

Allied Forces

Unions and environmentalists can work together for jobs and ecological sustainability

MAE BURROWS

TATSURO “BUCK” SUZUKI was a Fraser River fisher and an activist in the United Fishermen and Allied Workers’ Union. Known as “Gumboot Suzuki”, he worked to protect the health of BC’s rivers and coastal waters in the early 1950s, long before concern about the environment was popularized. Early accounts described Suzuki lobbying and organizing to protect marsh habitat and to stop the dumping of untreated sewage into the Fraser River, home to one of the world’s largest salmon populations. To Suzuki and other fishers, there was never a division between the environment and jobs. A healthy environment and a conservative attitude toward resource extraction meant economic security and community stability.

This is a lesson that unions and environmentalists are still struggling with today.¹ When unions and environmentalists work together, they can be very good friends and achieve environmental and economic goals. When they don’t work together, both sides, as well as the environment, lose badly. In British Columbia, the summer of 1997 showed how ugly it can get when labour and environmentalists are pitted against each other.

A coalition of European environmental groups, including Friends of the Earth and Greenpeace, were leading a boycott of BC wood products derived from the old growth rainforests of the central coast region.²

Greenpeace had met with the forest companies to discuss objectionable forest practices and the potential consequences of a boycott on corporate bottom lines. However, it held no formal meetings with the unions that represented the workers involved, the Industrial, Wood and Allied Workers of Canada (IWA), the Canadian Energy and Paperworkers (CEP), and the Pulp and Paper Workers of Canada (PPWC). Nor was there any discussion about the likely consequences of the boycott for the workers, i.e., lost jobs.

Also missing from the coalition’s action plan was any mention of strategies that could help workers, their families and communities make the transition to an economy based on forest conservation rather than clear-cutting. In doing so, the environmental groups

had ignored a key belief of trade unionists: if society decides to raise environmental standards, then society as a whole should share the social and economic costs. Workers and their communities should not bear the full brunt of the changes.

In response to the boycott, the IWA took a page from the environmentalists’ own tactics book. As part of their “Fight Back For Forest Jobs” campaign, union members set up blockades against two Greenpeace ships in Vancouver harbour.³ A number of key unions, including several that had otherwise good relationships with Greenpeace and other environmental groups, joined the protest. Their support for the IWA action was a message to environmentalists that they needed to communicate with workers before engaging in actions that could hurt them.⁴

The summer of 1997 had already seen environmentalists pitted against resource workers in BC. Greenpeace – along with the Western Canada Wilderness Committee, the Sierra Club of Western Canada, and other organizations – had demanded that a salmon fishery be shut down to preserve coho stocks.⁵ The union complained that it was neither consulted nor notified of the demand, which was delivered through the media. Nor had fishery workers forgotten what occurred a year earlier when Greenpeace protested a fishery that had already been authorized by the federal Department of Fisheries and Oceans (DFO). Instead of protesting at the corporate offices of the fishing companies or at DFO headquarters, Greenpeace activists chose to confront workers at their work-site. On one occasion, Greenpeace activists went so far as to damage a fisher’s nets.

Such conflicts about “jobs and the environment” caused enormous distress to workers and environmentalists alike. Hostility escalated to the point where some environmental activists received death threats, bullets in the mail, and sexually explicit hate calls.⁶ The provincial government even got involved, labeling environmentalists as “enemies of British Columbia.”⁷ BC’s summer of 1997 exemplified environmentalists and labour at loggerheads.

These conflicts are occurring at a time when the need for environmentalists and labour unionists to cooperate has never been greater. Labour standards, jobs, environmental protection, social programmes,

In BC, the summer of 1997 showed how ugly it can get when labour and environmentalists clash.



Mainstream media often portray the jobs *versus* environment attitude. Under-reported are the social activities of unionists and the thousands of volunteer hours environmentalists devote to restoring habitat or participating on advisory panels. Here Salmon Enhancement Program worker Russ Davies (left) and UFAWU-CAW member Elvin Phillips rescue salmon fry and smolts from Coquitlam's withering Hyde Creek. In this effort about four to five thousand smolts were rescued from drying sections of the creek.

and community stability are threatened by corporate concentration, globalization and investment and trade agreements. To be effective against this corporate onslaught, environmentalists and labour need to work together.

