

Q&A on Magna

The CAW-Magna Framework of Fairness Agreement An Historic Moment for our Union – What Does it Mean?

The announcement on October 15th of the joint Framework Of Fairness Agreement (FFA) between the CAW and Magna has caused a mixed response among members of our union. Some think it presents an opening for organizing a huge, stubbornly anti-union employer. Some just want to know more. But others are honestly concerned, to say the least, about what looks like a dangerous new direction for the CAW.

The FFA talks about an “innovative” new relationship with management, with flowery language about working with the employer to “take on the imports.” It doesn’t include the right to strike – which is justified by rhetoric about how that right isn’t all that important for workers. The FFA also sets up a very different internal representation system. Magna workers will not have the same shop-floor rights as other CAW members. All this seems to be in complete opposition to the CAW’s own principles. Does the FFA signal a future trend for other workplaces and sectors?

Since October 15, a major debate has emerged inside the union, driven by concerns raised from the grassroots. For the first time in decades – and definitely for the first time since most of today’s members joined the union – people have begun to challenge the leadership and question this new policy direction. Local unions have passed resolutions. All kinds of materials have been produced on both sides of the issue. Retirees, active workers, friends of the union and others in the labour movement have been raising concerns about the Magna deal.

In the course of this debate, the opposition to the Framework has been called “armchair critics,” retirees, a handful of political opportunists, one or two locals, people out to “get” Buzz Hargrove and “arrogant” people who “sneer” at workers’ gains.

But this is not about personalities. It is time to have a fair and open debate at the CAW Council and leave the name calling behind.

Those of us who question this agreement represent a substantial number of CAW members – rank and file activists and leaders who are genuinely concerned about the direction of our union – a union born in the struggle against concessions in the midst of a terrible recession in the mid-1980s. We see the FFA as anything but “fair.” It’s a move that could dramatically weaken not just our union but also the entire labour movement which is facing enormous challenges.

This pamphlet is produced by a group of CAW members who have come together to express our concerns, respond to the major arguments used by our union’s leadership, and address many of the questions raised by other CAW members. We hope that those of you who have questions about the agreement and the overall direction of our union, or simply want to know more about the Magna issue, will take the time to read this pamphlet and make up your own minds about the Framework Of Fairness.

When it comes to the CAW’s approach to Magna or any other issue, the union’s membership has the right to make the ultimate decision.

**Let’s look at some of the questions that people have
about the Magna Framework**

➔ Members will have a collective agreement with all of the usual CAW features. The Magna Framework and National Agreement are far from perfect, but won't they provide a 'foot in the door' and the foundation for a strong union?

Magna workers will have collective agreements with many traditional CAW elements, such as wage increases, seniority, skilled trades program, H&S, and some benefits. There will also be a rudimentary grievance procedure. But the similarity with a real union stops there. Increases are tied to a different structure than traditional agreements: the annual increase formula is based on 5 key areas – such as Health and Safety (tied to lost time incidents), productivity, quality, and 'core values.' There is also a profit sharing component. What the workers will *not* have are the building blocks for creating a presence in the workplace that is independent of the employer, such as a shop steward system and the right to strike.

➔ But Magna workers will be represented by full-time local representatives and will be able to select a union representative without management interference. They might call it something different, but it's the same thing as a shop steward. What's all the fuss about, anyway?

The representation system at Magna might seem like ones in other CAW workplaces, but it isn't. The number of workplace representatives, their duties, and the way they are elected – all are major departures from the CAW norm.

- There is *only one* union representative in each plant, for all shifts, regardless of its size. (The union rep is called a Magna-CAW *Employee Advocate* – not a worker or union representative.)
- The EA's responsibilities include working towards Magna's goals and principles. For example, the EA is to "*work with all parties to develop continuous improvement ideas to make the division more competitive, consistent with the Statement of Principles in this Agreement.*" (FFA, page 5 and Article 3, page 34 of the National Magna Agreement).
- The EA is chosen by a convoluted process that includes everything *except* direct election by the members. Candidates don't simply run for office, but "apply" for the position, and are vetted by a group of union members elected to a joint union-management "Fairness Committee." This committee submits a list of recommended applicants to the Assistant to the CAW President, and he or she gets the final say in choosing the EA.

