

Employment Equity

business administration it has had in over 50 years. Because of their ideological approach to things, some of President Reagan's advisors want to get rid of the numerical goals. Canadians know Secretary of Labour Bill Brock because he was trade negotiator for a while. He is urging the President and the administration to keep the numerical goals. The National Association of Manufacturers, speaking on behalf of its members, told President Reagan that it liked the present system, the numerical goals in the Bill, and the manner in which the program operates. The association went on to indicate: "Tell us what you want us to do and we will do it. Then no one will be able to criticize us for not doing what the law says and no one will be able to take us to court".

I have a question for the Hon. Member for York East, for the Minister and for the Conservative Government which says that it wants to speak for all Canadians. Why will they not accept the arguments of the organizations representing the very people the Bill is supposed to help? They do not have to accept the arguments of Hon. Members of the opposition Parties; we only make our cases for blatant political and partisan reasons! Why will they not accept the arguments and the case put for making the Bill a workable one by these organizations which represent native people, visible minorities, non-Anglo-Saxons, non-protestants, older ethnics who have been discriminated against for many years, women and the handicapped, all those people who are under-represented in employment.

I say to the Hon. Member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine East (Mr. Allmand) that I have not been enthused or impressed by the efforts of the former Government.

In conclusion, if one looks at American television programming, sometimes one sees a post office in New York, Chicago or Los Angeles. One cannot help but be struck by the large number of non-white people who are working in the post office. I just use that as an example. I venture to say that if one looked at a Canadian post office in Vancouver, Toronto or Winnipeg, one would see very few non-white people working there.

Our record in providing employment for members of minority groups is not a good one. We have a long way to go and a lot for which we should be apologetic.

Mr. Gerry Weiner (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, all Hon. Members of the House share a common goal, employment equity. However, there are some philosophical differences and techniques. Some very useful discussion has taken place over the last eight or nine months, but that is what it is all about. That is what the democratic process is all about. That is what the House of Commons is for. We cannot agree on exactly how it will be put into effect, but we all want the same results. With concern being shown and with heart being put into the debate, we know that all Canadians will be well protected by the supervision, surveillance and guidance of all Members of the House of Commons.

In this particular motion we are being asked for prescribed goals and timetables. We had a feeling that that would mean more quotas, a new enforcement agency and more regulatory bodies. Those are the things we wanted to avoid. We did not want to worry about process. We wanted to worry about results, and it is results which we will all be monitoring.

I should like to clarify the following because it may need some clarification. Mr. Fairweather stated that reports submitted under Section 5 would give enough evidence of systemic discrimination. It is exactly what the commission wanted, and how it will deal with data was included in its testimony. If results are bad, the Canadian Human Rights Commission can conduct an investigation, including access to the action plans. If the investigation of the Canadian Human Rights Commission leads to evidence of systemic discrimination, the CHRC can impose penalties under Section 41 of the Canadian Human Rights Act. The Bill is mandatory in two ways—failure to report and the action of the Canadian Human Rights Commission.

Motion No. 32A would have the fine increased from \$50,000 to \$500,000. We feel that \$50,000 is realistic. It is in accordance with other legislation, such as the Canadian Human Rights Act. For these reasons I am opposed to the two motions now being discussed.

[Translation]

Mrs. Lucie Pépin (Outremont): Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the amendment. I heard my colleague say earlier that we all had the same objective in discussing this Bill because we supposedly all want to achieve equality. He added that all Canadians would be much happier with a Bill such as this one if it were to receive passage without any changes. As for me, I would be rather surprised if satisfactory results could be achieved before certain changes are made and certain penalties are included.

The Human Rights Commission is also being asked to act as guard dog to point out irregularities. If we refer to the hearings held by the Parliamentary Committee, we see that all the groups who appeared before the Committee denounced this piece of legislation. They all referred to the lack of seriousness and will shown by the Government because no penalty was provided and the Bill had no teeth. We have the impression that this Bill will be another smokescreen as often happens with the Bills aimed at women which this Government introduces. If we compare the Abella Report with this Bill, we have the impression that the measure as it now stands is a travesty of the report. We all know that, without penalties, it is impossible to have an acceptable piece of legislation.

All that is being asked of the employers is to submit a report in two years, in 1988, and we cannot even know their action plan. This Bill was denounced by all the groups representing women, the handicapped and the minorities, it includes no penalties and has no teeth, it provides only for voluntary action and it shows a lack of seriousness on the part of the Government. The Human Rights Chief Commissioner came twice