

LARRY SEFTON
MEMORIAL LECTURE

THE
LABOUR MOVEMENT
and the
UNIVERSITY

by
Lynn Williams

Secretary-Treasurer, United Steelworkers of America
6 December, 1982



University of Toronto

The Annual Larry Sefton Memorial Lecture was established by Woodsworth College in 1982 using funds donated to the University in the Update Appeal. It honours Larry Sefton, one of the founders of modern trade unionism in Canada. In his trade union, political and community work, Larry Sefton met a standard of good citizenship which serves as an inspiration to all Canadians.

It is an honour, a privilege and indeed a solemn responsibility to be asked to deliver this first Larry Sefton Memorial Lecture at Woodsworth College at the University of Toronto. I accepted the invitation with alacrity and enthusiasm because of my wholehearted agreement with the decision of the college to establish this lecture series, and in so doing to honour our own Larry Sefton, and in honouring him to recognize as well both the United Steelworkers of America and the Canadian labour movement.

Larry Sefton was a giant among men and a giant among leaders. Those of us who were privileged to know him and to work with him and be his friends knew that at the time. One could not be associated with him and not know that you were involved with a person of exceptional insight and sensitivity, of unusual awareness, intelligence and strength. The nearly ten years since his death have done nothing to dim our appreciation of him -- quite the contrary, the years have but added to our understanding of his unique capabilities as we have constantly missed, and frequently longed for the benefit of his penetrating insights and cogent advice.

One reason that I applaud so vigorously the decision of the college in establishing this Memorial Series, is my concern that Larry's role in building our Union and the Canadian labour movement could well not receive the attention it should as the history of the movement is chronicled. My concern is based on a number of elements in his approach to his responsibilities that do not lend themselves to the historian's work.

He was not a person, for example, to rush into print at every possible opportunity, or to be seeking the public function in order to have his thoughts and opinions recorded and published. His was frequently the key judgment, the critical strategy, the determining influence, the telling opinion but on more occasions than not, it fell to someone else to make the comment for the record.

Larry Sefton's leadership was not a leadership in the main of speeches, although he was a brilliantly effective speaker -- clear, witty, persuasive, withering when the occasion required, or of letters or documents. His was a leadership of personal contact and inspiration, of quiet assistance at points of critical priority, of personal example when that was all that was required, and of personal intervention when example was not enough. The result is that much of Larry Sefton emerges through the lives of others -- his search for leaders and his encouragement of those he found was a constant preoccupation, but is the kind of leadership approach which results in others being written about, not Larry himself. It is my hope that this Memorial Series will focus some very necessary attention on the life and work of Larry Sefton, and in so doing will encourage those labour historians who really care to search into the record and accomplishments of this great man. Any who do, will, I am sure, find it a rewarding journey for themselves, and for those who benefit from their scholarship as well.

What were his accomplishments? They obviously cannot even begun to be summarized in these introductory remarks. When he became the Director of District 6 of the United Steelworkers of America, in 1953, it had 30,000 members -- twenty years later, at the cruelly premature conclusion of his career, District 6 had 130,000 members.

Larry excelled at every aspect of trade union leadership. His talents emerged early, in the 1940 strike at Kirkland Lake. One of his responsibilities was to tour the country, seeking support for the strike. This total experience, both at the strike scene in Kirkland Lake, and in his tours, contributed a great deal and early in his career to his appreciation of the difficulties and realities and the possibilities of the emerging industrial union movement in Canada.

In Hamilton, he was the organizer and then the strike leader in the historic recognition struggle of 1946. Many other names appear in the record, and many others made outstanding contributions in that struggle, but Larry as the leader who had to pull it all together, and keep it all together, in Hamilton, in the face of the multitude of internal and external stresses, strains and crises which are part of any social struggle, but were particularly virulent in this situation because of the intransigence of the steel company, and the hostility and division within the community of Hamilton, and among the workers themselves, with regard to the strike. Larry not only led them to victory, but went on to lead them in building a united and strong local union out of the divisions, fears and difficulties of this decisive struggle.

Larry went on to pioneer and to lead in a multitude of union endeavors. He led our negotiations at Stelco from 1946 on and throughout his career as Director. When we assumed bargaining rights at Inco, it was Larry himself who led in the delicate and difficult task of establishing a first agreement upon which future progress could be firmly based.

