX XI

### THE FIRST REPORT OF THE WHITLEY COMMITTEE

#### REPORT

#### OF THE

#### RECONSTRUCTION COMMITTEE ON RELATIONS BETWEEN EMPLOYERS AND EMPLOYED

To the Right Honourable D. Lloyd George, M.P., Prime Minister.  
SIR,

We have the honour to submit the following Interim Report on Joint Standing Industrial Councils.

2. The terms of reference to the Sub-Committee are :

“(1) To make and consider suggestions for securing a permanent improvement in the relations between employers and workmen.

“(2) To recommend means for securing that industrial conditions affecting the relations between employers and workmen shall be systematically reviewed by those concerned, with a view to improving conditions in the future.”

3. After a general consideration of our duties in relation to the matters referred to us, we decided first to address ourselves to the problem of establishing permanently improved relations between employers and employed in the main industries of the country, in which there exist representative organisations on both sides. The present report accordingly deals more especially with these trades. We are proceeding with the consideration of the problems connected with the industries which are less well organised.

4. We appreciate that under the pressure of the war both employers and workpeople and their organisations are very much preoccupied, but, notwithstanding, we believe it to be of the highest importance that our proposals should be put before those concerned without delay, so that employers and

employed may meet in the near future and discuss the problems before them.

5. The circumstances of the present time are admitted on all sides to offer a great opportunity for securing a permanent improvement in the relations between employers and employed, while failure to utilise the opportunity may involve the nation in grave industrial difficulties at the end of the war.

It is generally allowed that the war almost enforced some reconstruction of industry, and in considering the subjects referred to us we have kept in view the need for securing in the development of reconstruction the largest possible measure of co-operation between employers and employed.

In the interests of the community it is vital that after the war the co-operation of all classes, established during the war, should continue, and more especially with regard to the relations between employers and employed. For securing improvement in the latter, it is essential that any proposals put forward should offer to workpeople the means of attaining improved conditions of employment and a higher standard of comfort generally, and involve the enlistment of their active and continuous co-operation in the promotion of industry.

To this end, the establishment for each industry of an organisation, representative of employers and workpeople, to have as its object the regular consideration of matters affecting the progress and well-being of the trade from the point of view of all those engaged in it, so far as this is consistent with the general interest of the community, appears to us necessary.

6. Many complicated problems have arisen during the war which have a bearing both on employers and workpeople, and may affect the relations between them. It is clear that industrial conditions will need careful handling if grave difficulties and strained relations are to be avoided after the war has ended. The precise nature of the problems to be faced naturally varies from industry to industry, and even from branch to branch within the same industry. Their treatment consequently will need an intimate knowledge of the facts and circumstances of each trade, and such knowledge is to be found only among those directly connected with the trade.

7. With a view to providing means for carrying out the policy outlined above, we recommend that His Majesty's Government should propose without delay to the various associations of employers and employed the formation of Joint Standing Industrial Councils in the several industries, where they do not already exist, composed of representatives of employers and employed, regard being paid to the various sections of the industry and the various classes of labour engaged.

8. The appointment of a Chairman or Chairmen should, we

think, be left to the Council who may decide that these should be :

- (1) A Chairman for each side of the Council ;
- (2) A Chairman and Vice-Chairman selected from the members of the Council (one from each side of the Council) ;
- (3) A Chairman chosen by the Council from independent persons outside the industry ; or
- (4) A Chairman nominated by such person or authority as the Council may determine or, failing agreement, by the Government.

9. The Council should meet at regular and frequent intervals.

10. The objects to which the consideration of the Councils should be directed should be appropriate matters affecting the several industries and particularly the establishment of a closer co-operation between employers and employed. Questions connected with demobilisation will call for early attention.

11. One of the chief factors in the problem, as it at first presents itself, consists of the guarantee given by the Government, with Parliamentary sanction, and the various undertakings entered into by employers, to restore Trade Union rules and customs suspended during the war. While this does not mean that all the lessons learnt during the war should be ignored, it does mean that the definite co-operation and acquiescence by both employers and employed must be a condition of any setting aside of these guarantees or undertakings, and that, if new arrangements are to be reached, in themselves more satisfactory to all parties but not in strict accordance with the guarantees, they must be the joint work of employers and employed.

12. The matters to be considered by the Councils must inevitably differ widely from industry to industry, as different circumstances and conditions call for different treatment, but we are of opinion that the suggestions set forth below ought to be taken into account, subject to such modifications in each case as may serve to adapt them to the needs of the various industries.

13. In the well-organised industries, one of the first questions to be considered should be the establishment of local and works organisations to supplement and make more effective the work of the central bodies. It is not enough to secure co-operation at the centre between the national organisations ; it is equally necessary to enlist the activity and support of employers and employed in the districts and in individual establishments. The National Industrial Council should not be regarded as complete in itself ; what is needed is a triple organisation—in the workshops, the districts, and nationally. Moreover, it is essential that the organisation at each of these three stages

should proceed on a common principle, and that the greatest measure of common action between them should be secured.

14. With this end in view, we are of opinion that the following proposals should be laid before the National Industrial Councils :

- (a) That District Councils, representative of the Trade Unions and of the Employers' Association in the industry, should be created, or developed out of the existing machinery for negotiation in the various trades.
- (b) That Works Committees, representative of the management and of the workers employed, should be instituted in particular works to act in close co-operation with the district and national machinery.

As it is of the highest importance that the scheme making provision for these Committees should be such as to secure the support of the Trade Unions and Employers' Associations concerned, its design should be a matter for agreement between these organisations.

Just as regular meetings and continuity of co-operation are essential in the case of the National Industrial Councils, so they seem to be necessary in the case of the district and works organisations. The object is to secure co-operation by granting to workpeople a greater share in the consideration of matters affecting their industry, and this can only be achieved by keeping employers and workpeople in constant touch.

15. The respective functions of Works Committees, District Councils, and National Councils will no doubt require to be determined separately in accordance with the varying conditions of different industries. Care will need to be taken in each case to delimit accurately their respective functions, in order to avoid overlapping and resulting friction. For instance, where conditions of employment are determined by national agreements, the District Councils or Works Committees should not be allowed to contract out of conditions so laid down, nor, where conditions are determined by local agreements, should such power be allowed to Works Committees.

16. Among the questions with which it is suggested that the National Councils should deal or allocate to District Councils or Works Committees the following may be selected for special mention :

- (i) The better utilisation of the practical knowledge and experience of the workpeople.
- (ii) Means for securing to the workpeople a greater share in and responsibility for the determination and observance of the conditions under which their work is carried on.
- (iii) The settlement of the general principles governing the conditions of employment, including the methods of fixing,

paying, and readjusting wages, having regard to the need for securing to the workpeople a share in the increased prosperity of the industry.

