

Welcome delegates Ontario Federation of Labour





~ CONVENTION SPECIAL ~

The election

What happened?

When John Robarts stepped down as leader of the Tories his party was in serious trouble with the electorate. High unemployment, inflation, the in serious trouble with the electorate. High unemployment, inflation, the Dunlop plant shutdown, the American takeover of Ryerson and Gage Textbook publishing companies, Stanley Randall's "forgivable" loans and fire-sale approach to selling our resources, Bill 167 — these and a score of other factors made the reelection of a Con-

factors made the re-election of a Con-servative majority government seem only a remote possibility.

Even at the beginning of the elec-tion campaign the NDP was still con-fident that it could win a great deal of new support from voter's who were tired of 28 years of Tory Rule. The voters did respond to the "It's time for a change" theme. "In problem is that Bill Davis was able to convince them that he represented change and that with his "new" leadership the reactionary Tory rule of Ontario had ended.

Stephen Lewis and the NDP's cam-paign committee decided to fight the Conservatives on the issue of leader-ship. One recalls the title of two of the articles in the slick 16 page magazine put out as the party's main election

leaslet: "Resourceful, efficient and con-cerned: the NDP teams puts it all to-gether" and "Stephen Lewis: Ontario's Been Waiting a Long Time." As June Callwood pointed out in the latter article, Stephen saw one of the major problems of the campaign as "assuring voters who resist change that the product is safe and even that the product is safe and even phen Lewis is fully accredited moderate." So moderate that the Globe and Mail editorially accused Robert Nixon of becoming more radi-cal than Lewis in the last weeks of the campaign.

cal than Lewis in the last weeks of the campaign. The NDP "product" was so "safe and pleasant" that the magazine gives more emphasis to issues that have the most middle class appeal — pollution, urban problems, high government spending — than it does to unemployment, plant shutdowns or other labour issues. Nowhere is our party's connection with labour mentioned, none of the articles are by or about trade unionists, Bill 167 is completely ignored.

The NDP's attempt to win middle ass votes was crushed in the rush to (Continued on Page 3)



At a press conference on Thursday, October 28 the Waffle labour caucus was launched publicly. Harry Green-wood, secretary of Local 1005 of the United Steelworkers, presented the statement of the labour caucus, a socialist program for trade unionists.

The statement called for a complete reorientation of the labour movement to deal with the grave economic situation now facing working people in

"The right wing establishment in the trade union movement leads us off the fields of battle. They have failed to mobilize our movement in the fight against the corporations. They have attempted to replace rank and file militancy with bureaucracy. They have tried to substitute submissions to the government for industrial action. Our task is to revitable the laction. Our task is to revitable the laction. Our motion of the property of the proper "The right wing establishment

The Waffle labour statement calls for action by the labour movement to confront the layoffs and shutdown that plague our branch plant economy. The statement stresses the need or Canadian workers to achieve complete control of their own trade union

movement.

The statement of the labour caucus calls for immediate mobilization of trade instances of the control of the contro

give support to resolutions calling for a fundamental change of direction for the labour movement.

Each day of the OFL convention, the Waffle labour caucus will hold meetings open to all OFL delegates to discuss strategy at the convention. We invite you to attend the meetings to find out where we stand.

CAUCUS MEETINGS

Sunday, October 31 at 9.30 p.m. in the

QUEBEC ROOM at the Royal York

Monday, November 1 ALBERTA ROOM at the Royal York

Tuesday, November 2 at 8.00 p.m. in the ALBERTA ROOM at the Royal York

During The Convention Visit the Waffle Hospitality Suite at the Royal York



Nixonomics

A strategy for Ontario labour

U.S. President Nixon's economic bombshells of the past two months have opened up a new era within the capitalist world. The effects of new American policies on Canada will be fundamental and will force the labour to appear to this strategy to this movement to adapt its strategy to this radically altered situation.

Nixon's economic moves affect Can Nixon's economic moves affect Can-ada in a highly selective fashion. The policy is pressing Canada into the eco-nomic mould designed for her within the American empire—that of resource base and secure consumer market for American business. The ten percent surcharge and recent American com-panies to export from the U.S. and to cut back production abroad will strike a serious blow at Canadian manufac-turing. These moves, however, will not turing. These moves, however, will not affect the export of Canadian raw materials to the United States.

materials to the United States.

