

Government Orders

Mr. Crosby: The amendment was proposed by my hon. friend who has just spoken, Mr. Speaker. I think it would be appropriate for the government to respond to that specific amendment in the interests of the debate, but I will be governed by your wishes.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): That really is the way it should be done. There are still a few minutes left, and I am sure the hon. member for Halifax West will split the time with the hon. member for Ottawa West.

Mrs. Catterall: Mr. Speaker, we have a group of motions before us, some of which were moved by the hon. member for Saskatoon—Dundurn and some of which were moved by myself. I presume I can speak to my own motion before its is responded to rather than after.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The hon. member for Ottawa West has the floor. The hon. member for Halifax West.

Mr. Crosby: Mr. Speaker, I would like to get the ground rules straight. I thought we would divide the time equally. Of course, if the members are not interested in what the government has to say about pay equity, it once again demonstrates that they are not interested in the realities of this dispute: pay equity, equality of pay; they are just posturing in an attempt to appeal to somebody outside this chamber.

Mrs. Catterall: Mr. Speaker, obviously I am going to have to speak extremely quickly. This group of motions before us is at the heart of both these strikes. It has to do with pay equity.

The government should have dealt fairly with the issue of pay equity with basic human decency, with the basic right of people to be paid a fair wage for the work they do equal to anybody else doing work of equal value. It has had over two years to do that. This strike of the hospital service workers would not be happening, and there is a very good chance that the strike of the ships' crew workers would never have happened.

This government is paralysed with fear to have a conciliation board deal with the issue of pay equity. I have a letter from the minister responsible for the Treasury Board which states that the adjustment of wages to meet equal pay for work of equal value can only happen in negotiations. It cannot happen through the

Human Rights Commission, and the minister responsible for the status of women knows it.

This week we commemorated the passing of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights. We are trampling on human rights with this legislation. We are trampling on human rights with the way these workers have been treated for the last two years. The minister responsible for the status of women sits there as if this is a matter of no concern to her.

We have talked about violence against women for a week. We have been shocked by the implications of what we have seen happen in Montreal. We have seen a consciousness raising among both women and men like I have never seen happen before in a short period of time. Violence against women takes many forms. One of the most pernicious, damaging and dangerous violences against women and as a result against their children and their families is economic violence. We know that women are underpaid for the work they do and now this government wants to perpetuate that.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): It being 5.45 p.m., pursuant to Order made Tuesday, December 12, 1989, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the report stage of the bill now before the House.

The question is on Motion No. 9. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), the recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 14. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?