Some labour unionists and environmentalists have recognized that co-operation is in their best long-term interests. Over a decade ago, at a 1987 Canadian Labour Congress convention, Bob White, then president of the Canadian Autoworkers' Union (CAW), recalled the Bread and Roses struggle of women in the early 1900s. A tragic fire at the Triangle Shirt Waist factory in New York City took the lives of many women workers. The popular labour song "Bread and Roses" was born out of the fire and spoke of how workers need more than decent wages – they need a safe and healthy environment within which to work. He argued that this struggle expressed the "best elements" of the labour movement by rejecting the reduction of human needs to a subsistence wage. White drew an analogy between the meaning of "Bread and Roses" and the meaning of "jobs and the environment." Employers' frequent assertion that the issue is jobs *versus* the environment has posed a false choice: both workers and the environment will continue to suffer as long as the need to make this choice is uncritically accepted.⁸

The CAW reiterated at its 1997 convention, the importance of working with environmentalists at its

1994 convention, when it adopted a set of "Basic Principles for Struggling with Conflicts."⁹ The key insight behind the document was that unions and environmentalists must think strategically in dealing with tensions that arise between them. Thinking strategically means that environmentalists and workers engage in constructive dialogue about the issues at hand. The goal is to understand each other's positions, and – ideally – to design a unified campaign that allows both groups to advance their interests.

An example of a unified campaign was the successful effort in the early 1990s to convince the BC government to implement zero-dioxin-discharge regulations. The campaign brought together fishers, pulp workers and other labour unions, First Nations, and environmentalists.¹⁰ Ironically, the alliance included many of the same organizations that would end up facing off against each other in the rainforest boycott of 1997. In 1998 a similar alliance of environmentalists and unions are working toward a comprehensive strategy to eliminate chlorine compounds from pulp production, a situation that would benefit the environment and workers' health, and not necessarily lead to job losses.¹¹

The Council of Canadians has coordinated many campaigns that have seen unions, environmentalists, student, church and poverty groups and others working together for common cause. This has included opposition to the original Canada-

US Free-Trade Agreement, the expanded North American Free-Trade Agreement and the current Multilateral Agreement on Investment. Great Lakes United is an international coalition of environmental, conservation, labour, community and recreation groups. Since the early 1980s, this coalition has been bringing citizens together to improve the environmental quality of the Great Lakes.¹²

Formal alliances or unified campaigns are possible when it is clear that conservation of resources and protection of the environment will result in more economic security in the longer term.¹³ However, such campaigns are less likely when, in the short term, jobs are threatened by environmental demands. In these instances, labour and environmentalists might try working in strategic parallel campaigns.

Such campaigns might look like this. An environmental group that strongly opposes clear-cut logging feels that a boycott is the only effective tactic to oppose the company's practices. A union that produces pulp from an area that has been clear-cut by that same company doesn't necessarily agree with the environmental group's views on clear-cutting, but the union does have serious working condition and other contract issues. If the union and environmental groups were to discuss strategy – the environmental group sharing information with the union about its boycott tactics, and the union engaging in its own job action against the company, an action supported by the

There is plenty of opportunity for dialogue on the environmental issues surrounding worker health and safety, and on public health issues such as sewage disposal, and air and water quality.

environmental and larger community – both groups could benefit. Unions and environmentalists could address their issues with the company as well as continue educating each other, rather than attacking each other and feeling attacked. So far though, lack of communication and strategic planning have inhibited such initiatives from taking place.

The recent history of conflict between them shows that environmentalists and unionists are still learning to work together. Both strategic alliances and parallel campaigns will more likely emerge if the two sides communicate clearly about their interests and goals. The first step in this process is to develop a mutual understanding of differences, whether this be in terms of organizational structures, how decisions are made, the issues of concern, or methods of campaigning. Besides arriving at a better understanding of their cultural and organizational differences, unionists and environmentalists also need to become more aware of how differences are magnified by the media and exploited by corporate interests.

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

A major stumbling block to collaboration between unions and environmental groups is their differing organizational structures. In unions, member workers are hired by employers who have the power to exclude certain people from joining the group. Members of a local union are brought together by the fact they share a workplace. They don't necessarily share political values or beliefs. This may mean that common positions arrived at have to be flexible enough to accommodate a broad range of views. Environmentalists, for their part, join groups by choice and are usually like-minded on the particular environmental issue that brings them together. This allows for a more single-minded, stronger position on an issue.

