

Industrial Relations

Mr. Knowles: One horse, one rabbit.

Mr. Gauthier (Portneuf): No, it is not that.

An hon. Member: Two horses.

Mr. Gauthier (Portneuf): There is a difference in imposing it by law and having it come about after a good understanding between the two parties. It is not the same thing and my hon. friend knows it.

Mr. Harris: Did you say "honourable and humble"?

Mr. Gauthier (Portneuf): Honourable and humble.

Mr. Harris: I thought the hon. member said "my humble friend".

Mr. Knowles: We are all honourable here; the book says so.

Mr. Gauthier (Portneuf): Yes. Some industries have gone a long way to make their employees feel that they are part of the company. Listen to this, and this exists in some parts of our country and in other countries of the world. Industries have gone a long way to make the employees feel that to a certain extent the company belongs to everyone working for it, whether he sweeps the floor, oils the machinery, works in an office or is even in the office of the manager or the president. They do not need to have the check-off, and I am positive that some companies make the employees feel that they are working for their own industry, and that is brought about by the way they treat their employees.

If my memory serves me well, I read somewhere that a man by the name of Tony Montiero—I am not positive that that is the right name—worked for quite a number of years in industry in the United States. He was a hard worker. He looked over various industries and saw that unrest existed between management and labour. He decided that he wanted to devote his life to the betterment of relations between the two parties. This Tony Montiero is preaching in different industries. If my memory serves me well, one company manager sent a letter to the newspapers of the United States stating that he was very glad to have a man of that calibre trying to do that much good for his compatriots in his efforts to try to develop understanding and fraternity between the two parties. He said, "Since we have had that man working in our industry the relations between myself and my employees are quite different from what they were and everything is going smoothly".

Well, he knew what psychology meant and he knew that in dealing with human beings we have to look at the intellectual, moral

[Mr. Gauthier (Portneuf).]

and spiritual side of the question as well as at the material side. That man has done a lot of good in the United States. If I have not given the proper name I shall correct it in *Hansard* tomorrow.

I think I have said enough, Mr. Speaker, to prove that I am not altogether opposed to the check-off, but I do not want it to be imposed by law because I believe that there may be friction, and I do not want any friction between the two parties because our opponents, those who want to destroy us—and they are in this country—will take the least opportunity to get in between the two parties and do their nasty work, as they have done in the past.

I heard the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mr. MacInnis) say that some say that labour is irresponsible. I have never heard that word used against labour in my life, and I have quite a large labouring force in my county, and I have industries in my county. There everything is working very smoothly because they see each other, they speak to each other and they understand each other. That is the way to look at this situation and to deal with the problem. If labour is that responsible I do not see why by law we should take from it part of its responsibility towards its union members and towards the employers. You are taking away a part of the responsibility of labour. We do not think labour is irresponsible; we think it is responsible, and we ask you not to take away a part of its responsibility toward the nation.

Mr. Speaker: Since it is six o'clock the house will at eight o'clock revert to the business which was under consideration prior to five o'clock.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

SUPPLY

INCOME TAX—PROVINCE OF QUEBEC

The house resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Abbott for committee of supply.

(Translation):

Mr. Gagnon:

Centralization, according to Proudhon, claiming exorbitant rights, aspiring to maintain in joint possession groups which are sovereign, by the very nature of things, and to govern associate cities like conquered ones, violates the very principle which it claims to uphold, i.e. the principle of political unity . . . There arises therefore immediately antagonism between central direction and