

racial equal rights movements and people like Martin Luther King? Women may not have had the same success as these groups have. I would appreciate the Hon. Member's further comment.

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Speaker, I have no actual figures, but the Hon. Member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine East (Mr. Allmand) is correct. I do not think that women have been as successful as have the black and Hispanic organizations in attaining the goals which all these minority groups have set for themselves. I suppose the reason for that is simple. The people in the groups with the political clout get the most.

In any area you look, you will see the Americans are far ahead of Canadians. The Americans are ahead because they accepted the fundamental principle, which is missing in this Bill, that pious resolutions and prayers will not accomplish the task and that educational programs and appealing to goodwill will not achieve the goal.

If I could just complete the sentence from the end of my speech, Mr. Speaker, the reason that the National Association of Manufacturers in the United States wants to continue its present system with the goals, the objectives and the target dates is not that they are nicer people than our employers but that, as they say very clearly: "We like the system because it tells us precisely what we are required to do. If the Government tells us what we are required to do, we will do it. If the numbers are not there and the goals are not there, if the target dates are not there, no matter what we do, we will be accused by some people that we have not done enough".

If the Conservative Government of Canada will not listen to representatives of minority groups or to representatives of labour unions or to spokespersons for church groups, all of whom have made clear their rejection of this Bill as it is presently written, I wish it would take the time to make inquiries from its friends. The Conservatives seem to be so friendly and ready to meet the needs, the requirements and the objectives of the business community, I wish they would take the time, make some effort—they could get our ambassador in Washington, who seems to have a little time—to contact the National Association of Manufacturers and find out why they are satisfied with the legislation as it is in the United States, and why they support the legislation as it is in the United States. If they did that, I am sure they would come back and be prepared to agree to amending the Bill along the lines I have suggested.

Mr. Nystrom: Mr. Speaker, I have a comment and a question. The Hon. Member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow) was mentioning the American program of mandatory affirmative action, employment equity. If I remember correctly, during the Second World War or thereabouts the American program was not mandatory. It was a voluntary program and the Americans found out that it did not work. They decided to change it in the 1960s. I am not sure of all the reasons they did so, but I know the Member for Winnipeg

North is very well read and versed in this area. Perhaps he can elaborate on why this change was made.

I also understand there are some members of the American Cabinet who are talking about ending the affirmative action program in the United States, some of the more reactionary members of Mr. Reagan's own Cabinet. How widespread is that mood and why are they trying to do this if there is a feeling in the United States that this is a good program? Perhaps the Member could shed some light on those questions.

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Speaker, as I have already indicated, the Secretary of Labour in the United States, Bill Brock, has made very clear his support for the existing law and the existing system in the United States. The reasons are obvious. It works.

Let me make one thing clear. When we talk about employment equity and affirmative action, we are not saying to employers that we want them to hire unqualified members of minority groups for the job. That would be wrong and it would be stupid. We are saying that we want employers to hire qualified members of the minority groups.

Let me put on the record a few paragraphs from a letter which Joseph Rauh, a famous civil rights advocate in the United States, wrote to Congressman James Scheuer, himself a supporter of affirmative action and civil rights. There are, of course, differences about how laws can be interpreted and how they will work. Mr. Rauh was talking about whether medical colleges should be required to accept black applicants. He says, and it is a very good illustration:

But in the light of 300 years of discrimination against Blacks, is it too much to ask that some preference be given to Blacks among qualified candidates for admission?

I stress "qualified candidates". Then in another letter he says:

—where a Black applicant to medical school is fully qualified under the school's own standards of admission, may the school give him preference in admission as part of its affirmative action program even though a rival white male applicant has higher qualifications.

The problem is not a qualified white against an unqualified Black—

What we are talking about is applications of qualified members of minority groups, that they must be given some assistance, a step up. That is what we are talking about in employment equity. That is what the Government refuses to address.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Questions and comments are now terminated. Debate.

Mr. George Baker (Gander—Twillingate): Mr. Speaker, I have a few words concerning this particular Bill, perhaps in a different area than has been mentioned during second reading debate and during the committee stage of the Bill, perhaps something completely different as it relates to this Bill but something which I was thinking a moment ago applies to this Bill given the clauses that are under consideration.

The Official Opposition is saying that in Clause 3 the Government of Canada should include Departments of the