

Union Mergers La fusion des syndicats

Harry Graham

Volume 25, numéro 3, 1970

URI : <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/028154ar>

DOI : <https://doi.org/10.7202/028154ar>

[Aller au sommaire du numéro](#)

Éditeur(s)

Département des relations industrielles de l'Université Laval

ISSN

0034-379X (imprimé)

1703-8138 (numérique)

[Découvrir la revue](#)

Citer cet article

Graham, H. (1970). Union Mergers. *Relations industrielles / Industrial Relations*, 25(3), 552–567. <https://doi.org/10.7202/028154ar>

Résumé de l'article

L'évolution des conditions socio-économiques oblige depuis quelques années à remettre en question la structure des syndicats américains. La fusion de la F.A.T. et du C.O.I. devait encourager le mouvement de fusion chez les syndicats dont les juridictions se recourent. Peu de fusions en ont résulté cependant ; celles qui ont eu lieu se produisent le plus souvent entre des petits syndicats dans un secteur de métier ou d'industrie en déclin et des syndicats plus grands capables de se maintenir.

Le développement des conglomérés industriels et la technologie croissante pourrait encourager les fusions. Les permanents syndicaux commencent à se rendre compte des avantages des fusions.

Tandis que la fusion de certains syndicats demeure désirable, il reste qu'une telle action demeure très difficile à mener à bonne fin. La conciliation des différentes structures internes, des idéologies et des rivalités politiques rend les pourparlers difficiles. Un exemple de ces difficultés est bien présenté dans les discussions qui visent l'union de la Fraternité internationale des travailleurs de l'industrie des pâtes et papiers (FAT-COI-CTC) et celui des Ouvriers-papetiers et travailleur® unis du papier (FAT-COI-CTC) depuis 1935.

Un des facteurs qui ralentit l'effort de fusion de ces deux syndicats est le fait que ni l'un ni l'autre n'est menacé de disparition. L'un et l'autre connaissent une situation financière solide ; le nombre de leurs membres demeure stable et les emplois dans leur secteur d'activité accusent une hausse graduelle.

D'autre part, le gouvernement interne des deux syndicats diffère d'une façon appréciable : ils ont des formes d'élection différentes ; les propositions d'amendements à leurs constitutions sont réservées à la majorité des délégués chez les ouvriers-papetiers, tandis que la Fraternité des travailleurs permet aux syndicats locaux de faire de telles propositions. Le pouvoir d'adoption de ces amendements constitutionnels va aux délégués à la convention ou, par un vote de référendum, à la majorité des membres chez la Fraternité des travailleurs ; seuls les délégués à la convention peuvent adopter ces amendements chez les ouvriers-papetiers.

Ainsi, le problème le plus difficile à surmonter sera celui de vaincre les différences dans les traditions et les attitudes face au gouvernement syndical. Si une preuve objective, telle qu'un déclin dans le nombre des membres ou un déficit au niveau des opérations, ne vient pas démontrer clairement la nécessité d'une fusion, il sera peut-être impossible de rendre les syndicats conscients des avantages d'une telle fusion. Avant d'en arriver à la popularité de fusion, il sera peut-être nécessaire de traverser d'abord un premier stage de développement dans cette direction. Ce stage pourrait être la coordination des négociations. Des négociations coordonnées semblent être l'étape qui doit logiquement suivre celle qui a amené les structures actuelles. Cette étape ne se rend pas au coeur des problèmes actuels et les efforts de coordination peuvent s'avérer inefficaces. Il faudrait procéder à la création de syndicats du type des conglomérés industriels. Un premier pas vers ce type de syndicat pourrait être la fusion des organisations dont les juridictions se recourent ou accusent une forte similitude. Il appert donc que des changements structurels s'avèrent nécessaires pour faire face aux problèmes actuels, mais de toute évidence, les syndicats ne désirent pas affronter ces problèmes d'une façon réaliste. S'ils maintiennent cette attitude, il est possible que les syndicats assistent à une baisse de leur pouvoir et de leur influence.

Union Mergers

Harry GRAHAM

The author stresses the importance of reexamining the structure of the American labor movement, which has to face changing economic and social conditions, and depicts the main difficulties which hinder changes in the actual system. His line of study bears specifically on the possibility of union mergers, which seems to be the most practical solution to the present structural inadequacies in unionism.