The effect of the Nixon moves on Canada should be seen as one single aspect of the American effort to rationalize the position of the United States within the capitalist world. While it is clear that the American moves were designaging industrial deal world of the Canada of th

affected by them than Canada. Since the new Nixon policies were launched the Canadian government has been desperately attempting to come up with a policy to deal with them. Ninenty-six hours after Nixon's television broadcast announcing the changes, two Canadian cabinet ministers were in Washington begging for exemptions from U.S. Secretary of the Treasury, Connally. This pilgrimage achieved no results though, and the Trudeau government tried instead to deal with the crisis through tax cuts and public spending.

and public spending.

The seven per cent cut in corporation taxes and three per cent cut in
the personal income tax, combined
with a half billion dollar public works
program is the Trudeau government's
answer to the economic crisis.

But the Trudeau program will not
prevent unemployment from climbing
this winter to an even more disastrous
high. The government is not dealing

with the central aspects of the American challenge and has evolved no policies to assure a secure economic future for Canadians. That must be the task of the labour movement if it is to serve the interests of working people in facing the economic crisis. It is not the control of the control economy

Two significant steps remain before the economic reduction of Canada is complete: the conclusion of long term complete: the conclusion of long extraction agreements to achieve complete American security of access to Canadian resources and the removal of all remaining barriers to the sale of American manufactured goods in Canada.

The agenda for the next year in the The agenda for the next year in the continuing American takeover of Canada is clear: the conclusion of further steps toward the completion of the continental energy resources deal between Canada and the United States and the removal of the protective clauses for Canada in the Canada-U.

and the removal of the post-clauses for Canada in the Canada-US-autopact Canada in the Canada-US-autopact Canada in the Canada-US-pactor Canada in Canada is al-ready underway. In September of 1970, the Canadian government agreed to the sale of 6.3 trillion cubic feet of natural gas, worth about two billion dollars, to the United States. The ex-port will take place over the next fif-teen to twenty years. Two months after that sale, cabinet-level talks be-tween the Canadian and American the possibility of a wide open market for Canadian oil in the United States. In its most basic terms, a continen-tal energy resources deal means the creation of a free North American market in energy resources. Present ownership and marketing patterns would be guaranteed a permanent existence, with the Canadian-American border erased in matters of energy

existence, with the Canadian-American border erased in matters of energy resources. This means secure and permanent access by American industry to Canadian energy resources and a guarantee that nothing would ever be done to interfere with that access whatever Canadian needs might become in the future. It involves a basic

(Continued on Page 2)

A fight back strategy

(Continued from Page 1)

commitment by the Canadian government to regard this country's energy resources as continental resources, and to give up any plans it might have for the development of those energy resources outside the framework of American corporate and military interests.

Such a deal, already begun with natural gas, is soon intended to cover oil, electric power, coal, nuclear energy and eventually fresh water.

gy and eventually tresh water. Energy Minister, J. J. Greene likes to picture the sale of our energy resources to the United States as jobcreating development ventures. Following the gas sale Greene met the presslead to the creation of 13,000 man-years of jobs, which translated into English means 13,000 jobs for one year. All of these jobs will be in construction of the pipelines, and once construction is completed, the jobs will disappear.

completed, the jobs will disappear. Foolishy, we in Canada are hitching our prices in energy fuels to the United States. The natural gas sale in September 1970 fixed a differential of five per cent between the domestic and export prices of natural gas. This ties our price to the rapily rising American price, threatening higher costs for people who use gas to heat their homes and for industries and utilities that wish to use natural gas. So threatening is this development that gas distributors in Ontario have begun to oppose further exports, warning that if a halt is not made, natural gas will be priced out of large sections of the Ontario market.

The U.S. government has made it clear over the past two years that it favours a full scale continental energy



Finance Minister Edgar Benson.

deal and that in return for opening up American markets to Canadian energy resources, Canada would be expected to purchase more manufactured goods from the U.S.

The proof that this is no idle or abstract point became clear following the oil talks in Ottawa in November 1970. Mitchel Sharp, Canada's Minister of External Affairs, said that if the United States was willing to remove import restrictions on Canadian oil, Canada should consider allowing the last protective clauses for Canada in the Canada-U.S. auto pact to be abrogated. This statement reveals that the government is willing to countenance plant shutdowns and layoffs in the industrial sector of our economy in order to achieve access for our raw materials to the U.S. market.

