

*Interim Supply*

concerned about one or two aspects of this honour. In view of the attitude of the former Canadian government toward Canadians accepting titles, would it be a violation of Canadian law if the hon. lady accepted this title? I wish also to know whether, in view of her elevation to royal rank she will be required to vacate her seat? If she is not required to vacate her seat, would she have to re-sign the roll in view of the change in name and title? I rise on this question of privilege because it has been concerning me for a few minutes.

**Mr. Argue:** I rise for a few moments at this particular time—

**Mr. Drysdale:** Are you on the question of privilege?

**Mr. Argue:** No. I rise to bring before the committee a grievance which I hope the Minister of Labour might consider. I see he is in the chamber and will undoubtedly consider the remarks I have to make. I am dealing with this matter at this time because there is the happy prospect of the house rather quickly adjourning and because the situation to which I shall refer has been deteriorating in recent days and may result, although I would hope not, in a very disagreeable strike from the standpoint of the employees, the company and the public. I refer, of course, to the current dispute between the Canadian air lines flight attendants association and Trans-Canada Air Lines. This issue has been raised in the house on orders of the day by myself and the hon. member for Skeena as well as others.

Although the minister has taken an interest in this subject there has not been any hopeful indication that this dispute is likely to be resolved amicably within a short time. The request of the employees' association for an inquiry into certain allegations has not been accepted by the government. A conciliation board, and its report, very often are helpful in arriving at the settlement of such a dispute. We have had some experience in this kind of recommendation with regard to another very major labour dispute in this country of some months ago, namely that between the non-operating employees of the railways and the railway management. The government some months ago failed to give, in our opinion, adequate support to the recommendations of the conciliation board which had been accepted by the employees. But none the less, after an interval of some months in which the public felt a railway strike might be imminent, the issue was settled on the basis of the conciliation board report.

In this dispute things have been following an almost identical pattern. A conciliation

board was set up. A majority report was made and, as far as two particulars are concerned, one of the members presented a dissenting report. A number of issues are involved but the issues in main dispute consist of additional pay because of the flight of high speed aircraft, the attendant inconvenience to the employees involved, the additional work involved, the additional amount of time required off the aircraft in order to make up a certain number of hours of actual employment.

The employees presented their case asking that one minute be added to each hour of time spent in the air for each additional ten miles of speed of the aircraft in excess of 300 miles an hour. The majority report of the conciliation board recommended a one-minute addition for each hour of service of employment in the air for each additional 25 miles per hour speed in excess of 300 miles per hour. Hence the employees, by this majority report, would receive 40 per cent of the amount they had requested.

They had also requested a general 15 per cent increase in pay. The conciliation board report was favourable to a 5 per cent increase in pay retroactive to October 1, 1960.

There seems to be a good deal of evidence that the company have really not bargained in good faith, and that they have taken steps which would suggest that they are endeavouring to recruit alternative employees or strike breakers, as they are very frequently called, with which to replace the employees involved in the dispute and that this kind of activity—and I think this is a serious charge—has been engaged in while the conciliation board was considering its report and certainly before the report had been made public. It is the feeling of the employees that they have been subjected to a great deal of intimidation, and they are therefore asking the minister to make an inquiry into this particular allegation.

I have in my hand a copy of a teletype dispatch sent out by the management to all T.C.A. stations prior to the report of the conciliation board. By reading this teletype dispatch I think I can point out exactly what the employees have in mind. The dispatch reads as follows:

The company has been attempting to negotiate a new contract with the flight attendants association since last summer. The major point at issue has been a "jet speed" clause which would result in approximately a 40 per cent increase in wage costs for flight attendants on DC-8 aircraft apart from the across the board increases demanded. Such a clause is unprecedented in the industry and is totally unacceptable to the company. The associations' bargaining representatives, however, have been adamant in their refusal to modify the specific demand in any way. As a result, an