

impossible, when you want to implement a program of this sort, to identify, other than by looking around and just by sheer personal observation, who falls into this category of a visible minority person and who should be identified for this affirmative action program.

Perhaps, as a result of that, the program so far does not seem to have been effective at all. In fact, the figures I have seen and have in my possession indicate that there has been virtually zip as far as progress is concerned in the visible minority category in the senior area of the Public Service.

That program was put in place, as I understand, in 1983. We are down the road about three years. It is interesting to note that the Bill that is in front of us, Bill C-62, has a provision in it that provides for review. I think this is an important provision. It says in the Bill that we are not going to be satisfied to just put the law into place, Bill C-62 on employment equity, but in five years time we are going to look at it and see how it works. Then every three years thereafter we are going to take another look at it to see how it works and make sure it is doing the job it is supposed to be doing.

As far as I can see, with respect to the Treasury Board regulations, three years down the line after they were put in place they are not working. At the end of five years I definitely hope the Government will publish, if it does not start publishing immediately, reports from the Public Service Commission as to how these affirmative action reports are working in practice, and that we will be able to judge for ourselves as parliamentarians whether affirmative action is working in the Public Service under the Treasury Board guidelines. It seems to me that five years is a good review period. It is enough for the Public Service to identify the problems, get the program working and make sure that it is starting to show some effective progress.

We are running out of time, as far as a five-year review is concerned, for visible minorities and for the disabled. Although women are making some progress, I am sure that much more should and could be made. I hope that we will have a commitment from the Government sometime during this debate that, whether or not Motion No. 8 is passed—whether or not the Public Service is included in the provisions of this Bill—the Government will publish reports from the Public Service Commission on how the existing Treasury Board guideline or regulation with respect to affirmative action is working. That would enable us to take some further action if, in fact, that is not the answer. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 66, to inform the House that the questions to be raised

### *Employment Equity*

tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: The Hon. Member for Don Valley East (Mr. Attewell)—Pornography—Request for tighter customs and excise laws; the Hon. Member for York East (Mr. Redway)—Consumer and Corporate Affairs—Request that warning label be placed on drug ASA; and the Hon. Member for Winnipeg-Birds Hill (Mr. Blaikie)—Trade—Canada-United States negotiations—Negotiator's views on water exports.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

### EMPLOYMENT EQUITY ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-62, an Act respecting employment equity, as reported (with amendments) from a legislative committee, and Motion No. 8 (Mr. Nystrom) (p. 12176).

**Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal):** There seems to be some misunderstanding, Mr. Speaker. So perhaps it might be necessary, although not in the nature of a history lesson, to clarify and elucidate for certain Members across the floor the history of affirmative action and how we come to call this a sad day. In fact, it was a black day as the members of the handicapped community came in large numbers with black balloons and called it Black Monday. I think that is truly what it is. The Member for York East (Mr. Redway) put into focus quite well the fact that there was a need for affirmative action for women, the handicapped, native people and visible minorities. The Treasury, through the action of the Member for Windsor West (Mr. Gray) when he was head of the Treasury Board, brought in the guidelines in 1983. At the time that those guidelines were brought in, the question was so serious and the situation of such great concern that the Abella Commission was also set into motion.

That commission carried out a mandate to study what the real problems were around what was then called affirmative action, which Judge Abella then named employment equity, but only after having studied, at great length, the particular problems that faced these particular constituencies. If the Members across the way had read the Abella Report they would know that it became quite apparent that the Treasury guidelines were not enough. They were not acting quickly enough. As the Member for York East pointed out, although women have moved forward somewhat, there has been very little forward motion for those of the other three groups who are of concern to us. The employment equity report by Judge Abella followed the 1982 Charter of Rights and Freedoms being entrenched in the Constitution guaranteeing a series of equality factors for all sectors of our society, and in particular equality for the four groups concerned. Following that, in 1983 we had the Treasury Board guidelines; in 1984 the Abella Report; and in 1985 the Equality For All Task Force went out.