This is a strategy for turning Canada into a permanent resource hinterland of the United States, a country bound to be economically and politically dependent. And because there are many more jobs in processing and manufacturing resources than in exporting them, Canada will become a country that will always have a high level of unemployment built into its economic structure.

Since the Nixon policies were announced in mid-August, there has been mounting pressure from Washington for the abrogation of the protective

clauses for Canada in the Canada-U.S. auto pact. This involves a critical, frontal attack on the position of Ontario industry.

The auto industry is central to emploment in the entire manufacturing sector of the Canadian accomony. More than \$9,000 Canadians are directly involved in the assembling of automobiles in Canada. This aspect of the industry alone accounts for nearly \$500 million being pumped into the Canadian economy in wages. The auto parts industry employs about 140,000 people in Canada. Other Canadians directly affected by the well-being of the auto industry are service station operators, car dealers, producers of car radios, and workers in the rubber industry, the steel industry and the petroleum industry.

If the U.S. abrogates the auto pact, the Canadian government should rationalize our auto industry to produce a Canadian auto for the Canadian market under public ownership.

The Canada-U.S. Auto Pact was initiated in 1965 as a means of rationalizing the North American automobile industry. It sought ultimate free trade in auto assembly and auto parts. One continental auto market, serviced by giant American producers, was the vision. It meant that Canadian auto plants would not be geared to producing for the Canadian market. Instead they would produce for segments of the entire North American market. The pact was rightly condemned by many as a step toward a fully integrated continental economy.

The Auto Pact did however, contain safeguards for Canadian auto production, which were to be removed as some indeterminate date in the future. The safeguards were as follows:

(1) The maintenance of a ratio between vehicles produced in Canada and vehicles sold in Canada of at least 75 to 100, similar to that which existed in 1964.

(2) The stipulation that Canadian value-added should not fall below the absolute dollar value achieved in the 1964 model year.

A third safeguard came in the form of an agreement, not between the two governments, but between Canada and the four US, auto corporations. This came in the form of letters of commitment from the four manufacturers to raise Canadian value-added by an amount equal to 60 per cent of the growth in the Canadian market and, beyond that, by \$260 million. The terms of this agreement, purchased by the government with a \$100 million tax concession to the auto producers, were met by the end of the 1988 model year. According to the terms of the pact, the entire agreement can be abrogated by either country on one year's notice.

year's notice.

The Auto Pact was undertaken partly because by the early 1960s Canada's position as an auto producer was so precarious that if the situation were not changed, drastic national solutions to the problems would have to be considered. In 1964 Canadian shought 75 per cent of the automobiles in North America while they manufactured only four per cent. In 1965 the United States enjoyed a \$768 million surplus in auto trading with Canada.

in auto trading with Canada.

This condition of the Canadian auto industry in 1964 is striking proof, for those who need it, that foreign ownership does not bring efficiency and competitiveness with it. After all, the Canadian auto industry was 100 per cent foreign owned, and yet it was so uncompetitive that it couldn't maintain control of its own domestic market, let alone export its products.

Had the Auto Pact not emerged, Canada would have been forced to take protective steps to guarantee the preservation of Canada's market for the sale of automobiles produced in Canada. Considering that the auto industry in this country is entirely foreign owned, there would have been long term pressure in favour of the production of a Canadian car, either with government assistance or under public ownership.

The auto pact had the effect of preventing such pressure for Canadians to emulate the Swedes and other Europeans who have produced their own automobiles. While the Auto Pact has maintained a continental market for the American producers, it still has not worked to produce sufficient continental integration to make the Americans happy.

ricans happy.

The Auto Pact has greatly increased the export of assembled automobiles and auto parts from Canada to the United States. In 1870 Canada enjoyed a surplus in the automobile trade with the United States for the first time ever. (The U.S. and Canada disagree sharply on the figures, with the U.S. claiming a large Canadian surplus, while Canada claims a small deficit. Most financial analysts believe Canada enjoyed a moderate surplus in 1970.)



U.S. Treasury Secretary John Connally.

The surplus was in part, accidental. The American auto manufacturers tended to concentrate in their Canadian plants the models that happened to be most successful in the market-

place.

