INTERVIEW WITH RICHARD CLARKE

March 8, 1973
Washington, D.C.

Interviewer: Alice M. Hoffman

INTRODUCTION

Born in Ottawa, Ontario, Richard Clarke began his lithographic career in Montreal and joined the Lithographers Union in 1941. By 1949 he was president of his local. He recalls the 1949 strike and lockout, the pressure exerted by the Canadian Lithographers Association, the consequent solidifying of the union in Canada, and the welfare program that resulted.

Clarke goes on to describe the organization of the Lithographers Union in Canada as opposed to the United States and the development of negotiations for area-wide geographical contracts, which occurred in Canada long before the United States. He tells how the Photoengravers were integrated into this system at the time of the merger with the Lithographers in 1964.

In 1957 Clarke was appointed International Representative. His responsibilities included negotiations, organizing, and servicing right across Canada. When Vice-President Arthur Brown retired in 1963, Clarke took his place in 1964. The whole Canadian setup of the Graphic Arts Union is administered through his office in Montreal. He is a member of the Executive Board of the Canadian Lithographic Institute which runs the education program in eastern Canada. Clarke contrasts the centralized control of the Canadian education program with the more decentralized system in the United States.

Clarke discusses the whole question of merger and relations in Canada with such unions as the Photoengravers, the Printing Pressmen, the ITU, and the Bookbinders. He expresses his advocacy of the one-big-union concept.

Clarke has been chairman of the Finance Committee of the Graphic Arts Union ever since he became vice-president. He is also Secretary of the Photoengravers' Pension Plan. He received this appointment from President Ken Brown because of his background as chairman of the Canadian Lithographers Plan in 1953.

Clarke completes the interview with a discussion of the nationalistic trend in Canada as far as International unions are concerned.

INTERVIEW WITH RICHARD CLARKE

March 8, 1973
Washington, D.C.

Interviewer: Alice M. Hoffman

INTERVIEWER: If you would give me your name, date and place of birth.

CLARKE: Richard J. Clarke. Born in Ottawa, Ontario, September 2, 1914.

INTERVIEWER: Okay, Mr. Clarke, why don't we just start with your first job experience and a little of your personal background and how you became active in the trade union movement.

CLARKE: Well, my first position in the lithographic industry was at the Consolidated Litho in Montreal. I was fortunate enough that I had an uncle who was foreman in the lithographic department; and through his connection with the company, they did get me a job in the printing end of it, not the lithographic end of it. And I started working on a letter press for the big sum of $8.00 a week, working 44 hours. And I received the $8.00 because my uncle was foreman. I should have started at $7.00, but they gave me an extra dollar. That's how I started at Consolidated Litho. The plan that my uncle had--this is of course very personal--was that he figured that he then could get me into the litho end of it. But he died within a year, so I stayed in the letterpress end for about two years.

INTERVIEWER: Was this an organized plant?

CLARKE: Yes. But I was in the letterpress. The letterpress wasn't organized. The litho was.

INTERVIEWER: I see.

CLARKE: When I moved into the litho, I frankly resisted joining the union at the time because I felt I couldn't afford the wages--the dues, not wages. The president of the local was working in the plant, and I was under some pressure to join because they didn't have a union shop agreement. But everybody except myself was in

the union. When I explained that I wasn't making enough money, he worked out a deal where I could pay my initiation fee at a dollar a week over a period of time, and I joined the union. That would have been about 1941 when I joined. By 1949 I was president of the local. Since I had joined, I felt that in the business of belonging to a union if my money was being spent on the union I wanted to know what was happening. I wanted to know how it was being spent, so I became active fairly fast, fairly fast.

I had had no, you know. . . as a young man there had been no union experience in my family at all. We were never involved directly. I should say with my immediate family. I had uncles who were printing pressmen, president of locals, what have you. I had a brother who was in the ITU for quite a period of time, active then. So that there was union background but never spoken about much in the house. Then, of course, I was in another city. I had been brought up in Ottawa, and I couldn't find good employment in Ottawa so I went to Montreal where this uncle of mine was. So that's how I got into the. . . .

INTERVIEWER: What business was your father in?

CLARKE: My father was. . . had been killed in the first World War. Killed overseas. My mother had died six months before. And the four of us were orphans. I was the youngest. I had two brothers and a sister. So that we had been brought up by a grandmother, who just finished raising nine children (laughter). She really had a family of thirteen. So that my father. . . we hear stories about him, but they can't be true. (Laughter) It doesn't seem possible, you know. He evidently was quite an entertainer. He would never hesitate to get up and sing and dance and do what you want, but he never seemed to be able to hold a job very well. So maybe it was true what they say about him. I really don't know.

INTERVIEWER: Well, this explains why your uncle took a particular interest in you.

CLARKE: Yes. One of the uncles was the president of the Ottawa local. He was my godfather. So that the printing industry was in our family. I used to go to the Ottawa Citizen, get up on a big pile of rolls off the press and watch the presses roll when I was about six, or seven years old, eight years old. I can remember going in. I think the inducement was that he could always get me a piece of pie or something like that from the restaurant next door. Because I could watch them and eat some pie. Then I did get into the union in Montreal, and I became active fairly fast.

INTERVIEWER: What was your particular job?

CLARKE: Plate making.

INTERVIEWER: Plate making.

CLARKE: Yeah. So that I joined the union. I became active. I was an officer in 1949 when the strike came about. The same man was still president.

INTERVIEWER: What was his name?

CLARKE: Jack Barker.

INTERVIEWER: Jack Barker?

CLARKE: Yeah. Jack Barker. Speaking about Jack Barker, you know on a tape of this nature, I have to be very clear about him. This might be one [sensitive] area although he's dead today. But he was president when we went on strike; and after a matter of, oh, I'd say, no more than a month of strike, the strike committee eased him out completely. I think it would be honest to say that Jack was playing both sides of the fence. We would have an executive meeting, outlining our strategy, and the employers would know about it in the matter of half an hour, an hour.

On one occasion we developed a strategy where we would send two hundred pickets down to the plant where both he and I had worked because we had heard that twenty-three of them were going in. And we sent down 200 pickets, and we were met with 300 policemen. And they kept cutting us off at the pass, making us keep walking around so we couldn't stop anywhere. Jack became a mental case. Not [from] that, you know, but over the years.

INTERVIEWER: Over the treachery. Well, what were the issues that brought about this strike in '49?

CLARKE: Well, it seems ridiculous today, but the main issue at that time was the welfare program. That was the issue. We had no welfare program. I was not on the negotiating committee that led up to the strike. I was running the finances of the local but not involved in the actual negotiations. But we were dealing with the

Canadian Lithographers Association which is an employers association that spreads over all of eastern Canada. When we talked to one contractor in eastern Canada in the Canadian Lithographers Association, they had a ruling that if we struck one plant they would walk out of every plant. At that time there were about seventy plants. And as I learnt of the history of the development of the strike--A. W. Brown was the vice-president at the time--they developed the strategy that because they couldn't get it resolved--they had gone through conciliation, the rulings of the Ontario Board and that--and because they couldn't resolve primarily welfare--that seemed to be the basis of it--they decided that they would strike two plants in Toronto. The union decided to strike two plants in Toronto. And as a result of that, the employers locked out every other plant. We claimed throughout the whole six months that it was a lockout in Quebec. It might have been a strike in Ontario, but it was a lockout in Quebec.

INTERVIEWER: In Quebec.

CLARKE: Yeah. We put up our signs--"Locked Out"--and that was it as far as we were concerned. The employers in Quebec tried to keep us in. I don't mean tried to make us break from the union; but even after the employers in Ontario locked everybody else out, the Quebec employers kept us in for another day or two days and tried to get a settlement but finally said, "Look, we don't have any choice. We will have to lock you out." Nobody went on strike. We all kept on working for the two days. . . .

INTERVIEWER: What were the kinds of pressures that the Canadian Lithographers Association were able to put on these employers in Quebec to force them into line?

CLARKE: Well, I would gather, looking at it from the same way they operate today, they would almost have a document signed in blood that they would have to adhere to the rulings of the negotiating committee of the CLA. And they had signed, I would assume, documents to the extent that, if the strike took place anywhere, that they would have to lock out: They would have to close that section of the industry. Talking with them after, they said it was the biggest mistake they ever made. Because what happened in '49 was that it solidified the Amalgamated Lithographers in Canada; up to that time they had been a loosely-knit union. But boy, that really brought them together. And it held them together ever since. Even though it was a six-months strike, it did us more good than anything else. And locking us out in Quebec helped us tremendously.

INTERVIEWER: Wasn't there also some attempt to equalize the wage structure in Canada with the United States wage structure? Was that part of it?

CLARKE: See, all through Canadian negotiations as long as I can remember, we always used parity with the United States. This was always a negotiating cry. We'd sit at the table and tell them frankly: a man is running a press in New York who's running a press in Montreal; we don't see any difference in the rates. There should not be. And we used that. We didn't have parity with the United States but in our contracts today we are in the top ten, fifteen rates compared with. . . . in the famous Rep book of ours. When we look at the Canadian rates, we find we are right up in the top ten, fifteen of the International. As a matter of fact, our four-color rates are probably the highest in the book. The first pressmen rates. So we've always used that in negotiations.

We don't use it today because the minute we start using it today, they start saying."All right, here's a contract from Dallas, here's a contract from New Orleans" and you know, so we don't use it. What they try to do today in negotiations, they'll pick out a clause and say, "Well, this is in the clause. This is part of an American contract. You have agreed to it." And then of course we reverse it and we say, "Yeah, all right. We agree to that clause then you give us all the other conditions that they have." (Laughter) They back off immediately.

So that the question of parity with the United States, it would have been part of the cry at that time that we wanted parity with the United States. And it would have involved part of the thinking. . . . now, I'm only familiar with the actual operation of the strike. Leading up to it, the strategy and what have you, I wasn't involved in that. All I know is that I was mad as the dickens that the strike took place. I didn't think it should have taken place at the time. They were my first thoughts on it. Looking back I think it was one of the greatest things that ever happened to us. It really cemented us together. We've just moved since then, we've moved tremendously since then because of that.

INTERVIEWER: So there has been over a period of time a similar kind of contract negotiation strategy as there is in the United States to eliminate what we call the southern differential. And that same movement has been going on to eliminate a Canadian differential to obtain parity.

