

the day. You may find it is to everybody's advantage if you are lenient in your ruling.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** The hon. member knows that the Chair is always lenient in its ruling, and we like to help out members in this chamber. However, I would like to bring it to the attention of the hon. member, as well as any other hon. member who is going to be speaking on these particular motions.

**Mr. Fisher:** Mr. Speaker, thank you for bringing that to my attention. I intend to address the motions momentarily. In spite of the situation we have before us where equalization, human rights, fairness and justice prevail, where we have tried in most of society to remove the discriminatory stigmas on these kinds of words, the word "chairman" is still used. Of course it should be "chair", "chairperson", whatever. "Chairman" is offensive and certainly ought to be removed, but this is just an example of the government ignoring the very essence of the subject which we are discussing. I do thank the Speaker for having brought that to my attention.

• (1610 )

In 1987, when the government did bring in the equalization payments, supposedly to ameliorate the problem of having discriminated against this group of people, there were no payments subsequent to July 26, 1987 until November of this year. There is an amazing sidelight to this. For the purposes of calculating income for pensions, the equalization payments which the government has reluctantly, I would suggest, come up with, do not count toward the pensions of these people.

This group, primarily composed of women, is perhaps even intentionally deprived of their full pension benefits because of the intransigence of this government in paying them what they ought to be worth. The main issue in this whole problem as far as the HS group is concerned is that the government will not only not pay up, but it will not include it in wages. That is the issue.

When I talked the other day about justice, that is precisely what I was referring to. It is a matter of justice that these people receive equal pay. I would suggest that somehow or other, the government either ought to be forced or ought to voluntarily include those equalization

payments back to the time when the original matter was brought up.

I see my time is almost up, Mr. Speaker. I am sure I will have opportunities to speak later on, but I do thank you for bringing to my attention the topic of the motion.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I will recognize the hon. member for Halifax West and then the hon. member for Churchill.

**Mr. Crosby:** May I defer to the hon. member for Churchill?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** The hon. member for Churchill has the floor.

**Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the parliamentary secretary. I realize that he would like to speak after me to try to cover up for the government's inactions.

Mr. Speaker, I heard your ruling with regard to speaking to the motion, but rather than rising a number of times this afternoon, I would like to speak on our position with regard to the bill and the amendments that have been forward by the member for Saskatoon—Dundurn on behalf of the New Democratic Party caucus.

Much has been made of the fact that on Monday night, the New Democratic Party would not agree to have this legislation passed that evening. The reason we did not do so is that we could not accept the fact that workers would not be able to negotiate or have a conciliation board, in this case, rule on job classifications.

We believe that all workers, whether they are under the auspices of the Public Service Staff Relations Act or the Canada Labour Code, should have the same rights to negotiate something that is as basic and as important as job classifications. We believe that that was doubly important in this particular case because we were talking about a mechanism to ensure that pay equity could actually come into force under the collective agreement.

We have made it very clear that we accept the fact that there must be a resolution of the regional disparity between the workers on the east coast and the west coast. We had made it very clear that we were concerned about the potential for loss of life, but we were not going to compromise our principles when it came to the very important issue of pay equity and the ability of workers, through their collective bargaining process, even when the collective bargaining process breaks down, as it has in