

Do you have any intention of moving on the pay side of this question so that it is not such a burden for employees after coming back from maternity leave?

**Mr. Cadieux:** Of course, when we pass legislation of this sort we usually look at the trends in collective bargaining. The legislation is now up to par with the trends in collective bargaining, or what is included in the various collective bargaining contracts.

● (1220)

Therefore, I think it would be premature to follow that now. Through the consultation process that we maintain with the unions and the employers we are keeping the Canada Labour Code as up to date as possible. Obviously, if there are variations, we will look into them, and, if necessary, we will bring forward further amendments.

**Senator Marsden:** I would be happier if you said that the government wanted to be a model employer and a leader in this, because, as we all know, the collective bargaining process, while good in many respects, does not necessarily mean that employees, especially women employees, make gains. If women had made gains, they would not be earning 60 per cent of the wages earned by men. That is the proportion that most women now earn in the federal domain. So I would urge you to lead rather than follow in that respect.

But let me ask you another question which goes somewhat outside of—

**Mr. Cadieux:** If I may just add to that, senator. We believe that since we have been in office we have led in many domains. Of course, we have a lot of catching up to do, because we were not around for many years. Nevertheless, senator, I take due notice of that.

**Senator Marsden:** Thank you, Mr. Cadieux. Perhaps I could ask you another question, which does not come precisely under the provisions of the bill but which deals with a matter of leadership.

If a female worker in your office is pregnant, the provisions of this bill will not apply to her, will they? As I understand it, as an employer you do not pay the contributions of an employee who might be off on maternity leave. Is that correct?

**Mr. Cadieux:** I am informed that the Canada Labour Code would not apply, or would not affect that particular employee. Nonetheless, Treasury Board has similar regulations. I am informed that that particular employee would receive similar benefits under Treasury Board regulations.

**Senator Marsden:** That is very interesting. Are you telling us that the Treasury Board, with respect to Parliament Hill employees, is ahead of Labour Canada in bringing in that provision, or will the provision be brought in simultaneously?

**Mr. Cadieux:** Perhaps there were no loopholes in the Treasury Board regulations, senator. We are dealing with a loophole right now. We are trying to block that loophole.

**Senator Marsden:** So Treasury Board has always paid the employee's part of the contribution?

**Mr. Cadieux:** That is what I am told.

**Senator Marsden:** That is good news.

**Senator Frith:** Mr. Cadieux, I take it everyone supports this legislation. Why did we not get it sooner?

**Mr. Cadieux:** I think I touched on that earlier. The amendments which brought about the loophole were passed in June of 1984 and came into effect in March of 1985. Consequently, those provisions have been in force for approximately two years.

We were informed of this particular abuse about four months ago, when a question was raised by the CLC in particular, and subsequently again raised in the House. Immediately after that we looked into the situation and went through the consultation process, which we believe in, in order to find the appropriate wording so we would not create another loophole.

The last meeting I personally had with representatives of the unions was about two weeks ago. The final drafting was completed and the legislation went before the House of Commons last Monday. It is now Thursday, and here we are.

**Senator Frith:** It received first reading in the House on Monday—

**Mr. Cadieux:** Yes, and went through all stages.

**Senator Frith:** It went through all stages on Monday?

**Mr. Cadieux:** Yes.

**Senator Frith:** You do understand that because a bill receives all three readings in one day in the House of Commons does not mean that that will happen here, but that does not change the fact that your other explanation is satisfactory.

**Mr. Cadieux:** I would certainly not want to impose what goes on in the other House on this house, senator, or vice versa.

**Senator Frith:** That is a good way of holding your popularity in this place.

**The Chairman:** Honourable senators, shall clause 1 carry?

**Hon. Senators:** Carried.

**The Chairman:** Shall clause 2 carry?

**Hon. Senators:** Carried.

**The Chairman:** Shall the title carry?

**Hon. Senators:** Carried.

**The Chairman:** Shall I report the bill without amendment?

**Hon. Senators:** Agreed.

**The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore:** Honourable senators, the sitting of the Senate is resumed.

#### REPORT OF COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

**Hon. Rhéal Bélisle:** Honourable senators, the Committee of the Whole, to which was referred Bill C-97, to amend the