

security employees in Dorval and Mirabel, and a reporter who clearly showed that the safety of the public was in jeopardy because of an unclear situation respecting wages, collective agreements, the way the employees were treated and fairness of the system. As we know, at the Dorval and Mirabel airports, certain security officers in charge of supervising the parking lots were getting \$6.45, while those in charge of passenger safety being were paid much less. Mr. Speaker, I must say that last Friday, there was a meeting in the basement of the Saint-Pierre-Apôtre Church of the members of the Quebec Labour Federation, and I imagine that the Hon. Member for Argen-teuil was invited to attend because of the victory won by that union. Mr. Speaker, this shows once again that unions are not always negative. These organized steelworkers paid only minimum wages have demonstrated that the lives of the passengers leaving Mirabel and Dorval were endangered because of the absence of equal treatment and justice for all. If organized labour and unions have negative sides, they can have positive sides too, Mr. Speaker. Like the Hon. Member for Ottawa—Vanier (Mr. Gauthier) and the Hon. Member for Papineau (Mr. Ouellet), I feel that Parliament Hill employees should have been given the right to strike. As mentioned by the Hon. Member for Papineau, everybody knows most of these employees: they are here to serve the Canadian public. For instance, there are the messengers who respond quickly and efficiently to the requests made by Hon. Members; there are the many minibus drivers; there are the people responsible for recording the official proceedings of the House for *Debates*; there are the television employees; all of them are serious people who are never absent, who never refuse to work and never do their jobs improperly. Granting these people the right to strike, a right which other civil servants enjoy, would have shown that we recognize their sense of responsibility.

As I mentioned earlier, Mr. Speaker, these people, in spite of their irregular hours, are paid straight time. Are there many employees across the country who, because of a change of schedule, are forced to work beyond a certain number of hours, will accept to be paid straight time? I do not think there are very many. I suggest we should have recognized the services these people have provided for so many years by granting them the right to strike or, at least, by ensuring that any legal expenses incurred in the adjudication of a dispute were paid by the Government.

Mr. Speaker, I think the time has come for the Minister of Employment and Immigration (Miss MacDonald), a person who at the time she was sitting on opposition benches had demonstrated a rather strong moral conscience, to exert pressures on her Cabinet colleagues, especially those with rightist tendencies—we know some of them—to accept at least the amendment as moved, so that the legal expenses incurred in the adjudication of a dispute can be paid for by the employer.

● (2040)

Mr. Speaker, there are not millions of dollars involved. We have heard about expenses in the order of \$800 000 for three

*Parliamentary Employment and Staff Relations Act*

trips made by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney). But that was for just one or two persons. We know about \$35,000 spent on selling his image in the United States. We saw today a magazine with a circulation of over 100,000 in which there were 17 pictures of him—and this morning he suggested that was still not enough—but as yet we do not know how much that has cost!

Mr. Speaker, there is not that much money involved where these employees are concerned. Employees of the House of Commons do not ask for that much. They only ask that the Government accept to cover their legal expenses, when they need to have lawyers to defend their cases in the arbitration process. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me this is simple, logical and sensible.

As suggested by my colleague for Saint-Denis (Mr. Prud'homme), certainly no one here feels this is an irresponsible request made by the employees. As suggested by my colleague for Saint-Denis, I say this is not unreasonable. If as individuals they find that request to be most reasonable, most responsible, why then do they, as the Conservative Party, turn it down as unacceptable?

Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has promised changes. Members of Parliament would have more power, they would have more freedom! We realize this is not the case, nothing has changed! There is increasing doubt as to who is leading that party. All we know is the Government is a huge voting machine. Conservative Members are a bunch of men and women who are playing musical chairs. But when the time comes to defend substantial issues, issues in which they believe, and certainly those people do defend that in their caucus, but it would seem there is an extraneous force that is not part of the Government but that makes those decisions, and those decisions fly in the face of what I believe is the philosophy of some of the Members. I am convinced that as private Members they would accept that. They all told me; Yes, really this is acceptable, it is reasonable, those are not outlandish costs, this is what is being done within the Public Service Commission.

Why discriminate against employees of the House of Commons? They are not any worse than employees of the Public Service Commission, Mr. Speaker. But not to know who among them made that decision, that is not good enough.

Mr. Speaker, on that issue you have the Opposition Members, whether in the New Democratic Party or the Liberal Party, and certainly some Conservative Members—not the true Tories, because for them we know that only the law of the jungle prevails, the survival of the fittest. But I am convinced that a minority of Conservative Members, along with New Democratic Party Members and Liberal Members, did all they could to give the best to our employees in the House of Commons.

In conclusion, I would like to commend my colleague for Hamilton East (M. Copps) and the Hon. Member for Ottawa—Vanier (Mr. Gauthier) for having fought vigorously