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Abstract

Both the development and the effective operation of health and welfare services, public and voluntary alike, depend heavily upon public understanding and approval. Yet welfare services have changed so radically in recent decades that much misunderstanding and "cultural lag" exists.

"Public opinion" comprises the expressions of interest and viewpoint of many different groups: there are many "publics" rather than one homogeneous citizenry. Trade unions are an important segment, not only as representing the increasing industrial sections of the working-force, but because of growing numbers and influence in public affairs.

Accordingly, the present study is directed particularly to the attitudes, views, and information about health and welfare services among members in a large and representative trade union (International Woodworkers of America, Local 1-217).

An original questionnaire was formulated and revised after some preliminary testing. After striking a random sample from membership lists, forty rank-and-file unionists and a group of officials were then interviewed in their homes or offices.

Some of the most best-substantiated findings are as follows. (1) There is a high degree of unanimity concerning the assignment of welfare responsibilities to government, and in particular, the federal government, though there is doubt as to the best division between provincial and local. (2) The rank-and-file reveal favourable feelings towards the Community Chest, whereas officials' views question the need for its existence. (3) The Community Chest is identified almost wholly, by both rank-and-file and officials as a fund-raising organization. (4) There is singularly little recognition of the need for citizen participation in welfare planning. (5) Trade union members in general looked upon social workers with some respect, but ascribed low status to their professional role. Both the kinds of tabulations in this rather neglected area of opinion measurement, and the views brought to light in this pilot study, suggest there could be considerable value in continued research.
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THE ROLE OF TRADE UNIONS IN SOCIAL WELFARE:

An Exploratory Study of the Attitudes of Trade Union Members Towards Health and Welfare Services
CHAPTER 1

ORGANIZED LABOUR AND MODERN SOCIAL WELFARE

A. The Community and Social Welfare

Since the last quarter of the nineteenth century when the Charity Organization Societies began in England, social workers have been concerned not only with the giving of effective and adequate personal service to families and individuals who needed it but also with a co-operative approach to the social welfare problems of the community at large.

In 1908, in Pittsburgh, the first council of social agencies was formed and in 1913, in Cleveland, the first modern community chest was established. The term "community organization" came into use about the time of the First World War although the 'fact' of community organization in the sense of the development of social welfare services and programmes to meet needs, must go back as far or almost as far as organized social service efforts.

Important changes have occurred both in the nature of communities themselves and in our understanding of the principles underlying their operation, since the first two decades of the twentieth century. These changes began to be manifest, historically, between 1920 and 1930: improved communication, rapid transportation, increased mobility, and expanding urbanization ran counter to the "community movement"
of the first decade of the century with its fervent faith in the neighbourhood and the small community as the foundation of democracy and the medium for the socialization of the individual. Sociologists became more interested in larger areas and began to talk in terms of city, suburban, and regional planning rather than of "community organization". Over recent years in the western world the traditional autonomous "village type" community based on primary group contacts, rural culture patterns, and residential propinquity has largely disappeared into the modern metropolis, and is rapidly declining even in non-urban areas.

This change, however, is reflected in the pure and applied social sciences primarily in orientation, focus, and technique rather than in basic values and objectives. Interest continues to center in the local area but it is concentrated less on the immediate structural type and more on relational systems, "contact clusters", and occupational and other interest groupings which are city-wide in their scope. Social control, planning, and social organization are now seen as effective only on this broader stage and as related to larger groupings, wider interests, and interlocking associations. Neighbourhood improvements, for example, cannot be attained in isolation since at every point they are inextricably intertwined with municipal government, regional planning, provincial and federal resources and controls. Similarly, changes in the modalities of social welfare planning as such are closely related to the
changes that have occurred in the planning, organization, and action in other areas of public concern.

What is needed is a definition that combines the earlier conception of the community in geographical terms with the current emphasis on wider interest groupings—what one writer has loosely termed "functional communities".¹ In the meantime, "community welfare organization" has apparently come to be accepted as the term to designate one of the major processes employed in social work, and if it is interpreted in the broader context indicated above, its limitations are perhaps no more serious than those associated with the terms "social casework", or "social group work", or "social work" itself.

Community organization for social welfare, therefore, is distinct from other types of community activities such as water works and public utilities, transportation, housing, parks, sanitation, schools and churches, because it is directly related to social welfare. But at the same time participants in community organization for social welfare are well aware of other essential needs of organizing the community and attempt to achieve close co-operation with other organizations which are active in related fields, such as the city council, education boards, labour unions and political parties.

---

A recent and definite revival of interest in the community as thus understood has occurred. This renewed concern results from current sociological and anthropological research, experiments in group dynamics, community adult education and similar movements in North America, as well as from the phenomenal expansion of "community development" in the technically less-developed countries in the world. The last definitely involves national planning and organization together with technical assistance, as well as local co-operation and self-help in the solution of the problem of how to prevent the destruction of the community spirit in the face of economic aid, industrialization, and increasing urbanization.

The local neighbourhood or community is now seen more clearly than ever before as the *locus* or "setting" in which the process of intergroup planning, co-operation, and action operates, and as the front line of community organization in social welfare as in other fields.

B. **Community Organization**

Little has been written about the history of community organization. The history of social work and social welfare as a whole is a surprisingly neglected field of study, and community organization has been even less explored than some other areas of the subject. Even in the textbooks aiming at being definitive, the history of community organization has usually been dealt with in a sketchy fashion. The chief
exceptions are Campbell G. Murphy's historical chapters, which relate community organization to a broad social and economic background, and Wayne McMillen's historical presentations under specific topics.¹

The history of community organization since 1870 may be thought of as falling into three broad periods: the first, centered about the charity organization movement, from the 1870's to about 1917; the second, characterized by the rise of federation—chests and councils—and extending from World War I to the end of the depression of the 1930's; the third, the period since 1939, marked by the broadened recognition of the process of community organization, greater leadership by public welfare agencies, and an increased emphasis upon the professional elements of community organization practice.²

Both practitioners and those who have taught the subject have found difficulty in defining community organization. Harper and Dunham, for example, present no less than thirteen definitions, which range in time of origin from 1921 to 1955. They are fairly typical, and probably include the definitions


that have been most widely used. The most recent of these definitions, by Murray G. Ross, combines the two prevalent ideas of meeting needs and achieving co-operation. Ross sees community organization as "... a process by which a community identifies its needs or objectives, orders (or ranks) these needs or objectives, develops the confidence and will to work at these needs or objectives, finds the resources (internal and/or external) to deal with these needs or objectives, takes action in respect to them, and in so doing extends and develops co-operative and collaborative attitudes and practices in the community."  

The process of community organization in social welfare is applied through certain gradually evolved and widely used methods, such as fact finding, planning, conference and committees, fund-raising, social action, recording, and education, interpretation, and public relations. It is these latter aspects of community organization method that we are primarily concerned with in the present study.

C. Public Understanding: through Public Relations, Education, and Interpretation

It is an unfortunate but apparently well-founded observation that the profession of social work has a poor press and suffers from unsatisfactory public relations. Indeed,

---

2 Ross, op. cit., p. 39.
social workers are often accused of not being community-minded, and of concentrating too exclusively on service to individual clients with a consequent disregard of their responsibility to the public at large and failure to assume the duties of broad social leadership.

Yet any programmes involving the numbers of people served directly by social welfare and the amount of money regularly spent must carry a heavy load of public accountability, whether this is conceived in formal, constitutional terms or in a looser, more figurative sense. Only an informed and alert public can provide both the support and the criticism that welfare agencies need. "In all times, in all lands, public opinion has had control at the last word . . . It is not only the right but the obligation of all individuals or aggregations of individuals who come before the public to see that the public has full and complete information."¹ Thus, as a matter both of political obligation and of practical effectiveness one can argue the necessity of understanding the public, of informing it, of winning it over. The ability to do so is a test of leadership.

This need for public understanding has been affirmed at many points in the literature of social work. In 1952, at the National Conference on Social Welfare, the president,

Lester Granger, said that "... after nearly a century of organized effort to promote community welfare the American public still does not grasp the full concept of community welfare, nor understand what it is that agencies and practitioners are really trying to do."¹ He challenged social workers to accept the responsibility for correcting the situation.

Robert H. MacRae has claimed that the utterances of certain conservative critics of social welfare "... will have served one useful end if they wake up social work to one great truth: that the future development and growth of health and welfare services, public and voluntary alike, depends upon public understanding and approval."² Not only is an adequate flow of information from any organization to its publics something owing to them, but it is important to the welfare and security of the organization itself to learn what others know and say of it. "Do we really know how people feel about welfare?" Wayne Vasey asks.³ "Are we actually aware of their attitudes to welfare programmes?"


Not only is the development of an informed public understanding an important part of administration in the case of individual social agencies, including the welfare council, but it is even more important, perhaps, in connection with interagency relations and the overall pattern of community welfare services. It is a major objective of community organization in improving existing resources as well as in the promotion of new services and programmes, and hence is a strategically significant part of welfare planning.

Public information can also be considered as a condition of the "use" of services in social welfare agencies. Most communities, for example, maintain a central information bureau or service which is designed to provide information for the public and in some cases to make referrals for service. Such public information may contribute ultimately to improving social efficiency as well as individual human welfare.

In order that any person with a problem may come to an agency and obtain help a number of conditions other than the existence of a service have to be operative: the individual must be aware that something is disturbing his well-being, that he is uncomfortable and needs to have help; existing services must be known and acceptable to the person with the problem; and they must be given at a time, place, and in a manner which will make it possible for him to use them. These conditions often do not exist. When this is the case, services fail to reach potential clients.
Understanding and knowledgeability about the proper use of community health and welfare services may also be considered as a contributing factor to the avoidance of dependency and parasitism, on the part of the people who are accustomed to using welfare services.

Assumptions about public attitudes may well affect the actual administration of welfare services. For example, Arthur J. Willcocks has conducted a small survey of public reactions to the concept of 'the means test' and its application to the social services in England. He found no evidence of strong emotional reactions; in fact, most people viewed the idea of the means test as something rather unreal—contrary to what Willcocks calls "the fabric of politicians' thought . . . that the means test is an indignity no one should be asked to submit to when in a position of need."¹

Certainly knowledge of public attitudes is essential to the improvement of services, the formulation of sound policies, the betterment of personal relationships, the overcoming of criticism, and the gaining of public good-will and understanding.

Skilled service in social work, therefore, is not enough--it is also necessary to promulgate the objectives and ideals of social work. And, since public support for social welfare programmes is necessary, it is a corollary that public understanding is equally essential.

In approaching this problem of public understanding, it is important "the public", as a convenient but often vacuous abstraction, should be seen in all its living variety, and the specific publics with which particular organizations have their dealings should be identified and purposefully educated. "The more one can divide the people one wants to reach into specific groups and then individualize the approach to them, the more effective understanding they will get of the ideas one is trying to get across." 1

Baker and Routzahn split the composite public into a number of smaller, more specific, and concrete audiences, or publics, and suggest that these more or less separate and identifiable groups be approached on a differentiated basis. They describe eight such publics, which are depicted diagrammatically in the form of concentric circles surrounding the typical social agency. 2 Other analyses have been suggested: Wayne Vasey, for example, lists five groups which are classified in terms of their attitudes toward the organization. 3

---


D. Organized Labour and Social Welfare

Organized labour is the 'public' whose attitudes and levels of understanding and knowledgeability about social welfare questions are being examined in this study.

It is well known that labour unions have had a long history of concern for the social welfare of their members and their communities. Even the earliest labour associations brought people together to consider common problems and to devise ways and means for their solution. Assistance to members in times of distress, public education, child labour, and working conditions are areas of collective action in which labour historically has demonstrated a deep and abiding interest.¹

Originally, however, labour unions manifested a marked suspicion of and notably little sympathy for social work, whether public or private. Even when industrial workers during World War I contributed to Community Chest drives, they manifested a distinct indifference to the aims and methods of charitable agencies and the programmes that the drives supported. However, by the early 1930's various points of contact began to emerge between labour and social work. Some of these were: (a) the election of more labour representatives to boards of social service agencies, planning bodies, public

welfare boards, and community chests; (b) the organization of social agency workers into labour unions; and (c) growing recognition of the importance of better labour participation in social work, as expressed typically in the conferences of social workers and labour union members.

World War II and the organization of the National War Fund in the U. S. A. plus labour's concern to alleviate the suffering in the war-torn countries, shed new light on the basic need for closer co-operation between labour and social work. Organized labour co-operated in the National War Fund through special war relief committees of the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations. Representatives of labour groups were employed in community chests, and labour began to play a more significant role in social work.¹

The unions¹ new interest extended beyond money raising and spread first to the interpretation of the services of local agencies to their members, as a part of their fundamental purposes as mutual aid organizations, and then to a concern for the planning of community welfare services. In short, instead of having mere "representation", labour moved into real participation

in the fact-finding, planning, fund-raising, and allocations of funds for social welfare. In taking over the labour participation programme of the National War Fund, Community Chests and Councils of America created what is known as its Labour Participation Department. The Department has a small staff recommended and approved by both the A. F. L. and the C. I. O. and stands in the position of a service centre for chests and councils and other welfare organizations and labour groups in the development of good relationships between labour and social welfare throughout the U. S. A. and Canada.

To lend its full weight to improving community health and welfare services, the founding convention of the A. F. L. - C. I. O. in 1955 established a Community Services Committee. This committee was set up to stimulate the active participation by members and affiliated unions in the affairs of their communities, and the development of sound relationships with social agencies in such communities. A statement of principles which explains clearly the union philosophy on community services was adopted by the A. F. L. - C. I. O. Executive Council in 1956; it is presented in Appendix C.

The Canadian Labour Congress established a Welfare Services Committee with similar purposes to those of the Community Services Committee of the A. F. L. - C. I. O. A Resolution on Welfare Services, adopted by the C. L. C. in Convention and therefore constituting a Statement of Policy,
is provided in Appendix D. In effect, the C. L. C. has tended to take a pragmatic view of health and welfare services. It has been actively involved in the work of private agencies. At the same time, the C. L. C. is in favour of a comprehensive system of social legislation which, if carried out, would at the least reduce the role of private agencies.

E. Attitudes of Trade Union Members: Their Importance

Some of the reasons for studying the attitudes of trade union members to health and welfare matters have been implicit in the foregoing discussion of the community, community organization for social welfare, the need for public understanding of social work, and the brief historical review of co-operation between organized labour and social service organizations, both public and private. There are, however, further, practical reasons for conducting research within this area which it would be well to mention before proceeding further.

To begin with, labour union membership represents an important source of income, (which may be in any given case either actual or potential), for those private agencies which rely heavily on voluntary contributions for their financing.

In Vancouver, today, for example, the Community Chest is in a period of crisis because of its failure to raise the funds necessary for the maintenance and improvement of services, and because of the erosion of public good will and confidence
towards the Chest and its fund-raising efforts. The Chest is presently concerned with putting new emphasis on campaign efficiency and organization, with stressing the need for a re-shaping of the voluntary health and welfare field of service in Vancouver, and with a heavy concentration on year-'round interpretation of activities.

The picture of the Community Chest in Vancouver is a continuously changing one; from an organization of 34 agencies in 1931 the Chest has grown to encompass 65 different organizations today. Over the years 66 new agencies have joined; 28 have merged, have had their functions assumed by government, have gone out of existence, or have withdrawn.

The 1961 Annual Report of the Community Chests and Councils of the Greater Vancouver Area states that "A large number of men and women still have to be convinced of the importance of United giving. Statistics from the 1961 report show that just half the employee force in Greater Vancouver gives at the place of work. The growth potential of the United Appeal is high and is of vital importance as services continue to report increasing social problems and a need for more adequate financing."¹

One of the Chest's prime functions is to create an awareness among citizens of what services should properly receive

voluntary financing and what services should be tax-supported. To be successful a United Appeal must encompass a major share of a community's voluntary health and welfare services.