CLARKE: You see, we sit in eastern Canada with contracts covering all of Ontario, Quebec, and so on with

identical wage raises, identical fringe benefits. So that we can't say in Quebec we want Ontario's. We have them. In Ontario, Quebec's, we have them. So that as a negotiating strategy we have to look somewhere else. You know, we really do. Because we're the highest rates in Canada. We're the highest rates in the graphic arts industry in Canada. We have the best conditions in the graphic arts industry in Canada, in eastern Canada. So that we can't use Canada as a comparison any more, and we never really did. We still say, you know, we want these rates but we'll use rates like Philadelphia. We'll be selective about the rates that we use. But I would think that in the last three or four sets of negotiations, very little reference is made to the States, in the negotiations. Very little. So I think we achieved the parity and surpassed it in a lot of instances so we. . . we throw it in occasionally just to keep them honest, but we don't really have much use in saying we want parity with the States. I think we've achieved it.

INTERVIEWER: But in 1949, this was an issue?

CLARKE: Oh yes, it was. Yeah. Because we were way behind in 1949. And, you know, we were using it, and it was aggravating the employers because everytime you mentioned the United States to a Canadian employer, he can see extra cost whether it's there or not; and he gets annoyed.

INTERVIEWER: What about the printing industry and the lithographic industry in Canada? Is it pretty much a Canadian-owned-and-managed-industry?

CLARKE: Yeah. It would be. We have, you know, like chains of companies--the Lawson chain for instance--they own companies right across Canada. Now, they're a Canadian firm. Ray Lawson, who used to head it, was at one time Deputy Minister, I guess some representative of the Crown in Ontario. I forget what it was at the time. But that's a Canadian company. Rolph Clark Stone owns companies in Montreal, Halifax, Toronto. That's Canadian-owned.

There hasn't been any great expansion of American companies into Canada. As a matter of fact, the connections you'll find, like in Lawson's, they're connected with a firm in England. The Rolph Clark Stone chain is strictly Canadian. Southam Press is Canadian. So we haven't had. . . we don't have the firms like Rand-McNally operating in Canada. Or Donnelly doesn't operate in Canada. Brown Bigelow doesn't operate in Canada. Although the Canadian employers all belong, most of them belong, to the PIA. There's an interconnection on an employer-association level.

INTERVIEWER: You better spell out what PIA means.

CLARKE: Printing Industry of America.

INTERVIEWER: Right.

CLARKE: You know, that connection is there, but it's not only an association level. Information that they exchange--how to beat the union--give them that information. Quite readily. But there's no inter--there's no really American money pouring into the printing industry in Canada.

INTERVIEWER: So it's a very different situation for the Graphic Arts Union as opposed to the Auto Workers or Steelworkers. . .

CLARKE: Yes. Definitely so. Well, for instance, we find that when we negotiate in the metal decorating, when we negotiate with Continental Can and American Can, their contracts with the Steel are identical to the American contracts. You know, they have to pay them a sabbatical leave of thirteen weeks. Well they have that only because it was negotiated in the States and just automatically was approved and extended in. The UAW did a different job in their negotiations. They tried to adhere to the American pattern but they deviated a few times. As a matter of fact, they got more money on one occasion than they did in the States. But I think basically they run about the same. It's not the same type of industry at all. We're not dealing with large American owners in the printing industry. We're dealing with Canadian owners.

INTERVIEWER: Well, in the strike in 1949, it looks as if it was kind of. . . . that once the employers got into it and once they committed themselves to this lockout, that it became kind of a life-and-death struggle.

CLARKE: Right.

INTERVIEWER: . . . at that point.

CLARKE: Yes it did.

INTERVIEWER: So did they engage in all the traditional efforts to break the union such as attempting to hire strikebreakers and this kind of thing?

CLARKE: Oh, very much so. Terrific amount of pressures put on people to cross the picket line, to go into work. And we were very concerned in the initial stages. When I said earlier that a lockout was good for Quebec, I mean it to the extent that I think we would have had a problem getting complete support in calling a strike. I think we would have had a very serious problem. When the employers locked them out, it was to them something that should never have happened; I'm talking now about the employees. It just solidified them. They said, you know, "this employer should not have locked me out." It was more of a personal relationship. Once they locked them out and started to harrass them to come back in again, it really solidified them,as a union.

INTERVIEWER: Hm-hm.

CLARKE: It really did. We did have scabs. And the employers were predicting that Montreal local would break. You know, they just come out and said it. They assured the Ontario employers that in a matter of a week or ten days they'd have all their people back in in Montreal and that would break the union, you know, as far as the solidity of the union was concerned. And they got the shock of their life, 'cause we had 326 members. And at the end of the six months only thirty had gone back in, and thirty or thirty-three of them were in my shop, friends of mine, where Barker, the president, and I worked. And that hurt us more than anything else; it really did. They were all personal friends, you know, and it really hurt us. I mean it hurt me personally.

INTERVIEWER: What kind of strategy did you use in attempting to keep men informed and to maintain this solidarity?

CLARKE: Well, we first of all formed a strike committee as the usual procedure. We formed the picket line, the picket line captains. We had what we called a strike committee that just sat; every morning we met at about 10 o'clock and went over what had happened during the night, what we had done on the picket lines. Where there were weaknesses we tried to zero in on them. We opened a very big room; and as the picket captains would go around, they would say to the fellows, "Well, you know, you've

got nothing to do, stop down." And as they'd come in, we'd yak with them. We'd serve coffee and what have you.

As a matter of fact, it was really something. There was a tavern right across the corner from where we were meeting, and after six months that fellow made enough money that he could renovate his whole tavern. (Laughter). Because it was sort of. . . from coffee come over and have a beer and come back again. But we tried to develop, to start with the committee and try to work from the committee out towards the people in the picket line. If we had a problem in a shop, then we would get the people together, you know, and talk to them about their problems. We'd have people come to us and say they were being pressured. You know, for instance, on one occasion two pressmen came to me and said that they were being pressured to go back in and that the head of their company, who was colonel in the Canadian army at one time, was calling a meeting at an armory. They said, "Now the pressure's on, and they want us to go to the meeting. They're pressuring our wives. Now, the only way we won't go would be if you do something about it." So Bill Dawson, who was the recording secretary for twenty-three years in that local. . .

INTERVIEWER: Dawson or. . .

CLARKE: . . . Dawson, D-A-W-S-O-N. And Raymond Godbout, who was vice-president, and myself, we went and picketed the armory. So that the pressmen would go by, see us there, and say to their wives, "Look, we can't go in there. It's being picketed."

And just one little incident. . . the colonel came out on top of the steps and saw us picketing, and he had this salesman with him who was a bit of a lackey and the salesman would trot down and say, "The Colonel is quite mad that you're picketing an armory." He said, "He wants to talk to you." So I said, "Well, if he wants to talk to us, tell him to come on down. Talk to us." You know. So he trotted back up and he talked to the colonel and come back down again with a message. And finally the colonel came down and said, "You've no right to picket an armory." And I said, "I agree. We have no right to picket an armory. And you have no right to call a meeting to break a strike in an armory. So if you want to complain, I'm intending to write the Army myself that you're using an armory as a strikebreaking place." So he backed off immediately. He couldn't have any part of that. But this Raymond Godbout, who was the vice-president, had worked for this colonel, who said to him, "It was the best day of my life that I fired you." And Raymond said, "It was a better day for me! (laughter) I'm out of it, and I can at least talk to you on a level like this."

Another time we were sitting in a bar with a pressman, and one of our international representatives was with me. And we were trying to persuade him, you know, that he should not go back in. And he said, "Well, the only way I will not go back in is if you'll punch me in the eye." And before he said "punch me in the eye" the rep hit him in the eye. And he said, "Fine. Thanks very much." Shook hands and went home. (Laughter) He said, "I don't have to go in now." He had, you know, a big bump on his eye. He didn't have to go in to work. So that saved him from crossing the picket line.

So you know, we kept a. . . those are just little incidents, but we kept a close watch with the people. We sent bulletins out telling them there were no negotiations going on because there really weren't. There was a question that the Montreal employers had guaranteed that the Montreal people would break. And, you know, they kept saying, "Any day now, any day now," but the day never came. And they finally had to settle. And they settled for the welfare plan. Put the welfare plan in, and today it's the best welfare plan in Canada.

INTERVIEWER: I think it would be interesting if you would describe some of the makeup of the membership in eastern Canada. Are they mostly English people, or are they a mixture, or. . ?

CLARKE: Well, the eastern group that I speak of is composed of the Toronto local, Hamilton local, London local, Ottawa local, Montreal local. That's what we call our eastern Canadian group. When you're talking Ontario, it's 99 percent English. When you talk Quebec, the Montreal local, when I was president, it was right 50-50. This would have been from 1949 to 1957. When I handed it over to Bob Edison, it was about 50-50. Today it's about 80 percent French, 85 percent French and the balance English. Because, you know, the French people have brought their families into it, and gradually there are more and more French-speaking people in the Montreal unit--because, you know, of the nationalistic trend toward their own language, too. They are bringing their people into the industry more than they did before. There was English employers primarily, and we had about half and half; but that's switched. Still, most of them are English employers, but the membership of the Montreal local was well within that range.

INTERVIEWER: Was there a struggle to kind of open up apprenticeship opportunities to French-speaking people in Montreal?

CLARKE: No. No. No. Nothing of that nature. It seemed to be automatic, in that, you know. . . like for instance there's a family of Petit's in the Montreal local. At one time there were nine of them.

INTERVIEWER: How do you spell Petit?

CLARKE: P-E-T-I-T. Small, it means in English. Well, at one time there were nine of them in the industry--three brothers and six children of the three brothers. So that, you know, they were bringing their families in. And that's how it started to develop more and more French speaking. There's always a pun on that one. If we'd say in the International that 'Petit' was leading the industry, we always had to explain as to the name, the number, what have you, because they'd probably pick out the wrong guy. (Laughter) Similarity in names is predominant in Quebec, very much so. We'll have rafts of Petits, Morins, you know, and the odd names that they have. One was Telisphore Petit.

INTERVIEWER: Telisphore?

CLARKE: Telisphore. Petit was one of the fathers, you know. Telisphore. We had another member whose name was Tousaints Beaudouin. That means "All Saints" (Laughter) in English. He was born on All Saints Day so the family gave him "All Saints." Another one was called Onzieme, and this was the craziest one because he was the eleventh child, so they named him eleven. (Laughter) Simple!

INTERVIEWER: If you had eleven, you'd be running out of ideas!