Union leadership is elected by a democratic structure, such as an annual convention. There is a direct line of accountability to the range of interests in the union. Leaders must listen to the membership, otherwise they will not be re-elected. In contrast, environmental groups seldom hold elections for leadership positions. However, there is a trend, reflected in groups such as the BC Environmental Network and the Sierra Club of Western Canada, towards designating spokespersons who are accountable to an elected steering committee or board of directors. Some environmental organizations, such as BCWILD have no membership and are accountable primarily to their foundation funders. Other environmental organizations, such as Greenpeace, have an appointed board of directors that sets policy, even though the organization's funding may come from individual contributor-members. In such cases, there is no active formal membership and no formalized direct accountability to the contributors.

These different organizational structures can undermine communication and co-operation. On the one hand, union members and leaders often question how the direction and tactics of major environmen-

tal campaigns can be determined by an individual or a small group within a large organization with little or no democratic legitimacy. Union members are often puzzled by the plethora of environmental organizations, the interests they represent and the ways in which they relate to each other. This lack of understanding can lead unions to bunch all environmentalists together and tar them with the same brush. Environmentalists, on the other hand, are often at a loss as to how to gain access to union leaders in a structured hierarchy or how to approach members to discuss a particular issue.

DECISION-MAKING PROCESSES

How unions and environmental groups make decisions is also very different. Environmentalists generally prefer horizontal decision-making structures and have a number of spokespersons and "co-chairs". Meetings are informal and may or may not be chaired, although they are usually "facilitated". Minutes may or may not be taken. Often decisions are reached through consensus. Formal resolutions are rarely put forward. As environmental activist Paul Senz described the environmental sector's approach to participating in a land-use process: "[We operated] in a non-hierarchical, non-patriarch-dominated, interest-based approach. We were a 13-member team that did not have a traditional hierarchical structure with spokesperson, steering committee, and second and third row. We were all it."¹⁴

In contrast, trade unions operate under a hierarchical structure, with one designated spokesperson at the head. Compare the environmentalist approach to that described by the forest union sector participant in the same planning process: "Our sector will have one spokesperson, as we believe that it is imperative to keep the number of representatives at the table to a minimum in order for the negotiations to be successful. The spokesperson will have full authority, as all issues will be dealt with through the steering committee."¹⁵ Trade union meetings usually follow Bournidot's (if a Canadian union, or Robert's if an American-based union) Rules of Order, so there is a chair, and minutes are kept. Resolutions are presented and voted on, and there is an expectation of group discipline in supporting a majority decision.

Environmentalists are often frustrated with what they see as a rigid and time-consuming consultation process within unions that prevents them from making timely decisions, for instance, on whether to participate in specific actions. Union activists, on the other hand, question whether a legitimate decision-making process was undertaken when environmentalists make public statements or announce positions. To trade union members it often appears that environmental spokespersons make statements on their own rather than on behalf of a constituency to whom they are accountable.

ISSUES OF CONCERN

Not only are there organizational differences between environmentalists and labour, but the two groups tend to focus on different issues. In British Columbia, environmentalists have focused on creating pristine protected areas, i.e., preserving big trees in big parks.

Resolution

In August 1997, at the Canadian Autoworkers Constitutional Convention in Vancouver, BC, the following resolution was agreed upon.

THE ENVIRONMENT

BASIC PRINCIPLES FOR STRUGGLING WITH CONFLICTS

The environment is not an issue involving "others".

- The environment is first of all a *public health issue*, affecting the air we breathe, the water we depend on, the food we eat, the soil our children play in; it's about chemicals, poisons and carcinogens in our community.
- It's about the future resources we leave for the next generation; it's about preserving and therefore sharing the beauty of nature.

Environmental issues can't be separated from the economic system we live in.

- An economic system that treats humans as commodities, interested only in their contribution to profits and discarding them at will, is unlikely to give much priority to our natural environment.

Our economic system divides us regarding our concerns over jobs vs our concerns over our environment.

- Although the long-term effects of environmental damage will negatively impact on all our lives, the need to earn a living in uncertain times pushes workers to focus on the *short term*, which often means laying environmental issues aside.
- Somehow we must address both the short-term (jobs) and long-term (environment) aspects of survival.

We can learn from our experience over health and safety.

- In the early days of the health and safety movement, workers were often confronted with the choice between trading off health (the work environment) for profits and competitiveness (i.e., jobs). When we resisted – with significant success – was this anti-social and a false choice?
- We demanded both a safe environment and decent jobs, and we are making substantial progress in this area.

Tensions will occur and we must think strategically in dealing with them.