"Future gains in scope and achievement," it is stated in the Report, "will be made by convincing citizens in key groups to give wider support to the Chest's work with their gifts . . . These groups include men and women in executive and management ranks, in the professions and in large employee groups. Individual backing as well as the backing of corporations and labour is vital to the Chest's future."¹

It is important, therefore, for the private agencies to know whether labour union members have beliefs or feelings about welfare questions which are likely to affect their level of giving. Gaining information of this kind would enable the private agencies to take remedial action by changing their activities in the direction indicated by public sentiment, by attempting to correct misinformation, by attempting to soften unreasonable prejudices, or reconciling themselves to the loss of income by frankly recognizing that there is a conflict of opinion which admits of no easy solution, or no solution at all. (Nor, in this connection, should we forget that trade union members represent a potential population of recipients of the services provided by private health and welfare organizations).

¹Loc. cit.
Organized labour also maintains a considerable financial stake in public welfare, both as a recipient of public welfare benefits and as a contributor to government revenues. For example, union members or their dependents can be expected to receive their proportionate share of veterans' pensions and allowances, assistance to the blind and the disabled, old age pensions and old age assistance, mothers' allowances, widows' pensions, family allowances, public health, and hospital expenditures.¹

Closely connected with the labour unions' active help in raising and contributing the necessary funds for voluntary health and welfare agencies is the participation of trade union members in a variety of volunteer activities. Not only do labour members volunteer their time to provide such services as visiting the patients of mental hospitals or the inmates of prisons, and working with youth organizations, but they also participate as labour representatives in community welfare councils and other social agencies.

As we have observed above, it is axiomatic in the traditions of North American private social work that the private social agencies are instruments, as it were, of the popular will in the sphere of charity. Accordingly, their government must be fundamentally representative in character.

The public's rights and responsibilities do not cease with making donations but extend in the fields of policy making. For this reason, among others, virtually all private agencies have a variety of constitutional devices for encouraging lay participation in the creation of policy. The chief and best known of these devices is the elected board of directors. In so far as representatives of labour on these boards bring to office recurrent and consequential attitudes about social welfare questions which will influence the part they play in the making of policy, it is again of considerable importance that these attitudes be known and be made explicit.

There is always the possibility that the attitudes of union members to social welfare questions will colour and influence the attitudes of people who are not union members. The obvious field of application for this hypothesis would be the family circle of union members. Too little is known of the ways in which opinion is originated and disseminated, but evidence does exist to suggest that the individual's voting behaviour (to take a relatively familiar example) is strongly influenced by the political sentiments prevailing in his own household. Thus a study of the attitudes of union members to social welfare questions might acquire an additional importance in as much as the union members could serve as a source of opinion determination for wider sections of the public.
Two other related considerations bearing on the importance of determining the attitudes of trade union members to social welfare questions are the fact that unions frequently organize their own welfare services, and the fact that unions often have agreements with their employers providing for certain welfare services. In assessing the range and structure of any community's welfare resources, and the extent to which the fact of having organized their own services—either independently or in co-operation with employers—colours the members' views of the desirability of providing services under alternative auspices, these two considerations would certainly need to be taken into account.

Of course, it is important to be aware that it has yet to be proved that the opinions of union members are in any systematic way different from those of the 'general public'. For example, labour union members, considered as donors to private agencies, may in fact be no more than representative members of the public as a whole, some of whom will contribute to the agencies and some of whom will not. For this reason it may be objected that union membership is an irrelevant frame of reference in the determination of public attitudes to social welfare questions, and we must confess immediately that this objection cannot be dismissed until evidence is specifically available to show that it is false.
But on the other hand it may also be said that: (1) the organizational apparatus of the unions constitutes a useful and ready-made social structure which can be employed, and, indeed, is employed by the private agencies for public education and fund-raising purposes; and (2) labour union attitudes to social welfare questions may not be by and of themselves typically different from other possible attitudes to social welfare questions but they may be different by virtue of the fact that a majority of labour union members are also members of some other specific group, for example "the working classes", or those with a commitment (formal or merely traditional) to certain courses of social policy which have a bearing on social welfare questions. In any event, it is only by undertaking studies like the present one that a controversy such as this can be resolved one way or the other. Indeed, it may in the last analysis be the chief justification of this type of inquiry that it serves to show just what the significant structural co-variables of public opinion really are.

F. The Immediate Circumstances of the Study

This study of the attitudes of members of labour unions in the City of Vancouver toward social welfare services has been sponsored by The Institute of Industrial Relations of the University of British Columbia. The Institute was created in 1960 by the Board of Governors of the University to engage in an interdisciplinary programme of research and education at the university and in the community.
This exploratory study was prompted principally by the important role of labour organizations in the financing and administration of social welfare agencies. The practical reasons for such a study have been outlined in this first chapter. The main area of investigation involves a descriptive assessment of the attitudes of labour union members to a variety of social welfare questions.

Chapter 2 contains a brief review of the history, present status, and probable outlook of labour unions. An analysis of the survey is presented in Chapter 3 preceded by a description of the methodology used in the study. The final chapter involves an evaluation of the results of the survey followed by a discussion of possible areas for future research.
"A Trade Union, as we understand the term, is a continuous association of wage-earners for the purpose of maintaining or improving the conditions of their working lives".¹ This definition seems to be as appropriate today as it was in 1919, as long as we add the words "salary-earners" to "wage-earners".

It has generally been possible to identify three stages in the evolution of trade unions in North America and the United Kingdom. The first stage refers to the early origins of trade unions. In this stage, the workers seek to protect themselves against adverse working conditions and inadequate financial rewards. The second stage of trade union development is marked by general recognition and acceptance of unions as legitimate institutions in a free economy. The agreements between unions and management are not just products of the combined powers and vulnerabilities of the two sides. They have become formalized in contracts negotiated on a basis of legal parity, and are maintained by attitudes of mutual respect.

¹Webb, Sidney and Beatrice, The History of Trade Unionism, 1666-1920, Printed by the authors for the Trade Unionists of the United Kingdom, 1919, p. 1.
In the third stage of union development, the position of the unions has become so well-established and secure that they have what one might term a quasi-constitutional status. They have a definite and legitimate policy-making role in their own right. They participate in decision-making processes in many social spheres, including serving on boards of nationalized industries and advising governments of the methods to be used for war-time industrial and military mobilization.

Of course, the three stages of development cannot always be distinguished. The stages merge into each other. There are times when unions appear to be regressing to an earlier stage of development. But the stages, as outlined above, do reveal a convenient framework within which we can analyze the particular development of the three countries with which we are concerned.

A. Trade Union Development in the United Kingdom

The "Industrial Revolution" usually refers to the period in British history, from about 1760 to 1820, during which Britain, as an economic unit, developed rapidly from a mainly rural, agricultural status to that of a complex, industrial community. The rapidity of these changes was enhanced by the application of power to industry, the opening up of new trade areas with their promise of high profits on invested capital and the increased use of machinery in the production of goods. Together with this was the enclosing of the
common lands, forcing the labourers from their rural homes to
the factories in the new towns.

Before the Industrial Revolution, wages had been
fixed normally by the justices of the peace or other public
authority. One result of the tremendous social changes taking
place was that the new owners and employers set their own levels
of pay. Thus arose the modern wage-earning class, who sold
their labour for wages. Members of this group gradually
developed a sense of solidarity because of their common status
vis-à-vis the new system. Out of this solidarity was to
grow the trade union movement as we know it today, as both a
reaction to and a protest against unbridled capitalism.

The first type of reaction to capitalism and
industrialism was one of sporadic, short-lived uprisings of
labour in a hopeless effort to change the economic system
back to its stable, agricultural ways. The Luddite Movement
was a skilfully-organized protest in the Midland Counties
against the inhuman machines that were competing with human
labour. The "Luddites", in 1811, began breaking the machines,
which were in the framework-knitters' homes, but were owned by
the employers. From the Midlands, "Luddism" spread to Lancas­
shire and Yorkshire, and the name was applied to all organized
attacks on machinery for some time after the original movement
had died down. In the village of Tolpuddle in Dorset, a group
of agricultural workers formed a lodge of a Friendly Society of
Agricultural Labourers. They were promptly arrested and sentenced to seven years' transportation. These instances, and many others, were perhaps no more than isolated protests, but there were a growing number of working men combining together, despite persecution and the repressive Combination Acts of 1799 and 1800, which had, once and for all, made trade combinations unlawful. The Combination Acts were repealed, together with other acts against combinations in particular trades, in 1824. Then came the Chartist movement, a radical economic movement which had the platform of reform of Parliament as a necessary means to economic changes. Following the collapse of Chartism in 1848, the workers began to accept industrialism as a fact; they sought, then, to ameliorate their conditions by moderate reforms.

This new era of trade unionism saw the emergence of the skilled craftsmen of the new industrialism. These groups of workers depended on mutual benefits and control of the supply of workers to enforce their demands. The Amalgamated Society of Engineers was formed in 1850-51, the first big amalgamation of trade unions of a variety of skilled trades and a model for other unions. This was followed by the Amalgamated Society of Carpenters and Joiners in 1861 and from then on, trades councils were formed in the larger towns to unite all the local unions in the district.
In 1868, the first Trades Union Congress met. It became strengthened further, in 1871, when the Trade Union Act was passed, giving the unions legal status and protection for their funds. This new legal position of the unions brought about the second stage in trade union development in Britain. The late 1880's saw the development of large industrial unions of unskilled workers among the miners, dockers and general labourers who, in contrast to the older craft union members, paid low dues and received few if any friendly benefits.

The new unions established their position beside the old, which began to adopt less exclusive policies under the influence of the new ideas. The new unionists laid great stress on agitation for a legal minimum wage, an eight hour day, and on the right to work— that is, the obligation of the government to provide work, or some form of income maintenance for the unemployed. These demands converged in an aspiration toward independent political action by labour. This was in contrast to the older, skilled, craft unions who had tended to seek political representation through the bourgeois Liberal Party in the hope that it would act on behalf of the unions in return for electoral support.

The "new" unionists formed the Independent Labour Party in 1893, led by Keir Hardie. They set to work to capture the T. U. C. or to urge the trade unions themselves to form an independent working-class party. In 1899, Keir Hardie was able
to influence the T. U. C. to abandon its policy of supporting Liberal candidates. Finally, in 1906, the Labour Party came into being, created and dominated by the trade unions. In the same year it gained 30 Parliamentary seats in an election that returned the Liberal Party to power.

This new unionism was socialist in its politics, although influenced more by Fabian reformism than by revolutionary Marxism. The Fabian Society, led by such people as Sidney and Beatrice Webb and Bernard Shaw, was distinctly non-Marxist in its political orientations. "In effect, it rooted itself firmly in established British ways of thought, and visualized Socialism as arising rather by a natural and gradual development of British institutions and tendencies than by any process of revolutionary upheaval."¹ Thus, Fabian Socialism gave to the Independent Labour Party the thing they needed—an idealistic and practical programme of social reform.

This second stage of union development, in which the unions are legally recognized and politically influential, is not a stage of continual growth and unchallenged involvement in the political, economic and social life of the country. There were wars, depressions and periods of acute industrial unrest. In addition, the law came into conflict with the unions again.

In the case of the Taff Vale Railway Company vs. The Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants (1901), it was decided that a union could be sued for damages caused by its agents' actions during a strike. This decision, which threatened the right to strike, was reversed by the Trade Disputes Act of 1906—the Labour Party's first important legislative success. Again, in 1909, W. V. Osborne, a branch secretary for the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants, sought to restrain the union from spending money to finance the Labour Party in particular, and to restrain the union from any form of political activity. The House of Lords gave judgement in the plaintiff's favour. This decision was reversed by the Trade Union Act of 1913, which allowed political action by unions, as long as the individual members who objected to political use of funds were allowed to "contract out".

These decisions, and the fact that trade conditions were such as to slow down advances in union activity, led to unrest among the members.

A new idea sprang up, and won wide acceptance, of using Trade Unionism not merely as a means of defending wages and conditions, but as an offensive weapon in a war upon capitalist society . . . . Syndicalism and Industrial Unionism, and later Guild Socialism, became the gospels of the day among the younger Trade Unionists and Socialists.\footnote{Ibid., p. 321.}
Syndicalism grew out of the disillusionment of the workers. They realised that democracy and capitalism were not improving working-class standards of life. Syndicalism developed mainly in France, but spread to England in this period of unrest. As Alexander Gray says: "Syndicalism is almost exclusively a theory of the class struggle, and of the place of the strike (and ultimately of the General Strike) as a weapon of class warfare".¹

At the same time, another doctrine was permeating English thought. In the United States, and "... active chiefly among the low-paid immigrant workers, and in strong hostility to the moderate policy of the main body of American Trade Unionists, the Industrial Workers of the World had from 1905 been preaching the doctrine of mass organization in 'One Big Union' based on the direct antagonism of the working and employing classes."²

Both these ideas influenced British thought and there began a trend to amalgamation of unions, to provide powerful weapons for achieving socialist aims. At the same time Guild Socialism developed, possibly as a combination of Syndicalism and Industrial Unionism, but adapted more to British conditions. As Gray says:"... they killed, and killed rather effectively,

²Cole, op. cit., p. 323.
the old idea of State socialism, meaning thereby straightforward nationalization; and they showed that it was rather a poor and unimaginative ideal. But having destroyed the old faith of socialism, they have provided no new abiding faith to take its place.\footnote{Gray, op. cit., p. 458.}

These new movements were cut short by the outbreak of the First World War in 1914. The end of the war in 1918 was followed by a further period of widespread strike action, interrupted by the defeat of the miners in 1921, but revised in the general strike called in 1926 in support of the miners. The defeat of the movement for a time seriously weakened the trade unions, but they recovered after the end of the depression in 1933, without resorting again to policies of mass action.

The third stage of union activity can thus be described as the time in which the unions became securely entrenched in the structure and fabric of society. Their membership becomes extensive, not only in terms of numbers but also in terms of their social range, in that they begin to reach into the ranks of the 'white-collar' worker and of the service trades and industries. At the same time, however, they have achieved, in large measure, the original aim for which the trade unions were established in the first place. That is, they have secured, through economic and political action, such things as minimum wages and government assistance for the
unemployed. Collective bargaining has become an accepted procedure, in both the legal and social sense, for the securing of better working conditions.

B. Trade Union Development in the United States

In the United States, the first stage of union development can be said to extend right through until the New Deal of the 1930's, when for the first time government showed a consistently positive approach to the establishment of union organizations.

In the eighteenth century, the United States had essentially a rural, agricultural economy. This factor, together with the rapidly-expanding land frontiers, the high mobility of workers and the excellent individual opportunities for advancement, created a situation where doctrines of class-conflict were unlikely to take root with the American people. Thus, there was sometimes little need, and often little opportunity for any major types of union organization. Other factors that influenced the slow growth of trade unions were the self-reliant individualism of the people, the continual influx of immigrants, (which tended to create differences and conflicts between the wage-earners themselves), and the division of State and Federal authority.

The first organizations of labour came into being during the 1790's. The Philadelphia shoemakers founded a worker's organization in 1792. It only lasted a year, but was
formed again in 1794 and continued until 1806. The first American trade unions were local craft unions concerned primarily with local craft problems. Often, the local craft unions became federated and were called 'Trades' Unions'. They were originally formed to provide common support during strikes, frequently maintaining a common strike fund. The 'Trades' Unions' were also concerned with drives for the ten-hour day, free public schools and abolition of imprisonment for debt.

During the 1820's, immigration was increasing, and labour became plentiful. As a result, pay was small, hours long and working conditions poor. In addition, as the factories developed and overseas markets expanded, a great need for capital developed. To fill this gap came the Merchant Capitalists. These men were importing merchants who possessed ample capital. They "... bought raw materials, found a producer to manufacture them into finished goods, and secured the markets for their sale."¹ For the shop owner, this increased the pressure to maintain high profits and the only way to do this was to lower wages, hire women and children, and work long hours. As a result, recognition of the need for unions was again stimulated among the wage-earning class. However, they had to fight the early anti-labour court actions and the prohibition of combinations. Many workers left the cities and moved westward,

leaving the craftsmen as the only male adult employees of significant strength and influence.

