

General, Air Canada, CN, CP, CBC, the Mint, Canada Post, Canada Ports, CMHC and almost all of the other agencies associated with the federal Crown. They have appropriate mechanisms for collective bargaining rights.

This Bill flows from the 1984 declaration by the Canada Labour Relations Board that it had jurisdiction over Parliament Hill employees. This would have offered superior rights and tools to the workers on the Hill to those being offered under Bill C-45. On examination of the clauses of Bill C-45 this morning I find it to be a document designed to choke a donkey. It contains some 89 clauses and dozens of subclauses explaining what powers employees do not have and why they should not have them.

This Bill is extremely revealing of the Government, the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. de Cotret), the Government House Leader (Mr. Hnatyshyn), and I suppose the entire front bench of that administration. They do not want to deal effectively with those workers who are deserving, more than anyone else in the country, of a demonstration of good faith by the Government.

The denial of these rights will affect committee clerks, constables and security, nurses, printing services, the staff of Members of Parliament, French and English indexers, the Senate maintenance and messenger service, the Library of Parliament, maintenance, the committee reporting services, the broadcast service, the messengers and distribution service, and the restaurant and cafeterias.

In the seven years that I have been here I have seen many occasions when workers on Parliament Hill have been very much in need of the protection that is provided by union rights and grievance procedures. As a matter of fact, this morning when I was taking the bus from the Confederation building, a Government Member on board wanted to get off at the front door of the West Block. The driver has been given certain criteria under which to operate the bus. He saw that there were other people on board who were coming here. He did not go to the side door, but stopped at the corner so that the Government Member had to get off and walk some 30 feet. The Government Member became upset and asked why he was not taken to the front door. It is because of situations like that that workers on the Hill require some kind of realistic protection, which is not provided in this Bill.

The Bill contains no solutions to the problems which originally led staff to begin organizing on the Hill. Bill C-45 very carefully prevents any real negotiations for the classification of position and assignment of duties. It very specifically prohibits any kind of negotiation on staffing with respect to job appointments, appraisals, promotions, demotions, transfers or lay-offs. As the Hon. Member for Nickel Belt pointed out, these are crucial rights because of the history of nepotism on the Hill, where a position has often been corralled by someone who happens to be related to a person with influence here. It is an example of another situation in which workers, whether or not they are new on the Hill, require some kind of procedure to protect their rights.

### *Parliamentary Employment and Staff Relations Act*

Grievance procedures cannot be truly negotiated because limits are set on what grievances can go to third party arbitration. Specifically, union grievances are not allowed. I can see the shame on your face, Mr. Speaker, that the Government cannot be controlled and brought into the 20th Century. Bill C-45 is a dinosaur egg. We will have to display a dinosaur egg every Easter to symbolize the reactionary tripe being drafted by the Government.

I believe Canadians want to know about some of the experiences of Parliament Hill employees rather than this lengthy Bill which consists of hundreds of pages, in spite of the Nielsen task force recommendation about saving money.

Let us examine the experience of a cafeteria service employee who cut his hand while working on the job. The nurse told him that it was not safe to go back to work because of the nature of his wound. However, his manager told the employee to go back to work or face disciplinary action. What kind of nonsense is that? This employee was working with food to be served to everyone on the Hill. He was told by the nurse to go home because he could not possibly stay on the job, for medical reasons.

The Government is not interested in knowing what is happening on the Hill. It must be stated and restated until the Government's dinosaur mentality fades.

The management, following their instructions, apply all kinds of criteria to the workers on the Hill. In the case I just mentioned, not only are these guidelines rubbish, they endanger the life and well-being, not only of the individual involved but of those who are eating the food. My friend from Sudbury raised the point—

● (1250)

**Mr. Rodriguez:** Nickel Belt.

**Mr. Fulton:** Your official residence is in Sudbury. I do not mind letting the people who live in Nickel Belt know that the Hon. Member lives in Sudbury.

**Mr. Rodriguez:** I don't live in Sudbury.

**Mr. Fulton:** You don't?

**Mr. Rodriguez:** No.

**Mr. Fulton:** In Capreol, then. I am sorry Mr. Speaker, it was a small error. I want to ask why Hon. Members opposite are not speaking in this debate. Why are my friends from Alberta not speaking? The Ministers of the Crown are refusing to rise and explain why security workers on the Hill, those people who put themselves between us and any problems, are not allowed to have any kind of grievance procedure whereby there is some kind of arbitration process, some kind of realistic collective bargaining procedure where their rights and concerns are heard? What if one of the senior management in security is a little off base on some kind of security measure and the younger fellow, the guy who has been more recently