

equals we must really believe in equality. We must act on it always, not just when we are forced to.

Ms. Mitchell: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order to ask for unanimous consent of the House to ask a related question of the minister.

I want to commend him for some of the steps that have been taken today, while I also support very strongly the position raised by my colleague.

The question I would like unanimous consent to ask has to do with systemic discrimination that continues in the Public Service against the employment of visible minorities. I am sure the minister knows that his government target for hiring minorities is far below the rate of participation of such people in the regular workforce. Even with such a low target, only a little over 1 per cent of federal employees are people of colour.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Mr. Cooper: Mr. Speaker, I understand that the question involved is not directly related to the subject.

My second concern is that the longstanding tradition of the House concerning statements is a very important one. To have us add to a statement a period for questions would be a very unusual precedent, one that I am sure most members in the House would not want to accept. So we would decline.

Mrs. Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order.

The request is highly unusual and, I think, highly unfair to the House. There is a period set aside every day for questions to the minister. If we want to enter into debate there is a way to have a debate, one in which all parties can participate.

I really must respond to the point raised by the member opposite who thinks that employment equity is a separate issue from pay equity. I am afraid he is quite wrong. He had better get himself a little better informed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: That sounds like a matter for debate.

Routine Proceedings

STRIKING COMMITTEE

TWENTY-NINTH AND THIRTIETH REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. Albert Cooper (Parliamentary Secretary to Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the twenty-ninth report of the Striking Committee.

While I am on my feet, I have the honour to present the thirtieth report of the Striking Committee.

If the House gives its consent, I intend to move concurrence in the report later this day. I would ask that we dispense with the reading of the report by the Clerk at the table as that report concerns only membership changes to committees.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[Editor's Note: See today's Votes and Proceedings.]

* * *

• (1240)

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

CONCURRENCE IN THIRD REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Saskatoon—Humboldt): Mr. Speaker, I move concurrence in the third report of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts presented to the House.

Under ordinary circumstances the tradition has been to notify those members of the Public Accounts Committee that I was going to move concurrence in this particular report. However, the member for Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia and the member for Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke are not in the House—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member.

The hon. member for Saskatoon—Humboldt has the floor for a motion to concur in the third report of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

Is there agreement that the House will concur in the thirtieth report of the Striking Committee presented by the hon. member for Peace River?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.