In recent years, changing economic and social conditions have directed thought toward a reexamination of the structure of the American labor movement. When the AFL & CIO were discussing merger, there was sentiment expressed that merger on the federation level would lead to merging of various international unions which have overlapping jurisdictions.¹ However, there have been few mergers to date. Fourteen affiliates of the AFL-CIO have combined since 1955.² The bulk of these mergers have involved small unions, most often in a declining craft or industry. These organizations have usually joined with larger, more viable unions. Among the mergers of this type have been Agricultural Workers, with 4,000 members, and the Meat Cutters in 1960; the Glove Workers, with 3,000 members, and the

| |
|---|
| GRAHAM, H., Assistant Professor, Center for Labor and Management, University of Iowa. |
|---|

* The author acknowledges with thanks the assistance of Professor Irving Kovarsky of The University of Iowa who read the manuscript and made several helpful suggestions. Michael Montgomery, Research Assistant, Center for Labor and Management, assisted in the research for this paper. The author assumes all responsibility for any errors of fact or interpretation.

¹ American Federation of Labor, *Report of the Proceedings of the Seventy-Fourth Convention*, Washington, D.C., 1955, p. 451.

² Bureau of National Affairs, Inc. *1967 Labor Relations Yearbook*, Washington, D.C., 1968, p. 611.

Amalgamated Clothing Workers in 1961 ; and the Textile Workers absorbed the 5,000-member Hosiery Workers in 1965.

Some recent union mergers have involved larger organizations. Often the combining unions dealt with the same employer or group of employers. Mergers in this category would include the Packinghouse Workers and the Meat Cutters in 1968 ; four of the railroad operating brotherhoods in 1969 ; and the Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers and the Steelworkers in 1967. The advent of several mergers between functioning unions coupled with economic developments may compel hitherto independent unions to reassess their attitude toward merger.

The rise of the conglomerate type firm, or the firm with a multitude of product lines, may act to stimulate union mergers. A study of the unions dealing with one conglomerate type firm indicates that seventeen different unions are active. Among them are unions affiliated with the AFL-CIO, the Alliance for Labor Action, and independent groups. In addition, the firm has large numbers of unorganized employees.³ Changing technology, which can render established crafts obsolete, may also force unions to think about merging. There has been some realization of desirability of union mergers among trade union officials. The former Executive Director of the AFL-CIO Industrial Union Department has noted that « we in the labor movement must recognize that the time has now been reached when we will have to be thinking in terms of mergers of unions. »⁴

While the desirability of mergers among unions may be apparent, such consolidations are typically very difficult to achieve. Unions bring to merger discussions certain forms of internal government, ideologies, and political rivalries which are difficult to reconcile. A case in point which seems to illustrate these difficulties is the oft-discussed but never consummated marriage of the Pulp, Sulphite and Paper Mill Workers with the United Papermakers and Paperworkers.

For a number of reasons, it might be expected that these two unions would have combined many years ago. They have often conducted joint organizing campaigns ; they bargain with many of the same employers and on occasion share certification of bargaining units. Their Executive

³ *Business Week*, May 17, 1969, p. 86.

⁴ BNA, Jack CONWAY, « Changing Concepts in Union-Management Relations, » p. 82.

Boards periodically hold joint meetings to discuss common problems, and the chief executives of each union have traditionally addressed the conventions of the other. Nevertheless, despite years of negotiation, a merger has not been achieved.

This study will present the record of attempts at merger between these two unions and the difficulties they encountered. Their experience may be illustrative of the problems to be expected when unions attempt to merge.

Historical Background

Unionism in the pulp and paper industry began in 1884 when machine tenders in Holyoke, Massachusetts, formed the Eagle Lodge as a social club for mutual protection and benefit. Only machine tenders, who are the most skilled group in the industry, were admitted to the Lodge, demonstrating the craft-conscious outlook. Other lodges were formed, and in 1893 the American Federation of Labor granted a charter to the United Brotherhood of Paper Makers. The jurisdiction of the UBPM extended only to machine tenders and beater engineers, the skilled occupations. After some initial organizing success, the UBPM fell upon hard times and by 1897 had only three locals. Consequently, the Brotherhood then applied for and received a charter from the AFL giving it jurisdiction over all branches of the papermaking trade. The machine tenders, however, resented association with less skilled groups, and in 1898 withdrew from the Brotherhood and established the International Paper Machine Tenders Union. Membership problems beset the IPMTU, and they soon admitted back tenders, a less skilled group. The back tenders were second-class citizens, relegated to separate lodges, with no representation on the executive board of their union. In 1902 the United Brotherhood and the Paper Machine Tenders merged to form the International Brotherhood of Paper Makers.

In the summer of 1901, active organization began among the pulp workers at Fort Edward, New York. The men at Fort Edward were granted a charter by the AFL as Fort Edward Laborer's Protective Union No. 9259, a federal labor union. Federal Labor Unions were directly affiliated with the AFL and did not have a parent International.