To be associated with Larry and collective bargaining was an exciting, demanding, and sometimes excruciating experience. He brought superb talents, and an almost overwhelming sense of responsibility to the task. He took pride in the agility and accuracy of his mathematics, in calculating packages in the days before the pocket calculator became pervasive. When theatre was called for, as it frequently is in the affairs of men, Larry would relish whatever role the circumstances required. I have seen rooms full of hard-bitten, experienced negotiators, leaders in their own right, sit silent and entranced as Larry would report on a development, or propose a strategy, or react to a bargaining ploy from the other side. I have been privileged, as hundreds of us in the union have been, in one or another of a wide variety of situations and circumstances, to hear Larry present the needs of our members across bargaining tables, or in government forums, with an eloquence and a sincerity which could not fail to influence all but the hardest of hearts. And I have seen him in the tough, pressure-packed, decisive

moments of crisis bargaining conduct himself with shrewdness and quickness, his eye ever on the main-chance of a riverboat gambler.

But let me not distort the picture, his was not the easy conscience of a gambling man, winning some, losing others. The intensity and concentration which he applied to the bargaining process was a reflection of the depth of his commitment to the needs and aspirations of our members. Once involved with the problem at hand little else mattered, nothing interfered.

To have some understanding of the reason for the intensity of Larry's leadership in a bargaining crisis, it is necessary to remember the times in general, and his background in particular. The critical element in his demanding sense of responsibility, as I have said, was his concern for our members. I believe that the memories of the hardships and sacrifices of his fellow workers at Kirkland Lake, and in the many subsequent struggles of which he was a part, were never far from his mind -- he worked passionately for such to be avoided if decent progress could be made without them, and if not, and such experiences were inescapable, it was then the responsibility of the union leader to ensure that such sacrifices were as minimal as possible, and were not in vain.

Kirkland Lake, however, had seen not only hardship and sacrifice for the men and their families, it had seen the Union smashed. During Larry's career as our leader he was building, building, building -- but it was often difficult and chancey building, in the sense that, unless one built carefully and intelligently and well, all could be lost. Without their union, if the instrument is smashed, working people have nothing. And Larry was always sensitive to that fact, and determined to do everything humanly possible and more, to be protector and defender, as well as advocate, of both the people and their union.

That sense of the fragility of the labour movement changed, for a time at least, as the years passed, and the movement grew and prospered and reached out to new groups such as the public employees. But the years of Larry's career were the building years. We can look back now and see how progress appears to have been, in retrospect, steady and continual and, one might conclude, almost automatic. In fact, it wasn't like that at all. Each step was critical, each challenge difficult. It was no accident that we progressed as we did in District 6 -- it was in large measure because we had a leader who had a profound understanding of the vulnerability of our movement and our people, and in consequence demanded of himself, and of everyone, the intensity of application and attention which were required, if we were to succeed.

I remember the summer of 1969, in which our members in our two largest groups -- at Inco and at Stelco -- were on strike at the same time. During the peak of the bargaining crises, Larry lived in downtown Toronto not in one hotel but in two, as he moved back and forth between the two negotiations, working, thinking, analyzing, proposing, committed almost without rest to the successful resolution

of those struggles, for the protection and benefit of our members, and for the preservation of their Union as an effective instrument on their behalf.

I remember the summer of 1966, in which the frustration of the workers in Sudbury erupted in a wildcat strike, a powder keg of social discontent. The coolness and the concentrated attention of Larry Sefton, who knew the miners and felt their frustration as his own, was able to provide the leadership which resulted in an honourable settlement then, and a much more united, organized and knowledgeable union with which to meet the difficult challenges which lay ahead.

Throughout his career, Larry played a decisive role in the internal struggles which determined the political direction of the Canadian labour movement. He was forcefully and eloquently on the side of the democratic socialists in the early leadership struggles with those of Communist persuasion and those in sympathy with them. He maintained the same strong commitment to political action in support of the CCF when the merging of the labour movements caused concern that the political energy of the Canadian Congress of Labour would be lost in the merged Federation. And in 1961, Larry and his Steelworkers were very much present and in evidence at the founding of the New Democratic Party.

