

graven images, so we will just bury the truth and we will not proceed any more with it." Instead they proceeded.

It is the same thing here. Many of the jobs which exist in our society today exist because of the worship of false gods, whether that be materialism or economic growth or whatever the case may be. We need to come to the point where we put the truth first and design jobs around the truth, rather than letting the existing jobs dictate what we preserve and what we do not.

Ms. Hunter: I think the brief intervention by my colleague from Winnipeg—Transcona this afternoon has demonstrated that there is a depth of knowledge within this caucus about the real priorities for the 1990s on environmental and economic issues.

The integration of the environment and the economy is doable. It is not only doable but it is a crisis situation. We have the vision in this caucus to be able to take it forth.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): It being 6 p.m., it is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 81(17), to inform the House that the proceedings on the motion have expired.

Pursuant to Standing Order 30(7)(a), the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed in today's Order Paper.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS—BILLS

[*English*]

PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYMENT ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

Mr. Neil Young (Beaches—Woodbine): moved that Bill C-225, an act to amend the Public Service Employment Act (staff of members of the House of Commons), be read the second time and referred to a legislative committee.

He said: Mr. Speaker, prior to my comments on my private member's bill—and I should say at the outset that I do not plan to take up the full 20 minutes that have

been allocated to me for debate—I think it would be useful for members on all sides of the House to understand a part of the history of this bill coming forward, which is in my name.

The bill was actually first introduced in 1984 by the then member of Parliament for Lachine, Rod Baker, who was also a parliamentary secretary at the time on the government side. The idea and the notion behind the bill came from a committee on which I had been asked to serve that was also made up of members from all sides of the House. It was a non-partisan committee, in the best sense of the word, and it had been lobbied extensively by members on all sides of the House to take a look at the problems that this bill is designed to address.

I rather suspect from those I have talked to that the bill will be adopted and referred to committee, as it was in 1984 when it received broad support from the House and would have gone to committee. I think some work has to be done on the bill. There are some flaws in it, and I recognize that, which can be corrected in committee. If that bill had been scrutinized by that committee and referred back to the House, the intent of this bill would now be legislation. Unfortunately an election in 1984 intervened in the passage and further consideration of the bill.

If the bill were implemented, it would simply accord the same privileges to staff of members of the House of Commons that are now granted to staff of cabinet ministers or the Leader of the Official Opposition. If a member is ever defeated, dies, or leaves office in whatever way, it would provide that an individual would worked in his or her office for a period of three years would receive consideration for priority employment in the Public Service of Canada. That is what the bill would do.

The bill would not give employees a right to enter the Public Service of Canada, but it would give them the opportunity to do so provided they met the standards and criteria the Public Service of Canada would require of any employee who applied for employment in that service. That is essentially what the bill would do.

I am told that the private members' committee that listened to the arguments in support of this bill was unanimous in its endorsement that it should receive full consideration in the House and I believe has made it a