(iv) The establishment of regular methods of negotiation for issues arising between employers and workpeople, with a view both to the prevention of differences, and to their better adjustment when they appear.

(v) Means of ensuring to the workpeople the greatest possible security of earnings and employment, without undue restriction upon change of occupation or employer.

(vi) Methods of fixing and adjusting earnings, piecework prices, etc., and of dealing with the many difficulties which arise with regard to the method and amount of payment apart from the fixing of general standard rates which are already covered by paragraph (iii).

(vii) Technical education and training.

(viii) Industrial research and the full utilisation of its results.

(ix) The provision of facilities for the full consideration and utilisation of inventions and improvement designed by workpeople, and for the adequate safeguarding of the rights of the designers of such improvements.

(x) Improvements of processes, machinery and organisation and appropriate questions relating to management and the examination of industrial experiments, with special reference to co-operation in carrying new ideas into effect and full consideration of the workpeople's point of view in relation to them.

(xi) Proposed legislation affecting the industry.

17. The methods by which the functions of the proposed Councils should be correlated to those of joint bodies in the different districts, and in the various works within the districts, must necessarily vary according to the trade. It may, therefore, be the best policy to leave it to the trades themselves to formulate schemes suitable to their special circumstances, it being understood that it is essential to secure in each industry the fullest measure of co-operation between employers and employed, both generally, through the National Councils, and specifically, through district Committees and workshop Committees.

18. It would seem advisable that the Government should put the proposals relating to National Industrial Councils before the employers' and workpeople's associations and request them to adopt such measures as are needful for their establishment where they do not already exist. Suitable steps should also be taken, at the proper time, to put the matter before the general public.



19. In forwarding the proposals to the parties concerned, we think the Government should offer to be represented in an advisory capacity at the preliminary meetings of a Council, if the parties so desire. We are also of opinion that the Government should undertake to supply to the various Councils such information on industrial subjects as may be available and likely to prove of value.

20. It has been suggested that means must be devised to safeguard the interests of the community against possible action of an anti-social character on the part of the Councils. We have, however, here assumed that the Councils, in their work of promoting the interests of their own industries, will have regard for the National interest. If they fulfil their functions they will be the best builders of national prosperity. The State never parts with its inherent overriding power, but such power may be least needed when least obtruded.

21. It appears to us that it may be desirable at some later stage for the State to give the sanction of law to agreements made by the Councils, but the initiative in this direction should come from the Councils themselves.

22. The plans sketched in the foregoing paragraphs are applicable in the form in which they are given only to industries in which there are responsible associations of employers and workpeople which can claim to be fairly representative. The case of the less well-organised trades or sections of a trade necessarily needs further consideration. We hope to be in a position shortly to put forward recommendations that will prepare the way for the active utilisation in these trades of the same practical co-operation as is foreshadowed in the proposals made above for the more highly-organised trades.

23. It may be desirable to state here our considered opinion that an essential condition of securing a permanent improvement in the relations between employers and employed is that there should be adequate organisation on the part of both employers and workpeople. The proposals outlined for joint co-operation throughout the several industries depend for their ultimate success upon there being such organisation on both sides; and such organisation is necessary also to provide means whereby the arrangements and agreements made for the industry may be effectively carried out.

24. We have thought it well to refrain from making suggestions or offering opinions with regard to such matters as profit-sharing, co-partnership, or particular systems of wages, etc. It would be impracticable for us to make any useful general recommendations on such matters, having regard to the varying conditions in different trades. We are convinced, moreover, that a permanent improvement in the relations between em-

ployers and employed must be founded upon something other than a cash basis. What is wanted is that the workpeople should have a greater opportunity of participating in the discussion about and adjustment of those parts of industry by which they are most affected.

25. The schemes recommended in this Report are intended not merely for the treatment of industrial problems when they have become acute, but also, and more especially, to prevent their becoming acute. We believe that regular meetings to discuss industrial questions, apart from and prior to any differences with regard to them that may have begun to cause friction, will materially reduce the number of occasions on which, in the view of either employers or employed, it is necessary to contemplate recourse to a stoppage of work.

26. We venture to hope that representative men in each industry, with pride in their calling and care for its place as a contributor to the national well-being, will come together in the manner here suggested, and apply themselves to promoting industrial harmony and efficiency and removing the obstacles that have hitherto stood in the way.

We have the honour to be, Sir,

Your obedient Servants,

J. H. WHITLEY, *Chairman.*

F. S. BUTTON.

GEO. J. CARTER.

S. J. CHAPMAN.

G. H. CLAUGHTON.

J. R. CLYNES.

J. A. HOBSON.

A. SUSAN LAWRENCE.

J. J. MALLON.

THOS. R. RATCLIFFE-ELLIS.

ROBT. SMILLIE.

ALLAN M. SMITH.

MONA WILSON.

*H. J. Wilson,*

*Arthur Greenwood*

(Secretaries).

8th March, 1917.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

(The place of publication is London, unless otherwise stated)

### SECTION I

#### UNOFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS

- AMULREE, LORD. *Industrial Arbitration in Great Britain*. Oxford University Press, 1929.
- ASKWITH, LORD. *Industrial Problems and Disputes*. Murray, 1920.
- AUSTIN, B., and LLOYD, W. F. *The Secret of High Wages*. Unwin, 1926.
- BURNS, E. M. *Wages and the State*. King, 1926.
- CLAY, H. *Report on the Joint Industrial Council for the Pottery Industry*. 1927.
- CLAY, H. *The Post-War Unemployment Problem*. Macmillan, 1930.
- CLAY, H. *The Problem of Industrial Relations*. Macmillan, 1929.
- COLE, G. D. H. *Chaos and Order in Industry*. Methuen, 1920.
- COLE, G. D. H. *Labour in War Time*. Bell, 1919.
- COLE, G. D. H. *Organised Labour—An Introduction to Trade Unionism*. Allen & Unwin, 1924.
- COLE, G. D. H. *Self-Government in Industry*. Bell, 1922.
- COLE, G. D. H. *The Next Ten Years in British Social and Economic Policy*. Macmillan, 1929.
- COLE, G. D. H. *The World of Labour*. Macmillan (Reprint), 1928.
- COLE, G. D. H. *Workshop Organisation*. Milford, 1923.
- COMMONS, J. R., and ANDREWS, J. B. *Principles of Labor Legislation*. Harper (New York), 1916.
- DE MONTGOMERY, B. G. *British and Continental Labour Policy*. Trübner, 1922.
- GOODRICH, C. L. *The Frontier of Control*. Bell, 1920.
- GRAY, H. L. *The War Time Control of Industry—The Experience of England*. New York, 1918.
- GREEN, L. H. "A Success of Whitleyism." *Manchester Guardian Supplement*. Nov. 30, 1927.
- GRIFFITHS, F. "Towards a New Industrial Order." (Pamphlet.) 1928.

