

that those grievances can be discussed between the employee, the union's representative and management. Usually they arrive at a settlement which is acceptable to both sides. If they do not, that dispute can go to an impartial arbitrator who would hear the case as presented by both sides and render a judgment. That is not provided for in this legislation.

The whole question of technological change and the adverse effects which it can have on employees, many of whom have worked on the Hill for many years is not dealt with. The situation is that we are cutting back on permanent employees and replacing them with temporary employees who are paid less money per hour and do not have the benefits of a pension plan, or sick leave. None of these benefits are provided for these temporary employees who are being found on the Hill and in Government Departments more and more.

All of these questions need to be dealt with in a fair and equitable way. The only way they can be dealt with in a fair and equitable way is if the legislation which we are now debating and which will eventually pass, gives the employees who want to join a union—I emphasize the point that the employees will join the union only if they want to—the same rights to have a union bargain collectively on their behalf as all other workers in this country who come under either federal or provincial jurisdiction. Because this Bill is so deficient in meeting the needs of workers who work on Parliament Hill, I and my colleagues in the New Democratic Party intend to vote against this it.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Questions or comments? Is the Hon. Member rising on a point of order?

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, we are awaiting a document which will be tabled under the House order which was passed earlier this day, and I think if we could perhaps proceed to the next speaker—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): We have questions and comments so we can carry on until questions and comments are terminated and then maybe at that time the documents will be in the House and we can hear the statement of the Minister of State for Finance (Mrs. McDougall). Are there any questions or comments?

● (1630)

Mr. Boudria: I have a short question I would like to put to the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow). He has been a Member of this Chamber for a very long time, as we all know. He has had the opportunity to meet with and speak to employees for many years. As a matter of fact, I remember quite well when I was an employee of the House of Commons in the 1960s going to his office, both as part of my duties and, along with others, whenever there was a grievance with which we were trying to get assistance. As history sometimes works, the tables have turned and I find today many employees coming to my office for the same reasons. The Hon. Member for Lanark—Renfrew—Carleton (Mr. Dick), with his usual wisdom, has said: "Perhaps they are very hard up". They're

Parliamentary Employment and Staff Relations Act

not that hard up because they would have gone to see him. Then again, they probably would not because the service they would get would not be very good.

At some point in the past, even though there were no formal structures by way of job descriptions and so on which we now see on the Hill, there was an informal rule of appeal, at least where an employee could air his or her grievance with an individual Member of Parliament. Through that mechanism, and through the good offices of the Speaker and others, there was at least a form of redress. Now, with the administration of the House fully structured and the employees' rights being unstructured, if the Hon. Member follows my line of thought, there seems to be a tremendous imbalance. On the management side everything is formalized, but there is very little of this on the employee side. That has, in my view, and I would like the Hon. Member to comment, created a situation where the employee is totally frustrated when it comes time to try to grieve an injustice. Of course, the employee is equally frustrated in attempting to get redress for that kind of situation.

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Speaker, if the Hon. Member is asking me whether the present system does not work very well, I agree with him. We have supposedly a very structured, trained and efficient management staff with great power, indeed too much power, to deal with the individual complaints of employees. If, on the other hand, he suggests that the situation was better years ago, I cannot agree with him. I can remember that when I first came here, outside the office door of one of the Liberal Members from Ottawa there could be found about 25 chairs sitting in the hall. I remember asking what the chairs were doing there. I was told that it was very simple, people who want employment with the Government come and see that Member and he is able to find them jobs. That was a very bad system of patronage which I think, fortunately, is long gone.

Mr. Dick: You are talking about Boudria.

Mr. Orlikow: Yes, I am talking about those guys.

Mr. Dick: That is how he got hired.

Mr. Boudria: Put that on the record.

Mr. Orlikow: I say to the Hon. Member who has just interjected that if I had been here in the years 1957 to 1962, when we had a Conservative Government with a big majority, probably the same thing was happening with a Conservative Member of Parliament from Ottawa.

Mr. Dick: Probably? You do not know.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Questions or comments.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I will try to ignore the subsequent ignorant interruption of the Hon. Member for Lanark—Renfrew—Carleton and go back—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Order, please.