

*Employment Equity*

there will be other steps and other measures to come in the future.

The system which has been put in place by this Bill is the first step. It is the first step which has been taken by any Canadian Government. It will be an effective first step. Employers are already hurrying to ensure that they are in line by the time this piece of legislation passes into law.

At the same time, I think it is incumbent upon the Government to ensure that its measures with the Public Service are hand-in-hand. Although the visible minorities were not made a target group in the Public Service until last year, it is time the Government pressed on with those measures to ensure employment equity in the Public Service. I am sure the Government will be doing just that.

• (1140)

With that, I would urge the House to pass this legislation as quickly as possible, bearing in mind that it was introduced in the House almost one year ago. It is about time we put it into law. It may be that the rules do not provide for the tabling of documents by private Members but, nonetheless, when a private Member says he is going to do it one would think he would do it.

**Hon. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine East):** Mr. Speaker, I was not going to speak to this sub-amendment but I am obliged to do so having heard the remarks of the Hon. Member who has just spoken. I might say that he has blatantly misled the House and the Canadian people on several points.

**Mr. Redway:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think that is an unparliamentary remark and should be withdrawn.

**Mr. Orlikow:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. It may be that the use of the word "blatant" is—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Just a moment. Does the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow) have something to contribute to this?

**Mr. Orlikow:** A point of order, yes.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Before I entertain a point of order, could I see the Table officers?

I did hear some awfully strong language coming from the Hon. Member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine East (Mr. Allmand). I do not think he really meant what he said. I would hope that he would withdraw at least that portion of the statement and carry on with debate.

**Mr. Allmand:** Mr. Speaker, I do not know what part of my remarks you disapprove of, but if it is the word "blatant" I will withdraw that word. However, it is my strong conviction that the Hon. Member has misled the House in the remarks he just made. I think that is parliamentary.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I will go along with that, but I feel that that is still very strong language according to statements that should be made in the House. I would hope that we could carry on with fellowship and compassion. Does the Hon. Member have another point of order?

**Mr. Redway:** Mr. Speaker, he repeated again a statement which I believe is unparliamentary and should be withdrawn. If it is your ruling, Mr. Speaker, that it was not—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Order, please. I will hear the Hon. Member.

**Mr. Redway:** Mr. Speaker, it is my submission that the phrase used by the Hon. Member that the House was misled by me is an unparliamentary statement and should be—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Would the Hon. Member mind resuming his seat? The Hon. Member withdrew the word "blatant". It is not parliamentary to say "deliberately misleading the House" and I think that saying "blatantly misleading the House" comes awfully close to being unparliamentary. That is why I asked the Hon. Member to withdraw. He has done so and, therefore, I think he should carry on with debate.

**Mr. Allmand:** Mr. Speaker, I want to substantiate some of the things I just said and describe how the public and the House could be misled by those remarks.

As I said earlier, Clause 2 of the Bill indicates that the purpose of this Bill is to achieve equality in the workplace. That is fine. That is great rhetoric of which we all approve. Clause 4 of the Bill says that an employer shall implement employment equity by identifying and eliminating barriers to employment for certain groups. That is fine too. It also says that an employer shall implement employment equity by instituting positive policies and practices to achieve a greater degree of representation for the target groups. That is fine too. Clause 5 says that employers have to prepare an action plan setting out goals and timetables. That is fine too, except for the fact that the action plans are kept in the vaults of the companies' head offices and are not communicated to anyone.

The Bill requires employers to do certain things but nowhere in the Bill is there a penalty attached if employers do not do those things. If employers do not live up to their obligations under Clause 4, there is no penalty for that. If employers do not live up to their obligations under Clause 5, there is no penalty for that. The only penalty in the Bill is described in Clause 7 which indicates that if an employer does not file the report required under Section 6, there will then be a penalty. Clause 6 simply requires the employer to file information regarding the composition of his workforce. As I pointed out the other day, he could keep on reporting year after year that the composition of his workforce has remained the same. He could have employed one woman in year one, one woman in year two and one woman in year three and he would not be subject to any penalty.