

*Government Orders*

The human rights commission is to be the overseeing group that looks after this. It will send in the equity police to make sure that everything is going according to Bill C-64. It is interesting to note that absolutely zero funding is to be given for that.

Suddenly this new bureaucracy or group is being set up that says: "We are going to have the equity police to make sure that everybody is hired properly. Maybe there is just the right number of people at the table; maybe the House of Commons staff can be broken down just fine". It is impractical. It is divisive. It is not going to work.

I get to these equity police. Dear knows how they are going to be assembled. I am not sure. I suppose they would have to fit under the right group. Who polices the police in this situation? There is zero funding for this bunch that will work under the human rights commission. How in the world are we ever going to be able to police such a thing?

We want less government. We want people to walk around in freedom, to be able hire who they think will do the best job for them and make sure that everybody is going to do the best he or she possibly can.

• (1300)

Knowing there is always someone trying to run a business, a government department or whatever, there is nothing that would make any of us, whether MPs, senators or whatever say we are really nervous and we want to make sure all the right things are being done. I am not sure the people who will be equity police will have the qualifications to do the cop job the government will be asking them to do.

The most amazing thing I find about this piece of legislation is with regard to the province of Ontario. This is not my home province but I visit here from week to week with my job. What an incredible turnaround when the socialist government, which was in power for several years, was thrown out on its left ear in June because of the Conservatives and Mike Harris and all he stood for. My friends will remember that just last year even a socialist NDP government in Ontario could not get this type of legislation through.

I know my friends over here are in full favour of Bill C-64. I have a question for one of them from Ontario. If the NDP socialist government in Ontario cannot pass employment equity legislation, how in the world will the Liberals do it? I know my friend from Broadview—Greenwood is very concerned about this. Although he is from downtown Toronto, a hair bigger than my hometown of Heinsburg, I would like him to answer the question seriously. Will it solve the problems? Will it make sure people have employment? Will it help the employment situation? I know numbers in employment are important to him.

He says it will and I have a great deal of faith in him, but I am not sure we can make this leap of logic that it will make a whole lot of difference. If an NDP socialist government could not even

get it through, how in the world will it fly across the country? It will not.

We have seen what has happened to the NDP and socialism. I can remember in the last Parliament I used to sit back there and the NDP was down here. What is happening worldwide? There is a move away from that government interference in our lives. We now see the NDP as a fourth party in the House. We will see that continue to move away. It has happened in Ontario and right across the country.

Hiring habits are wonderful but as soon as someone tells us we have to do this or they will come after us if we do not, we know even in our human nature that as soon as someone says we have to do this they are toast. It is as simple as that. It did not work in Ontario and it simply will not work here. Employment equity legislation flies in the face of the merit principle.

Is the Revenue Canada document "The Employment Equity Action Plan for 1995-96" a start or is it the be all and end all? Will 1995-96 be the big watershed year for employment equity or will it be the start of something that leads us down the path of divisiveness and danger?

A really good example in this document states how hiring quotas would work, quotas being what we are talking about. The government is refusing to acknowledge that. It says it is not talking about quotas or specific numbers. It is numbers, it is quotas and it is tokenism that we are really talking about here.

Under women the document states females are under-represented in certain occupational groups, namely auditors, managers and senior managers. The solution to the problem is the following discriminatory statement from the document: "Consider only female recruitment when external hiring is undertaken as an ongoing policy".

If the men in the Chamber cannot see through that, surely the women can. Can anyone imagine anything so pathetic as somebody saying we should consider only female recruitment when external hiring is undertaken as an ongoing policy? That is absolutely ridiculous.

Let us look at our own situation in the House of Commons. I am a woman involved in politics. I represent one of the 53 women MPs out of 295. We are under-represented in the House of Commons but let us keep working on it. There were 40 women in the last Parliament. We are 53 in this Parliament. My friend over here is a new MP which is great because we have more numbers. Would she not sooner work with a smaller group of really committed, class act, competent women rather than having 51 per cent of the MPs here elected just because they were women?

Let us look at people who have some abilities in this place. I said this before in the Chamber and I am not ashamed to say it again. If I go anywhere in my constituency and say: "Hello, Mr. Mills, my name is Deborah Grey, I am your member of Parliament, I am your Reform candidate, please vote for me, I am a woman", I would expect him to take me into his house, sit