

that, on dissolution of Parliament, every member of the Board of Internal Economy would continue in office until another member was appointed in his place. That has been amended to make it clear that the Speaker and Deputy Speaker shall be deemed to remain in office as such as if there were no dissolution. That continues the practice, honourable senators, of the Speaker continuing the administration as he formerly did.

● (2350)

The final amendment is to clause 2 which formerly stated that the act would come into force or be deemed to have come into force on September 9. The phrase, "deemed to have come into force," has been deleted. Clause 2 now states that the act shall come into force on September 9, 1985.

Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

Hon. Charles Turner: Honourable senators, since I graduated from the University of Hard Knocks during the dirty thirties and through life's ups and downs, I have learned a lot about people. During my 27½ years on the railroad as a brotherhood official, I met many employees in the various railway YMCAs where grievances were given a complete airing day in and day out. As the Honourable Senator Sinclair would know, the cinders would really fly.

This would give us the opportunity to visit the boss the next morning, and, through good communication, we were many times able to deliver the goods. The problems would be resolved before they got too hot to handle.

During my 16 years as an MP, I listened to the problems of thousands of residents in my riding. I listened; I acted; and, thus, I was able to help thousands of people.

In my opinion, the four additional members of the back-bench should have the opportunity to walk down the halls and go into the various rooms to listen to and talk with the employees. They should listen to their complaints and grievances and then act. That is what democracy is all about. If they listen and act before the smoke turns to flames, then they can avert a major blaze.

During my five years as Chief Government Whip, I constantly talked to employees, who were lined up outside my door, about grievances and complaints about the House of Commons. There appeared to be no one to listen to the complaints, no matter where they went. No answers were forthcoming. Naturally, this brought the request for a union to knock at the door of the House of Commons.

When Senator Sinclair, as president and chairman of CP, was negotiating rates of pay, he did not need to put anything in writing because he would act upon his decision. That was a sign of an honest, sincere, hardworking businessman.

Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

Senator Turner: If his employees had grievances or complaints and they contacted the boss, they would never have to wait for an answer; it was given in short order.

The House of Commons officials appear to live in a different world. Many times they negotiate a contract with their

[Senator Phillips.]

employees, but seem to forget the increase in the cost of living and what their employees are going through. Therefore, dedicated, sincere employees, who have gone through long years of service for the House of Commons, are many times earning less money in terms of the increase in the cost of living. I believe this is wrong. This is not democracy. This is not the just society we all talk about.

If the new members on this board take time to listen to the employees and act on the many staffing problems in the House of Commons and in the Senate in a responsible way, many of the irritants could be eliminated and the staff morale would go up in short order. This would be democracy at work in Canada. Once again, the old saying in labour relations is appropriate: "You always get more with honey than you do with vinegar."

Honourable senators, I think Bill C-63 goes a long way and is a great step in the right direction.

Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

Hon. Eymard G. Corbin: Honourable senators, I intended to pose a question to Senator Phillips when he terminated his speech, but, as Senator Turner rose faster than I did, I did not wish to interrupt him. Perhaps I may be allowed to put a brief question to Senator Phillips.

I believe the text of the bill is rather explicit, but I would like to hear from Senator Phillips some assurance that this legislation does not infringe in any way, shape or form on the rights and privileges of the Senate and the members of the Senate insofar as some of the facilities and the services on the Hill are shared. Can he give me that assurance?

Senator Phillips: Honourable senators, in reply to Senator Corbin, I see nothing in the bill to indicate any infringement on the rights and privileges of the Senate.

I presume the Board of Internal Economy will continue the work of the Internal Commissioners in the House of Commons and will not assume any other function than that formerly held and carried out by the Internal Commissioners.

I have asked for and received explanations on several clauses which I thought might affect the Senate. The explanations I have received from the legal authorities is that they have been transferred verbatim from the present act and inserted into this bill. Therefore, there should be no changes in the relationship between the two chambers.

Hon. John B. Stewart: Perhaps when Senator Phillips rises to close the debate he will deal with this question. I would refer to clause 1 of the bill, which would amend subsection 16(5). This is found at the top of page 3 of the bill. There it states:

The estimates referred to in subsections (1), (2) and (4) shall, on approval by the Board of Internal Economy, be transmitted by the Speaker to the President of the Treasury Board who shall lay them severally before the House of Commons with the estimates of the government for the fiscal year.