elements to this Bill at which we need to take a closer look. First, the Bill does not apply to federal Government employees. Second, it applies to companies on the federal scene with only 100 or more employees. Third, there is absolutely no enforcement mechanism for the action plans, and fourth, the action plans are on a voluntary basis, kept secret within the confines of the companies involved. Do we really believe that a secret action plan which is not subject to public scrutiny will mean a change in the employment situation for visible minorities, natives, the handicapped and women? I do not think so.

As was pointed out by the Hon. Member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine East, the actual wording of the legislation is faulty. In a sense, current discriminatory practices with respect to employment will be institutionalized. I am referring to Clause 4(b) which calls upon companies to institute such positive practices that are at least proportionate to representation in the workforce. However, the practices these companies are required to activate as set out in the secret plans that will be kept in company vaults should be targeted not to the workforce but to the population.

For example, let us say that the visible minority portion of the workforce of Toronto is 10 per cent. It may be that 60 per cent or 70 per cent of visible minorities have totally dropped out and are no longer attached to the workforce. Those people will be ignored. The Bill calls upon the companies to set targets based upon the number of people currently in the workforce instead of setting targets based on the number of people in the population at large.

The native community is a good example of a group for which targets must be set, not based on the population that is currently attached to the labour force but on the population of the community at large. If we ignore those who have dropped out because they have lost hope and have gotten fed up with the system, then we are in a sense institutionalizing through targets the very discriminatory practices which have led thousands and indeed hundreds of thousands of peole to leave the workforce and find themselves on family benefits. All disabled persons in the country who currently receive benefits are not included in this program because they are not a part of the workforce. At the very least, the Government should include a clause which sets targets based on the number of people in the population at large and not specifically restricted to the number of people attached to the labour force.

[*Translation*]

In my opinion, the Government has decided not to proceed with the very good amendments introduced by my colleague from Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine East (Mr. Allmand) because it does not really believe in them. Mr. Speaker, if we really have independent Members in the House, in keeping with the new Government style advocated by the Government House Leader, I would like to give them an opportunity to vote independently and reject the Bill as it stands now, so I propose—

[*English*]

I would like to give private Members on all sides of the House an opportunity to vote on this issue. Therefore, I move, seconded by the Hon. Member for Bourassa (Mr. Rossi):

That the motion be amended by deleting all of the words after the word "That" and substituting the following:

"Bill C-62, An Act respecting employment equity, be not now read a third time, but that the Bill be referred back to a legislative committee for reconsideration of Clauses 3, 5 and 7 thereof."

• (1250)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I see no problem with the proposed motion moved by the Hon. Member for Hamilton East (Ms. Copps) and seconded by the Hon. Member for Bourassa (Mr. Rossi).

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Speaker, I was about to put questions to the Hon. Member as part of the 10-minute question period. Is that in order now?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I will allow questions and comments.

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Speaker, the amendment which the Hon. Member put before the House would send the Bill back to committee for reconsideration of Clauses Nos. 3, 5 and 7.

Clause No. 3 is the interpretation clause which deals with, for example, whether or not federal Government Departments should be included in the Bill. I presume the reason she included Clause 3 is that she wants to proceed with an attempt to include federal Government Departments and, as she pointed out in her speech, to lower the floor for companies covered from 100 employees to 25 employees.

Clause 5 deals with action plans. Is it the Hon. Member's intention, in sending the Bill back to committee, to strike out that clause which indicates that the action plans should be kept secret in the vaults of the head offices of the companies?

Clause 7 deals with the sanction. In my remarks I argued that Clause 7 could be strengthened if the $50,000 fine for not moving ahead was applied to Clauses Nos. 4, 5 and 6. Would she elucidate, since she made her amendment near the end of her remarks, on whether that is what she hopes to do in committee?

Ms. Copps: Mr. Speaker, I should like to take those questions in reverse order. Quite clearly Clause 7 refers to a fine only if the employer does not comply with Clause 6, that is, the obligation to report to the federal Government. It is the only obligation which is subject to a fine. Therefore, in a sense an employer could report as follows: "I have not done anything and 1986 has passed. I have reported and therefore I am not subject to a fine". We feel that that is wrong. By extending the sanction or the offence to Clauses Nos. 4, 5 and 6, we would place an obligation upon an employer, not only to report but also to develop an affirmative action plan within the context of the company which would hopefully be an open and accessible plan and, if not implemented, would be subject to some kind of