- The EA is subject to votes by the membership every three years, evaluating her performance. She needs 65% to keep the position. In other words, the best members can do is remove an EA. They can't actually run against the EA or vote for an alternative. Instead, the appointment process above would determine their replacement. (Framework, Appendix C, page 18 and National Magna Agreement, Article 3, pp 34,35);
- The Magna local's bargaining committee will be made up of the EA from each unit. The bargaining committee will ultimately be chosen by the National Union and not the membership.
- The Local Executive is elected by the EA's, not the membership. (Framework, page 6)
- The EA is the only representative from each unit at the local executive. There is no general membership vote, normally the highest authority in any local. (Framework, page 6)

The FFA rules on selecting EA's make it impossible to exercise union democracy in the workplace. The process of choosing representation is taken out of the hands of the membership. This also runs against CAW traditions of local union democracy. According to our union's constitution and previous union policy documents, the National office of the union should not be involved in the selection of local union representation.

This agreement also violates a long accepted principle of independent and democratic unions: while the number of union representatives is subject to bargaining between the parties, unions have the sole right to determine *how* their representatives are to be selected. The Magna agreement gives management a hand in defining the union's internal decision-making processes. This is an unprecedented interference in the internal affairs of the union.

➔ Ok, but what about the Fairness Committee? Isn't that like a steward body or the joint labour-management committees in other CAW workplaces? Won't the union members on the Fairness Committee represent workers' interests and concerns?

Aside from the one union official in the workplace, there are no stewards or committeepersons. Instead, there are Fairness Committee members, elected by work area. These might look like stewards, but they are anything but. According to the Framework, (FFA, page 16), Fairness Committee members must:

- have good disciplinary records;
- be committed to *management* principles; and
- *not* represent their fellow workers. The FFA reads, “*While some Fairness Committee members are also members of the Union, they are not union representatives nor does their role include the representation of employees.*” (FFA, page 10)

The Fairness Committee is therefore not a stewards’ body or a joint labour-management committee in the accepted sense, because the workers are not there to represent workers’ interests and concerns.

Management will set the agenda of the Fairness Committee and workers will discuss how to solve management’s problems. Without an independent system of stewards or committeepersons – a basic element of worker representation that dates back to the origins of industrial unions in Canada and the United States – union members will find it extremely difficult to organize around and defend their interests in the workplace.

➔ Well, even so, once these structures are in place, can’t people use their positions as EA or Fairness Committee reps to advocate for workers and to build an independent union structure? Once we’ve got a foothold, can’t we build a real union from the inside?

Other elements of the FFA are going to make it very difficult for workers to build a real union at Magna, especially if that involves confronting management. There will be enormous pressures on workers and the CAW to “behave” in ways that management approves of.

The National Magna Agreement contains a *Letter Regarding Depoliticization Of The Work Environment*, which commits the union to: “*recognize and agree that activities in a division that politicize or polarize the workplace have the potential to disrupt the operations and create a negative work environment. Such activities are inconsistent with the shared interests identified above, and lessen the democratic involvement of employees in workplace issues. As such, the parties agree that they shall ensure that no such activities take place in any division covered by the Framework of Fairness Agreement.*” (National Magna Agreement, p91). How can the union agree to “depoliticize” the workplace and fight for the members at the same time?

All structures and procedures relating to industrial relations between Magna and the CAW (representation, concern resolution process, and

fairness committee) are contained in Part A of the collective agreement. Without the right to strike, the only way to change the collective agreement is through bargaining or binding arbitration. But both the FFA and the collective agreement limit the arbitrator’s jurisdiction to Part B of the contract.

The union is allowed to organize about 5 Magna plants per year. There are about 45 Magna units in total. It will likely take about 10 years to bring the 18,000 Magna workers into the CAW and create the Magna local. During that time, what happens if workers start to resist and demand a fightback against company? It puts the union in a position where, if it wants to organize all of the 45 units, it would have to police the workers. In fact, the FFA is *explicit* that the rules can’t be changed. (FFA, p.13) It prevents the union from organizing an independent steward body, “polarizing the work environment,” exercising the right to strike or challenging Magna’s corporate goals and principles until all the plants are organized. How can any of this be changed without jeopardizing the entire project of organizing Magna?

➔ But Magna workers will have access to Paid Educational Leave. Won’t it be easier to politicize them once they’re in the CAW and exposed to our education programmes?

