

*Air Traffic Control Dispute*

**Mr. Speaker:** If the hon. member will read the standing order he will see that it says, "with reference to which a notice of motion has been previously given". Notice has been given. The hon. member may not agree with this, but certainly notice has been given.

**Mr. Lambert:** No.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been placed in the hands of the Clerk of the House, and there is no question in my mind but that notice has been given.

**Mr. Lambert:** Well, Mr. Speaker—

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member has had the opportunity to make this point. I take into account what he has said and have come to the conclusion, not necessarily easily, that the terms of this standing order do not preclude the acceptance of the motion. However, I feel this is a borderline case procedurally; there is no question about it. The only difficulty with which I am really faced at the moment is the notice. The notice, though filed with the clerk, is not on the order paper, and this places the government in a weaker position to oppose a debate at this time.

● (4:30 p.m.)

There is no doubt whatsoever that there is considerable public interest in this very important matter, as evidenced by the statements made by hon. members this afternoon. I am taking into account the fact that this is a short day, and that there is an hour and a half or so left in which hon. members might have the opportunity to indicate what, in their view, the government might want to do in connection with the settlement of this strike. In considering all aspects of the matter, the public interest and the fact that the procedural case against the motion is not too clear or too strong, I believe that I should accept the motion of the hon. member for Ontario.

**Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member for Ontario would permit me to ask the house to allow me to revert to motions. I wish to table two copies of the first half of the Robinson report, so that it will become a public document. I regret that the judge did not have it printed and there are only a few copies, but I will try to get as many copies as I can. I think it is only fair to hon. members, Your Honour having made the decision, that they should have the document.

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

[Mr. Lambert.]

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Starr), seconded by the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) moves that the house now adjourn.

**Hon. Michael Starr (Ontario):** Mr. Speaker, in asking permission to table the first half of the document, the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill) has used the same argument that was put forward yesterday, namely that it was necessary for the government to wait until they received the second half of the report before any conclusions could be reached. May I say to the government and to the ministers who are involved in this whole affair, in particular the Minister of Transport, that the most important issue in the dispute is the salaries and wages of the members of the association. The first part of the report makes a recommendation in that direction. All the government has to do, without further procrastination, and in view of the fact that they appointed a renowned judge to inquire into the whole situation, is to accept his report. This is our advice, unless the government has not been frank and revealed to us the whole situation. The government has not told us up to date what are their reasons for not accepting the recommendations of Judge Robinson.

Let me tell the government that there must have been a reason for choosing Judge Robinson to take on this important task. I am well aware of the fact, owing to my previous association with the labour department, that on many occasions that department has used Judge Robinson's services in disputes between management and labour because he has a good reputation and he is renowned for his work in this area. I suggest this is the primary reason for the selection of Judge Robinson from amongst other judges. Surely, if he was chosen on that basis, then this government should have no hesitation in accepting his recommendations, especially since these recommendations are considered by at least half the people who are involved in the dispute, that is the employees, as a fair and just settlement. It is our opinion that what the judge recommends is fair and just, in view of the fact that he has recommended an average of a 15 per cent increase. We can only assume that these are the facts because we read about them. The government has not been frank with parliament and has not told us what are the true facts. If these are not the facts, then I think the President of the Treasury Board should inform the house as to why he does not consider the recommendations to be acceptable. Why is the government refusing to accept