

Next Issue:
ELECTION
'87

Freedom Flyer
The official publication of the Freedom Party of Ontario
November 1987

THE LABOUR ISSUE



NINE NEW CHOICES: Freedom Party now has *nine* officially-registered constituency associations, all formed in ridings where candidates were fielded during the recent provincial election. They include *London North, London Centre, London South, Middlesex, Elgin, Mississauga East, Mississauga South, Don Mills* and *Fort York*. Details to follow in the upcoming election issue of *Freedom Flyer*.

OFFICIAL TAX RECEIPTS NORMALLY ISSUED IN FEBRUARY: Financial contributors to Freedom Party should be aware that it is our normal practice to issue *official tax receipts* for all contributions in a given calendar year in *February* of the year following --- just in time for tax returns. This makes administration for us much less complicated, and cuts down on the number of requests for "duplicate" receipts that invariably seem to get lost when issued up to fourteen months before they can be used. However, **tax receipts will be issued earlier upon request.** Corporate contributors whose fiscal year-end does not coincide with the calendar year are advised to let us know, if they have not already done so.

THE ISSUE IS "CONSENT": The first issue of Freedom Party's "issues and philosophy" newsletter, *Consent*, will be on its way to members and supporters in early December. Published every other month, it will feature articles and commentaries on a wide range of subjects pertaining to human relationships, including sex, politics, and religion. Controversial? You bet.

COMPUTER FACILITIES EXPANDING: Freedom Party is currently in the process of transferring its information and data files on members and supporters from a less-than-adequate "floppy disc" storage system to a 20-meg "hard" drive storage system. In addition to being able to handle thousands of times the information at many times the speed, the new "IBM compatible" system will improve our ability to respond to members and supporters. Please accept our apologies for any omissions or duplications that may accidentally result from the changeover. They will be temporary.

TENTH CONSTITUENCY ASSOCIATION FORMING: As of this writing, Freedom Party is in the process of registering its *tenth* constituency association in *Oakville South*. Anyone interested in getting involved is invited to call constituency president **Dan Chalykoff** at 844-5974. He's looking forward to hearing from anyone interested in spreading our "free markets, free minds" message to the residents of Oakville South.

JUST OUR OPINION: Over the past six months, various representatives of Freedom Party have had at least thirty of their letters to the editor printed in various publications, including *Canadian Business Magazine, Financial Post, Graffiti, Toronto Star, Toronto Sun, Globe and Mail, London Free Press*.

GET THE FAX, FAST! Freedom Party has purchased a *fax-machine*, so we are now able to send our media releases, information, photographs, speeches, statements, etc. to almost any newspaper --- including the one in *your* community --- instantly! For those who don't know, a "fax" machine is a lot like a photo-copier, only it can send and receive its images via telephone lines. We expect that, in future, we will be able to instantly respond to throne speeches, budgets, etc., and have that response "phoned" to various Ontario newspapers within minutes after our releases have been prepared.

CAN WE SURVIVE DEMOCRACY? On March 18, 1987, straight from a court appearance on his Sunday opening charges, FP action director **Marc Emery** addressed University of Western Ontario political science students on the subject of "democracy". Sponsored by the Marxist-based "Student Centre for Public Issues", Emery's speech offered a sharp contrast to the prevailing understanding of what "democracy" is all about. Freedom Party members and supporters will be delighted to learn that the speech will be reprinted and published in a future issue of *Consent*. It's an eye-opener.

BUSINESS IS IMPROVING: Although Freedom Party's past involvement with fighting a *Business Improvement Area [BIA]* in Oakville's suburb of *Bronte* didn't kill it right away, the *Ontario Municipal Board* appeared satisfied that a large enough opposition to the BIA existed to justify its dissolution. One more BIA defeated!


NEVER ON A SUNDAY: FP action director **Marc Emery**, whose Sunday opening charges have forced him to make five court appearances so far --- only to have the crown delay proceedings --- has yet to have his day in court. On a subsequent second charge of employing "too many" people on a Sunday, Emery will offer his *own* defence on January 12, 1988.

EVER ON A SUNDAY? Toronto furrier (and FP supporter) **Paul Magder**, after winning his last court battle on Sunday opening charges, must once again fight for his legitimate right to operate his business as he sees fit. His latest court victory is, once again, being appealed by Ontario's Attorney-General.

LABOUR

VS.

LABOUR



Robert Metz
President & Party Leader

THE TRUTH BEHIND THE LABOUR MOVEMENT

If there's one thing I've had drummed into me over the past several months, it's this:

The public hates unions.

Except for a small core of ideologically radical supporters, almost everyone has something bad to say about unions. The *reasons* for hating unions are many and varied, but the *feeling* sure is familiar.

"They should all be shot!" is a frequently-expressed sentiment. "Lazy bums" is another. "Why should *they* be going on strike when they make so much more than the rest of us?" is *the* number one complaint.

Yet, despite all the complaining, broad public acceptance of unions --- as legitimate political and bargaining agents --- still persists. How come?

I think the reason has something to do with this: You see, too few of us really know what's going on *behind* the labour movement. Hardly anybody really understands the *issue*.

Just what is it that the labour movement wants? What is it really after? Why is it that everything the labour movement wants has to be achieved by *forcing* everybody else to go along? Why can't it achieve its goals through *reasoned advocacy* and *mutual consent*?

Why won't the "labour movement" *play fair*?

LABOUR vs. LABOUR

"Without adding collective bargaining principles to the *Charter of Rights and Freedoms*," announced CUPE's president, Jeff Rose, "unions may lose the right to negotiate *mandatory union membership*. To bargain successfully," he concluded, "individual needs have to be suppressed to serve the needs of the majority."

But "suppressing the needs of the individual in order to serve the needs of the majority" is precisely what leaders of fascist, communist, socialist, and many of the eastern and third world countries have been advocating and are practicing today. And you can only suppress the needs of the individual by suppressing individual rights.

Any group, association, or union that can't recognize the principle of *individual rights* isn't an "association", but a gang or mob --- or worse.

And that's what's wrong with the labour movement. It wants to "suppress the needs of the *individual*."

LABOUR vs. LABOUR

So much for labour philosophy. Let's examine this frightening goal via *practical* application:

A good place to start would be by taking a realistic look at how the "labour movement" views *labour* itself. Everybody knows that if there's one thing union members are told to hate above all else, it's a *scab*.

Somebody who's willing to do *their* job for less.

Scab labour.

(continued next page)

LABOUR vs. LABOUR



The very term sounds offensive, and with good reason. Economically, "scab labour" means *competitive* labour. Politically, it means *the enemy*.

Yet, even "scab" labour is still *labour*. Obviously, the labour movement's philosophy that "everybody should have the right to a job" is practiced as "Nobody has a right to *our* jobs."

And that's the awful truth behind the labour movement. While it camouflages itself behind its proclamations that everyone should have a "right to a job", it systematically works to deny the opportunity of *earning* that right to anyone who isn't a dues-paying "member".

I hate to disappoint anyone, but I'm afraid there just isn't any such thing as "the *right* to a job" --- and that's why the labour movement (or government, for that matter) is incapable of actually providing such a right.

A "job", lest we forget, is simply the term we use to describe a particular *relationship* --- specifically, an economic one. A "job" is not a piece of property that anyone can "own" or claim a "right" to.

By suggesting that an employee has a "right" to a job, the labour movement is advocating that *some* people should have a "right" to a *relationship*, regardless of what the other half of that "relationship" may have to say about it.

So excuse me for bringing this up, but I thought we're supposed to be living in a free country where we have a right to choose our relationships. Surely, freedom of association *must* include the right *not* to associate. Otherwise, where's the "freedom"?

It seems to me that if two or more people can't get along or agree with each other, then it's their moral, ethical, and logical obligation to peacefully go their own separate ways and find others with whom they *can* get along. But the labour movement just doesn't see it that way.

When unionized employees vote to strike against an employer, they're admitting by their action that their relationship with that employer is no longer satisfactory to them. But if that's the case, why hang around? Why not do the right thing and look for greener pastures elsewhere?

Can anyone offer me a logical reason why some guy who isn't happy with his job should have a "right" to it? Can anyone explain why the guy who *would* be happy with that job *shouldn't* have a right to compete for it? Does this make any sense at all?

LABOUR vs. LABOUR

The labour movement insists that its monopoly on the employer-employee relationship is necessary so that employers will "bargain in good faith."

Now that's the biggest contradiction of them all! How on earth can anyone in his right mind claim to be "negotiating in good faith" when one of the parties in the negotiations has no right to negotiate with others? What's left to "negotiate"?

That unions exercise legalized coercion as their method of "negotiating" is nothing new to those of us who believe in individual freedom. What *is* astonishing is how so much of the Canadian public, despite being aware of it, tacitly accepts this coercion --- and sometimes even outright violence --- as inevitable and legitimate aspects of the labour movement.

Our laws do not prevent the use of this coercion. Instead, our labour laws institute, sanction, and enforce it. Explicit in every union action from initial certification to its "negotiating" philosophy and ultimately to its political advocacies is the use of coercion and the denial of freedom of choice to anyone who does not agree with its militant labour stance.

Legalized *coercion* is the tool of the labour movement. Mutual *consent* is the target of its destruction.

It's *coercion* when individuals are forced to join a union against their will just because a "majority" votes for it. Don't *minorities* have any rights? Should the rest of us just stand back and keep swallowing the old union line that it *represents* its members when we all know that union methods of recruitment depend on the word *mandatory*?

Just ask Merv Lavigne what *he* thinks about union coercion. Ask him how he felt about being forced to fund political causes he doesn't even agree with.

FREEDOM FLYER

Volume 2, Number 5, August-December 1987, is published by the Freedom Party of Ontario, a fully-registered Ontario political party. Contributions are tax-creditable. **Subscription rate: \$25** for six issues.

Editor: Robert Metz; **Layout & Design:** Marc Emery; **Contributors:** Robert Metz, Marc Emery, Lloyd Walker, Greg Jones, Robert Vaughan.

THE FREEDOM PARTY OF ONTARIO

Statement of Principle: Freedom Party is founded on the principle that: *Every individual, in the peaceful pursuit of personal fulfillment, has an absolute right to his or her own life, liberty, and property.* **Platform:** That the purpose of government is to protect individual freedom of choice, not to restrict it. **Provincial Executive:** Ontario President: Robert Metz; Vice-president, Ontario: Lloyd Walker; C.F.O.: Murray Hopper; Action Director: Marc Emery.

Freedom Party of Ontario, P.O. Box 2214, Stn. A., London, Ontario, N6A 4E3 (519) 433-8612
Offices: 364 Richmond St., 3rd Floor, downtown London

LABOUR vs. LABOUR



Or, if you prefer, talk to Dolly Foran of the *Arlington Crane Company* in Hamilton, a company she supposedly "owns" --- only she's not allowed to choose who works for her. Because of union coercion, she is only permitted to hire unionized labour and can't even hire her own nephew.

It's coercion that the labour movement supports by arguing that Toronto furrier Paul Magder shouldn't have the legal right to open his store on a Sunday. Or that Bob Stollery of *Eastway Ford* in St. Thomas shouldn't be allowed to sell his cars on a Sunday.

Why should the labour movement care? You'd think it would be happy at the employment opportunities and jobs created. But no. Because plentiful employment and jobs are *not* the goal of any movement dedicated to maintaining a *labour monopoly*.

Which explains why the labour movement detests the independence of the particular individuals I've mentioned. After all, what is it that Bob Stollery, Paul Magder, Dolly Foran, and Merv Lavigne really want?

