



James Bailey

Union boneheads take over

Well, it seems the boneheads of the world are finally starting to take over. News reports this weekend indicated the Union of Postal Workers (I refuse to use their national appellation because the union is clearly not Canadian in attitude or leadership) are opposed to supervisors and letter carriers handling the delivery of old age pension cheques — it's "hot mail," according to the union.

The arrogance, greed, stupidity and ruthlessness of that union's executive have reached the point that it wants to use the financial deprivation of old age pensioners as a weapon in their war on the government. Where does it stop? Are postal workers really so oppressed that they have the moral right to interfere with senior citizens receiving what is, in many cases, their only source of income?

"To hell with the public," union president Joe Davidson says. His antics suggest that he perhaps should be relegated to that location. Davidson displays the symptom common to most fanatics: he has become so obsessed with

the rightness of his cause that he is prepared to inflict any amount of suffering upon innocents in his path to achieve it. Adolf Hitler, you may remember, was also prepared to go to somewhat extreme lengths in the advancement of his point of view.

Davidson is not a Hitler, of course. For one thing he doesn't wear a moustache. But he is dangerous.

Canada's relative prosperity and internal peace has always been based, to a large extent, on the essential reasonableness of its people, of their willingness to see the other guy's point of view. We accept many unspoken rules of behavior. If, for example, a number of people are waiting in line to see a movie, certain conventions are followed. The first people to arrive line up nearest the ticket wicket, and when the doors open, they're the first-ones in. Someone at the rear of the line could probably bull his way through and get in without being physically restrained, but there's an understanding between us all that such things just aren't done.

Even in the midst of a conflict, there are levels of conduct below which, as a normal human being, you do not go. If you're served a bad meal in a restaurant, you send it back, you don't dump it on the floor. If your neighbor has his stereo on too loud late at night, you ask him to keep the noise down, you don't throw a firebomb through his front window. If your level of response drastically exceeds the problem — if you shoot the encyclopaedia salesman instead of slamming the door on him — then society exacts criminal penalties.

In fact, our criminal law often acts against individuals who have not done harm to anyone simply because their actions could eventually have negative consequences for society as a whole — the so-called "victimless" crime. Narcotics offenses, prostitution, and displaying obscene material are crimes under law in which all the players are willing, and sometimes enthusiastic participants. Society is considered to be the victim, and the appropriate penalties are applied.

The postal unions, however, face no penalties although their semi-annual strikes cause severe economic hardship, including the absolute destruction of many businesses and jobs. The insanity is compounded by the fact the actions of one union means that members of the other union are unwillingly thrown out of work as well.

Certainly workers in private industry have a right to withdraw their services if they are not paid what they feel are equitable fees, just as manufacturers have a right to withdraw their products from the market if they are not paid equitable prices. But no right is absolute.

Withdrawal of an essential public service to pressure an employer with potentially limitless funds has nothing to do with free collective bargaining. Attempting to force a wage settlement by driving the country to its knees is not bargaining, it's extortion.

Joe Davidson says the public can go to hell. I have a few ideas where he should go. And if he gets there, I hope they lose the key.



John Stewart

Election questions

Elections are supposed to be decisive things. They are, of course, to the extent that they pick one man to represent an area.

But the outcome of the ward 3 by-election Monday leaves many questions unanswered about why Chic Murray won. It would be fascinating to know the process which goes on in people's minds to determine their votes.

Was the announcement of the \$900,000 civil action by former Mayor Murray against the "Mississauga Five," as Mayor Dobkin jokingly refers to the defendants, interpreted by voters as reaffirmation of his innocence or did the generally cynical public figure the suit was a smokescreen so the inquiry would not be discussed until after the by-election?

Did the bad blood between Murray and Dobkin, which is now becoming documented in a series of legal actions commemorating the bitterness of their feud, play a role in voters' minds? Was the vote so close because people are afraid that the addition of Murray to council will add a fourth ring to the present city hall circus?

If the inquiry and all of its ramifications did play a role, it was probably in the kind of vague way Murray suggested Monday night: "A lot of people had questions in their minds." Whether those people set aside those misgivings and voted on the basis of record and whom they thought would do the best job or whether they let it influence their decision is an intriguing imponderable.