During his years of service on the Executive of the Canadian Labour Congress his judgment was often critical. In his work on the first Commission on Structure of the Congress he faced the challenge of the role of Canadian members in international unions, and was decisive in developing the standards of conduct for international unions in Canada which have enabled Canadian members to affirm their proper role in their international unions and within the Canadian labour movement, and in this way contribute significantly to the strength and accomplishments of both.

And through it all, he carried his basic responsibilities in building our District and our Union constantly, tirelessly, imaginatively -- dreaming of new goals, of new ways to lead, to inform and inspire. He established, for example, training for our full-time staff representatives in District 6 in the Steelworkers long before it was attempted in most trade unions. And it was a unique kind of training. Not for Larry was the teaching of the day-by-day skills of the job -- his interest was in the critical and emerging issues of the day, he wanted the leadership of the Union to be aware and prepared, and brought many of the best informed people of the time to meet with us in such sessions.

District 6, during Larry's years as Director, covered half a continent, all of Canada from the Quebec Ontario border to the West Coast. Larry took his talents to every corner of it, determined that we should organize and grow in our metal and mining jurisdiction as industry grew and the economy developed. He would regularly do his Western tours, maintaining contact with our staff and our local leadership, and building, building, building.

Larry's influence in the trade union movement was not, of course, confined to District 6, nor to Canada. He played a full role in the life of our International Union. He served in a variety of capacities -- preeminently as a member of the International Executive Board, also as Secretary of the Nonferrous Conference of the International Union, our largest bargaining conference, in normal times, after Basic Steel itself, and as the Secretary of the Union's Constitution Committee at International Conventions. There was not for him, and as a result of his initiative there has not been for any of us from Canada any sense of second-class citizenship in the life of our International Union. Certainly I owe the privilege which is mine, to serve as an International Officer, directly to Larry's insistence by his actions and the ready acceptance of that position by everyone in our Union, that we function together as brothers and sisters, as trade unionists, building our solidarity, searching and working for a better society.

Larry pioneered, in establishing, within the framework of the International Metalworkers' Federation, the International Trade Union Secretariat with which virtually all of the metal unions in the democratic world are affiliated, the World Nickel Conference. Unfortunately his final illness prevented him from participating in our founding meeting but he initiated what has proven to be a very productive, particularly Canadian oriented, international trade union relationship. Directly as a result of the work of our conference, nickel workers in New Caledonia, on the other side of the world, were brought into the mainstream of the world labour movement. I shall never forget the many expressions by New Caledonian delegates at subsequent conferences, of appreciation for the improvement in their working conditions and their living standards which were directly attributable to their contact with nickel workers in Canada, brought about by the Nickel Conference. These experiences also led to an increasing awareness, on the part of Canadian nickel workers, of world developments in their industry, which in turn resulted in Canada being the only participating country in the law of the Sea Conference, which included a trade unionist, Assistant to the National Director of the Steelworkers, Bert Munro, as a member of the Advisory Group to its delegation. Unfortunately, present economic conditions, and the resulting disasters in Sudbury, Thompson and in New Caledonia, make much of this seem somewhat irrelevant at the moment, but circumstances will change, we will change them at the ballot boxes, and these kinds of contacts and involvements may well play a major role in shaping a new, more equitable and more successful social and economic future for our country, and for the world.

There were obviously many facets to Larry Sefton, this accomplished and complex man, which contributed to the broad range of his achievements, but if one was critical it would seem to me to have been the extraordinary breadth of his interests. His was not a narrow institutional view -- his concerns and his intellectual curiosity were as broad as life itself, so that he brought to his labour responsibilities ideas and inspirations gleaned from a wide spectrum of knowledge and experience.

How effective was he? Of that I may not be the most objective, nor the most appropriate judge but I believe that no one can come close to our Union without finding it be a strong, decent, democratic, proud trade union which has made, both by direct contribution and by example, an immeasurable contribution to the development of the labour movement in Canada. Larry Sefton was at the heart and core of that contribution.

I would like to congratulate Woodsworth College on their decision to honour and remember Larry Sefton with this annual Memorial Lecture, and also to congratulate the university and the constituent entities which are involved -- Woodsworth College, the Centre for Industrial Relations, the School of Continuing Studies, the Community Relations Office -- and the Ontario Federation of Labour on the general program of which this evening is a part.

The Exhibit "Working People: A Century of Canadian Labour" and the lectures provide a most appropriate recognition of the significance of the labour movement, and an understanding of some of the most critical current issues with which it is involved.

