

us". There is a long list of complaints filed by unions on this issue but there certainly have been complaints on these issues that have been spoken about publicly.

The vast majority of managers and employers in the public sector are good, decent, hard-working people. But there is an old saying, and I will probably get it wrong, that absolute power corrupts absolutely. It is important we have checks and balances in the legislation to ensure that the power is not absolute, to ensure that there is a process by which redress can be sought by workers in the public sector, to ensure that these people can not only be protected but that there is a bit of distance between the person who is the complainant and the person who makes the decision about the propriety of the complaint. To have the very people whom the complaint was against make any kind of a determination about whether it is a valid complaint is hardly appropriate.

Therefore we very strongly feel that anything that can be done to improve the wording of the legislation by these kinds of amendments, or indeed by other amendments that were unfortunately found to be inappropriate to fit the parameters of the legislation, should in fact go into it.

Another problem is that in the whole context of the merit principle harassment can clearly be an interference in the process and the confines of the merit principle as the Public Service Commission has outlined.

We are also concerned that the employer now has the right to deploy people hither and yon. It is particularly important, given these new powers, that these amendments be in place.

We also have to be cognizant that without these kinds of checks and balances these amendments would bring we could very well find workers in the public sector victimized by the very Public Service Commission that purports to be the protector of these workers.

It is absolutely critical. I would plead with hon. members on the government side of the House to give us good, solid reasons why these amendments would not be appropriate and could not be accepted by the government. We have not heard one word on these particular amendments from the government, either in the committee or here in the House.

Government Orders

I think it is time. My goodness, I am sure hon. members on the government side of the House have the independent thought and ability to put words together and give us rational explanations for why the government cannot accept these kinds of amendments.

I would urge that the parliamentary secretary who is responsible in the House and his colleagues get up and tell us why we are wrong and why these amendments should not be supported.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

Madam Deputy Speaker: 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.

Madam Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

Madam Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

Madam Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

Madam Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 11. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Madam Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

Madam Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

Madam Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen: