Motions Nos. 2A, 9, 11A, 13A, 14A, 15, 16A, 20A, 22, 24, 25A, 26A, 31 and 36A.

After consultation, I have decided to select for debate Motions Nos. 11A, 14A, 16A, 24, 25A and 26A. They will be grouped and voted on as follows: Motion No. 11A will be debated and voted on separately; Motion No. 14A will be grouped for debate with Motion No. 12A but will be voted on separately; Motion No. 16A will be debated and voted on separately; Motions Nos. 24, 25A and 26A will be grouped for debate with Motion No. 27A with separate votes on each of the said motions; Consequently, Motions Nos. 2A, 9, 13A, 15, 20A, 22, 31 and 36A will not be put to the House and will be dropped from this day's *Notice Paper*.

The House should know that in selecting motions already dealt with in committee at this time, the Chair has borne in mind the fact that all the motions in amendment to Bill C-62 were on the Notice Paper before the provisional Standing Order 114(10) was adopted.

Resuming debate on Motion No. 8.

**Mr. Deans:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might prevail upon the Chair; in the future when extensive rulings are being made perhaps the Table could provide us with a copy of the ruling in order that we could follow it?

**Mr. Speaker:** I apologize. Normally that is our practice, as the Hon. Member knows. I thought it had been circulated. It turns out that it had been prepared but because of a change in language which I added at the last minute before Question Period, it only reached my hand a few moments ago. Normally, absolutely that would be our process.

**Mr. Allmand:** Mr. Speaker, in the ruling you just made, the second paragraph, you refer to Motion No. 10A. In my Order Paper there is no such Motion No. 10A. I do not know what you are referring to. Could there be a typographical error?

**Mr. Speaker:** In Parliament, anything is possible.

I can see the confusion. The Hon. Member should know that Motion No. 10A which I referred to is Motion No. 10A in the original Order Paper which was put to the House and was ruled out of order earlier. The Parliamentary Secretary argued earlier today that two motions which were still available were consequential to that motion. That was his argument for Motions Nos. 13A and 15 if I remember correctly. The Chair indicated that it was dealing with the admissibility on procedural grounds of Motions Nos. 13A and 15 on the basis of their having been presented in committee, as a prior condition.

Resuming debate.

**Mr. Howard McCurdy (Windsor-Walkerville):** Mr. Speaker, before we rose for luncheon, I had reviewed, at least in part, the record of the Public Service in respect to the application of affirmative action and what little success it has achieved, in particular, with respect to the implication of affirmation action programs for visible minority groups. Of course, it has already been said that in spite of a claim to affirmative action programs for the disabled, some 75 per cent of federal employees who have supposedly benefited from that program are on term or temporary employment. Similarly, where women have been the subject of what might be deemed a more effective affirmative action program, there is a considerable record of deficiency, a lack of uniformity and a lack of understanding of exactly what steps have been pursued in each department. In the last year in particular I have received complaints from members of the visible minority population with respect to the treatment of their job applications and, once employed, the failure to promotion which remind one of the experiences of so many minority group members in attempting to obtain jobs in the private sector. These are the types of experiences which led to studies by the Urban Alliance on Race Relations on discrimination in employment which were reported from Toronto. These reports indicated that visible minority group members have about one chance in three as compared to white applicants to obtain employment in that city. I have described that city previously as one which has a record of inter-racial understanding. On that basis it must disturb us all in respect to the situation which might exist elsewhere.

• (1510)

If there is any doubt of the need for affirmative action in the Public Service, one need only take note of the recent formation of a visible minority caucus in the Public Service of Canada which records a very serious situation evolving with respect to visible minority employees of the federal Government. This is as a result of the failure to have a strong affirmative action program, as well as the recent spate of lay-offs and the promise of further lay-offs in the Public Service. What is being said is that the old record of last hired and first fired is being played again in the federal Public Service. As lay-offs are occurring it is being said that since visible minority group members have been more recently employed they are experiencing lay-offs. More important, and I think more serious, are mounting complaints that visible minority group employees are being subjected to re-evaluation with respect to merit. They are having their grades altered in such a way as to promise the almost certain outcome that they will be laid off in the near future when the lay-offs penetrate into the departments involved in this Government effort to cut expenditures by dismissing employees.

There is also increasing concern among those seeking promotion that because of the threat of lay-offs, the lack of effective affirmative action and a lack of sensitivity, members of visible minority groups who are employees of the Government are becoming very concerned about the lack of effective protection for what status they have so far achieved. This is a record which is similar to that in the private sector.

It is clear that the amendment which has been proffered by the New Democratic Party should be postively entertained. It should be adopted to ensure that the federal Public Service is included in the legislation. If it is not, then members of the