All labour organizations were slowed in their development by the depression which began in 1857. After the Civil War, however, numerous local unions were established throughout the industrial areas. The Knights of St. Crispin, a shoe workers' union, was founded in 1869, but it collapsed in the face of wage cuts and the introduction of new machines.

Two general trends of union formation were evident at this time. First, the centralizing of all local unions and, second, the forming of national bodies of all locals of the same craft. In 1866 the National Labor Union was formed, composed of national trade unions, local unions and reform organizations. Eventually, it turned more and more to political action. The trade unions withdrew, and the National Labor Union finally disbanded after an unsuccessful attempt to form a National Labor and Reform party.

To circumvent employers' lockouts and blacklists, many workers were led to meet secretly. The Noble Order of the Knights of Labor was established in 1869 in Philadelphia. It was made up of tailors, shoemakers, carpenters, miners, railroad and other organized and unorganized workers. During the 1880's it abandoned its practice of secrecy and its membership increased to more than a million members. "The general and far-reaching aim of the Order was the substitution of a
co-operative society for the existing wage system, which it hoped could be attained through education and legislation.  

In Chicago, on May 3rd, 1886, however, the Knights of Labor failed to support a general strike for the eight-hour day. The following day, in Haymarket Square in Chicago, violence erupted at a general public meeting called to protest the violence and police brutality the day before. The outcome of this meeting, including the killing of a policeman, swayed public opinion against the unions. The Knights of Labor gradually lost its influence.

During this period of strife and industrial growth and expansion, the American Federation of Labor came into being. The national craft unions had been attracted by the high idealism of the Knights of Labor, but they soon became dissatisfied with its all-inclusive membership, notably because its actions and policies were often at odds with particular craft interests. The American Federation of Labor was formed in 1886. Samuel Gompers, of the Cigarmakers' Union was chosen the first president, continuing in that office, with the exception of one year, until his death in 1924.

---


In contrast to the mixed assemblies of the Knights of Labor, complete autonomy was retained by each organised craft in the American Federation of Labor. Each National union (International if it included Canadian locals) had its own constitution, its own rules for internal government, and its own procedures for dealing with employers.¹

Gompers favoured centralization of authority in the hands of union officers, payment of dues large enough to permit the accumulation of large funds, and the adoption of a system of benefits to ensure union loyalty. The A. F. L. had as its aim the improving of working conditions, wages and hours, and not political and social reforms. From this base developed the philosophy of 'business unionism', which had the object of securing benefits for workers, enforced by trade agreements. To support their aims, the use of strikes, boycotts and picketing were to be employed. Growth was retarded, however, by the use, on the part of employers, of the lockout, blacklists, and judicial injunctions.

For many years, the unions continued their fight against both the employers and repressive legislation. The United Mine Workers of America was chartered by the A. F. L. in 1890. The Industrial Workers of the World was formed in 1905. It existed for many years with the avowed intention of advancing labor interests by direct political and economic action through 'revolutionary socialism'. However, being at odds with deep-rooted ideological trends in American life, it

¹Peterson, *op. cit.*, p. 6.
was opposed by organized labour as well as by the employers, and soon disappeared as an effective force.

World War I set in motion forces that added great impetus to union growth. Because union leaders had served on war councils they had achieved greater prestige and influence for the unions, thus making it easier for the latter to increase their membership. However, in the United States, the public acceptance of labour unions was delayed until the period following the prolonged depression of 1929-1933. Another main reason for the absence of trade union growth during the twenties was the failure to organize the expanding mass production industries.

During this time also, industries were paying high wages, providing welfare schemes, pension plans, medical services, and so on. Employee stock ownership was encouraged, and in many industries company unions were formed, to improve efficiency by encouraging automation, subdivision of processes and so on, as well as to forestall the development of unions of a more independent stance.

The second stage in union development occurred during and after the depression. In 1932, "... organized labour received its first substantial protection and encouragement from federal legislation. The Norris-LaGuardia Act ... declared the workers' right to self-organization and collective bargaining to be the public policy of the United States". ¹ In 1933, the

¹Peterson, op. cit., p. 22.
United States Industrial Recovery Act declared that employees had the right to organize and bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing, free from interference or coercion by employers. With this statutory charter of liberty, the workers flocked into unions. In 1935, the National Labour Relations Act (the Wagner Act) was passed, providing a firmer constitutional basis for union activities, including collective bargaining and self-organization.

Mass production methods had given rise to a vast number of unskilled and semi-skilled workers who had no effective voice in the A. F. L. The A. F. L. had consistently tried to prohibit these men from joining, although some industrial unions were in fact affiliated to the A. F. L. In 1935, the Committee for Industrial Organisations was formed, for the purpose of encouraging the unorganized workers in mass production to organize on an industrial basis. The A. F. L. interpreted this as a threat to itself and accused the Committee for Industrial Organisations of setting up dual unions. By 1938, this committee had extended its power and influence and gained government sympathy and support. As a result, the Congress of Industrial Organisations was set up, including among its most important union members the United Steel Workers and the United Automobile Workers. Industrial workers thus acquired their own powerful, militant, and dynamic voice.
In this New Deal period, labour entered the political field. The unions supported Roosevelt and his policies of liberal support to labour. During the war emergency the unions, with few exceptions, supported the government in its efforts to enforce peaceful settlements of labour disputes. The National War Labor Board, formed in 1942, was a tripartite board composed of labour, industry and public members appointed by the president. It was charged with the responsibility for ensuring the peaceful settlement of all labour disputes for the duration of the war and controlling the granting of wage and salary increases in essential and war industries.

After the war, unions again became militant, with a consequent increase in the number of strikes, particularly in industries unionized by the C. I. O. There were growing demands for curbs on the power of labour. These demands originated primarily from three sources: the general public, who were concerned about the increasing number of strikes; the conservative middle class groups with their long-standing suspicion of unionism; and the employers.

As a consequence, Congress passed, in 1947, the Labor-Management Relations Act, commonly called the Taft-Hartley Act. This act provided protection and greater freedom of action for management, while restraining some union activities including the power to call nation-wide strikes that threatened the public health and interest. The union policy of permitting only union members to be hired by employers i.e. the closed shop, was
prohibited. Union shop policies were permitted i.e. non-unionists could be hired, but they were required to join the union after a trial period. The Taft-Hartley Act further provided that union shop agreements could not be entered into in states in which they were prohibited by state law. This provision touched off a series of bitter fights over the enactment of such measures in a large number of states. By 1956 "right-to-work" laws, as they became known, had been enacted in 18 states, most of them in predominantly agricultural areas that were seeking to attract industry. Neither political party in the United States has made any attempt to repeal or amend the closed shop regulation up to this time and while holding a majority in the Congress.

C. Trade Union Development in Canada

In Canada, because of the predominance of agriculture in the national economy, the trade union movement has been comparatively limited in scope until recently. Trade unions were in fact comparatively slow to develop in Canada until the middle of the nineteenth century. Up until then, unionism was mainly confined to small trade unions set up by skilled handi­craft workers. However, in the two decades after 1850, unionism expanded rapidly because of the influence of the expanding trade union movement in Great Britain and the United States.
Canadian local unions during this period tended to affiliate with the larger American organizations in their respective industries and trades. At the same time, attempts were made to federate them into local councils. The Toronto Trades Assembly was formed in 1871, representing 15 local unions. In 1872, the Assembly was tested when the printers in Toronto went on strike for a nine-hour day. Soon after the walk-out began, a number of union leaders were jailed for 'conspiracy'. Widespread agitation from unions and their supporters induced the Canadian government to pass new legislation, modelled on that of Britain's, freeing unions from liability under the common law for conspiracy in restraint of trade.

This provision of legal sanction led to attempts to form one national body of unions. In 1873 the Canadian Labour Union was formed, but only lasted until 1877. At this time the Knights of Labor came into prominence in its attempt to organize skilled and unskilled alike into local general labour unions. It lasted for more than a decade after it had died out in the United States.

A new Canada-wide federation was formed in 1886. Arising from a convention of trade unions and the Knights of Labor, it was called the Dominion Trades and Labour Congress, known from 1892 as the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada. Eventually, in 1902, and under the influence of the A. F. L., the
Knights of Labor were expelled. Thus did the T. L. C. become committed to a policy of working in conjunction with international unions.

The Knights of Labor and a number of Canadian unions immediately formed the National Trades and Labour Congress, known from 1908 as the Canadian Federation of Labour. Despite their losses, the T. L. C. enjoyed rapid growth until the 1920's. "In Canada, as in the United States, maladjustments arising out of the war and culminating in the boom and collapse of 1920-1921 created widespread labour unrest and conflict. Strikes and lock-outs reached an all-time high in size, frequency and numbers involved during 1919". But the problems faced by the T. L. C. resulted in further defections.

In Western Canada, in 1919, dissident T. L. C. affiliates met to consider their future course of action. As a result of this meeting the One Big Union was organised in opposition to the T. L. C. It proclaimed a policy of revolutionary unionism similar to that of the I. W. W., and launched a programme to organize workers by industries rather than by trades. Owing to its revolutionary appearance and its part in the general strike in the City of Winnipeg, repressive legislative action was taken. In addition, the T. L. C. strongly opposed the O. B. U. and it went into a long decline.

---

The enactment of the Wagner Act in the United States in 1935—which provided a constitutional basis for trade union activities such as collective bargaining—resulted in agitation for similar legislation in Canada. A more immediate effect, however, came from the C. I. O. expulsion from the A. F. L.

In 1938, the Canadian branches of C. I. O. international unions were expelled from the T. L. C. They joined the All-Canadian Congress of Labour in 1940, when it became known as the Canadian Congress of Labour.

The outstanding development since the end of World War II has been the merger, in 1956, of Canada's major labour Federations to form the new Canadian Labour Congress.

The preliminary agreement and final merger of the A. F. L. and C. I. O. in the United States in 1955 made a similar merger in Canada a foregone conclusion. The divisions between the two major labour congresses in Canada had not been as deep, intense and pervading as in the United States, in any case.¹

In 1956 also, the Canadian and Catholic Federation of Labour voted overwhelmingly in favour of seeking means for affiliating with the new Canadian Labour Congress.

D. The Present Status and Problems of Trade Unions

Today there is growing concern in many western countries about the position and role of the trade unions in the social structure. Only a decade or so ago, the general public evinced

¹Ibid., p. 53.
great sympathy and support for the trade unions. People recognized that there was a need for labour to be organized, so as to bring the standards and conditions of living and working up to acceptable standards of decency, safety and comfort. Yet there are now serious signs that many people are becoming hostile to and angry about trade union activity.

In the United States, certain sections of the population are becoming more and more concerned about the danger—whether real or imagined—of the unions acquiring monopolistic and irresponsible power. The Taft-Hartley Act, already referred to, is perhaps an example of this change in public opinion. In Canada, the public, or some sections of the public, is more fearful, possibly, of the dangers, even if unfounded, of the direct link between the trade unions and the former C. C. F., formalized in the New Democratic Party. In Great Britain, the middle class public is expressing a similar resentment and fear.

In the three countries we have discussed, representatives of all major political parties, in principle at least, uphold unionism and collective bargaining as the fairest and most efficient means for regulating relations between workers and employers. What is of concern to us at this time, however, is not so much where the unions presently stand as where they will go in the future. In the U. K., representatives of the unions sit on the boards of nationalized industries and are consulted by the government and the employers.
The unions had become in a very real sense a part of 'the establishment'. Their association with the Government and employers on scores of committees of all kinds and their accepted right to be consulted on any subject affecting their members directly or indirectly made them an important influence in the nation's councils and also, many people felt, imposed a responsibility on them. They had become a part of the body of the State in many of its intricate ramifications, instead of being, as they once were, something outside the State and in some senses a rival power.\(^1\)

The key words in the above statement are "... imposed a responsibility on them".

With reference to the U. S. and Canada, Professor Jamieson writes:

The survival and growth of a vigorous labour movement is vital for the preservation of democracy in modern industrial society . . . . In the context of an industrial system dominated to an increasing degree by large and powerful aggregations of capital, unions are necessary as a 'countervailing force\(^2\) to protect workers from exploitation and to ensure them a fair share of the proceeds from industry. Fully as important is their role of protecting and enhancing the individual worker's sense of identity and self-respect against the arbitrary exercise of authority by management, and encouraging their greater participation in decision-making processes.\(^3\)

---


\(^2\)Galbraith, John Kenneth, *American Capitalism*, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1956. Professor Galbraith suggests that, in a stable economy, the function of the Federal government should be to support the 'countervailing power' of the consumers. In other words, the buyers can and do exercise a controlling influence on the unlimited power of private industry. He goes on to say that strong unions develop as a 'countervailing power' to strong corporations.

Again, the key words in this statement are "... encouraging their greater participation in decision-making processes" and, we are tempted to add, the consequent need for a determinate and particularized sense of responsibility.

Possibly because the U. K. has had the framework of a 'Welfare State' and also because the unions have had a political voice for over half a century, that country has already seen the participation of unions in the policy-making activities of Parliament and in various branches of government outside the legislative chamber. In North America, on the other hand, the unions have had no specific and consistent voice in Congress or Parliament. However, in both the U. K. and North America, there has been a growing recognition of the need for and the logicality of trade union participation in the affairs of the country. In North America, we have a growing mass of evidence to show that 'Big Business' contains an inherent trend towards the danger of monopolistic practice; that 'private enterprise' in its pure form is unable to meet the public demand for full employment and a high standard of living; that it is possible to control the seasonal and cyclical fluctuations in employment; that inflation and deflation are no longer necessary evils; and that interference with the free play of supply and demand does not result in economic chaos.

Can we still profess a belief in pure or ideal private enterprise? Is it not true to say that, in North America, we already have the beginnings of a planned economy,
indeed, even of a corporate society? Every day, various levels of government take a step further into the area of planning and control of the private sector of the economy. The 'conventional wisdom' is being severely challenged in all sectors of the economy.

The question of concern to us, then, is how the unions perceive their role in the present economic and social system, and what characteristic perspective they have on their future activities.¹ "Most union leaders and members on this continent have been and are essentially pragmatic in viewpoint and policy, and merely reflect the more widely accepted values of North American society, with all its strengths and weaknesses".² Professor Jamieson goes on to say that, as a kind of mirror response to the business ethics of their employers, unions also have adopted a policy of free-enterprise and "business" unionism, in pursuit of their private group interests. This often results in a situation of scarcely more than "aim-inhibited" economic conflict and competition. Thus, if we were to ask the labour unions in North America to 'hold the line' on wages for a certain period of time and for a stated purpose, what would their

¹Baum, R. C. R., The Social and Political Philosophy of Trade Unions, Unpublished Master's Thesis, Department of Anthropology and Sociology, University of British Columbia, 1962. This thesis, under the sponsorship of the Institute of Industrial Relations, attempts to relate the political activities of trade unions to the social values of the society in which unions operate.

²Jamieson, op. cit., p. 354.
reaction be? The implication of the passing of acts like the Taft-Hartley Act is that Congress and business, at least, believe that unions would put higher benefits for their members ahead of co-operation with their traditional opponents. At the same time, we have implied earlier that increased union participation and influence in the affairs of the State require a 'sense of responsibility' from the unions. Can we ask them to act 'responsibly' when the free and morally arbitrary play of the market is still permitted and governments have refrained from instigating any definite and clear methods for meeting human needs through government and enabling the unions to predict, with some degree of accuracy, the future status of their members?

But here we can go one step further. In the U. K. the 'welfare state' has progressed beyond the North American stage of development. There, where planning is more acceptable as a function of government, do the unions honour the 'responsibility' we ascribe to them in a planned or semi-planned economy? The answer, according to Michael Shanks,¹ is a resounding negative. He states that the T. U. C., for example, has been both unable (owing to lack of adequate power over its member unions) and unwilling to commit the labour movement to a wage policy related to increased productivity. He attributes this failure to many factors, including the 'working-class'

fear that, at any moment, they could find themselves 'on the dole' once again and thus at the mercy of the employers. These were the fears present and valid in the earliest stage of union development, but Shanks contends that this fear remains even today,—in circumstances far less likely to justify it.