It’s true that all of the CAW’s educational programmes directly contradict the philosophy behind the FFA. In these courses, workers learn about independent, democratic trade unionism, the idea that workers and employers have conflicting interests, why it’s important to reject the logic and power of corporate competitiveness, and the traditions of struggle that workers have created to make gains for themselves and other workers. Assuming that Magna workers would be exposed to this, how will they experience CAW educational courses, such as PEL, that run against the grain of the Framework and the “union” environment that the National office has negotiated for them? What can they do with this education once they return to their workplaces – if their experiences contradict what they learn in classes? If the education programmes have an effect on them, won’t it lead them to “politicize” and “polarize” the workplace and violate the FFA? What will the National office do when Magna workers, full of fighting spirit after their experience at Port Elgin, begin to call into question the terms of the FFA? Will the National office support shop-floor activism, or will they police compliance with the FFA?

Even more, it's hard to see workers at individual Magna plants, part of one local union, isolated from their brothers and sisters in neighbouring local unions and labour councils, becoming part of the proud culture of social unionism of the CAW. Where are the experienced trade unionists going to come from to nurture and mentor them?

CAW members know that the best kind of union education happens in the context of struggle: on the picket line, through various kinds of direct action on the shop floor, and so on. That's where the things learned in educationals become real, start to make sense, and are useful to people. Will Magna workers ever have the chance to use any of the things they learn from the CAW, especially without the right to strike?

➔ Come on, most CAW locals hardly ever use the right to strike anyway. Most of our collective agreements are concluded without a strike, and they're some of the best ones around.

It's true that most collective agreements in Canada, let alone the CAW, are negotiated without actual strikes taking place. However, that doesn't mean the right to strike isn't important. In fact, most of those collective agreements come about precisely because workers have taken a strike vote and have given their bargaining team some leverage at the bargaining table. It is the *threat* of a strike that is key to so many collective agreements getting signed. If workers can never use the threat of not working to back up their demands, what incentive will employers ever have to improve wages and working conditions? (This is what we teach our members in all of our collective bargaining education classes).

While strikes are relatively rare, they provide important experiences in building worker solidarity and collective power. They teach important lessons about the nature of employers and are key elements in building independent unions. Strikes are the strongest weapon workers have.

Giving up the right to strike only makes Magna feel secure – not the union. Magna can go about bargaining a new collective agreement without fear that production will be disrupted. The union, on the other hand, is left to place its hope in Magna's good will. It's precisely because the right to strike is such an important source of power for workers – the only one, really – that Magna was so committed to getting rid of it in the FFA.

Before we dismiss the importance of the right to strike, keep in mind one thing: anyone who knows the history

of our union knows that so much of who the CAW is today has been shaped by strike action: our major gains, or identity and our structures.

➔ Lots of CAW members, like those in the health care sector, and other public sector workers don't have the right to strike and go to arbitration instead. Aren't their collective agreements OK?

There are a number of sectors in Ontario and the rest of Canada where strikes are illegal and, like many other unions, workers who don't have the right to strike try and make the best of that limitation – no one denies that. But "making the best of it" is not the same as justifying or legitimating the denial of the fundamental right of workers to withdraw our labour and of the power behind workers threatening and/or exercising that right.

Public sector workers have been fighting against limitations on their right to strike for decades. Their struggles have played a big role in strengthening the union movement as a whole and defending public services. They need the support and solidarity of private sector unions. When people argue that the right to strike isn't important – it belittles and delegitimizes the historical struggles of public sector unionists for the full right to strike.

Not having the right to strike limits workers and we need to fight to change laws that deny that right everywhere. It is rather odd to hear defenders of the Magna deal arguing as if the right to strike doesn't matter, while on the east coast, the union supports the Nova Scotia Federation of Labour's campaign against the provincial government's anti-strike bill.

At Magna this is a significant concession that affects CAW members across the sector. Assemblers are always looking to reduce interruptions in just-in-time delivery. Non-union Magna eliminated the possibility of legal work stoppages there and pressured other unionized parts suppliers to do the same. Now, the union will legitimize that role, hurting the interests of our members in units that currently have the right to strike.

➔ Magna workers don't currently have the right to strike anyway. They are not giving anything up and getting third party arbitration is a step forward for them. How could we be opposed to this?