The members of the Fort Edward union realized that organization of other mills in the vicinity was required. A representative of the union visited Hudson and Palmer, New York ; Northampton, Massachusetts ;

Bellows Falls and Wilder, Vermont ; Franklin and Berlin, New Hampshire ; and Livermore Falls and Ramford, Maine.

By 1903 the pulp worker organizations were large enough to be granted an AFL charter. However, President Gompers and the Executive Council of the AFL had doubts about the ability of the pulp workers to govern themselves, since their organizations were composed of unskilled and semi-skilled workers.⁵ Consequently, the pulp worker unions were directed to affiliate with the Paper Makers. At that time, the name of the organization was changed to the International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, Pulp, Sulphite, and Paper Mill Workers. The pulp workers were accorded less than full acceptance by the paper makers. They were required to maintain separate locals and meet separately from the skilled groups. In 1905, the union convention passed a resolution barring all but qualified machine tenders from the presidency. This second-class citizenship was intolerable to the pulp workers and, at a convention held in January, 1906, the pulp worker locals voted to secede and establish their own union, the International Brotherhood of Pulp, Sulphite and Paper Mill Workers.

Rivalry between the two groups began immediately, and for three years the unions fought one another. In June, 1909, a « peace treaty » between the two groups was concluded which remained in effect until 1957. The treaty gave the Paper Makers jurisdiction over all machine room help and beater engineers in news, bag, and hanging mills. In other mills, the IBPM had jurisdiction over the same jobs in addition to beater-men, finishers, calendar and rotary men and their helpers. The Pulp Workers had « all other pulp and paper mill help who are not connected with any other international union. »⁶ A joint conference board of three executive officers from each organization was established to hold regular meetings. The unions also agreed to « do everything within their power to further the interests of the other organizations. »⁷ On July 2, 1909, the American Federation of Labor issued a charter to the International Brotherhood of Pulp, Sulphite and Paper Mill Workers.

The two unions developed a policy of assisting rather than competing with one another. They frequently shared the costs of organizing campaigns, and often one person represented both unions in forming and

⁵ International Brotherhood of Pulp, Sulphite and Paper Mill Workers, *Pulp, Sulphite and Paper Mill Workers Journal*, July-August, 1941, p. 2.

⁶ *Journal*, April, 1929, p. 3.

⁷ *Ibid.*

servicing local unions. It became standard practice for the president of one organization to speak at the convention of the other. During the 1930's, the two International Presidents, Matthew Burns of the Paper Makers and John Burke of the Pulp Workers, made joint appearances before the boards formulating the codes required under the National Industrial Recovery Act. Both presidents spoke together at meetings of the manufacturers association. As the unions expanded during the 1930's and 1940's, they often shared bargaining rights in the same plant and in many instances negotiated agreements jointly.

As the two unions recovered from the effects of the Depression and as membership expanded, there developed sentiment, particularly in Paper Makers, for the merger of the two unions. At the 1935 convention of the IBPM the following resolution was introduced :

Whereas, the more united workers are the more strength there is, and Whereas, it seems that more progress could be accomplished if both organizations in the paper industry were united; therefore be it resolved, that this convention go on record as approving such amalgamation and that our officers be instructed to confer with officers of the International Brotherhood of Pulp, Sulphite and Paper Mill Workers with the aim in view of merging the two organizations.⁸

The proposal for amalgamation was received unenthusiastically by the Executive Board of the Pulp Workers. At that time, there was no particular reason for the Pulp Workers to be interested in merger. Interest in the industrial type of organization operated in their favor, as did their dues structure, which was lower than that of the Paper Makers. Another factor favoring the Pulp Workers was changing technology. By the terms of the 1909 treaty, the Paper Makers had jurisdiction over certain types of workers in bag paper mills. When the treaty was signed, a distinctive grade of bag paper was manufactured, but with the development of the sulphate pulping process, bags came to be made from kraft paper. Kraft mills, though, were outside the jurisdiction of the IBPM. Thus, changing technology effectively shut the Paper Makers out of a significant and growing field. From this position of strength the Pulp Workers could afford to put off the Paper Makers merger offer.

In a speech to the 1944 convention of the Pulp Workers, Burns again spoke for merger. He voiced the fear that the efforts of the CIO and District 50 of the Mine Workers would destroy the two AFL unions.

⁸ International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, *Proceedings of the Fourteenth Convention*, March 4-9, 1935, pp. 110-111.