We have suggested that unions and union members do, or should in the future, participate more in the implementing of social policies for the benefit of the total population. We can now go on to ask whether these same unions should participate in the health and welfare arrangements of society, whether governmental or private. It should hardly be necessary to say that unions have participated in health and welfare plans for a number of years. In the U. S. and Canada, the union members have recognized the failure (or inappropriateness) of government in the provision of comprehensive health and welfare programmes in the past. Accordingly, they have attempted, through their unions, to compensate for these gaps in security by demanding large wage increases and fringe benefits from private industry. Because of this, however, the benefits have mainly been obtained for members only, and have not been related to the needs of the total community. In the U. K., on the other hand, the unions have, through political action, been influential in the development of health and welfare programmes for the total population.

He says a drastic reform is needed, first of the trade unions, and also of the whole system of industrial and class relations. He proposes a united, dynamic society, in which trade unions should take their place, with government and business, in the management of the economy.
We must now turn to the question of whether the North American unions feel that they have any responsibility for the provision of total citizen services. Should they cooperate with the community chest and other private welfare agencies? Should they demand representation in the shaping of the increasingly comprehensive and socially strategic public health and welfare programmes? What do the members think? What are the union policies in this matter? We shall now attempt to answer some of these questions.
CHAPTER 3

THE ATTITUDES OF LABOUR TO SOCIAL WELFARE

1. Survey Procedure and Method of Sampling

This chapter contains a description of the procedure and methods used in this study. This is followed by an explanation of the rationale for the questions, together with an analysis of the survey results.

Our major methodological consideration in this project was the problem of deciding which union or unions should be our objects of study. To help clarify this problem a discussion was held with the Labour Representative of the Community Chest in Vancouver.\textsuperscript{1} It was recognised, at this time, that with the likelihood of a maximum of 50 individual respondents (given the circumstances under which the study was being carried out) it would not be possible to obtain any type of representative-ness of the trade union population as a whole. In addition, with the large number of trade unions, both craft and industrial (and completely ignoring the 'white-collar' and professional groups), it would not have been possible to contact representatives of them all, even in the most nominal fashion.

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{1}Charles E. Lamarche, Labour Staff Representative, Community Chest and Councils of Greater Vancouver, Vancouver, B. C.
\end{flushright}
The largest union in western Canada is the International Woodworkers of America, Western Canadian Regional Council Number 1. We therefore decided to contact this union, at least in order to obtain a more detailed notion of what our procedural and methodological problems were likely to be. We met with the Financial Secretary of Local 1-217.¹ We were offered the fullest co-operation possible regarding the provision of membership lists and other facilities, and given total freedom to select any number or type of individuals without hindrance.

At this point we decided to limit our consideration to the International Woodworkers of America, partly on the basis, mentioned above, that we could not hope to survey a truly representative selection of unions, and partly because this study is a pilot survey of the opinion of trade union members toward public and private welfare services. It is hoped that further studies, whether under the sponsorship of the Institute of Industrial Relations or other auspices should deal with other aspects of this important and significant area of research. In view of these various considerations, therefore, we decided to aim for a representative sample of the one local union.

¹S. M. Hodgson, Financial Secretary, International Woodworkers of America, Local 1-217, Vancouver, B.C.
The union records were examined to ascertain the method of recording the names of members. The 'rank-and-file' names, totalling approximately 5,500 members, were recorded in two ways: first, by plant, and second, on index cards, in alphabetical order on three large revolving drums. This latter system was the master system and most appropriate for our purposes.

We decided to take a sample of 100 from this master index. We used a series of random sampling numbers,\(^1\) actually getting only 99 names, as one number turned up twice. From this number we excluded those members living outside the City of Vancouver leaving us with 57 names.

The shop stewards' names were listed in a separate index. There were about 450 of these names and we used the same tables, although different numbers, to take off a sample of 40. Of these, 21 members actually lived in the City of Vancouver. We therefore had the names and addresses of 78 union members, excluding the 8 officials of this local.

A letter was sent to these members, introducing the two interviewers, outlining briefly the general purpose of the survey and requesting their co-operation. The letter was on the letterhead of the International Woodworkers of America and signed by the Financial Secretary.

---

Shortly thereafter, four pre-test interviews were carried out with two rank-and-file members and two shop stewards respectively. The questionnaire was revised in some respects before the main interviewing was carried out. The four pre-test interviews were not used in the final compilation of data.

It had been hoped originally, that interviews could be carried out on the employers' premises. This plan could not be followed, however, owing to the difficulty of arranging meeting times and the problem of taking the men off the job when relief men could not always be available. We therefore contacted the men, by telephone or personally at home, to arrange convenient times for the interviews.

The circumstances under which the study was being carried out seemed to indicate that it would be possible to interview some 30 rank-and-file members and 15 shop stewards. We had no way of knowing whether the opinions of the shop stewards would show any significant differences from those of the rank-and-file. It was anticipated, however, that the shop stewards, owing to their greater participation and (possibly) greater interest in the union, would be more aware of, concerned with and informed about the subject which we were studying.

Of the 57 rank-and-file members with whom contacts were attempted interviews were actually completed with 22; 5 members had moved from their listed addresses and could not be
contacted within the time period allotted for the interview; 6 members could not speak English sufficiently well to understand the questions; 10 members were not contacted at all because no reply was received at their home after two attempts, on different dates, to contact them had been made. The other 12 members refused to be interviewed, giving a variety of reasons for their refusal, such as--"I don't know enough about the subject"; "I think you are trying to sell something"; "I am too busy". We should have liked to see more of the members who were not properly contacted, but limitations of time became an important factor.

Of the 19 shop stewards contacted, 18 were actually interviewed, and 1 member had moved and was not located. We realised that the resultant sample would be heavily weighted in favour of the shop stewards (if they were to show significant differences), but we wished to have as large a number of interviews as possible. We ended up with 22 rank-and-file and 18 shop stewards, for a total of 40 members interviewed.

The data from the 40 interviews were combined for purposes of analysis, although a separate analysis of the shop stewards was carried out, and significant differences were noted. An obvious example of a major difference was that all the shop stewards who were contacted agreed to be interviewed. This raises the question of whether the opinions of the rank-and-file members who were not contacted, for whatever reason, would have
affected the final results. On the other hand, however, the rank-and-file members who were contacted had both positive and negative opinions, and there does not appear to be any reason to suppose that those who refused would necessarily have tended to be either more or less positive, though it remained a possibility that this was in fact so.

We should like at this time to report that in fact there were very few significant differences between the rank-and-file and shop stewards. We used as our basis of differentiation the fact of 10 percentage points variation in the responses of the two groups. To our surprise, there was only one question which revealed a degree of difference in excess of 10 percentage points. This difference will be recorded in the analysis.

The only other significant difference is that a much higher percentage of 'don't know' or 'no opinion' responses was obtained from the rank-and-file members. This would tend to support the contention, above, that the rank-and-file members who refused to be interviewed may only have added a higher percentage of 'don't know's', rather than tending to be necessarily more or less positive.

2. Rationale of the Questions

The questionnaire used for the pre-test is shown in Appendix A. Following the pre-test, changes were made in several questions and the questionnaire is shown in its final form in Appendix B.
The total questionnaire was designed to obtain the opinions and attitudes of trade union members toward public and private welfare services. Out of the multitude of questions that are theoretically possible for the purpose of assessing attitudes, we have selected six main areas.

A. **Personal Information**

Although the personal questions numbered 6 to 13 inclusive, were considered necessary, they were located in the questionnaire following several introductory questions concerning health and welfare services in relation to union sponsorship. The personal questions covered such things as age, occupation, education, length of union membership and offices held in trade unions. The names of the members were known, of course, but anonymity was assured for all respondents.

It could not be known, prior to the analysis of the data, whether the personal information could be used as a basis for establishing significant differences in response.

B. **Levels of Information and Knowledgeability**

Questions 14 and 15, and 17 to 21 inclusive, were designed to determine the levels of information and knowledgeability of the union members. This is an area of primary concern because no meaningful study can be made of attitudes until it can be determined that the subjects of the study have some minimum awareness of the matters to which it is supposed they possess attitudes.
Questions 14 and 15 asked for the kind of referral the respondents would make if friends who were experiencing child problems or marital conflicts asked the members for advice. From the replies to these two questions we hoped to obtain a statement of the members' knowledge, or lack of knowledge of community services. In addition, we wanted to know if the members saw problems of child behaviour and marital discord as suitable concerns for community health and welfare services.

Questions 17 to 21 covered the area of the members' awareness of the relationship between the Trade Unions and the Community Chest.

C. Attitudes of Trade Union Members

Questions 1 to 4, 16, and 22 to 26 inclusive were designed to determine the attitudes of unionists to certain health and welfare matters. Questions 1, 2 and 3 asked whether unions should be concerned with health and welfare matters and, if not, whether this concern should be for members only or the whole community. Questions 4, 16 and 25 asked whether unions should operate their own health and welfare programmes; if not, should this be in spite of, or instead of, similar community services. These latter questions were located at separate parts of the questionnaire to enable us to test the consistency of the opinions of the members, without the members having the aid of the alternatives before them at the time the question was asked.
Questions 22, 23, 24 and 26 were opinion questions, in which an attempt was made to ascertain the views of the members concerning the Community Chest and fund-raising. It is well known that the Community Chest, or United Fund, in most areas of North America, is faced with the problem of necessary expansion of services. At the same time, this requires steadily-increasing financial support. If trade union membership is a meaningful reference group for the members, it follows that the opinions of the members concerning the Community Chest are important, for three reasons.

1. If the members are generally in sympathy with the aims of the Community Chest, the trade unions then become a large present or potential source of funds.

2. If the members are opposed to the Community Chest, we must either accept the fact that one major population group in the community is not a source of funds, or different and more appropriate efforts must be made to enlist their support.

3. Whatever may be the members' opinions, do these same opinions bear any relationship to the opinions of the officials of the particular union? In addition, how do these opinions compare with the official policy statements of this union; also because this union is affiliated with the A. F. L. - C. I. O. and the C. L. C., what are the official policies of the national organizing bodies?

D. Responsibility for Health and Welfare Services

Question 5 was designed to find out to whom the union members would assign the responsibility for a variety of health and welfare services. The respondents were given a list of health and welfare services and asked to state who
should be assigned the responsibility for providing these services: federal, provincial or municipal government, private agencies, union, or management.

Some of the health and welfare services in this list are provided by Community Chest agencies. Others were recognized government services and two services, health insurance and retirement pension, referred to programmes that were not available to the total population. The answers to this question could be contrasted with the views of the union officials and, again, with the policy statements of the national union bodies.

E. Importance of Social Problems

Questions 27 and 28 were designed to discover trade union members' opinions of the importance of certain social problems. In question 27, the respondents were given a list of 'social problems' with which welfare services are designed to deal. This list was restricted, therefore, to the specific area of health and welfare. The members were asked to select from this list the three problems that they considered the most important, in their order of importance.

In question 28, the respondents were given a list of what were termed 'topics of concern to Canadians', and they were asked anew to rate these topics. However, the list for this question included the three choices that the respondents had selected from question 27, in addition to such topics as
'abolition of capital punishment'. The purpose of these two questions was, therefore: first, to obtain the opinions of the members about priorities in health and welfare; secondly, to ascertain their views about the priorities of these same health and welfare problems in relation to general topics other than health and welfare. We hoped therefore to ascertain the level or degree of concern that union members may possess about health and welfare matters in their normal day-to-day activities when they are exposed to numerous problems of a varied nature.

F. Perception of Social Workers

Questions 29 to 34 inclusive were constructed in order to obtain some idea about the unionists' perception of social workers. Questions 29 and 30 asked for general information about any contacts the respondents may have had, directly or indirectly, with social workers or social work agencies. From these questions, we hoped to obtain facts about two areas of concern: (1) if the respondents had had contacts, we should expect that they would be more knowledgeable when answering further questions about social workers; (2) we wanted to know if the sampled persons were members of the social class generally believed to be in receipt of a large part of many of the community social services.

Question 31 asked whether the respondents believed that social workers needed special formal education and, if so,
at what academic level. In other words, do the trade union members perceive social workers as members of a profession in possession of, or requiring, specialized knowledge and skills to fulfil their responsibilities to the community in an adequate way?

Question 32 was aimed at eliciting opinions about the appropriateness of the salaries paid to social workers, in terms of whether they are overpaid or underpaid. Question 33 required the members to be more specific about what they thought social workers received as annual incomes. These latter two questions, again, were aimed at the respondents' perception of social workers as a specific occupational group.

Question 34 asked the members to compare social workers, on a basis of income, with seven other occupational and professional groups. This question was more specific in attempting to obtain the respondents' views about the relative importance or status of social workers in the community.

3. Analysis of the Survey

A. Personal Information

There were eight questions, from 6 to 13, designed to obtain information about the individuals being interviewed.

1For the remainder of Chapter 3 when referring to both the rank-and-file and shop stewards we shall use the term 'rank-and-file'.
Question 6: In what age group are you? The age distribution of the rank-and-file unionists is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 30</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 or over</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As well as the rank-and-file members, five union officials were also interviewed. Two officials were between 30 - 39 years of age, two between 40 - 49, and one under 30 years of age.

Question 7: Country of Birth? Of the 45 trade unionists interviewed, 33 were born in Canada. All but one of the shop stewards were born in Canada. All the officials were born in Canada. The following is a list of the countries other than Canada where the unionists were born (with the number of respondents born there, in brackets): Russia (3), Poland (3), Germany (2), United Kingdom (2), Hungary (1), and China (1).

Question 8: How long have you lived in Canada? The average length of residence in Canada of the trade union members not born in Canada was 22 1/2 years, ranging from 6 to 50 years.

Question 9: Present occupation? There were 5 skilled tradesmen interviewed during the survey—one electrician, one steam engineer, one welder, and two carpenters, along with 20 skilled labourers, 9 labourers, and 6 maintenance men. The officials interviewed were the president, the first vice-president, the second vice-president, the third vice-president, and the
financial secretary of the local union. Except for the third vice-president, who is an unpaid official and is employed as a skilled labourer in a plant, the officials hold full-time paid positions.

**Question 10: Length of membership in (a) trade unions, (b) I. W. A.?** The length of membership in trade unions of the men and women interviewed ranged from 7 months to 44 years with an average of 15 years. Within the I. W. A. itself, the length of membership ranged from 6 months to 21 years with an average of 11 1/2 years. There were 20 out of the 40 rank-and-file members who had belonged only to the I. W. A. in their union membership. The officials had belonged to trade unions for an average of 20 years; they had belonged to the I. W. A. for an average of 15 years.

**Question 11: Offices held in the I. W. A. (a) at the present time (b) in the past?** There were 18 members of the survey group presently serving as shop stewards along with one member who served on a welfare committee, and one member who served on a credit union committee. Of the individuals who stated that they had held offices in the past, 5 had been shop stewards, 2 had been on plant committees, 2 on safety committees, and 2 on welfare committees. In other words, 23 out of 40 of the survey group had at one time or another served as shop stewards.
The present officials had held a variety of offices in the past including the positions of shop steward, plant chairman, education committee chairman, grievance committee chairman, third vice-president, vice-president of the Regional Council Number One, international board member, and executive board member of the Canadian Labour Congress. The officials, therefore, had a great deal of experience in union affairs before being elected to their present positions.

**Question 12:** Offices held in other unions? Only 2 rank-and-file members reported that they had held offices in other unions, both as shop stewards; one of these men was now a shop steward in the I. W. A., the other was not. None of the present officials had held offices in other unions.

**Question 13:** Grade of school finished? Results to this question were as follows, (with the number of respondents completing the grade, in brackets): Grade 3 (1); Grade 7 (3); Grade 8 (17); Grade 9 (4); Grade 10 (6); Grade 11 (3); and Grade 12 (6). The following training levels had been achieved, each by separate individuals: a 4-year apprenticeship as a steam engineer; a 3-year apprenticeship as an electrician; and a 3-year teaching certificate in a European country. Two men had completed 4-year night school courses in electrical maintenance.

