

Getting Together and Remaining Together

Fellowship under pressure not lasting—Organized labor and Goodwill

By J. W. MACMILLAN.

If a ship were wrecked on the coast of an uninhabited island in the midst of some lonely sea, and but two of the crew survived to begin life afresh upon the island; if those two happened to be captain and common sailor, between whom there had been no relation except that of master and servant, that relationship would inevitably be altered. They would be driven into friendship. A natural human relationship based on their intrinsic worth as human beings would arise. It might easily happen that the man from the fore-castle would become the leader, if he chanced to have had more experience in past times in roughing it, and was the more resourceful of the two. With the loss of the ship all that was artificial, traditional and adventitious would disappear, and a new condition, more just and happy, would take its place. If these two men were normal human beings they would become comrades, sharing each other's intimate thoughts, and pledged by affection to each other's welfare.

Let us suppose that, after a time, these Crusoes are rescued. The vessel that carries them back to the world of men separates them. One becomes the guest of the captain in the cabin, and the other is given a bunk with the sailors. The dress which is supplied to them sets the mark of superior and inferior position on them. No doubt the strong friendship which had been nourished in hardship and loneliness on the island would persist. The two would often meet, and still pledge their affection. The separation on the vessel would be looked upon as temporary, and they would resolve to renew the old association once they reached land.

But it is extremely unlikely that, in spite of their regard for each other, the intimacy bred on the island would continue. Every day spent on the voyage back to civilization would make it harder to regain the free comradeship of their exile. And, when the port had been reached, new mergings in old groups, the resumption of old habits, and the necessity of seeking their aforesaid jobs, would effectively disrupt their comradeship. They might meet occasionally afterwards "as ships that pass in the night," but they would not be close friends again. With the release from the pressure of exile, loneliness and the need of co-operation in order to preserve their lives, and the reflux of the old-time customs and habits of their lives they would become as strangers to each other. If it happened that they found themselves working on the same ship again, the early relationship of master and servant would re-assert itself, and their lives only touch as one gave orders and the other obeyed.

That may prove to be the story of the relationship between capital and labor. They have been thrown together during the four years of war much as the two men were thrown together on the lonely island. The pressure of attack by a formidable and ruthless enemy has driven them into intimacies and co-operations which they had not dreamed of before. The result of this companionship has bred in both of them a new respect and esteem for each other. The question is, will this new and wholesome relationship continue? Will it show the strength necessary to resist the return of the old-time industrial conditions, with their inevitable tendency to separate master and men and drive them into enmity to each other?

The good feeling which prevails at the moment between capital and labor is undeniable. It is evident in Britain, the United States and Canada. It is, when one recalls the situation five years ago, an astonishing phenomenon. In Britain there are the merging of hand and brain workers in one organization, the Whitley proposals, the industrial councils and employment bureaus, and so many other evidences of good will towards each other on both sides that I need say no more of them just now.

In the United States we have the public pronouncements of such men as Charles Schwab, John D.

Rockefeller, Jr., Earl Dean Howard, and a host of others. What does it mean when the United States Chamber of Commerce adopts an industrial platform in which one of the planks is:

"The right of the workers to organize is to be admitted and collective bargaining conceded?"

In an address before the member of the Chamber of Commerce, John D. Rockefeller, Jr., asks what the attitude of the leaders of industry should be as they face the period of reconstruction. He says:

"Will it be an attitude in which I myself profoundly believe, which takes cognizance of the inherent right and justice of the principles underlying the new order, which recognizes that mighty changes are inevitable, many of them desirable, which not waiting until forced to adopt new methods, takes the lead in calling together the parties interested for a round-table conference to be held in a spirit of justice, fair-play and brotherhood, with a view to working out some plan of co-operation which will insure to all those concerned adequate representation, an opportunity to earn a fair wage under proper working conditions, with such restrictions as to hours as shall leave time not alone for food and sleep, but also for recreation and the development of the higher things of life."

In line with this is the statement of Mr. Howard, of the firm of Hart, Schaffner & Marx, which firm, it will be remembered, passed through a severe experience in the strike of their employees eight years ago. He says, speaking of collective bargaining:

"We have found it a good thing. One valuable thing about it is the wholesome criticism of

the management. Grievances are not to be ignored or refused consideration, but welcomed rather. Improved management is the result."

