

*The Budget—Mr. McIvor*

I had an interview with a successful businessman of Ottawa and, after reading the budget, his conception of it, in the words of Agrippa, was: Almost thou persuadest me to be a Liberal. Of course the word used originally was not "Liberal".

When the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Drew) was speaking this afternoon I was intensely interested when he referred to the late Angus L. Macdonald who, as was well said this afternoon, was a great Canadian. I would say further that he was a great Christian Canadian. But I was disappointed when the Leader of the Opposition said that Quebec does not stand alone in this respect. Then he proceeded to read what he had said in the legislature in Toronto, and I think he convinced us that Ontario stood with Quebec in this issue.

I will say for the late Angus L. Macdonald that he agreed with the Minister of Finance and was premier in one of the nine provinces that co-operated. I believe that showed the wisdom of this former member of the house.

While it may be true that at one time Ontario stood with Quebec in this issue, it does not stand in that position today because the government of that province has entered into a co-operative agreement with the dominion. Quebec stands alone. I did admire the Leader of the Opposition when he stood in the house and championed the cause of his friend. I do not know whether I am safe in saying that they are kindred spirits.

The fact is, however, that Quebec now stands alone, and I am sorry that it does, because I think the citizens of that province compare favourably with those of any other part of Canada.

**Mr. Dufresne:** That is the best part of your speech.

**Mr. McIvor:** However they do not all agree with the premier of that province.

Another feature of the budget I like is that, notwithstanding the fact that we are likely to have a new pension scheme for the handicapped, there was no increase in taxation.

**Mr. Fraser (Peterborough):** That is only a promise.

**Mr. McIvor:** There was no increase in taxation, notwithstanding the increase in the indemnities of the members of both houses of parliament, and in the salaries of civil servants. There was no increase in taxation despite the fact that the St. Lawrence seaway has been promised, and the work is likely to begin this year. Not only that, but there is a decrease in taxation to the extent of about \$30 million.

I know there are hon. members in the house—and I agree to some extent with what

they say—who say that we should be giving, giving, giving. But we cannot keep on giving without getting. We must have taxation, and I must congratulate the minister upon not having increased taxation at this time.

The hon. member for Spadina (Mr. Croll) spoke about combines; the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Blackmore) spoke about communism and the need for a royal commission. I, too, have a pet subject, and I should like for a few moments to place before the house a cure for strikes. I agree with the *Ottawa Journal* when it says this:

The right to strike is a vital right; one of the democratic freedoms. If there be those to argue otherwise they are but blind reactionaries, people who would repeal the twentieth century.

The outstanding right of labour is the right to strike, just as industry has the right to shut down. My first cure or suggestion comes from a friend in Fort William, Edgar Rutledge. His suggestion is that a committee be chosen like a jury, with rights of a jury. If the number of people affected is small, the committee might be smaller, but he suggests that a committee be formed, four from the dominion government, four from industry and four from labour. These people would elect their own chairmen and their judgment would be final, but they should not be tied in to any particular political party. They should be free. I notice that in the British house a formula to settle British industrial disputes without recourse to strikes is the aim of Sir Walter Monckton. I hold in my hand a long article which I shall not read. They emphasize the same thing, that it is possible to set up a committee to settle industrial disputes. My friend, Mr. Rutledge, says that they should have the right of a jury. Human beings are human beings, and I do not know how this would work.

My second cure for strikes is the right to share in the profits. This summer I received from the Minister of Labour (Mr. Gregg)—and I was grateful to him for giving me the finding of his research workers—a letter, as follows:

I promised to write you further on the subject of profit sharing plans in Canada.

Although at present there is not much statistical data on the extent of such plans in Canada today, our economics and research branch is planning to include a question on the subject in its annual survey of working conditions this coming April.

There is an organization known as the council of profit sharing industries, Akron, Ohio, which has been active in encouraging the formation of profit sharing plans both in Canada and the United States. Information from this group on plans affecting Canada was published several months ago and indicated that 50 Canadian firms were members of the organization and that they employed 30,000 workers.