- The most difficult choices involve jobs that affect a specific group vs environmental implications that primarily affect a broader and different group. To deal with this, both sides must think *strategically*.
- Those who make the environment the centre of their political activities can't build a constituency if they're perceived as being insensitive to jobs and people's livelihoods.
- Workers and unions can't build the broader alliances they need in today's times – especially with young people – if we're cornered into being seen as insensitive to the wider community and the kind of environment we will leave for future generations.
- We need public education and will to achieve that campaign goal, unions and environmentalists need to think and work strategically, but we're barely talking to each other. ☒

Many workers are deeply concerned about preserving the natural environment, but the issue of protected areas does not touch them in their daily work life. Rather they are centrally concerned with survival issues such as pay, working conditions and job security.

However, this does not mean that there is no overlap or room for co-operation in issues of concern. In fact, there are fertile grounds for creating dialogue about environmental issues around worker health and safety, and public health issues such as sewage disposal, and air and water quality. Transportation

and its effects on the atmosphere, recycling and urban livability are other environmental issues that may be of concern to specific groups of workers.

One reason this overlap is not regularly exploited is that environmentalists, and the public in general, are normally exposed to a narrow spectrum of union activities in the media. Mainstream news media usually report on unions when angry workers set up picket lines, protest job losses or confront environmentalists. This may fit the image of unionism that a corporate-controlled media wants to project, but it omits aspects of workers' lives that are more socially oriented: organizing fundraisers for inner city school hot-lunch programmes, defending workers against harassment by employers, organizing pieceworkers forced to work long days for less than minimum wage, or campaigning against child labour. Nor do the media provide adequate coverage of the large number of workplace deaths due to unsafe working conditions and debilitation resulting from working in toxic environments.

Environmentalists, too, are victims of distorted media coverage. Underreported in the media is the hands-on work done by environmentalists to restore habitat, and the thousands of unpaid hours put in by environmental volunteers as they participate on advisory panels.¹⁶

Media coverage of union activities is blind to the fact that not all unions are the same in terms of the scope of their concerns. At one end of the spectrum are "business unions", which see their role mainly in terms of signing up members and negotiating good wages and working conditions. They tend to wed their fortunes to those of their employers, and normally do not look beyond the workplace for direction, vision or solutions. This is the type of union usually characterized in labour stories in the media and the type that environmentalists usually have in mind when they criticize the union movement for being narrow-minded in its interests. However, there is another type of union that receives much less attention: these are the "social unions", which take a broader view of the union's role in society. For instance, the current hand-out from CAW called "Statement of Principles: Environment" says:

Workers must have the right to choose both economic security and a healthy environment for ourselves, our families and future generations. By taking a stand for a cleaner environment through tougher controls on our employers, we reject the blackmail of choosing job security over the environment.¹⁷

Business and social unionism represent two ends of a spectrum – individual unions usually include shades of both types. It is important for environmentalists to recognize this basic reality and to work with the socially progressive elements within all unions.

CAMPAIGN STYLES

Unions and environmentalists also differ in their approaches to campaigning. Unions are involved in day-to-day economic, health and safety issues. Therefore, their approach to bargaining tends to be about concrete topics with a clearly defined agenda towards which they work systematically. Unions identify contract goals, prioritize them, and systematically nego-

Alliances between unions and environmentalists scare the hell out of industry and the mainstream media.

tiated to win as many as possible, while recognizing that some items will fall off the list. Once an objective is reached, an agreement is acknowledged and a period of peace is expected.

Environmentalists don't work this way. For example, those engaged in a campaign to save a pristine watershed from logging may see their cause in terms of some high moral value. They may feel that compromise, and even the process of bargaining itself, is morally wrong. The focus of such environmentalists is on a single goal – while ignoring the larger context of community stability, jobs, and the economy – and their unwillingness to compromise alienates many workers. Such campaigns are perceived as unsympathetic to workers, their families and their communities.

Moreover, many environmental campaigns are initiated by groups with their headquarters outside local communities, and are carried out by individuals with no connection to local grassroots elements. There is often no consultation nor communication with workers. This allows corporations to divide workers and environmentalists further by devising public relations strategies that underline environmentalists as “outsiders”.

Finally, the language of campaigns can also differ. Coming from a workplace perspective, unionists sometimes use language that is interpreted by environmentalists as exhibiting disregard for environmental values. Fishery workers, for example, may call salmon “pieces” – each of which has an attached price tag – while environmentalists may call salmon “icons”. These differences need to be understood and bridged.