But to President Burke, the answer to competition was more cooperation between the two unions. He said :

Now, whether the unions amalgamate or not . . . we will have to get together, to present a united front. Our interests are all the same. We have got to improve our fighting methods against these unions. (CIO and District 50). Let's stand up. Let's build up our organizations. Let's work closely together. We have got to coordinate our efforts better. We have got to put up vigorous organizing drives in every section where there is still organizing to be done.⁹

The Pulp Workers appointed a study committee and the matter died.

While the question of merger was of interest throughout the remainder of the 1940's, it was not a particularly urgent matter. But in the early 1950's, the Paper Makers began to press for merger with renewed vigor. For example, the September, 1953, issue of the *Paper Makers Journal* carried two articles advocating unity. The timing of the Paper Makers may have been influenced by the no-raiding pact developed by the AFL and the CIO. That pact was announced in July, 1953.

The Pulp Workers, however, remained unreceptive. Writing in 1954, Vice-President Ivor Isaacson commented :

I am not in favor of amalgamation with the Paper Makers or anyone else . . . We will continue to do alright as we are without the Paper Makers or the CIO Paper Workers.¹⁰

President Burke of the Pulp Workers was also cool to the merger idea. He wrote Vice-President John Sherman :

I think the (Executive) Board members are pretty well in agreement even upon the question of amalgamation. The officials of the Paper Makers are using the wrong tactics on this question of amalgamation. We cannot be bludgeoned into amalgamation with the Paper Makers or anyone else. The facts are that our members are indifferent to the question of amalgamation. I think it was you who said at the (Executive) Board meeting that there did not seem to be very much sentiment either for or against amalgamation. That is exactly the way it appears to me.¹¹

⁹ International Brotherhood of Pulp, Sulphite and Paper Mill Workers, *Proceedings of the Twentieth Convention*, October 9-13, 1944, pp. 24-25.

¹⁰ Papers of the International Brotherhood of Pulp, Sulphite, and Paper Mill Workers in the Wisconsin State Historical Society, Madison, Wisconsin. Letter from Ivor Isaacson to John Burke, February 1, 1954.

¹¹ *Ibid.* Letter from John Burke to John Sherman, September 10, 1954.

At a joint meeting of the Executive Boards of the two AFL unions in January, 1954, a joint study committee to examine the question of amalgamation was formed.¹² In view of the attitude toward amalgamation held by President Burke and members of the Pulp Worker Executive Board, this agreement to participate in the study committee was probably for show purposes. It would have been unrealistic to expect the committee to recommend merger, faced as it was with the intransigence of President Burke. Burke may have been willing to participate in the study group to placate those members who were interested in merger. In any event, after one year the Executive Board of the Pulp Workers expressed the opinion that a satisfactory merger agreement could not be reached and withdrew from the Amalgamation Committee.¹³ While functioning, the committee had met three times and could not come to an agreement. One concern was the jurisdiction to be given the proposed amalgamated union. President Burke of the Pulp Workers was well aware of the fact that his union had overstepped its jurisdictional boundaries on more than one occasion. His approach to the jurisdictional problem was to depend upon strength to enforce the union's claims. He once stated :

As you know, our International Union has overstepped the lines of jurisdiction as laid down by the American Federation of Labor many, many times.

I have always avoided making any complaint to the American Federation of Labor because of the action of other American Federation of Labor unions because we are so vulnerable to counter charges against our union. It seems to me that we will have to battle it out with these unions and depend upon our own strength and resources for survival in the struggle.¹⁴

Given that attitude at the top of the Pulp Worker hierarchy, it is easy to understand why the Amalgamation Committee was unable to reach agreement on the jurisdictional issue.

Another area of disagreement involved the internal administration of the amalgamated organization. The two unions brought to the discussions profoundly different conceptions of trade union government. As will be shown later, the Paper Makers are a rather decentralized organization while the Pulp Workers are centralized. Resolving these conceptual differences had continued to frustrate merger and may be one of the main stumbling blocks to union mergers in general.

¹² *Ibid.* Executive Board Report, January, 1954, No page numbers.

¹³ *Ibid.* Executive Board Report, January, 1955, pp. 4-5.

¹⁴ *Ibid.* Letter from John Burke to Ivor Isaacson, June 4, 1953.

Rebuffed by the Pulp Workers, the Paper Makers began to court the CIO Paperworkers. Paper Maker President Paul Phillips declared :

Labor unity in the paper industry does not begin and end with the Paper Makers and Pulp Workers. Real unity involves ALL workers in the industry. It definitely includes the United Paperworkers, CIO. ¹⁵

The 1955 Convention of the Paper Makers authorized the Executive Board to discuss the merger question with other unions in the paper industry. ¹⁶

Perhaps stimulated by the interest shown by the Paper Makers, the Pulp Workers devoted a great deal of attention to the merger question at their 1956 Convention. Debate on the subject filled 38 pages of the *Proceedings*. The Executive Board introduced a resolution which provided for establishment of a three-man « Unity Committee. » ¹⁷ The Committee would be authorized to meet with similar committees from other organizations to discuss merger possibilities. ¹⁸ Formation of the committee was approved.

