declared illegal by Mr. Justice Addy of the Federal Court was allowed to last ten days before a draft agreement was signed under which the rights of Parliament had once again been negotiated.

Mr. Chairman, I was among those who last year urged Department of Transport and Treasury Board officials to bring legislation before Parliament which was sitting then, in order to ensure that the law of the land was enforced and that the law enforcement agencies were respected. Now, one year later, we are still living the consequences of this period and, in this perspective, everything that was undertaken to settle that conflict seems even more out of proportion and from many aspects useless. It is sufficient to read what the Hon. Jean Marchand, who is in the gallery tonight, stated on July 12, 1977, on the publication of the report of the Commission on Bilingual Air Traffic Services to be convinced that if we want to put back some order in the relations between CATCA and the Department of Transport, we must come back to a fair situation and not question the labour relations philosophy which marks the Canadian federal public service as one of the most progressive in the world.

Mr. Marchand wrote on July 12 last:

"The interim report shows that the argument of air safety invoked by CATCA and CALPA against bilingualism in Quebec for air communications was false and even ridiculous. This was a bugaboo that could not have scared people with the barest knowledge of the problem, especially not the government."

And he added:

"(c) From everything that has been said, it also appears that the federal Department of Transport really is the best agency to regulate air traffic, like it regulates maritime and rail traffic. It has the knowledge, the staff and the means to protect the public and the employees in the field of air traffic." Mr. Marchand also stated: "It therefore seems to me that an inquiry commission, whatever the honesty and the qualifications of the judges, is redundant and can only serve to put an end to the phychosis artificially and illegally created by CALPA and CATCA."

Therefore, if we want to normalize the relations between the Canadian Air Traffic Control Association and the federal Department of Transport, if we want to give back to the authorities concerned the responsibility towards Parliament and the Canadian public, if we want to re-establish the authority of Parliament and the Minister of Transport, we must annul the protocol of agreement of June 28, 1976, between the Minister of Transport, CATCA and CALPA, recall orders in council 1576, 1583, and 1588 and give to the federal Department of Transport sole responsibility for implementing bilingualism in air communications in Canada.

This is why, Mr. Chairman, I would like to table the text of the following amendment to subclause (5) of clause 5 of Bill C-63, seconded by my colleagues the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Duclos) and the hon. member for Matane (Mr. De Bané), I therefore move that Bill C-63, An Act to provide for the continuation of air traffic control services, be amended by adding immediately following clause 5, subclause 5, the following, as subclause 6:

6.(1) Orders CP-1976-1583 and 1976-1588, minutes of the meetings of the committee of the Privy Council, approved by His Excellency the Governor General, on June 23rd and 28th, 1976, and the protocol agreement between on the one hand, the Minister of Transport and, on the other hand, the Canadian Air Traffic Control Association (CATCA) and the Canadian Air Line Pilots' Association (CALPA), signed on June 28th, 1976, are abrogated and annulled.

(2) The Minister of Transport alone is responsible for the implementation of bilingualism in air communications.

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: Order, please. The Chair has reservations about the amendment being in order. I feel it is in no way pertinent to the bill now before the committee.

[*English*]

I wish to refer to May's nineteenth edition page 521, inadmissible amendments. I quote from paragraph 1:

An amendment is out of order if it is irrelevant to the subject matter or beyond the scope of the bill—

I think this amendment breaches both grounds and it does go beyond the scope of the bill. Therefore it is not receivable.

Mr. Rodriguez: Mr. Chairman, I have a couple more questions I want to ask the minister. Can an employee under this agreement use non-utilized time off for familiarization flight?

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): Mr. Chairman, I will endeavour to ascertain the answer to that question. In the meantime I can give an answer to the previous question of the hon. member. He talked about the total compensation and the allocation of moneys between the various people who fell into the different levels and different categories, the different classifications.

Going through Schedule I, I wish to revise my figure. I gave an erroneous figure earlier. The total cost has been costed out at $3,372,000. The number of people in the different categories are as follows: A1.00, 75; A1.01, 94; A1.02, 257; A1.03, 212; A1.04, 289; A1.05, 589; A1.06, 309; A1.07, 85; and A1.08, 33, for a total number of controllers of 2,213. Yes, experience is taken into account in providing the annual increment at all levels up to a maximum of six.

Mr. Rodriguez: While the minister is getting the answer to that question, I wonder if he could give the rationale for the non-payment of an employee's familiarization flight taken in conjunction with his days of rest.

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): Mr. Chairman, I will endeavour to ascertain that information and send it to the hon. member.

Mr. Rodriguez: On the retirement or debt, which is Schedule II, is this new or was there a similar clause in the previous collective agreement, and what is the projected cost of this clause?

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): Mr. Chairman, in answer to the first question of the hon. member, familiarization flights are taken during an employee's normal hours allotted so that