Simple. The right to choose the terms of their own relationships. The right to *consent* to their relationships.

And isn't that really what all of us want and need? Is that so much to ask?

Too much, it seems, for the labour movement.

LABOUR vs. LABOUR

But the use of union coercion doesn't end with labour. *Unions also advocate business monopolies.*

For example, Canada's postal unions are fully aware that their influence on *Canada Post* represents a handicap to the business. They know that if the consumer had a choice to go elsewhere for postal service at competitive rates, their members would be out of a job.

So in order to compensate for the damage they do to the business (apparently you can bite the hand that feeds you; just don't bite it off!), unions must resort to advocating forced relationships in the marketplace as well. In other words, organized labour must advocate *business monopolies*.

So, far from being *opposed* to business monopolies, as so many people believe, unions are explicit and uncompromising *supporters* of business monopolies.

A classic example occurred during the recent provincial election when both management *and* labour of *Labatts Breweries* staged a public protest against free trade in the brewery industry.

Citing the fact that Canadian brewers were only "75% as efficient" as their American counterparts (an embarrassing admission, when you stop to think about it), both labour and management were successful at having the brewery industry exempted from the free trade negotiations.

When both business and labour combine forces to argue that their *inefficiency* is a good reason to force Canadians to pay them higher prices, and when our governments go along with it, then you can be pretty sure that we're all in a lot of trouble.

The question begging to be asked is just how did our breweries become so uncompetitive in the first place? Ironically, because of the very *protectionism* they lobbied to keep. Does anybody honestly believe that *more* protectionism is going to improve the brewery industry's inefficiency?

While there doesn't seem to be much common sense behind arguments supporting protectionism, it sure is easy to understand the *motivation* behind it.

LABOUR vs. LABOUR

Because it has not been seen in its true philosophical light, organized labour has been falsely credited with being the primary cause behind the over-all improved working conditions, wages, and standard of living that the common worker has become accustomed to over the past half century.

And that's ironic. Because *economic freedom*, coupled with the *capital* and *technology* that were created as its consequence, is the real reason that the common worker's standard of living has improved. And guess what? That's the very thing the labour movement is *against*.

If, after all, unions have anything to do with the creation of wealth, then it follows that an impoverished nation like Bangladesh could solve its standard of living problems simply by unionizing all the labour in the country.

Of course, we all know that wouldn't happen. In fact, the standard of living in the country would certainly *drop*. Unions can only coercively *redistribute existing wealth*, not increase it. Ironically, unions can only perpetuate their parasitic existence in the few Western nations that still boast some semblance of semi-free economies.

You won't find any major strikes or collective bargaining going on in black Africa, most of Asia, or in communist countries because they have so little wealth to redistribute to national labour in the first place. And what little wealth does exist is already being "redistributed" by their governments.

LABOUR vs. LABOUR

It's time we took our blinders off and stopped pretending that "organized labour" is a *pro-labour* movement at all. It is, in fact, a profoundly *anti-labour* movement, much more dedicated to its ideology (of "suppressing individual needs") than to the best long-term interest of workers in the marketplace.

(continued on next page)



For that reason, **Freedom Party** is about to embark on an incredible task: we intend to challenge the very root of the *labour mythology* on which organized labour depends to get its support.

Among the myths:

- * That unions raise our standard of living;
- * That unions are "democratically" run;
- * That strikes are a legitimate way to "bargain in good faith";
- * That *compulsion* and *force* are a necessary means to achieve positive results.
- * That unions are *in favour* of more jobs;
- * That unions are *against* business monopolies;
- * That unions "protect" their members against unsafe working conditions;
- * That unions "represent" their membership, or for that matter, "workers" in general;
- * That unions are necessary to counter a concentration of power in the hands of business or government;
- * That unions protect the "little guy" in society;
- * That unions "were necessary at one time", but have now simply become "too big and powerful".

And the myths go on and on.

But in order to launch a successful educational campaign against this union mythology, we can't afford to adopt a half-hearted philosophical approach to the labour issue. Any hesitation on our part about attacking the *fundamental premise* of unions (i.e., that *coercion* is a legitimate element in labour relations) will amount to nothing more than a tacit approval of their actions and their political goals.

You can't win a philosophical debate in the long-run by saying that "Unions would be OK if they just weren't so _____." (You can fill in the blank.)

There's a lot more involved with advocating freedom in labour relations than trying to illustrate the *practical* shortcomings of organized labour's goals. There's a deeper reason why its philosophy doesn't work in practice. *Unions by their very structure, nature, and definition are wrong*, and this point must be made clear to everyone involved in the issue.

And that's what make it such a scary challenge.

To a lot of people, suggesting that you're "against unions" is interpreted as being against the right to voluntarily organize a labour association. Far from it. Because if there's one thing that a union *isn't*, it's a *voluntary* association.

We have to start looking at unions and the labour movement for what they *are*, not what we'd like them to be --- or what they "could be" --- if only they were "run properly", or "weren't so violent."

It just isn't so.

Until the term "voluntary" is re-instated as the *fundamental* element underlying all labour relations, labour itself will continue to be the biggest loser in what can only ever be a continuing *political* conflict between "organized" labour and competitive labour.

And that's the truth behind the labour movement.

A copy of the brochure used in **Freedom Party's 'Garbage Strike Campaign'** is in the pocket below. This campaign was the first of four labour controversies **Freedom Party** participated in this year.



FREEDOM PARTY TRASHES GARBAGE STRIKE

*Our 'Had Enough of all
the Garbage?' campaign
a big hit with taxpayers*

*Administration and
Support for the
"Freedom Party"
A Retiree-on Pension*

Unlike many organizations claiming to believe in and uphold the principles of individual freedom, every **Freedom Party** campaign is designed to be a physical demonstration of our philosophical principles. **Action and philosophy.** One without the other amounts to a betrayal of one's principles and thus, would be a betrayal to ourselves and to our members and supporters.

*Freedom of choice is what **Freedom Party** is all about! ---and we mean it!*

Even before the **Canadian Union Of Public Employees' (CUPE) local 107** was properly organized to call its "outside workers" strike in London on May 8, **Freedom Party** was ready to respond with a campaign combining constructive protest with the promotion of private contracting as a means of introducing freedom of choice to municipal services.

Union pickets had only been set up for about two hours in front of London's city hall when **Freedom Party** held a news conference within twenty feet of the striking workers. The event was covered by all of London's four local radio stations, CFPL-TV (London), the *London Free Press*, CKCO-TV (Kitchener), and the *Globe and Mail*.

For the striking CUPE workers themselves, the strike was ostensibly called over the issue of "job security", and many of them honestly believed this to be the issue --- despite an explicit guarantee in the city's offer protecting their jobs from contracting-out.

For CUPE, on the other hand, the issue was obviously one of *union* security which it saw being threatened by an increasingly competitive labour market. To get its members' support, the union repeatedly (and falsely) claimed that "Contracting-out is taking our jobs," when in reality the city contracted work out only when municipal employees retired or quit. Naturally, the union wanted the positions vacated through attrition to be filled with new employees who would be included in its bargaining unit (Local 107) which would continue to protect its ability to monopolize labour in municipal services.

For **Freedom Party**, however, the issue behind the municipal strike clearly boiled down to a matter of **choice**.

It was in this spirit that we produced our pamphlet titled *Had enough of all the garbage?* which was produced for the purpose of redefining the issue behind London's municipal strike from our perspective. This involved identifying the problem (i.e., a labour monopoly), identifying a solution (i.e., contracting-out municipal services), and demonstrating that **Freedom Party** members and supporters care enough about their community that they would volunteer to pick up as much garbage as possible --- *at no charge* --- in order to help keep the community safe and healthy. As a practical service, the garbage pick-up program became our rallying point to protest the municipal strike in a constructive way.

HOW THE CAMPAIGN WORKED:

Two days prior to any scheduled neighbourhood garbage pick-ups by **Freedom Party** volunteers, approximately 500 brochures would be delivered to the affected neighbourhood. In addition to the information mentioned above, the brochures also indicated which streets would get garbage pick-up and the schedule for such pick-up. Residents were encouraged to separate their most perishable garbage from the rest since, in order to be most effective, no more than four bags per household would be picked up. In this way, we could rid an area of nine to ten square blocks per day of its most offensive garbage.

During the three-week duration of the strike, **Freedom Party** volunteers picked up 70,000 pounds of garbage (32,000 kgs.) from over 5,000 London homes. Three volunteers per day manned a fourteen-foot *Budget Rent-a-truck*, tightly packing hundreds of bags of garbage which were then unloaded by hand at a private landfill dump site outside the city.

STRIKE PEACEFUL

Despite the expectations of many, there were no violent incidents or serious threats of violence associated with the London municipal strike. Throughout **Freedom Party's** entire garbage pick-up campaign, those who manned the garbage truck and delivered literature never had to deal with any physical or verbal intimidation of any kind --- with one notable exception.

While picking up garbage in one particular neighbourhood one day, a striking municipal employee stood on his porch and delivered a three-minute "speech" complete with obscenities and charges of "scab labour" that drew the attention of the entire neighbourhood who just looked on in amazement. One gentleman approached our truck and remarked "Well, I guess it takes all kinds to make the world go round."

But for the most part, public reaction to our campaign was quite the opposite. Hundreds of people came out to thank us and many others attached notes of praise and thanks to their garbage bags when we came around to pick them up.

As for **CUPE's** reaction to our campaign, we can only comment that its attempt to urge the *Ministry of the Environment* to prosecute us was both petty and desperate.



THE RESULTS

Public reaction to **Freedom Party's** garbage pick-up campaign, particularly over the phones, was greater than any other in our experience. Most calls were clearly supportive of our efforts, though some hostile calls were received from union households where, virtually to a call, it was obvious that they did not really understand what the actual issue in the strike was.

Financially, our garbage pick-up campaign cost around \$2000 to run for the three-week period, with revenues related to the strike totalling around \$750 on the day that the strike ended. We are confident that the gap can be filled through the generous contributions of party members and supporters who recognize the value of community activity as being the only way to build future political credibility.

Most importantly, **Freedom Party** established the philosophical framework within which the issue of contracting-out was discussed and debated. Our figures were quoted, our arguments were applied, and common sense ultimately prevailed.

CUPE local 107, by using *legislative force* as its only tool of "persuasion," created many victims of its action, including homeowners, taxpayers, businesses, and the striking workers themselves, who will not soon forget the folly of the union's decisions and lack of leadership. As the strike wore on, it became obvious that public support was clearly *not* with the striking outside workers, and after 24 days, they were forced to settle for virtually the same offer they had originally refused.

Justice prevails.

Freedom Party members and supporters are encouraged to read the enclosed brochure (*Had enough of all the garbage?*). It is a tight, to the point, informative brochure, but most importantly **IT CAN ALSO BE REPRODUCED FOR YOUR COMMUNITY** should you find yourself in a similar situation as that in London. If you anticipate a municipal strike in your community, we'll be happy to lend the benefit of our experience to your own circumstances.

Remember, freedom of choice is what we're all about! --- and we mean it!

*Admiration and
Support for the
"Freedom Party"
A Retiree-on Pension*

THANKS
A LOT,
FREEDOM
PARTY!
YOU'RE GREAT

Top right: Emery
as seen on TV
news outlining
free garbage
pick-up by FP.

Left, top, below:
Samples of notes
and envelopes left
with garbage, many
with donations.