- GUILLEBAND, C. W. *The Works Council: a German Experiment in Industrial Democracy*. Cambridge, 1928.  
 HALLSWORTH, J. *The Legal Minimum*. Labour Publishing Co., 1925.  
 HAND, F. H. "The Work of Joint Industrial Councils." *Manchester Guardian Commercial*. July 28, 1927.  
 HOBSON, J. A. *The Condition of Industrial Peace*. Unwin, 1927.  
 HOBSON, J. A. *The Problem of the Unemployed*. Methuen, 1904.  
 HOBSON, J. A. "The Economics of Bargaining." *Economic Review* (Vol. IX, pp. 20-41), 1926.  
 HUTCHINGS, B. L., and HARRISON, A. *A History of Factory Legislation*. King, 1926.  
 JOHNSTON, T. B. "Industrial Councils and Their Possibilities" (in *Lectures on Industrial Administration*). Manchester University Press, 1920.  
 KIRKALDY, A. W. *Industry and Finance. War Expedients and Reconstruction* (Chap. IV on "Workshop Committees" by C. G. RENOLD). Pitman, 1917.  
 KIRKALDY, A. W. *Labour, Finance and the War*. Pitman, 1916.  
 LLOYD, C. M. *Trade Unionism*. Black, 1928 (3rd ed.).  
 LIBERAL INDUSTRIAL INQUIRY COMMITTEE. *Britain's Industrial Future*. Benn, 1928.  
 MACASSEY, SIR LYNDON. *Labour Policy—False and True*. Butterworth, 1922.  
 MEAKIN, W. *The New Industrial Revolution*. Gollancz, 1928.  
 MILNE-BAILEY, W. *Trade Unions Documents*. Bell, 1929.  
 MOND, SIR ALFRED. *Industry and Politics*. Macmillan, 1927.  
 ORTON, W. A. *Labour in Transition*. Allan, 1921.  
 PIGOU, A. C. *Principles and Methods of Industrial Peace*. Macmillan, 1905.  
 PITMAN, SIR ISAAC. *Dictionary of Industrial Administration*. 1928. (Article on "Whitleyism" in Part 23.)  
 RENOLD, C. D. *Workshop Committees*. Manchester, 1917.  
 RICHARDSON, A. "The Man-power of the Nation." (Pamphlet.) 1916.  
 RITCHIE, D. G. *The Principles of State Interference*. (Social Science Series), 1891.  
 ROBERTSON, D. H. *The Control of Industry*. Nisbet, 1926.  
 ROWE, J. F. W. *Wages in Practice and Theory*. Routledge, 1928.  
 SCHLOSS, D. H. *Methods of Industrial Remuneration*. Williams & Norgate, 1898.  
 SELEKMAN, B. and S. *British Industry To-day*. Harper & Bros. (New York), 1929.  
 SELLS, D. *The British Trade Boards System*. King, 1923.  
 SHEPHERD, E. C. *The Fixing of Wages in Government Employment*. Methuen, 1923.

- SQUIRE, R. E. *Thirty Years in the Public Service*. Nisbet, 1927.
- THE GARTON FOUNDATION. *Memorandum of the Industrial Situation after the War*. 1919. *The Industrial Council for the Building Industry*.
- The Staffordshire Sentinel*. Pamphlet giving account of the Opening of the National Council for the Pottery Industry (1918) and Objects and Constitution of the Council. Leading article on same, Jan. 18, 1918. Accounts of Council meetings in 1918.
- Towards Industrial Peace*. (Report of Conference of League of Nations Union, 1927.) King, 1927.
- TILLYARD, F. *The Worker and the State*. Routledge, 1923.
- URWICK, L. *The Meaning of Rationalisation*. Nisbet, 1929.
- VARIOUS AUTHORS. *Labour and Industry*. Longmans Green, 1920.
- WEBB, S. *The Works Manager To-day*. Longmans Green, 1917.
- WEBB, S. and B. *The History of Trade Unionism* (Revised Edition). Longmans Green, 1920.
- WHITLEY, J. H. *Industrial Unrest—an Analysis of the Whitley Commission Report*. 1918.
- WHITLEY, J. H. "The Whitley Councils—The Growth of the Movement," in *Employers' Year Book*. 1920.
- WHITLEY, J. H. "Works Councils and Industrial Councils" (Manchester). University of Manchester publication No. CXXVII.
- WILLIAMS, G. *Social Aspects of Industrial Problems*. King, 1923.
- WILLIS, W. A. *Trade Boards at Work*. Nisbet, 1920.
- WOLFE, H. *Labour Supply and Regulation*. Milford, 1923.
- WOODINGS, W. "Democratic Control—the Key to Industrial Progress." (Pamphlet.) 1919.
- Annual Reports and Pamphlets published by National Joint Industrial Councils.
- Reports of Conferences of Joint Industrial Councils.
- POTTERY INDUSTRY JOINT INDUSTRIAL COUNCIL.
- Yearly Reports and numerous Pamphlets, including :
- Circular Letter, sent out in 1919, on a Central Association of Industrial Councils.
  - Memorandum submitted to the Committee on Industry and Trade in 1925.
  - Correspondence with the Cabinet about Legislation for the Provision of Statistics (1929).
  - Correspondence with the Melchett-Turner Conference about Whitley Councils (1929).
  - Correspondence with Industrial Councils about Unemployment Insurance (1929).
  - Correspondence with Industrial Councils about Publicity for British Goods (1929).

- COX'S POTTERIES ANNUAL AND YEAR BOOK, FOR 1924 AND 1925.  
(Articles on Whitley Councils.)
- ASSOCIATION OF JOINT INDUSTRIAL COUNCILS AND INTERIM  
RECONSTRUCTION COMMITTEES.  
Reports of Meetings.  
Memoranda on Special Subjects.
- FEDERATION OF BRITISH INDUSTRIES.  
Recommendation on the Whitley Report. (1917.)
- LABOUR RESEARCH DEPARTMENT.  
*The Workers' Register of Labour and Capital for 1923.*  
Collection of Records, Notes and Press Cuttings.
- NATIONAL GUILDS LEAGUE.  
National Guilds or Whitley Councils (1918).  
Notes from Trade Unionists on the Whitley Report.
- NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL ALLIANCE OF EMPLOYERS AND EMPLOYED.  
*Unity*—a monthly Review of Industrial Affairs, with  
Whitley Council Notes by F. H. Hand, and  
A Series of articles on Conciliation Machinery.
- PAISLEY TRADES AND LABOUR COUNCIL.  
*Towards Industrial Democracy.* (A Memorandum on Work-  
shop Control), 1917.
- The Labour Year Book*, 1919 to 1930.
- TRADES UNION CONGRESS.  
Reports and Papers.
- THE CIVIL SERVICE CONFEDERATION.  
*The Whitley Bulletin*—Monthly Journal of the National  
Whitley Council (Staff Side) for the Civil Service.
- WEYMOUTH JOINT COMMITTEE OF ALLIED ENGINEERING TRADES.  
Memorandum on Works Council and Workshop Control,  
1917.

## OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS

## GREAT BRITAIN

## ACTS

- TRADE UNION ACT, 1871.  
MASTERS' AND WORKMEN'S CONCILIATION ACT, 1872.  
EMPLOYERS AND WORKMEN ACT, 1875.  
CONSPIRACY AND PROTECTION OF PROPERTY ACT, 1875.  
TRADE UNION ACT, 1876.  
FACTORY ACT, 1878.  
EMPLOYERS LIABILITY ACT, 1880.  
ACT TO AMEND AND EXTEND THE LAW RELATING TO TRUCK,  
1887.  
ARBITRATION ACT, 1889.  
TRADE UNION (PROVIDENT FUNDS) ACT, 1893.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

243

CONCILIATION ACT, 1896.  
FACTORY ACT, 1901.  
EMPLOYMENT OF CHILDREN ACT, 1903.  
TRADE DISPUTES ACT, 1906.  
NOTICE OF ACCIDENTS ACT, 1906.  
WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT, 1906.  
INVESTIGATION ACT, 1907.  
COAL MINES REGULATION ACT, 1908.  
OLD AGE PENSIONS ACT, 1908.  
LABOUR EXCHANGES ACT, 1909.  
TRADE BOARDS ACT, 1909.  
SHOP HOURS ACT, 1911.  
COAL MINES (MINIMUM WAGE) ACT, 1912.  
TRADE UNION ACT, 1913.  
MUNITIONS OF WAR ACT, 1915.  
MUNITIONS OF WAR ACT, 1916.  
MUNITIONS OF WAR ACT, 1917.  
WAGES (TEMPORARY REGULATION) ACT, 1918.  
TRADE BOARDS ACT, 1918.  
PRE-WAR PRACTICES ACT, 1919.  
INDUSTRIAL COURTS ACT, 1919.  
RAILWAYS ACT, 1921.  
AGRICULTURAL WAGES (REGULATION) ACT, 1924.  
COAL MINES ACT, 1926.  
TRADE DISPUTES AND TRADE UNIONS ACT, 1927.

## MEMORANDA

### MINISTRY OF RECONSTRUCTION.

Memorandum on Interim Industrial Reconstruction Committees (1917).

### MINISTER OF RECONSTRUCTION AND MINISTER OF LABOUR.

Memorandum on Industrial Councils and Trade Boards, Cd. 9085 (1918).

### MINISTRY OF LABOUR.

Suggestions as to Constitution and Functions of a Joint Industrial Council. H.M. Stationery Office, 1919.

Memoranda on Application of the Whitley Report to Government Industrial Establishments (1919), including Report of Conference for the Consideration of a Draft Scheme for the Application of the Whitley Report to Government Industrial Establishments.

Summary of the Inter-Departmental Committee's Report on the Application of the Whitley Report to Government Industrial Establishments.

Draft Constitutions of Trade Joint Council and of Departmental Joint Council.

Constitution and Functions of Shop, Department and Yard Committees in Admiralty Industrial Establishments.

Memorandum on the setting up of Departmental Councils in the Administrative and Legal Departments of the Civil Service (1919).

Model Constitution for Departmental Councils in the Administrative and Legal Departments of the Civil Service (1919).

**MINISTRY OF LABOUR. INDUSTRIAL COUNCILS DIVISION.**

Bulletins on Industrial Councils.

No. 1. July 1919.

„ 2. December 1919.

„ 3. September 1920.

**MINISTRY OF LABOUR.**

Suggestions as to the Constitution and Functions of Works Committees in industries in which National Joint Industrial Councils are established. H.M. Stationery Office, 1920.

Statement of the Government's Policy in the Administration of the Trade Boards Acts, 1909 and 1918. Cmd. 1712 (1922).

Directory of Employers' Associations, Trade Unions, Joint Organisations, etc. H.M. Stationery Office, 1925.

**INDUSTRIAL COUNCILS BILL, 1924.**

Bill No. 15 of 1924.

**INDUSTRIAL COUNCILS BILL, 1930.**

Bill No. 57 of 1930.

**CONSUMERS COUNCIL BILL, 1930.**

Bill No. 48 of 1930.

**WORKS COUNCILS (No. 2) BILL, 1930.**

Bill No. 138 of 1930.

**HOURS OF INDUSTRIAL EMPLOYMENT BILL, 1930.**

Bill No. 173 of 1930.

**RATES OF WAGES BILL, 1931.**

Bill No. 180 of 1931.

**ROYAL COMMISSION ON THE CIVIL SERVICE.**

Appendix to Part I of Minutes of Evidence, with Introductory Memoranda relating to the Civil Service. H.M. Stationery Office, 1930.

**MINISTRY OF LABOUR.**

Twentieth Abstract of Labour Statistics of the United Kingdom. Cmd. 3831 (1931).

*The Ministry of Labour Gazette*, giving special articles, and monthly reports of Trade Disputes; Prices and Wages; Employment; and Legal Cases affecting Labour.

*The Month's Work*. Various Statutory Rules and Orders, giving particulars of work and wages for industries with Industrial Councils.