While the Pulp Workers considered the formation of a committee, the Paper Makers continued to search for a merger partner. Both the Paper Makers and the CIO Paper Workers passed merger resolutions at their 1955 conventions. Both appointed committees to consider the question of unity. The committees met during 1955 and 1956 and found that their Constitutions were generally similar. There were, however, some points that were difficult to compromise. The main problem concerned selection of officers. The IBPM elected vice-presidents-at-large by a referendum system and gave the president power to appoint regional directors. The Paperworkers provided for election of officers by delegates from designated regions. Election to the Executive Board automatically conferred directorship of the region of election. ¹⁹ One factor which may have made agreement possible was the fact that both unions divided the country into regions for administrative purposes. While the Pulp Workers have a defacto regional system, it is not spelled out in the constitution.

¹⁵ International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, *Paper Makers Journal*, March, 1955, p. 4.

¹⁶ *Paper Makers Journal*, June, 1955, p. 9.

¹⁷ International Brotherhood of Pulp, Sulphite and Paper Mill Workers, *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fourth Convention*, September, 1956, p. 185.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁹ United Paperworkers of America, *Proceedings of the Special Convention*, March, 1957, p. 9.

At a four-day meeting of the IBPM and UPA Executive Boards in November, 1956, agreement was reached. It was accepted at special conventions of the IBPM and UPA in March, 1957. The new union was named the United Papermakers and Paperworkers and had a membership of approximately 118,000. The Pulp Workers had 162,000 members.²⁰

Subsequent Developments

Since the merger of the Paper Makers and the Paperworkers, efforts have continued to achieve merger between the UPP and the Pulp Workers. The UPP passed a resolution favoring such a merger at its first convention. The Pulp Workers, however, continued to go slow on the idea of merger. At the 1962 convention, a resolution was introduced requesting the two International Presidents to move « in a constructive manner » toward merger.²¹ The committee that considered the resolution recommended nonconcurrence and it was voted down. A substitute resolution requesting a membership referendum on the merger question was defeated.²²

Following the 1962 Convention, President Burke of the Pulp Workers retired. He had held office since 1917 and was not interested in merger. William H. Burnell, the First Vice President, succeeded Burke. Due to his advanced age, Burnell was clearly an interim president. In spite of the lack of express direction from the Twenty-Sixth Convention, the Pulp Workers did take action on merger prior to the Twenty-Seventh Convention in 1965. In January, 1965, President Phillips of the Papermakers suggested that joint meetings be held to discuss mutual problems. President Burnell reconstituted the Pulp Workers Unity Committee and two meetings were held in 1965. Discussions were tabled pending action at the Pulp Workers Convention to be held in September, 1965.²³ At that Convention, a resolution was passed authorizing continued talks with the Papermakers.²⁴ The 1965 Convention selected a new president for the Pulp Workers. Joseph Tonelli, the Second Vice President, was elected President. Prior to assuming the Presidency, he had endorsed the concept of merger and at the Convention he supported the merger resolution.

²⁰ Leo TROY, *Trade Union Membership, 1897-1962*, National Bureau of Economic Research, New York, 1965, p. A19.

²¹ International Brotherhood of Pulp, Sulphite and Paper Mill Workers, *Proceedings of the Twenty-Sixth Convention*, September, 1962, p. 362.

²² *Ibid.* p. 365.

²³ International Brotherhood of Pulp, Sulphite and Paper Mill Workers, *Proceedings of the Twenty-Seventh Convention*, September, 1965, p. XX.

²⁴ *Ibid.* p. 209.

The new President of the Pulp Workers continued the Unity Committee, and it met with representatives of the Papermakers in April, 1966. The Papermakers had prepared a detailed proposal dealing with the problems of merger.²⁵ The proposal covered the drafting and adoption of a new constitution, the duties of officers and representatives, and a division of the United States and Canada into administrative regions. The Papermaker proposal became the basis for discussion between the two unions. In June, 1967, the Executive Board of the Papermakers approved the proposal.²⁶ The Pulp Worker Executive Board approved it in July.²⁷ However, at a joint meeting of the Executive Boards several items developed on which it was impossible to reach agreement.²⁸ One point which may have been difficult to reconcile may have been related to the Papermakers' desire for regional government. The merger proposal called for division of the United States and Canada into sixteen regions for administrative purposes.²⁹ The Pulp Workers may have been reluctant to accept this formal division of the continent into regions, in view of their tradition of electing officers on an at-large basis.

