



LODGE 1922 EXECUTIVE BOARD FOR 1959

Back Row L. to R.: Wm. Boothroyd (G.L. Rep.), Frank Jones (Treas.), Herb. Brooks (Sentinel), Joe Birbauer (Vice-Pres.), Mike Rygus (G.L. Rep.), Al Breadman (Bus. Rep.).

Front Row L. to R.: Pete Rogers (Rec. Sec.), Larry Perry (Conductor), David O'Donnell (Trustee), Mary Hendry (Fin. Sec.), Bill Kanis (President), Vern Bock (Trustee), W. (Sandy) Wilson (Trustee), Centre: Ken Woods Chairman Office Committee).

Editorial

PLENTY AND POVERTY

The first January meeting of the Sister Lodges saw the election of the Lodges' Committees: Entertainment, Welfare, By-Laws, Educational, etc. Perhaps the most important of all these internal committees is the Educational, having, as its object the job of informing membership what is happening in the labour movement as a whole and the responsibility of keeping membership aware of legislation either being processed in the various levels of government or on the books to be processed.

The past six months has revealed a strong point by management in its determination to hold the line and allow no further monetary or contractual advances by labour. Yet a glance at the daily financial pages of the press reveals a startling healthy economic picture despite the dismal spouting of management and politicians alike. We seem to be living in a strange land of plenty and poverty.

Cabinet Ministers assure the populace, don't fret, we have a fine sound healthy economy. Employment Service Officers assure the job seekers; there is nothing and won't be for some time.

And all the while the poison of dissatisfaction and despair pervades more and more of our people, much to the delight of a certain great foreign power.

We live in a curious world, where interplanetary travel is envisaged and national and international poverty is ignored.

TRAFFIC ACCIDENTS IN 1957

"Accident Facts 1957" available from the Motor Vehicles Branch, Ontario Department of Transport, Toronto 2, presents some shocking information about the tragic toll of human folly on our provincial highways.

Of the 76,302 accidents reported, three types made up 88.6% of the total: Collisions between vehicles accounted for 66%; non-collision accidents (where vehicles left the road and overturned) made up 12.8%; collisions with fixed objects such as bridge abutments amounted to 9.9% of the total.

The months when most accidents occurred were December, January, November. The biggest percentage happened in broad daylight on clear dry roads.

Younger drivers were involved in a disproportionate number of accidents. The age group 16-19, made up 6.8% of all licensed drivers in 1957, but accounted for 11.3% of all drivers in accidents. Drivers in the age group, 20-24 represented 12.1% of all licensed drivers, but accounted for 18.5% of all the drivers in all accidents and 18.7% of the drivers in fatal accidents.

The actions of drivers reported most frequently were:

(a) All Accidents—1. Inattentive driving; 2. Speed too fast for road or traffic conditions; 3. Drove off roadway; 4. Did not have Right of Way; 5. Following too closely.

(b) Fatal Accidents—1. Speed too fast; 2. Drove off roadway; 3. Driving on wrong side of road; 4. Inattentive driving.

THE ROAD TO SERFDOM

*Published in the 17 Dec. 1958
Issue of the Toronto Globe
and Mail*

Since Prime Minister Diefenbaker announced, last September, that a decision on the future of the Avro Arrow would be delayed for the following six months, one thing—not too clear at the time—has been definitely established. Manned aircraft are not to be abandoned in favor of missiles. Every military authority worth mentioning has been very firm on this point. All have insisted that manned aircraft are to be an important weapon for the West's defense for as far ahead as anybody can see.

Suggestions have been made that the Canadian Government took the United States-produced Bomarc missile as a more advanced defense weapon which would replace the Arrow. This is not the case. So the question comes back, not as a matter of military policy, but as one of effectiveness and efficiency in terms of economics. Canada has spent a great deal of money on the Avro Arrow. Certainly, some of that money was wasted; but this was not Avro's fault.

What counts now is the Arrow's value in terms of alternate weapons and Canada's ability to play its part in the Western defense complex. One of the virtues of the Arrow's development has been its contribution to Canada's industrial diversification. With the Arrow (and CF-100) expenditures, we have bought new skills, new techniques, new industrial processes and plants which otherwise would not exist, but which today range far beyond the needs of the Avro program in their service to Canada. These gains are emphatically worth keeping.

There is another factor. It is the considered opinion of the military men, and aircraft experts who have no fear of being quoted, that the Arrow is the best plane of its kind in the advanced stages of development. There is, furthermore, good reason to believe it has in no sense attained its full potential. If, as these men also say, manned aircraft are essential, it must be assumed that—for the foregoing reason alone—the Arrow has a part, and a big part, to play.

Supposing the Arrow is not permitted to play its part? If that is the case, there will be a wide gap, an inviting gap, in Western defenses for the next two or three years, until the F-108 becomes available. This is a U.S. plane, similar to the Arrow, but in one vital respect very different from it. While the Arrow is in pre-production, the F-108 is still on the drawing-board. Yet everyone is talking about adopting it—adopting it before it has even been seen, adopting it because of somebody's "guesstimate" of what it

(Concluded on page 11)

THE ROAD TO SERFDOM

(Continued from page 4)

will do. Not only the defense of North America, but the defense of Western Europe, is being rested on this flimsy supposition.

Here we have an extreme example of what has been evident since 1945—the determination of U.S. industry to monopolize the defense systems of the West. This is something Canada does not have to accept. Certainly, Canada wants to have integrated defense — but Canada should not accept an integration that entails economic subordination or impoverishment.

