

—their self-respect demanded good medical service at a cost they could afford and at a time and place convenient to them. So far State and National governments have actually done very little to solve the worker's health needs as the worker sees them, although a movement for some social security has been initiated.

Therefore when war conditions provided the opportunity for labor to secure

health insurance and service for the worker, the initiative was seized. Labor unions now have power to develop the kind of health programs they believe the workers prefer. No doubt past experience has generated policies within labor unions which will influence greatly their attitude toward management cooperation or government control of these health services.

Some Implications of Collective Bargaining

By H. D. Woods

EXPERIENCE in the field of industrial relations during the past few years suggests that important changes in the character of collective-bargaining institutions and in the objectives of labour through the collective bargaining machinery are taking place. The undue emphasis in the press on such manifestations of industrial unrest such as strikes, lockouts, illegal picketing and the like have obscured the larger issues and diverted public attention from fundamentals. Careful examination of the data reveal unmistakable trends which are of profound importance.

Observing the principle battlegrounds of industrial dispute helps one to understand more clearly what seem to be the principle issues, and particularly how the issues are being modified and reshaped under current industrial relationships. The impression one gets is apt to be confusing. Labor demands for wage increases, union security, the check-off, shorter hours, holidays with pay, and the like become involved with government policy regarding inflation, as reflected in price controls including wages and with the ambitions of political parties, both reformist and revolutionary. Labour demands and management refuses and does a lot of preaching. To add to the confusion, in this country, we face

the problem involved in the reversion of the responsibility for labour matters from federal to provincial governments next April.

The problem is to see if all the bits and pieces of industrial relations can be fitted into a rational mosaic. To do this it is necessary to examine the purposes of collective bargaining and the forces governing the process.

The two sides to the wage contract are the employer and the employee. The employer often believes he has little or no need to deal collectively with his employees. Traditionally he has opposed the organization of the workers and has used every possible device to prevent organization. The law, bargaining power, the yellow dog contract, the lockout, the company union and other instruments including violence have been used to prevent independent organization. He has likewise attempted to limit the activities of unions after they are organized. In other words these workers' associations have had to establish the right to exist on the one hand, and the right to act on the other.

Employers have been surprised at the toughness and persistence of trade unionism. This arises out of the nature of the wage contract. The employer bargains either directly, or through an employers' association, whichever he thinks is the stronger. The worker has been turning

more and more to the labour union as his bargaining agency. The employer has often made the mistake of looking on the trade union as purely an economic agency, similar to an employers' bargaining association. This is a too simplified interpretation of the trade union movement. The trade union satisfies, in addition to economic purposes, certain psychological and sociological needs of the worker.

Every man, likes to identify himself with a group. If a strong economic motive exists the inclination to association is fortified. For example, the average individual who joins a service club or a board of trade, or in some cases even a church does so because of the unconscious impulsion to associate, rather than in response to a rational desire to carry out the functions for which the organization exists. This is true of unionism, although it may be becoming less so as the unions become more and more the economic bargaining agent. Negatively the union is a mass declaration of independence from the employer. One labour writer points out that every worker on occasion wants to tell his superior to go to hell. Joining a union is a collective way of doing so.

Positively the union provides the worker with the satisfaction of belonging, to an association. It gives him status in his own society, even though he may not participate to any great extent in union affairs. It is well to remember these non-economic impulsions towards association.

Scientific management is based partly on the recognition of the non-economic interests of the worker. Employers have been only grudgingly giving up the notion that by wise direction they can cater to these psychological needs and hence avoid organization. But intelligent personnel direction must be prepared to accept collective bargaining as part of the process of industrial relations.

So far nothing has been said about the third party's interests—the public. As long as collective bargaining works

reasonably smoothly the public takes little notice of the process. But the public is doubly concerned. In the first place the public suffers when industrial strife produces a slowdown, a strike, or a lockout. This point need not be laboured after recent experience.

The public is also concerned with the impact of industrial relations on social institutions. Here we get onto very controversial grounds. The type of contract may profoundly alter some social institution. Furthermore, trade unionism is the core of the labour movement which includes as well, cooperatives, credit unions, political parties and the like. Socially all of these represent a sort of surge of labour in, what they consider to be, the direction of a better life.

Now unionism and collective bargaining are a product of democratic principle and practice, and so are these other worker institutions mentioned above. They are rooted in the right of associations and other principles of a free society such as freedom of expression, the right to withdraw work and the like.

This whole relationship between collective bargaining and these democratic principles become particularly significant as the area of the economy covered by collective bargaining is enlarged. For example, the closed shop as a principle has been in practice in certain trades for many years. In fact, in Britain it was normal in agreements of the last century. While it was met by considerable hostility, it was not until the C.I.O. started its drive for the union shop that employers began to appear as the defenders of democratic rights of workmen.

The question of union security is the most important one in the collective bargaining field to-day. It is unwise to minimize the importance of the current wage drive, but this is labour's attempt to nail down the increased real income brought about by stabilized wartime regulations, all-out production and full employment. The wage drive represents collective bargaining in action;

the security drive represents a determination to recast the structure of collective bargaining or to establish an altered framework within which bargaining is to take place. Labour is attempting to consolidate the gains made with regard to recognition which were achieved in the United States under the Wagner Act in the 1930's and in Canada under war-time orders-in-council.