Factors Inhibiting Merger

One of the main difficulties faced by these organizations in their efforts to merge may be the fact that, while they are not thriving, neither are they in imminent danger of collapse. It is likely that both unions can continue to remain in existence for the foreseeable future without undue difficulty. Both unions, as is shown in Tables I and II, have reasonably satisfactory financial positions. The Pulp Workers, in fact, are improving their financial position somewhat. To the extent that they are more financially secure than the Papermakers, they may be reluctant to merge with a less prosperous organization.

Neither the UPP nor the Pulp Workers has grown in size in recent years. Part of the failure to grow is attributable to the fact that in 1964 approximately 20,000 members on the West Coast voted to leave the

²⁵ United Papermakers and Paperworkers, *Report of the International Executive Board to the Fourth Constitutional Convention*, October, 1966, No page numbers.

²⁶ United Papermakers and Paperworkers, *United Paper*, July, 1967, p. 1.

²⁷ United Papermakers and Paperworkers, *United Paper*, August, 1967, p. 1.

²⁸ United Papermakers and Paperworkers, *United Paper*, November, 1967, p. 3.

²⁹ United Papermakers and Paperworkers, *Report of the International Executive Board to the Fourth Constitutional Convention*, October, 1966, No page number.

unions and establish an independent organization. However, the Paper and Allied Products industry has experienced significant expansion in the decade of the 1960's. Employment increased from 480,000 in 1960 to 531,000 in 1967.³⁰ In the face of this expansion, Table III indicates the stable character of these unions. They have been unable to increase their size substantially.

Both organizations face pressure from rival unions. They have, however, held their own in NLRB elections. In the 1963-1968 period, the UPP record was 18 wins and 18 losses against the Teamsters, 10 wins and 9 losses against District 50, and 27 wins and 30 losses against all other unions (excluding Pulp Workers). The Pulp Workers' record was 13 wins and 12 losses against the Teamsters, 10 wins and 4 losses against District 50, and 25 wins and 37 losses against all other unions (excluding UPP). Thus, while these unions have not compiled a record of outstanding success, neither have they succumbed to the attacks of rival organizations.

TABLE I

UPP — Net Assets

| | January 1 | December 31 |
|------|-----------|-------------|
| 1963 | 3,989 | 4,383 |
| 1964 | 4,362 | 4,497 |
| 1965 | 4,497 | 4,602 |
| 1966 | 4,602 | 4,265 |
| 1967 | 4,265 | 3,581 |

Receipts and Disbursements

| | | |
|------|-------|-------|
| 1963 | 3,824 | 3,402 |
| 1964 | 3,452 | 3,309 |
| 1965 | 3,313 | 3,372 |
| 1966 | 3,484 | 3,788 |
| 1967 | 4,510 | 5,169 |

Source : Bureau of Labor-Management Reports, Form L-M2, 1963-1967.

³⁰ U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Handbook of Labor Statistics*, Washington, D.C., 1968, p. 72.

TABLE II

PSPMW — Net Assets

| | January 1 | December 31 |
|------|-----------|-------------|
| 1963 | 8,398 | 9,489 |
| 1964 | 9,489 | 10,811 |
| 1965 | 10,811 | 9,915 |
| 1966 | 9,915 | 10,207 |
| 1967 | 10,207 | 10,065 |

Receipts and Disbursements

| | | |
|------|-------|-------|
| 1963 | 4,710 | 4,261 |
| 1964 | 6,963 | 6,931 |
| 1965 | 5,163 | 6,011 |
| 1966 | 7,478 | 7,563 |
| 1967 | 8,074 | 8,179 |

Source : Bureau of Labor-Management Reports, Form L-M2, 1963-1967.

TABLE III

Number of Members
(000)

| | UPP | PSPMW |
|------|---------------|-------|
| 1955 | 100 pro forma | 154 |
| 1957 | 110 | 161 |
| 1959 | 116 | 164 |
| 1961 | 121 | 142 |
| 1963 | 122 | 137 |
| 1965 | 120 | 135 |
| 1967 | 120 | 135 |

Source : Bureau of National Affairs, *Labor Relations Yearbook*, Washington, 1968, pp. 610.