Several weeks ago Prime Minister
Trudeau revealed the dangerous course
our government is embarked on, when
he refused to guarantee that Canada
would not bargain away the protective.
Clauses in the auto pact. The overall and the servery sears
that appropriate the servery sear since 1966, the Auditor General's report
has contained a criticism of the government for its failure to set up
proper administrative machinery to
deal with the auto pact. The Auditor
General makes it clear that the government does not even have a clear idea
what quantity of automobiles and
auto parts have been imported into
Canada.

Instead of talking about bargaining away the protective clauses in the auto pact, the government should be calling for an upward revision of the targets for Canadian production in the pact's safeguards to guarantee jobs for Canadian workers.

Canadian workers.

Should the U.S. then wish to abrogate the auto pact, the Canadian government should prepare to rationalize our auto industry to produce a Canadian auto for the Canadian market, under public ownership. This would guarantee the jobs of Canadian workers.

The alternative to this will be disaster for Canadian workers. The layoffs of 2,000 workers by General Motors several weeks ago will be only the beginning if we continue on our present course.

The energy deal and the attack on Canadian manufacturing concretizes the politics of anti-imperialism in this country. It now becomes clear that the dependency of Canada leads not to a quieter life in our corner of the world, but to a transformation of the environment itself, which turns our country

into a giant supplier for the industrial system of the United States.

The stark threat which faces Canadians makes the political expressions which we have had in our national politics largely irrelevant. A new Canada and a new Canadian politics will be borne out of the struggle that must be joined to make possible a society in Capada, in which our resources serve people both at home and abroad and in which the people who work in the industries of the country determine the direction of the economy and receive its benefits.

The impending energy deal forces the Canadian people to face up to fundamentals in contemplating their future course. It will mark a gemine parting of the contemplating their future course. It will mark a gemine parting of the contemp deal means breaking fundamentally with past social and economic developments in Canada. Canadian capitalists and their governments cannot avoid the energy deal because their whole history has led them to it. At this point in Canada it becomes clear that only socialism provides an alternative path than can lead us out of the political dependency and economic under-development that is our fatigue than the contemplation of the political dependency and economic under-development that is our fatigue and the canadian people to independence and socialism.

Only through a strategy of using the resources in Canada to develop and diversify the Canadian economy can this country ensure all of its people jobs and control of their lives socially and cultically. Surple exported only after the resource needs for this kind of strategy have been amply planned for.

for.

Only public ownership of the resource industries can break us out of the pattern of dependency and comparative underdevelopment that has been endemic to Canada. Repatriation of the Canadian economy should begin at its centre — the resource sector. Through public ownership of the resource industries we will take the key sector of our economy into our own hands. It will give us the opportunity to master the skills necessary to run our economy and to develop it qualitatively in the interests of human well-being.

We can then industrialize in the resource-producing areas, which have long been seen as sources of raw materials. The wealth that comes out of the groud in the countless Canadian mining towns would be channelled to diversify the economy of the resource producing areas so that people there could pursue a wide variety of activities and occupations.

The energy deal and the fate of the auto pact make it clear that if Canadian workers are to defend their jobs, their organizations alone can be counted on. It would be folly to imagine that the AFL-CIO which supports Nixon's drive to move jobs from the branch plants to the U.S. will stand up for the interests of Canadian workers. The current crisis forces the Canadian labour movement to take steps toward complete mastery in its own house.

Waffle Labour News
Editorial Board
HARRY GREENWOOD
United Steelworters
ANDY SIMKO
C.B.R.T.
DALE O'DELL
U.A.W.
LEN HARRIES
Postal Workers
DAN HEAP
International Brotherhood of

The Waffle Labour News is published by the Waffle labour caucus, Post Office Box 339, Station "E", Toronto,



Aircraft workers

Fighting Nixon's wage freeze in Canada

Over 4,700 Canadian workers are paying the stiff price of Washington's trying to patch up the American eco-

At the Douglas Aircraft plant in Mal-At the Douglas Aircraft plant in Mal-ton, Ont., the company is refusing to meet wage demands of UAW locals 1967 and 673 because it says it must follow the Nixon wage guidelines in the U.S., so it plans to enforce them in Canada too.