Thank You
I hope this helps
some with the gas
Julia Van
Arsen



Praises and Thanks

Special thanks must be extended to FP Action Director Marc Emery and to London South president Andrew Steckley who both manned FP's garbage truck virtually every day it was in operation. Both deserve the praise and recognition of FP members and supporters for their three weeks of dedicated work.

Others who deserve our recognition for slogging or stacking garbage are: Tom Ofner, Chris Hanington, Lili Cummins, Steve Sharpe, Mark Pettigrew, Mike Patterson, Greg Jones, Sandra Sweeney, Anne del Negro, Lloyd Walker, and Ray Monteith.

Our thanks are also extended to those who delivered pamphlets during the campaign: Tom Ofner, Andrea Hanington, Mike Patterson, Lloyd Walker, Marc Emery, Sandra Chrysler, David Eisan, Jeannette Genge, Lili Cummins, Dean Hodgins, Greg Jones, and Robert Vaughan.

MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT CONSIDERS LAYING CHARGES AGAINST FREEDOM PARTY

When it was learned that FP volunteers were picking up garbage as a community service, an official from Ontario's *Ministry of the Environment* pointed out that **Freedom Party** was picking up garbage "without a permit." But because the service was being offered *free*, the Ministry's hands were tied in its attempt to lay appropriate charges against us. (As an officially-registered political party, we were, of course, accepting tax-creditable *contributions* that could be used to support our campaign.)

Ironically, the Ministry never *directly* contacted anyone at **Freedom Party** offices, and we only learned of their efforts when a reporter from the *London Free Press* called us to ask if we had the approval of the Ministry to conduct our campaign.

Our reply? We had the approval of the citizens of London and that was the only approval that was of concern to us.

We added that the Ministry's attempt to apply its regulatory restrictions to our campaign was so absurd that we would welcome them to lay charges. In any case, since our response, we've heard nothing more from them.

Londoner Marc Emery, action director for the Freedom Party of Ontario, has been picking up garbage voluntarily this week.

Murray conceded Emery's situation is "a grey area" because the bookstore owner isn't charging for the service and has said he is using a dump in Southwold Township. "But we will be investigating that."

Emery said Thursday afternoon he hasn't a certificate of approval because he doesn't "believe in that government stuff."

"I've got the approval of the citizens of London." He confirmed that garbage he has collected from 20 city blocks in the last three days has gone to the Southwold site.

Emery said he "would be more than happy to be charged by the appropriate authority."

His London-based Freedom party, an officially registered political party, announced its plans to provide the service on Friday.

...and in the following day's newspaper...

"I think it's a very irresponsible thing. I think it'll probably end up dumped along the road," said Local 107 president Wayne Brand.

Brand said the ministry should take action against Marc Emery, action director of the Freedom Party of Ontario, for collecting garbage free of charge and taking it to a dump in Southwold Township. "That man's defying the law. Why aren't they charging him?"

Murray said the ministry is investigating Emery's actions. "It's a bit of a grey area that would need to be settled in the courts. I can't say any more than that."

CAUGHT IN THE MIDDLE!

Admiration and respect must be extended to *Barry Malcolm*, a striking CUPE worker who also happens to be **Freedom Party's** candidate for *London North* in the recent provincial election.

Barry's support of **Freedom Party** and the principles it represents was made well known to CUPE's representatives. Barry repeatedly addressed the nature of the union's strategy and goals, both at union meetings and on the picket line. Ironically, despite their numbers, it was union executives and supporters who were always intimidated when Barry was in their presence, and not the reverse.

Barry's arguments must have been effective, since not one of his 17 co-workers on a picket-line would sign a "petition of unity" when CUPE representative Gilles LeBel approached them while on strike duty.

The London Free Press SATURDAY May 9, 1987

London & Western

Volunteers to make token trash pickups

Emery claims taxpayers 'forgotten'

By Joe Matyas
London Free Press

Admitting it was partly a publicity ploy for the Freedom Party, Marc Emery announced Friday a group of volunteers will provide limited free garbage pickup for London homeowners during the strike by city outside workers.

Starting Tuesday, party volunteers plan to pick up garbage in a three- to four-block area of the city each day for at least two weeks, said Emery, a founder of the party.

He said garbage will be picked up on selected streets where homeowners will be informed in advance of the collection.

After collecting the garbage, party members will truck it out to a private dump in Southwold Township and will pay the dumping fee, he said, adding \$2,000 has been budgeted for the project.

He conceded it was a token gesture, but said somebody had "to be sympathetic to the forgotten people in this strike — the taxpayers."

Emery denied his party's action would be tantamount to strike-breaking. "Absolutely not. We're doing this free. We're aiming for neighborhoods where there are a lot of old people, people without cars who can't haul their own garbage away. If that's strike-breaking we have a serious problem."

The party may gain publicity out of its action, but it wouldn't be exploiting the situation for political gain, he said.

After making the party's an-



MARC EMERY: denies action strike-breaking

nouncement outside city hall, Emery was challenged by a picket, who questioned his motives. He assured the man the party wasn't trying to undermine the strike.

"If you want to build goodwill with the public, you should be joining us."

After the confrontation, Emery

said the party would consider stopping its collections if "the situation becomes too intimidating for our volunteers. We would have to reconsider if there was too much union resentment."

Told of the party's plans, Canadian Union of Public Employees spokesman Gilles LeBel said "what they are doing won't impact on the strike. It's a drop in the bucket. It's not worth commenting on."

Mayor Tom Gosnell said the city would neither endorse nor condemn the party's collections.

Garbage means votes, political party decides

BY DAVID HELWIG
Special to The Globe and Mail
LONDON, Ont.

In a marvel of modern political science, the Freedom Party of Ontario is hoping to generate votes from rubbish.

The 300-member, provincially registered party has called a press conference this morning to announce its scheme to provide free trash removal during what is expected to be a long strike by London garbage collectors and other outside workers.

Wayne Brand, president of Local 107 of the Canadian Union of Public Employees, said originally that the strike would begin yesterday. But by the end of the working day, most of the local's 450 members were still on the job.

About 150 employees whose jobs are dependent on heavy equipment were sent home by city officials, who expressed concern that equipment would be stranded if workers left their jobs during the day. The 150 employees were paid for four hours work.

The union is expected to announce its revised strike plans some

time today.

The major issue in the dispute is the hiring of private contractors for snow-removal jobs.

At the Freedom Party's provincial headquarters yesterday, volunteers were planning their garbage collection service, which will begin with a rented truck driven by Marc Emery, owner of a local bookstore and a co-founder of the London-based party.

In an interview, Mr. Emery said the truck will be used at least nine hours a day to pick up garbage in selected residential areas.

"We will be sending at least three tonnes to a landfill site outside the city," Mr. Emery said.

He said his party has enough money to run the service for one month, and donations will be sought to expand the operation to as many as 10 trucks.

The cost of running one truck, including dumping fees, is \$3,400 a month, Mr. Emery said.

The right-wing party, which advocates freedom of choice in such matters as pornography and Sunday shopping, says the city should allow private contractors to handle all of its garbage disposal needs.

Above: Reprinted from the front page of the *London Free Press*, although the photograph of Emery was taken several years earlier at a *Progressive Conservative* gathering where he spoke on the subject of censorship.

At Right: Reprinted from page A13 of the national edition of the *Globe and Mail*.

"I just love freedom, don't you?" is a typical Ray Monteith greeting, but Ray says it like no one else --- with evangelical zeal and a twinkle in his eye.

Despite being a "life-long Conservative", Ray finally became disgusted with the Conservatives and threw his lot in with David Peterson and the Liberals during Election '85 in the hope that Peterson was "a decent man" who would extend more individual freedom of choice to Ontarians. A retired railroad worker who had been employed by *Conrail* for 38 years, Ray posed with David Peterson for a photograph which was used in Peterson's 1985 election campaign material.

Although, as an Elgin county resident, Ray lives only thirty miles away from London, he was not familiar with **Freedom Party** at the time. But when he later visited our offices, he discovered that **Freedom Party's** commitment to the principles of individual freedom coupled with its enthusiasm about it matched his own outlook on life.

After years of searching, Ray Monteith finally found a "home" in **Freedom Party**.


A devout *Seventh-day Adventist*, Ray is very much opposed to Ontario's discriminatory Sunday closing laws and at his insistence, we produced our now-famous "It's Your Choice... Even On A Sunday" brochure. Were it not for Ray, **Freedom Party** may never have experienced the many positive consequences that grew out of its Sunday shopping campaign.

Ray spent entire Sundays talking to shoppers and handing out literature last December where his activity was covered by his local paper, the *St. Thomas Times Journal*. Ray was also instrumental in contacting the director of the Department of Public Affairs for the *Seventh-day Adventist Church of Canada*, D. Douglas Devnich, who agreed to be a guest speaker at our Paul Magder dinner last April.

At 67 years of age, Ray must be one of the fittest senior citizens alive, considering that he helped us haul garbage during our garbage pick-up campaign in London, and that he spent entire winter days *outside* discussing freedom issues with residents of his riding.

Ray was **Freedom Party's** candidate in Elgin during the recent Ontario election, and we look forward to watching him bring his evangelical fervour to future campaigns as well.

At Right: News coverage of Mr. Monteith's fight for freedom of choice in Sunday shopping as reprinted from the December 8, 1986 front-page article in the *St. Thomas Times Journal*. **Below:** A 1985 *Liberal* campaign photograph featuring Ray Monteith with David Peterson. Ray was soon convinced that freedom of choice was not a part of the Liberal government's mandate.



PROFILE; RAY MONTEITH



By The Times-Journal
and Canadian Press

Three St. Thomas grocery stores opened for business and were charged with contravening the Ontario Retail Business Holidays Act by City Police.

A and P Food Store, 780 Talbot Street, and Loblaws Superstore Food Warehouse, 295 Wellington Street, have each been charged under the act three consecutive Sundays while IGA Foodliner at Homedale Plaza has been charged the last two.

While local church groups continue to oppose Sunday openings there were no organized protests in St. Thomas Sunday, although church spokesmen said the matter would be up for discussion soon.

The Freedom Party of Ontario, on the other hand, was handing out pamphlets to A and P shoppers encouraging the freedom to choose to shop or not to shop on Sundays.

Ray Monteith of St. Thomas said he was at the store about six hours, handed out about 300 pamphlets and received supportive responses.

"They (Sunday shoppers) don't like government interference with our way of life," Mr. Monteith said, adding he expects pamphlets will be handed out at all three stores next week.

Mr. Monteith said the store was "fairly busy" and about 98 per cent of those he spoke with favored Sunday openings.

Mr. Monteith said "religion needs freedom to operate properly" and the church-and-state combination historically doesn't work, so churches shouldn't be involved in the issue.

Delivering our message on the postal strike

When the *Letter Carriers Union of Canada* called the first of two strikes to plague *Canada Post* this year, **Freedom Party** reacted in a manner somewhat inconsistent with its past demonstrations of "protest".

Unlike the strike that crippled London's municipal services earlier in the year, *Canada Post's* well-entrenched monopoly on mail service made it impossible to offer a realistic alternative. Delivering people's mail was simply out of the question, especially in light of the fact that the union was calling for *rotating* strikes which would only slow the mail rather than stop it.

So, initially, we thought we would sit this one out.

But then it happened. The violence. The vandalism. The threats.

But the worst of it was that *no one rose to challenge the goal or tactics of the letter carriers union*. No one exhibited the moral or political courage to face an obvious truth: that *no one* should be granted the right to a **monopoly**. And that means in labour *and* in business.