CLARKE: But the makeup would be about that percentage. But the Quebec local. . . Montreal local is becoming more and more French. Our Quebec local is 100 percent French. 100 percent French. There are no English-speaking. . .I don't mean. . . English background. They speak English, but there are no English families in the city of Quebec. They're all French.

INTERVIEWER: How long did you have to be in the strike before you could get the Canadian Lithographers Association into any kind of meaningful negotiations?

CLARKE: Well, as I said, they sort of sculled it along thinking that the Montreal locals would break. That seemed to hold it off for quite a while. There really weren't any meaningful meetings for a long period of time. I would guess that they started to get them going back into it sometime around--I'm just thinking back--probably October, November before they started to get really serious about it. It started the beginning of July and terminated on the 5th of December. The agreement was reached on the 5th; we took it to our membership on the 6th; and they went back to work on the 7th. So that I would assume. . . . I started to get into the negotiations in November because our president was incapacitated by that time. He had just been moved right out, completely. The funny thing about the Montreal local was that we had the strike, and we decided during the strike that the local should have a full-time officer. It seems ridiculous in the face of it. Here we were fighting for our lives; we had no money. . . .

INTERVIEWER: Were you paying strike benefits?

CLARKE: Yes. We were paying. . . we were having international strike benefits. At the time it was $40 a week. But through the other unions, other locals of the International, we were able to add $10 and $15 a week to that. Chicago was tremendous. They just kept pouring money into that to help us. The American locals, we wouldn't have been able to survive without the American locals. And what we did, we developed a central fund where all the money came in from all the other locals. And from that we would divide it. If we had--I forget the exact number--well over a thousand people say roughly, and we had $10,000, we would divide so much per man. The Montreal local started the strike with probably fifteen to sixteen thousand dollars, which in '49 was not too bad, you know; but by the time we got into the strike, that went very fast. By the time we finished the strike, we had no money. We owed the International about $15,000 in per capita. We had had a membership of about 326, and we were down to less than 300. And we'd blandly sit down and say, "Let's have a full-time officer." (Laughter) And we did it!

INTERVIEWER: How did you do it?

CLARKE: Well, we did it. What we did was we decided, and we had an election during the strike. They asked me to run for the job, and I knew very well that my job back where I worked was in jeopardy. There was no question of it because I had led the strike. I had picketed the place. I had been antagonistic toward the em-

ployers, so much so that I was persona non grata, believe me. And I knew that my job was in jeopardy, not that that's what I made my decision on; but they were pressuring me to become the president. And we did have an election. Another chap decided to run against me, and. . . . well I shouldn't say we had an election because he withdrew. So then that made my position that I could become president. But there was a matter of about $75 settlement for us to go back to work, and that was only contingent on the fact that we would report in. So what we did was--I wanted to get that 70 odd bucks--so I went back in to talk to the company, knowing that they weren't interested in hiring me at all because there was a question of employment of some people. Most of our people got back right away. So in the interview they brought a stenographer in, and I said, "I'm not speaking in front of a stenographer because you'll edit it and you'll try to say I said things that I hadn't really said." So they let her go, and then they said to me, "Are you prepared to come back to work tomorrow?" And I said, "Yes." They said, "You're president of the local." I said, "No." I wasn't, you know. It was a thin line. I wasn't president until the next day. So I got my money from them, and then I became president. We still had no money. I had to wait for the first shop delegate to bring in the dues from the members to get my wages. That's how we started. We didn't have a cent. At the end of the strike we had under 300 members, and by December 31, 1956, we had 650 members in the city. We had paid our debts to the International, and we had over $40,000 in the bank when I turned it over to Bob Edison in 1957.

INTERVIEWER: Oh, boy!

CLARKE: So it was a switch. It was. . . not talking of myself as being president, but it was a good move on the part of the local. . .

INTERVIEWER: Prior to your being president you had been treasurer?

CLARKE: Treasurer.

INTERVIEWER: Treasurer. Well, how was settlement finally made with respect to parity with the United States and with respect to the health and welfare program? What kind of settlement did you get?

CLARKE: The settlement, primarily the only decent part of the settlement, was the welfare. There was no

question of getting parity with the United States. And at the end of the six months everybody was talking about principles, and the money had sort of been diluted, and frankly the welfare was the key, not the parity. Not the parity with the United States by that time.

INTERVIEWER: Uh-hm.

CLARKE: There was a money settlement, but the welfare came into being at that time in '49.

INTERVIEWER: Now, you had had no welfare up until this time?

CLARKE: No. None whatsoever. None whatsoever.

INTERVIEWER: Okay. Well, that's important to get down because I think Munson gives you a different impression--that there had been one and that it was being improved.

CLARKE: Not at all. It was a fight to get welfare into the benefits of the union of the members. Oh, yes.

INTERVIEWER: The Steelworkers had the same strike in the same year. . .

CLARKE: Uh-huh.

INTERVIEWER: . . . for pension benefits. It was a long strike.

CLARKE: Yeah. The key was the welfare; and once they agreed on the welfare and the setting up of a welfare program straight across, then they started to gear and get the settlement. It wasn't a happy settlement. I had the distinct pleasure of presenting it to about 300 people who were completely divided, and that's a terrible thing. And we had held them out another day to vote on it, not allowed them to go in, which also was a concern to the ones who wanted to go in by that time. Compared to what we've settled with since, it really wasn't a great settlement.

---

[1] History of the Lithographers Union, Fred C. Munson. The Wertheim Committee on Industrial Relations, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass, 1963

We went through the usual argument, "Who won the war" type of thing. The employers, you know, claimed that they got off with a fairly little settlement, and the unions said, "We won. We got the welfare." So. . . .

INTERVIEWER: It was a Mexican standoff!

CLARKE: Yeah, just about. And I think by the end of six months. . . I've talked often to employers since, and they have said to me on several occasions--the same employers who were involved at the time--that it was the biggest mistake of their lives, that they should never have locked us out; that they should have tried to get back to the bargaining table to settle with us. Because the final settlement was not that much greater than when we went out. In all honesty, you know. You get up and say, "Yeah, we won a wonderful victory." It wasn't quite so. But it was a victory as far as the union was concerned.

INTERVIEWER: Was the Ontario Government Conciliation mechanism involved in attempting to settle this strike?

CLARKE: Yes. They're always involved when there's a strike on. Both Ontario and Quebec were involved in this because in Ontario and Quebec you can't go out on a strike until you've gone through a conciliation service. At that time there used to be an arbitration board, and then the minister would decide whether or not it was necessary even to go to another tribunal. They didn't in this case. And then you have to wait fourteen days before you can take action. So we had gone through all that procedure. But even after that, when the strike is on, they're available to help and will help. So that I would assume--and I'm a little vague as to who would have been involved--but I would assume that probably to get the parties together again the government services were used to get them back to the table, to try to settle this strike.

INTERVIEWER: And A. W. Brown would have been involved at this level?

CLARKE: He was the vice-president.

INTERVIEWER: Yeah.

CLARKE: I was just a lowly treasurer at that time. (Laughter)

INTERVIEWER: Well, one other question that I wanted to ask you because, obviously, when you have a strike of this protracted length and it becomes this kind of life-and-death business, the attitudes of the community become important. What kind of community support from other elements in the labor movement, or just other elements in the community, did you feel that you had?

CLARKE: To be honest about it, we had no support from anybody.

INTERVIEWER: Canadian Labor Congress. . . .

CLARKE: Well, you know, support. They reported in their magazine that the strike was on, you know, but that would be about it. Other unions constantly crossed our picket lines. There was no question of any support from other unions in the graphic arts or anywhere else. . . .

INTERVIEWER: The Pressmen didn't support you, or. . .

CLARKE: No, not at all, not at all. And as far as. . . we used to picket and have signs, and I guess maybe for about the first month maybe two write-ups in the newspaper and that petered out. Public support was negligible. So we were on our own. We fought the whole thing on our own.

The only time we got a lot of publicity was that on one occasion one of the scabs was crossing the square and he got a black eye. . . we always said he walked into a tree. It had the same effect. And the employers put out $1,000 reward for information leading to the arrest of anybody who had hit this scab. So then we got a lot of publicity. Then we immediately became union goons beating up people, and he walked into a tree! You know, it was dark and he walked into a tree. I think that $1,000 reward is still outstanding. (Laughter) I've never heard of it being collected, of course. I hope not. I think it's still outstanding. The $1,000. That received a lot of publicity. Immediately a thing like that. . .

INTERVIEWER: Well, what about the situation with respect to the development of lithographic processes at this particular time? It looks to me as if, if you were able to make it on your own, it was partly because in Canada, as in the United States right in this period of time, there was a tremendous increase in reliance on offset press. I mean this was where the printing industry was really developing.

CLARKE: It was just timely that the movement was towards offset and has developed tremendously since in that area. That was sort of the switchover around that particular time. That, and the early '50's, there was a tremendous growth in the offset industry so that the employers were glad to get us back and glad to improve and get the industry going back again on good grounds, you know. I think it was a salvation. If we had been in the reversal of it, if we had been in the letterpress end of it, we might still be on the street. You know, the anxiety was to get it settled because they were losing the potential growth of the industry.

INTERVIEWER: In a growing market.

CLARKE: Yeah. Very much so. Since that time that industry has grown tremendously. For instance, the Montreal members now. . . at the time, in 1949, we had just a little over 300; it's now around 1,600. And they're sitting with $500,000 in there--in the bank account--as compared to us struggling to get something going even to pay the president's wages. Yeah, so there's a vast difference in that industry. Toronto at the time probably had about 500-600 members, somewhere in that area. Now it's close to the two-thousand mark.

INTERVIEWER: Yes.

CLARKE: It shows that growth is there. The industry has grown tremendously.

INTERVIEWER: Right. Well, why don't you describe the setup in Canada, particularly as opposed to the setup in the United States--the difference in the way it's organized, negotiating the area-wide geographical contract.

CLARKE: Well, I would think this started just a bit prior to the '49 deal 'cause we were then working on a common contract in the litho industry. The negotiations with the Canadian Lithographers Association covers all Ontario--and I think I said this before--all Ontario, Quebec, and a few shops in the Maritimes. So when we sit down to negotiate a contract, we're negotiating for 80 percent of the lithographic industry because the Toronto area produces just over 50 percent of all printed material in Canada and Montreal about 30 percent. So we're talking about 80 percent of the printed material tied into those two major provinces. We negotiate one contract covering them completely. That means that the conditions, as far as we are concerned, as applies to management, are identical whether the plant's in Montreal, Toronto, Halifax, Paris, Ottawa, what have you. And we negotiate with the Employer's Association who represent companies in all those areas. Once we negotiate that contract, then we move that same condition into the independent shops. So that the whole industry is tied to identical conditions, wage-wise, contract-wise. We negotiated the pension plan in 1953 which was completely portable in that a person could move from one city to another. As a matter of fact, all of our fringe benefits are completely portable. So what we're talking about really is one large local covering eastern Canada.