A piece of American legislation is being enforced on Canadian territory, being enforced on Canadian territory, against Canadian workers, by an American company, and the Canadian government is doing nothing about it. The task of stopping what's been called "one of the most blatant slaps in the face to Canadian independence, and gestures of contempt to Canadian workers," has been left to the workers of 1967 and 673.

No bargaining is taking place, since the company refuses to discuss economic issues, and the 4,700 workers have been out on strike since Oct. 13.

"This guy called Adamson from Douglas' head office comes into the Douglas' head office comes into the bargaining session and says the company will not discuss economic issues until the situation at the American plants of Lockheed and Boeing have been regulated," recounted a UAW spokesman. In effect, Adamson told representatives of Canadian workers that they were market as the control of the control that they weren't getting a cent until the American employees got their contract first — since a settlement in Malton could be used as a basis for

the union to get a settlement later at Boeing and Lockheed. So 4,700 Canadian workers have to wait.

"We told Adamson that we weren't part of the United States," the UAW spokesman said, "but obviously, as far as they're concerned, this is part of the U.S." Ironically, the Maiton plant is in Ontario Premier William Davis' in 10 Charlos Premier William Davis'

riding.

The company has fought "tooth and nail" to wiggle out of paying group insurance premium and Blue Cross, and has been sending letters to the families of workers virtually inviting them to scab— an invitation no one is taking and the scale of the company is taking up.

is taking up.
"It's disgusting that this company would badger the already worried families of workers with this cheap barrage of letters to heighten their fears and destroy morale in the strikers' families," said the UAW spokesman, "we went through the roof here when we went them?" saw them.

saw them."
What makes this strike special is that the company is not saying that union wage demands are unreasonable union wage demands are unreasonable

- it's saying it doesn't plan to discuss
them because of the situation in the
United States. What can workers do
when they are confronted with this?
To win the strike at Douglas is one
step. But to prevent any future Douglases — and there will be many Douglases developing in future as the U.S.
solves its problems at others' expense

- is to reverse the wholesale hand-out
of our industrial sectors to fortign







Playing the bosses game at Texpack

The Textile Workers Union of Am

The Textile Workers Union of America played the role of strikebreaker during the recent Texpack strike.

The TWUA filed application for the bargaining rights for scabs who crossed the CTCU's picket lines at Texpack's recently opened runaway plant in Rexdale.

On September 29 the comments of the commen

in Rexdale.

On September 29 the company announced its intention of reopening Rexdale. One day later, September 30, the TWUA filed its application for certification. It claims to have signed all the scabs working in the Rex

up all the scabs working in the Rex dale plant.
CTCU president Kent Rowley in a letter to David Archer, president of the Ontario Federation of Labour, questioned the TWUA's actions: "There is no way that the TWUA could have organized these strikebreakers without the collusion of the company. This is pure, out-and-out strikebreaking." A Previously the Company. This pure, out-and-out strikebreaking. "Previously the Company Texpack's earlier attempts to break the strike. "Tex pack had shown how far these employers are willing to resort to viol ence, if necessary, to defeat the legitimate aspirations of their employees." On Sept. 20 the OFL said "we support the strikes in their opposition to in junctions and the strikebreaking activities of the Company."
Rowley in his letter to Archer asked him "to restrain the conduct of its affiliate and to oblige the TWUA to withdraw its application before the Board, as it constitutes outright strike-breaking."

withdraw its aspication devote the board, as it constitutes outright strike bearing and the strike of the strike provisions of the Act. Strikebreakers cannot replace regular employees in a legal strike. However, regardless of the legality of the action of the TWUA, every decent trade unionist in Canada will condemn the officers of that union for engaging attribetors of that union for engaging attribetors of that union for engaging attribetors of the strike of

"In reply to your (CTCU) letter of October 4 . . . I have consulted our affiliate and organizing director, Bud Clark, and he has assurred me that all employees were signed up in a proper

manner."

The OFL letter supports the TWUA saying that the TWUA "signed up the new employees as they come in. He (Bud Clark) has practically 100 per cent membership."

Why Davis won

(Continued from Page 1) Bill Davis just as it was in 1968 by Trudeaumania. But in the process we lost many potential working class voters who didn't see the NDP as the party of working people.