BUILDING TRUST

Many of the obstacles to strategic co-operation between unions and environmental groups could be

addressed through better information sharing. Workshops attended by both unionists and environmentalists could provide a venue for such sharing. Union representatives could explain the workings of the Canadian Labour Congress, provincial federations of labour, district labour councils and regional and local union organizations, and how they fit together. Environmental representatives could describe their membership, funding and decision-making structures, and outline their relationships with provincial and national environmental networks. Each “side” could explain the issues of concern to them and together the participants could look for areas of potential overlap. The occasion could also be used to expose media and corporate attempts to paint unfavourable pictures of either labour or environmental groups and to present more accurate portrayals.

Unionists and environmentalists could also undertake a variety of activities within their own constituencies to improve understanding and the atmosphere for co-operation. Social activists in trade unions should educate their members about the relationship between long-term job security and a healthy environment. They need to work to insert environmental statements in their union constitutions and to present environmental statements for debate at conventions.

For their part, environmentalists need to address livelihood issues as an important ingredient in their programmes for long-term environmental protection. They need to acknowledge that improvements in environmental standards sometimes lead to immediate job loss, and they need to support “just transition” policies in their press conferences, presentations to government, and in joint efforts with unions. Just transition policies assist individuals and communities that have been disrupted by changes in environmental standards and are based on the principle that workers should not be required to bear the full brunt of the environmental measures concerned.¹⁸ Such a policy could include a number of goals, such as “restructuring and re-training to provide employment opportunities for displaced workers, as well as a placement programme, severance pay and counseling. Just transition may also provide support for affected communities,” especially in single-industry or resource-based towns, so that the community can get assistance to diversify its economy.¹⁹

Together, environmentalists and unions need to develop an economic analysis about jobs and the environment, and to challenge the jobs-versus-environment argument. Environmentalist Miranda Holmes believes an “alliance between unions and environmentalists scares the hell out of industry and the mainstream media, who like to perpetuate the jobs-versus-environment attitude.”²⁰ Unions and environmentalists need to formulate a green social movement and economic development plan. Workers and environmentalists also need to work together to develop an economic analysis that deals with environment and work-related changes due to globalization and trade liberalization policies. More broadly, both groups must address conspicuous consumption and the Western industrial paradigm of continued growth and development. If environmentalists and labour

RÉSUMÉ

EN COLOMBIE-BRITANNIQUE, les intenses confrontations entre les milieux environnementalistes et syndicaux ont retenu l'attention. Pourtant, ces deux groupes pourraient au contraire être des alliés dans des luttes économiques et sociales plus grandes, comme par exemple contre la mondialisation des marchés, les nouvelles ententes économiques, les concentrations d'entreprises ou le portrait défavorable que les médias peignent d'eux. L'auteure de cet article soutient qu'ils auraient tout à gagner d'une coopération stratégique. Celle-ci serait possible si syndicats et environnementalistes avaient une meilleure connaissance des nombreuses différences culturelles et structurelles qui les distinguent, que ce soit au plan des modes de prise de décision, de leurs sources de financement, de leurs obligations, de leurs militants, de leur langage, de leurs styles de négociation ainsi que de leurs objectifs respectifs. D'un côté, les syndicats doivent éduquer leurs membres sur les liens qui existent entre la sécurité d'emploi à long terme et un environnement sain. De l'autre, les environnementalistes doivent adopter des stratégies visant une «transition équitable», afin de soutenir travailleurs et communautés déplacés à cause de changements dans les normes environnementales. De plus, les deux groupes devraient tendre vers une analyse économique conjointe et un mouvement écologique social. Une coopération stratégique entre eux créera un climat favorable à la protection de l'environnement, au respect des droits des travailleurs et à la stabilité des collectivités.

don't form strategic alliances, then jobless growth and continuing ecological decline will be our legacy for the new millennium. **A**

Mae Burrows is executive director of the T. "Buck" Suzuki Environmental Foundation, Environmental Director of the United Fishermen and Allied Workers' Union/Canadian Autoworkers' Union, and chair of the Vancouver and District Labour Council's Environment Committee.

NOTES

¹ This article specifically deals with environmentalists and unions working together; however, it is also important for both environmentalists and unions to forge stronger alliances with First Nations.

² Charlie Anderson, "Battle Lines Drawn in Fight for the Forests," *The Province* (Vancouver: June 15, 1997).

³ Industrial, Wood and Allied Workers of Canada's (IWA) "Fight Back for Forest Jobs" campaign package issues (Vancouver: July 29, 1997).

