

## UNIVERSAL ACCESS TO FAIR ORAL HEARINGS BEFORE REFUGEE BOARD

**Mr. Dan Heap (Spadina):** I also have a petition from a number of residents in Toronto concerned about the situation of refugees approaching Canada for protection. They say we need a system that will better protect them. They point out that such a system was proposed by the standing committee with support from all Parties as well as from the churches, the Canadian Bar Association, the Canadian Jewish Congress, and many other groups and individuals.

• (1300)

They call upon Parliament to enact legislation which will embody the principles of fair and quick oral hearings of refugee claimants before a refugee board independent of the Immigration Commission universal access to such hearings for every claimant in Canada, and adequate opportunity to arrive in Canada to make this claim.

## PROTECTION OF AUTO PACT SAFEGUARDS

**Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor):** Mr. Speaker, I have yet another petition to present with respect to the Auto Pact and the safeguards which are such a crucial part of that trade agreement with the United States. This petition is signed by workers from Windsor, Amherstburg, Woodslee, Essex, Oldcastle, Kingsville, Stoney Point, Cottam, Belle River, McGregor, and Tilbury. They call upon Parliament to make certain that in any free trade negotiations with the United States the safeguards in the Auto Pact are protected because they see this as crucial to thousands of jobs in the Essex—Windsor area.

This brings the total of petitioners on the subject from my constituency to nearly 8,000.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

## QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

**Mr. Doug Lewis (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, question No. 127 will be answered today.

[Text]

## TERM EMPLOYEES

Question No. 127—**Mr. Attewell:**

In 1985 and 1986, did the Public Service Commission employ any persons hired on a short-term basis under six months and, if so, by year (a) how many (b) what was the total cost?

**Hon. Robert de Cotret (President of the Treasury Board):** The distribution of term employees, subject to PSSRA 1-1, hired for a duration of six months or less and the salary cost are as follows:

<i>Motion to Adjourn under S. O. 29</i>		
Fiscal Year	Number of Hirings	Total Equivalent Annual Salary Cost at Time of Hiring
1985-86	49,151	\$462,660,674*
1986-87	47,996	\$480,413,357*

Equivalent annual salary is defined as the employee's rate of pay expressed as an annual amount. In other words, it is the amount an employee would receive over a month period.

\*This amount represents the cost based on the assumption that employees are employed for the maximum six months.

[Translation]

**Mr. Lewis:** Mr. Speaker, I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The question enumerated by the Parliamentary Secretary has been answered. Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

\* \* \*

[English]

## MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER S. O. 29

## TAX REFORM STATEMENT—ALLEGED ABUSE OF PARLIAMENTARY PROCESS

**Miss Aideen Nicholson (Trinity):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to propose, pursuant to Standing Order 29, a motion to adjourn the House for the purpose of discussing a specific and important matter requiring urgent consideration, namely, the abuse of the parliamentary process by the Government in misleading the House with regard to the nature of and circumstances surrounding its tax reform announcement yesterday which amounted to a Budget in every sense except in the recognition of the proprieties, both in the House and in the preparation.

If this had been presented, as it should have been, as a Budget, Members would have been entitled to a six-day debate. The method of presentation has deprived Members of a careful and public examination of these tax measures which were, however, carefully explained to 31 individuals who were not elected representatives of the people.

My proposal is that in view of the importance of the matter it deserves a full debate in the House.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** I thank the Hon. Member for her representations. The Chair has indeed received a notice pursuant to Standing Order 29. However, the Chair believes that the matter does not meet the requirements necessary for the Chair to approve a debate under Standing Order 29. Therefore, the Chair rejects the motion.