Mort Lazarus was quoted in the papers as blaming Mac Makarchuk's loss of the Brantford seat on his close identification with the Texpack strike. If even labour leaders believe the NDP is too closely indentified with the trade union movement then we're in erious trouble

The NDP lost so many working class ridings — Brantford, Fort William, Oshawa. Peterborough, Killiam, Oshawa. Peterborough, Killiam, Oshawa. Peterborough, Killiam, Oshawa. Peterborough, Killiam, Oshawa. Peterborough, Oshawa. Peterborough, Oshawa. Peterborough, Oshawa. Os The NDP lost so many working class dings — Brantford, Fort William, shawa, Peterborough, Kitchener,

Steve Penner in Dovercourt lost by only 55 votes, increasing the NDP vote by 25% with no financial or organizational support from the party.

And Jean Usher in Carleton East in-creased the NDP's vote from 1000 to 6000, half the vote of her opponent. Amazingly, Jean had only a \$1,500 budget running in what was supposed to be a hopeless NDP riding.

to be a hopeses NDP riding.

NDP leaders are now saying that we weren't able to compete with Davis' multi-million dollar advertising campaign. Well, our party will never be able to compete on that level. Nor can we excome the immerstang alone.

The NDP has to realize that it must begin now to organize a mass base in support of socialism. We cannot afford to mobilize ourselves as we did this time. We have to work with trade unionists, with unorganized workers, with women, immigrants, the unemployed, with community groups—to strengthen their organizations, to confront the government when it enacts reactionary legislation, to fight plant shutdowns, wage freezes and mass layoffs in a militant manner. Only then can we hope militant manner. Only then can we hope to win elections. And what is more, our victories then will truly represent solid and lasting gains for the working people of Canada.

How the injunction battle floundered

In early 1966 Lord Thomson of Fleet decided to hurl a thunder-bolt at 49 of his minions on strike at the Oshawa Times and decided to smash the picket

of his minions on strike at the Oshawa Times and decided to smash the picket lines and get the paper out with scal labour. An injunction was granted to restrain picketing and all systems seemed go-after all the injunction was a tried and tested method of breaking a strike and the bosses, courts and government felt they had every reason to repeat the formula in the properties of the properties of the properties of the properties. The Ontario labour movement was seething with resentment over the widespread use of injunctions against the growing strike movement and in Oshawa they decided to put an end to them. And it was done without lawyers, submissions, research papers and verbal histronies. Hundreds of workers of Oshawa simply manned the picketline and ignored the injunction and the injunction went away. Or, as the Toronto Globe and Mail wept: "Ontario has failed the courts In the II days that elapsed between the issuing of a court injunction limiting the number of pickets at the Oshawa Times and the estlement of the strike, order and no effort was made to enforce the law."

The government, of course, wanted to enforce the injunction but the mass

force the law."

The government, of course, wanted to enforce the injunction but the mass support for the strikers was so overwhelming that they had to call off the dogs and inform His Lordship that he had to settle.

There was a tremendous lesson in the following the course of the

There was a tremendous lesson in the Oshawa Times strike, but unfortunately it was the bosses who did the learning, and when a similar situation developed at a strike-bound plastic factory in Peterborough the police and courts moved with a vengeance. The police landed on a peaceful demonstration of the police landed on a peaceful demonstration of the police landed on a peaceful demonstration. The police landed on the courts quickly complied and some of those arrested were sentenced to two months in iail. in iail

in jail.

The workers fought on couragously at Tilco but they were beaten by the injunction and the inability of theunion movement to break the injunction at the only place it is possible—on the picket-line.

on the picket-line.

True enough, there was a lot of huffing and puffing by the leadership of
the OFL. At the convention of that
year many of the leaders rose to oratorical heights, especially as they
fought resolutions which would put
some teeth into the injunction fight.
It was the year that a New Democratic government of the property of the protical slogan, of in 67—(and as one member of the executive of the OFL stated.

tical slogan, 67 in 67—(and as one member of the executive of the OFL stated, as he opposed organizing a mass demonstration at Queen's Park). "It will be satisfied with only 67 people at Queen's Park if they are there on a more or less permanent basis"—clever. David Archer, fighting off challenges from the floor for some action, declared that he has spaced to the control of the

or pin us to any predetermined course of action."