During the war, union security was reasonably protected by the technique of certification and by the social interest in preventing industrial dispute. Labour was in a strong position. That position has become potentially weaker since the close of hostilities. While the actual machinery set up officially has not changed appreciably, the possibility of an easier labour market coupled with the prospect of the return of labour administration to the provinces, and the anticipated fear of hostile employers' action could result in a loss of ground by organized labour.

It is not beyond the realm of possibility that the union shop might become the predominant pattern in industry. At least there are indications that some greater degree of union security is spreading, either through a membership clause or a check-off provision or a combination of these two. The Rand decision in the Ford strike granted union security via the check-off. The Saskatchewan legislation has provided for it through both membership and the check-off. We may be now passing into a period when such security will be granted. This conclusion has also been reached by many employers and managers.

There are a number of important implications to follow from such a situation if it becomes general. Workmen will be in a position similar to the lawyer who must be in good standing with his bar association before he can practice his profession. While employers may have little or no restriction placed on their hiring activities, they will find that all their labour problems will become involved in union relationships. The

power of the unions will be enhanced very considerably. There will probably be a gradual increase in union influence, and management may of necessity have to concede larger functions to the unions and to share some management functions with them.

In a sense unions have been given a quasi-official status with the advent of certification and the responsibility to act as bargaining agent for all the workers. While it is true that we have been having a very considerable number of certification elections, it is well to remember that the present represents an early stage in this development. There have been few re-elections after one union has been certified. It is a fair presumption that after the labour field rounds out its union expansion, there will be a tendency for established unions to consolidate and for intra-labour strife to work itself within the certified agency rather than through competing organizations.

Some social action designed to prevent abuse of power may be necessary. Undoubtedly considerable law breaking has been associated with the current spate of industrial strife. In some instances the law may be frustrating the purposes of collective bargaining and in others tactics of parties may be subverting the law. This is a problem in itself.

But the social interest becomes involved in another way. It has become apparent that unions, in their major efforts are acting in concert with the aid of overall plans and strategy. It is quite obvious that, for example the Canadian Congress unions have been acting in accordance with plans worked out by the Congress. This has been stated in so many words by President Mosher in his annual address to the convention of the Congress when he said—"—the Canadian Congress of Labour has undertaken to serve its affiliated and chartered unions in a more comprehensive manner than has ever previously been attempted in Canada by any central labour body. The Congress has endeavored to develop

general policies behind which it could mobilize the strength of all its unions, and for the first time a very large body of workers, representing many of the basic industries of the nation, and located in various centres from coast to coast, sought simultaneously the same objectives."¹ This reflects the growing relative power of union and federation head offices. Its effect may be to force the establishment of national policies or approximations thereof with regard to wages, hours, and the like. There are discernible patterns in some of our major strikes, for example steel. The incipient movement toward industry—wide bargaining on both sides suggest the same trend. Probably the emergence of employers' associations is part of the same piece. Developments in the United States appear to be following similar paths, and organized labour is demanding not only union security but a much greater influence in national economic policies.²

All this suggests that the weakness of labour in the old condition of small organizations and limited security may be passing. If so it has great significance for industrial relations. The steel strike

showed that labour now has the power to enforce a wage which might have important national economic influence. If anything this labour power will grow. It will draw its support from trade union members and numerical political strength. The implications for settling the conditions of work, for wage theory and the like are tremendous.

European countries, notably Great Britain and Sweden, have developed collective bargaining institutions to a greater degree than has North America. But they have usually also developed powerful labour political parties and have worked out, more or less, a division of function between the two wings of their movement. On this continent labour has stressed collective bargaining machinery and neglected political action. It is now striving for security of collective bargaining agencies. At the same time it is enlarging the scope of such agencies by including in bargaining broader issues of social and economic policy and by utilizing the power of central offices of the federations. In a sense the bargaining table is being enlarged to provide for larger people, and larger issues are being thrown on the table.

It is not possible to say how far these developments will go at the present time. They are, none the less, significant and will bear watching.

1. *The Canadian Unionist*, Vol. XX, No. 10. October, 1946.
2. See, for example, an article entitled "National Collective Bargaining" in *Personnel Journal*, November, 1946, by Solomon Backin, Textile Workers' Union of America, C.I.O.

What Are the Possibilities of Settlement in Canada's North Land?

By H. W. HEWETSON

CANADA, according to the 1941 census, has a little over three persons per square mile. This low density is occasioned, of course, by the fact that including the unsettled parts within provincial boundaries about eighty per cent of Canada is practically devoid of popula-

tion. Thus it is with reason that the outside world looks on Canada as an empty country. Often have we been warned that our great unfilled spaces constitute a standing temptation to peoples in the overcrowded parts of the world. The lure of a great unexploited territory remains even though no people on earth has yet found any important use for arctic or sub-arctic lands. At the moment we need not fear the infiltration of large numbers of Asiatic

EDITOR'S NOTE: Professor Hewetson is on the staff of the Department of Political Economy of the University of Alberta. During the summer of 1944 he made, on behalf of the Canadian Social Science Research Council, extensive studies of the North Country.