That leading employers of labor in Canada are inclined to adopt the same views is shown in the utterances of Sir John Willison, speaking for the Canadian Industrial Reconstruction Association, in an address published by this Association. Sir John says:

"... the organization of labor is natural and necessary. . . . It is vain to contest the validity of its right to organize, to deny the necessity for collective action, or to minimize the benefits which through organization have accrued to the working population."

So much for the side of capital. On the side of labor we may call attention to the devoted and enthusiastic energy of organized labor throughout the English-speaking world in aiding to win the war, and which often led to the sacrificial abandonment of advantages which had been won by hard fighting, and were regarded as most precious. Not only in Britain and the United States, but also in Canada, labor leaders have used their persuasive powers to impel the workers to make the utmost contribution possible for the great cause of right and freedom imperilled by the war.

Such is the happy and conciliatory position to-day. But will it last? It is certain to be subjected to tests of extreme severity. The average employer, when he finds that making profits has become less easy, and that the unemployed are beginning to look through the bars of his outer gate, while his patriotic impulses are no longer stimulated so forcibly, will be tempted to recur to thinking of labor as a commodity, and forgetting that it is flesh and blood.

The workers have never been so strongly placed as during the last few years, because there has been no margin of the unemployed. While this unusual power may occasionally have led them to use language more positive than formerly, it has also given

(Continued on page 13.)

WEEK'S RECORD OF ACTIVE MONTREAL STOCKS.

Sales.	Open.	High.	Low.	Last sale.	Net chge.	— Close —	Asked.	Bid.	
100	Abitibi, pfd.	90%	90%	90%	90%	+ 3/4	
125	Ames-Holden, pfd.	69%	70	69%	70	+4	69%	69 1/2	
1/2	*Asbestos	46 1/2	46 1/2	46	
75	Can. Car, pfd.	85	85	85	85	unch.	85 1/4	84 1/4	
185	*Can. Cement	65	65	65	65	- 1/2	65 1/4	65	
10	Do., pfd.	95 1/2	95 1/2	95	
65	Can. Steamships	45%	45%	45%	45%	+ 3/4	45%	45 1/2	
81	Do., pfd.	78%	78%	78%	78%	unch.	78%	78 1/2	
135	Dom. Steel	62 1/4	62 1/4	62	62	- 3/4	62 1/4	62	
50	Dom. Textile	104	104	104	104	+ 3/4	104	103 3/4	
20	Do., pfd.	101 1/2	101	
711	Laurentide	197 1/2	198	197	197	unch.	197 1/2	197 1/4	
90	Montreal Power	87%	87%	87%	87%	- 1/4	87%	
15	Ontario Steel	27 1/4	27 1/4	
35	Penmans	77 1/2	80	
5	Riordon, pfd.	94	
10	St. Lawrence Flour	95	96	94 3/4	
10	Steel of Canada	64%	64%	64	
25	Wayagamack	53%	53%	53%	53%	- 3/4	54	54%	
— BANKS —									
5	Molsons	179%	
53	Montreal	216	216	216	216	unch.	
10	Ottawa	203	203	203	203	+1	202 3/4	
1	Scotia	255	
20	Union	163	163	163	163	+3	164 1/4	
— BONDS —									
\$400	Can. Loan (1925)	96 1/2	
1,000	Do. (1931)	95 7/8	96	95 7/8	96	96	
6,850	Victory (1922)	98 1/2	98 1/2	98	98 1/2	98	
18,750	Do. (1927)	100%	100%	100 1/2	100 1/2	- 1/2	101	100 1/2	
16,650	Do. (1937)	102 1/2	102 1/2	102 1/2	102 1/2	unch.	102 1/2	102	
3,000	Dom. Cotton	98	98	98	98	+1	
3,000	Dom. Coal	92%	92%	92%	92%	+2%	92	
12,000	Wayagamack	81	81	81	81	unch.	82	81	
— UNLISTED SHARES. —									
189	Laurentide Power	61 1/2	61 1/2	61 1/2	61 1/2	unch.	61 1/2	61	

*—Ex-dividend.