

Government Orders

[Translation]

I will now put motion No. 3 to the House.

[English]

MEASURE TO ENACT

Mrs. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West): Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I thank you for your ruling and compliment you on your first day fully in charge of the Chair at the head of the House.

I would like to put forward an argument that Motion No. 4, dealing with employment equity, be allowed by the Speaker on the basis of the note contained in the Standing Order. I will quote from that:

A motion, previously defeated in committee, will only be selected if the Speaker judges it to be of such exceptional significance as to warrant a further consideration at the report stage.

I would like to put forward the argument very briefly on the significance of this motion. It relates to the functions of the Canadian Centre for Management Development, its programs, operations, staffing, and those who are included in its courses and in the composition of its board. In all those functions, the consideration of equality of opportunity and employment equity should be front and centre.

If given the opportunity, I would refer the House to the submission to the legislative committee of the Human Rights Commissioner. He is responsible for safeguarding human rights for all Canadians. I am quite prepared to quote from his statement to the committee which made it extremely clear that a comprehensive inclusion in this bill was necessary to safeguard the protection of human rights and equitable opportunities in the Public Service of Canada.

If there is further need, as the Standing Order says, to demonstrate the exceptional significance of this motion, it is certainly in the task force report on barriers to women in the Public Service that was tabled in the House very recently. It made clear that employment equity is an idea that the Public Service and the government subscribe to. Still, a great deal needs to be done to change our management practices, the culture, and values on which the Public Service operates at the most senior levels, if employment equity is to become a reality rather than an ideal.

I would make the argument that employment equity is a fundamental principle and that in the training and development of the skills of our managers, it must be a central consideration that is integrated throughout.

Mr. Ross Harvey (Edmonton East): Madam Speaker, I too, would like to add my congratulations to those of the hon. member to you, on your first full day in the Chair. I know it will be a worthwhile experience for all concerned.

I would like to say on behalf of my colleague that we would support the submission of the hon. member that, if at all possible, this matter be reconsidered and Motion No. 4 be allowed. We believe it to be of significant importance that the House be given the opportunity to decide whether or not that organization which, after all, will be the organization that fosters the head of the Public Service—its brains and its direction—will reflect the society that that Public Service is intended to serve. We consider that to be a key principle and one eminently worthy of consideration by this House, regardless of whether or not it was dealt with in committee.

Madam Deputy Speaker: I thank the hon. for Ottawa West and the hon. member for Edmonton East.

After listening to arguments from the hon. member for Ottawa West and her colleague, I may say that this amendment can be considered of very exceptional significance and warrants further consideration at report stage. I will accept this motion.

We will start with Motion No. 3.

Mr. Murray Cardiff (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister, President of the Privy Council and Minister of Agriculture) moved:

Motion No. 3

That Bill C-34 be amended in Clause 5 in the English version by striking out line 16 at page 3 and substituting the following therefor:

“(c) cooperate with other persons and bodies engaged in man-”.

He said: Madam Speaker, this amendment as originally formulated in committee, mentioned co-operation with others. Our legislative advisers have indicated that the wording could be interpreted as limiting the scope of the co-operation rather than broadening it, which was the original intention of the amendment. They have suggested that “persons” and “bodies” would convey the