The issue isn't whether or not arbitration is a step forward for Magna workers. The issue is the right to strike and what kind of union we want to build at Magna. Do we want to build a union that puts its trust

in an arbitrator or a strong, independent union, capable of making new gains and defending them in the future? The union has the responsibility of fighting for the right to strike – recognized as a fundamental right of workers everywhere. In the Magna Framework and National Agreement the union voluntarily agrees *never* to fight for it. True, Magna workers aren't giving up anything they don't already have now, but the CAW and the employer are denying these workers the possibility of winning a right which is absolutely fundamental to their future strength. CAW workers know from first hand experience that a group of workers is not just made a union when it's on legal paper at the Labour Board. A union is made when a group of workers come together and are able to use their collective power to make new gains and defend them when they're under attack.

You know, the argument that, 'Magna workers didn't lose the right to strike because they never had it' sounds a little like 'new hires in the U.S. didn't have their wages cut in half because they didn't have UAW wages before.' In both cases, what is being created is second-class union members and in both cases this threatens workers well beyond Magna and new hires. In this context, Magna IS a foot-in-the-door but it's an opening for management to set the bar lower for both those coming into the union 'movement' and all workers. The UAW concessions resulted in two-tier wages, the FFA results in two-tier representation.

Even the workers at Integram, the CAW-organized Magna plant in Windsor, who originally gave up the right to strike during their first collective agreement, were on the verge of winning that right this October, but were forced to give it up by the Magna Framework.

➔ It doesn't matter if the Framework of Fairness has all those problems, because we can't organize Magna any other way. Organizing under the current legal framework and economic conditions is too hard, too restrictive, and too biased to the advantage of the employer. Employers' sophisticated anti-unionism works to make organizing almost impossible. CAW already did everything it could to organize Magna the normal way.

Certainly, organizing is not easy and in today's political and economic environment. Lots of people will say it is impossible. Prior to the FFA, Frank Stronach did everything he could to keep the union out of Magna. He and other employers have a lot of power to undermine organizing drives. The Labour Relations Act isn't very strong after the Harris government got finished with it, and the McGuinty government hasn't

done much to reverse the damage. But there are reasons to think that Magna can be organized:

First, in the 1930s, in the midst of hard economic times and with no laws to back us up, people also said it was impossible to organize autoworkers – and we did it. The UAW was organized by workers during the Great Depression, when conditions of mass unemployment and insecurity were the worst. There was a mass movement in North America to unionize industrial workers, and our union was part of it.

Such an effort would be difficult today, but we never really tried. The CAW has never mounted the kind of sustained, mass, community-based campaign necessary to organize the likes of Magna, or Toyota or Honda, as if our lives – and the lives of our neighbours and kids – depended on it.

The Integram Example

There is an example of how to organize Magna: the Integram plant in Windsor. There, we used a neutrality agreement bargained with Chrysler, and a creative, community-based strategy of organizing. The CAW was successful in organizing a workplace with an independent, membership-elected union committee and where the right to strike – although suspended for the first agreement – would have come into force, had that plant not come under the new Framework agreement. The success at Integram should have sparked a realization that organizing was in fact possible and launched a national campaign using the techniques developed there. Instead, the young CAW member who led the organizing drive was sent back to work on the line. We already had a foot in the door with Integram and two other Windsor-area Magna plants, but the CAW did not launch a massive campaign after this success.

Second, we should use our power inside the industry: employer neutrality letters are also important for creating space to organize – where Magna's principal customers (our auto assembly employers) – agree to pressure their suppliers to allow unionization. But to bargain these letters and to make them effective, we would need to educate our members to make this a priority in bargaining and even then, we would need creative ways to organize. This, too, has not been done.

Certainly, there are circumstances where we can bargain a prior agreement with an employer to allow us to organize workers in their plants without interference – we have done this in a number of places before such as CAMI or Freightliner. The problem in this instance is that the Framework Of Fairness and the Magna

National Agreement create terms that make it almost impossible to have a real union – and the leadership has accepted it.

Finally, there has been no real effort to pressure the Ontario government to make it easier to organize – by bringing back a card-check certification process. McGuinty's Liberals have refused to undo Harris's labour law changes and the CAW's support for this government has been embarrassing, because we haven't even demanded a change. Lobbying politicians behind closed doors isn't enough. We should be working to unite unions in Ontario in a movement to challenge the McGuinty government to change the laws, but we remain unwilling or unable to mobilize or to work with other unions to do so.