Much progress has been made in that regard since my days here at the University. I was a student participant in an earlier manifestation of an interest in matters related to the labour movement, namely the establishment of the Institute for Industrial Relations under the direction of Vincent Bladen. My recognition of progress is not meant to imply any criticism of that beginning -- I look back at my participation in the key program of that time, the industrial relations seminar conducted by Farrell Toombs, as a most rewarding experience. Harold Logan was teaching at the university then -- his work, "Trade unions in Canada" if I remember the title correctly, was a pioneering effort. In more recent years John Crispo's energy and quick and controversial turn of mind were much involved in developing labour relations studies and programs.

The present Centre for Industrial Relations, as I understand it, now has an excellent library on labour and related matters, provides within the university both an undergraduate and a Master's program in industrial relations, publishes a newsletter "Labour Relations News", and is involving itself in a variety of labour related programs both for the community at large and to meet the need of particular clients.

All of which brings me to my topic, the Labour Movement and the University.

I should say as I approach this discussion, that I have some reservations concerning my qualifications to make any very definitive observations in this regard. I was encouraged to pursue this assignment with the assurance that all that was expected were my thoughts and observations, not a major research tome, whose conclusions could be defended to the end. So that is what you will receive, my thoughts and observations -- you have my apologies in advance if any of them should be based on understandings of the facts which are inaccurate or out-of-date.

My ideas about the relationship between the University and the Labour Movement, both in terms of the extent to which there has or has not been a relationship, and of the extent to which there ought to be one, have always revolved around the idea of access.

My view of the university sees it as a wondrously privileged place, the custodian, if you will, of the sum total of the intellectual and cultural accomplishments of our society. Custodians in the nature of things become more than that title may imply -- they aren't simply the keepers -- they become as well the principal users and interpreters of that for which it is their privilege to be responsible.

If this view of the role of the university is at all accurate, it means that the university is at the centre of the development of our society, not in the sense that it is the place in which the critically important decisions are made, but in the sense that it is the repository of the knowledge that is essential to the functioning of society, and is, or ought to be, the most likely source for the genesis of the new ideas and insights upon which the future will depend.

One sees its functional role clearly in the multiplicity of technical and professional facilities which the modern university provides. Its role as initiator may be more difficult to discern, particularly in relation to the broader social questions of our time, although here, too, I believe it is clear that many new social and cultural trends and ideas have their origin within the university culture.

My deepest and longest held conviction, with regard to the relationship between the university and the labour movement, is, therefore, that workers and their organizations ought to have equitable access to the storehouse of knowledge and expertise which the university represents, and that, by and large, they do not.

Most other elements in society do. The university is the training institution for all of our professions, and many of our technicians. There aren't many power centres in our society, in government, or industry, or wherever, whose leadership personnel at least, have not had some involvement with some aspect of what the university, in one or another of its roles knows, or presumes to know, or at least teaches about.

The formal education and training of personnel is only one aspect of these inter-relationships. The ties of communication and information between the universities and the "establishment" institutions, government, business and industry, are much deeper and more complex than simply through the college educations their executives and others may have received. Research projects of many kinds, consulting relationships, task forces to examine particular problems, executive seminars, endowed professorships, and on, and on, provide that whatever it is that the university represents, it

interrelates with and is available to these groups on an ongoing and continuing basis.

Contrast this with the circumstances of working people and their institutions.

While some progress has been made in terms of the accessibility of working people's children to the university, the sad reality seems to me to be that progress in this direction has been declining in recent years. There are, of course, and unfortunately, a multitude of social and cultural factors involved in this circumstance, and dealing with them is a complex and difficult problem. However, the economic factor of cost is clear and self-evident, and the facts are that, on that basis alone, many people, otherwise qualified and interested, are prevented access.

A few years ago it seemed to me that we were moving well in the direction of providing a much greater equality of opportunity in regard to cost at least. That was the principal reason why those of us active in the labour movement in the Niagara Peninsula at the time of the establishment of Brock University at St. Catharines, encouraged significant labour and community support for that institution. Although I have no statistical evidence one way or the other, I do believe it helped provide more access, as presumably did all the regional universities. It would be expected that this has been particularly true with regard to those in the northern sections of the province.