The inquiry cloud has, I believe, done a disservice to Frank Bean, who came within 44 votes of topping the mighty. Although Murray attributed the closeness of the race to the inquiry and his contention that the press raised doubts in the public mind, a rather large factor was Bean's own strength. He is well known in the community and well respected. I don't believe he was quite the neophyte Murray thought he was.

Another factor in the outcome was undoubtedly the genteel manner of the whole affair, with the candidates scurrying around on tippy-toes making sure they didn't land on each other's feet. As one veteran political observer noted as returns came in at the Burnhamthorpe community centre Monday night, "I would have run a very different campaign if I was Frank Bean."

Bean felt, probably rightly so, that an aggressive campaign which challenged Murray more directly might have lost him votes because of the public's distaste for the confrontation-style politics now associated with city hall.

The greatest factor in the outcome was the entry of the three candidates who could not possibly have won. Murray's astute comment on the field of five was "the more the merrier." The "name" candidate always like to see as many faces as possible to fragment any strong "anti" feelings against him among several people.

The strong third place showing of Bonnie Roberts was probably the most significant factor Monday. Most of her supporters were anti-Murray types whose second choice for office would almost surely have been Beans.

Della Saunders and Bill Eady pulled a total of almost 400 votes in an election where the difference was only 44.

Where those votes would have gone is another mystery, although if most of those voters felt strongly about Murray they would probably have voted for him in the first place, realizing he might have been in trouble.

The most disturbing aspect of the election is that with so much attention focussed on the ward, and with all of the publicity the events leading up to polling day received, there was such a poor turnout.



Karl Schuessler

Why settle for a reprint?

A few words today about wedding photographers.

If anyone knows how the wedding goes, the photographer does. With his camera, he darts all over the scene, catching every detail of your wedding from putting the boutonniere into your lapel to that last goodbye before the honeymoon begins.

Years ago the wedding photographer wasn't a "rover." He stayed in his studio and you came to him. The couple right after their wedding, drove to his studio and had one picture taken. Copies of it would be sent to every relative.

But no more. Now you have a whole candid-camera album of wedding prints. And the photographer has to be all over the place to get them: in the bride's home, at the church, at the altar, in the sacristy, and at the reception.

Sometimes I think every wedding couldn't go on without the photographer. In that vast company of people that makes up a wedding, the photographer is indispensable. He's the director; he makes things happen. He knows where everyone has to stand, when to throw the rice or confetti, the right time to cut the cake, where the best background scenery is. One photographer told me he always takes his couples over to a perfect setting by the river and takes the photo at just the right time, when the sun's at a perfect height and casting the right shadows.

Sometimes I get so busy watching the photographer move around, I forget about the wedding. And if I do think of the wedding, then I imagine the whole event in front of me is a dress rehearsal, with everyone going through the motions for the camera.

I fool myself into thinking that what's going on up there is for the photographer and his camera; that it's for viewing later in a picture album book; that going through the wedding pictures months later is more real than the wedding itself. Am I kidding myself? Is this the way a wedding should be?

A look back in pictures may capture forgotten moments. It can draw out events that happened so quickly. It's so ironic. It takes months of planning and painstaking detailing — and then it's over in 20 minutes. At least a picture album records those exciting seconds.

However, I insist: A wedding is a wedding for its own sake, not the camera's sake. The wedding that's happening this day is something I'm sharing in right now. I'm living in and through a wedding today and I refuse to let pictures take its place. An album is only a

reminder of that day. I only want to relive my wedding — not live it — in a book.

It's no wonder some churches ban picture-taking in church. The flashing bulbs and peripatetic photographer distract and interrupt. One time I lost my place in reading the wedding service. That time it was TV cameras moving up and down the aisles while I groped through lights, camera and action to marry off, quarterback Wally Gabler.

But it's more than this. It's the greater confusion that substitutes the genuine with a replica. Why have a reprint when I can have the activity? Why settle for copies when I can experience first hand?