INTERVIEWER: How was that established?

CLARKE: Well, this came a little bit before my time. It was established by the locals coordinating their negotiations. What we do now. . . what we are trying to do in the States, we. . . they sat down, because I was not involved in it, but they sat down and said, "Now, if we're ever going to get our conditions the same, we have to make our proposals the same." So that's what they did. They developed a common set of proposals and then went into Toronto, went into Montreal, went into Hamilton and presented the employers in those cities with identical proposals.

INTERVIEWER: So you were way in advance of the IUD?

CLARKE: Oh, yes. Very much so and very much in advance of what we are doing in our union here in the States. What they're trying to do now is similar to what we did back in the early forties, and we're doing that now with the Bookbinders immediately. So we're moving into the same area with them. Once the employers realized that we were doing that, then they started to get together. And actually it was received very well by the employers, talking with people who were involved at the time.

INTERVIEWER: It rationalizes their industry.

CLARKE: Yeah. And what it does to them is that they know that, if they're competing with a firm in another city, they know at least that their labor costs are identical. They know they are not having a job done on them by some fellow undercutting them on labor costs. So it depends then on quality, productivity, service and whatever profit margin they want to take on the thing.

INTERVIEWER: But at least it's not coming out of the hides of the men who work in the plant.

CLARKE: Correct. Yeah. And what has been beautiful for us is that we can move people anywhere at all because they know they walk from a plant in Montreal and they go 400 miles away and they don't lose one hour of benefits.

INTERVIEWER: Are your people pretty mobile? Do they tend. . .

CLARKE: Yes, they do.

INTERVIEWER: . . . . to move around a lot?

CLARKE: Yes, they do. Because of that. We have a constant. . . I don't mean, you know, people moving every day, but we'll have people move all over. The flow of people between Montreal and Toronto and Hamilton. . . . because we do the same system internationally. Where there are job openings they come into my office in Montreal, and I send it out to the Canadian locals, and we generally fill it with somebody who wants to move.

INTERVIEWER: Was there any problem with integrating the photo-engravers at the time of the merger into this system?

CLARKE: Yeah. Because, we had the history of the common approach to things; the Photoengravers did not. As a matter of fact, when I was president of the Montreal local, I had gone in and met with

the Board of Photoengravers in Montreal to talk about pensions because we were very much involved in pensions. And I said to them, "Well, what do they have in Toronto?" And they said, "We don't know." I said, "Well, do you have a copy of their contract?" They said, "No." There was no inter-relationship at all between the locals, and that was in the fifties.

When we merged in 1964, we started to move immediately. And what we do to establish our proposals is that we have the locals go to meetings and then send them into my office and then I sort of list them together. And then we go to a common meeting of the negotiating committees of all the locals, and we knock out the unnecessary things like, you know, this fellow wants a holiday because the moon is going to be in a certain spot, you know, that sort of thing. We'll throw that stuff out and then get common proposals. So then to do that we had to also start including the Engravers into these meetings so that they would understand our working. And they adapted pretty fast. In meetings we're going to hold in August of this year, we will be putting identical proposals into the litho and into the commercial engraving. We have common termination dates; we'll put the identical proposals; we'll be dealing with Employers Association who know how to operate; and there is. . . probably the only difference now in engraving plans and litho plans. . . contracts, would be about a couple dollars a week. Gravure are way out, but the commercial engraving are identical. As a matter of fact, we've approached the employers twice to have common negotiations, covering all litho and engraving.

INTERVIEWER: What about bargaining about some kind of local issue? Is that. . .

CLARKE: Well, this isn't the problem that we have. The local issues generally involve the same sort of issue in another city because they're doing identical work. If it's a shop grievance, that's something different. But a local issue doesn't seem to generate at all because they're accustomed to knowing that it's got to fit into the pattern of the overall picture. We don't really run into local issues. Since 1949 we've only had three grievances with the Employers Association that have gone to arbitration.

INTERVIEWER: Oh my!

CLARKE: We won two and lost one. You know. . .

INTERVIEWER: That's incredible!

CLARKE: It sounds incredible, but it's so. It's so. We've only really had three issues to go to arbitration. It just seems to be a pattern. We've often had disputes, you know, and we have the setup within the contract--this is some sort of rambling because I'm getting around to different things--but the setup within the contract is that, first of all, because it covers five locals, if there's a problem within the local or a shop, it goes to a local committee; if they can't resolve it, then it goes to what we call an executive labor management committee; and we generally resolve it at that level. That's the five presidents and myself will sit down with the committee of the employers. And we generally, so far, have been quite successful.

INTERVIEWER: Well, that's a real testimonial to the working. . .

CLARKE: To the working of the ideal of the thing.

INTERVIEWER: . . . .working. . .

CLARKE: So that I'm very confident by next year, this coming contract at the end of this year, it'll be one set of negotiations covering litho and commercial engraving.

INTERVIEWER: Well, now, in 1957 you were appointed International Representative?

CLARKE: Hm-hm.

INTERVIEWER: Appointed by whom?

CLARKE: By the International. Recommended by A. W. Brown. He did a con job on me, really. (Laughter) And did one on May, too. I really laughed at that. We were just talking. . .

INTERVIEWER: Your wife?

CLARKE: Yeah, my wife. He came in and sat down with us, and I admire the man greatly. But he's very. . . he started talking about the problems of the job. You know, he agreed and said I'd be away,

but then when I was in Montreal, I'd be home and I'd have more time at home. May's still waiting for that time at home! (Laughter) Some sixteen years later she's waiting for the time at home, and it hasn't really come about. But I had worked with Art for a period of a year. As president of the Local, I had worked with Art. As a matter of fact, he had offered to recommend me in 1953, and I refused because I felt that I didn't have enough experience. I had only been president for about two or three years. I had been on the Council for two years and got off because, frankly, I thought the International Council in the two years that I was on was as useless as could be.

INTERVIEWER: Why?

CLARKE: Because it wasn't resolving or developing any policies--resolving any problems or developing any policies at all. I recall very vividly sitting down as a councillor, and they argued for two days whether or not they should issue a withdrawal card to a man from Syracuse to Rochester. All the decisions in those days were being made away from the Council. Council was not a policy-making apparatus of this union in those years. There were things involved in it. John Blackburn was the president, but the decisions were not made at the Council. And I felt it was a waste of time. And I got off it. I didn't run for it the next term. I didn't run for it in '53 because I felt the time away from my local was being spent sitting and listening and to things that could have been resolved by administrative setup.

INTERVIEWER: Yeah.

CLARKE: The real serious problems of the union in those days were being resolved by a few people in the background, not by the Council. So I got off. Didn't want any part of that. I had enough problems developing in my local and working in my own local without spending, you know at that time, I guess, it was a week every. . . four times a year. So I just wasn't interested. I didn't run again, so I stayed with my local.

INTERVIEWER: So what was your assignment as International Rep? What sorts of chores did you take on?

CLARKE: Well, I would guess somewhat similar. . . really working with Art, working on the negotiations,

organizing and servicing. That was it. And right across Canada. We did have another rep at the time. Bert Taylor was his name.

INTERVIEWER: Bert what?

CLARKE: Bert Taylor. Yeah. He came out of London. But Bert had a few problems to the extent that he wouldn't fly. So if he went out to Western Canada, he'd take a train. . .

INTERVIEWER: Oh boy.

CLARKE: . . . and so the locals in Western Canada were objecting because they'd have to wait. So I started to get involved out there, as well. And we overlapped. The theory was that Bert had Western Canada, and I had Eastern Canada to service, as far as anything we could do, you know. But it developed that I was servicing right across Canada. I could get out to Winnipeg and back before Bert could get there by train, and we would have the problem resolved and get back again. (Laughter) So it didn't work out.

INTERVIEWER: What sort of problems were they?

CLARKE: Well, negotiating primarily. Strike situations, small shops or individual shops, although we don't have a great number of strikes up our way. Again, welfare, pension, you know, advising as to where we should head, and negotiating and developing materials for it. I sort of go on and say all the problems of a representative. And up our way it's compounded a bit by the size of the territory because you really have to travel tremendously. I average still today about 220 days a year on the road. I travel that. . . .

INTERVIEWER: That's a good bit of the year.

CLARKE: Yeah. I got a plaque the other day for flying a million miles. (Laughter) That with a $1.65 will get you a $1.65 meal.

INTERVIEWER: Now, when did you become vice-president then?

CLARKE: When Art Brown retired. He retired officially through the Montreal convention in 1963. I was nominated to take his place and took office in February, 1964.

INTERVIEWER: Did you have any opposition for the job?

CLARKE: I've never had opposition in any position I've ever run for.

INTERVIEWER: Well, that's the way to run!

CLARKE: Yeah. Doesn't give you any problems. (Laughter) I find in talking with people that have had opposition, I sort of feel that maybe I haven't had the opportunity of fighting somebody for a job. But I never have. I've never, since I've joined the labor movement--you know, sincerely joined it--have had opposition for a position. I was nominated by every Canadian local at the Montreal convention. Every Canadian local got up and nominated or seconded my nomination, and I've never had oppositon since.

INTERVIEWER: How often did you meet in convention with the Canadian group?

CLARKE: Group?

INTERVIEWER: Yes.

CLARKE: Well, this advisory group that I keep referring to, we meet almost constantly because we meet. ... every time there's a joint trustee's meeting on pension, we'll come in the day before and we'll talk together about the problems or the education on the S.U.B. or the welfare or any of those areas, you know, we're together all the time. But in addition to that, I call a meeting of all the presidents of the Canadian locals in off-convention year. They come in from right across Canada and sit down for two days, and we talk about the Canadian problems. At the convention we have a luncheon meeting of all the Canadian delegates to discuss Canadian problems.

We have the International office in Montreal, and two of the representatives work out of there with me, which is unique, different than in the States. They actually work in my office; Len Paquette and Vince Mailloux of the Bookbinders. They're in my office, which is unique because our reps in the States work from their homes. We have that as a basis of our operation. Everything is serviced through that office in Canada. All the contracts come through there with my recommendation. They come in there, and Ken generally accepts my recommendations on the contract. So we gear things through that office. We have the presidents meet in off-convention years to define policy within the International structure as it pertains to Canada. So things are different there. It's another country.

