

That usually happens after a considerable period of disruption in areas where the public is vitally affected. However, to my knowledge this is the first time we have been asked to pass legislation or informed of the legislation before the negotiations were completed. After a long period of negotiations the union gave notice that it was in a position to go on strike on Monday night and that there would be work stoppages of the rotation type. Those stoppages would no doubt have caused considerable disruption, but certainly not the end of air transportation in Canada. If the union had operated rotating strikes as had been done in the past, the disruption would have been of relatively short duration in particular areas around the country. Undoubtedly some concern would have been caused, but there would not necessarily have been a stand-still in air transportation in our country.

Last Friday the government did not indicate that it had legislation prepared. I gather it did not have it prepared until today because it was indicated to my caucus that there was a particular bill with certain clauses affecting this situation, and that when the bill was introduced it would be a different bill eliminating some very bad aspects. The bill would have involved penalties.

Very shortly after we adjourned on Friday the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) went on television and said that it was his intention to introduce legislation immediately to end the strike which was to take place a number of days hence. I am sure that the Minister of Labour (Mr. Munro) will agree with me that having Saturday, Sunday and Monday to settle a strike with mediators of the calibre of Mr. Kelly, or some others I know of—and certainly most of them are not involved with the Treasury Board—provided a reasonable opportunity to settle that strike.

At that time not only the points which have been mentioned were in contention but there were a number of other points which were in contention on Friday. They were in contention on Saturday, and I gather that it was not until later, on Sunday and Monday, that a number of those points were dropped by the union. They involved important issues about which I am sure the union was concerned. They involved pensions, leave, and familiarization matters. These and other matters which were still in dispute were dropped by the union in return for just referring the issue of wages to the AIB. The union suggested that it could live with that and abide by the decision of the AIB. It seems to me that that was the best time for the Minister of Labour to get involved and to bring in his best mediators to have a look at the situation and to try to correct the bungling which took place, mainly because of the Minister of Transport.

Anyone with a Prussian-like mind can probably develop a disaster out of a reasonably negotiable situation, but after the Minister of Transport made the statements he made I can understand the leadership of that union saying that the only alternative was to shut down and to do it then. I can understand the union not wanting to accommodate the government for the next two or three days. Mr. Speaker, may I call it six o'clock?

#### *Air Traffic Controllers*

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** It being six o'clock, I do now leave the chair until eight o'clock tonight.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

#### AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

**Mr. Peters:** Mr. Speaker, before lunch—

**Mr. Stanfield:** Which day?

**Mr. Peters:** Well, if you are a rural Canadian you call it lunch; if not, you call it supper. Before we rose at six o'clock I was suggesting that the previous negotiations led to the strike, because the Minister of Transport had willed this to happen.

In the two or three days leading up to the strike the union had made a number of concessions which were not met with concessions on the other side, and this is one of our problems. The Minister of Labour is responsible for some labour negotiations in the federal field; similarly, the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Andras) also has jurisdiction over some of those negotiations. Unfortunately, Treasury Board does not engage in negotiations as other employers do; hence any settlements to which it is party differ from the kind of settlements arrived at in other labour disputes.

In the present instance parliament is being asked to legislate air traffic controllers back to work. When parliament has legislated workers back to work in the past, it has always been reasonably generous to those it legislated back to work. Usually it agreed to the appointment of an arbitration board consisting of a union representative and a management representative. If parliament does this in the present instance I presume Treasury Board, or a representative of the Department of Transport, will represent management. In addition, parliament agreed to appoint an impartial arbitrator, who agreed to consider the matter in dispute and bring in a decision on which a settlement could be based. Usually such a decision has been reasonable, acceptable and justifiable, and to my knowledge it has been done this way in the past.

Parliament is negotiating a contract, Mr. Speaker. Parliament, by passing this legislation, will determine the wage structure of the controllers and some of their conditions of work. It is rewriting their contract of employment retroactively, I presume, to January 1 of this year. Therefore parliament is negotiating their contract. Unfortunately we do not have the facts on which we can negotiate such a contract. We are not expert enough to negotiate it, and there is nobody sitting on the other side of the table, as it were. I do not think the government and the opposition should be asked to make a settlement on behalf of a third party, but this is exactly what they are doing.

I am concerned about this question because it seems likely that the Post Office employees will strike, and parliament will also be asked to settle that strike with legislation. That course