

*Parliamentary Employment and Staff Relations Act*

are insensitivities in this chamber, so be it. I say, if the hat fits, wear it.

Let me deal with grievances. Any collective bargaining must permit the employees to negotiate grievances. Bill C-45 does not allow workplace problems to be addressed by union grievances. For example, health and safety problems in the print shop and cafeteria, or air quality environmental problems in the Wellington building cannot be subject to a union grievance. Technological change cannot be grieved under Bill C-45. All of these remain management rights, but do not just touch the rights of management, they affect the workers. Technology on the Hill has moved ahead rapidly. Yet, Bill C-45 does not allow workers to grieve technological change. Can you imagine that occupational health and safety infractions cannot be grieved.

What is the purpose of Bill C-45 if there is no right to strike? The workers retain the right to remove their services if an impasse comes. I do not believe that the employees on the Hill are any different from others in the workforce. They do not go out on strike every year. Statistics show that 93.7 per cent of all contracts in this country up for negotiation are settled without a strike. We cannot take seriously any suggestion that in 1986 the whole operation of Parliament would grind to a halt and somehow our ancient privileges would be breached if the workers on Parliament Hill go on strike. Bill C-45 would give limited bargaining rights to workers on the Hill, because it does not cover all the employees on the Hill. The workers in the cafeteria, the restaurant, and the Library, and the bus drivers and messengers are covered by Bill C-45. However, the employees who work for MPs, Senators and the Speaker are not covered by Bill C-45. The fact is that we are eliminating about 1,200 employees from any coverage whatsoever.

We in the New Democratic Party entered into an agreement with our employees. We have a parliamentary association of support staff which is called PASS. We negotiate within the limitations of what the House allows and we have put in place a grievance procedure. We have established a technological change clause. We have tried to implement with our employees an agreement about all of those items under our direct control and which we can negotiate. I believe we have given an example of a process that other political parties in this chamber ought to consider with their staffs as an interim measure, but interim measure only.

Any collective bargaining process must have certification. It must allow the employees to have a process to apply for certification. Bill C-45 states that applications for certification must be made to the Public Service Staff Relations Board. If normal Public Service Staff Relations Board procedures were followed, existing cards would be void, due to being untimely. All these cards that the workers have signed in their application to the Canadian Labour Relations Board and subsequently through their appeal board would be wiped out. They would be starting from scratch. It seems to me that this whole process

in Bill C-45 is a thinly veiled attempt at union busting. That is what it is.

In conclusion, this Parliament of Canada ought to be an example of how we treat employees. It should be a shining example and a beacon to the private sector throughout the land, that this is how the Members of Parliament deal with their staff, the people who serve them and help them perform their duties to the best of their ability. Anything less is a dereliction of duty.

**Mr. Boudria:** Mr. Speaker, I want to take a few moments to make some comments on the speech made by the Hon. Member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez). I listened to him very attentively because I do have considerable interest in the fate of the employees of the House of Commons. As the House knows, I am the only former employee of this institution to have been fortunate enough to be elected to represent a constituency. During his remarks, the Hon. Member alluded to a certain Member who had been previously on staff. Of course, there is only one, as you know very well. I will come back to that in a moment.

The Member stated that he believed that a number of Canadians would think we would perhaps be better off sometimes if this Parliament was shut down for a period of time. I really take offence to that remark, because I think it is the greatest honour and privilege of all of us, to serve our constituents in the House of Commons. To suggest that the role is worth anything less than that does no service, not only for the employees of this House we are defending, or pretending to defend, when speaking on this Bill, but it does no service for the constituents we represent here in Parliament.

Let me deal with the Hon. Member's remarks concerning past harassment of employees, nepotism and so on. There are employees in the House who have been working on Parliament Hill for many years. Yes, the practices that were in place perhaps did not have all the redeeming qualities they might have had, and it is quite true that perhaps all the formal structures to ensure that there never was favouritism were not there. However, to claim that throughout the years the employees who have been working here for all these years are somewhat less than qualified does no service to them.

**Mr. Rodriguez:** Put your question.

**Mr. Keeper:** Let us hear the question.

**Mr. Boudria:** My final comment concerns the remark that was made in regard to myself and how I got my job on Parliament Hill. I am not ashamed of my humble beginnings. I started here on October 25, 1966, as a bus boy for the parliamentary restaurant making \$44 a week in salary. When I walked to Parliament Hill to ask the manager of the parliamentary restaurant for a job on that day—

[Translation]

**Mr. Desrosiers:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.