

Employment Equity

Human Rights Commission which we know it cannot perform. We are handcuffing the commission.

This motion requests that this information be made available to the commission upon request. Why would the Government not be delighted to go along with that part of the resolution? It should not be necessary for the Canadian Human Rights Commission to scramble around to find information when it thinks something is wrong. The Government wants the Canadian Human Rights Commission to play a guessing game and look stupid and ineffective which will give the groups that are discriminated against a sense of frustration and a feeling that the commission is no good. People will say that the commission is incompetent and inept and it will be blamed for that which the Government should be blamed for.

• (1540)

Mr. Howard McCurdy (Windsor—Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to determine whether the rejection of this amendment was due to silliness, stupidity or unconscionable trickery. In response to a significant concern, I heard the Parliamentary Secretary telling us that he lived in a good neighbourhood where people worked hard. He told us that his father came here with a nickel. That was his explanation for the denial of this simple amendment. Let me tell him that the women, the disabled and native people of this country reject that. Let me tell him that people like my great, great grandfather who were brought or came to this country as former slaves with less than a nickel in their pockets will not accept that as an explanation.

The fact is that this Government did not in the first instance want to have goals. That is why we have this silly arrangement in this Bill which separates the process from the goals. Having conceded that there should be a definition of goals, year by year, how silly it is to reject having those goals revealed to those directly involved! It has to be a deliberate attempt to sabotage the intent of the clause which adopts the goals. There can be no answer except trickery. I cannot believe that the Government would be so stupid as not to realize that the one way to ensure that an employer will implement serious employment equity processes is by ensuring that every employee subject to those processes and benefiting from those goals knows what the goals are. Could it be possible that the Hon. Member does not know of incident after incident of complaints of discrimination against employers where the excuse has been that the employee responsible for hiring was unaware that the company had a non-discriminatory or affirmative action program?

What concerns me most of all is that this is another example of this Government's refusal to address the needs of those people who are supposed to be benefiting from this legislation. We know the scenario. It is to go slow and not to offend those who are responsible for what many people who are victims regard as a criminal act, that is, the rejection of these people for a job, the denial to them of economic opportunity, the denial of the opportunity to participate in this society in a way

that would accord them independence. That is what is at issue here.

Does this Government not have the will to address the needs that exist? It is obvious that the Parliamentary Secretary does not care that this legislation not only fails to address the needs of minority groups, but he denies a proper hearing for this amendment. It cannot be denied now that this Parliamentary Secretary and the Minister he represents are so lacking in conscience that they will pass a shadow of a Bill, one with no substance, and one which will deny the needs of those whose needs this Bill is supposed to meet.

Let us give reconsideration to this denial. Let us examine what is being said. Let us consider the fact that you have at least accepted that there will be goals set year by year. Give us an explanation different from the history of your family, the neighbourhood in which you live, and different from this oft-repeated notion that those who are not visibly definable as minorities have sometimes achieved success in a way which leads them to believe others are not denied that success because of their colour, their sex, their disability, or because they are a member of the aboriginal peoples of this country. Reconsider this and put yourself in the shoes of those who cannot deny to which group they belong and therefore have no support in fighting the discrimination they have experienced in many ways all their lives without the recourse this Bill is supposed to provide, which in fact this Bill manipulates in so many ways so that recourse will not be there at all.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): The question is on Motion No. 21A. The Hon. Member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine East (Mr. Allmand) moves:

Motion No. 21A

April 7, 1986—That Bill C-62, be amended in Clause 5 by striking out lines 12 to 16 at page 3 and substituting the following therefor:

"section (1) shall be

(a) retained by the employer at the employer's principal place of business in Canada for a brief period of at least three years after the last year in respect of which the plan is prepared;

(b) communicated to the employer's employees and any existing bargaining agent: and

(c) made available to the Human Rights Commission, on request."

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): All those in favour will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.