The officials had reached the following levels of education, (with the number of men completing the grade, in
brackets): Grade 7 (1), Grade 10 (1); Grade 11 (2); and Grade 12 (1). One man had also completed a 2-year business course.

B. Levels of Information and Knowledgeability

There were seven questions, 14 and 15, 17 to 21, designed to determine the levels of information and knowledgeability of the trade union members.

**Question 14:** Let us suppose some friends of yours have a serious problem concerning their child's destructiveness in the home and they ask where they can go for help. What would you tell them? A list of the sources of service suggested by the rank-and-file unionists is shown in Table 1.

A considerable awareness of public and private agencies was shown by the trade union rank-and-file members. The variety of answers indicated in Table 1 shows not only that trade union members have some familiarity with the existence of health and welfare resources but also that they accept the existing services as resources to be used for diagnosis and treatment.

It can be seen from Table 1 that 55 per cent. of the unionists were oriented to community health and welfare services, whether it be a professional person, a private agency, or a public department. Ten per cent. of the men and women interviewed were oriented to the church. It was felt by the interviewers that the 5 per cent. who mentioned the police or 'private agency and lawyer' conceived the answer in terms of discipline.
Table 1. **Suggested Sources of Service:**

**Child Problem**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Per Cent.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oriented to health and welfare services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Welfare</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Health Unit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatrist</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Aid</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Inspector</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Doctor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Oriented to the church**         |     |           |       |
| Church                             | 4   | 10.0      | 10.0  |

| **Oriented to 'self-help'**        |     |           |       |
| Friends                            | 3   | 7.5       |       |
| Deal with at home                  | 7   | 17.5      | 25.0  |

| **Others**                         |     |           |       |
| Police                             | 1   | 2.5       |       |
| Private Agency and lawyer          | 1   | 2.5       | 5.0   |

| **Don't Know**                     |     |           |       |
| Don't Know                         | 2   | 5.0       | 5.0   |

| **Total**                          | 40  | 100.0     | 100.0 |

Twenty-five per cent. of the unionists stated that the problem of the child's destructiveness should be settled within the family or with the help of friends or neighbours. This concept of 'self-help' may be the consequence of a number
of factors. To begin with, these persons may not be aware of existing services. Even if the individuals know of the existence of certain community resources, their attitude toward the services may be a possible deterrent. Although no one person said as much, to some individuals the whole idea of using a welfare service is distasteful because it clashes with their concept of self-reliance. Also connected to the idea of self-reliance may be the notion that the use of welfare services is degrading and humiliating.

Some of the trade union members wanted to know the degree of seriousness associated with the word 'destructiveness'; it was suggested to them that the child's behaviour was beyond the control of the parents for reasons of which they were unaware. Only 2 individuals were unwilling to state a reply.

Answers to question 14, therefore, ranged from the concepts of self-help and discipline (police) to the awareness of treatment available from professionally qualified practitioners. "The psychiatrist would know whether a child is mentally ill or just plain bad" was the reasoning of one person. Another said: "A psychiatrist is good at handling children and we must remember that the parents are to blame." Certainly very few, if any, of the men and women interviewed were able to draw upon first-hand experience to answer this question. Nevertheless, recognition and acceptance of available community health and welfare services is very evident.
The answers of the officials to question 14 showed a considerable orientation to community health and welfare services. The sources of service and information mentioned by the officials were a physician, the Children's Aid Society, the City Social Service Department, the Information Service of the Community Chest, and the permanent labour representative at the Chest. These latter two replies show a specific knowledge of referral sources which no rank-and-file members were able to state.

**Question 15**: Let us suppose some friends of yours have a serious marriage problem and they ask you where they can go for help. What would you tell them? The list of the answers to this question is shown in Table 2. It can be seen that 50 per cent. of the trade union rank-and-file members selected 'the pastor' as the primary source of assistance with a marriage problem. Twelve and one-half per cent. of the members suggested a marriage counsellor as their first choice of referral. One individual referred to a general welfare agency. It is interesting, to go further, that three persons mentioned 'the pastor' as a second choice and four persons referred to a marriage counsellor as the alternative—in each case, to the pastor.

The role of the clergy in marriage counselling is clearly recognized in the answers to this question. The recognition of a marriage counsellor as a separate entity from
Table 2. **Suggested Sources of Service: Marriage Problem**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Per Cent.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oriented to health and welfare services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage Counsellor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oriented to the church</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oriented to 'self-help'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The couple themselves</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The friend himself</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oriented to 'self-help'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private agency and lawyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorce lawyer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community 'board'</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community 'board'</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Inspector</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The church was also clearly indicated although no one stated under whose auspices a marriage counsellor works. One person's reasoning was reflected in his comment that the problem would be handled with more privacy by the church than by any other community agency.
General awareness and acceptability of community services are indicated in the following replies: a private agency and a lawyer (combined as one resource by two people); a divorce lawyer; and a health inspector. The individual who referred to a 'board' of responsible community individuals showed little awareness of existing services. Ten per cent. admitted that they did not know what to do in such a situation.

The concept of 'self-help' was suggested by 12.5 per cent., 7.5 per cent. who felt the problem could be most adequately dealt with by the married couple themselves, and 2.5 per cent. who thought that they themselves might try to help the couple with their problem without any further outside assistance. The pride in self-reliance is inherent in these replies, along with the possible feeling that using other services is distasteful and perhaps humiliating.

The answers of the officials to question 15 were as follows: a physician, a marriage counsellor, the Information Service of the Community Chest, the permanent labour representative at the Chest, and the concept of 'self-help'. The officials, therefore, showed a considerable orientation to health and welfare services, although one man maintained that 'to help oneself' is the best policy to follow in the handling of a marriage problem. References to the Information Service and the labour representative at the Community Chest illustrate an awareness of two specific resources for information which the rank-and-file did not show.
In the replies to questions 14 and 15, therefore, it is clearly demonstrated that trade union members are aware of existing health and welfare services. At the same time, many individuals maintain faith in the concept of self-help.

**Question 17: Do social welfare agencies render their services to all income groups?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Per Cent.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The replies to this question—the first in a series of five, designed to determine further the levels of understanding and knowledgeability of trade union members—illustrate a variety of opinions. Fifty per cent. of the rank-and-file stated that social welfare agencies render their services to all income groups. There were only two individuals who showed exceptional awareness by pointing out that while social welfare agencies are available for people of all incomes it is most unlikely that such community services are used by all income groups.

It can be said that many union members are most familiar with the concept of social assistance and feel, therefore, that social welfare agencies do not render their services to all income groups. The fact that one-half of the men and women interviewed answered either 'no' or 'no opinion' shows that their understanding of private agencies is not clear.
Eighty per cent. of the officials gave 'yes' as the answer to this question. One official dissented: he did not think that social welfare agencies provided service to all income groups; he thought, however, that wealthy people were able to 'pull strings' and receive the service to which he (the official) believed that they were not entitled!

The certainty of the 80 per cent. in replying to the question was considerably more emphatic than the answers of the rank-and-file. The officials quickly recognized that people in the higher income brackets were less likely to use community welfare services than people of low incomes. They were familiar with the concept of 'the means test' and its use in some facets of local services.

**Question 18: How many organizations does the Community Chest support?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Per Cent.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fifty per cent. of the rank-and-file correctly stated that there were 65 agencies supported by the Community Chest in Vancouver. A few individuals admitted guesswork but many recalled the correct number from the recent fund-raising campaign. Three or four members referred to news stories about agencies withdrawing from the common fund; they were not certain whether
such withdrawals had occurred and they thought that 66 or 67 might be the correct answer.

Again, as in question 17, fifty per cent. gave an incorrect answer or did not want to make a guess. 'Don't Know' was the reply of 15 per cent. of the unionists interviewed although this was one of the few questions in which 'Don't Know' or 'No opinion' was not provided as an alternative.

The interviewers were surprised to find that only two officials knew the correct answer to this question. Two officials said there were 101 agencies in the Community Chest. One official said that he did not know. It might well be said that if the majority of officials are not aware of the answer to this straightforward question then it is not surprising if a majority of the rank-and-file do not know the correct answer.

**Question 19: Do you believe that organized labour and community chest agencies should work together?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Per Cent.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>72.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 20: Do you think that most labour leaders in Vancouver want their unions to co-operate in the Community Chest?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Per Cent.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 21: Do you think that most Community Chest leaders are interested in gaining the co-operation of organized labour?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results from questions 19, 20 and 21 indicate that trade union members definitely favour organized labour and community chest agencies working together and that they think the leaders of both groups want to co-operate with each other. The leaders, meanwhile, showed no such unanimity in answering the same questions.

The officials answered question 19 differently both in content and emotion from the union rank-and-file. Sixty per cent. of the officials said that organized labour and the Community Chest should not work together; this reply was based on the fact that they do not believe in the Community Chest. The officials made their feelings known in no uncertain terms. They felt that health and welfare services should be a government responsibility and that union membership in the Community Chest could only serve to prolong the responsibilities of private welfare, a state of affairs to which they were very much opposed.

It is surprising to find such a variance of opinion between the majority of the rank-and-file and the majority of the officials. The opinions of the officials in particular could have serious implications for the community's private agencies.
The officials themselves found it difficult to answer question 20; and there was a surprising diversity in their conclusions. Forty per cent. replied 'yes', 40 per cent. had 'no opinion', and 20 per cent. answered 'no'. It would seem that the officials are uncertain of their role as union leaders in relationship to the community's private health and welfare resources.

Eighty per cent. of the officials recognized in question 21 that Community Chest leaders are interested in gaining labour's co-operation--primarily for financial reasons, they said. The officials made no mention of union participation in welfare planning or on agency boards and committees.

It was clear to the interviewers—as a result of comments added to the unionists' answers—that the financial purposes of the Community Chest were most frequently in the minds of the men and women interviewed. There were no references to union participation in welfare planning or on agency boards and committees.

Several trade union members referred specifically to the Chest and unions co-operating for financial advantages and suggested that 'contribute' might well have been substituted for 'co-operate' in these questions. They seemed desirous of emphasizing the difference between contributing to and of co-operating with the Community Chest. Certainly the results to these questions illustrate the awareness of trade unionists of the need for both groups to co-operate--at least for fund-raising purposes.
C. Attitudes of Trade Union Members

There were ten questions, 1, 2, and 3, 4, 16, and 25, 22 and 23, 24 and 26, that were specific attitudinal questions.

The first series of questions in the questionnaire was designed to determine the attitudes of trade union members towards the union's role in what was generally phrased as 'health and welfare matters'. To supplement these general questions were others about the union's operation of its own health and welfare programmes.

Question 1: In your opinion, should a union be concerned with health and welfare matters?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Per Cent.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 2: In your opinion, should a union be concerned with the health and welfare of union members only?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Per Cent.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 3: In your opinion, should a union be concerned with the health and welfare of the whole community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Per Cent.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It can be seen from question 1 that the rank-and-file trade union members unanimously agreed that a union should be concerned with health and welfare matters. Questions 2 and 3, however, registered a clear difference of opinion, with 52.5 per cent. of the members indicating that a union should think of its members' health and welfare as a solitary venture, something apart from the rest of the community. This disturbing statistic illustrates that a great many trade unionists do not yet perceive the union as a co-operating unit in a larger society, but rather as a self-sufficient working-man's group.

The officials also showed 100 per cent. agreement in question 1 that a union should be concerned with health and welfare matters. In question 2 the officials were again unanimous, this time that a union should be concerned with more than the health and welfare of union members only. The majority of the answers of the rank-and-file, as we have seen, were opposed to this point of view. All the officials recognized in question 3 that a union should be concerned with the health and welfare of the whole community.

**Question 4: In your opinion, should unions operate their own health and welfare programmes?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Per Cent.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Two other questions, 16 and 25, designed to complement question 4, were introduced at separate places in the questionnaire. Answers to these questions indicated less certainty about the union's provision of services than in question 4.

**Question 16:** In your opinion, should unions operate their own health and welfare programmes only when other agencies cannot supply needed services?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Per Cent.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 25:** In your opinion, should unions operate their own health and welfare programmes even if other agencies already supply them?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Per Cent.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the replies to questions 16 and 25 are certainly not unanimous it is possible to say that approximately 60 per cent. of the rank-and-file trade union members see the need for organized labour to work within the existing structure of health and welfare organizations wherever these are satisfactory, rather than create its own duplicating network of facilities and services.
Although 62.5 per cent. of the rank-and-file approved the idea that unions should operate their own health and welfare programmes none of them volunteered to explain their reasons. The officials, 80 per cent. of whom said 'yes' to question 4, qualified their statements by explaining that unions have to operate their own programmes because present government provisions are completely inadequate.

One official pointed out that the chief programme areas for the union in health and welfare matters involve counselling and representation on workmen's compensation disputes and on unemployment insurance problems, and providing information for union members on social assistance, in the medical services plan (M. S. A.)\(^1\), and on loans.

Again, in question 16, the officials were more specific in providing their answers. Sixty per cent. said 'yes', 40 per cent. said 'no'. The interviewers were reminded that some of the officials believe that government should be responsible for all services. One official felt, however, that there are some counselling duties which the union is more appropriately equipped to handle than a government department.

Question 16 was the only place where the answers of the shop stewards were significantly different from the members'.

\(^1\)M. S. A. (Medical Services Association) is a service organization operating a medical service plan on a non-profit, prepayment and voluntary basis for and by its members—employers, employees and doctors, and underwritten by the doctors of British Columbia.
who did not hold any offices. Sixty-seven per cent. of the shop stewards answered 'no' whereas a similar majority of the non-office holders had answered 'yes' to this question.

The officials' replies to question 25 were 40 per cent. 'no', 40 per cent. 'no opinion', and 20 per cent. 'yes'. One official qualified his remarks by pointing out that if "other agencies" meant private agencies, his answer would be 'yes', but if "other agencies" meant government, then his answer would be 'no'.

A considerable variety of opinion, therefore, illustrated the trade unionists' feelings about question 1, 2, 3, 4, 16 and 25. For example, it was stated that: "Only big unions can provide health and welfare services for their members;" "the worker must be protected--a fund for cases of dire need is essential"; "the men need health and welfare services because if they are not healthy they don't work, and don't pay union dues, therefore the union suffers"; "the union should handle services because the government would let men shirk."

Opinions were also expressed volubly against health and welfare programmes within union activities: "the union should be devoted to proper business matters such as wages and hours of work, not health and welfare"; "wages and hours of work must be neglected if health and welfare are thought about part of the time"; "unions exist to get more money for the workers--that's all!"
The variety of attitudes is a reflection of the lack of any well defined majority in the complexity of answers to the problem of the union's concern for, and provision of, health and welfare services.

The attitudes of trade union members were further probed in a number of questions about the Community Chest.

**Question 22:** Do you believe that the Community Chest should be maintained in times of full employment and general prosperity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Per Cent.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 23:** Do you believe that the Community Chest should be maintained in times of low employment and general depression?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Per Cent.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The answers of the rank-and-file to questions 22 and 23 very much support the institutional concept of social welfare services which pictures them as 'first-line' functions of modern industrial society. Several individuals added their feelings that although they recognized the Chest as a valuable community organization they believed that the government should be more properly in charge of health and welfare services.
Comments such as "in the good years the Community Chest should build up a surplus, and in difficult times the government should support it", "some people always need help—there are always problems", and "the Chest supports too many agencies" provide further indication of the trade union members' awareness of the need for adequate social services.

The one individual who objected to the existence of the Community Chest felt that he should be able to support the agency or agencies of his own choice rather than contribute to a common fund. He also felt that Chest officials received 'fabulous salaries'!

In replying to questions 22 and 23 the officials found it difficult to be specific because of their over-riding philosophy that the government should be responsible for all health and welfare services. In question 22, 20 per cent. said 'yes', 40 per cent. said 'no', and 40 per cent. said 'no opinion'; the same percentages were recorded in question 23. On the whole, the union officials were less willing to accept the existence of the Community Chest than the rank-and-file union members.