The leadership of the OFL went into the injunction light: briefs and presentations were hurled at the Tory fortress at Queen's Park. Conferences were held, sometimes at the Chateau Laurier in Ottawa, sometimes at the King Edward in Toronto, and the air was purple with pious pleasand the air was purple with pious pleasand purple and the Chateau Laurier in Ottawa, sometimes at the King Edward in Toronto, and the Ontario labour movement was given a Royal Commission of its very own. However, when Justice Rand was finished it appeared that the trade union movement was given gio to be put back to the days of the Tolpuddle Martyrs. We now have bill 167 to re(Continued on Page 4)

Organizing women:

key labour strength

From the earliest days of Canadian history, women have shared the common struggle with men to survive in a society which has never acted in the interests of working people. And since those first days, women have not confined themselves to being the wives of workers, or the mothers of future workers. Many have been active in what the society defines as productive work. But their participation in the labour force has not been the same as that of medical their participation in the labour force has not been the same as that of medical their participation in the labour force in the same and the same that the same th

Intil and envious for work, ignormore individual ways, these women
are an easy mark for unscrupulous
and miserable working conditions became a threat to everything the unions
had been able to win. Some women
realized that they must join the struggle and began to participate in union
organization.

During World War II, many thousands of women entered the war
plants, mastering trades and skills few
women had every worked before. Women and the streetcars, worked on the
docks, harvested the crops-performed

men ran the streetcars, worked on the docks, harvested the crops--performed many jobs in areas which men today defend as 'male preserves,' places where the 'weaker' sex is incapable of doing the job.

Injunction battle

(Continued from Page 3) mind us of the Rand Commission . . . And the NDP didn't get 67 seats in

And the NDP didn't get of seats in 67.... We should remember this recent bit of our history because the injunction is still very much in use, and people are facing jail again for tackling the vicious devices a consistency of the control of the labour movement by briefs and commissions has not worked and a new resolve to challenge nijunctions by a united labour movement when and as they arise is, at this time, the only way forward.

The Ontario labour movement does

The Ontario labour movement does The Ontario labour movement does not need to get into the sterile argument between the ultras who order-up general strikes like one does a round of beer and the establishment who see the materialization of a future NDP government as the balm for all hurts, to propose a policy of direct action—not at Queen's Park but at the factory

site.

There is a question that goes: What if they gave a war and nobody came? In the context of the discussions at this convention of the OFL a similar question should be asked. What if they gave an injunction, and everybody came.

The Second World War experience was an eye-opener for many working women. When they were needed in the labour force, their contribution and their ability to engage in productive work of all kinds was applauded. A few concessions were even made to lighten the double tasks of worker and lighten the double tasks of worker and mother through the provision of day care centres throughout the cities. But, of course, the women were used as a pool of reserve labour and when the men returned home, the day care centres were closed and the same women who had worked hard and still managed to care for their families, were told that their place was in the home; that they were failures as mothers if they 'neglected' their children to participate in the labour force.

But many women continued to work because they had to—just like most men. These women were channelled into the expanding service occupations in the economy—jobs which were low-paying, unorganized and which men viewed as women's work. In industried more than men performing the same tasks. In the growing 'white color with the product of plotted more than men performing the same tasks. In the growing 'white col-lar' occupations women were similarly treated—except in these areas another dimension to the job assumed impordimension to the job assumed impor-tance. Not only were women, as men, forced to hire themselves out and en-dure the usual conditions of work, they also had to sell their faces, their fig-ures and their voices as well. The 'voice with a smile' who sits behind the switchboard at Bell must also look and dress a certain way to be hired

and dress a certain way to be hired for the job.
But this does not come as a surprise; we are all aware that capitalism has used workers in the way it has seen fit. But what can be condemned and must be changed, is the way in which the trade union movement has accepted and reinforced prevailing attitudes towards women workers. Most unionists are confused in their attitude towards the fact that women do work and some even know that women constitute approximately 30% of the labour force, they see women's jobs and women's wages as less important than n's wages as less important than se of men.

those of men.

Many male workers understand that
the majority of women who work do
it because they must, but they continue
to express the private opinion that
they don't like their own wives working and that the incomes of women are merely a supplement to those of their husbands. If the woman is a single parent it's unfortunate, but she gets shoved into the same bag as married women bringing in the so-called econd salary.

