

*The Address—Mr. Macdonnell*

Lincoln, I wish to quote from Lush and then from Amory. Let me say that these are two practical men. They are not long-haired evangelists. Lush has practised profit sharing for 13 years. He has this to say:

It has been said with much truth that the only way to defeat communism is with a better ideology, and just as soon as management raises its sights and comes through with higher thinking, backed by unselfish leadership, management will find that slowly but surely its role of leadership will be accepted. Loyalty, good will and confidence cannot be bought. These must be won.

I also want to read from Amory. He has been a manufacturer and he is deputy president of the industrial co-partnership association. He says this:

Let the chosen representatives of employers and trade unions get together and make a reappraisal of what is needed by industry for maximum efficiency in the interests of all. If this were done with honesty and good will, many time-honoured techniques of both sides would be discarded as outworn and irrelevant to the needs of today and tomorrow.

I have always believed that in these matters the prime responsibility for the initiative lies with the employers.

I want to stress that again. The prime responsibility lies with the employers.

Let the employers first make a sincere reappraisal of their practices to see if they really measure up to an attitude of partnership and consultation on equal terms.

I continue with another quotation from Amory:

Our system of democracy is on test industrially as in other fields. We are competing with communist countries whose governments do not allow either free choice to interfere with its priorities or controversy and competing loyalties to weaken its single-minded concentration on economic results. In this race the free democracies are in danger of being left increasingly behind. In the face of this competition, we shall only survive if we cut out the waste, the misdirected efforts and, worse still, the inertia that results from our over indulgence in the luxury of scrapping about the subdivision of our present earnings and replace this with a much more dynamic spirit of positive co-operation.

I am sorry to read at length but I felt that it was worth while to put on the record these statements by practical men who have proved the success and feasibility of what they say.

I have made some considerable inquiry, so far as I can, as to the attitude of the ordinary hourly worker. I said the other day to a man who had a good deal of manufacturing experience, "would you say that a considerable number of hourly workers have very little interest in what they are doing?" He said, "you could put it more strongly than that."

I am going to stick out my neck by giving a small experience of my own. Years ago,

when I was in business, our company occasionally discharged the functions of receiver and manager. We were for four years the receiver and manager of the Dominion Steel and Coal Company in Nova Scotia. We got some good advice when we were going there. We were told that the workmen were mostly from Scotland or had a Scottish background. We were told, "you can lead them anywhere but you cannot drive them an inch". This was good advice, and I like to think we followed it.

We had two great advantages, of course, as receivers. First of all, we were not regarded with suspicion as the owners often are. We were not the owners, we were merely another employee. We were working for the benefit of the company and the workers knew that their pay was the first thing that came out of the earnings we made. We had an advantage there. Second, we had another advantage in that we were bound to give the worker the full story of the operations of the company. I think that is a very important matter. I think a great deal of the dissatisfaction from which workmen suffer results from the fact that they do not believe they know the whole story. Those of us who are at all familiar with these matters know that that is true.

Even the best of manufacturers, even the best people in business, often consider themselves entitled to at least some accelerated construction here or a little extra there so as to keep the accurate story of the earnings from the worker. Now, coming back, I want to add this from my own small experience. We had, I think, a very good relationship with the workers during the four years we were there. They came on one occasion and asked for more wages, and it was my duty to explain the situation to them. One thing they found difficult to understand was depreciation, but they accepted it. They believed what we told them, and at the end of the day they said that it looked as if the money was not there. They did not press their request. No one can ever make me believe that if you are able to get a good relationship with sensible men who believe you are sincere you cannot talk to them as man to man on sensible terms. I want to say that there is no mystery about getting on good terms with men. Various people have done this. Simpson-Sears, Dominion Foundry and Steel in Hamilton and other companies, to mention no more.

I have been tremendously impressed with this Lincoln book. I wish I could prescribe it as reading for everybody. I cannot believe