Internal Government

There are some differences in the internal government of the Papermakers and the Pulp Workers. The Papermakers provide for division of the Continent into regions. Each region is administered by a Vice President, Regional Director. These vice presidents are nominated and elected in the regions they are to administer. Regional vice presidents are subject to recall by a special recall convention held upon request of a majority of the locals in a region. The Pulp Workers provide for election of officers at large at the convention. There is no procedure that enables the rank and file to remove vice presidents between conventions. However, the president can remove an officer for cause.

The Papermakers provide a more elaborate disciplinary procedure which gives the membership more procedural safeguards than that provided by the Pulp Workers. Participants in the Papermakers' disciplinary procedure are permitted to appeal to the International President; if dissatisfied, to the Executive Board within 30 days; and if still dissatisfied, to the convention. The Pulp Workers provide that the appeal procedure terminates at the level of the International Executive Board.

In the area of amending the constitution, the Papermakers provide that any local may propose amendments by filing them with the secretary-treasurer. Amendments may be adopted by a majority of convention delegates or by a majority of those voting in a referendum. The Pulp Workers provide that a resolution to change or amend the constitution must be introduced at the convention by a majority of the delegates. There is no provision for change between conventions. Changes must be accepted by majority vote of the delegates at convention.

It seems clear that the main thrust of the Pulp Worker Constitution is to centralize decision making power in the International office. The at-large election of vice presidents, the provision for giving the Executive Board final authority in disciplinary matters, and the obstacles placed in the path of those who might want to change the constitution indicate the emphasis placed upon keeping power in the hands of the International officers. The Papermakers, on the other hand, seem to place more stress on local and regional autonomy. This different emphasis in internal government may be one reason why merger of these unions has been difficult to achieve.

expect the way to be cleared for closer cooperation between unions. Such cooperation may end in merger. At this stage in the development of the trade union movement, coordinated bargaining represents the logical next step in the evolution of a more rational structure. However, it does not strike at the heart of contemporary problems. Efforts at coordination may be spasmodic and ineffective. What may be required is the creation of conglomerate type unions.³² A first step in the creation of such unions would be merger of organizations with similar or overlapping jurisdictions. The material presented in this study indicates that such mergers will not be ease to achieve. Unless this situation changes, the outlook for the trade union movement is not bright. Structural changes are required to meet current problems, but the evidence to date shows the unions are unwilling to face these problems realistically. Until this attitude changes, unions may see their power and influence eroded.

LA FUSION DES SYNDICATS

L'évolution des conditions socio-économiques oblige depuis quelques années à remettre en question la structure des syndicats américains. La fusion de la F.A.T. et du C.O.I. devait encourager le mouvement de fusion chez les syndicats dont les juridictions se recoupent. Peu de fusions en ont résulté cependant ; celles qui ont eu lieu se produisent le plus souvent entre des petits syndicats dans un secteur de métier ou d'industrie en déclin et des syndicats plus grands capables de se maintenir.

Le développement des conglomérés industriels et la technologie croissante pourrait encourager les fusions. Les permanents syndicaux commencent à se rendre compte des avantages des fusions.

Tandis que la fusion de certains syndicats demeure désirable, il reste qu'une telle action demeure très difficile à mener à bonne fin. La conciliation des différentes structures internes, des idéologies et des rivalités politiques rend les pourparlers difficiles. Un exemple de ces difficultés est bien présenté dans les discussions qui visent l'union de la Fraternité internationale des travailleurs de l'industrie des pâtes et papiers (FAT-COI-CTC) et celui des Ouvriers-papetiers et travailleurs unis du papier (FAT-COI-CTC) depuis 1935.

Un des facteurs qui ralentit l'effort de fusion de ces deux syndicats est le fait que ni l'un ni l'autre n'est menacé de disparition. L'un et l'autre connaissent une situation financière solide ; le nombre de leurs membres demeure stable et les emplois dans leur secteur d'activité accusent une hausse graduelle.

³² Jack CONWAY, « Coordinated Bargaining, » *Agenda*, January-February, 1968, p. 26.

Both the UPP and the Pulp Workers have chief executives who have arrived at the top position recently. President Joseph Tonelli of the Pulp Workers was elected at the 1965 convention. He succeeded William Burnell, who had filled the unexpired term of John Burke. Burke had been president of the Pulp Workers from 1917 to 1965. The union was very much his creature. He saw it struggle for survival in the 1920's after losing a strike against the International Paper Company. He led the revival in the 1930's. When he retired, the union claimed membership of approximately 175,000 members. Before committing the union to merger, the new president may be anxious to compile his own record. He has led the union into fields where no activity had been done before. For example, the International is one of three sponsors of a \$190 million redevelopment project in New York City, which will include housing, industry, and a college campus. It is unlikely that the union would have participated in such a venture under President Tonelli's predecessors.

