

Now the industrial efficiency of which much is being said and written at the present time, is a labor-saving method. "Pacemaking" by employers, which has contributed largely if not wholly to systematic "soldiering" among their workmen, may be called "efficiency"; and in so far as "efficiency" and "pacemaking" are identical, labor organizations are in the right, morally and economically, in denouncing it, in discouraging it, and in putting it under the ban of labor unionism. But the particular industrial "efficiency" to which Louis D. Brandeis has recently directed general attention is not "pacemaking"; and, as we understand its explanations, it cannot be profitably used for "pacemaking." On the contrary, its general use would tend to do away with "pacemaking" completely until its benefits had brought in other economic factors. For "pacemaking" consists in tempting the stronger and more enduring workers in an establishment to raise the standards of strength and endurance. But a high expenditure of strength and endurance is not necessarily high efficiency.

+

Contrary to that brutal method, the "efficiency" method we are considering seems to realize the highest efficiency in production not at higher but at lower points of strength and endurance. It is somewhat, for instance, as if a standard unit for daily running were to be set. Some persons would be unfit for running; these would be weeded out. Others might be fit for running, but more fit for something else; these too, would probably be weeded out later on. Of those who were adapted for running, tests would be made to ascertain the standard unit, which would be not at the longest distance under a strain for a short time, but at the longest distance under only such strain as would permit continuous exertion without loss of power.

+

But why isn't that "pacemaking," so far as the under-fit are concerned? If they have to resort to that employment from scarcity of opportunities for employment, it is "pacemaking." But in behalf of the efficiency idea it is argued that there are other and fit working opportunities for workmen weeded out anywhere as unfit. Were this true, continuously and without limitation, the argument would be good. In that case all kinds of work would increasingly rise in efficiency, producing larger results with the same or diminishing effort; and with every advance in efficiency in one kind of work, the demand for more labor

in most or all other kinds would prevent an excess of work relatively to working opportunities.

+

But we have no more reason to suppose that under existing industrial circumstances, labor-saving efficiency in method would have any different result from labor-saving machinery. Instead of more jobs than men, there might come more men than jobs; and the later effect of that upon efficiency would be to turn it into "pacemaking," and thereby to make it contribute to the exploitation of labor, just as improved machinery has done. In this view of the matter, is it not natural that labor unionists should instinctively discredit the "efficiency" movement? Natural, yes; but not reasonable. The reasonable thing to do is to demand of those who are exploiting the "efficiency" idea, that they use their influence concurrently in ridding modern industry of the ancient shackles which force poor laborers to yield to rich idlers the greater product that results from greater efficiency. An increase of 50 per cent in wages for several hundred per cent increase in productiveness, cannot be very attractive to workmen conscious of the certain decline in wages after "efficiency" has established higher levels of productiveness with lower levels of labor force. Nevertheless, if the efficiency movement is what it seems to be, there is no recourse for organized workmen but to swallow their objections, as they have had to do regarding improved machinery, and concentrate their energies upon securing for labor the benefits of both.

+ + +

### A SUGGESTION FOR THE STUDY OF TIPS.

"Tips are bad, but you can never get rid of the custom." The second part of this common remark need not come true. The custom is so undemocratic that in time it is sure to be abolished, and we may hope that each discussion of the subject will help to bring the end a little nearer. Hardly a year passes without some attempt somewhere to undo it, and each attempt will suggest another.

An attempt was once reported from Yale University. The reports did not give details, but enough was said to indicate that the attempt was to be serious. This academic movement has brought a suggestion. The professors of sociology in that university might set the subject as a theme for post-graduate investigation. Nearly every subject of a social nature has been set for investigation in our graduate schools except the tipping sys-

tem, and this would make an excellent subject for original research. The student might compare foreign and domestic tips, and tell us how much more burdensome the custom is in this country than abroad. One might guess that tips are about five times heavier over here than in Europe, but a scientific investigation would be necessary to establish the exact facts, and such an investigation would be valuable. Perhaps the Pullman company, or the Association of New York Restaurant Keepers, or the recently discovered contractors for tipping privileges, might be induced to offer a prize for the best monograph on the subject.

Some of the restaurants in London have a system which I have not seen in this country. You may not see the individual waiter, but at the cashier's stand there is a little box, like the boxes one sees in some places for the Salvation Army or the Children's Hospital, and over this little box is the invitation to contribute to the waiters. From one point of view this is a decided improvement. It emphasizes the ultimate effect, and the invitation should be made to read very plainly, "Help us to pay our help." All such departures as this from the usual custom, and there may be others, should form a part of the sociological student's scientific investigation.

Furthermore, the investigation should establish the facts as to the grades of tips, according to cities and location in cities, according to length of time on Pullmans, and according to wealth and station of tippers. There is a tradition that Mr. J. P. Morgan never tips with less than a five-dollar note and that Mr. J. D. Rockefeller never tips at all. These facts should be known. And who knows what differences may prevail between New York and Chicago, or between Sherry's and the Hotel Astor? In fact there is no subject on which people are more in the dark, and it is strange that it has so long escaped the ubiquitous search for new subjects of research in our graduate schools.

One evening on an ocean steamer, at one of the customary entertainments, a Philadelphia school-teacher was called on to give advice and information on the subject of tips to his fellow-tourists. It is hard to say why a school-teacher should have been called on, but he did himself great credit by saying that he knew nothing to say. Here then is a subject of interest to the thousands of travelers in all countries, and yet as to definite information all of us are as much in the dark as that Philadelphia teacher. Surely in this age of scientific investigation a subject of such general interest should not be longer neglected.

If the investigator is of a democratic turn of mind

he might be induced to carry his investigation into a consideration of the effect of tips on the character of the recipients, with some discussion of the degrading and undemocratic tendency of the custom. But this is more than can be reasonably expected of the University investigator, and all we ask at present is a study of the facts.

J. H. DILLARD.

\* \* \*

## PUBLIC SANITATION AND ITS REVENUES.

The following editorial appeared in a recent issue of "American Medicine":

*"The unearned increment does not seem to have the slightest relation to medical matters, but as it is a subject of intense interest to publicists, sanitarians must learn the arguments now being worked out to justify society in taking what is said to belong to it and not to the individual. It has always been accepted as an axiom that no rapidly growing community can possibly tax itself sufficiently to provide those sanitary necessities which cities of slower growth obtain only after decades of effort. It is now claimed that increased real estate values really belong to the people who created them and not to the man who was lucky enough to own the property and who did absolutely nothing to add to those values. It is therefore said that the unearned increments of valuation should yearly be taken to construct water and sewer systems, to pave streets, and to use in removing wastes and combatting disease. The idea is so revolutionary and borders so closely on the propositions of certain radical socialists, that there has been a great outcry against it, particularly from the English bankers who represent the people possessing this unearned wealth. Nevertheless the proposition is being seriously discussed by statesmen and has been taken up in America by conservative men who cannot possibly be accused of ill considered radicalism. The subject is thus brought into the sphere of practical sanitation and the medical profession must study the arguments, pro and con, to determine whether they are not justified in joining in the movement to put an end to preventable disease by methods never tried because money was never available.*

*"The ownership of increased valuation is the question in dispute. It is now openly claimed that if New York City should tax itself fifty millions to build subways which would add fifty millions to the property value of the regions served, the increase belongs to the community, who can take it*