These developments, along with more generous funding by government of loans and scholarships, brought great hope. Regretably, the days of austerity have produced a number of cutbacks in educational assistance, not the least significant of which have been in the area of student assistance and tuition fees, the result of which must inevitably be to push the university into a more elitist, less open, position.

The worker's institution, the labour movement, has not fared much differently. There has been improvement, this present program, the ongoing work here at the university is evidence of that, and there are many other examples as well. There has been a most encouraging increase in the number of studies in labour history in recent years. Dr. Laurel Sefton McDowell's study of the Kirkland Lake strike, to be published this spring, and Dr. Desmond Morton's history of the Canadian labour movement, are two distinguished examples.

There are examples of programs, some conducted by the Industrial Relations Centre here at this university, which are developed for and with unions, with the purpose of meeting their particular needs. Again this represents impressive progress, and I don't wish to sound too negative or to be in too complaining a posture. Nevertheless, when the level of university activity, overall, which relates to the labour movement is compared to the continuing interchange between the university community, in a wide variety of ways and means, and the

business, industrial and government communities, it can readily be seen to be much less significant in the general scheme of things than, in my judgment at least, it ought to be.

Nothing important, of course, is without some complications, and there are one or two related observations which I feel I should make.

One is that I would not like to give the impression that I see some magic in the university community, which would provide solutions for the labour movement's needs and problems that have not otherwise been available. I see no such magic. In fact, if my thesis regarding the depth of the university's relationship with the other segments of society is pushed to the limit, and the university is thereby responsible for the mess which exists in many of their circumstances, we may be well advised to have little contact.

No, I don't want a labour movement that depends on the universities, or the government or anyone else for that matter; I want a labour movement that is strong and independent and true to itself and its own responsibilities and objectives. My thesis is straightforward. In carrying out their responsibilities and objectives, in as multifaceted and complex as society as ours, the labour movement should have equitable access to every piece of useful and relevant information that is available, much of which resides within the university community.

There is the question of cost. The labour movement, like the membership which it represents, does not have the same ability to provide research grants, or pay conference and consultant fees, as do corporations or governments. Just as inability to pay should not in an equitably structured democracy preclude working people from access to the storehouses of cultural and technical knowledge, so should it not preclude their institutions from similar and appropriate access.

Limited access has been compounded by limited outreach. If the labour movement and working people have been lacking in access to the university, so too has the university community not reached out to involve itself with working people and the labour movement in any manner equivalent to the level of its involvement with and recognition of other institutions and social groupings.

Undoubtedly, some part of the explanation comes from the nature of the labour movement itself. Trade unions have often begun in secret and conspiratorial style, and it was frequently wise that they did. Labour has often been suspicious of influences which were or appeared to be allied with the power structure, and frequently had good reason for feelings of suspicion and concern.

The labour movement in North America has been engaged in a now more than century long struggle for recognition and acceptance. Any easy assumption that this is an exaggerated point of view, has surely been shattered by the Ontario government's authoritarian destruction of collective bargaining rights for half a million public employees,

including those at the universities. We seem to have no trouble recognizing the injustice, more than the injustice, the attack on fundamental human and democratic rights which actions of this kind represent when they are taken against Air Controllers in the United States, or Solidarity in Poland. The principle is no different when we do it here at home.

The gap between the university community and the labour movement, has meant that many in the university have little understanding of what the labour movement is really about. Perceptions of the movement are often very unrealistic, from the classical economists and the business schools on the one hand, who frequently view the trade union as an unnatural and improper interference with the market place, to the radical theorists on the other, who often appear to believe that they have a better appreciation of what the trade union movement is and what it should be about than does the movement itself.

A similar set of attitudes and a similar lack of realistic understanding often applies to working people themselves, as well to their unions. Workers, too, often are seen on one extreme as numbers, for the purposes of the economist or the engineer, or at the other extreme, as romanticized figures in the class struggle.

The reality, of course, is that workers are people, real people, with all the same needs, hopes, dreams and problems that everyone else experiences. What sets them apart, from all the groups with whom the university is more familiar, is their vulnerability.

