

Madam Speaker, I ask that it be printed in *Hansard* as if read.

[Text]

*Question No. 105—Mr. Duhamel

Since September 4, 1984, in the federal government (a) how many people have been hired for contract positions (b) what percentage is found in each of (i) visible minorities (ii) women (iii) aboriginal peoples (iv) disabled?

Hon. Gilles Loisel (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of State (Finance)): There are no positions in the federal government that are classified or identified as contract positions and there is no comprehensive repository of government contracts awarded to individuals or to firms for the services of individuals. When contracting for goods and services valued at more than \$200,000.00, departments must abide by the requirements of the Federal Contractors Program for Employment Equity administered by the Canada Employment and Immigration Commission. However, no details on representation are held by the federal government.

[English]

Mr. Cooper: Madam Speaker, I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

Madam Deputy Speaker: The questions as enumerated by the parliamentary secretary have been answered. Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

MISCELLANEOUS STATUTE LAW AMENDMENT ACT, 1991

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Ms. Campbell (Vancouver Centre) that Bill C-35, an act to correct certain anomalies, inconsistencies, archaisms and errors in the Statutes of Canada, to deal with other matters of non-controversial and uncomplicated nature therein and to repeal certain provisions thereof that have expired or lapsed or otherwise ceased to have

Government Orders

effect, be read the second time and referred to Legislative Committee G.

Mr. Brian L. Gardiner (Prince George—Bulkley Valley): Madam Speaker, just before Question Period I had an opportunity to start putting a few comments on the record about Bill C-35, and I would like to continue now with them.

As you know, Madam Speaker, what we are dealing with in the House today is a bill with quite a title that I think Canadians would be interested in:

An act to correct certain anomalies, inconsistencies, archaisms and errors in the Statutes of Canada, to deal with other matters of non-controversial and uncomplicated nature therein and to repeal certain provisions thereof that have expired or lapsed or otherwise ceased to have effect.

The legislation, which is being brought before us today, is a mouthful for us to consider. These are essentially a number of changes to government legislation that are, in the government's hopes anyway, deemed non-controversial and that should not have any debate.

I did say, at the opening of my comments, that when the minister who introduced the bill first spoke he said that he was hoping to get unanimous consent in the House to move as quickly as possible today into Committee of the Whole to consider this bill. I said at that time, and I repeat it now, that our party cannot give that unanimous consent.

I think that is an important point to make. A bill of some 120 pages that amends a large number of statutes should be given an opportunity for a closer examination in committee. That is only appropriate.

We are quite prepared at this stage of the debate to move along quickly. But it is only proper that this Parliament, when considering a bill like this, has a closer examination of the bill in committee to see just what is in there.

Certainly, when this House receives a report from the legislative committee, we will be more than prepared to give the legislation its consideration and its early passage.

Why do I say that we have to do this, Madam Speaker?

I have not been a member of Parliament for a very long time but I have had an opportunity over the past to see what other governments have done, including this government, when we are presented with these omnibus bills. When you start going through these bills you have a number of questions. As a member of Parliament I do