

saluted, bowed before and waited on hand and foot. I gave the example of the little green bus which goes from the Confederation Building to the Centre Block. If a lowly messenger gets on the bus and it is carrying a Member as well, it cannot stop at the West Block even though it has to go right past, even though the Member is not in a hurry. Even though there is no vote being taken in the House, the bus goes directly to the Centre Block.

**Mr. Minaker:** Not when I'm on it!

**Mr. Rodriguez:** That is the policy. We also have a parking area which is called the pit. The bus was not allowed to go down there until an employee on the Hill was assaulted in the pit at night. Suddenly our consciences got pricked and we sent the bus down into the pit again. The bus is for MPs. We are treated in a way which isolates us from the realities of this world. On the Hill it is unreal. People got jobs on the Hill in the messenger service, the cafeterias and restaurants, based on who they knew, based on nepotism. That is an established fact. In some instances that practice still exists today.

Now, finally, Parliament is shamed because the workers on the Hill are taking active steps to organize themselves into a collective. They have been embarrassing Parliament and parliamentarians into treating their employees with the kind of respect that collective bargaining ensures. That is why we now have Bill C-45 before this House. I want to and did give credit to the Conservatives for at least bringing it forward. It is something which the Liberals, even though they knew what was going on, never dared to do. We must not forget that. They will now parade around—and it is unfortunate that none of them are in the House at this moment—as the great friends of the workers. I will rephrase that. I cannot see any of the Official Opposition who will make an argument against what I am saying.

Bill C-45 has been brought into the House. I want to ask how Government Members can look those workers in the eye and say this Bill will ensure their right to negotiate grievances, staffing, classification, occupational health and safety, and technological change? How can Conservative Members look in the eyes of those people who serve them so well and say they are doing the best they can?

This Bill is a son of the Public Service Staff Relations Act. My colleague from Kenora—Rainy River says it is illegitimate at that. We know the PSSRA was the cause of most of the problems between the Canadian Union of Postal Workers and the post office management. It does not permit those items I have listed to be negotiated. If the Government really wanted to do something, there is an alternative. It could have covered these workers under the Canada Labour Code. That Code is far more comprehensive legislation than the PSSRA. If on this Hill, for example, there has been a demotion, a firing, or a cut in pay Bill C-45 does not allow the worker to grieve that. It does not permit grieving of that particular practice, which is still happening on this Hill. How can you look the people who

*Parliamentary Employment and Staff Relations Act*

work for you in the eye and tell them you are giving them something that will provide protection.

● (1230)

On the question of grievances it does not allow workplace problems to be addressed by union grievances, or grievances filed by a group of workers. For example, health and safety in the print shop and in the cafeterias; air quality and other environmental problems in the Wellington Building cannot be subject to a union grievance. Technological change is overtaking this Hill rapidly; one only has to look at the introduction of the OASIS Program and the Micoms and the word processors, and a whole host of other technological changes. In fact, the House has been cutting the staff on the Hill. There was a 40 per cent cut in maintenance staff on the Hill. Workers under Bill C-45 would not be able to grieve such situations.

How can these Government Members look the staff on the Hill in the eye, those who wait on them hand and foot and serve them with a great deal of deference and respect? How can they the masters tell the workers on the Hill, "We are doing the best we can for you". Air Canada workers, railway workers, a whole host of other public servants across this country are covered under the Canada Labour Code. What skin is it off their nose to permit the workers on the Hill to come under the protection of the Canada Labour Code.

We had the example of somebody working in the cafeteria cutting their hand. He went to the nurse and the nurse said, "You can't go to work, go home". The worker reported to the supervisor and the supervisor said, "You get your buns on the job or else you get off the job". That kind of thing will continue under Bill C-45. It does not allow the right to strike. It is not that workers on the Hill all want to go out on strike tomorrow. But in fact that is the ultimate, that is the last resort. Bill C-45 does not give workers the right to remove their services. As my colleague from Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom) asked, what has been the reason for not going with the right to strike? We are told, "Oh, we have got to go with the privilege of Parliament. You cannot interfere with parliamentarians' rights".

The Mother of Parliament, which we have always traditionally looked to for our examples in our parliamentary processes, has have full bargaining rights for their employees, including the right to strike. I have not read where the workers at Westminster have tied up Parliament and prevented parliamentarians from doing their job. Yet we have this condition in Bill C-45. We have no grievance procedures that are of strength, no staffing permitted to be grieved, the whole question of classification is non-negotiable, occupation, health and safety are non-negotiable, non-grievable, and the right to strike is not there.

The Conservatives have not been participating in this debate, and I wonder why the benches on the government side have been so silent. I would like them to enter into debate on the principles of Bill C-45. They owe it to the workers on this Hill who have served them and who continue to serve them so