

Employment Equity

Mr. Holtmann: As a matter of fact, it was our Government which introduced some study on exactly that point.

Mr. Cassidy: Where is the action?

Mr. Holtmann: We are the Party which put a book together entitled *Equality for All*. It presented these topics for discussion, not necessarily as our policies.

Mr. Cassidy: Where is the action? Some 18 months have gone by.

Mr. Holtmann: Mr. Speaker, it seems that the Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre cannot stop talking to listen. He keeps his jaw jiving, whether or not he has gums in his mouth.

Mr. Cassidy: Why haven't you put forward a Private Member's Bill?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Taylor: You made your speech when you were standing up.

Some Hon. Members: Order!

Mr. Holtmann: The point is that we have gone further in this particular Bill than was ever anticipated. It certainly is not perfect. We admit that.

Mr. Cassidy: It is far less than you promised. You promised and you did not deliver.

Mr. Holtmann: Well—

Mr. Thacker: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It relates to the unparliamentary conduct of the Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy). I wish to listen to my colleague, the Hon. Member for Selkirk—Interlake (Mr. Holtmann), and I am being prevented from doing so by the unnecessary interruptions of the Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre. I think the Chair has a responsibility to stop the Hon. Member from interrupting or to name him.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair does not believe that is a point of order.

Mr. Holtmann: Mr. Speaker, I will not dwell on this matter much longer. I am sure the Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre is being so provoked that he cannot stand his position and he will probably jump up again. That will cause the debate to deteriorate. The Hon. Member has had an opportunity to speak.

I would like to say that the Government can stand proud with respect to the introducing of legislation which will move us in the right direction. Some people think it is not enough. We will examine how it will effect equity in terms of employing people who are not as fortunate as the rest of Canadians. This is a matter which needs to be considered fully. That is

what we are doing here today. I would like to listen to good and adequate representations from members of the New Democratic Party and not this rhetoric—

Mr. Cassidy: Where is your Bill on political rights?

Mr. Holtmann: —of promises and broken promises.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words with respect to Bill C-62. The motion moved by the Hon. Member for Yorkton—Melville (Mr. Nystrom) calls a spade a spade. It has been put forward to point out that Bill C-62 is weak. Therefore, we would not be too concerned if the motion were defeated, if the Government would allow the remaining motions to pass. If that were to happen then the defeat of this particular motion would not mean a thing.

The Hon. Member who just resumed his seat said that the Government has done a lot. He spoke about the book presented by the previous administration, which happened to come out during the administration of the present Government. God knows that the previous administration did not do too well in the area of equal opportunity.

It must be understood that the philosophy of equality is not the philosophy of the Party in Government. That Party does not feel that equality should be part of its responsibility as a Government. It has shown this in almost every area in which it has brought forward legislation. It is a word which members of the Party like to use but which does not fit their philosophy. Consequently, they use it in vain at every opportunity. They have suggested equal taxation for all people, while moving in the opposite direction. They have suggested equal opportunity with respect to training; yet they have reduced the amount of money which they pay to colleges and training institutions. They have suggested equal opportunity and assistance for small business. What have they done in this regard? They have given assistance to big business instead, in order to keep it in place. They have said that they would give equal opportunity to civil servants, yet they have cut back in this area, both in terms of pay and in terms of the opportunity to work. Members of the Government have suggested they would give equal opportunity to farmers. What has happened is a degeneration of opportunity in terms of farmers being able to stay alive and survive on this earth.

The point I wish to make is that if this particular motion is defeated, and the reason for it being defeated is the passage of the other 59 motions, then we will be happy to vote against it. However, what we can expect is the defeat not only of this motion but a defeat of all the others. The motion before us would amend the Bill to state exactly what it is. It is a Bill which has no teeth in terms of any kind of equity being achieved. So if members of the Government wish to defeat this motion and pass all the others then we will go along with them. If that is not the case, then at least let us be honest and pass this motion in order to say that this is what the Bill really does.