

had expenses to put out such as child care, travel costs, they had to put all that out to come back here to work overtime. They did not get their overtime pay in the subsequent paycheck and they had to wait six months to get the overtime. If it were a tradesman on the Hill he got his overtime pay in the next check.

I had to write a letter to the head of the administration over in Vatican II across the road, they call it South Block. I had to write to the head honcho and say, "Look, why do these people have to wait six months to get what is theirs, what they have worked for?" Suddenly after a week they got their overtime pay. There is no reason at all for that.

There are other examples. Employees of the Library of Parliament were denied maternity benefits for a full year after such benefits were finally extended to House of Commons employees. The Library administration said it was an administrative error. We had the case of Library employees who worked side by side in the same office, doing the same job, with the same responsibilities, yet classified differently and at significantly different salary levels. Indexers in the Library of Parliament earn an average of \$6,000 a year less than people doing the same job for the House of Commons.

In the Cafeteria service an employee cut his hand on the job and was told to visit the nurse. The nurse told him it was not safe to work and he should go home. The manager told the employee he either got his butt back on the job or he would face discipline. There is no system, there is no method. You cannot impose it from the top, the worker has to sit across from the employer and they have to negotiate.

When you look at Bill C-45 you ask yourself where are the shortcomings? Why is the New Democratic Party opposed to Bill C-45? Because, in fact, Bill C-45 is almost the son of the PSSRA, the Public Service Staff Relations Act. We know from experience that the PSSRA caused enough problems with the workers in the Post Office. That is why they fought so hard and so long to be taken out from under the PSSRA and put under the Canada Labour Code. We were all part of that fight, because the Public Service Staff Relations Act limits what things can be negotiated. For example, under the PSSRA you cannot negotiate technological change, and under the Canada Labour Code you can. There is the whole question of staffing, grievances, the right to strike, and the question of classification; there are limitations in the Public Service Staff Relations Act that are not in the best interests of workers.

This Government has chosen to introduce Bill C-45 with all of its shortcomings and it is asking this Parliament to accept them. It is asking this Party, which is a labour party, to accept Bill C-45 as adequate. As a matter of fact the workers themselves do not want Bill C-45. There are far too many limitations in Bill C-45. Any collective bargaining act must have important factors such as classification. They ought to be able to negotiate job descriptions, the assignments of pay levels, and the evaluation of duties. Presently, as I have pointed out, job descriptions are changed arbitrarily by the powers that be over at Vatican II. All that does is result in frustration, poor

Parliamentary Employment and Staff Relations Act

morale and ultimately second class service to the honchos in the House of Commons.

Bill C-45 excludes classification from negotiations so the employees on the Hill would not be able to negotiate job classification, that area where some of the greatest injustices take place on the Hill at the present time. Under the PSSRA you cannot negotiate job classification. The Bill does not allow the employees to negotiate staffing. Unfair job appointments, promotions, demotions, transfers, etc., cannot be grieved to third party arbitration. There is no conciliation process in Bill C-45 on these matters.

We have a history of nepotism on the Hill. There was a time when, if an M. P. had a third cousin from a sixth uncle, fifth removed, he could get a job on the Hill. There are some people on the Hill who somehow or other ended up working in the Cafeteria of the House of Commons because they knew a friend of a friend who knew an M. P.

An Hon. Member: No.

Mr. Rodriguez: Yes, yes, absolutely. It has been known to happen. "You have to have connections" as it said in *Death of a Salesman*. This Bill does not—

Mr. Boudria: Say that outside the House.

Mr. Rodriguez: Why is the Hon. Member so sensitive? Did I mention a name?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: On a point of order.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Prud'homme: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The Hon. Member for Saint-Denis (Mr. Prud'homme) on a point of order.

Mr. Prud'homme: Mr. Speaker, I am listening with great interest to the Hon. Member, but with reference to his comments on that restaurant employee who could have become a Member of Parliament, I do not think he has to give his name in order for us to know very well who that person is. I would hope the Hon. Member who is well known for his oratory would stick to the legislation. We are listening carefully, but I do not see why he should attack one of our colleagues. We know very well who is involved and I find that really unfair, as we say in English!

● (1450)

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez) has the floor on debate.

Mr. Rodriguez: Mr. Speaker, I do not know where all this sensitivity comes from. I pointed out that nepotism on the Hill has been historical. The fact that this Bill does not allow one to negotiate staffing means that we can very well end up continuing the same process. I did not name any names, but if there