It used to be Washington's excuse that it could not share defense production with Canada because Canada did not have the necessary skills and industry. Now, after considerable cost, Canada has them. So now, we hear other excuses. They do not hold water. The harsh fact is that the U.S. is expecting a country running into the red by more than a billion dollars a year to scrap an industry which has had a large part in that country's economic growth—and to use the saving, so-called, to buy U.S.-built weapons at whatever price the U.S. wishes to put on them. In that way, we would become completely subservient to the U.S., not only in the military sense, but, and to a greater degree, in the economic one.

Now, it happens to have been shown in a good many fields that whatever the U.S. can do, we can do as well—and often cheaper. So if the Bomarc is the desirable weapon we in Canada have to lean upon, we in Canada should insist on producing it. (We doubt that Bomarc is, in fact, that good; it is our understanding that the U.S. Army, by way of showing its superiority over the U.S. Air Force in missile development, has been using the USAF's Bomarc as a "drone" for its own Nike.)

On the face of it, the Canadian Government has two alternatives. We can produce our own manned aircraft, the Arrow; and so doing, leave gaps in the West's defense line which the U.S. will have to worry about. Or we can seek a little collaboration in the United Kingdom, where, for a good many reasons, we should be buying and selling more. If the U.S. does not want a two-way street on defense production, perhaps the British do.

The British are pretty well up in most of the modern weapons. And they have suffered, as we have, from Washington's determination to dominate the munitions picture. Perhaps we can talk business with them. And if that antagonizes the U.S., if that makes the U.S. think Canada is being stubborn, we can point out that our risk is no greater than theirs.

OFFICE COMMITTEE REPORT TECHNICAL ASSOC. LODGE 2030

January 1959.

The Office Committee takes great pleasure in utilizing this opportunity to wish all the members of the Lodge a Happy New Year and may our Negotiating Committee obtain a prosperous Contract for us, not forgetting to wish the Company luck in obtaining a respectable Contract with the Government.

MEETINGS WITH LABOR RELATIONS DEPARTMENT:

An official request for Restoration of Seniority was tendered to the Company by the union for Brothers W. Kent, Dept. 7002 and J. Morton, Dept. 7006. Brother KENT'S seniority has been concurred with and has been restored to Dec 30th, 1950 in occupational group 32.

Seniority for Brother MORTON has not been concurred with by the Company due to the fact that the Brother failed to report to work as a re-hire on April 26th, 1944.

Chief Steward WALLY LAMBLE was very alert in taking up a complaint from 717 Aircraft re Staff Expeditors performing the work of 717 Aircraft progress men. Wally spoke to Earl Wilkins the Staff Administrative supervisor who came up with a very unsatisfactory answer.

Wally then phoned me regarding the supervisor's statements. I then called the office committee together and took the case up with Labor Relations. The result was to the satisfaction of the Lodge.

The supervisor of Dept. 6014 made some detrimental remarks to a member under his jurisdiction. This was taken up by the office committee through the efforts of Brother ORTON CORBETT, the department steward. The supervisor and the Brother concerned were interviewed by a Labor Relations Rep. and myself, as acting Chairman of the office committee. The outcome of the interview was satisfactory and the results made known to the complete office committee. This kind of a case is no doubt one of many that may occur throughout the plant and pass by unheard of, BUT, as I previously remarked without Bro. Corbett's quick action we would not have been able to clamp down on supervision 'riding the back' of one of our members.

The office committee did not concur with a request by the Company for an odd shift arrangement in Dept. 6901 Exp. We stated that we required a complete list of all the odd shifts, in operation which had automatically terminated on December 10th due to the expiration of the 1957 Collective Agreement. We have now received the revised list and can now quote that approx. fifteen employees are on odd shifts, at one time.

SISTER MANIEX one of our Executive members complained to the union that the temperature in their new location was extremely cold. The vice president, and myself went and investigated this complaint with the result that we nearly fell over each other getting back to report to the Company. Mr. Neil Troy, of Labor Relations rectified the complaint satisfactorily.

MRS. SUMMERS #84919 Department 6014, was interviewed approx. six weeks ago and informed that she would be doing the work of a clerk Master Records "A" This she did for six weeks. She then approached her group leader and inquired as to whether or not she was going to be re-classified from the "B" Classification to the "A". Apparently she was then told that the job would be within the "B" range. ORTON CORBETT the steward in the dept. reported the matter to Fred DOWNEY his Chief Steward. Eventually, the matter came under the jurisdiction of the office committee, who investigated the case and came to the conclusion that it was a genuine case where an employee was required to work out of her classification. We met the Company over this matter. The result—MRS. SUMMERS has now been re-classified and made retroactive to November 22nd '58, without going through the usual grievance procedure.

The office committee requested Restoration of Seniority for JIM STRONG, Dept. 4301 due to sickness. This has been granted by the Company.

An employee in F. Wood's section was sick for two days, and was refused pay because she did not phone. Action by the office committee cleared up this complaint satisfactorily.

The office committee was given notice by the Company of a LAY-OFF in Staff of 20 (TWENTY) employees and has since met with the Company to discuss this matter. By the 30th of January the lay-off and bumping procedure will have been completed.

The Chairman of the Steward Body will issue a detailed list, together with the Mechanics of This Lay-off, as soon as the information is available.

Fraternally,
Tony Barr,
Acting Chairman, Office Committee
Technical Associates Lodge 2030.