

*Parliamentary Employment and Staff Relations Act*

**Mr. Langdon:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the Hon. Member for Hamilton East (Ms. Copps) for this chance to comment on how passing strange many things are in the House of Commons. I must say it has been a passing strange week in the House of Commons.

**Mrs. Mailly:** We got some work done for a change! We passed Bill C-62.

**Mr. Langdon:** The notion that we might actually smoke out some Conservatives to speak on this matter is one which I find delightful.

**Mr. Thacker:** There's no smoking in this place.

**Mr. Langdon:** With all due respect to my colleague, the Hon. Member for Broadview—Greenwood (Ms. McDonald), the idea of smoking out Conservative Members to speak on an issue as important as this is a serious matter.

**Mr. Gauthier:** You can flush them out.

**Mr. Langdon:** If they are not prepared to be smoked out then perhaps, as my colleague suggests, they can be flushed out.

**Mr. Gauthier:** Just pull the chain!

**Mr. Langdon:** Flushing them out is likely to lead to commentary which will at least be as interesting as that usually heard from Conservative back-benchers.

To be absolutely serious, we are talking about an important principle. I put it to every Conservative back-bencher who is here that we should not impose on our employees—and they are our employees—a piece of legislation with which they so fundamentally disagree.

**Mrs. Mailly:** That's not what they tell me.

**Mr. Langdon:** If we do that then we will create for ourselves, for the House and, therefore, for the country, tremendous problems in the future. We do not have to do that. We can accept the motion with respect to a 30-day hoist. We can send the Bill back for consideration to see what discussions can take place with respect to it, just as they should have taken place, on an equitable basis, between the Government and the employees who have expressed their desire to become unionized. We could see brought back to this House a piece of legislation which represents agreement instead of disagreement. I put it to Conservative back-benchers, many of whom have been involved in business dealings, that the basis upon which one must act with one's employees, certainly the basis I learned in any organizations which I helped run, has to be one of agreement. I agree with the Hon. Member for Hamilton East. Let us try to smoke out Conservative back-benchers. Let us try to get this Bill hoisted and ultimately changed so that it meets the needs of our employees.

**Mr. Lewis:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the Hon. Member's responsibilities to his constituents and his oath as a Member of

Parliament, is he prepared to cross a picket line in order to come to Parliament?

**Mr. Gauthier:** That's my question.

**Mr. Langdon:** The question which has been asked is a very serious one.

**Some Hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Langdon:** I will answer it. Let us recognize that the right to strike is not—

**Mr. Andre:** Who's being flushed out now?

**Mr. Langdon:** —at the heart of the Opposition which has expressed it.

**Some Hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Langdon:** My answer to the question is quite clear.

**Mr. Andre:** Who do you think you are, Brian Orser?

**Mr. Langdon:** As Simon Reisman said the other day: "Who's Brian Orser?"

**Ms. Copps:** Who's Brian Muldoon?

**Mr. Langdon:** They still have not discovered who he is.

The question I have been asked is would I be prepared to work if Parliament were faced with a strike. We have faced the question in the past when the translators went on strike. Our caucus answered by agreeing to sit in the Chamber but refusing to work in committees. I expect the same thing would take place with respect to any strike which might occur. But to trivialize this crucial issue of agreement in this way is to make a serious mistake, as the Government so often makes.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** It being one o'clock, I do now leave the chair until two o'clock today.

At 1 p.m. the House took recess.

---

**AFTER RECESS**

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

**Hon. Bob Kaplan (York Centre):** Mr. Speaker, before I turn to the substance of the motion, I wish to reflect on something of which all Members are aware. Yesterday, a very important decision came from the courts on the subject of the legality of the unionization of parliamentary employees. Although, as I understand it, it came from the court of first instance, the decision was that unionization is not lawful under the Canada Labour Code.

We are actually debating a motion for a 30-day hoist of this Bill. I would ask Hon. Members opposite to take account of the decision that was made yesterday. It does change a great