➔ What about the CAMI Agreement in 1988? Didn't we agree to give up certain rights in order to get our 'foot in the door' there? Didn't we eventually build a strong, independent union there?

While CAMI was an example of an employer neutrality agreement – where management didn't dispute our organizing efforts and agreed to a contract before the plant was organized – it was very different from Magna. The CAMI agreement contained provisions for an independent, elected set of in-plant union representatives and the right to strike. As well, the union was fairly clear that, in spite of its acceptance of the team concept as a method of organizing production there, it rejected notions of 'partnership' and competitiveness-inspired work intensification, and encouraged efforts by the workers to build a strong and militant union culture.

Key elements of the union's development were the numerous shop-floor work stoppages – organized with the help of the in-plant reps – and the 5-week strike in 1992, which built the power and solidarity of the local union.

Magna is very different. There are no stewards, no right to strike, mixed messages about partnership and competitiveness and a clear commitment to avoid any workplace militancy.

➔ We don't have time for long-term organizing efforts which might fail in the end. The CAW is facing a major membership crisis, especially in the parts sector. Shouldn't we pursue every possible avenue to bring members into the union and fast?

Increasing union density in the parts sector is critical for wages and working conditions there and in assembly, as employers look to outsource to reduce labour costs. But increasing union density only means

increasing membership numbers on paper if we can't organize a real, independent union. Without the bargaining tools (threat of strike, work disruptions) needed to leverage better conditions for workers, increased union density is meaningless. There is no easy shortcut.

➔ The Magna Agreement is a specific attempt to address a real problem for the CAW. Why should it hurt the rest of the union movement? If anything, it might inspire other unions to seek innovative ways to build.

When the largest private sector union in the country – the CAW – organizes the largest employer in the auto sector, gives up both the right to strike and independent worker representation and then argues that it doesn't matter, it sends the wrong message to other workers and employers everywhere.

This certainly will weaken the rest of the union movement. Employers in all sectors – public as well as private – can come to the bargaining table and demand that they give up what we gave up. This will surely undermine the bargaining position of other unions.

Employers have always used Magna as an example of what they want. Now that Magna is organized without the right to strike and without independent worker representation, they have the CAW's stamp of approval.

➔ Many of the opponents of the deal, however well-intentioned they might be, just don't seem to get it – that we are facing a totally new climate for the labour movement. We no longer have an auto pact. Employers can move their operations where they wish and customers have many choices where to source their components. This places enormous pressure on us to change the way we do things. We are no longer living in the 1960s or 70s. The Magna agreement is an example of the new and innovative choices we have to make today.

No one denies the enormous power that globalization, free trade and the right-wing movement of governments have given to employers. This is all the more reason for unions to challenge that power, by providing workers with the tools to defend their rights. Giving up the right to strike, an independent and democratically elected steward system and agreeing that management is our partners will not guarantee us anything, except that the employer will come after us for more in the future.

Certainly, the situation today is not good for us. But how are we going to ever change that without building the capacity of the union to fightback – in the workplace and on the political terrain?

Remember, in the 1980s the UAW – then our union’s ‘parent’ – made the same arguments. That’s why we split from them. We argued that no matter what the circumstances, the union had to maintain its independence from the employer and fight to make gains for workers.

➔ Magna workers have the democratic right to decide. Who are we to tell them what to do?

Ultimately, Magna workers will decide about their union rights. No one is saying otherwise.

On the other hand, we – the CAW membership and leadership – have both the right and the responsibility to offer choices that will make the union at Magna strong and effective – the kind of choices that we would demand for ourselves. Offering them a union without internal democratic structures independent of management, denying them the right to withdraw their labour and refusing to help them limit their dependence on the employer’s competitive market position is the wrong thing to do.

Just like we refuse claims by employers that it is undemocratic to deny workers the right to vote on management’s last offer in a collective bargaining situation, we can’t argue that it is undemocratic to deny Magna workers the right to vote on this flawed agreement.

➔ Why is this being brought to the CAW Council, anyway?

The three dollar an hour wage increase was an important gain for the workers. On the other hand, had Magna paid these workers the “average wage in the sector” the wage increase would have been much higher. (But, with Magna being the largest employer in the auto sector, shouldn’t they pay MORE than the industry average? Shouldn’t they be paying the leading wage rate? By paying this lower ‘average’ rate, even if they are organized under the Framework, Magna is a “free rider.”)

