

Privilege—Mr. Boudria

its advice. It is a very, very sad day for Canada and for Canadians.

* * *

PRIVILEGE

ALLEGATION OF PATRONAGE

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Mr. Speaker, I wish to rise on a question of privilege. I wish to inform you that if you judge, as I have, that a *prima facie* question of privilege has been made, I am prepared to move the necessary motion that the matter to which I will refer in a minute be referred to the Standing Committee on Elections, Privileges and Procedure.

Earlier today in the House of Commons, the Hon. Member for Lanark—Renfrew—Carleton (Mr. Dick) made allegations to the effect that I had been employed at the House of Commons through the patronage of an Ottawa-Carleton area Member of Parliament. Those motives that have been imputed are totally false, as you of course know, and as I am sure the Hon. Member knows deep down in his heart. I would ask that the statement be withdrawn and, in the absence of that, I would wish to move the necessary motion to which I referred a while ago.

Mr. Dick: Mr. Speaker—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The Hon. Member for Lanark—Renfrew—Carleton (Mr. Dick) will be given his opportunity, but I just want to say something. The Hon. Member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell (Mr. Boudria) has just made reference to something which did not arise from the debate occurring at this particular time. If he does feel that he has a *prima facie* case of privilege, then he should give the proper notice and it should be dealt with tomorrow. I am afraid that I cannot accept it at this time and therefore we should go on to Orders of the Day.

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, on that same question of privilege, the House interrupted its normal business to go to a statement by a Minister by unanimous agreement. The Hon. Member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell (Mr. Boudria) wanted to raise this point at that time. He did not do so for the sake of keeping our word with the Government that we would not interfere with the arrangements made for the Minister of State for Finance (Mrs. McDougall) for 4.30 p.m. I would hope that—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I hope that the Hon. Member will give notice in writing so that we can go ahead and deal with it accordingly.

Order, please. I wish to inform the House that because of the ministerial statement and pursuant to order made earlier this day, this sitting will be extended by 25 minutes. Therefore,

the adjournment proceedings will begin at 6.25 p.m. The House will now turn to Orders of the Day.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

PARLIAMENTARY EMPLOYMENT AND STAFF RELATIONS ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Hnatyshyn that Bill C-45, an Act respecting employment and employer and employee relations in the Senate and House of Commons, be read the second time and referred to a legislative committee; and the amendment (Ms. Copps)(p. 833).

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I recognize the Hon. Member for Ottawa—I am sorry, the Hon. Member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell (Mr. Boudria). How could I forget that?

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Mr. Speaker, inadvertently you were quite correct. The Ottawa area is part of my riding. I represent the Counties of Glengarry, Prescott and Russell as well as that part of Ottawa-Carleton called the Township of Cumberland. Unbeknownst to you, Mr. Speaker, you were quite correct in calling me the Hon. Member for Ottawa, as I do represent at least a small part of the Ottawa-Carleton region.

Mr. Gauthier: We're very proud of you.

Mr. Boudria: Thank you. I am pleased to participate in this debate on Bill C-45 this afternoon. We should look at some of the history of Bill C-45 and more particularly at the question that begs to be asked today, which is, why are we now dealing with this Bill when the case of the employees of the House of Commons has been before the Canada Labour Relations Board for a long time. The board decided in its wisdom that the employees of the House had collective rights under the Canada Labour Code. Of course that has been dragged through various steps of the court process. As far as I know, on every occasion the courts and the board dealt with this topic, adjudication has always been on the side of the employees. Negotiations are scheduled to proceed on Monday, April 21 or some four days from now. Why are we attempting to sneak through the legislation at this time? Why do we want to do it now? Why can we not wait until the process is finished and final judgments come down on the issue? Why would Hon. Members of the House want to pass this piece of legislation now? What is the need to pass it now? Are we collectively afraid of what eventually will come out of the court decision? If that is not the case, and since we have not had such legislation since 1867, why do we need to pass it before next Monday at which time the negotiations will get under way?