

*Supply*

the summary concludes: "Persons who came from the third world regions but who arrived here young enough to obtain all their education and experience in Canada performed as well as native born Canadians in nearly all the cases". This study was conducted in 1992.

• (1610)

The results of another study by Daniel Boothman are: "The results of our job loss model show that women are less likely to lose jobs than men, all else being equal. Visible minority status had no significant effect on the probability of job loss".

Another point on page 50 states: "Being a woman increases the probability of promotion in the model. This effect is significant at the 10 per cent level. Visible minority status had no significant effect".

In the final statement: "In closing, this study found no strong evidence or a disadvantage for women and visible minorities in movement between jobs".

I would like to ask the member if he has studied and recorded these views in his presentation.

**Mr. Pagtakhan:** Mr. Speaker, Canadians cannot be fooled. I have faith in our people.

The Reform Party has to be sure it has seen the questionnaire, the subquestions and whether the explanations have been given very well. That not being done, I will not comment further on that point.

Second, he alluded to advertisements being posted limiting hiring to certain designated groups. This is against the Canadian Human Rights Act. This is not the intent of the legislation. Bill C-64 will not condone such advertising. If the member has knowledge of that he has an obligation to report it to the Canadian Human Rights Commission and file a proper complaint. I will be with him challenging that kind of advertising.

The last point is that there is no discrimination now in the workforce according to the study which I have not seen. I will admit for the sake of argument in his reading of this that there has been no discrimination against visible minorities. Let us assume for the sake of argument it is a statement of fact. He said the study was done in 1992. The present law was passed in 1986.

My conclusion is the law is working. Let us keep it to sustain positive equality in Canada.

**Mr. Jim Abbott (Kootenay East, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, it is fairly evident from any survey of any group of people that there is no support for the government's bill among the population at large. Survey after survey comes back stating that 80 per cent of Canadians are opposed to bills of this type.

I ask the member who is the chairman of the committee specifically about some things that happened there. Could this be the reason why the government, in an agreement with the two opposition parties, decided to take the bill after first reading directly to committee?

The opposition parties thought there was going to be a fair opportunity to review the bill on a clause by clause basis. Once they got into committee they found that the chairman had decided that debate was going to be restricted to five minutes per clause which is completely out of touch with reality. Is this a fair and open way to study legislation or is it just a way for the government to slide things by so that the 80 per cent of Canadians who are opposed to this bill do not know that the government is sliding this one by them?

**Mr. Pagtakhan:** Mr. Speaker, there is a fundamental rule in law. If one relies on hearsay it is very dangerous. It is not my recollection that this member had attended a meeting of our committee. Perhaps I missed one.

Second, for him to say the chair decided on a five-minute limit to debate on clause by clause, please check the record.

**Mr. Abbott:** Liberal members decided.

• (1615)

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Order. The time has expired for questions and comments. I would add that we are treading very close to the line in terms of dealing with the actual motion of the Reform Party today and the business of the committee of the House. I would like to remind members to be somewhat judicious. Resuming debate.

**Mr. Andy Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is an honour for me to participate in this debate today. I thank my colleague from Winnipeg North for sharing his time with me.

It is a great honour to rise in the House to respond to the motion put forward by the hon. member for Fraser Valley East which seeks to condemn the government for its policies in the area of employment equity, in particular Bill C-64. To be honest, I find the hon. member's motion hard to fathom since it flies in the face of two of the most cherished core values we hold as Canadians, justice and equality.

The member of the opposition is correct in one regard, namely that this government is deeply committed to assuring equality of opportunity for all Canadians. This should come as no surprise for our red book clearly states that we seek a country where all of us see ourselves as contributors and participants and not liabilities and dependants. It further underlines our commitment to building a Canada characterized by integrity, compassion and competence.