Despite its anger at the strikers, the public did not seem able to connect the violence, intimidation, and over-all tactics of the labour union with its *philosophy*. And that made *education* and *awareness* the primary goals of **Freedom Party's** campaign.

Thus, **Freedom Party** staged rotating information counter-pickets at London's two main post offices --- on the days that the carriers were *working*. It was not our intention to provoke a confrontation. We simply wanted to "deliver" our own message to labour, management, and consumers alike.

The message? That open competition is the only long-term solution to the problems that plague *Canada Post*.

In addition to the literature distributed by our counter-pickets in London, volunteers delivered our message door-to-door to homes in London, Mississauga, Oakville, Ottawa, and St. Thomas.

Admittedly, our brochure was blunt and to the point. But until someone displays the courage necessary to adopt a moral stance and takes the proper action necessary to address the truth behind union goals, decreased productivity, higher prices, controlled markets, and labour strife will be with us to stay.

At right is an article from the July 8, 1987 *Mississauga News*. Though the reporter is not sympathetic to our position, the information in the article is accurate.

Freedom Party out for show and tell

By MICHAEL LIGHTSTONE
Staff Reporter

One of Ontario's newest political fringe parties is hoping to make a showing in the next provincial election and is currently trying to drum up support in the Mississauga area.

The 3-year-old Freedom Party has an area representative in Bill Frampton, an Applewood Hills computer programming analyst.

Frampton is busy distributing party literature and trying to recruit new members.

The party, which brandishes the motto, "Free Markets, Free Minds," is based in London, Ont., and led by Robert Metz.

Frampton declined to indicate where the Freedom Party lies on the left-right political spectrum, saying it was not an accurate indicator of political ideology.

Instead, he said the party stands for freedom of choice, free enterprise, civil liberties, and contrary to a political brochure, is not anti-labor.

A Freedom Party pamphlet noting the recent mail strike states, "The labor monopoly, with which Canada Post must currently contend, should be ended, allowing others in our community to be hired when those dissatisfied with their jobs choose to withhold their labor."

"Most definitely . . . the right to strike must be ended," the leaflet reads.

The brochure also includes an appeal for party supporters to "help counter-picket a local post office."

The 19-day mail strike ended on the weekend with a mediated settlement.

Frampton maintained the party is not anti-union but does not think workers should be obliged to join a union in a "closed shop" workplace.

The Freedom Party is an officially registered Ontario political party.

Below is Freedom Party's brochure distributed during the Letter Carriers' strike.

**"force"
"threats"
"violence"
"monopoly"
"coercion"
"intimidation"
"vandalism"**

Although we achieved excellent visibility and were able to articulate our philosophic message to the public via our brochures and through the media, on a *recruiting* level, our campaign proved to be less than effective.

Like the *National Citizens' Coalition*, who also aimed an anti-postal monopoly campaign at the general public, we discovered that the "general public" *really doesn't care* about the prospect of reduced postal service.

Although it may *sound* like there are a lot of people who complain about our inefficient postal service, there are very few who are actually willing to *do* anything about it. For most people, the mail means *bills*, and as far as bills are concerned, the later the better.

Unless, of course, you happen to be the person *sending* the bill.

Therefore, the next time a postal strike significantly affects mail service, the *business community* will become the primary market target of our message.

And since fundraising and recruiting new supporters are critical to **Freedom Party's** growth, our future campaigns will incorporate a much more effective recruiting message as well.

Live and learn.



Freedom Party representative **Andrew Steckley** is seen in these photographs (above) *manning our counter-pickets* and (below) *talking to local TV media*.





NO SERVICE FROM FOOD SERVICE!

As if to demonstrate the philosophy and arguments presented in our successful effort to halt CUPE's certification of the *University of Western Ontario's* (UWO) technical and support staff, the same union called a strike of the already-unionized food and services maintenance staff in early September --- just when thousands of students were returning to campus to resume their studies.

As with so many unions in the labour movement these days, the strike was called over the issue of increased wages and the ever-critical issue of "job security". And just like the strikes that plagued *Canada Post* and London's municipal service, this latter issue translated into a militant stand against *contracting out* of services. (Sound familiar?)

As one might expect, the *Liberal* and *PC* campus clubs refused to take a stand...

Campus reaction to the strike was a perfect reflection of the public's reaction to major strikes affecting so-called "essential services": a lot of anger, general ignorance about the nature of the issue, and a call for *compromise* to end the dispute as soon as possible.

But an even more interesting reaction to observe was that of the various political campus clubs who responded in the true tradition of the parties they represent.

As one might expect, the *Liberal* and *Conservative* campus clubs refused to take a stand and pandered to a lack of public understanding of the issue by simply urging an undefined "compromise."

FREEDOM PARTY VS. The NDP

However, there were *two* campus clubs who actually did have something to say, though *what* they were saying was as different as night and day: **Freedom Party** versus the **New Democrats**.

The *New Democrats* obviously felt that the *best* way to address the issue was by calling for a boycott of classes, recommending that everyone help create "an unsightly, dilapidated campus" until the strikers got the "pay equity and job security they deserve", and by urging that *contempt* be directed at anyone trying to offer food services on campus during the strike.

Students —

are you sick and tired of the way the administration jerks around campus workers and refuses to negotiate a fair settlement? Here's what we can do to help the striking workers:

* Don't buy food on campus

SCARS deserve our contempt, not our money!

* Don't co-operate w/ the administration

An unsightly, dilapidated campus during the strike will pressure the administration to give the striking workers the pay equity and job security they deserve, so please, don't clean up!

* Boycott classes this Wednesday

Learn about life through SOLIDARITY, join the picket line!

THE
NEW
DEMOCRATS

Above: The *New Democrat* viewpoint on the strike.

In sharp contrast to the *New Democrat* approach, **Freedom Party's** campus club advocated freedom of choice in food services. Written from a students' perspective, the club distributed an eight-page pamphlet calling for the contracting out of food services, an end to the campus monopoly of providing such services, and for the provision of allowing students themselves to become involved in the provision of campus services.

Many of **Freedom Party's** pamphlets were handed directly to angry students disembarking from buses whose drivers refused to cross CUPE's picket lines. Despite the fact that these students had paid for their bus transportation and that published bus routes indicated they could be dropped off at various stops within the campus, they were **nevertheless forced to walk** to their classes from the university grounds' entrance. If nothing else, the bus drivers helped illustrate the worth of a union contract; even when signed, there is still no guarantee of service.

Campus media response to our campaign, like every other element of the *issue*, was another reflection of our experience in the *political marketplace*.

Freedom Party's brochure outlining the true nature of the 'issues' in the strike on the *University of Western Ontario* campus. Over 1,000 were distributed to students on the UWO campus.

MONOPOLY FOOD SERVICES VS. FREEDOM

The *Gazette*, UWO's student newspaper which is distributed city-wide in London, completely refused to cover **Freedom Party's** activities, but devoted an entire front page to the *New Democrats'* approach to the issue. And the *London Free Press*, which received our press release several days earlier, made only brief mention of **Freedom Party's** activities when it ran a front-page story on the *New Democrats'* call for a class boycott.

Apparently, if what one advocates is principled, reasonable, constructive, and appeals to common sense, the media has little interest. But if what one advocates is irrational, disruptive, and unprincipled, then it is worthy of front-page attention. This may well be a handicap that **Freedom Party** supporters may have to live with.

If what one advocates is principled, reasonable, constructive, and appeals to common sense, the media has little interest...

In any event, when the striking food services and maintenance workers finally returned to work six weeks later, very little was gained in terms of what they went on strike for. But in a very important sense, they still attained a victory.

Aside from **Freedom Party's** efforts, no one displayed the courage necessary to condemn the strike action, and because of that, CUPE was the winner on the philosophical battlefield.

...but if what one advocates is irrational, disruptive, exhibitionistic, and unprincipled, then it is worthy of front-page attention.

Though most students agreed with our message, few were willing to challenge the status quo. The vast majority of students simply wanted the strike to end. Few were really interested in discovering and pursuing the paramount issues of right versus wrong, freedom versus coercion, individual responsibility versus collective rule, etc.

Like the general public when faced with strikes, students tend to blame *both* sides in the issue, which is tantamount to supporting the *union*.

Blaming both sides, however, implicitly acknowledges that the union's position is as justifiable as management's --- and thus justifies the use of legalized extortion and intimidation. A "compromise" or even a "willingness to negotiate" with those whose ultimate "bargaining power" depends not on their competitive ability, but on threats, violence, extortion and intimidation --- is an explicit acceptance of coercion as a legitimate negotiating tool in human relations.

It is a view that **Freedom Party** simply cannot share.

U.W.O. STAFF SAY 'NO!' TO UNION CERTIFICATION!

Having been an active member of **Freedom Party** for several months, Robert Vaughan was aware of its successful effort in helping persuade *Eaton's* workers *not* to join a union in September 1984. So when he suddenly found himself faced with the prospect of fellow workers at the *University of Western Ontario* [UWO] trying to force him to join the *Canadian Union of Public Employees* [CUPE], he knew exactly where to turn for help.

With the assistance of **Freedom Party's** executive and Andrea Hanington, a fellow UWO staff member and **Freedom Party** member, a quick face-lift was given to the pamphlet used in the *Eaton's* campaign. The new "SAY NO!" pamphlet was virtually identical to the one **Freedom Party** produced for *Eaton's*; for the most part, the revised pamphlet simply substituted the word "*Eaton's*" with the word "UWO". It seems that when you're dealing with a principle, only the names of the players change.

On March 10, 1987, at a meeting called by union organizers, the pamphlets were handed out to all attendees. It was received with enthusiasm and relief by the staff, while union organizers were obviously shocked at the prospect of having to deal with opposition at its first ratification drive meeting.

Union organizers had obviously not expected a professional counter-campaign to their certification drive. In the following weeks, both CUPE and the *UWO Staff Association* (UWOSA) hastily tried to win some lost ground by distributing opposing pamphlets of their own.

Following the meeting, a total of more than 2,000 "SAY NO!" pamphlets were distributed to every affected department at the university. The response was excellent and over forty people joined our newly-formed *U.W.O. Staff for a Cooperative Work Environment* (SCWE) and many others helped by gathering signatures on petitions drafted *against* the union's certification drive. Others wrote letters to the editor of *Western News* (a UWO newspaper), while still others phoned in their disapproval to the UWOSA office. People who, normally, were politically unmotivated, suddenly sprang into action when confronted with the prospect of having to belong to a forced association.

The union had six months to collect signatures from 55% of the eligible 1,300 staff members for automatic certification. A 45% sign-up rate would have forced a vote on certification, while a 35% response rate would have enabled union organizers to ask the *Labour Relations Board* to hold a vote.

By the end of the six-month period, the union was unable to accrue even the 35% support rate required to approach the *Labour Relation Board*. Many people, including pro-union supporters, openly acknowledged **Freedom Party's** pamphlet and Andrea Hanington's letters to *Western News* as the main reasons for the defeat of the union drive.

On the following two pages are letters from FP member Andrea Hanington to the University newspaper, Western News, regarding the union certification drive.

Ironically, a *voluntary* staff association had successfully represented UWO technical and support staff for many years, yet it was one of the most active agents in promoting union certification.

Since **Freedom Party's** assistance against the union certification drive on campus coincided with London's municipal garbage strike, **Freedom Party** was simultaneously fighting CUPE on two fronts (and later in the year, on a third front).

