

*Air Traffic Controllers*

respect to reclassification and the level which that would have cost, in terms of 12.6 per cent. There was a unanimous report of the conciliation board before the government came with this bill and the 8 per cent total compensation in this legislation.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Broadbent:** Mr. Chairman, that is not an analysis. I say to the minister that that is propaganda.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Broadbent:** I have in my hand a copy of the report of the conciliation board which the minister has been proudly reporting on, and which has been so loudly cheered by his yelping backbenchers. The minister keeps reiterating that this report pertains to the 8 per cent settlement. As I thought everyone understood by now, this whole issue concerns reclassification. I should like to quote from page 2 of the report—

**An hon. Member:** Order.

**Mr. Broadbent:** Whenever you present the truth to a Liberal, he wants you to shut up.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Broadbent:** I say to the backbenchers, who were only listening to the minister, to listen to what the report indicates.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Broadbent:** We can stay here all night. We probably will.

**Mr. Corbin:** That does not bother us.

**Mr. Broadbent:** Nothing bothers you, brother.

**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** That is one of your problems, Corbin.

**Mr. Corbin:** Canadian people love you.

**Mr. Broadbent:** At page 2 the report reads as follows:

In the course of the proceedings of this conciliation board the parties engaged in considerable discussion with respect of these two issues. As these matters are beyond the jurisdiction of this board, we make no recommendation with respect to them. However, in view of the fact that these two issues were of paramount importance, we urge the parties to continue their efforts to resolve them.

**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** There is your answer.

**Mr. Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier):** So, what is new?

**Mr. Broadbent:** In terms of the substance of the minister's argument, this paper does not mean a damn thing and he should know it. It indicates that the two parties should get together, try to work out a solution and make unanimous recommendations on other matters.

Normally on labour matters the minister speaks seriously, and I mean that. If this amendment is passed by this House, it would provide what legislation introduced by the Liberal

government during the last ten years always provided, namely, an arbitrator. Back to work legislation has always provided that, since I have been here from 1968. We have not sat down and indicated that all the "t's" have been crossed and all the "i's" have been dotted. Here we are imposing a specific settlement on workers and we are setting up an arbitrator who does not have a ceiling under which to operate. That has never been done before. We propose a specific ceiling which the arbitrator cannot go beyond. The entire point of the amendment is to have an impartial arbitrator who can interpret the legitimacy of CATCA's case.

The minister has stated that the President of the Treasury Board dealt with that argument this afternoon. I say to the minister in all seriousness that I listened to the President of the Treasury Board this afternoon and I—

**Mr. Munro (Hamilton East):** You were not in the House.

**Mr. Broadbent:** I was present for the first couple of minutes, and I have since read *Hansard*.

**An hon. Member:** Where did you get a copy of *Hansard*?

**Mr. Broadbent:** I have it before me now. I suggest that members of the Liberal party should take the time to read it.

I do not want to waste the time of the House by speaking to the Minister of Labour when he is not listening. I should like to ask him if he is going to reply.

**Mr. Munro (Hamilton East):** You have got to sit down before I can answer.

**Mr. Broadbent:** Well, will you listen?

**Mr. Munro (Hamilton East):** I am listening.

**Mr. Broadbent:** Prior to this contract coming into being, there was no program pertaining to reclassification, which was the case made by the President of the Treasury Board this afternoon. He also cited two letters. In my reply tonight I indicated there were six letters, and not two letters. In the six letters it was abundantly clear that prior to the controls legislation being passed the government was negotiating with CATCA on the issue of reclassification. Thus, there was a clear understanding between the government and CATCA that reclassification was an issue. I also said that nowhere in AIB law or regulations are there instructions as to what is to be considered as legitimate criteria to apply to the reclassification point for consideration by AIB.

● (2300)

This is an open-ended situation. My point to the President of the Treasury Board, which I am now making to the Minister of Labour, was this: if it is so open-ended in terms both of the law and the regulations, and if they have been talking about changing the classification for over two and a half years, why is the government reluctant to put it to the AIB to decide? That is the question. This amendment would make that possible. It would be open to the arbitrator at least to consider