**Question 24:** Do you think that door-to-door canvassing is a good way in which to raise funds for charitable purposes?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Per Cent.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>57.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A small majority of the rank-and-file trade unionists were opposed to door-to-door canvassing. "It is better to give at work" and "there is too much overlap between home and office collections" seemed to be the most frequent objections to home canvassing. "There is no harm done" and "the only way to get the message across is to talk to individuals at their front doors" were often voiced as favourable opinions to the idea of door-to-door canvassing.

The officials answered 80 per cent. 'no' and 20 per cent. 'yes'; they were very much against door-to-door canvassing as a way of raising funds for charitable purposes. This feeling is connected with the officials' belief in the primacy of government responsibility for welfare services.

**Question 26:** (a) Do you think that most workers give to the Community Chest because they feel pressured?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Per Cent.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>72.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Do you think too much pressure is put upon working men for giving to the Chest?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(c) Where does this pressure come from?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Chest</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A minority of the rank-and-file—27.5 per cent.—felt that most workers give to the Chest because they feel pressured. Of that 27.5 per cent., only 54.5 per cent., however, felt that too much pressure is put upon working men to give to the Chest. The figures in (c) include some members' opinions that pressures are felt from more than one source. Many of the men and women who did not feel that workers give to the Chest because they feel pressured favoured the method of deducting charitable donations from the payroll.

The officials' response to question 26 was considerably more emphatic than the rank-and-file members; 80 per cent. of the officials felt that most workers give to the Community Chest because they feel pressured. Of that 80 per cent., 75 per cent. felt that too much pressure is put on working men. The officials felt that most of the pressure came from the Chest and from management, with the union least guilty of putting pressure on the unionists to give to the Chest. They suggested that management often puts workers in the position where they are unable to refuse.

The questions designed to determine the attitudes of trade union members along with their levels of understanding and knowledgeability of certain health and welfare matters have been analyzed and assessed up to this point in the chapter. The rest of the chapter will include an assessment of the results of the questions dealing with the responsibility for social
services, the importance of social problems, and the perception of social workers. A further evaluation of the total questionnaire will be presented in the final chapter.


**Question 5:** Who do you think should be responsible for providing the following welfare services? A list of services was presented to the union members along with a number of choices to one of which they could assign responsibility for each service. The answers of the rank-and-file are shown in Figure 1. The answers of the officials are not included in Figure 1, but are added to the description in each section.

(a) adoption of children: Eighty-five per cent. of the respondents indicated that some level of government should be responsible for this important service. Although there was some recognition that co-operation among the three levels of government is appropriate—that one level of government does not provide the most satisfactory administration, there was no specific indication that the trade union members know what the present arrangements are for the adoption of children.

Of the officials, 80 per cent. felt that the adoption of children was most properly a government responsibility; 40 per cent. said the federal level, 20 per cent. the provincial level and 20 per cent. the municipal level. One official felt that physicians should handle adoptions.
FIG. 1. Assignment of Responsibility for Service—

Relative Proportions
(b) **marriage counselling**: The widest diversity of opinion in question 5 was found in this section. A total of 60 per cent. selected government. The church was selected by 10 per cent. although this alternative was not presented on the questionnaire. Trade union members chose 'private agencies' as most properly responsible for marriage counselling more often (15 per cent.) than for any other section of question 5. Another 15 per cent. stated 'don't know', also a larger number than in any other section of question 5. The answers of the officials were identical to their replies in section (a)--in other words, 80 per cent. selected government and one individual suggested referral to a physician. The answers showed very little recognition of the specific resources available in the community.

(c) **health insurance**: Government was assigned the responsibility for this social service by 82.5 per cent. of the respondents, including 60 per cent. who favoured the federal level of responsibility. All the officials said that the federal government should be responsible for this social service.

Every person interviewed stated an opinion to this question; there is no doubt that this is one problem about which all unionists are concerned. The union was assigned the responsibility for health insurance by 12.5 per cent. of the unionists; this was the largest assignment of responsibility
given to the union in any part of question 5. There was some confusion over the term 'health insurance'; some members expressed satisfaction with the coverage received under the current M. S. A. plans although they admitted that they were not entirely clear about the sponsorship of such arrangements.

(d) recreation facilities for children: The responsibility for this service for children was designated to government by 97.5 per cent. of the trade union members, with the provincial and municipal levels of government being selected most often. One individual believed that the private agencies should be responsible.

The government was chosen unanimously by the officials—40 per cent. said federal, 40 per cent. provincial, and 20 per cent. municipal.

(e) recreation facilities for adults: Similarly, in this section, a vast majority (82.5 per cent.) of the unionists selected government, with the provincial and municipal levels once again chosen by the greater percentage (72.5 per cent.). There were few queries about the meaning of 'recreation facilities for adults'. One individual said that "adults should make their own fun."

Of the officials, 80 per cent. selected the government, 60 per cent. said federal, 20 per cent. said provincial. One official said that adults should be responsible for their own recreation.
(f) **retirement pensions**: Ninety per cent. of the trade unionists assigned this responsibility to government, 75 per cent. specifically to the federal government—a greater number than any other section in question 5. Some of the people interviewed needed clarification that they were being asked whom they thought 'should' be responsible, not whom they thought 'is' responsible for retirement pensions which were defined as "any pension granted at the end of a man's working life". One individual suggested that eligibility for the provincial old age pension in British Columbia should be reduced from 65 to 60 years of age.

There was no doubt that this area, along with health insurance, was of the utmost concern to the trade union members. The federal government was assigned responsibility for these services by a large majority of the unionists, including 100 per cent. of the officials who were interviewed.

Reactions to sections (g), (h), and (i), in question 5 were quite similar, as can be seen in Figure 1. Some level of government was chosen almost unanimously as most adequately responsible for the mentally ill, social assistance, and the chronically ill. The latter was defined for the members as a 'long-term physical disability preventing the individual from working for a living'.

The officials provided identical answers to sections (g), (h), and (i) also. Eighty per cent. of the officials stated
that they thought the federal government should be responsible for these services; 20 per cent. selected the provincial government.

The results to question 5 leave no doubt that trade union members believe that government should have the responsibility for providing a variety of health and welfare services. Over 85 per cent. of the possible selections were cast in favour of government responsibility. Consequently, very little responsibility was assigned to private agencies, the union, or management.

The federal level of government was recognized as the appropriate level for responsibility of all the welfare services except recreation facilities for children and adults where the provincial and municipal levels were assigned most of the responsibility.

It is significant to compare the results of question 4 where 62.5 per cent. of the unionists felt that unions should operate their own health and welfare programmes, with the results of this question 5 where government is selected overwhelmingly to provide a variety of services—to the virtual exclusion of any union responsibility. This would seem to indicate that union members see health and welfare services within a broad community perspective; at the same time there is considerable confusion in unionists' perception of the trade union's responsibilities to the members themselves within the community.
The officials answered the eight sections of question 5 with an overwhelming vote in favour of government responsibility for health and welfare services. The officials showed no hesitation in answering these questions as they reaffirmed the beliefs about government responsibility recorded in their answers to questions previously described in this chapter.

E. Importance of Social Problems

Questions 27 and 28 were designed to discover trade union members' opinions of the importance of certain social problems, first, within the context of health and welfare alone, and secondly within the general context of problems of concern to government.

Question 27: The following is a list of the social problems with which welfare services are designed to deal. Please rate them in what you consider is their order of importance.

The list included the chronically ill, retarded children, unemployment, alcoholism, poverty, drug addiction, juvenile delinquency, and mental illness. Figure 2 illustrates (a) the first choice percentages, (b) the second choice percentages, and (c) the third choice percentages of the ratings given in question 27 by the rank-and-file unionists. Figure 2 also illustrates the total weighted percentages of the ratings.

In questions 27 and 28, the first choices were given a weighting of 3 points, the second choices a weighting of 2 points, and the third choices a weighting of 1 point. These were added together to give the total weighted percentages.
FIG. 2. IMPORTANCE OF SOCIAW PROBLEMS
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- Unemployment
- Retarded Children
- Drug Addiction
- Chronically Ill
- Juvenile Delinquency
- Mental Illness
- Poverty
- Alcoholism
including first, second, and third choices.

The trade union members selected unemployment as the social problem which they considered most important. There was no widespread agreement, however, that any one problem was outstanding in its importance; the final percentages were well divided.

There is no doubt that unemployment is the problem closest to the hearts of union members, although it might be considered surprising that it did not receive a higher total in the weighted percentages. The second overall choice—retarded children—is indicative not only of the high emotional appeal of children, but also of the fact the unionists have been influenced and swayed by the way popular opinion has been excited by recent campaigns in British Columbia on behalf of retarded children.

Juvenile delinquency and drug addiction received considerable notice, a likely result of the barrage of publicity given to these problems in all the news media in the last several years. The large amount of attention given to these areas of concern perhaps falsifies the real extent of the problems.

Of the problems which received a small amount of recognition from the unionists, poverty was frequently connected with unemployment and therefore considered a minor problem. The fact that mental illness received only slight attention is an indication, perhaps, of the continuing low social visibility of mental illness, and is a reflection of traditional avoidance
reactions to this problem. Alcoholism was considered the least of the problems perhaps because of confusion about the seriousness of the term used. There was no recognition of alcoholism as a disease.

The officials considered unemployment a greater problem than did the rank-and-file unionists. This area of concern received 33 per cent of the total weighted percentages of the officials' ratings, followed by juvenile delinquency and the chronically ill, each with 12.5 per cent. On the whole, the officials' ratings were very similar to the rank-and-file members.

**Question 28:** Please rate these topics of concern to Canadians in what you consider is their order of importance.

For each individual his three top choices in question 27 were added to the following list: abolition of capital punishment, European Common Market, need for more schools, nuclear arms in Canada, Canadian membership in Nato, and national health scheme. Figure 3 illustrates (a) the first choice percentages, (b) the second choice percentages, and (c) the third choice percentages. Figure 3 also illustrates the total weighted percentages of the ratings, including first, second, and third choices.

The most significant result of this question is the high overall rating given to health and welfare problems. From Figure 3 it can be seen that the top five choices in terms of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. TOTAL WEIGHTED PERCENTAGES</th>
<th>B. FIRST CHOICE PERCENTAGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Health Scheme</td>
<td>National Health Scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>Unemployment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for more Schools</td>
<td>Need for more Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retarded Children</td>
<td>Retarded Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Delinquency</td>
<td>Juvenile Delinquency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Addiction</td>
<td>Drug Addiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronically Ill</td>
<td>Chronically Ill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abolition of Capital Punishment</td>
<td>Abolition of Capital Punishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>Poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Illness</td>
<td>Mental Illness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear Arms in Canada</td>
<td>Nuclear Arms in Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcoholism</td>
<td>Alcoholism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Second Choice Percentages

D. Third Choice Percentages

FIG. 3. TOPICS OF CONCERN
total weighted percentages are a national health scheme (17.9 per cent.), unemployment (16.3 per cent.), need for more schools (12.0 per cent.), retarded children (10.0 per cent.), and juvenile delinquency (8.8 per cent.).

Three of these selections are carried over from the earlier question and certainly the additions—'national health scheme' and 'need for more schools'—are within the scope of health and welfare. No particular attention is paid to other problems of concern to government in the company of health and welfare problems, by the rank-and-file trade union members.

The top three choices in total weighted percentages of the officials' ratings were unemployment (30 per cent.), nuclear arms in Canada (23 per cent.), and a national health scheme (13 per cent.). Although unemployment and a national health scheme were also of great concern to the rank-and-file, the officials' concern for the problem of nuclear arms was vastly different from the rank-and-file. The interviewers believe this choice to be a result of the officials' interest in the political platform of the New Democratic Party constituted in 1961.

F. Perception of Social Workers

The final section of the questionnaire was constructed in order to obtain some idea about the trade union members' perception of social workers. Questions 29 through 34 deal with unionists' contacts with social workers, and what they think a social worker's education and income ought to be.
Question 29: Do you know of anyone who has had contact with any social workers or social work agencies?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Per Cent.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If YES, in what ways? This second part to the question provided a variety of replies. Some individuals referred to more than one contact. The receiving of social assistance was the most frequent contact; it was mentioned 9 times. Two replies referred to the adoption of children, and two to the plant welfare committee. Contacts that were mentioned once were related to an illegitimate child, large families without a wage-earner, a retarded child, 'child welfare', a minister who did social work, and a social worker who was a friend of the family.

Question 30: Have you had any personal contact with any social workers or social work agencies?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Per Cent.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>77.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If YES, in what ways? The few people who have had contact mentioned the following circumstances: adoption of children (2); canvassing (3); friends (2); social assistance (1); ward and foster child of the Children's Aid Society (1).
From the largely negative response to this question one might infer that the trade union members did not want to talk about the subject, or that they have always had secure employment without recourse to social assistance, or that they are not sure who a social worker is when they are in contact with one.

Certainly questions 29 and 30 illustrate that the rank-and-file trade union members have had little contact with social workers or social work agencies and that they have little awareness of the role of social workers in the community.

Each of the officials, however, was able to affirm that he knew of persons who had had contact with social workers or social work agencies and that he himself had had such contact. The officials showed no reluctance in answering questions 29 and 30, an indication perhaps that in their official status they have more opportunity for such contact and therefore more awareness of the social worker as a trained practitioner in the community. The officials mentioned social assistance, the adoption of children, and the Community Chest staff as the most frequent contacts they have had.

**Question 31: Do you believe that social workers need special formal education?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Per Cent.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If YES, at what academic level?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Per Cent.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Complete high school education</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Complete college education</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Additional college graduate education</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eighty-five per cent. of the trade union members agreed that social workers need special formal education. There was a considerable diversity, however, in their replies to the qualifying part of the question: of the 85 per cent. who recommended special formal education, 59 per cent. saw a college education as a prerequisite for practising social work. Three individuals in the group who thought high school education was sufficient added that they felt practical experience was the most valuable education along with a certain innate skill to practise social work.

The unionists' further comments provide a significant addition to question 31: "Social workers need lots of training like teachers do"; "social workers don't need education--they need maturity and love of people"; "all people need somebody to talk to some times and social workers need to be very well educated so that people will respect them and listen to their advice"; "everybody needs education today if they want to earn a decent living".

Although results to questions 29 and 30 showed that union people have had little contact with social workers,
question 31 illustrated that the rank-and-file trade union members have some respect for the social worker and their own conception of a social worker's responsibilities.

The officials agreed 100 per cent. that social workers need special formal education; 80 per cent. said that social workers should have additional college graduate education and that this should largely involve practical training. The officials, therefore, showed considerable recognition of the need for adequate training of professional practitioners. Only one official thought that high school education was satisfactory for a social worker.

**Question 32: Do you think social workers are (a) overpaid, (b) underpaid, or (c) don't know?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Per Cent.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) overpaid</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) underpaid</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) don't know</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results to this question show that a majority of the rank-and-file trade union members were unwilling to make a guess. A small majority of those who did answer the question thought that social workers were underpaid. Eighty per cent. of the officials believed that social workers were underpaid. One official said that he did not know. It is perhaps not unreasonable to say that the officials showed more awareness than the rank-and-file unionists of the social workers' financial situation.
Question 33: What do you consider is the approximate annual income of a social worker (with at least 5 years experience)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Per Cent.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Under $3,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) $3,000 to 4,999</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) $5,000 to 6,999</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) $7,000 to 9,999</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) $10,000 or over</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of unionists were at first unwilling to answer this question; they admitted that they did not know. They were asked to make a guess; five refused. Sixty-five per cent. placed social workers in the $3,000-4,999 income bracket—which might well be considered the same income bracket as the men and women interviewed.