This was a significant coincidence. The municipal garbage strike provided the best possible illustration of the truth behind the arguments we presented in our "SAY NO!" pamphlet. For the staff on campus, it was an opportunity to observe --- at a relatively safe distance --- the negative impact of union "membership".

It was with a great deal of satisfaction that we learned of the impact of our campaign. At a CUPE union meeting called for striking municipal employees, a union representative openly condemned **Freedom Party** for "ruining our certification drive at UWO" and for picking up the municipality's garbage that was being left to rot by striking municipal workers.

Unknown to CUPE union representatives at the time, one of their "striking members" present at the meeting happened to be **Freedom Party's** candidate for London North, Barry Malcolm. Upon their discovery of Malcolm's presence, the subject matter quickly changed from a condemnation of **Freedom Party** to more "pressing" matters.

The most distinctive aspect about **Freedom Party's** involvement with the staff at U.W.O. was in the fact that the party was not officially identified as a participant in the campaign. As with our approach to *Eaton's* in 1984, knowledge of our involvement spread quickly by word of mouth and the feedback was most supportive.

At **Freedom Party** we are proud of our past successful *Eaton's* campaign and are equally pleased with the results at the *University of Western Ontario*.

Congratulations must be extended to both Robert Vaughan and Andrea Hanington whose personal courage and effort were the key ingredients of a successful campaign. The past success of organized labour's "recruiting" drives has largely depended upon apathy, fear, and misinformation; Robert and Andrea have proven that these tactics can be easily overcome simply by making the effort to stand up and be counted.

Freedom Party will always be more than willing to help members, supporters, or their friends who find themselves victims of union coercion anywhere in our province. If **you** should find yourself in a similar situation, and would like some help with printing or distributing literature (even if you simply want to make a point!) --- call us!

FREEDOM PARTY --- your new choice, now!

Group opposed to idea of compulsory union

Dear Sir:

I would like to make it clear to anyone who is still undecided about union representation, that SCWE (Staff for Cooperative Work and Environment) is not offering alternative representation. We are just a number of concerned individuals who think that compulsory unionization of UWU's support staff is unwise and unnecessary. We are speaking up to make the undecided aware of the alternatives and/or consequences. Unlike a union, our "followers" are a voluntary group and we wish to defend and preserve our right to freedom of choice. If defence of this fundamental right is termed reactionary and somewhat paranoid, then perhaps we are.

I would also like to point out that if you choose not to be a member of a voluntary organization, you do not pay a membership fee, but if you choose not to be a member of a union such as CUPE, you are still forced to pay a membership fee (union dues). You have no choice about this, therefore you are a member and to me that means compulsory membership. To think otherwise would be somewhat naive. The only important point is whether membership is voluntary or compulsory.

May I also remind the writer (Lynette Geddes, Student Services, *Western News*, April 2/87) who mentioned the only strike in the history of UWU, of how much indirect effect this strike had on a large number of uninvolved people. (Busdrivers would not cross picket lines and passengers were asked to get off the buses at the UWU gates.) This may only have been a small incident, an annoying inconvenience, however, I will leave it to your imagination what the results would be, should we become unionized and were asked to perform the same function.

In response to the same writer's example: "Caretaking staff negotiated their 1986-87 contract at the same time as UWOSA did and were offered the same 3.5 percent. They took it to arbitration and got 3.5 percent but retroactively plus individual bonuses..." One must wonder under what circumstances the caretaking staff received these "extras".

Lastly, I would like to add my personal comments on "democratic votes, collective actions and overwhelming majority." Whatever these words may mean, they mean nothing to me, the individual. I become lost in a group. Thus at the time of "democratic votes and collective actions" a group of people (usually called a majority) can impose their will (decision, choice) on another group of people

Letters to the Editor

we are only opposed to the "mandatory" part of the group, where some individuals have rights, (the right to strike) but others do not (the right not to strike, but to work.)

I would like to quote a paragraph from our local newspaper — *London Free Press*, Friday, May 29, 1987, Section A2: "Charter safety urged for union rights." I quote: "Without adding collective bargaining principles to the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, unions may lose the right to negotiate mandatory union membership," says Jeff Rose, President of Canadian Union of Public Employees (CUPE). "To bargain successfully Rose said, individual needs have to be suppressed to serve the needs of the majority." End of quote.

Suppressing the needs of the individual in order to serve the needs of the majority is precisely what we must not allow in our University (or in our country for that matter). The leaders of Communist Russia and many of the eastern and third world countries have been advocating this and are practicing it now. The unions are advocating it in our country; who will advocate and perhaps even enforce and practice it next? The unions speak of collective rights. This is a contradiction of terms. A group or collective, large or small, is only a number of individuals; it can have no rights as a group, other than the rights of its individual members. The notion that rights belong to the group but not to the individual means that rights belong to some people, but not to others, it means that some people can have the right to impose their wishes on others and the criterion for such a privileged position consists of numerical superiority. It is only when a number of individuals voluntarily agree to be part of a group, association or union, that it can function without violating the rights of some of its members. Any group, association or union that does not recognize the principle of individual rights, is not an association, but a gang or worse.

No matter what advantages unions seem to promise, their basic philosophy is still associated with words and actions such as "Mandatory," "Compulsory," "Force," "Demands," "Threats," and sometimes even "Violence." A university (a place of teaching and research) should have no room for such words and actions.

Andrea Hanington,
Department of Microbiology

(smaller and usually called a minority). Since the smallest minority is the individual (me) I am given no choice except to let the "majority" make the choices for me. Democracy, more familiarly known as Majority Rule only means who gets to make my choices for me and wipes out the option that I as an individual should have the right to make those choices (decisions) myself. Therefore, numbers instead of rights and freedom of choice become the focus on any given issue. In a voluntary association, everyone has a choice; in a compulsory union such as CUPE, only some have a choice, others do not. Is this right?

We are a large number of staff at UWU and I think we do need an organized group to speak and negotiate on our behalf, but let us keep it on a voluntary basis. Support a voluntary staff association, with more involvement and perhaps a higher membership fee, so that these volunteers can be reimbursed for their efforts.

We are a civilized people and some of us strongly object to Mr. Fred Stam's idea of the "Clout".

Andrea Hanington
Dept. of Microbiology

'Mandatory' key word to opponents of union

Dear Editor:

Mr. Taylor entirely misses the point when he says that CUPE is not CUPW and chides us opponents of unionization for raising the spectre of strikes and drawing analogies to militant union activities such as that of the Canadian Union of Postal Workers (CUPW). The point is that it does not matter whether it is CUPE, CUPW or any other labor union, because the basic principle of all of them is the same, "mandatory" membership, in other words, forcing some individuals to pay union dues, regardless of whether they wish to be members or not. Mr. Taylor goes on to say that no one really wants to go on strike. Does someone then force them? He also says that the right to strike is a protection to be used as a last resort. Protection for who and against what? What about the right not to strike? We as "Anti-unionists" are not opposed to unions, associations, organizations, etc.;

Ideals seen as essential human potential factor

Dear Editor:

It is not surprising that Professor Neill who thinks that threats, demands, force, violence should be a part of the "intellectual enlightenment" of today's universities, would also advocate force as the only way a group can be united and speak with power. It is morally wrong to form a group without the consent of all of its members. It is also legally wrong when it involves money. Money taken from individuals without their consent is against the law and is usually called stealing (only unions or the government can do this legally) but this is what would happen to slightly less than half the support staff, if a union is allowed into this University. Today's unions make decisions only in terms of the good of the whole (the needs of the majority); one must remember how many atrocities have been committed against individual human beings (all over the world) is the name of the very same, very worn out, meaningless phrase, "For the Good of the Whole." Whole of what? If the administrators deal only with numbers rather than with people now, will they deal with us in a more human perspective when they are pushed into a corner and presented with an ultimatum?

I cannot sympathize with Professor Neill for having lost his illusions 19 years and 10 months ago. Perhaps he should have left the university at the same time he lost his illusions.

No, most of us are not perfect and we do not expect perfection. Most of us are not infallible; we do make mistakes, but all of us need ideals. Unfortunately, only some of us have them. However, there is no exoneration for those who have had ideals and have knowingly abandoned them, especially if they are teachers. The need for ideals is imperative if we are to live (and ultimately survive) as human beings in a civilized world, not as savages in a jungle.

I would like to quote yet another article, this time from the Saturday Sun, Toronto, Ontario, June 20, 1987, "Tactics outrage CUPE". It says: "The country's largest union threw its support behind the striking letter carriers and condemned the Tories for letting Canada Post hire strike breakers. 'Such brutal conduct is bad enough when resorted to by private employers'..." (stated in a telegram to Prime Minister B. Mulroney).

It seems unbelievable that hiring people who are willing to work is termed "brutal conduct"... When UWOSA chose CUPE in a bid to certify UWO support staff, their reason was that CUPE's philosophy most closely resembled their own. Does UWOSA not know and therefore not understand CUPE's philosophy, or are we to think that they do know but choose to ignore it? It is especially in times of conflict that the union's philosophy becomes blatantly obvious.

If CUPE increases its stronghold in our University, it is only CUPE who will benefit. The administration has nothing to gain from them and will lose out in the long run, but the support staff will always be caught in the middle.

Andrea Hanington
Dept. of Microbiology

Below is the brochure written and printed by Freedom Party to help the support and technical staff at the University of Western Ontario in resisting a union certification drive. Much of the content was from Freedom Party's original brochure produced to help Eaton's employees fight a 1984 union certification drive.

UNION?

THINK ABOUT IT.

**STRIKES.
LAY-OFFS.
UNION DUES.
UNION POLITICS**

Jobs are not 'possessions' of workers

Sir: In his Jan. 16 letter, *Strikebreakers deserve no compassion*, John Clarke has made it clear why he is the president of a small group of unemployed, and quite possibly unemployable, men and women. Given Clarke's inability to understand the concept of property, his reference to the "possession" of jobs by strikers was understandable, but incorrect.

Jobs are not property, they are the consequence of a voluntary agreement between two parties, an employer and an employee (or group of employees, as in the case of a union). Having a job is of itself not a matter of "right," but is dependent on another kind of right entirely. That right is called "freedom of association," and is a right which Clarke seems to covet for organized labor, but would deny both to employers and to competing labor, whom he unhesitatingly refers to as "scabs".

When workers withdraw their services in the form of a strike, they are indicating that an agreement no longer exists and that they no longer want "their" jobs under the conditions presently offered by the company.

Clarke, however, wants it both ways. He claims that jobs belong to the strikers even though they are stating, with their actions, that they no longer find these jobs acceptable.

The question begged by Clarke's letter is: Whose fault is it if another individual says to a striker's employer, "I'm willing to accept your conditions and work for you"? Is a striker's anger really based on that individual's actions or on his own misjudgment of his value to the employer?

Clarke doesn't care about such details. He just wants to channel the striker's anger through physical violence and through "hatred and contempt" aimed at anyone who would dare to compete in the labor market.

Clarke, in total contradiction to his stand on business, would not call for controls to

restrict the power of those mini-monopolies called unions; he wants them protected even further and, thus, given even more power. Perhaps it is the contradictions in his own Marxist-based philosophy that Clarke should expend some energy examining.

Yes, employee associations of all kinds (unions included) do have a valid place in today's world. But for the same reasons that any other group should not have the power to run roughshod over non-members, a line must be drawn limiting the power of unions to the employer-employee relationships of their members only.

In disagreement with this, Clarke and the London Union of Unemployed Workers want their philosophy and work attitude forced, even violently, on members and

non-members alike.

