

*Motions*

without being married because the livelihood of one partner would be lost upon entry into a legal marriage. The federal and provincial Governments have agreed on this for implementation in January, 1987, and it comes not a moment too soon. This provision should hold for all other kinds of pensions as well.

There is a recommendation that credit splitting become automatic upon divorce or marital breakdown. There is an agreement now to make it automatic upon divorce, but it is still on application for marriage breakdown. There is also the problem of the adequacy of the pension. Half of a pension, which will be prorated for the number of years of marriage, is not very much. There will be no real equality in Canadian society until all women have pensions in their own names, including homemakers.

There is a recommendation to broaden the spouse's allowance to include all persons in need of it between 60 and 65 without regard to marital status. The Government says "no" on account of restraint. We wonder why restraint should be considered here when it is not considered in a lot of less important measures. The Government did not say "no" to the billion-dollar bank bail-out on grounds of restraint. However, on a matter of nondiscrimination, restraint is used as an argument.

There is a recommendation that unisex mortality tables be established for the calculation of annuities. The Government says it has met the spirit of the recommendation through other measures, but I am a little more skeptical.

I have to be a little more critical in the area of employment equity than I was in the area of pensions. *Equality for All* recommended very aggressive application of equal pay for work of equal value. The members of that committee, in their unanimous report, were very clear on the need for vigorous, strong action. Unfortunately, the Government response is one of complacency. The status quo is acceptable and the Government says it will continue to pursue enforcement of existing provisions. However, these existing provisions are very inadequate. Bill C-62 is not adequate and has been condemned by the organizations concerned with women's rights, native rights, and the rights of the disabled and of visible minorities. The recommendation of the Subcommittee on Equality Rights was very clear. Legislation on employment equity should contain enforcement mechanisms to provide for the review of special programs by the Canadian Human Rights Commission. That commission should be given additional funds and person years to accomplish these tasks. Yet the Government is very wishy-washy in its reply:

● (1730)

"The Government is of the view that the reporting requirements in Bill C-62, together with making such reports available to the public, are sufficient to ensure compliance".

I say bunk to that. There is a requirement for reporting but no penalty for failing to make any improvement in access to jobs for women, natives, the disabled and visible minorities. Adverse publicity has not worked in the past. It has not

worked in the private sector for a very obvious reason. There is money to be made by discriminating and paying people less than what they should be paid. Even in the case of Crown corporations where making a profit is not the object, such as the CBC, there is ongoing discrimination against women. There has been public criticism for more than a decade on precisely this point and it has not moved the Government to act.

Let me quote further regarding the complacency of the Government: "The risk of adverse publicity that an employer would face unless progress in implementing employment equity is demonstrated in the reports, as well as the possibility that such reports will provide the Canadian Human Rights Commission with information upon which to initiate an investigation, will provide adequate inducement to employers to achieve the desired results".

Unfortunately, this is wishful thinking. The Bill is the first step towards the Government's goal of employment equity. It attempts to balance the needs of the designated groups against the Government's desire not to interfere unduly in the operations of employers. Unfortunately, it does not balance these two concerns evenly at all. It is weighted heavily to the desire of employers to move slowly, to continue discriminatory practices, and to be less than vigorous in pursuing equality goals.

Regarding physical and mental disability, we see some improvements. Again, not quite as many as we would like to see. The Government has not acted on several important proposals of the committee, for example, on Recommendation No. 41 on interpreter services for the hearing impaired at federal public hearings so that these people can participate fully in this aspect of public life, and Recommendation No. 42, to implement the recommendations of the *Obstacles* report. That is a good report with a host of very strong and constructive proposals to admit disabled people into Canadian society and the workforce. Yet there is no immediate action, only further consideration. There is only further consideration on recommendations for amendment to the Canadian Human Rights Act, and further study on child care, although we just had a major study chaired by Doctor Cooke which provided a massive plan to provide child care services. It was a very thorough response to precisely the concerns raised by the subcommittee, and yet further study is called for by the Government.

Regarding immigration, we have some important recommendations and good progress. One recommendation is that the Act be amended to ensure that there is no discrimination, as in the Charter of Rights. The Government accepts that recommendation. It also accepts that medical requirements be more flexible in the determination of eligibility for immigration. We have seen enormous hardship with very rigid criteria being applied, and many Canadians have suffered difficulty in family reunification, because of overly rigid health requirements. We are pleased to see that there will be some flexibility and reason prevailing here.

Recommendation No. 33, concerning elimination of the distinction between citizens and permanent residents and spon-