## REPORTS

- BOARD OF TRADE, Report on Rules of Voluntary Conciliation and Arbitration Boards and Joint Committees. Cd. 3788 (1907).
- BOARD OF TRADE, Report on Collective Agreements. Cd. 5366 (1910).
- BOARD OF TRADE, Annual Reports on Strikes and Lockouts.  
 For 1909, Cd. 5325 (1910).  
 „ 1910, Cd. 5850 (1911).  
 „ 1911, Cd. 6472 (1912-13).  
 „ 1912, Cd. 7089 (1914).  
 „ 1913, Cd. 7658 (1914-16).
- BOARD OF TRADE, Reports of Proceedings under Conciliation Act, 1896.  
 Eighth Report, H.C. Paper No. 96 of 1911.  
 Ninth Report, H.C. Paper No. 87 of 1912-13.  
 Tenth Report, H.C. Paper No. 38 of 1913.  
 Eleventh Report, H.C. Paper No. 89 of 1914.  
 Twelfth Report, H.C. Paper No. 185 of 1919.  
 Report on Transport Workers' Disputes, Cd. 6229 (1912).  
 Sir George Askwith's Report to BOARD OF TRADE on the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act of Canada, 1907. Cd. 6603 (1913).  
 The Industrial Council Report on Enquiry into Industrial Agreements. Cd. 6952 (1913).  
 Commission of Inquiry into Industrial Unrest. No. 7 Division. Report for Wales, including Monmouthshire. Cd. 8668 (1917).  
 Commission of Inquiry into Industrial Unrest. Summary of Reports of the Commission. Cd. 8696 (1917).
- MINISTRY OF RECONSTRUCTION COMMITTEE ON RELATIONS BETWEEN EMPLOYERS AND EMPLOYED (THE WHITLEY COMMITTEE).  
 Interim Report on Joint Standing Industrial Councils. Cd. 8606 (1917).  
 Second Report on Joint Standing Industrial Councils. Cd. 9002 (1918).  
 Supplementary Report on Works Committees. Cd. 9001 (1918).  
 Report on Conciliation and Arbitration. Cd. 9099 (1918).  
 Final Report. Cd. 9153 (1918).
- MINISTRY OF LABOUR, Industrial Reports.  
 No. 1. Industrial Councils (1917).  
 „ 2. Works Committees (1918).  
 „ 3. Industrial Councils and Trade Boards (1918).  
 „ 4. Industrial Councils (1920).

Sub-committee of the Inter-Departmental Committee on the Application of the Whitley Report to Government Establishments. Report on the Application of the Whitley Report to the Administrative Departments of the Civil Service. Cmd. 9 (1919). (Reprinted, 1925.)

Report of National Provisional Joint Committee on the Application of the Whitley Report to the Administrative Departments of the Civil Service. Cmd. 198 (1919). (Reprinted, 1927.)

Coal Industry Commission Act, 1919 (Second Stage). Reports by Justice Sankey and other Members of the Commission. Cmd. 210 (1919).

MINISTRY OF LABOUR, Report of the Committee of Inquiry into Night Work in the Bread Baking and Flour Confectionery Trade. Cmd. 246 (1919).

MINISTRY OF LABOUR, Intelligence and Statistics Department. Report on Profit Sharing and Labour Co-partnership in the United Kingdom, Cmd. 544 (1920).

Industrial Conference. Report of Provisional Joint Committee presented to Meeting of Industrial Conference, Central Hall, Westminster, April 4, 1919. Cmd. 501 (1920). (This includes Cmd. 139, with added Appendix.)

Report on the Work of the National Maritime Board. Cmd. 545 (1917-19).

Transport Workers Court of Inquiry. Report and Minutes of Evidence of the Inquiry. Cmd. 936 (1920).

Conciliation Act and Industrial Courts Act. Report on conciliation and arbitration, including particulars of proceedings under the Conciliation Act, 1896; The Coal Mines (Minimum Wage) Act, 1912; the Wages (Temporary Regulation) Acts, 1918 and 1919; the Restoration of Pre-War Practices Act, 1919; and the Industrial Courts Act, 1919. H.C. Paper No. 221 of 1920.

Report to the Minister of Labour of Committee appointed to inquire into the Working and Effects of the Trade Boards Act. H.M. Stationery Office, 1921.

Industrial Courts Act, 1919. Report by a Court of Inquiry concerning the Dispute in the Tramway Industry. H.C. Paper 37 of 1921.

Industrial Courts Act, 1919, and Conciliation Act, 1896. Report on Conciliation and Arbitration. H.C. Paper 185 of 1921.

MINISTRY OF LABOUR. Report on the Establishment and Progress of Joint Industrial Councils. 1917-1922. H.M. Stationery Office, 1923.

Court of Inquiry Report on Dock Labour Dispute. Cmd. 2056 (1924).

- MINISTRY OF LABOUR, Annual Reports.  
 Report for 1923-1924, Cmd. 2481 (1925).  
 .. .. 1925, Cmd. 2736 (1926).  
 .. .. 1926, Cmd. 2856 (1927).  
 .. .. 1927, Cmd. 3090 (1928).  
 .. .. 1928, Cmd. 3333 (1929).  
 .. .. 1929, Cmd. 3579 (1930).
- Chief Inspector of Factories and Workshops. Annual Reports.  
 For 1918, Cmd. 340.  
 .. 1919, Cmd. 941.  
 .. 1920, Cmd. 1403.  
 .. 1921, Cmd. 1705.  
 .. 1922, Cmd. 1920.  
 .. 1923, Cmd. 2165.  
 .. 1924, Cmd. 2437.  
 .. 1925, Cmd. 2714.  
 .. 1926, Cmd. 2903.  
 .. 1927, Cmd. 3144.  
 .. 1928, Cmd. 3360.  
 .. 1929, Cmd. 3633.
- Royal Commission on the Coal Industry (1925). Report. Vol. I.  
 Cmd. 2600 (1926).
- Committee on Industry and Trade. Survey of Industrial  
 Relations. H.M. Stationery Office, 1926. (Chapter V.  
 Machinery for Industrial Negotiation.)
- Committee on Industry and Trade. Final Report on Industry  
 and Trade. Cmd. 3282 (1929).
- Report of the Delegation appointed to study Industrial Conditions  
 in Canada and the U.S.A. Cmd. 2833 (1927).

## FOREIGN PAPERS

- Report by Canadian Department of Labour on "The principles  
 and practices governing Industrial Councils and Works  
 Committees in Canada, Great Britain and the United States."  
 1921.
- U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR. BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS.  
 Bulletin No. 237, Industrial Unrest in Great Britain.  
 (1917.)  
 Bulletin No. 255, Joint Industrial Councils in Great  
 Britain. (1919.)  
 Bulletin No. 383, Works Council Movement in Germany.  
 (1925.)  
 Bulletin No. 481, Joint Industrial Control in the Book and  
 Job Printing Industry, by E. C. Brown. (1928.)

## INTERNATIONAL LABOUR OFFICE

## LEGISLATIVE SERIES (Geneva).

Austria—Labour Councils, 1920. Nos. 19-20.

Czechoslovakia—Act and Order; Mines Councils, 1920.

Nos. 3-5.

Germany—Act and Order; Works Councils, 1920. Nos. 1 and 2.

Germany, Bremen—Acts; Labour Councils, 1921. No. 1.

Luxemburg—Decree; Works Councils, 1920. No. 1.

Bethelot, Marcel. Works Councils in Germany.

International Labour Office, Series B, No. 13 (1924).

*International Labour Review*

Vol. IV. Collective Bargaining in Germany (Sitzler).