Clarke's attitude toward the unemployed is such that they all must surrender their individual freedom of choice, their economic alternatives, and their competitive edge to accept terms of employment suitable only to Clarke and the LUUW.

Those who happen to disagree with the LUUW by negotiating freely with their employer or by accepting conditions of employment suitable only to their personal circumstances, should be wary of "pools of water", "ropes long enough to hang a body with", and people like Clarke who must resort to such methods as their only means of persuasion.

London

LLOYD WALKER

Member,

United Electrical Workers, Local 546

Traditional philosophy of unionist

Sir: In his letter of Feb. 9, *Jobs are not possessions of workers*, Lloyd Walker clearly shows his opinion of unions, unemployed workers and scabs. How anyone could so boldly sign his name proclaiming to be a union member and then make such degrading remarks about the working class is beyond me. He can be construed to be either totally ignorant of labor history or to be expounding the philosophy of the Freedom Party of Ontario, of which he has signed himself vice-president in other letters in this column.

I am the president of the United Electrical Workers Union, Local 546 and I wish to make perfectly clear that Walker's comments in no way represent the position of our union on scabs, collective bargaining, or the unemployed. He is expressing his own views or views of those he represents. History has shown that one of the most effective tools used by bosses and right-wing political groups is Red baiting. He certainly tries this ploy with his attack on John Clarke, president of the London Union of Unemployed Workers.

Having been a member and activist in my local union for 22 years, and having gone through two strikes, the last one in 1979 lasting over 20 weeks, I have certainly experienced the anger and frustration of scabs crossing picket lines and police interference. Had Walker experienced the same, or had he stood shoulder-to-shoulder with fellow workers on the Fleck or Gainers picket lines, watching scabs try to steal their jobs and police by the hundreds brutalizing strikers, he might have a very different view of scabs.

As one who is opposed to workers using whatever means necessary to protect their lot in life by protecting their jobs from union-busting employers, I have not once seen Walker refuse the wages and benefits gained by our local through struggle and strike at his place of employment. Perhaps he would be much happier working in a non-union job for lower wages, poor working conditions and a union-free environment. Should he decide that he wishes to accept his own terms of employment in future negotiations when the rest of our members decide otherwise, then I am sure he will very quickly find out what his fellow brothers and sisters think of scabs.

London

JIM JOHNSTON

President,

U.E. Local 546

Above: Lloyd Walker, Freedom Party Vice-President, wrote this letter to the London Free Press. At the time, Lloyd was a 'member' of United Electrical Workers Union local 546. He had his views challenged by his union president, whose letter is shown below Lloyd's.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Postal unions price their labor too high

Sir: The "No Scab Mail Here" cards delivered by the Letter Carriers' Union of Canada (LCUC) mention some valid criticisms of Canada Post, but completely fail to justify the union's position.

Canada Post has an obligation to deliver the mail and that obligation is not just to the receivers but also to the senders. After all, who paid for the stamp?

There's no question that Canada Post is an inefficient and unprofitable organization that could benefit by becoming more competitive, as the LCUC card points out. However, the union fails to acknowledge the significant role that it has played in that inefficiency by pricing its labor so high that it could not survive in a competitive environment.

The reduction of mail delivery, the introduction of community mail boxes, and the reduction of the number of carriers have not been suggested by Canada Post because it feels the public deserves less nor because it wants a confrontation. It is resorting to these alternatives because, in attempting to balance its budget, it must address those areas which are currently costing the most for

the least return, namely, the high cost of labor.

The postal unions have priced themselves into their own predicament. The salt in the wound is that we, the taxpayers, are forced to subsidize their demands.

Why have the postal unions succeeded in raising the price of their members' labor beyond its worth? Why have things become this bad? It is because the post office has been and is being legally sheltered from the responsibilities and benefits of free-market competition. It simply doesn't have to be efficient to survive as any ordinary business does. Because it is illegal to compete with our postal monopoly, Canada Post has secured a huge section of the market without providing the service to earn it.

If members of the public are discontent with the mail service, I urge them to address the issue at its real source, by calling their MP and demanding an end to the postal monopoly.

London ANDREW STECKLEY
President,
London South Freedom Party
Association

Writer says unions have sanction to abuse force

Sir: Why do unions have the sanction to abuse force, when no other entity in society does? The garbage strike in London is an excellent illustration of this principle in action. It shows what's wrong with unions.

Unions use force in three different ways:

- They force you to join if you want a job in one of their "closed shops."
- They force members to contribute union dues which may support causes and beliefs that such members may disagree with.
- Unions can withdraw their services under the protection of law (force) while tying the hands of the employer and the customer.

Society should sanction the use of force for three reasons only:

- By the armed forces to protect our sovereignty (external defence).
- By the police to protect our citizens (internal defence).
- By the judiciary to settle disputes amongst citizens.

This is the purpose of government — that a consenting society gives elected officials and leaders the sanctioned use of force so

we can be protected and live in a peaceful environment. Force is justifiable only in retaliation for its use against you or in defence. No other use of force is or should be tolerated in a free society.

Who elected the unions?

Unions should not be allowed to operate under the sanctioned use of force. The law should be changed so that unions operate on the same basis as any other group in society — voluntarily. The power of unions would then be proportioned to the amount of actual voluntary support that they receive and deserve.

This "legal hostage taking", this misuse of power by greedy unions against innocent third party citizens who pay their taxes for essential services should be stopped!

Let the city contract out the jobs to those who want to work and who don't aspire to invade the labor-management powers, which the voters have elected to give our civic government.

London R. J. W. SMEENK

Only one way to ensure service

Sir: On the cablecast coverage of city hall on June 1, I watched with displeasure as city councillors roundly congratulated themselves on a "victory" in the recent London garbage strike.

I cannot see how letting the citizens of London suffer 24 days of blackmail and unhealthy garbage accumulation can be construed as a victory. If city council was to live up to its mandate to serve the citizens of London (its only mandate), it would have contracted out curbside garbage pickup the day following a strike announcement. Then, the only ones to suffer would be the striking municipal employees who are obviously prepared to put their purely political interests above loyalty and service to the taxpayers of London.

Only when council contracts out to companies who will not be permitted to disrupt service will Londoners get any long-term security of services they pay for. Though the strike may be over, this issue is far from settled. The citizens of London still have no guarantee this kind of service disruption to protect the narrow interests of union power will not happen again.

In The Free Press, Alderman Paul Yorke commented about private contracting: "I don't think the savings of years ago are there today." Yorke is incorrect, and there are dozens of cities in Ontario where garbage collection and disposal is 20 per cent to 40 per cent cheaper per capita than in London. In Kitchener, homeowners and businesses are very happy with their garbage collection and disposal, which is done at 30 per cent less than what is paid for here in London.

In that same article, Alderman Pat O'Brien was quoted: "Those jobs (of striking workers) are a right, and I won't support taking them away." Jobs are only a "right" if both parties come to an agreement and put their agreement in writing. When the outside workers of London went on strike, they were saying quite clearly that the city's terms were now unacceptable to them. Once the city's job offer is refused, the workers give up all rights to these jobs, and they should have all been contracted out immediately, while the city was no longer under any contract with these ex-employees (as they should have been correctly viewed).

The only legitimate concern of city hall should have been the right of taxpayers to receive uninterrupted essential service. This should be council's only concern, now and in the future. The only way to protect this right of the taxpayers is to contract out to companies or workers who cannot blackmail us into bending to their political interests.

London MARC EMERY

A representative sampling of letters to the editor on labour by Freedom Party members.

- Next 2 Pages: Garbage Strike Insert from page 6 -

IT'S TIME SOME OF IT WAS CLEANED UP.

HERE'S HOW WE CAN START...

CAN YOU HELP?
CALL
433-8612

Don't get mad! Get even!
HERE'S HOW YOU CAN HELP!

Volunteer to deliver pamphlets! Volunteer to drive a truck! Lend a truck!* Volunteer to load garbage. Offer a financial contribution!*

Let yourself be heard! Write or call your alderman, Controller, or Mayor. Tell them what you think! Write a letter to the editor of the *London Free Press* and let the community know what you think!

Let us know what you think and how you might be willing to help. Just phone our offices.

Turn your frustration & anger into constructive action!

*Contributions to *Freedom Party* in cash or kind are tax-creditable! Contact us for details!

IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO HELP OUT
OR OFFER SUPPORT

PHONE: (519) 433-8612

P.O. BOX 2214, Stn., A, London, N6A 4E3

SCHEDULE OF STREETS TO BE SERVED

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 3, TWO BAGS per apartment unit in these areas ONLY:

848 KIPPS LANE
850 KIPPS LANE
852 KIPPS LANE

OUR TRUCK WILL BE IN YOUR PARKING LOT FROM 7.00-9.00 p.m. WEDNESDAY EVENING. BRING YOUR BAGGED GARBAGE DOWN TO US. Schedule cancelled if strike ends.



Freedom Party
...Your new choice, Now!

FREE
GARBAGE
PICK-UP
Details on back...

HAD ENOUGH OF ALL THE GARBAGE?

It's happened before, and unless City Hall seriously starts to consider the option of *completely contracting out its garbage services* to more *efficient*, less costly, and *dependable* private garbage disposal companies, *it will happen again*.

Yes, it's another **GARBAGE STRIKE**. And although the walkout called by the **Canadian Union of Public Employees (CUPE)** affects more municipal employees than just those working directly in waste disposal, we thought that this was one area where a withdrawal of services would have direct effects on *every homeowner* in the City of London. It's an issue that hits you right in your own backyard, you might say.

Though the union claims it is *not* trying to put pressure on **taxpayers**, you can bet that it's *counting* on that pressure to turn into *political pressure* forcing City Hall to give in to union demands.

"We're prepared to take as long as it may take ...to settle the matter in a way in which it will benefit the members of this local union," argues **CUPE** representative Gilles LeBel in a press interview. "If it takes weeks, if it takes months, we're prepared to meet the situation." And on the other side of the controversy, the city administrator has flatly stated that "the city will never give in."

GARBAGE DISPOSAL: A LOCAL COMPARISON

London is one of an ever-decreasing number of Canadian cities that do not contract out garbage collection and disposal services.

Residents of Kitchener, for example, pay \$14.98 per person per year for waste collection and disposal, by contracting out the provision of this service to a private firm called Laidlaw Waste Disposal. Under this relationship, there is no possibility of a strike or disruption caused by labour disputes.

London residents, however, pay over \$20 per person per year and still have to risk periodic strikes and disruptions in service!

So for over 25% more in cost, they receive less service and less commitment to that service!

AS TAXPAYERS, WHAT CAN WE DO?

Considering who's ultimately responsible for financing municipal government, it's surprising that the **taxpayer has no active voice** in the negotiation of a basic service that should never be allowed to be threatened by political interests and objectives.

The union, of course, says it has no answer for what to do with all the garbage that will pile up during the strike, because its only answer to that problem is to give the union what it wants --- a **labour monopoly** restricting the taxpayer's *choice* in determining who can provide basic municipal services.

On the other hand, the city government is only taking half-hearted and ineffective measures --- that in no way address the fundamental issue --- by designating temporary dump sites, which during the last municipal garbage strike ended up being in many of London's recreational parks that taxpayers were already paying to keep up. Because they do not wish to provoke further union unrest, the city refuses to open London's already-established and tax-supported dump sites. In so doing, it is denying access to a service and to property that is supposedly "owned" and financially supported by the very people to whom access is being denied.

All this, and no refunds, no tax breaks, and not even an apology from either side in the dispute.

