

Air Traffic Controllers

every one of these are items agreed to between the parties themselves prior to this legislation being brought down. I would assume the hon. member would wish to see adopted the very terms to which the controllers have agreed and which, presumably, they wish to be adopted. All those areas in Schedule II are areas where beneficial and constructive collective bargaining went on.

With respect to Schedule I, I am getting an estimate of the over-all cost of the 8 per cent which will amount, roughly, to 8 per cent of the present cost of the salaries of all the controllers in Canada, including their fringe benefits. As far as the eight columns of figures are concerned, these are different steps within each classification, the principles of which have been acknowledged; the parties have been operating under them for some time. The contest came with respect to reclassification, the general upgrading of the various levels within each classification.

I repeat that Schedule II represents what the parties have agreed upon, and Schedule I is a reflection of the apportionment of the 8 per cent total compensation. If the apportionment as set out is not to the satisfaction of the parties, Clause 5 provides for an arbitrator who can be requested by the controllers to decide on a different allocation. I am now in a position to give the hon. member the figure for the total cost. It is \$3.8 million in terms of the increase set out in the bill before us.

Mr. Rodriguez: It may be that the minister's bureaucrats have worked this out with CATCA, but since I am now a party to the agreement as a member of parliament I should like to ask certain further questions; it is not enough for the minister to tell us that all this has been agreed to. I have been injected into this situation as a member of parliament, and since I want to vote intelligently upon the matter I need to know these things. Can the minister tell us where "experience" fits in in Schedule I? Can he tell us the number of employees associated with each of the categories mentioned?

Some hon. Members: Question!

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): As to the number of employees affected in each of the columns of figures, I can supply that information without difficulty. We will get the information to the hon. member shortly.

Mr. Rodriguez: I do not want to be obstreperous, Mr. Chairman—

Some hon. Members: Oh!

Mr. Rodriguez:—but I should like to know, before we vote on this collective agreement, the number of employees involved in each of these categories. I want to know this as a negotiator. For the minister to say he does not have this information handy means he was expecting to push this bill through in a very short period. It is important we should get these figures, that we should be given a breakdown of these employees. Could the minister explain to me as a negotiator what is a

[Mr. Munro (Hamilton East).]

"high density U.S.A. unit"? Is that like a low density minister?

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): If the hon. member wants an explanation of the various terms used in Schedule II, I suggest he has only to start reading them. Perhaps that will enlighten him as to what they mean.

Mr. Rodriguez: It is obvious the minister is not familiar with his own bill. The minister gave us the figures of the cost of Schedule I, the rates of pay. I believe he said the total cost would be \$3.8 million.

The Chairman: Order. It occurs to me the hon. member is going far beyond the amendment which is before the committee. The hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby has moved an amendment which is directly related to a settlement. The committee will be considering the schedules at some point. I think the hon. member should try to limit his contribution to the amendment in front of the committee at this time.

• (2250)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Rodriguez: Perhaps we can deal with the amendment and then we can return to clause 5 and get into specific questions.

As the minister has not spoken since earlier today, I wonder what his reaction is to the amendment of the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby.

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): Mr. Chairman, the reason I did not respond is because I thought the President of the Treasury Board explained in some considerable detail precisely what took place in the negotiations which led to the conclusion before us. The total compensation of 8 per cent was based on a conciliation board report which was unanimous. That is not an unusual procedure when we are passing legislation with respect to back to work.

The hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby took exception to my analysis on the basis that what I did not tell the House was that reclassification was beyond the purview of the conciliation board. That is true in the sense that under the Public Service Staff Relations Act classification is not subject to the collective bargaining process and arbitration, which is part of the law passed by parliament. Naturally it is beyond the conciliation board's purview.

The costing of the total compensation of 8 per cent and how it was arrived at was not done by the government itself, as has been suggested by other members of the New Democratic Party. There was the conciliation board, with labour, management and government representation. They were unanimous in recommending a total compensation of 8 per cent in this particular case. What was left in the conciliation board report was the availability of the parties to get together with respect to the apportionment of that 8 per cent.

As the President of the Treasury Board said, when speaking for the negotiators, there was no prior commitment with