The eastern group meets constantly. I go out to Vancouver. I'll be out in Vancouver in two weeks' time to meet with them on problems in that area. I go through Western Canada. So we keep talking with our people to make sure that we know what is needed and what we can give to them, as far as the operations are concerned.

INTERVIEWER: Yeah. That's obviously so important.

CLARKE: Yeah.

INTERVIEWER: It's clearly a factor in keeping everybody rolling in the same direction. . .

CLARKE: Hm-hm.

INTERVIEWER: . . . in that they feel that they've been a part. . .

CLARKE: Right.

INTERVIEWER: . . . of. . .

CLARKE: . . . and what we do, too, is we have all the joint trustee benefit programs. . . we try to carry them through to the other areas. For instance, our pension plan goes right across Canada. We have members in Winnepeg, in Edmonton, Calgary; the only place we don't have is Vancouver, and they have their own pension program. That's the Lithographer's Pension Plan. We

have the early retirement now right across Canada. The administration of the Canadian setup is in my office in Montreal.

So that we keep them tied together, not only in meetings but also in the servicing of them. Our procedure on negotiations, for instance, is that we will work with the locals on the proposals. Generally there will be a representative tied in with the negotiations. There are very few negotiations going on in Canada that the International is not represented at the bargaining table, and it has an effect on the employers. If the rep is unsuccessful, then I move in on it to see if I can settle it. So that's our procedure right across Canada, not just eastern Canada, right across Canada. In eastern Canada the large negotiations I chair right from the beginning.

INTERVIEWER: Well, what about these various activities of the Canadian Graphic Arts Union? For example, you had mentioned that you were chairman of the Educational Executive Board. What kind of education programs have you developed? Were they tied in with the International?

CLARKE: This pertains to the schooling. Yeah. The Education program of the International--there again we operate differently. It keeps coming through that we do things differently. Negotiating with the association, we negotiated originally fifty cents a week per employee. Now, we put that into a common pool, and from that we started to move out to develop the schools. Now, we have the structure of the Executive Board of what we call the CLI, Canadian Lithographic Institute; that's the five presidents, myself, and six employers. We're the ones who run the educational program in eastern Canada. Then we have local boards in each city composed of the local people and local employers.

INTERVIEWER: In each city where you have a school?

CLARKE: Yeah. In each city where we have a school. So they're the local joint administrative boards. They actually run their own school. But all the money is handled through the central fund. So we have a school in Toronto; we have a school in Montreal. . .

INTERVIEWER: . . . coming through the educational board. . .

CLARKE: Well, same system as we have here in the States where we have schools in the cities. But where the difference is in Canada is that. . . for instance, Philadelphia has a school, has the employers, the unions; they run the school for Philadelphia alone. Well, we run schools in six cities with the same Board, but then we had to get the other middle board to actually run the school. But they have no control over the finances. They have to submit their budgets to the Executive Board; and if we approve their budgets, then they can spend that money. There's a control on the amount of money. . .

INTERVIEWER: So there's a greater amount of centralized control?

CLARKE: Right. Centralized control and answerable to this overall group. That generates now somewhere around $200,000 a year.

INTERVIEWER: Are the employers represented on that group?

CLARKE: On the Executive Board and on the local administrative boards that actually run the school. So we take, for instance, if we took Philadelphia, Washington and Baltimore and said, "Okay, you have schools. But then you have to answer to this Board that controls all those schools." That's about the picture as far as Canada goes. Winnipeg has now asked to come into it as well. But we have them in London, Ottawa, Toronto, Montreal, Quebec City. We have actual, physical schools, running courses. We are now graduating over 300 apprentices a year, coming out of those schools. That's the educational program.

INTERVIEWER: Now, in Canada do you have the same situation as in the United States where there's an increasing number of journeymen in the schools rather than apprentices?

CLARKE: Well, we have it in a couple of areas. We ran out of apprentices very fast in London, because it's a small local--265 members--so they have a school. So what we're doing there is giving journeymen courses. We're moving, not so much in Toronto, we're still. . . quite a number of apprentices in Toronto because of the large size of the local, but they are running journeymen courses and upgrading them. We would be running almost similar programs there. Where we are just starting a school. . .

INTERVIEWER: So you have the same kinds of pressures to upgrade. . .

CLARKE: Oh, yes.

INTERVIEWER: . . . people to respond to the technological changes. . .

CLARKE: As a matter of fact, we're running a special course in our Toronto school this summer for about five pressmen who have never run anything bigger than a 17 x 22. They're good, good, skilled men, but they've never worked on bigger equipment, so we're giving them a special crash course sort of thing to upgrade them for larger equipment 'cause we have two-color and large equipment in the school.

INTERVIEWER: Do you have four-color in the school?

CLARKE: No. No, we don't. The value of the equipment in our Toronto school now runs about $300,000. All donated. We don't buy anything. I say we don't, we might purchase the supplies, but we don't buy any equipment. We get it all donated. So it's similar. It's within the International guidelines as far as running the schools and part of the same setup. It's just a little unique in that we centralize the control of it. That's about that as far as education is concerned.

INTERVIEWER: Well, as you moved into the activities with the International and began to be involved in these discussions with respect to merger of the various unions in the graphic arts, what was your feeling about that, particularly in terms of. . . it's obvious you didn't have too good relations with the Pressmen back home. . .

CLARKE: Quite obvious!! (chuckling)

INTERVIEWER: . . . and probably not very much contact with the Photoengravers either.

CLARKE: Well, prior to the merger with the Photoengravers, that's correct. I guess, I think I was invited

to one convention they had in Montreal, and I came out wondering what a photoengraver was. I really didn't know much about it because they weren't in the shop I was in. We have our trade shops. They knew the photoengravers and frankly it was a problem in the merger then because I don't think they liked the Photoengravers too much. And I think the Photoengravers today would admit that probably they were a little bit obnoxious in those days. They were really highly skilled--they are still highly skilled, of course--but their industry has changed and the need of them isn't as great. It was much greater going back to, let's say, the fifties or early sixties. So that the merger with the Engravers really didn't create any great ripple. It really didn't. The Canadian people were solidly behind it. In the merger I think only one Canadian local on the litho side voted against it, and that was like a split vote, almost. So that all locals in Canada voted in favor of merger with the Photoengravers.

Now, why did they vote in favor of the Photoengravers? I would think simply because we were recommending it. The International was recommending it as a good thing. The fellows in the trade shops were concerned because they could see the knocking down of the walls between the engravers and themselves, and they were concerned about the engravers doing their jobs. And they raised these questions.

INTERVIEWER: And what about Pressmen doing their jobs? I mean there was some discussion in the early sixties about merger with the Stereotypers and with the Pressmen. . .

CLARKE: And the Pressmen as well. Well, that didn't seem to concern our people that the Printing Pressmen were doing their jobs. What concerned our people with the Printing Pressmen was the horrible contracts that they had, to the extent that if a man was operating the same piece of equipment--and it still exists today in our major areas--it would be as much as a dollar an hour difference, running the same piece of equipment. That was what our people were concerned with. And we didn't get a great deal of objections from our pressmen because, again, what we're saying was, if we could get to the bargaining table representing these people, we would soon close that gap between their operation costs and our contract shops. And we didn't get a great deal of resistance to merger with the Printing Pressmen.

INTERVIEWER: Did you see an organizing problem, though, with respect to the fact that an employer would prefer to sign a contract with the Pressmen's Union rather than with the ALA prior to merger?

CLARKE: Oh, yeah. Still do, still do. We lost a web press out in Winnipeg simply because they put the Printing Pressmen on, signed a sweetheart contract with them at $1.50 an hour less than what we were asking for the web press. And we went through various boards, and they were able to hold. They still have that press because. . . they still do. We still have that problem. The same problems exist today that existed when we were talking with the Printing Pressmen before. To gain the contracts primarily. . .

INTERVIEWER: What about leadership of the Pressmen in Canada? Are they. . . ?

CLARKE: I'd be sued for defamation of character if I. . . (laughter) No, the leadership of the Printing Pressmen in Canada has never been good. Never been good. I guess that's a pretty broad statement--"never been good." In my time, anyway. They had a vice-president in Canada that to me did not do his job, did not do his job. I knew him personally, but he did not do his job. He preferred sitting at home and phoning rather than getting in and getting at the core of the problem. So that. . . and I don't believe really that he did his job. So the leadership of the Printing Pressmen in Canada has not been the greatest.

As a matter of fact, as much as I am not happy about ITU operations, I find their leadership much stronger in Canada than what the Printing Pressmen were. They're very strong, as a matter of fact. We have more problems with ITU than we do with the Printing Pressmen. We're generally successful in any operation, where we are, you know, fighting the Printing Pressmen for a particular shop. We're generally successful whereas with ITU, we've taken a hosing a couple of times. I don't understand why, of course. (laughter) I can't imagine anyone wanting to join them and not belong to us! That just doesn't make sense to me. Just not convincing enough in that particular thing. No, I never did think that they [Printing Pressmen] had very good leadership. And it shows through their contracts. They're. . . now today, there are more specialty workers in Canada in the Printing Pressmen's Union than there are printing pressmen.

INTERVIEWER: Right. And specialty workers would be. . . .

CLARKE: The catch-all.

INTERVIEWER: . . .the catch-all, the District 50 of the. . .

CLARKE: Right. Similar to that, and sign horrendous contracts. Really do. But the Canadian vice-president now is a specialty man--Steele from Toronto. He took Bob Brown's place. Bob Brown was the Printing Pressmen's vice-president in Canada. They don't have an office the way we do. They don't have an International office. The vice-president, Brown, used to work out of his home. And I think Steele works out of the office of the specialty workers in Toronto. I've only met him a couple of times.

INTERVIEWER: How do they feel about prospective discussions about merger? Or how did they feel?

CLARKE: The Canadian section were in favor of merger of the Printing Pressmen. I receive this information almost constantly not only from their leadership, but from their membership as well. I think they would want merger and still do. I think they still do. We've never had a problem on a vote in Canada on the basis of merging with any of the organizations within the Graphic Arts people. We adhere to John Connolly's philosophy. It should be one big union. We really do. I think it makes sense. And our leadership has the same approach. If I speak at a meeting, I'll talk on it--on mergers within the Graphic Arts--if a local president speaks, if our reps speak, generally within their talk they'll talk about the success of the merger with the Photoengravers, the success that we see now with the merger with the Bookbinders.