Freedom Party believes that the *purpose* of government is to *protect* our freedom of choice, *not* to restrict it.

It is in this spirit that we recommend *contracting out garbage services to the most competitive and efficient companies available as the only proper, practical, and long-term solution to the challenge of providing many of our basic municipal services*. But until that happens, the taxpayer's choice will remain restricted.

IN THE MEANTIME, HERE'S WHAT WE CAN DO:

What can one person do? Plenty. What can **five, ten, fifty, or a hundred** people do? A lot more. We believe that Londoners can work together even when their paid elected officials and those paid to provide them with services cannot.

Right now, **Freedom Party** members, supporters, and volunteers are organizing to put their time, money, and efforts into a campaign to help alleviate, admittedly in a small way, the inconvenience caused by a garbage strike. *They're willing to pick up your garbage --- free of charge!*

HERE'S HOW OUR GARBAGE PICK-UP CAMPAIGN WILL WORK:

(1) Collectable garbage must be in standard (26"x36") plastic garbage bags *securely tied closed*.

(2) Garbage must not weigh more than bag can efficiently carry.

(3) BRING UP TO 2 BAGS OF GARBAGE TO OUR TRUCK THAT WILL BE IN YOUR PARKING LOT FROM 7.00 P.M. TO 9.00 P.M. WEDNESDAY EVENING.

We're not trying to imply that **Freedom Party** is doing this just as a "community service," or that we can possibly accomplish a task that we pay millions of dollars each year to the city to have done for us. We believe that our campaign is a *positive, constructive* way of registering citizen protest against those who would hold them hostage to their economic or political demands. Unlike the options of *picketing, remaining idle, or feeling totally frustrated* in expressing our outrage at this turn of events, we think our campaign will send a clear message to *both* city hall and to CUPE representatives. And at the very least, a small amount of garbage *will already have been disposed of in the process of voicing our protest!*

That's why, particularly in the early part of our campaign (and depending on how long the strike lasts, and on how much support the community offers us), we can only start by offering **LIMITED GARBAGE PICK UP IN RANDOMLY-SELECTED AREAS**. If you've received this pamphlet in your mailbox, then you are either in one of these selected areas, or *very near to one*. (see schedule on back)

- Next 2 Pages: Postal Strike Insert from page 13 -

**Don't get mad! Get even!
YOU CAN DELIVER
YOUR OWN MESSAGE!**

Here are some of

actions you can take.

Tell your letter carrier how you feel about picket line violence. *Why hasn't he condemned it? Or does he support it?* Pass moral judgement on his actions and the strategy of violent confrontation encouraged by the postal union.

Tell the public how disgusted you are. Hand deliver a letter to the editor of your local newspaper. Express your disgust for the union-approved violence on the picket lines on open-line shows and with your friends. Don't fume in silence.

Help us spread the message of *freedom of choice* and *competition* for postal services. Call us up and offer to deliver some of these brochures.

Help us print up more of these brochures, send us a tax-creditable donation of any amount.

Help us man our *counter-picket lines*. **Freedom Party** will prepare a professional sign for you.

Call your **MP** ---demand an end to the postal monopoly. Open competition for first class mail will end all the problems that have accrued with this fat, belligerent postal monopoly.

Send in the coupon attached and indicate how you wish to get involved! It's your future, and you can't entrust it to the current postal monopoly and its strike-prone unions.

Freedom Party is an officially registered Ontario political party that believes the *purpose of government* is to *protect* our freedom of choice, *not* to restrict it. **Freedom Party** has members and supporters throughout Ontario and will field several candidates in the upcoming Ontario election.



Freedom Party

If you wish to
discuss these ideas further,
then call us at
(519) 433-8612

or send the coupon enclosed
or visit us at

our head offices AT:
364 RICHMOND ST., 3rd FLOOR,
LONDON, ONTARIO

**Now
it's
time
to
deliver
ours:**

**FREEDOM
OF
CHOICE!**

**"force"
"threats"
"violence"
"monopoly"
"coercion"
"intimidation"
"vandalism"**

**The
LETTER CARRIERS
have
delivered
their
message...**

Yes, it's another postal strike. Proof positive that the last time a postal strike was "settled", nothing was really settled at all.

The current postal strike, called by the *Letter Carriers Union of Canada* (LCUC), has been marred by threats, assaults, violent outbreaks, and thousands of dollars of damage to public and private property alike.

Violence, coercion, thuggery, intimidation, vandalism, obstruction of the law, public mischief, assaults, perpetual discontent, and plain stupidity: the inevitable results of a *labour monopoly*.

It's an absolute disgrace, and union members and representatives should be ashamed of themselves. But instead, they're actually *proud* of their actions. They proclaim "victories" whenever their violent actions result in halting postal deliveries --- and have even gone so far as to criticize police for arresting those guilty of *assault* and *willful damage*.

We believe these actions speak for themselves. So while the letter carriers may not have been delivering our mail, they certainly have been successful in delivering a clear message to all of us.

The message?

That LCUC members have a "right" to wages well above their legitimate market value. That LCUC members have a "right" to use violence to prevent *service competition*. That LCUC members have a "right" to use violence to prevent *labour competition*. That LCUC members have a "right" to blackmail their employer and the customers on whose goodwill and support their livelihood depend.

By their actions, LCUC members have shown us that they do not respect the rights of others to receive a service *they have paid for*, or even to go about their own business. LCUC members have demonstrated that they believe they have a "right" to their jobs without having to *earn* that right, and have made it their objective to obliterate the rights of others to compete for their jobs.

By appealing to *mob violence* instead of to *reason*, there is at least *one* thing they have legitimately *earned*: the disrespect and contempt of every tolerant and respectful citizen.

It is indeed a paradox to watch certain individuals resort to violence to "protect" a job that is, as their strike action illustrates, so dissatisfying to them.

Even more telling is the response and reaction of the letter carriers' union itself: *Not one representative has publicly condemned the violence and no members have been fined or reprimanded for their illegal actions!* If this is considered to be acceptable behaviour on the part of its members, what makes LCUC's role as a representative of "organized labour" any different from those engaged in *organized crime*?

Militancy has increasingly become the principle behind the labour movement in Canada today, and the use of *militancy as a matter of right* is its objective. And the labour movement makes no secrets about that fact.

"Without adding collective bargaining principles to the Charter of Rights and Freedoms," announced one labour representative recently, "unions may lose the right to negotiate *mandatory union membership*. To bargain successfully," he concluded, "individual needs have to be suppressed to serve the needs of the majority."

Suppressing the needs of the individual in order to serve the needs of the majority is precisely what leaders of communist, socialist, and many of the eastern and third world countries have been advocating and are practicing now. Any group, association, or union that does not recognize the principle of individual rights, is not an association, but a gang --- or worse.

Is this the "principle" on which labour relations should operate in a free society?
We think not.

Freedom Party believes that the *purpose of government* is to *protect* our freedom of choice, *not* to restrict it.

The time is long overdue that the concepts of *mandatory, compulsory, coercion, demands, threats, intimidation, monopoly, force and violence* were replaced by the concepts of *consent, peaceful cooperation, mutual respect, mutual benefit, tolerance, reason --- and choice!*

But as long as elected representatives of the three major political parties in Canada insist on maintaining a monopoly on postal services, that won't happen.

Of course, **OPEN COMPETITION IS THE ONLY LONG-TERM SOLUTION TO THE PROBLEMS THAT PLAGUE CANADA POST.**

But even with the current political unwillingness to do this, there are still other options that could be pursued until the proper action is eventually taken.

For example, postal services could be *contracted-out* to those companies offering the most efficient service for the least cost. The *labour monopoly*, with which *Canada Post* must currently contend, should be ended, allowing others in our community to be hired when those dissatisfied with their jobs choose to withhold their labour.

Most definately, *the right to strike* within a government-granted labour monopoly *must be ended*.

We also recommend that any union activity resulting in physical violence or damage to property should automatically de-certify the union, if it does not take the responsible action necessary to compensate those who have been injured or whose property has been vandalized. All strikers found guilty of violent action should be fined or jailed --- and *fired*, never again having the option to work for the post office. Their actions demand that they be treated as the criminals they are!

If you're happy with the service being provided now, then of course you're under no obligation to take any action. But if you'd like to see a change, send in the coupon below:

FREEDOM PARTY OF ONTARIO		P.O. BOX 2214, STN. 'A'	
LONDON, ONTARIO		N6A 4E3	
Yes, I'd like to deliver my message to the postal unions!			
<input type="checkbox"/> I'll deliver Freedom Party brochures about the postal strike.			
<input type="checkbox"/> I'll help counter-picket a local post office (Freedom Party will prepare a sign).			
<input type="checkbox"/> I'll give a tax-creditable donation to help pay for more brochures. <i>Amount enclosed:</i>			
(<input type="checkbox"/> cheque <input type="checkbox"/> VISA <input type="checkbox"/> money order <input type="checkbox"/> cash)			
<input type="checkbox"/> I'd like more information about Freedom Party .			
NAME _____		ADDRESS _____	
CITY _____		POSTAL CODE _____ PHONE _____	

- Next 4 Pages: UWO Campus Strike Insert from page 15 -

WHAT YOU CAN DO

1. Tell your Student Council rep that the USC should recommend to the university that it contract out food services.
2. Write a letter to the Gazette or to Western News and let them know how you feel.
3. Write to the University of Western Ontario administration and tell them you think monopolies, no matter how well intended they were meant to be, are bad business. *As a student*, tell them it is not in your interest, and therefore not in the university's interest.
4. Tell the strikers, politely but firmly, that you resent their tactics of blackmail. Pass moral judgement on their actions. They have a legitimate right to withdraw their labour, but they do not have a right to inhibit others from entering the university to provide garbage pick-up, mail-delivery, bus service, or alternate food and maintenance services.
5. Help us hand out these brochures while the strike is on. Our phone number and address are below.

WHO WE ARE

This brochure was published and sponsored by the *UWO Campus Association of the Freedom Party of Ontario*. Our association is made up of *Western* students who believe that the purpose of government is to protect our freedom of choice, *not* to restrict it.

If you would like more information about freedom and **Freedom Party**, call us at 433-8612 during the day, or campus co-ordinator *Greg Jones* in the evenings at 434-9904.

If you wish to write us, send comments or questions to:

P.O. Box 2214, Station "A",
London, Ontario, N6A 4E3



Freedom Party

MONOPOLY FOOD SERVICES VS. FREEDOM OF CHOICE

***The real issues
in the service
disruptions on
our campus...***

***from a student
perspective***

We should remind both the unionized workers and the university that *food services* and *maintenance* exist only to serve the needs of the students, and not vice-versa. The students' access to services must certainly be a higher priority than the goals of the CUPE union or the goals of the university's monopoly on food services. Western *students* are the reason both the university and these jobs exist, yet we are the ones doing all the suffering. *Why?*

UWO Student Council President Alan Williams told the press and student body alike: "*We recognize this is a legal strike. We don't intend to take sides on this.*"

Yes, the unionized workers of the food and maintenance services here at Western are on strike, affecting campus life significantly, but we're not supposed to take sides. *Why?*

The continuance of the status-quo is clearly against the interests of every Western student.

During this strike, Western students are forced to put up with a complete halt in food services, campus maintenance, while bus service, garbage collection and even mail services are severely disrupted within the campus perimeter.

Unlike USC President Alan Williams, we think UWO students should take a side and stand up for their freedom of choice. We think UWO students should take a stand against *the University food services monopoly*.