Sixty per cent. of the officials agreed with the majority of the rank-and-file that social workers earn $3,000-4,999 annual income. One official suggested $5,000-6,999; one official suggested $7,000-9,999. The officials answered this question more readily than the rank-and-file unionists. Although the officials felt that salaries were low for social workers, the majority were quite vehement in asserting that salaries paid to social workers should be considerably higher. It is important to realize that the members were asked 'what is' rather than 'what should be' a social worker's salary. The latter distinction was the core of the next question.
**Question 34:** Do you think a social worker should earn as much as a . . . ?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a) schoolteacher</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Per Cent.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>77.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) plumber

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>47.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(c) personnel manager

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>40.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(d) trade union business agent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>57.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(e) lawyer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>12.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>67.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(f) radio disc jockey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>50.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(g) engineer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>17.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is no doubt that trade union members found it most easy to compare the position of social worker with that of
schoolteacher. Not only did the largest percentage (77.5 per cent.) of unionists vote 'yes' to section (a) but also the smallest (7.5 per cent.) number of 'no opinion's' was registered in this first section. To section (a) the officials answered 80 per cent. 'yes', 20 per cent. 'no', so that they also found this comparison adequate.

A majority of trade union members, however, did not feel that a social worker should earn as much as a lawyer or an engineer. They immediately recognized that a considerable amount of training is necessary for an individual to become a member of these professions. They attached more status to these positions than to social work positions. The officials answered 40 per cent. 'yes', 60 per cent. 'no' to section (e) and 40 per cent. 'yes', 40 per cent. 'no', and 20 per cent. 'no opinion' to section (g). The officials, therefore, agreed with the rank-and-file about the status of a lawyer, but gave more recognition to a social worker in comparison with an engineer.

There were added comments about the legal profession which showed some familiarity with lawyers; many trade unionists recognized that there was a great variety of positions that could be held by a lawyer. There was some consistency in the remarks of 5 unionists who said that they knew lawyers earned more than social workers but they thought that social workers should earn as much as lawyers.
The job of personnel manager was another position which the unionists recognized as one of great variability of income—usually depending on the size of the company. The replies to this question showed an equal split of 40 per cent. each, with 20 per cent. who found it too difficult to compare. A majority (60 per cent.) of the officials suggested that a social worker's salary should be as much as a personnel manager; 20 per cent. said 'no'; 20 per cent. had 'no opinion'.

A sizeable majority of unionists felt that a social worker should earn as much as a plumber, a trade union business agent, and a radio disc jockey—sections (b), (d), and (f) respectively. These occupations also brought forth a large number of 'no opinion's' which showed an understandable unwillingness, on the unionists' part, to make any poorly-based judgements. The answers of the officials were similar to the rank-and-file: section (b), 60 per cent. said 'yes', 40 per cent. had no opinion; section (d), 80 per cent. said 'yes', 20 per cent. had no opinion; section (f), 60 per cent. said 'yes', 40 per cent. had no opinion.

There were two comments made in connection with question 34 that would turn the head of any social worker: "Salaries for social workers cannot be settled because social workers are priceless if they are dedicated" and "social workers should be paid as much as physicians because they are just as valuable; they are dealing with human beings".
On the whole, questions 29 to 34 illustrated that the rank-and-file trade union members' perception of social workers is extremely limited. They do not have a great deal of knowledge or understanding of what the role of a social worker represents. Less than 40 per cent. had any contacts with or knew of anyone else having contacts with social workers or social work agencies. A great many of the unionists admitted to having difficulty in answering this group of questions; they were understandably unwilling to make guesses.

The unionists showed a limited awareness of social workers—their education, their income, their actual professional status, and their types of work. Several trade union members said that they had always considered that social workers worked on a voluntary basis and that money was of no concern to them.

The officials, on the whole, showed more recognition and awareness of social workers; they had a greater appreciation of the social worker's role in the community.

It would no doubt be possible to discern more implications of the data which have been collected; we are conscious of the fact that our attention has been confined to the obvious and gross implications. The final chapter will set forth an evaluation of the results along with speculations about future research arising from this study.
CHAPTER 4

APPRaisal ANDpERSPECTIVE

A. An Evaluation of the Survey

The questionnaire used in the survey was designed to determine the levels of knowledgeability of the trade union members on social welfare questions, their attitudes to certain health and welfare topics, their views of the relative importance or severity of the social problems with which welfare services are designed to deal, their opinions on the proper location of responsibility for the provision of social services, and finally, their perception of social workers.

The attitudes of the trade union members revealed in answer to the survey questions showed that a majority of both rank-and-file members and officials had considerable awareness of health and welfare services. When confronted with hypothetical problems of a personal nature (i.e., in questions 14 and 15) the labour people generally saw a need for service from community resources whether it was a "free" professional person, a private social agency, or a government department. They recognized the existence of services and accepted the need for such resources. At the same time, however, there were very few references to specific community agencies.

A minority of the trade unionists clearly revealed their belief in the principle of self-help, a feeling which
may be the consequence of a number of factors. The union members may have been unaware of certain community services, they might have a poor regard for present resources, or they might feel that the use of such services is distasteful or humiliating—a sentiment which reflects the philosophy of rugged individualism and free enterprise characteristic of the "North American way of life".

A significant difference between the officials and the rank-and-file was the fact that the officials were aware of specific referral units such as the Information Service of the Community Chest and the permanent labour representative at the Chest. It was surprising to find that none of the rank-and-file members showed any familiarity with these basic resources.

The Community Chest was recognized as a vital health and welfare service in the community by a majority of the trade union rank-and-file members. Their acceptance of the Chest, however, was based almost entirely on its role as a fund-raising body. The rank-and-file gave no indication that they were aware of the Chest's role in welfare planning. They made no references to the importance of citizen participation in social welfare, whether in social planning or on agency boards and committees.

In contrast to the rank-and-file unionists the officials expressed their whole-hearted disapproval of the Community Chest as a community health and welfare organization.
In their opinion, some level of government should assume the entire responsibility for the provision of welfare services. The officials were considerably more vehement both in the content and the expression of their answers to questions about the Community Chest.

The unionists' opinions leave little doubt of the need for increasing efforts on the part of the Community Chest to develop public understanding through education and interpretation. The fund-raising purposes of the Chest seem to be clearly recognized by the trade union members. The importance of its role in social planning and citizen participation seems to be unacknowledged.

The rank-and-file union members agreed unanimously that unions should be 'concerned' with health and welfare matters. All the officials, but only a small majority of the rank-and-file, however, saw the need for the union to work within the existing structure of community health and welfare services rather than create its own parallel network of services. In other words, a considerable number of rank-and-file unionists saw the union as something apart from the rest of the community and were unable to see the broader implications of union participation in the health and welfare services of the community. Their primary orientation was to a view of the union as a kind of mutual benefit society rather than as an organization whose role could only be discharged effectively and
appropriately through the planned integration of its activities with those of complementary social structures.

The difference between the feelings of the rank-and-file and those of the officials about the Community Chest can be seen clearly in their opinions on 'the pressure to give'. Most of the rank-and-file did not think they were pressured unduly to give to the Chest whereas the officials were of the firm opinion that there was too much pressure for the working man to give. The officials' feelings are perhaps a reflection of the responsibilities which they hold in the union's official contacts with Community Chest representatives, but may also very well be indicative of their views as to the legitimacy of the Chest's fund-raising activities.

There is no doubt that the trade union members firmly believe that government should have the responsibility for providing a considerable variety of health and welfare services. The federal level of government was recognized as the appropriate level for most social services.

The union members revealed a wide divergence of opinion about the relative importance of a variety of social problems. Although there was no doubt about their choice of unemployment as the most important social problem, there was little clear differentiation among their other choices. The unionists showed considerable interest in rating the list of social problems which was provided them in the questionnaire
(i.e., Questions 27, 28), but at the same time it might be said that they showed a low level of thoughtful awareness in their consideration of these problems. We do not suggest, however, that a representative group of social workers would have shown a higher level of knowledgeability or understanding about the problems of union organization, the economic prospects of Canada's forest industries, or the arguments for or against the "closed shop."

Health and welfare problems dominated the union members' choices, in comparison with other general topics of concern, in Question 28. They showed particular concern over the need for a national health scheme and for a solution to the problem of unemployment. Social workers may well feel that this fact reveals the existence of an untapped capital of public interest in and good will towards the objects of their professional concern. But if we are right in arguing that other aspects of our data indicate a relatively low level of knowledgeability and "involvement" among our respondents, it is plain that this capital has yet to be put to intelligently chosen and productive uses.

The trade union members' perception of social workers (Questions 29-34) was what we might perhaps term benevolent but narrow. The unionists had had very little contact with social workers or social work agencies and consequently did not show much awareness of the education, income, status, and types of work connected with social work. The members seemed to
be confused about the status of social work as an occupation or treatment profession in the community: they did not see the role of social work and social work agencies as something unique and non-transferable to other organizations or professions.

While the questions about social workers were themselves limited in scope they did at least illustrate the need for greater public understanding of social work and the role it can play in the community. But lest we be (rightly) accused of professional parochialism and vanity, it should be said that neither do we believe that investigation would reveal a particularly high level of public understanding of the social role, the requisite skills or the usual rewards of schoolteachers, research scientists, public health nurses or hard-rock miners.  

B. Implications for Further Study

To point out the possibilities for future research is an important function of this exploratory study into the attitudes of trade union members towards social welfare, as it would be, of course, of any piece of exploratory research. This project has been sponsored by an institute which was

1 The general significance of this fact should not be overlooked. It could be convincingly argued that if the many centrifugal and disintegrative tendencies of contemporary social life are to be controlled, we all need to have a far more detailed and extensive understanding of the way in which our social system actually works than we presently do; and one central feature of such an understanding is an adequate conception of the social role of different occupational groupings. The implications of this observation for our educational arrangements are far-reaching and profound.
created to stimulate and subsidize an interdisciplinary programme of research, and we therefore regard it as not the least part of our obligation to the unwritten terms of that sponsorship to make what suggestions we reasonably and appropriately can for the composition of an agenda for subsequent investigation.

Although this study has been limited and modest in its scope, it is at the same time more ambitious in its aims and its recognition of the importance of certain broad social issues than many of the more usual types of research project, in the field of social work, concerned as they often are with relatively restricted clinical and administrative problems. We feel, therefore, that it is important not only to identify further areas for research, but also to give some indication of the important issues on which they are based.

Although the propositions that are set forth in the following discussion may go beyond the limited results of our study, it is still possible that these hypotheses will serve to discriminate genuine and spurious problems, false and valid assumptions, and that other researchers will accordingly find it worthwhile to examine them thoroughly.

In Chapter 2, we have suggested that the development of the trade unions has revealed certain distinctive patterns. In the U. S. A. the unions have been essentially pragmatic in their activities. This means that they have historically identified themselves with the laissez-faire, private enterprise
doctrines of industry itself and have sought to improve their economic standards by the use of full co-operation with management. As a natural corollary to this, they have avoided establishing close and abiding affiliation with any political parties.

In the U. K., on the other hand, labour has traditionally adopted the policy of attempting at the same time to ensure the greatest possible political and legislative effectiveness. (This has been so much in evidence that the word 'unionist' has almost implied politically left-wing leanings and affiliations). Undoubtedly, therefore, union membership has in the past stimulated awareness of human needs in areas other than the purely industrial. The 'political voice' of labour in the U. K. has accordingly reflected a policy of government-sponsored social services, primarily for the benefit of trade unions, but in practice for the ultimate benefit of the total community.

This ideological celebration and political implementation of the social services has resulted in the acceptance over the greater range of the spectrum of public opinion of the appropriateness of and necessity for certain minimum levels of social planning. This trend has been evident in Western Europe most recently with the formation of the European Common Market, this being the latest and most consequential development of the trend to the embodiment of collective purpose at progressively higher levels of social organization.
In North America, and particularly in the U. S. A., this trend has been viewed with alarm and scarcely-veiled abhorrence by business and industry. The political voice of the people, at least until recently, has tended outwardly to be a support to and a reflection of the private enterprise system. Only this month, however, events in the steel industry in the U. S. A. have revealed the insecurity of this system. Indeed the question now appears to be whether the U. S. government does in fact offer succour to the private enterprise system. The President has responded to the announcement by the steel companies of an increase in steel prices (traditionally a morally acceptable decision by any private company) with a fervent and outraged denunciation of such a bald expression of power and self-interest. It can fairly be said that this situation reveals the dilemma faced by the proponents of the laissez-faire, entrepreneurial system.

In Canada the influence of the social and political traditions of both the old world and the new are in evidence. Labour has traditionally adopted a pragmatic approach to its

---

1See, for example, the article "Big Business Gets Lesson From Steel's Price-Grab," by Thomas M. Franck in *The Sunday Sun*, Vancouver, April 21, 1962, p. 6. The author comments on the spectacular blitz by President Kennedy on the steel companies who tried to raise their prices and also on the decision to cancel government contracts with companies who allegedly will not hire or promote Negroes.

2Baum, *op. cit.*
problems. At the same time, however, it has lent its support to a limited political approach in the past. More recently, with the advent of the New Democratic Party on the political scene, it has seemingly come to the conclusion that political power (or at least a political voice) is necessary in this new era of rapidly-changing and far-reaching developments in the social and economic spheres.

In answering a question on the assignment of responsibility for the provision of health and welfare services it could be anticipated that trade unionists would be at least in some degree influenced by this dilemma. Certainly the A. F. L. - C. I. O. statements in regard to health and welfare reveal a pragmatic approach.\(^1\) The C. L. C., however, has made recommendations concerning broad legislative measures in the field of health and welfare. Until these measures are implemented they will continue to support the existing voluntary health and welfare services.

The union members that we have interviewed revealed a surprising level of agreement concerning the role of government in the provision of health and welfare services. Of the nine services listed, only marriage counselling "scored" less than 80 per cent. assignment of responsibility to government. This reflects a high degree of agreement between the

---

\(^1\)See Appendix C.
members, the officials and the statements of policy of the C. L. C.

Such facts are diametrically opposed to the apparent views and orientations of the A. F. L. - C. I. O. and its leaders. We are not in a position to know what American unionists think about these matters, but we should like to offer the suggestion that it is by no means certain that they would not have views on these matters that were similar to those of the Canadian unionists we have interviewed. This would mean that we could ask two major and significant questions and provide tentative answers that would justify (and indeed would require) close analysis.

First, does the A. F. L. - C. I. O. speak for and reflect the views of the rank-and-file unionists in the U. S. in this particular matter? The answer could be that it does not. Second, does the stand taken by the President of the U. S., in which he has placed the government as a countervailing power between and over industry and labour, reflect the views of labour? The answer, again, might very well be that it does.

Because of the overwhelming assignment of responsibility to one or other level of government, it is interesting to note that a large majority of the members interviewed saw the Community Chest as a necessary and vital community service. The query that comes to mind concerns the possible role of the Chest. If it is not to provide or sponsor health, adoption,
marriage counselling and recreation facilities, what is its function in the community? It could be suggested that in fact the union members (like a large number of citizens in the community) do not understand and appreciate the function of the Chest. At the same time they conform to "conventional wisdom" and offer financial support to an organization that appears to be "here to stay" and socially acceptable.

The solution to this problem appears to fall into two broad areas of consideration. First, we wonder whether the Chest is guilty of presenting itself as a fund-raising organization to the exclusion of its other functions. If it is, we must ask why this should be. It could be that the Chest has established an order of public priority in which finances must be considered the basic need to be met. On the other hand perhaps the Chest believes that because of its quasi-constitutional status it should not be accountable to the public for actions other than in the area of fund-raising.¹

The second area of consideration is the degree of participation and involvement of the trade union members in the

¹"Chest News is Good News", The Sun, Vancouver, August 31, 1960, p. 4. This is an editorial referring to the Citizens Survey Committee of the Community Chest and Councils of Greater Vancouver, which recommended that representatives of the press should be able to attend and report the proceedings of Directors' meetings of the Chest. This recommendation caused considerable controversy before it was approved.
Chest. Obviously, the responsibility for recruitment does not fall solely on the Chest. The unions need to exercise more influence on their members in relation to participation in the advisory and service functions of the Chest. Indeed we would suggest that all citizens in a democratic society have a duty to the voluntary (and public) health and welfare services. This means not merely participation as a volunteer at the service level (which service can be used as a palliative for a troubled social conscience) but personal involvement at the policy-making and decision-making levels. The Welfare Services Committee of the C. L. C. is an expression of the recognition by the C. L. C. and its affiliates of the need for this participation, but we suggest that much more needs to be done if we wish to develop services to meet identified social needs and achieve an enlightened and morally objective citizenry.