While we certainly welcome the Windsor Modules workers into the CAW, we remain very concerned that the leadership would deny them the right to a real agreement and use the Framework to deny them gains that they could have made anyway.

This is an issue that affects our entire union and the union movement as a whole. It therefore needs to be debated, voted on and decided at the CAW Council.

CAW members have a right to democratic input into the policy of our union. The Magna Framework was conceived and negotiated behind closed doors without any input from the union’s membership or the CAW Council – the parliament of our union.

Shouldn’t an issue as important as this have been brought to the CAW Council *before* it was negotiated and announced to the public at large? Shouldn’t the Council delegates have had the opportunity to debate the strategy behind the Framework *before* the union agreed to use it as a basis to bargain with Stronach?

➔ But hasn’t the Magna Windsor Modules Plant already been organized under the new Magna Framework?

The Windsor Modules plant was performing work that had been previously outsourced from Chrysler. There, it has been done for close to \$34 per hour, while at the Magna plant, workers were being paid \$12. The CAW local at Chrysler had insisted that this plant be unionized. Clearly, the CAW had received voluntary recognition at Windsor Modules long before the FFA came into effect.

Rather than being the result of the Framework Agreement, the Windsor Modules contract was being bargained BEFORE the agreement came into effect. Had a regular agreement been applied, workers there would have had full representation rights and the right to strike. In the midst of bargaining in May, Magna called a halt, arguing that it should wait until the Framework Agreement came into force.

Even more, isn’t there something wrong with using the Framework as a basis to bargain a first agreement *before* it could be discussed at the Council? Will that contribute to the debate or will it make a real debate very difficult, if not impossible?

➔ In the existing Magna plants the CAW has organized, the union has successfully built a working relationship with management and a strong, independent union, including some of Magna’s existing system, with a fairness committee and Magna grievance system. Magna can work with us. Why wouldn’t we be able to do the same with the new framework?

Existing Magna-Caw agreements, like Integram, in Windsor, not only include Fairness Committees, the Open Door and other Magna institutions, but also have

independent, democratically elected union stewards and an option for members to use a real grievance procedure. While they didn't have the right to strike after their initial three-year agreement, they could have gotten that right after the second agreement ended. By joining the Framework and the new Magna National Agreement, much of this will change. In other words, the new deal at Magna undermines real gains made in previously organized units. The FFA represents a step backwards.

➔ When all is said and done, isn't this really a question of trusting our union and its leadership? If you believe in the CAW and its tradition of struggle, our success at building the union at Magna is beyond question. We need to pull together behind our leadership to support our union in this challenging effort.

No one is questioning the CAW's tradition of struggle and success. The debate is about maintaining that tradition. Those successes were built on the basis of a number of key principles that apply today as much as they did in the past. They include independence from employers, democratic discussion and debate and a deep respect for the ability of the membership to fight for their rights and move forward when given the leadership and opportunity to do so.

Many of us question whether the Magna agreement reflects those principles. It doesn't allow the members to organize a workplace base independent of the employer and rejects the right to strike. It was conceived and bargained *before* there was any real debate. It reflects a deep pessimism about workers' ability to fight and accepts the idea that the union can't really organize large groups of workers in today's environment. Instead, it seems to concede that we have no choice but to live with the employer's definition of what a union is.

The concern is not just about the Magna agreement, but that the Magna agreement reflects a larger concern about the direction of our union.

Accusing those who criticise this decision with disloyalty is very disturbing. There is a crying need in our union for more democratic debate and discussion over key policy decisions. This means that in order to move forward in difficult times, real differences of opinion about the union's direction need to be heard before we make those decisions.

Dissent isn't the same as disloyalty. All of us are loyal to this union. But our loyalty isn't to any particular individual or leader or policy, but to the ideals, principles and members of the union.

If the union takes the wrong decisions and applies the wrong policies, it will weaken the union and hurt the membership. Criticism of the Magna Framework and a healthy scepticism about our capacity to use it as the basis for building the union is necessary to eventually organize those workers and build a real union there.

If you are convinced that the Magna Framework is a bad idea, contact CAW President Buzz Hargrove at cawpres@caw.ca, or call him at the CAW National Office at: (416) 495.6555