'second salary.'
With the present high unemployment
the attitudes of male workers towards
women are more clear: 'women are
taking away mens' jobs,' or 'men are
taking away mens' jobs,' or 'men are
the real breadwinners. Worry about
the situation of women when things
are better.' These attitudes divide
working people—the blame is placed
on women, on immigrants, on other
groups of workers, rather than on

those who do the hiring and those who create unemployment for their own profit. Organized labour must be clear about who is the real enemy. The unions themselves have ignored

The unions themselves have ignored the history of women in their unions. Virtually no trade union histories have anything to say about the role which women have played in the long story of struggle. Most unions have kept no records of the number and participation of women in their union. Only recently, with the growing anner of tion of women in their union. Only re-cently, with the growing anger of Canadian women making itself felt in the society generally, has an attempt been made to discover that history. And most of the work is being done by women who have never been in-volved in the trade union movement— because the unions themselves are not

doing it.

The acceptance by trade unionists of the social view of women as helpers and supporters has had a profound impact on the way in which women participate in unions. Even in those unions with a large percentage of female workers—the leadership is dominated by men. The executives, the full-time officials and organizers are full-time officials and organizers are view women as having equal potential for leadership and responsibility and women do not have to encounter this view very often before they come to believe it themselves or decide to fight back.

The trade union movement must begin to view women workers as being as important as male workers; it must undertake massive organizing of wo-men in this country (83% remain un-organized); it must reject the convicwomen should be the silent member-ship and the secretaries to the union leaders. If it fails to do so the fighting back which women are now beginning to do within the unions will be only the first warning skirmish.

WAGE - PRICE - FREEZE - FRAUD

Why is it that wage and price controls, once so repulsive to "free enterprise," are now apparently the way of the capitalist future?

The answer, of course, is that some time ago competitive capitalism became monopoly capitalism.

Corporations believe in planning and controlling, with the state to do it over the capitalism became monopoly capitalism, and controlling, with the state to do it over the control of the control

should go through the heart of any real socialist.

One thing the corporations haven't fully controlled so far is the organized fully controlled so far is the organized fully controlled so far is the organized fully controlled full contro

round, so it's profits that must rise so as to create the incentive to invest that will then create the jobs.

If it sounds indirect, it's because it

is.

It works by trickling down, so it may not work very well at all. But no matter, corporate profits will rise and that's the real name of the game. So let none of us imagine that the problem is that the distribution of income may worsen. It must or the strategy fails and unemployment remains.

Nor should we expect the Canadian government to be more humane. It was exactly the same strategy that underlay Mr. Benson's most recent minibudget when personal taxes were cut by 3% and corporate taxes by 7%.

Which is not to say that there were

Which is not to say that there were not, and are not, alternatives. If the object of the exercise was really to stimulate the economy for the benefit of people in general, then taxes could

have been cut for wage-carners and demand and employment increased in that way. But even that simple and straightforward option is denied us by the pandering to the corporations.

The same is true for wage and price controls. They are not necessary, at least not wage controls. The problem, after all, is not inflation but unemployment. It's time we got our priorities straight. That's not to say that there isn't creeping inflation. But those who are use for wage controls are saving impacts.

straight. That's not to say intain there isn't creeping inflation. But those who argue for wage controls are saying implicitly that it outloom wage demands. The fact of the matter is that in a world dominated by giant corporations, even the big unions simply don't have that kind of power. Businessmen find unions a convenient scapegoat to divert our attention from the very real monopoly power that the corporations have. The latter find that they can maximize profits by escalating prices. For Canada, where American-based multi-national corporations wield the power, the process is even simpler. Rising prices just roll across our famous undefended border.

Should it become necessary to do

something about inflation then first and forenost it's prices that must be controlled. Wages can be left to be determined by collective bargaining. Corporations can be counted on to refuse wage demands that they can't pass on in the form of higher prices.

We must be realistic, however. Our logic may be sound, but it is unlikely to win out. What Washington does, Ottawa is quick to follow. We must be ready for the worst. Nothing short of a clear refusal by organized labour to go along is likely to stop the process. Meany was followed by the total cooption of the leadership of American unions into administering the machinery of controls. In Canada, the CLC leadership has spoken out against controls, but if the ball is to be carried it will have to be by the rank and file. We must hold our leadership to the line.

When the controls do come, we must refuse to obey them. Starting now, we must organize around this issue to create a new militancy. The impending country gives a new relevance to the old weapon of the general strike.