Vol. V. Collective Labour Contract in France (Pirou).

Vol. X. Administration of Labour Laws in England (Gutteridge).

Vol. XII. Labour Legislation in U.S.A. (Rice).

Vol. XII. Labour Laws in France.

Vol. XII. Industrial Disputes in Germany (Sitzler).

Vol. XIV. Trade Union Reform in Italy (Arias).

Vol. XV. Trade Organisation in Italy (Bottai).

Vol. XV. Administration of Labour Law in Germany (Siefert).

Vol. II. No. 1. Works Councils in the Czechoslovakian Mining Industry.

Vol. III. Nos. 1 and 2. Works Councils in Co-operative Societies in Germany.

Vol. III. No. 3. Joint Industrial Councils in Canada.

Vol. IV. Nos. 1 and 2. The German Works Councils Act (Bernstein).

Vol. IV. No. 3. Joint Industrial Councils in Great Britain.

Vol. V. No. 3. The Works Councils Act in Austria.

Vol. VIII. No. 4. Progress of Joint Industrial Councils in Great Britain.

Vol. XI. No. 2. The Legal Nature and Economic Significance of German Works Councils.

Vol. XVIII. Nos. 1-5. The Regulation Hours of Work in European Industry.

## INDEX

### A

Admiralty Departmental J.C., 30  
Air Ministry J.C., 30  
Arbitration, 35, 60, 139, 149  
Arbitration Act, 1889, 5  
Arbitration Boards, 5, 16  
Arts and Crafts Exhibition, 79  
Association of Joint Industrial  
Councils, etc., 35, 107, 114,  
129, 134, 164, 182

### B

Barnes, Rt. Hon. G. M., 9  
Bellhouse, Sir G., 128  
Board of Trade, 6  
Bonar Law, Rt. Hon. A., 28  
Boot and Shoe Manufacturing  
J.I.C., 104, 166  
Brooklands Agreement, the, 141  
Building Trades J.I.C., 104, 166  
Burnham, Viscount, 188

### C

Cast Stone Industry J.I.C., 71  
Cement Industry J.I.C., 67, 75  
Chalk Sectional Council, 67  
Chemical Industry J.I.C., 100  
China Clay Industry J.I.C., 67,  
73  
Civil Service J.I.C., 28, 31, 74,  
131, 174  
Coal Mines Regulation Act, 1887,  
5  
Coal Mining Industry and the  
Scheme, 42, 151  
Coir Mat and Matting J.I.C., 87

Collective Bargaining, 4, 115, 168  
    Extended by the Scheme, 125  
Conciliation, 15, 35, 60, 126, 137  
Conciliation Act, 1896, 5  
Conciliation Boards, 4  
Consumer, Protecting the, 177  
Cooperage Industry J.I.C., 67  
Co-operation :  
    Among the Councils, 129, 155  
    With Government Depart-  
        ments, 66, 128, 182  
    With Outside Bodies, 67, 182  
Corn Production Acts (Repeal)  
    Act, 1921, 109  
Corsar, Mr. H., 180

### D

Dismissals, 167  
District Councils, 36, 37, 67, 73,  
140  
    List as to, Appendix VI  
Dock Labour J.I.C., 74

### E

Education and Apprenticeship,  
63  
Electrical Cable Making Industry  
J.I.C., 36, 72, 129  
Electrical Contracting Industry  
J.I.C., 36  
Electricity Supply Industry  
J.I.C., 25, 36, 71, 74, 143  
Empire Development, 163  
Empire Marketing Board, 80, 164  
Employers' Liability Acts, 1880  
    and 1906, 5

### R

- Employment Exchanges, 52, 155, 156
- F**
- Factory Acts, 1878 and 1901, 5  
 Flag Day, 79  
 Flour Milling J.I.C., 61, 63, 64, 101, 144, 159, 181  
 Foster Committee of Building Trade, 104, 166  
 Furniture Warehousing and Removing J.I.C., 71
- G**
- Gas Industry J.I.C., 25, 127, 159  
 Gas Mantles J.I.C., 162  
 General Strike, the, 146  
 Glass Making J.I.C., 162  
 Glove Making J.I.C., 61, 64, 80, 144, 162  
 Government Building Trade J.C., 30, 76  
 Government Co-ordination Committee J.C., 30  
 Government Engineering Trade J.C., 30  
 Government intervention in Industry, 5, 7  
 Government lessening of effort for Scheme, 97  
 Government Miscellaneous Trades J.C., 30  
 Government opposition to Scheme, 27  
 Government Shipbuilding Trade J.C., 30  
 Green, Capt. L. H., 101, 147
- H**
- Health, Welfare and Safety, 56, 62, 132  
 Heath, Sir T., 28  
 Heating and Domestic Engineering J.I.C., 64, 73  
 Hitchins, Mr. W. L., 99, 180.  
 Holidays, 59
- Home Office, the, 6  
 Hosiery J.I.C., 61
- I**
- Improvement of Processes, 134  
 Industrial and Commercial Problems, 61, 134  
 Industrial Councils Bill, 35 : Chap. XI, 194  
   Arguments against, 110-14  
   Arguments for, 114-18  
 Industrial Courts Act, 1919, 16, 139  
 Industrial Disputes, Chap. XIII  
 Industrial Fatigue Board, 130  
 Industrial Unrest, 9, 136  
 Insurance Committees J.I.C., 63  
 Interim Industrial Reconstruction Committees, 23, 34  
 Inventions. *See* Statistics  
 Islington, Lord, 110
- J**
- Joint Industrial Councils. *See* Whitley Councils  
 Joint Industrial Scholarship, 79  
 Johnston, Mr. T. B., 77
- L**
- Lead Industry J.I.C., 67, 73  
 Liaison Officer, 51, 142  
 Little, Mr. D., 117  
 Lloyd George, Rt. Hon. D., 11  
 Local Authorities Administrative, etc., Services J.I.C., 26, 36, 97, 125  
 Local Authorities Non-Trading Services J.I.C., 25, 26, 74, 124, 139
- M**
- Macassey, Sir L., 89  
 MacDonald, Rt. Hon. R., 109  
 Making Up and Packing of Textiles J.I.C., 73  
 Mander, Mr. G. le M.; M.P., 107

