

negotiation for classification problems, such as those related to job descriptions, the level of pay and job evaluations.

How could we imagine that employees who work for us on Parliament Hill would be satisfied with a collective bargaining system which does not allow for the negotiation of classification matters? This would mean that the classification level of an employee could be changed arbitrarily by management without the employee or his representatives being able to negotiate this matter with the employer. It is unthinkable. This would mean a bargaining system much weaker than those which exist in the private sector. Yet, Mr. Speaker, if there is one place in Canada which should serve as a model for collective bargaining and employee protection systems, it is certainly the House of Commons.

If those who work for the Ministers and the Members of Parliament, and thus for the Canadian public, are not well protected and do not have a satisfactory system or collective agreement, how can this be held up as an example for the private sector, where workers are often prevented from organizing and are given as few benefits as possible?

As concerns the classification system, I would like to quote some of the views expressed by the Public Service Alliance of Canada: "The present classification system has evolved throughout the years in the very special environment of Parliament Hill. People there say: 'This is the source of a lot of employee discontent. Many employees have no job description. Those who have feel that they are outdated, frequently and arbitrarily amended in an environment which recently witnessed major technological changes. This situation—'"

I am quoting the Public Service Alliance.

"—is a source of frustration, insecurity and a very low morale among employees."

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that merely by this text which I have just quoted from, it becomes abundantly clear that clause 5(3) of Bill C-45 is not good enough. We want employees who are happy, who have a part to play in the determination of their salary levels and who have a say in the assessment of their performance.

We do not want the arbitrary which has reigned for so many years over employer-employees relations on the Hill to continue. If we have to deal with a bill such as Bill C-45 to set the bargaining rules between employer and employees, we want to start on the right foot. There has never been a global protection scheme for Parliament employees on the Hill.

Therefore, on this side of the House, we are saying that if we are to start on the right foot, we should not accept this Bill which, in the opinion of several House Members and employees—you have heard the objections put forward by House Members, Mr. Speaker, and I support them—is not satisfactory.

I feel, therefore, that it would be reasonable to have the amendment moved by my colleague the Hon. Member for Hamilton East (Ms. Copps) be put and that Hon. Members

*Parliamentary Employment and Staff Relations Act*

should support it, especially those on the Government's side: those who have taken part in this debate so far have been few and far between. That would provide them with the opportunity to think this over for a few days and take part in the debate some 30 days hence, when the period suggested by my colleague the Hon. Member for Hamilton East is expired.

I do not want to speak any longer, Mr. Speaker. I think we should vote immediately on my colleague's amendment, because I feel it is a major one which should logically allow us to study with a clear mind the consequences of the Court's ruling.

• (1510)

[English]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Are there questions or comments? The Hon. Member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Keeper).

**Mr. Keeper:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for my colleague. The problems which led employees on the Hill to organize and seek collective bargaining rights had to do with classification, promotion and staffing decisions. However, questions with respect to these areas are not dealt with in the legislation which is before us. How is it that the Government can possibly think that Bill C-45 will resolve the labour-management difficulties on Parliament Hill when the Bill does not deal at all with the root causes of the discontent? The legislation fails to deal with these areas which led to organizing in the first place. Could the Hon. Member please comment on my remarks?

**Mr. Guilbault (Saint-Jacques):** Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member is entirely right. What he has just said is a summary of my speech. When some of the main elements normally found in a collectively-bargained contract are not found in this legislation then I say that it is faulty. The Government should go back to the drawing-board. This is exactly what I have been saying. In fact, there is little more I can say. The items outlined by the Hon. Member should be subject to negotiation. The employees should have a say in how they are classified, paid and so on. It was the purpose of my speech to point that out.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some Hon. Members:** Question.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The question is on the amendment standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Hamilton East (Ms. Copps):

That the motion be amended by deleting all the words after the word "That" and substituting the following therefor:

"Bill C-45, and Act respecting employer and employee relations in the Senate and House of Commons, be not now read a second time but that it be read a second time one month hence."

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.