INTERVIEWER: How many additional. . . does the merger with the Bookbinders change your relative membership status, or do you remain about the same? About 13 percent. . .

CLARKE: No. . . No. Actually, prior to the merger, under the LPIU, we ran around 11 or 11-1/2 percent, but we were gaining every year. We were organizing in Canada at the rate of 8 percent a year for the past five years. The industry is only growing just over one percent in employees. But we were organizing. . . now, the figures are not that relative. But at least we were progressing steadily. When we merged in 1964, we had 4,600 members. When we came into the merger with the Photoengravers, we had 6,450 members. So we had increased from there. That gave us about 11 to 12 percent in the International.

The ratio that we use in Canada in the International Union generally should be about ten percent population;

you know, we're ten percent population in the United States. So that same ratio extends that, if you're part of an International Union, you should be about 10 percent of the International. We were better than that. The Bookbinders, on the reverse side of the coin, were only around five percent. Just a little bit over five percent. They actually had 3,800 members in Canada when we merged. So that brought our overall percentage down, whereas we're sitting now with around. . . 10,500 . I'm throwing out some figures, but approximately in that area, of an International membership which some people say is 130 [thousand], some say 120, some. . . so our ratio now is probably about nine percent.

INTERVIEWER: So what I hear you saying is that you have a big organization job to do now in terms of organizing Bookbinders.

CLARKE: Very much so. And a tremendous field to do it in because there's another five percent sitting around there who should have been organized. So that's, you know, over 3,000 people.

We just did a survey to put on that organizer in the Toronto area, and we have a list now, just in Toronto, of over 5,000 unorganized people in the Graphic Arts. I can truthfully say that out of that 5,000, three thousand are bookbinders. But we already are moving in the area of picking them up. In Hamilton we picked up a bindery of 25 people in one of our organized shops. The lithos organized; we just picked up the twenty-five people, and we're negotiating for them under the litho contract. We didn't put them into the bindery; we put them into the litho. We're doing the same in Montreal; they're joint organizing in Montreal. They're picking up shops; they're working on the thing. So I think we've got a greater potential on a ratio than they have in the States.

INTERVIEWER: Yeah.

CLARKE: And we get annoyed if they're less than ten percent. So our people are all mad. (Laughter) They're gonna organize a little bit. I use incentives. I keep telling, you know, I give them these figures at every one of our conferences. I show them the relative position of all Canadian locals from the largest to the smallest. I show them what they grew between certain periods of time. We keep these statistics up all the time. And then I do sort of. . . put it on a competitive basis; you know. I say, "Ottawa picked up 200, but you only picked up 50." That sort of thing. We try to develop some incentives. And what they're doing

subconsciously is they're trying to move up in the level of the setup. So we sort of keep them geared a little bit to do some organizing. And then we'll help them on their organizing; the International reps will help them when they get into a particularly difficult organizing drive. So we do move in and help them on that.

So honestly there is a greater potential, much greater potential of organizing for us, and we're already moving in the merger with the Bookbinders toward common proposals. I mentioned this briefly a few minutes ago that we had a meeting on February 10th and 11th of the Toronto Bookbinders local, Ottawa, Montreal, London; and we established a common set of proposals. So we know the employers are expecting something from us and we don't want to disappoint them (Laughter) So they're going in with the same proposals in Toronto, Montreal, Ottawa, London in the next set of negotiations. And I've already told the employers that they're going to be receiving this. Quite similar to the litho contract, binder contract. Again, trying to establish a common termination date, so that we'll be able to move in within two or three contracts to an industrial contract covering the whole shop.

INTERVIEWER: Has the IUD approached you for. . . have you been active in the IUD in sharing this experience with how you got these common termination dates and so forth?

CLARKE: No, not to my knowledge. I've never been asked about it.

INTERVIEWER: Seems to me they need you! (laughter)

CLARKE: We've had a little bit of a problem on occasion in that they forget that other country is sitting up there. They really do. That's why we're having a problem on the Burke-Hartke Bill. They've forgotten completely.

INTERVIEWER: IUD has gone completely gung-ho for Burke-Hartke.

CLARKE: Yeah. And you know, Goldfinger says we don't understand the bill; there's really nothing in there to hurt Canada. Well, I think Goldfinger should read the bill again.

INTERVIEWER: You mean Matt Goldfinger?

CLARKE: Yeah. Matt Goldfinger of the AFL-CIO. Yeah, he's come out with those statements that the Canadian labor movement doesn't understand the bill. We understand it too well. That's the problem, you know. CLA have done a terrific research on it; they've dissected the bill. No matter what happens. . .unless there's exemption for Canada, which isn't possible under GATT really. . .

INTERVIEWER: Under what?

CLARKE: GATT. I'll have to get the official name of it. That's the agreement on tariff restrictions between all countries. There's an official name of it. G-A-T-T. Tariff. Something to do with tariff. But under that, if you come out with a tariff, you can't exempt a country.

INTERVIEWER: Right.

CLARKE: And Goldfinger seems to imply that they will do something about the bill. But nothing has been done about the bill yet to exempt Canada, which they can't do even if they wanted to. So the only other area they'd be able to do is if the bill is modified where it would be selective to the extent that they would only put a tariff on a certain product, you know, that sort of thing.

INTERVIEWER: That wouldn't hurt Canada very much. . . .

CLARKE: That wouldn't hurt Canada a great deal. And I don't, you know. . .

INTERVIEWER: That's hard to do in view of the vigor of the Japanese getting into all areas at once.

CLARKE: That's right. How do you select?

INTERVIEWER: Right.

CLARKE: They're into all industries.

INTERVIEWER: Well, I would suspect, Dick, that you have played a role in Ken Brown's rise to prominence in the International. Is that the proper suspicion on my part? (Laughter)

CLARKE: Well, I don't know what sort of a role. Ken's and my relationship goes back to when Ken was vice-president of the Toronto local and prior to that, even, through his father. Art and I have been friends since '49; that would be the best time to sort of spell it out. I worked with Ken when he was president of Toronto and I was president of Montreal. We did negotiations together. We were on the same negotiating team, you know, that met with the employers. I can tell you honestly that any opportunity that I've ever had to extol the wonders of Ken Brown--and this isn't for political reasons--I've done it purposely because I think he's a wonderful guy. And we've worked well together. Ken is an idea man. He develops ideas, projects, and I think that's tremendous in an organization like this.

I really got a real bang out of the fact that when Ken was assistant to the president, at that time our relations, like with Swayduck, using Swayduck at that time and pretty strong control through. . . I don't know what it means but, you know, the control was there. I remember people saying to me after Ken was assistant for a while, that he was Swayduck's boy, and I laughed.

INTERVIEWER: Yeah.

CLARKE: Because I knew Ken well enough he's not anybody's boy. And I said, "Just give him the time." It proved true. I don't hide it in any way; I think Ken has been one of the best things that's happened to this union. I say that sincerely because I think it's true. I enjoy working with him. He's a fellow that's worked hard all of his life, and I admire him. Well, I don't know, you know. To talk of the development of Ken I don't think I had any part in the development of Ken. He developed himself, quite readily. But I know, I worked with him. I worked with him over the years.

INTERVIEWER: Have you seen him grow over the years?

CLARKE: Oh, yes. Very much so. I can tell you when he became. . . the first time he became president of

the Toronto local, I got a number of phone calls from Ken. . . you know. "How do we do this? What should we do?" You know, he was learning at that time. If he starts listening to these tapes sometime, he'll probably get a laugh out of it. I don't know whether he realized it, but I got the impression when he first became president of Toronto, that he purposely avoided asking his father advice on things. But he never hesitated to ask me because I had been president for a while and I had gone through a pretty rough session as president. And at that time I was very prominent in the operations of the eastern Canadian group. So I'd get a phone call occasionally from him on certain problems that I know that if he had asked his dad, he would have gotten an answer. But I don't think he'd go to his dad at that time.

INTERVIEWER: If he had asked his dad, he would have gotten the same answer.

CLARKE: The same answer or maybe a better one, I don't know. But I think there was sort of something involved within him, that he was hesitant to go to his father on a thing like that.

INTERVIEWER: He wanted to be his own man.

CLARKE: Yeah. And I worked with Ken for quite a period of time. We don't always agree on things. That's quite so, but we generally work them out. If we have problems, we can work them out. And I'd never hesitate to put on tape or anywhere else that I'm an advocate of Ken Brown. I guess it's obvious. People know that. But I don't think I've lost my own approach to things because of that. I think as president of this union, I think he's been great.

INTERVIEWER: Well, what about the workings of the Finance Council? Just exactly what is the area that the Finance Council is involved with?

CLARKE: The committee? Like my work as far as the Finance Committee is concerned? Well, I think you have to start at the convention. That's the beginning of it to the extent that the Finance Committee recommends budgets for the operation of this union. I'm not certain, prior to my being involved in it, as to what type of budgeting system they did. When I became chairman of the Finance Committee.. .

INTERVIEWER: Which was when?

CLARKE: . . . let's see, I'll have to check on that. I became vice-president in '64, so it would have been at the next convention, I would guess, because I've been chairman of the Finance Committee ever since I've been vice-president. So I would assume that it would have been at the first convention right after, and I've been ever since. I've worked with the local. . . with the International financial officers to develop the budget and with the accountants so we would have something to go by. It must have been that because I have all the documents right from the first budget that I worked on right through until now. What we would do as a Finance Committee, we would develop a budget for the operation and bring it to the Convention for approval and then the Finance Committee of the Council would check at every council meeting as to whether or not we are living within the budget; and if we're not, then where are we moving out from it, and then try to zero in on that to see if we can't control it.

INTERVIEWER: Do the other committees submit to the Finance Council suggestions as to what share of the pie they feel they ought to have?

CLARKE: Well, if they have any projects going; you know, if they have projects going. For instance, the subsidy program, they will submit it to the Council for approval. But they would consult with the budget. . . Finance Committee as to whether or not that amount of money is available within the monies that are there. Now, you know, the budget is not an end-all. It is a guide as to how the International should be operating, and it's been an excellent guide over the years. We've kept fairly well within the budget over the years.

We've gone out of it occasionally, particularly when we come into a merger. You can't predict the cost of a merger. You know, the material that has to be done, the meetings that have to be held--you can't anticipate that at all. So in a year that we were talking merger, you will find that our budget has been pushed out of line a bit. But outside of that it's kept fairly well in line. And then a constant check is made at each Council meeting by the Finance Committee of the Council. We met the day before yesterday, and we'll be reporting at this Council meeting recommendations for the termination of the defense assessment, for instance. Although we don't <u>have</u> to do it--the Constitution says it will come off automatically--we're recommending a date for it to come off.