- Masters' and Workmen's Conciliation Act, 1872, 5
- Match Manufacturing J.I.C., 59, 61, 71, 129, 155, 176
- Melchett, Lord, 160, 187
- Melchett-Turner Movement, 160
- Merchandise Marks Act, 1926, 80
- Mining Industry Act, 1920, 43
- Ministry of Health, 6
- Ministry of Labour, Industrial Relations Dept., 140
- Ministry of Labour, Joint Industrial Councils Division, 19
- Ministry of Munitions J.C., 30
- Ministry of Reconstruction, 23
- Munitions of War Acts, 8, 109
- N
- National Industrial Council, 160, 194
- National Maritime Board, 72, 74, 143
- Needles and Fish Hooks J.I.C., 61, 76
- North Midland Brewers District Council, 76
- North Midland Road Transport Board, 74
- O
- Office of Works J.C., 30
- Organisation and Work of Subsidiary Bodies, 66
- Organisation of Industry, 66, 148, 157  
Advanced by the Scheme, 123  
Changes in, 4
- P
- Paint, Colour and Varnish Trades J.I.C., 71
- Painters and Decorators J.I.C., 19
- Plumbing Industry J.I.C., 67, 75
- Post Office Administrative Whitley Council, 31
- Post Office Engineering and Stores Dept. Whitley Council, 31
- Pottery J.I.C., 19, 35, 60, 61, 63, 65, 71, 77, 85, 91, 129, 133, 156, 159, 162
- Printing and Allied Trades J.I.C., 52, 60, 62, 65, 74, 79, 85, 101, 133, 138, 140, 144, 145, 154
- Q
- Quarrying J.I.C., 74, 75, 149
- R
- Railway Wages Boards, 41, 174
- Railways Act, 1921, 4
- Rates of Wages Bill, 1931, 108
- Rationalisation, 156
- Reconstruction, 8
- Renold, Mr. C. G., 84 (footnote)
- Research. *See* Statistics
- Road Transport J.I.C., 116
- Roberts, Rt. Hon. G. H., 28
- S
- Safeguarding of Industry, 80
- Safety. *See* Health
- Scott, Sir R., 173
- Shop Stewards, 10, 82, 185
- Short time working, 154
- Silk Industry J.I.C., 51, 129
- Sparkes, Mr. M., 12
- Specialists to aid the Councils, 178
- Standardisation of wages and conditions, 126
- Stationery Office J.C., 30, 72
- Statistics, research and inventions, 65, 77, 180
- Strikes and Lockouts. *See* Industrial Disputes
- T
- Tariff, 161
- Tin Mining J.I.C., 67
- Trade Boards Act, 1909, 6, 38, 94, 109

- Trade Boards Act, 1918, 40, 109  
 Trade Cycles, 155  
 Trade Dispute, Definition of, 136  
 Trade Disputes and Trade Unions Act, 1927, 107, 148  
 Trade Union Acts, 1871 and 1876, 5  
 Trade Unions, 6, 11  
 Trades Union Congress, 107, 157, 160, 162, 185  
 T.U.C. General Council, 108  
 Tramway Industry J.I.C., 26, 60, 70, 186  
 Treasury, the, 30  
 Treasury Agreement, 1915, 8  
 Truck Act of 1831, The 1886 Act to amend the, 5
- U
- Unemployment, 154  
 Unemployment Insurance, 155
- W
- Wage Negotiations, 76, 138, 148, 179  
 List as to, Appendix VIII  
 Wage Rates, 7  
 Wages and Conditions of Work, 59, 138  
 Wages (Temporary Regulation) Act, 1918, 109  
 Wallpaper Makers J.I.C., 61, 76, 79, 131, 144  
 War, the, 6, 82, 137  
 War Boards of Control, 7  
 War Cabinet, the, 16  
 War Office J.C., 30  
 Waterworks Undertakings J.I.C., 22, 25, 99, 130, 143  
 Welfare. *See* Health  
 Whitley Committee :  
 Assistance of to the Ministry of Labour, 19  
 First Report of, Appendix XI  
 Meetings of, 8  
 Minority note of, 16  
 Reports of, Chap. II  
 Whitley Committee :  
 Terms of reference of, 3  
 Title and personnel of, 3  
 Whitley Councils :  
 Areas of, 70  
 Breakdown of, 103  
 Committees of, 49, 57, 58, 73  
 Constitutions of, 48  
 Difficulties in establishing, 20  
 Directory of, Appendix III  
 Establishing the, Chap. III  
 Establishment eras of, 22  
 Expenses of, 49  
 Figures of establishment of, 22, 33, 43  
 Functions of, 55, 98, 179  
 Growth and development of, Chap. V  
 Lack of power to enforce agreements of, Chap. XI, 94  
 List as to Committees of, Appendix V  
 List as to meetings of, Appendix IV  
 List of Councils established, Appendix I  
 List of defunct Councils, Appendix II  
 Meetings of, 14, 50, 52, 75, 98, 130  
 Membership of, 48, 70, 172-6, 178  
 Officers of, 49, 57, 71, 171  
 Procedure of, 50, 70  
 Representation percentage for, 20, 172  
 Sample constitution of, Appendix IX  
 Size of, 48, 173  
 Statistics as to, 69, 73, 75, 77, 109, 150, 152  
 Subjects for discussion by, 52, 170  
 Under Government authorities, Chap. IV  
 Use of Government buildings for, 51



- Whitley Councils :  
 Variations in scope of, Chap. VIII  
 Work of, Chap. VII, 102  
 "Whitleyism," 33, 123
- Whitley Scheme, the :  
 and Industrial disputes, Chap. XIII  
 and modern problems, Chap. XIV  
 Criticisms and suggestions as to, Chap. XV  
 Defects and failures of, Chap. X  
 Employers and, 185, 187, 191  
 Foreign interest in, 44  
 Indifference and opposition to, Chap. XVI, 193  
 Labour and, 188  
 Machinery of, 13, Chap. VI : 69  
 Some results of, Chap. XII : 141, 197  
 State assistance for expansion of, 195
- Whitley Scheme, the :  
 The Government and, 190  
 Trade Unionism and, 189, 191,  
 Wool and Allied Industries J.I.C.  
 100, 115, 128, 133, 139, 146  
 Workers' share in management,  
 165  
 Works Committees, 15, 37, 38,  
 68, 75, Chap. IX  
 Arguments against, 86  
 Benefits of, 89, 91, 140  
 Constitution of, 82  
 Functions of, 84  
 Lack of success in establishing,  
 84  
 List as to, Appendix VII  
 Sample constitution of, Appendix X  
 Subjects for discussion by, 88  
 Works Councils, 92, 196  
 Works Councils Bill, 92  
 Works Inspectors Conferences,  
 78  
 Workshop Control, 11, 84

# BOOKS TO READ

---

---

**ENGLAND TO-DAY: A Survey of Her Economic Situation.** By F. CYRIL JAMES, Ph.D. Crown 8vo. 252 pp.  
6s.

This book describes in simple form the present economic organization of England. In surveying the situation in regard to finance, industry and trade, it becomes clear that these are closely related to one another and that the individual worker or employer is indirectly affected by economic aims or political policies influencing any one of these fields. An examination of England's position in regard to foreign trade and international finance demonstrates the extent to which her prosperity is dependent upon the economic well-being of other nations.