⁴ Press releases from UFAWU-CAW (Vancouver: July 3, 1997); Pulp, Paper and Woodworkers of Canada (Vancouver: July 4, 1997); and Communications, Energy and Paperworkers Union of Canada (Vancouver: July 14, 1997).

⁵ Press releases from environmental groups: "Fish War Opening Means Coho Extinctions" (Vancouver, BC. The Fraser River Coalition, Greenpeace Canada, Sierra Legal Defense Fund, Speak for Salmon, Steelhead Society of BC - Selective Fisheries Initiative, and Western Canada Wilderness Committee, August 14, 1997); "US 'Defeated in Fish War But Canada Continues War on Endangered Coho Stocks'" (Vancouver, BC The David Suzuki Foundation, The Fraser River Coalition, Greenpeace Canada, Sierra Club of BC, Save Our Fish Foundation, Speak for Salmon, Steelhead Society of BC - Selective Fisheries Initiative, and Western Canada Wilderness Committee, August 20, 1997); and "Warnings Over Coho Refuted by Catches," *The Fisherman*, 62:10 (Vancouver: October 20, 1997).

⁶ Stephen Hume, "Truth Is a Casualty in Woods War," *Vancouver Sun* (June 21, 1997); and "Government for Some of the People," *Vancouver Sun* (July 19, 1997).

⁷ "The Americas: A Surprise in the Woods," *The Economist* (July 19, 1997).

⁸ Laurie Advin, "Blind Date," *Our Times* (February 1987), p. 24.

⁹ Resolution at Canadian Autoworkers Constitutional Convention (Vancouver: August 1997).

¹⁰ See "Pulp Pollution Campaign Update," *West Coast Environmental Law Research Foundation Special Pulp Pollution Edition Newsletter*, 14:4 (Vancouver: Spring 1990).

¹¹ This alliance is at the beginning stages; therefore there is no written documentation. Information on the alliance can be obtained through Fred Wilson (CEP) Vancouver 604-682-6501, Delores Broten (REACH! for Unbleached) Whaletown 250-935-6992 or Mae Burrows (UFAW/CAW) 604-255-1336.

¹² For further thoughts on labour and environmentalists working together see Richard Kazis and Richard Grossman, *Fear at Work: Labor and the Environment* (New York: Pilgrim Press, 1982); Laurie Advin, *Politics of Sustainable Development: Citizens, Unions and the Corporations* (Montreal: Black Rose, 1998); and Wally Seccombe, "Environmentalists Meet the Labor Movement: Is an Alliance Possible?" *New Solutions*, 5:4 (Summer 1995), p. 63-76.

¹³ See: Thomas Michael Power, *Lost Landscapes and Failed Economies: The Search for a Value of Place* (Washington, DC: Island Press, 1996); and *Environmental Action* (Summer 1995), which has several articles on this topic.

¹⁴ See Mae Burrows, "Consensus Negotiation: Conflict Resolution or Containment, Vancouver Island CORE: A Case Study" (Burnaby, BC: Masters of Arts Thesis, Simon Fraser University, April 1996), p. 84.

¹⁵ *Ibid.* p. 84.

¹⁶ See Martin A. Lee and Norman Solomon, *Unreliable Sources: A Guide to Detecting Bias in News Media* (New York: Carol Publishing Group, 1992); and Michael Karlberg, "News and Conflict," *Alternatives*, 23:1 (Winter 1997).

¹⁷ "Statement of Principles: Environment" (Vancouver: current handout distributed by CAW, no date).

¹⁸ *Report of the Environment Group, Alternative Federal Budget* (Ottawa: Ontario. Canadian Labour Congress, 1998), p. 14.

¹⁹ Green Job Creation Workshop Handout (Canadian Labour Congress, Jobs Now Conference, February 17-20, 1997), p. 3.

²⁰ Daniel Tatroff, "Deep River Blues: A BC Union's Fight to Save the Fraser," *Our Times* (February/March 1994), p. 27.

Alternatives

JOURNAL

back issues



Full set of back issues available at special discount. Complete list is also available on our Web site (Includes some bound photocopies for out-of-print editions). Contact us for details.

Alternatives Journal c/o Environmental Studies, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada N2L 3G1
Email alternat@fes.uwaterloo.ca • Phone 519-888-4442 • TOLL-FREE 1-866-437-2587 • Fax 519-746-0292

www.alternativesjournal.ca