And if I have to keep cameras out of churches to stop the confusion, then it's worth it. Maybe that trip to the photographer's studio isn't such a bad idea after all.



Stewart Page

Hockey's goon mentality

The Ontario attorney-general, Roy McMurtry, who used to play quite a bit of hockey in his day, wants to clean up the game by prosecuting "clear cases." These, says McMurtry, are cases in which criminal law has been breached, that is, cases of outright assault and battery. One problem is that the attorney-general has not yet clearly defined what acts fit into this category.

It is not clear, either, whether only hockey would be affected by a crackdown on violence. Should the state prosecute participants in all sports in Canada who take part in nasty conduct? There is hardly a sport which does not have "violence" by some definition. In fact, some sports, such as boxing and lacrosse feature violence. Should boxers be prosecuted? The law is vague.

There appear to be at least five reasons why cracking down on hockey violence, (necessary as it is,) will be exceedingly difficult.

Firstly, our system for grooming young hockey players, save for a few exceptions, still socializes youngsters to view the sport of hockey as a business, an entire way of life, where winning is an end in itself, seemingly

above and beyond all others. Parents end up driving children to arenas at all hours, picking them up, buying expensive hockey equipment. Coaches yell at their players, even berate them, as if they were on trial or something.

Secondly, despite our pious denials, there is an animal side to human nature, which not only condones, but actually encourages and feeds upon violence. The next time there's a fight, watch the lucky spectators in the front row, behind the plexiglass. Most will be laughing and getting a tremendous kick out of it all. Listen to parents scream at referees. It's fun to be outraged, especially when so much of you is not really outraged at all.

Thirdly, the toy world of hockey has now built up a vast protective apparatus, which can masquerade and protect its products — players. The system thus continues to nourish the "goon" mentality. The players are protected from the real world, officials of this apparatus can then state, "We will police ourselves," just like Charles Manson telling the Los Angeles police he'll try to behave himself from now on. The extent of the bureaucracy and business empire becomes clearer when one thinks of the in-

stance recently where weeks of hearings by amateur hockey groups were held to determine in what city a 14-year-old boy would be "allowed" to play hockey. A 14-year-old boy!

Fourthly, the hockey system still does not instill respect for officials, for the rules or for sportsmanship. Officials are little more than nuisances, to be treated with contempt. The children learn it from the coaches and from other puppets of the hockey mentality.

Fifthly, an attack on violence by increasing the severity of penalties for infractions (the strategy usually adopted by the hockey establishment to avoid examining its own mentality), will not work. As fines for fighting go up, so do salaries. Let's be realistic. Being fined \$100 is nothing to most pro hockey players. Many players have stated, "It's worth it, just to get even with a guy!" The upshot is that despite the cries of protest from the real world, the hockey establishment, very simply, does not want to clean up its act. It does not even understand what the real world wants or why. Its managers and owners are concerned not with the effects of violence on youngsters, but with remaining financially solvent. National Hockey

League president Clarence Campbell says he feels violence, after all, is a necessary "safety valve." Gordie Howe laughs at McMurtry: "He'll have to put on skates to catch us!" Maple Leaf Gardens president Harold Ballard says "violence is what keeps the game alive." Absolutely no one of any significance in hockey has openly agreed with the attorney-general. Hockey has not been active, but reactive, in its efforts to curb violence.

The problem is that since hockey itself does not wish to crack down, chances are it will become increasingly hostile and resistant to McMurtry's actions — the team owners feel that violence is what keeps Hockey alive. You have to be able to lick 'em in the alley or you ain't ever gonna do it on the ice. If these people gave players hell and threatened to send them to the minors, or get rid of them when they tried to carve up someone on the ice, the violence would diminish. Hockey players may be animals, but they couldn't succeed completely without help from their bosses and peers. Of course, being scorned by such people seems utterly inconceivable. The insulation of players from the real world is too great.