Alan Williams should have stated clearly that the university should never have started a food services monopoly in the first place. Monopolies by their very nature are inefficient, bureaucratic and unresponsive to consumer demand. With the certification of CUPE as the workforce bargaining agent, further service disruptions and deterioration became only a matter of time.

With a union-dominated workforce, the potential for blackmail is always there.

CONTRACT OUT THE FOOD SERVICES ---NOW!

Now that this strike has demonstrated how vulnerable UWO students are to this kind of monopoly, it's time for the university to take the bull by the horns and protect our *uninterrupted* access to services while *enhancing* our freedom of choice ---by contracting out the food services ---*now!*

With contracting out, Western students would be protected from the abuses of monopoly control. Competition on campus in food services means we will have choices in price, quality, style of dishes (Chinese, Italian, etc.) and not just left with the same bland offerings of the current university-union run food services monopoly.

Contracting out to several firms, perhaps turning the Centrespot into a multi-restaurant food court, with additional variety throughout the campus, for 2 or 3 year contracts, will guarantee UWO students are served on a non-interrupted basis.

By taking the university out of the actual food business, there won't be any confrontation between unions and the university. We can get on with our studies without strike hassles, and they can go out and negotiate contracts with a variety of food providers for the Western student population. Then the university and the students can monitor the situation without the threat of blackmail or confrontation.

With contracting out, we'll be able to have the best of all worlds.

The strike is wrong because Western students cannot in any way benefit by the university having a monopoly on food services. It is not in our interests to have so much power concentrated in the hands of one supplier and one union.

The university should get out of the food services business and leave it to a variety of professionals who can offer us competition, value, and diversity. Period.

Labour Relations 101

As to the union, let's look at their arguments as set forth in their brochure, "*Once upon an an ivory tower*" (we're not kidding about that double "an", it's there on the front cover, believe it or not).

"...our cafeteria hot carts are antiquated."

This is the union's explanation for lukewarm 'hot' food that food services offers. The union is saying more money should be thrown into the food services monopoly to correct this. We think there's no sense in throwing good money after bad (food). The university must realize by now that operating a monopoly food services department is inefficient, politicized, of mediocre quality at best. A situation like this is not in the best interests of the over 20,000 individual students at UWO.

The reputation of Western will continue to be damaged by these confrontations and disruptions, which are bound to re-occur if the current monopoly situation remains.

If the university contracted out food services to a number of restaurants and food providers, these new companies would pay for and set up their own equipment. But if the university spends more money on new equipment for its problem-riddled monopoly, it will make contracting out much less attractive in the years ahead. Western students will be stuck with lousy food and no choice. Maybe the union knows this, and further entrenchment of the status quo might seem in CUPE's interest, but it isn't in the interests of Western students.

Among the many beneficial stipulations the university could negotiate with contracted out firms could be a provision that each restaurant or food service hire a certain percentage of its workforce from the students at Western, a deal not possible now with the university's own monopoly!

In commenting on "job security", the CUPE union brochure says "the trend on Canadian campuses is for multinational food service companies ---with slick promises of efficiency and profitability--- to take over university food service departments. We don't want this to happen at our university."

What the union is against is *our freedom of choice*.

While the union may not like *freedom of choice*, we feel it's a prerequisite for a free society. Blackmail is shunned in a free society. The union wants to "protect" their bogus "right" to blackmail. With contracting out, Western students would never have to go through this kind of extortion again. With contracting out, we'd have a wider choice of foods to choose from, of better quality, and competitively priced. If they don't perform to our benefit, the university can renew the agreement with other firms more anxious to give Western students the service and products we're willing to support.

What the union doesn't say in their brochure is that contracts with these so-called multinationals expire at the end of a limited time frame, just like the CUPE union contract does. The difference is that in contracting out, no multinational can blackmail the university into negotiating an unfavourable deal. The CUPE union can. It has the power of blackmail over the university and its students, whereas a contracted out company *cannot*. That is a big difference!

Another of the many benefits of competition for food services on campus would be the opening up of the market for *student-run* food services to operate. Certainly with all the talent and enterprise on campus, Western students themselves ought to have the opportunity to get in on the action of feeding over 20,000 students. With *freedom of choice*, the possibilities are unlimited.

The union comes pretty close to telling a bare-faced lie when they say "*the prices you pay in a (contracted-out) cafeteria could rise dramatically*." This is so unlikely because if prices did become unreasonable, the university could simply refuse to renew the contract. The loss of such a lucrative market (especially after investing their own money for all that new equipment) will definitely keep prices competitive. If we have a food-court concept in the existing Centrespot, then competition right there would keep prices as low as possible.

The union also doesn't tell you in their brochure that strikes aren't permitted where contracting out is in place. The union doesn't tell you that food prices are generally *lower* and food quality *better*.

In the union brochure, they say "*we have a long way to go to catch up*" before they get the wages they consider "fair". Which means more strikes in the future, even after this one is "settled".

And if the union gets these hefty wage concessions, who do they think has to cover the increased cost of their wages? **We do!** Western students are the individuals that will have to pay more to the food services monopoly while we continue to get saddled with the restrictions and penalties of being forced to prop up the status quo.

Solving this monopoly problem with its strikes, poor food, etc. means **contracting out ---now!** This will give us a permanent solution, not the brief, politically motivated truce that we will get if the food services monopoly is maintained. With today's monopoly situation, we'll all be going through these hassles in just a few more years, then again, then again, *ad infinitum*.

The union says they want "*protection*" against contracting out. What they really want is to put up a barrier between UWO students and our freedom of choice. With this current food services monopoly, UWO students lose in every way; mediocre food, higher prices, less choice, strike disruptions, bus hassles, garbage hassles, and all the rest.

Let's fix this situation now. Say yes to competition and freedom of choice!

**IF YOU *HAD* A CHOICE,
WOULD YOU CHOOSE
MONOPOLY
OR
FREEDOM OF CHOICE?**

With unionized monopoly food services, students receive;

- * No choice
- * Monopoly
- * Strike disruptions
- * Mediocre food
- * Bus service hassles
- * Garbage service disruptions
- * Mail delivery & pick-up disruptions

With a contracted-out arrangement, UWO students could receive:

- * Many choices
- * Better quality food
- * Variety in the kinds of food available
- * Competitive pricing
- * Guaranteed bus service
- * Guaranteed garbage service
- * UWO students could receive many new jobs with new companies offering food services on campus. The university could get this commitment in the contract.

If the union wins, UWO students lose. If the university insists on propping up the food services monopoly, UWO students lose. If we have our freedom of choice, UWO students win. It's as simple as that.

It's your choice, now. Please make yourself heard.

- Next 2 Pages: U.W.O. Certification Drive Insert from page 18 -

**U.W.O.
HAS AN EXCELLENT
REPUTATION!**

- * EXCELLENT WAGES
- * HONOURS ITS EMPLOYMENT COMMITMENTS
- * EXCELLENT WORKING ENVIRONMENT
- * SUPERIOR DENTAL, PENSION, AND OPTICAL BENEFITS

**And after all,
U.W.O.
is our university too!**

We chose to work here!

**SAY
NO
TO UNION RULE!**

UNION?

THINK ABOUT IT.

**STRIKES.
LAY-OFFS.
UNION DUES.
UNION POLITICS.
TENSION IN THE
WORKPLACE.
FORCED PAYMENTS TO
POLITICAL PARTIES.**

Do we really want to see the University develop the same reputation as the other union-dominated industries and services like the *Post Office*? Do we really appreciate what they have done for us, the consumer, citizen, or taxpayer?

SPEAK UP for yourself and for your good employer. Speak out for a prosperous future as a free U.W.O. employee.

Robert Vaughan
519-679-2111, Ext. 6640 (days)
or
Andrea Hanington
519-672-4825 (evenings)

Sponsored by:
U.W.O. Staff for a Cooperative Work Environment
(SCWE)

WHY?

WHAT CAN A UNION DO FOR YOU?

UNIONS can CALL STRIKES that take away your earnings, cripple research projects, and make the University less attractive to students and to government grants (which will find themselves directed to non-unionized universities where the same objectives can be accomplished with less money).

UNIONS DEMAND your LOYALTY at the expense of your commitment to UWO. Unions need an environment of tension and conflict to justify their militant methods of "negotiation." Unions thrive on the "Us versus Them" mentality.

UNIONS COST EVERYONE, and incur costs unrelated to your representation by the union. The UWO Staff Association currently receives \$4 per month from its members, a fee which is used *entirely for their benefit*. It has already demonstrated that \$4 per month is sufficient funding for a representative (and *voluntary*) body.

UNIONS HAVE OTHER USES FOR YOUR MONEY. Unions hand your money over to certain political parties, whether you agree with the stand of those parties or not.

UNIONS TAKE further POLITICAL STANDS (saying they represent YOU!) on abortion, censorship, daycare, and other issues, again, whether you agree with those stands or not. This means that your money could be *used against you*, supporting causes to which you may be opposed. Needless to add, UNIONS also SUPPORT OTHER LABOUR GROUPS who share their philosophies. In contradiction to the terms of your own labour contract, your union may expect you to honour the strike action of other unions!

Unions protect lazy and unproductive employees (who should be let go), putting a *heavier work load* on good, reliable employees. More *tension*, more *conflict*, more *injustice*, --- more *union unrest*!

Once established, UNION MEMBERSHIP IS COMPULSORY, and becomes a condition of employment.

UNION POLITICS in the workplace can cause *internal division*, *tension*, and *apathy*, a situation that openly invites radicals to take over key union positions. Unions resist economic and managerial measures necessary to keep their members competitive in the labour marketplace. Thus, unions restrict flexibility and destroy incentive, resulting in a loss of productivity --- harmful not only to staff and management, but to the education of students, and ultimately to the University's reputation itself.

Once handed over to a union, the exercise of your *freedom of choice* is no longer *yours* --- it's *theirs*. Instead of being treated like *individuals*, the new rules of the game demand that everyone become a *bargaining pawn*, used to serve and advance *union interests*. Unions only think in terms of the value of "jobs", not in terms of the value of "people."

WHAT U.W.O. HAS DONE FOR US.

The UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN ONTARIO *hired us* in good faith, expecting a value for value relationship. Either party dissatisfied with that relationship has the *freedom* and *right* to terminate it. *No one* should have the right to impose unagreed-to obligations on others without their consent.

U.W.O. TRUSTS US. Staff and employees are on an honour system: no punch clocks, easy to arrange hour changes, etc. This climate of cooperation will soon disintegrate under the impending era of divisive union relations. *Unions thrive* in an atmosphere of *distrust*, since satisfied employees are poor union prospects.

U.W.O. MAKES OUR JOB POSSIBLE by providing the environment in which we work. U.W.O. has provided full-time employees with optical, drug, dental, insurance, disability and pension plans. It provides employee allowances, a generous vacation policy, education subsidies, and sickness benefits.

The U.W.O. has recognized our *voluntary* staff association which, for just \$4 a month, has negotiated an excellent wage and benefit package for its members.

But now that association is telling us that: "Each individual within the constituency will have the opportunity to decide during the coming weeks whether to continue to receive very little return for the intensive efforts of the Staff Association or to step positively into the future."

We disagree. On the contrary, we believe that the wave of the future is *voluntary* employee and staff associations and the spirit of co-operation under which they are formed.

Our choice regarding a union may well be the *last* one we'll be allowed to exercise "as an individual". If a union is ratified, **INDIVIDUAL CHOICE** will be replaced by **COLLECTIVE** bargaining.

Think about it.