INTERVIEWER: I see.

CLARKE: So that the Council, then, is the final authority and suggests the date it will come off. So that it's a committee that budgets and watches and tries to keep the International within the guidelines.

INTERVIEWER: How large a committee is it?

CLARKE: On the Council, it's eight people. At the convention, it runs about twenty-five. I don't know how many will be on it at the next convention because. . .

INTERVIEWER: Of the merger.

CLARKE: . . . of the merger, because of the double number of delegates coming in. It's a mixed group now. There are Bookbinders on it now because of the merger.

INTERVIEWER: Well, one thing that strikes me as somewhat curious is that you, coming out of the Lithographers, find yourself also chairman of the Photoengravers' Pension Plan.

CLARKE: Well, Secretary of it.

INTERVIEWER: I see. Secretary. . .

CLARKE: Secretary of it. Well, (Laughter) you'll laugh a little bit about this one. I've been Secretary since the first committee was appointed, and Ken appointed me on that committee primarily because of my background in pension. I was the first chairman of the Canadian Lithographers Plan in 1953. I negotiated that pension plan and was chairman of that for ten years. I'm still a member of the Board but not chairman any more because it was just too much. So I had a background in pension. I was also concerned and involved in the development of the early retirement at that time, around the same time, because we had started prior to '66 working

on that. And Ken asked me to sit on that Pension Committee. I think primarily because of my experience. After I had been on it a while, I asked him to take me off because looking at the pension program it had no way to go. It just couldn't go anywhere, so that. . .

INTERVIEWER: Why?

CLARKE: Well, you know, he asked me to sit on it, but that pension was going nowhere. It was. . . by 1980 there wouldn't have been any money left in it.

INTERVIEWER: Because of the age of the Photoengravers?

CLARKE: Because of the plan itself. The plan was an insured plan. The Photoengravers have had, I think, bad actuary advice from the actuaries. They also, as trade unionists, have developed a tremendous program using their hearts and not using their heads because of lack of experience in pension programs. You know, maybe they might take exception to that. I don't know but it's so. Because the plan developed where they told something like 1,500 people that if they paid $120, they'd start drawing $30 a month pension from it. So they all paid it and started to draw it. Some of those people, still, some of those people, 15 years later, are still drawing. . .not $30, but drawing money from it. So the whole plan had to be revamped.

So I think Ken originally put me on the Pension Committee because of my pension experience and then kept me on the Pension Committee through the throes and the agonies of moving the plan. . .completely changing the plan, moving it out from the insured-type of plan that they had into a plan, a sound plan, actuarially. So that it meant a complete renovation of the plan.

INTERVIEWER: Did this create certain kinds of political problems within the Photoengravers that they maybe had second thoughts about merger? (Laughter)

CLARKE: Political problems? I would think it did generate political problems. It depends what political problems mean. I think there were people involved in it who were self-centered, self-interested, who were using it to maintain a political position. And I think that because of that, it did hurt the Photoengravers for a while until the plan was renovated the way the plan is today. Yeah, I

would think there were political motivations and some people holding onto the plan, keeping the plan, not resisting change within the plan. . .

INTERVIEWER: What effect did the non-merged locals. . .what effect did that have on this whole situation? For example, in Philadelphia, where you have non-merged locals but the International is merged. Do they have their own pension plans? How. . . .

CLARKE: Well, not the Engravers. You see, the engraving plan is on a per capita basis. So that every Photoengraver, no matter where he works, merged or unmerged, has to belong to the plan because it's paid through per capita to the International. So, there's no problem involved there.

You know, I'm an advocate of merger. I think those locals should be merged together and try to tie some of these things together. We just put the Bookbinders up our way by tying their welfare plan into the Litho welfare plan, have saved them an increase in premiums. And it can be done by the greater volume of buying. You know, greater purchasing powers is what happens in welfare. But coming back to a situation like Philadelphia or Toronto, where they are not merged, has no effect on their pension program. I would think it would have an effect on welfare where they're buying for a smaller group when they could be in a larger group. It has an effect on the overall operation of the local. I think they all should be merged. No question of that.

INTERVIEWER: Well, Dick, is there anything that we ought to cover? We haven't really talked very much about negotiating, for example, on some of the areas where you're negotiating in metal decorating and some of these areas, which I know are a problem in the States. . .

CLARKE: Yeah, it's a little different approach in the metal decorating. We don't have the same large group to do the negotiating. We form a separate committee from the locals that are involved with metal decorating. That would be Toronto, Hamilton, and Montreal. They are the only three areas we have with the metal decorating. We form a different committee. And I moved out as chairman of those meetings, and Len Paquette, International Rep, has moved in as chairman of the metal decorating. We purposely, over the

years in Canada, have moved the metal decorating ahead of the paper. We've better conditions in the metal decorating than we do in the paper houses.

INTERVIEWER: Why is that?

CLARKE: For several reasons. We know that it's. . .the preparatory part is identical. The press line is different. There's more involved in the press work--a better balancing of the ink to the water because they're working on metal. It's a more difficult job, although I guess people running web presses and sheet presses might not agree.

We also have had pressure from our metal people in that some of their conditions should be different. For instance, they feel that, our metal decorating people feel, that they should have the best of the Litho contract and the best of the steel contract. You know, that's their philosophy. If the balance of the shop has something better, without looking at the overall. . . .for instance, the sabbatical leaves that the Steelworkers have developed, where they get that thirteen weeks. . . .

INTERVIEWER: Thirteen weeks. . . .

CLARKE: . . .we have done a program on that to show our people that if two employees come into the Continental Can Company the same day, that our people at the end of twenty-five years would have picked up at least five more weeks of vacation than the Steelworkers do with their sabbatical.

INTERVIEWER: Yeah.

CLARKE: That's great! It's a great theory. A fellow said, "Yeah, but I've been here fifteen years." You know, he gets thirteen weeks; I don't get thirteen weeks. I only get five or four, whatever is in the contract. So they want that, for instance. We've never agreed to negotiate it, but we have negotiated more money. We have used that as a basis of better conditions within the metal decorating, but it's. . .we have, I would guess probably 300 metal decorators. So we do do different negotiations for them.

Well, if you have a few minutes, I would like to talk about the business of the nationalistic trend in Canada.

INTERVIEWER: Yeah, that's. . . .

CLARKE: . . . as far as International unions are concerned.

INTERVIEWER: Yeah, I'd very much like to hear you do that.

CLARKE: It's been a problem, you know, the development of the CNTU in the Province of Quebec whose whole theory was nationalistic and that the international unions, the American-controlled unions, should not be operating in Canada. And we have had this over a period of time. There's a number of Canadian-based unions who are talking about it. What we have done, our International union, going back to some of the things I've said before, have purposely set up almost complete autonomy in Canada for our operation. You know, we have a policy-making body that makes policy that pertains to Canada but doesn't move away from the International policy on things. But we gear it to what happens in Canada. We develop our own proposals in Canada. We do our own negotiating in Canada; we handle things through a Canadian International office; we elect Canadian councillors; you know, that sort of thing. The only thing that we don't do that is demanded by these people who say Canadian unions should be Canadian is they don't elect an International officer like myself. I am elected on an overall. . .by the whole. . .because I work in the States.

INTERVIEWER: Yeah.

CLARKE: You know, I've negotiated with Harvard University, for instance; I've settled strikes in Baltimore; you know, that sort of thing that I've done as far as my own duties are concerned. But the international union movement as a whole has been a wonderful thing for Canada. You know, the business of not just the graphic arts, but the International as a whole, has kept the Canadian union on a par with the employers, kept them in the same ball park, protected them. You know, they have the same pressures, the same assistance behind them. For instance, our '49 strike, we would not have survived in '49 if we hadn't had American money coming in to help our people.

INTERVIEWER: Right.

CLARKE: It's needed. You know, that sort of thing. All of our monies paid per capita is kept in Canada;

our pension money is kept in Canada. We have the distinct advantage of an International union where we have all our own things covered, and we're not really paying towards the expense of running the International. None of our money pays toward that office in Washington directly. So that in essence they're assisting subsidizing our Canadian Graphic Arts, our union, to exist in Canada by a form of assistance, bargaining at the table to get them better conditions, and also compensating against American interest as far as the management is concerned.

I think it would be a sad day for Canada if suddenly some law was passed where you could not belong to an international union. I think the labor movement would be just desperate. It would just be. . .unless you were Steel, you know, with 150,000 members or CUPE--that's a council union, Canadian Union of Public Employees--something like that with about 110,000 or the Public Servants Alliance with 100,000. Those sort of locals, those unions would be viable and would be able to hold their position, but any small union would be wiped out almost overnight by management, if they didn't have protection of it. Now, I don't find in our union great demands to get out from being part of the International. I really don't. I get isolated cases. . . .

INTERVIEWER: What about the other side of the coin? Are there any American. . .are there any pockets of American resentment that you do keep all this money in Canada?

CLARKE: Not within our union. The question is never raised. You know, we account for all the monies together. The question is never raised as to. . . you know, the monies are for the operation of the International because we allocate them that way. So we really don't get any resistance.

What I find throughout the United States--and this worries me very much--is a lack of understanding of Canadian problems. Take the Burke-Hartke bill, for instance. Even people within our own union don't seem to understand that this is going to be a problem. Our meeting with the Bookbinder, one of our officers said, "Well, we've got to think of our American members." And said, "Well, you'd better think again." All you have to do is think back to the oil crisis that developed just a matter of a month or so ago. Our friend, Nixon, had said, "We will not buy more than 94 thousand or 95 million barrels a day of oil from Canada," and restricted it. All of a sudden, when there was a crisis, they moved up to 127. You know, the need was there. Now, if the United States could be self-sufficient and were part of the North American continent, it would be wonderful; but they can't be.

You know, we're the North American continent and we're being reminded of this by the United States when they need oil and water and things like that.

INTERVIEWER: Right.

CLARKE: But we're not reminded of it when it comes to a trade problem. You know, the problem then isn't quite the same. And I keep telling our people and telling other international unions that they just can't isolate Canada from their thoughts when they're thinking of bills like Burke-Hartke or the manufacturing clause of the income act which bars Canadian printing coming down, being produced in Canada and coming down. Those sorts of things. . . and our union has addressed itself to that and is addressing itself right now to the Burke-Hartke. And that's why I thought I might have been down there! (Laughter) But our union's position, I'm sure, will be that Canada's consideration should be given for Canada under the Burke-Hartke Bill. Whether it can be achieved or not is a different story.