Blacklist this band

The popularity of rock music has brought too many retarded adolescents into show business. They not only propagate amplified noise, but they carry in their songs the kind of message or philosophy that one would expect from ignorant or shallow minds. Their usual heroic message is that you should do your own thing, which, if it were to be interpreted according to their lifestyle, means, in many cases, drugs and debauchery. Their taste in clothes is as loud, garish and demeaned as their taste in music. Any school that invites rock singers for a performance has only itself to blame if trouble follows.

Yet Daryl Gates, principal of a school in Nova Scotia, invited a rock and roll band to the school and then proceeded to be surprised when they abused his hospitality by saying from the stage to the students: "Do your own thing; don't listen to authority." The students and the student council were as offended as the principal. In fact, it was they who complained to the principal, with the result that he came down and told the band to leave.

Now I don't know anything about the lifestyle of this particular band. In spite of the fact that most of their program had to do with the Devil and Black Mass and the Church of Satan, they may be sober, respectable people. But when musical entertainers go to schools and say to students, "Don't listen to authority," thereby inciting impressionable youngsters to become anti-social, they should certainly be blacklisted by all schools.

The leader of this band has claimed that the principal of the school is trying to blacklist the band in schools across the province. Well, the band asked for it. In fact, it makes me indignant to think that the bandleader has the gall to be indignant. It is not all this Satan and Black Mass business that worries me so much (the band was probably staging a horror show), but the message: "Do your own thing; don't listen to authority." No band or group of entertainers propagating such a message should expect to be invited to schools, nor should it be surprised to be blacklisted by schools. Principals of schools, go ahead and do your thing: blacklist them. Good riddance.



Doug Kennedy

Reins for inflation

Since my last report to you before the provincial election, many significant changes have resulted. Now we have a minority government in Ontario for the first time in 30 years.

In this situation, it is the responsibility of all political parties to cooperate to the greatest extent possible. Ontario's voters expect this approach to running the shop at Queen's Park. To do so requires the opposition parties to be more positive, a little more realistic and no longer completely negative.

They must exercise a little more restraint, in the same way that the federal government is asking Canadians to do their part in fighting inflation.

Since Prime Minister Trudeau announced his wage-and-price-controls program on Thanksgiving evening, there has been considerable criticism of this program from many quarters.

There has been so much criticism that we

are losing sight of the effort: to contain inflation and to strengthen our economy. Let's not kid ourselves that if the federal program does not work, we face even tougher times ahead.

That is why Darcy McKeough, provincial treasurer, has announced other proposals to fight inflation: a freezing of all senior civil service salaries through 1976; a reduction in Ontario Hydro borrowing for 1976; a further reduction in staffing of the Ontario public service for another year; keeping the Ontario budget to within a 10 percent increase for 1976; and stressing that the maximum \$600 increase for low income people is insufficient.

These measures will help Ottawa to get on with its job of dealing with inflation.

The speech from the throne, which the lieutenant-governor delivered on Oct. 28, serves to point out just how much work will be tackled in the next legislative session — and how much

the sensible co-operation of all parties will be needed.

Naturally, Ontario residents are being urged to conserve energy, and the rising price of this resource is a top priority for the government. Plans for the development of inter-provincial electricity grid and the orderly allocation of natural gas are under way.

Prices are also the reason for the immediate concern about rents. One of the highlights of this session has been the introduction of a bill to limit the increase in rents charged during the period from July 29, 1975 to Aug. 1, 1977. In respect of leases granting or renewing a right of occupancy between July 29, 1975 and Jan. 1, 1976, the maximum increase in rent permitted during that period is eight percent more than the rent charged prior to July 29, 1975.

In addition, a rent supplement, retroactive

to April 1 of this year, is planned for senior citizens.

Two other topics covered in the throne speech were firearms control and Sunday store hours.

The Ontario government is not willing to wait too long for the federal government to take some action toward gun control. Instead, it is prepared to step in with some of its own legislation.

To deal with the issue of Sunday store hours, an ad hoc committee is being set up to review briefs and representations and reach a decision satisfactory to a majority of Ontarians. Other committees have been established to deal with estimates, Ontario Hydro's proposed rate increases, legislative procedures and guidelines for the provincial ombudsman.

Mr. Kennedy is Peel South Progressive Conservative MPP.