The Papermakers also have a president who recently assumed office. Harry Sayre, the current president, took office in January, 1968, following the resignation of his predecessor. The fact that both unions have new leadership may be one of the factors inhibiting merger. Both leaders may be reluctant to relinquish the chief executive position at a time when they have had a short period in which to compile an independent record.

Conclusions

The difficulties experienced by the two unions examined in this article may be illustrative of the problems to be expected when two unions attempt to merge. Overcoming the different attitudes and traditions towards union government may prove to be one of the most formidable obstacles to merger. If the need for merger is not clearly demonstrable through objective criteria such as declining membership or deficit operations, it may be impossible to make unions aware of the benefits that might develop from merger. Prior to widespread combination of unions, there may have to be another stage of development. Coordinated bargaining may represent that stage. The development of coordinated bargaining will operate to reduce the incidence and intensity of jurisdictional disputes.³¹ As the bitterness engendered by such disputes ebbs, we can

³¹ Jack CONWAY and Woodrow GINSBURG, «The Extension of Collective Bargaining into New Fields,» *Proceedings of the Nineteenth Annual Meeting of the IRRRA*, San Francisco, 1966, p. 304.

D'autre part, le gouvernement interne des deux syndicats diffère d'une façon appréciable : ils ont des formes d'élection différentes ; les propositions d'amendements à leurs constitutions sont réservées à la majorité des délégués chez les ouvriers-papetiers, tandis que la Fraternité des travailleurs permet aux syndicats locaux de faire de telles propositions. Le pouvoir d'adoption de ces amendements constitutionnels va aux délégués à la convention ou, par un vote de référendum, à la majorité des membres chez la Fraternité des travailleurs ; seuls les délégués à la convention peuvent adopter ces amendements chez les ouvriers-papetiers.

Ainsi, le problème le plus difficile à surmonter sera celui de vaincre les différences dans les traditions et les attitudes face au gouvernement syndical. Si une preuve objective, telle qu'un déclin dans le nombre des membres ou un déficit au niveau des opérations, ne vient pas démontrer clairement la nécessité d'une fusion, il sera peut-être impossible de rendre les syndicats conscients des avantages d'une telle fusion. Avant d'en arriver à la popularité de fusion, il sera peut-être nécessaire de traverser d'abord un premier stage de développement dans cette direction. Ce stage pourrait être la coordination des négociations. Des négociations coordonnées semblent être l'étape qui doit logiquement suivre celle qui a amené les structures actuelles. Cette étape ne se rend pas au coeur des problèmes actuels et les efforts de coordination peuvent s'avérer inefficaces. Il faudrait procéder à la création de syndicats du type des conglomérés industriels. Un premier pas vers ce type de syndicat pourrait être la fusion des organisations dont les juridictions se recoupent ou accusent une forte similitude. Il appert donc que des changements structurels s'avèrent nécessaires pour faire face aux problèmes actuels, mais de toute évidence, les syndicats ne désirent pas affronter ces problèmes d'une façon réaliste. S'ils maintiennent cette attitude, il est possible que les syndicats assistent à une baisse de leur pouvoir et de leur influence.

LE SYNDICALISME CANADIEN (1968)

une réévaluation

Les objectifs syndicaux traditionnels et la société nouvelle (Jean-Réal Cardin — Gérard Picard — Louis Laberge — Jean Brunelle). Les structures syndicales et objectifs syndicaux (Stuart Jamieson — Philippe Vaillancourt — Roland Martel). La démocratie syndicale (Gérard Dion — Adrien Plourde). Les rivalités syndicales : force ou faiblesse (Evelyne Dumas — Gérard Rancourt — Raymond Parent). Le syndicalisme et les travailleurs non-syndiqués (Léo Roback — Jean-Gérin-Lajoie — F.-X. Légaré). L'extension de la formule syndicale à des secteurs non-traditionnels (Shirley B. Goldenberg — André Thibaudeau — Raymond-G. Laliberté — Jean-Paul Brassard). Le syndicalisme et la participation aux décisions économiques (Bernard Solasse — Jacques Archambault — Fernand Daoust — Charles Perreault). Les syndicats et l'action politique (Vincent Lemieux — Marcel Pepin — Laurent Châteauneuf et William Dodge). Le syndicalisme, la société nouvelle et la pauvreté (Hon. Maurice Lamontagne). Bilan et horizons. Annexes : Le syndicalisme au Canada ; la Concurrence syndicale dans le Québec.

Prix : \$5.00

LES PRESSES DE L'UNIVERSITÉ LAVAL

Case Postale 2447

Québec 2

Téléphone : 656-2131