I am not sure that there are many people in the university, and with whom the university comes in contact who really understand just how vulnerable a worker is in our society; who really understand what a devastating, soul destroying, lost feeling it can be to have your livelihood, your job, the relevance of your skill swept aside by economic decisions over which you have no control, which neither you nor anyone else seems really to understand, and about which nobody seems able to do very much, except possibly provide endless explanations which offer little hope and less sustenance. This is the experience of thousands upon thousands of decent working people. The university is one place from which solutions to these terrible problems should be emerging -- is enough concerned thinking, analyzing, creative policy development and review really being carried out?

No other group in our society experiences any comparable sense of insecurity. Individuals do, of course. It's fairly common currently to read about the traumas of executive unemployment. But that is an individual, not a group, phenomenon. There is no common experience of living without any real sense of security, threatened with temporary or permanent job and income loss at frequent, even regular intervals. That is not the general fate of doctors, or lawyers, or executives, or senior government officials.

There are other aspects of the industrial workers' experience in particular, which are frequently unknown to many in the university community -- the factory atmosphere with its many discomforts and its sometimes life threatening risks, the authoritarianism of traditional management-worker organizational structures, the exclusion of the worker from meaningful participation in the work decision which affect him most.

The practices and traditions of the labour movement grew out of these experiences. They are what makes the labour movement more pragmatic on occasion, than more theoretical viewpoints might suggest appropriate. They are what makes the labour movement more stubborn sometimes than may seem reasonable in some eyes, and tough and strong and able to endure sacrifice and hardship almost beyond belief. But let me not be too heroic -- it's also the kind of life experience than can sometimes, all too easily, lead to defeat and despair. You see, trade unionism is really played for keeps. There are regrettably, stupidly, still today, employers and other forces who really try to smash unions, and don't shy away from smashing some people along the way. That was what the Stelco strike in 1946 was all about, and that was the measure of Larry Sefton, that he was able to lead his people through that experience successfully. That was a big, dramatic, focal crisis. There are mini-versions of it all the time, each of which, in its own way, is also for keeps, and requires the same inputs of courage, and intelligence and common sense.

It's difficult for me to think of any institution that lives this kind of existence, quite like a trade union does. I don't mean to suggest that there aren't critical periods of decision making for any institution -- a university, a business -- but I don't believe there is any in which the very existence of the institution is on the line, in as frequent and fundamental a way.

It isn't my intention, incidentally, to suggest that this describes the average or the typical collective bargaining relationship. There are many mature and sophisticated relationships, which can be accurately viewed and assessed as problem-solving procedures in the very best sense. In these situations each side recognizes their different needs, and also the needs which they share, and proceed to seek rational accommodations within the framework of their separate necessities.

There's a great deal of this positive kind of collective bargaining experience around, and there should be much more study undertaken in relation to what and where it is, and how and why it works. But underneath it all is the basic reality of what a union is in our society, and what it has to do, and be prepared to do, to carry out its responsibilities to its members, and to survive.

This mention of positive accomplishments, which might usefully be studied, encourages me to mention another.

In many ways the single most significant change brought about by trade unionism has been the development of a concept of individual rights for employees, protected by the process of complaint handling and dispute settlement which we call the grievance procedure. This procedure ultimately rests on the right to arbitrate unresolved grievances and disputes, and there has been considerable study of the arbitration aspect. Insofar as I am aware, however, there has been little study of the enormous number of problems resolved; justice determined; wrongs rectified in the earlier stages of these procedures, without the need of arbitration. I believe that the labour movement devotes more of its time and energy, and more of its resources, to this essential and fundamental work than to any other of its endeavors. This is human rights at its most basic -- this is the most critical single factor in the entire union workplace effort. It is what brings an end to servitude in the workplace, and begins to establish a system of civil rights in its stead.

An interesting development of recent years in the labour movement--university relationship has been the increasing presence of collective bargaining on the campus. This has brought with it some interesting variations from more normal collective bargaining procedures -- if I understand it correctly the professors here threatened to strike in order to win compulsory arbitration -- a rather different approach. I am not really sure exactly what it reflects, possibly, among other elements, a greater confidence by professionals in the university that professional arbitrators would deal well and fairly with their proposals, than must industrial trade unionists feel when presented with an arbitration alternative in a bargaining dispute.

In any case, there can be no doubt that the arrival of collective bargaining on the campus is a positive development in terms of the university's awareness of the labour movement, and its long-term relationship with it. Although I recognize that it could not realistically have happened otherwise, I do regret that it is essentially a craft model of collective bargaining which exists on the campus, not an industrial union model.