**CO-OPERATIVE BANKING.** By N. BAROU, with an Introduction by LORD PASSFIELD. Demy 8vo. 370 pp.  
15s.

In their organization, resources, investment of funds and profit and loss policy, Co-operative Banks differ considerably from the capitalist Banks. Co-operative Banks serve as a basis for the establishment of a co-operative financial system in each country and for the formation of an International Co-operative Bank. This book makes an analysis into the working of over 150 Banks in 42 different countries.

**BRITISH RAILWAYS IN BOOM AND DEPRESSION.**  
By C. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL, Ph.D. Demy 8vo. 128 pp.  
6s.

This book, besides dealing analytically with present conditions and explaining their causes, has, in addition, more than a transient interest, because it traces not only the effects of trade fluctuations on British railways as far back as 1878, but also the relation of fluctuations to profits, wages and the general level of charges under the terms of the Railways Act, 1921. In it, too, partial use has been made of studies in the United States, where problems of the business cycle and rate regulation have been subject to much keener investigation.

**THE NEW SURVEY OF LONDON LIFE AND LABOUR.**  
Volume Two. London Industries (1). Demy 8vo. 508 pp.  
Buckram, 17s. 6d.

Clothing—Engineering—Building—Furniture—Dock Labour—Domestic Service—Boots and Shoes.

Harold J. Laski in *The Week-End Review*: "The second volume of this great survey more than fulfils the promise of the first. If it lacks something of the 'personality' of Charles Booth's comparable volumes that is, perhaps, in large part atoned for by the much more satisfactory statistical material that it contains. Indeed, there is a sense in which the most remarkable feature in the book is the greater degree of accurate quantitative knowledge of urgent problems now at our disposal. It makes the business of legislative planning a far more orderly process than could have been the case some forty years ago. Principle can now be tested against observation in a way that was not then possible."

---

---

P. S. KING & SON, LTD.,  
14 Great Smith Street, London, S.W.1.

# BOOKS TO READ

---

---

**HISTORY OF FACTORY LEGISLATION.** By B. L. HUTCHINS and A. HARRISON, D.Sc., with a Preface by SIDNEY WEBB, LL.B. *Third Edition*, revised, with a new Chapter. Demy 8vo. 298 pp. 9s.

This book contains a brief description of the origin of Factory Legislation and a full history of its development from 1800 onwards.

Originally published in 1903, it was the first systematic and complete analysis of its subject and ranks to-day as a standard work of reference.

**FACTORY LEGISLATION AND ITS ADMINISTRATION, 1891-1924.** By H. A. MESS, B.A. Demy 8vo. 228 pp. 12s. 6d.

The last thirty years or so have seen a great deal attempted and a good deal accomplished in the matter of factory legislation and its administration. It is the purpose of this book to give a history of those efforts, to record the achievements, and to point out and comment on some omissions and some failures of the period.

**FAMILY ALLOWANCES IN PRACTICE.** An Examination of the Family Wage System and of the Compensation Fund in Belgium, France, Germany and Holland. By HUGH H. R. VIBART, M.A., B.Litt. Demy 8vo. 260 pp. 10s. 6d.

This book is an attempt to describe the short but remarkable history of the Family Wage System in Europe, and in some measure to examine the reactions and the problems to which its rapid development has given rise.

*Daily News.*—"Mr. Vibart's studious, detailed and unpartisan book will enable many readers to follow the significant object-lesson which France is exhibiting to the world."

**THE TAILORING TRADE.** Select Documents illustrating the History of Trade Unionism. By F. W. GALTON. With a Preface by SIDNEY WEBB, LL.B., First published in 1896, re-issued 1923. Crown 8vo. 340 pp. 5s.

"This volume has for its basis a remarkable series of documents relating to the London Tailoring Trade, which have been, until lately, practically unknown to Economic Students. . . . We have in this unique series of contemporary pictures of the Tailoring Trade, extending over a century and a quarter, most interesting materials, both for the story of the industry itself, and for that Economic History of the eighteenth century of which we are all so much in need."

---

---

P. S. KING & SON, LTD.,  
14 Great Smith Street, London, S.W.1.

# BOOKS TO READ

---

---

**THE BRITISH EMPLOYMENT EXCHANGE.** By JOHN B. SEYMOUR. Demy 8vo. 300 pp. 12s.

A description of the past work of the British employment exchange, together with an analysis of the many forms of service it now renders in administering government programmes in connection with employment and unemployment, and suggestions as to further development.

*Scotsman.*—"Mr. Seymour has made a very thorough study into the histories of the activities which centre round the Employment Exchange, and the result is a book which will have considerable value as a volume of reference."

**ARBITRATION PRINCIPLES AND THE INDUSTRIAL COURT: An Analysis of Decisions, 1919-1920.** By MARY THERESA RANKIN, M.A., D.Phil. Crown 8vo. 192 pp. 7s. 6d.

This book gives an analysis of the Decisions of the Industrial Court dealing with wage disputes during the first ten years of the Court's existence, 1919 to 1929. The analysis brings out the nature of the principles applied by the Court, and forms a critical survey of wage policy over the period in a definite and unmistakable way.

**THE BRITISH TRADE BOARDS SYSTEM: An Inquiry into its Operation.** By DOROTHY SELLS, Ph.D. Demy 8vo. 304 pp. with 4 graphs. 12s. 6d.

The Minimum Wage in various occupations has been considered and fixed by the Trade Boards established by the Act of 1909. It is frequently asked by persons concerned with reconstruction problems in the field of labour: "How has the Trade Board System developed in Great Britain, and how has it worked under the test of time and economic chaos?" This book is an attempt to answer the question in so far as it is possible to do so from available information.

**THE INDUSTRIAL SYSTEM: An Inquiry into Earned and Unearned Income.** By J. A. HOBSON. Demy 8vo. 358 pp. *Second Impression. Revised Edition.* 7s. 6d.

Contents: A Business—Trades and Their Place in the Industrial System—Spending and Saving—Costs and Surplus—Wages, Interest and Rent—Ability—Distribution of the Surplus by Pulls—Prices and the Ratio of Exchange—The Mechanism of Markets—The Law of Supply and Demand—The Size of Businesses—Trusts and Monopolies—The Labour Movement—Socialism and the Social Income—Taxation of Imports—Money and Finance—Insurance—Unemployment—The Human Interpretation of Industry.

---

---

P. S. KING & SON, LTD.,  
14 Great Smith Street, London, S.W.1.