It should be noted that this study has been concerned solely with health and welfare matters which are commonly recognized as social welfare services. Richard Titmuss has argued that in any discussion of welfare services we should take cognizance of the fact that there are fiscal welfare benefits (e.g., insurance premiums paid to a registered pension plan are deductible for income tax purposes) and occupational

welfare benefits (e.g., many benefits are provided by employers, such as sickness benefits, which aid in raising the standard of living of the employees) in addition to the conventional social welfare benefits. All three types of welfare benefits provide substantial relief from undue economic hardship on the part of all citizens. In our study we have focussed attention on the health and welfare services generally considered acceptable or necessary for the 'disadvantaged' in our society. It should be remembered however, that this is a limited approach to a proper assessment of opinion about health and welfare services.

Again, it would be interesting to know what the "white-collar" and professional groups think of these services and whether the usual stereotyped judgements about self-sufficiency and rugged individualism would reveal themselves. What, for that matter, do the very people who might be expected to be the most ardent advocates of laissez-faire and self-reliance--namely our business leaders and captains of industry--think of these problems? It would be as rash to suppose that their responses could be confidently predicted as to assume that no conservative government could come to power in a country in which the working classes constituted a majority of the electorate. Yet the refusal of the different levels of government in Canada to assume greater responsibility for the financing and administration of welfare services is often explained and sometimes justified by claiming that the business community would be opposed to such a move. We should perhaps remind
ourselves that the élite of the business world includes Paul Hoffmann as well as Charles Wilson, just as American military leadership has included both George Marshall and Douglas MacArthur.
Appendix A

Pre-test Questionnaire Used in Survey of Trade Union Members

1. In your opinion, how far should a union's role extend in the area of health and welfare?

   A union should not be concerned with health and welfare matters at all ____
   A union should be concerned with the health and welfare of union members only ____
   A union should be concerned with the health and welfare of the whole community ____

2. Which of the following statements comes closest to your own point of view?

   Unions should never operate their own health and welfare programmes ____
   Unions should operate their own health and welfare programmes but only when other agencies cannot supply needed services ____
   Unions should operate their own health and welfare programmes even if other agencies already supply them ____

3. Who do you think should be responsible for providing the following welfare services?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Govt. (Fed., Prov., Mun.)</th>
<th>Private Agencies</th>
<th>Union</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adoption</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital counselling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health insurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation-Gym. facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement pension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health</td>
<td>Govt.</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentally Ill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronically Ill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. How old are you? ______
5. Country of birth? ______

6. How long have you lived in Canada? ______

7. Occupation? ______

8. (a) Length of membership in trade unions? ______
   (b) Length of membership in the I. W. A.? ______

9. Offices held in the I. W. A. (a) In the past? ____________
   (b) At the present time? ________________

10. Offices held in other unions? ________________

11. Check the last grade of school that you have finished.

   Grades: 1..2..3..4..5..6..7..8..9..10..11..12..13
   University: 1..2..3..4..5..6
   Business: 1..2..3...
   Trade: 1..2..3..4..5
   Other (specify): __________

12. (a) Let us suppose some friends of yours have a serious problem concerning their child's destructiveness in the home and they ask where they can go for help. What would you tell them? ________________
   (b) Why? ________________
13. (a) Let us suppose some friends of yours have a serious marital problem and they ask you where they can go for help. What would you tell them? _____________

(b) Why? ____________________________________________________________________

14. Do social welfare agencies render their services to all income groups?  
   Yes _____
   No _____
   No opinion _____

15. How many organizations does the Community Chest support?  
   42 _____
   65 _____
   87 _____
   101 _____

16. Do you believe organized labour and community chest agencies should work together?  
   Yes _____
   No _____
   No Opinion _____

17. Do you think most labour leaders in Vancouver want their unions to co-operate in the community chest?  
   Yes _____
   No _____
   No Opinion _____

18. Do you think most Community Chest leaders are interested in gaining the co-operation of organized labour?  
   Yes _____
   No _____
   No Opinion _____

19. Under what conditions do you believe that the Community Chest should be maintained?  
   (a) _____ In times of full employment and general prosperity.
   (b) _____ In times of low employment and general depression.
20. Do you think that door-to-door canvassing is a good way in which to raise funds for charitable purposes?

Yes ______
No ______
No Opinion ______

21. Do you think that most workers give to the community chest only because they feel pressured?

Yes ______  No ______

(a) IF YES: Do you think too much pressure is put upon working men for giving to the Fund?

Yes ______  No ______

(b) IF YES: Where does this pressure come from?

Union ______  Management ______
Both ______

22. The following is a list of the social problems with which welfare services are designed to deal. Please rate them in what you consider is their order of importance:

(a) _______ chronically ill
(b) _______ retarded children
(c) _______ unemployment
(d) _______ alcoholism
(e) _______ poverty
(f) _______ drug addiction
(g) _______ juvenile delinquency
(h) _______ mental illness

23. Below is a list of topics of general importance to Canadians. Please indicate what you think should be their level of concern to Canadians, using the accompanying scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>utmost concern</th>
<th>some concern</th>
<th>no concern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) abolition of capital punishment</td>
<td>(b) European Common Market</td>
<td>(c) need for more schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
24. Have you had rather frequent personal contact with any social workers or social work agencies?  Yes _____  No _____

If Yes, in what ways?  (Please check)

(a) You are a member of a social work agency board.
(b) You have done volunteer work for a social work agency.
(c) You have a family member or close friend who is a social worker.
(d) You have a family member or close friend who is a volunteer worker or leader in a social work agency.
(e) You have been supplied with social work information by an agency executive, board member, or public relations representative.
(f) You initiated the efforts of learning more about your local social work agencies.
(g) You received direct service from a social work agency at some time in your life.
(h) Other.

25. Do you believe that social workers need special formal education?  Yes _____  No _____

If you have answered Yes, at what academic level? (check one)

(a) _____Complete high school education
(b) _____Complete college education
(c) _____Additional college graduate education

26. Do you think social workers are (a) _____overpaid
(b) _____underpaid

27. What do you consider is the approximate annual income of a social worker (with at least 5 years experience)?

(a) _____Under $3,000.
(b) _____3,000 to 4,999
(c) _____5,000-6,999
(d) 7,000-9,999
(e) 10,000 or over

28. Do you think a social worker should earn as much as a

(a) schoolteacher
   Yes  No  Don't Know

(b) plumber
   Yes  No  Don't Know

(c) personnel manager
   Yes  No  Don't Know

(d) trade union business agent
   Yes  No  Don't Know

(e) lawyer
   Yes  No  Don't Know

(f) radio disc jockey
   Yes  No  Don't Know

(g) engineer
   Yes  No  Don't Know

Ask "Why?" in each of the above.
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Questionnaire Used in Survey of Trade Union Members

1. In your opinion, should a union be concerned with health and welfare matters?
   Yes _____  No _____  No opinion _____

2. In your opinion, should a union be concerned with the health and welfare of union members only?
   Yes _____  No _____  No opinion _____

3. In your opinion, should a union be concerned with the health and welfare of the whole community?
   Yes _____  No _____  No opinion _____

4. In your opinion, should unions operate their own health and welfare programmes?
   Yes _____  No _____  No opinion _____

5. Who do you think should be responsible for providing the following welfare services?

   Fed.  Prov./  Private  Union  Management  Don't
   Gov't.  Mun.  Agencies  Management  Know
   Gov't.  __________  ________  __________  _____

   (a) adoption of children
   (b) marriage counselling
   (c) health insurance
   (d) recreation facilities for children
   (e) recreation facilities for adults
   (f) retirement pensions
6. In what age group are you? Under 30 ______ 30-39 ______ 40-49 ______ 50 or over ______

7. Country of birth? __________________________

8. How long have you lived in Canada? ______

9. Present occupation? ________________________

10. (a) Length of membership in trade unions? ______
    (b) Length of membership in the I. W. A.? ______

11. Offices held in the I. W. A. (a) At the present time? ______
    ________________________________
    (b) In the past? ______

12. Offices held in other unions? ____________________________

13. Check the last grade of school that you have finished.
    Grades 5-13
    University 1-6
    Business College 1-3
    Trade or Technical School 1-5
    Other (specify) ____________________________
14. Let us suppose some friends of yours have a serious problem concerning their child's destructiveness in the home and they ask where they can go for help. What would you tell them?

15. Let us suppose some friends of yours have a serious marriage problem and they ask you where they can go for help. What would you tell them?

16. In your opinion, should unions operate their own health and welfare programmes only when other agencies cannot supply needed services?

   Yes _____  No _____  No opinion _____

17. Do social welfare agencies render their services to all income groups?

   Yes _____  No _____  No opinion _____

18. How many organizations does the Community Chest support?

   42_____  65_____  87_____  101_____  

19. Do you believe organized labour and community chest agencies should work together?

   Yes _____  No _____  No opinion _____

20. Do you think most labour leaders in Vancouver want their unions to co-operate in the Community Chest?

   Yes _____  No _____  No opinion _____

21. Do you think most Community Chest leaders are interested in gaining the co-operation of organized labour?

   Yes _____  No _____  Don't Know _____

22. Do you believe that the Community Chest should be maintained in times of full employment and general prosperity?

   Yes _____  No _____  No opinion _____

23. Do you believe that the Community Chest should be maintained in times of low employment and general depression?

   Yes _____  No _____  No opinion _____
24. Do you think that door-to-door canvassing is a good way in which to raise funds for charitable purposes?

Yes _____  No _____  No opinion _____

25. In your opinion, should unions operate their own health and welfare programmes even if other agencies already supply them?

Yes _____  No _____  No opinion _____

26. (a) Do you think that most workers give to the Community Chest because they feel pressured?

Yes _____  No _____

(b) Do you think too much pressure is put upon working men for giving to the Chest?

Yes _____  No _____

(c) Where does this pressure come from?

Union _____  Management _____  Community Chest ____

27. The following is a list of the social problems with which welfare services are designed to deal. Please rate them in what you consider is their order of importance:

(a) _____ chronically ill
(b) _____ retarded children
(c) _____ unemployment
(d) _____ alcoholism
(e) _____ poverty
(f) _____ drug addiction
(g) _____ juvenile delinquency
(h) _____ mental illness

28. Please rate these topics of concern to Canadians in what you consider is their order of importance:
(a) _____abolition of capital punishment
(b) _____
(c) _____European Common Market
(d) _____need for more schools
(e) _____
(f) _____nuclear arms in Canada
(g) _____Canadian membership in NATO
(h) _____
(i) _____national health scheme

(Note: the 3 top choices in No. 27 are to be inserted in (b), (e), and (h).)

29. Do you know of anyone who has had contact with any social workers or social work agencies?

Yes _____ No _____

If YES, in what ways? ____________________________________________________________

30. Have you had any personal contact with any social workers or social work agencies?

Yes _____ No _____

If YES, in what ways? ____________________________________________________________

31. Do you believe that social workers need special formal education?

Yes _____ No _____

If you have answered Yes, at what academic level? (Check one)

(a)_____Complete high school education
(b)_____Complete college education
(c)_____Additional college graduate education
32. Do you think social workers are (a) ____ overpaid
    (b) ____ underpaid
    (c) ____ don't know

33. What do you consider is the approximate annual income of a
social worker (with at least 5 years experience)?
    (a) ____ Under $3,000
    (b) ____ 3,000 to 4,999
    (c) ____ 5,000 to 6,999
    (d) ____ 7,000 to 9,999
    (e) ____ 10,000 or over

34. Do you think a social worker should earn as much as a:
    (a) schoolteacher    Yes ____ No ____ Don't know ____
    (b) plumber          Yes ____ No ____ Don't know ____
    (c) personnel manager Yes ____ No ____ Don't know ____
    (d) trade union business agent Yes ____ No ____ Don't know ____
    (e) lawyer           Yes ____ No ____ Don't know ____
    (f) radio disc jockey Yes ____ No ____ Don't know ____
    (g) engineer         Yes ____ No ____ Don't know ____
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Basic Welfare Principles Adopted by the AFL-CIO
Executive Council, February, 1956

1. The union member is first and foremost a citizen of his community.

2. The union member has a responsibility to his community. He must co-operate with his fellow-citizens in making his community a good place in which to live, to work, to raise children. He must be concerned about the availability of adequate health, welfare and recreational services for the whole community.

3. Unions have a responsibility for the health and welfare of their members and their families which extends beyond the place of employment. This responsibility includes not only the emergency caused by strike, unemployment or disaster, but extends to helping the employed member meet his personal or family problem.

4. The community has a responsibility to its citizens. It must be prepared to meet those social needs which individuals or families cannot meet or meet adequately with their own resources.

5. Unions have elected to finance, support and participate in existing community social service agencies rather than to establish direct social services of their own. To the degree that the personnel and facilities of social agencies serve all the people, they serve the men and women of organized labor, and unions shall be encouraged to continue this policy.

6. Government has the basic responsibility for meeting the broad health and welfare needs of the people.

---

1AFL-CIO Community Service Activities, AFL-CIO Guide to Community Services, 9 East 40th Street, New York, 1956. We are well aware that a substantial and independent piece of research could result from compiling and collating a variety of union statements of policy on welfare services in both Canada and the United States. Unfortunately, this analysis could not be carried out within the limits of time provided for this study.
7. Voluntary or privately-sponsored social agencies and facilities occupy an important position in meeting the social welfare needs of the community. Major responsibilities falling within the scope of voluntary social work are the fields of character formation, child guidance, family counselling and youth activities, as well as in the area of experimentation and pioneering research.

8. It is the responsibility of organized labor to co-operate with other community groups in improving the quantity and quality of social services, while at the same time educating union members about available health and welfare services and how to use them.

9. Assistance in whatever form should be given on the basis of need, regardless of the cause of the need and without regard to race, colour or national origin.

Appendix D

Resolution on Welfare Services
(Canadian Labour Congress)

WHEREAS workers need the services welfare agencies can provide, and

WHEREAS they often do not know what services are available or how to use them, and

WHEREAS the necessary information can best be provided by union Welfare Services Committees, properly organized and informed, and

WHEREAS such Committees can also help to secure Labour representation on the Boards of the Welfare agencies, and to inform union members on the gaps in services and the best way to fill them, by private efforts or by legislation:

BE IT RESOLVED that this Convention call upon the incoming Executive to set up a Congress Standing Committee on Welfare Services, to:

1. Encourage equitable labour representation on agency boards and Committees.

2. Stimulate labour participation in formulating agency policies and programmes.

3. Develop techniques and methods to interpret for union members agency programmes and practices.

4. Assist union members, their families and other citizens in time of need.

5. Plan for union participation in civil defense and disaster relief programmes and operations.

6. Help in the development of health and welfare services such as blood banks and multiple screening.

1This Resolution on Welfare Services was sent to us by Mr. A. Andras, Director of Legislation, Canadian Labour Congress, 100 Argyle Avenue, Ottawa, Canada.
7. Co-ordinate fund-raising drives, through voluntary federation wherever possible, for voluntary health and welfare services.

8. Co-operate with other agencies in dealing with and in solving social and health problems.

9. Participate in all genuine efforts designed to improve social work standards and practices.

10. Arrange (with the Congress Education Department) for classes for union counsellors at Institutes and Seminars and the Summer School; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Canadian Labour Congress urge:

1. All national and international affiliates to establish Welfare Services Departments with full-time staff wherever possible.

2. All provincial Federations of Labour and Labour Councils to establish Welfare Services Committees, with full-time staff wherever possible.

3. All local unions to establish Welfare Services Committees.

4. All affiliates to extend full co-operation to the National Committee in the development of its policies and programmes.
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