Jean Gerin-Lajoie, the retired Director of District 5 of our Union which represents our members in Eastern Canada, has recently completed a history of our Union in Quebec. In it he makes the point, which he says emerges clearly from his research, that the industrial union structure, in which all levels of employment are in one organization, requires an examination of the total picture, a concern about the circumstances of all who are involved, in a different way than does the craft approach. His thesis suggests that this is one factor in explaining the traditionally greater concerns of industrial unions, as compared with craft unions, with the broader social and political questions in society. The fact that their bargaining and other union initiatives require them to be concerned with a broad array of problems and issues, not the narrow concerns of one particular group, encourages a more sweeping perspective on other questions as well. A University bargaining group that involved all

their employees might be more than a university administration would wish to contemplate, but it surely would require the trade union representatives to develop a knowledgeable understanding of the needs of the total university community.

The view of the university as civilization's storehouse, which I expressed at the beginning of these few remarks, obviously leads to the question, what should the role of the storehouse be?

As I suggested then, it clearly requires those who must care for its contents, and those who must ensure that it receives the additions which are necessary for its currency, and those who must study and reflect upon their meaning. It does not, however, achieve its full purpose if it does not also serve -- clearly it does this in the training of its students, and as I have indicated, in its outreach to some elements in the community.

One of my purposes this evening is to suggest that it should continue to improve and expand upon its teaching of labour related matters to its students and upon its outreach to the labour section of the community.

I am also tempted to suggest in passing, that the need to reach out more effectively to the labour community might well be viewed as part of the need to reach out in new ways to the problems of society in general, as differentiated from those of particular elites. Is the university, as the resource centre of our accumulated scientific and cultural knowledge, really serving us as well as it should with regard to the critical issues of our time -- unemployment, and the horrendous condition of the world economy -- the quality of life and the future of our planet -- the population explosion and world development -- war and peace -- in the words of a title of a recent lecture by B.F. Skinner -- "Why are we not acting to save the world?"

What is involved in continuing to expand the universities outreach to the labour movement? Some of what is required is simply a greater awareness and emphasis on labour questions in the general program of the university -- more research, more teaching, a deeper understanding of its needs and its place in our society.

Another important aspect of an improved relationship would be to search out more and better ways in which the university and the labour movement could interact to the benefit of both, with the knowledge and skill of the university more available, in more useful ways to the labour movement, and with the experience and understanding of the labour movement similarly available to the university.

The great impediment, or at least one great impediment, to bringing about these kinds of changes and improvements is money. My feeling over the years, buttressed by some experiences, is that the universities would be willingly provide many useful services for us, if we could provide the money. "Aye, there's the rub!" We don't have

the money -- and many useful projects which could otherwise be undertaken, are not.

This is not as it should be. Universities receive large amounts of public support, to which all citizens and all elements in the community contribute. As I have indicated, many sectors receive a generous return from this support if only in the fact that the universities provide the training which enables their enterprises, private and public, to function and to succeed. I make no complaint about that, in its own terms, because the entire community benefits, or should, from the accomplishments of its components. My proposition is that the labour movement in relation to its needs and circumstances, should also receive a return since its constituency, too, is a significant factor in the support which the universities receive.

The universities work with and for the labour movement should be supported by the general financing structure of the university, not only by special funds which have been provided for that purpose, as is so often the case. It should be one of the core responsibilities, not an extra tacked on after other more significant matters have been attended to.

In this connection, some mention of the situation with regard to labour education and the universities in the United States might be relevant. Most of the significant labour centres in American universities are located in the land grant state university's systems. Many of these universities were established as agricultural schools, mandated to be of assistance through teaching and research and other means to the agricultural community. The rationale for the addition later on of labour education facilities was that as employment shifted from farm to industry, workers like farmers were entitled to research and training which could assist in the improvement of their economic condition.

The development of increasing relations between the labour movement and the university must also be on the basis of continuing, informed and sensitive consultation. The labour movement has many reasons, some well-founded, some not, to be sensitive regarding the university and its role. The labour movement has very special needs, and exists in a very different environment, as I've tried to indicate, than do the other constituencies with which the university interacts. This may require both more effort and concern and also some new, specifically designed and carefully thought out approaches.

However, the rewards for doing this, and doing it well, would, I am sure, be impressive for all concerned.