INTERVIEWER: Well, the thing that is puzzling me, too, about all this is that--it is not so true in the Graphic Arts industry--but in many, many industries, the steel industries, for example, where you say on the basis of membership they might be able to go it alone, but on the other hand there's a great deal of American money on the employers' side. . .

CLARKE: Oh, yes.

INTERVIEWER: . . . and therefore it seems to me that they would be in a very difficult situation which could eventually bounce back on America, too. If it becomes cheaper to manufacture steel or to fabricate steel in Canada because of the capacity to depress wages to a certain extent, then the American steelworkers will eventually lose jobs.

CLARKE: Well, it's a possibility, but. . .this business of wages, for instance. The steelworkers wages in Hamilton are higher than the steelworkers' wages in the States.

INTERVIEWER: At the moment they are. Right?

CLARKE: Yeah. Now, if what you're saying is that if there was a division, although they do operate pretty well on their own. . . .

INTERVIEWER: Well, even if it wasn't on the basis of wages. Let's say it was on the basis of productivity. . .

CLARKE: Right. It could create problems, I agree. Oh, yeah. There's no question of the American money in most of our industries. The United States owns 95 percent of our oil companies, 95 percent. There's only 5 percent that operate under a Canadian company, and they were going to sell to an American interest but the Canadian government stepped in. You know, the business of our industries. And this is the point that is difficult for some people in Canada to understand--that international unions as such have to be international to fight international employers.

INTERVIEWER: . . . to fight international employers.

CLARKE: Right. And that's the basis. The employers in Canada are great ones for the propaganda, "Why shouldn't you be a Canadian union?" And the ones who are pressing it most are American interrelated companies. They really are. And it's obvious that they could do what you just suggested. That's part of the reasoning behind it. They feel they can handle a smaller group without the financial resources of an international union. And I just blindly tell our people that we need that sort of thing. But the Burke-Hartke Bill doesn't help us.

INTERVIEWER: No. (Laughter)

CLARKE: It doesn't really. (Laughter) And even to the extent that our Minister of Labor recently made a speech in which he was talking about the business of why should unions be international. And I just about died because I know him personally, and I intend to talk to him about his speech. I haven't got the text of it yet, but I saw him on TV; and he was just mouthing and the reporter was saying what he was saying. And the reporter was saying that he was stating that unions should not be international, that unions should be Canadian based. If the Canadian Minister of Labor is saying that, I think we should be talking to him, very seriously. Really.

INTERVIEWER: Well, he may be saying that in part because he feels that it is a popular. . .that. . .

CLARKE: Well, he's a politician.

INTERVIEWER: Right.

CLARKE: I'm more concerned with the fact that most of the propaganda is coming from more American employers than the Canadian-based unions, which of course is great for them.

INTERVIEWER: Right.

CLARKE: It just doesn't seem to happen.

INTERVIEWER: Well, I wonder. . .are your members typically NDP'ers or can you make kind of a political statement like that about the majority of your members?

CLARKE: I think the biggest problem we face in a political field. . .when I was president of the Montreal local, I was a member of the NDP. I was carrying a card. I still vote NDP. Bill Dodge was a personal friend of mine. He is now the secretary/treasurer of the CLC. He and I worked together in the Montreal Labor Council. We were both on the Board of Directors of the Labor Council, and he was an ardent NDP'er and that's how I first started to get involved. So I said to Bill one time, "Why don't you come down to a meeting?" And you know, I guess I was naive about it because I got up at the next general meeting and said that I felt that we should be, you know, have some understanding of politics, what's going on, and that I was intending to invite an NDP'er, Bill Dodge, to our next meeting to speak. And this storm came up, you know. All the reds, the blues, the liberals, the conservatives immediately jumped up and wanted equal time and said they didn't have to listen to NDP. The NDP'ers got up and said we should at least hear the story. And I backed off, for the moment, and I sort of re-grouped and said, "Okay, if that's the feeling, let's do it that way." So I did develop a series of meetings.

I don't think the labor movement, in the Province of Quebec for instance, supports the NDP. It's quite obvious they don't. They didn't get a seat in the last House. I think in

Ontario they mostly supported the NDP Party and do in some areas vote, but I don't think the NDP Party has the full support of the labor movement. They have the support of the officials in most unions, but they don't have the full support of the labor people themselves yet.

INTERVIEWER: Is it stronger in B.C.?

CLARKE: Yes.

INTERVIEWER: Greater amounts.

CLARKE: And also in Manitoba and Saskatchewan where we have three NDP provincial parties.

INTERVIEWER: I gather you could really talk in terms of a labor party there.

CLARKE: Oh, yes. And Ontario--very strong; Quebec--not a member and no interest although Dave Lewis is very much liked and has promised to spend more time in the Province of Quebec. But I think he's just whistling "Dixie" until he gets some strong people in the province to support him. But it's right across Canada. If you ask the people what is the party of the labor and they'll tell you the NDP. And I think it's certainly on the upswing. When you can take three provinces, you're already sitting pretty nicely. Situated in three areas, you can move into some of the other areas. I don't think they'll leap the government, but I think they'll eventually get to be the opposition. You know, beautiful position right now where they're sitting with the thirty-one seats, the Liberal Government, a minority government with 109, the Conservatives with 107. And the NDP can swing it whatever way they want. They can throw that Government out tomorrow if they want, or they can hang on and make them put in legislation which is, in the general area, what they want as the budget just came out recently. There was something for everybody; you know, they increased the income tax; you know, they did a whole job. . . the old-age pension went up. And that was all things advocated by the NDP Party. So, it is a labor party, but it hasn't got the full support of labor.

I think probably some of the problem is, in our industry for instance, our people are no longer the laboring people. They think of themselves as middle class; they live in suburbia, they have cars, you know; they don't acknowledge the

fact that they are labor as such. They are averaging probably $14,000-$15,000 a year, and they're suburbanites. And it's difficult to tie them in unless there's a crisis. So we have that problem in our union. Steel is strong on NDP, very strong on NDP.

INTERVIEWER: Hm-hm.

CLARKE: (too low to be distinguishable) A chap by the name Parks, who's the treasurer of the NDP Party, he was with Steel. I think he's on leave of absence, Eamon Parks, he's on leave of absence. And he's active with the NDP Party. And we've had Dave Lewis at our conventions, and I think he's a great guy.

INTERVIEWER: Well, I must say, when I look at our neighbor to the north, I think about four more years and see the contrast and the kinds of things that are going on where here our whole proverty program is being dismantled and we have this great program of redistributing the wealth, namely taking it from the poor and giving to the rich. . .

CLARKE: Yeah.

INTERVIEWER: And I (laughter) say to myself, "Gee, wouldn't it be nice to live in a country you could belong to a party like the NDP?" (Laughter)

CLARKE: Like the NDP. Yeah. And a country that is looking after people. You know, for instance, our Medicare program, I think that was one of the greatest things that's ever come about. And I constantly needle our people down here, saying the United States is the wealthiest country in the world and yet you can't afford to go to hospital unless you have a welfare program or something like that. Whereas in Canada, if we take sick, we go into the hospital, we don't pay a cent. We go to a doctor, we don't pay a cent. We've got a credit card, that you can just hand to your doctor when you go in. Now, admittedly, we pay for it, but we pay for it in a way that is payable, you know. It's not sort of gougy. For instance, the problem in Quebec is the tax. The most you can pay in a year is $125. That's the most any person can pay. But if you're not paying a tax, you don't pay a cent and get exactly the same fare as a millionaire.

INTERVIEWER: Whereas now Nixon is planning to increase the amount that you have to pay rather than. . .

CLARKE: And even so much so that the older people who thought they had Medicare, now he's telling them you'll have to pay and pay more, more than what you were paying before.

INTERVIEWER: Right.

CLARKE: That's why what happens here, when I raise this question, is they say, "Well, that's socialized medicine!" And I say, "Great." (Laughter) I think its wonderful. So it's socialized. You can walk into the hospital and you don't have to. . .give an arm or a leg or a body to get out of the hospital. . .

INTERVIEWER: Right.

CLARKE: . . .you know, it's covered and it's been a great. . .a tremendous thing in Canada. Every province has it, federally assisted, so that. . .

INTERVIEWER: Just on the whole business of the relationships between the United States and Canada, I saw a very interesting story on the TV which was a great shock to the interviewer: They were talking about amnesty for the American young people who fled to Canada. So this guy goes up to interview a young man who has ended up in London, in the town of London. And he has a job; I forget just what it was he was doing but the TV interviewer is talking to him and asking him if he would like to see amnesty declared. Yes, he would like to see amnesty declared. Well, why would he be so interested in this? Well, it's a matter of justice, equity, and so on and so forth. And he said, "Well, don't you also mean that you would like to be able to return to the United States?" And there's sort of a pause, and he said, "Well, yes, I would like to go back and see my family instead of their always having to come to see me. . ."

CLARKE: Yeah.

INTERVIEWER: "Oh," the reporter says. "you mean you wouldn't intend to return to the United States to live?"

"Oh, no. No. Of course not. (Laughter) Why would any one want to live in the United States?"

CLARKE: Okay. It's very interesting even on that on the figures, you know, during the Vietnam War, the constant propaganda that there are 50,000 Americans in Canada. The true figures are coming out. I don't know if you've seen them.

INTERVIEWER: No, I haven't.

CLARKE: Actually, 1,400!

INTERVIEWER: Yeah. Right.

CLARKE: In Canada. The way it was visualized in the newspaper was that the border opened and they were pouring across the border, you know. I think Canada's benefited by some of those people coming up because they're young, they're aggressive. They think for themselves, and a lot of them are highly-skilled people.

Well, I'm not an American but to get on the Vietnam War and I get a little bit uptight because we had a very good young friend of ours get killed over there, a Canadian who was going with our daughter. And he joined the American Marines and got blown up in a tank, 18 years of age. He was a Canadian fighting over in Vietnam. They buried him with full military honors in Canada, but, you know, it just didn't seem right.

INTERVIEWER: I didn't know a Canadian could join American Marines.

CLARKE: No. Very much so. He was an American Marine. We buried him from our church in Montreal.

INTERVIEWER: That is a tragic situation.

RICHARD CLARKE

Index