

### *Adjournment Debate*

The adjustments announced for the EU group in April, 1990, were about a half of what it was owed. No adjustments at all were provided to the other underpaid groups.

What that really means is that a lot of women who work for this government were cheated out of money they were owed by this government.

As a result, over 15,000 Public Service Alliance members filed grievances requesting implementation of the study results. In the meantime the employer is trying to block the tribunal's investigation of the complaint.

Recently several conciliation board tables that reported back to the President of Treasury Board in recent negotiations prior to last week's strike reported that the current pay equalization payments should be factored into bargaining and that it is important and it is justified for this government to be implementing pay equity during this round of bargaining.

Since 1990 the federal government has twice attempted to block in the federal courts the Canadian Human Rights Commission from investigating the pay equity situation. Chief Commissioner Max Yalden said last week during the dispute with the Public Service Alliance that the federal government is not playing fair with the then striking public service employees.

He found it very strange that the government is still trying to kill a human rights tribunal set up to resolve the pay equity issue while at the same time telling striking employees that the issue should be dealt with by the tribunal, not at the bargaining table. The tribunal hearings began this month.

• (1850)

If the President of Treasury Board were being straight with us in the House that day, if he were serious when he said that pay equity would be implemented, why after these last three months is the Treasury Board still trying to block pay equity?

The question also needs to be addressed of why we as parliamentarians accept that women who are working for the public sector should receive a quarter, a half or a third of what they are owed.

I think it is very important for us to recognize that the Prime Minister in the 1988 election campaign was committed to pay equity. I think it is also important for the Treasury Board to be aware that women in the Public Service Alliance were very clear going back to work this

week that they will not accept less than the pay equity they are entitled to.

**Mr. Bill Kempling (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board and Minister of State (Finance)):** Mr. Speaker, I have very limited time to respond to this question, so I will cover it as fast as I can.

In 1984, during the election, we committed ourselves to pay equity in the Public Service. In March 1985 the President of the Treasury Board put in place a joint union-management committee to investigate and recommend how we could implement equal pay for work of equal value. It concluded that there were approximately 73,400 government employees involved.

On June 27, 1986 the Employment Equity Act received Royal Assent after debate in this House and in committee.

The remedial action that the government decided to take fell into two phases. In phase one the government allocated \$317 million for retroactive payment, an average of \$4,800 for each employee involved. Phase two allocates \$76 million in salary adjustments from April 1, 1990.

Pay equity affects women, aboriginal people, visible minorities and disabled people. The Canadian Human Rights Tribunal has been mandated to examine complaints filed in relation to the equalization adjustments. The government remains committed to pay equity which is not affected by the present negotiation, the zero, three and three that is going on with the Treasury Board and PSAC at the present time.

Let me say this again. The government is committed to pay equity and will continue to be committed in the future. Finally, pay equity is not on the negotiating table in the current discussions between PSAC and the Treasury Board.

[*Translation*]

### MONTREAL'S ECONOMY

**Mr. Alfonso Gagliano (Saint-Léonard):** Mr. Speaker, I want to raise again a question I asked on September 16, at the very beginning of this new session, about the deplorable economic situation in the Montreal area. I raised that issue earlier, in February and also in June, when we held in this House an important debate on Montreal's economy, which my colleague from Saint-Denis organized and participated in.