



# House of Commons Debates

---

VOLUME 133

NUMBER 032

1st SESSION

35th PARLIAMENT

---

OFFICIAL REPORT  
(HANSARD)

**Tuesday, March 8, 1994**

**Speaker: The Honourable Gilbert Parent**

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, March 8, 1994

The House met at 10 a.m.

---

*Prayers*

---

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

### SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES (B), 1993-94

A message from His Excellency the Governor General transmitting supplementary estimates (B) for the financial year ending March 31, 1994, was presented by the President of the Treasury Board and read by the Speaker to the House.

(1005)

**Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure):** Madam Speaker, accordingly I am tabling a copy of the supplementary estimates for the current fiscal year ending March 31, 1994.

I have copies of the supplementary estimates to be distributed to the Prime Minister, the leaders and Treasury Board critics of the opposition parties.

\* \* \*

### LAND CLAIMS

**Mr. Jack Iyerak Anawak (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):**

[*Editor's Note: Member spoke in Inuktitut.*]

[*English*]

Under the provisions of Standing Order 32(2), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, copies of the Sahtu, Dene and Métis land claims agreements, volumes I and II.

The appropriate legislation to bring this agreement into force will be introduced in the very near future.

## INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY

**Hon. Sheila Finestone (Secretary of State (Multiculturalism) (Status of Women)):** Madam Speaker, it is so nice to see you in the chair as I make a statement on today, International Women's Day.

It is a day to look back and celebrate how far women have come and to look ahead to see what we still must do to achieve equality.

On this day I hope all members of the House, women and men alike, will take time to reaffirm their commitment to equality for the women of Canada: equality in decision making, equality in the workplace, equality in the economy and equality in the home.

[*Translation*]

Canada is known as one of the world's leaders in promoting women's equality. Canada helped obtain recognition of women's rights as an inalienable, integral and indivisible element of universal human rights at the World Conference on Human Rights held in Vienna last year.

Canada has also shown it is in the forefront of efforts to combat violence against women throughout the world. The survey conducted by Statistics Canada and the report of the Canadian Committee on Violence against Women, both published last year, were the first of their kind.

Canada was also instrumental in preparing the United Nations declaration on eliminating violence against women, adopted in December 1993. Last week, the UN Human Rights Commission announced that it would appoint a special reporter on violence against women.

[*English*]

Later today I will be participating in an event with my colleague, the Secretary of State for Latin America and Africa and Canadian retailer, The Body Shop, as we continue our partnering efforts in the country to put an end to violence against women.

(1010)

The daisy I am supposed to be wearing has not arrived yet. I will be wearing it this afternoon as it will symbolize those efforts today.

As The Body Shop says, in the name of love let us stop the violence. That means violence against our sisters, our children,

*Routine Proceedings*

our mothers and our elderly grandmothers. However all the words, the declarations and the research do not mean a thing if they are not supported by consensus in society, a consensus for change. The women of Canada have serious concerns about the many continuing inequities in our country.

Since 1976 the women of Canada have comprised the majority of the population, but we still represent less than 20 per cent of the members of the House. It is a record number, yes, but still not enough.

In 1975 we only averaged 60 per cent of men's full time earnings. Almost 20 years later that figure is still at only 72 per cent, largely because most women are still in low paying, insecure jobs. The salaries of immigrant women are only about 80 per cent of that of the average woman's salary in Canada. Women who are in the workforce should receive equal pay for work of equal value.

In 1975 the poverty rate for families headed by women in Canada was 40 per cent. Today that figure has increased to 62 per cent. The children, our future and theirs are at stake. I find those figures really frightening. This is one of the major challenges our social security review will have to address.

Another disturbing challenge we will address is breast cancer. One in every nine Canadian women will get this disease. It is the leading killer of women ages 35 to 54. Breast cancer, like other women's health concerns, has long been neglected in terms of research and prevention.

These few statistics speak volumes about women's inequality in Canada today. How do we move forward toward the goal the United Nations has set for equality by the year 2000? What we need are changes in attitudes, priorities and values on the part of individuals, communities, organizations and governments to give the concerns of women the attention they deserve.

Within government we must realize that our decisions have the potential to affect women very differently from men. From tax law to legislation on dangerous offenders, from health policies to immigration guidelines, the impact can be different on women because of our different socioeconomic circumstances.

I ask the members of the House to examine every issue, every policy and every program as if they were wearing gender tinted glasses, the rose tinted glass, looking at it from a woman's point of view.

My goal is to ensure that all national legislation and policies are developed with full consideration for women for their needs and aspirations. I think there is the political will in the House to do so. I am confident that the House could become a model Parliament, demonstrating that a partnership between women and men is the only way to address the issue of women's equality right across the spectrum of political ideology.

Our government is developing and implementing policies which are sensitive to the particular needs of women. I ask everyone to work together with us as we put in place a more equitable and just society for all Canadians.

Next year the world will be looking at our progress and at that of other nations at the fourth UN conference on women in Beijing, China. We should think of the consequences if we do not work to improve the situation for women in Canada. What will we say to our daughters and granddaughters who look to their elected representatives to help lead the way in this process for change? We cannot ask our daughters to hold back their aspirations until we are ready for them.

[Translation]

Through our work in our constituencies, our communities and our parliamentary committees, each and everyone of us can make a difference.

Today, on International Women's Day, I am counting on each and everyone of you to help me advance the cause of genuine equality for Canadian women.

(1015)

In return, I can assure you that future generations of Canadians will remember the 35th Parliament of Canada as the one that made a difference, for the sake of our daughters and our sons.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Québec):** Madam Speaker, International Women's Day indeed affords us a unique opportunity to assess the progress made by women. Above all, it allows us to evaluate the genuine will of our leaders.

In terms of statements and commitments, Canada is a world leader in this area. However, the government's actions have certainly not lived up to its promises. According to the United Nations' human development index for 1993, Canada only ranks eleventh in so far as the status of women is concerned, whereas previously it was in eighth place.

As we can see, the actions of our government do not match the promises made. Should the secretary of state get the idea of responding that her party was not in power then, I would point out to her right away that the present government's commitments as contained in the throne speech and in the budget show no change at all in the course previously set out. No new initiatives whatsoever have been put forward.

Mention is made of salary disparities between men and women. What does the present government intend to do to address this situation? Between the throne speech and the budget, I see no undertaking to correct the problem of wage disparities between men and women, even among the federal government's own employees.

*Routine Proceedings*

When the Secretary of State for the Status of Women speaks of the poverty rate among women, she should draw a connection between income and poverty and pursue this analysis, insisting that her colleagues comply with court rulings ordering the federal government to pay its employees a relatively modest sum of money in order to close the wage gap between male and female federal employees. No effort has been made in this regard and none is planned. What about the government's responsibility to address this serious injustice within its very own institutions?

The secretary of state's goal is that in six years' time, policies and laws will take into account the needs of women. Madam Speaker, women need money, jobs, equitable salaries and adequate working conditions. Everyone already knows that this is what women need. How are we going to be any closer to this goal in six years when this government has nothing concrete to offer? How are we going to achieve this goal without daycares, without job creation programs geared to women, without wage equity, without occupational training, without a clear vision? Madam Speaker, I fear that we will not. Six years is too short a time frame given the pace at which the government is setting its priorities.

I would be curious to know what kind of progress Canada will claim to have made at the Beijing Conference. Will it be announced that the women and men of this government have agreed to take no action whatsoever? Will it be announced that the Canadian government does not comply with the country's laws and courts?

I would like to address the House for the first time in English and say:

[*English*]

Put the money where it should be.

[*Translation*]

Madam Speaker, I am prepared, as are all of my women colleagues in the Bloc Québécois, to work with our male colleagues and even with those on the other side of the House. I am prepared to put my money where my mouth is.

[*English*]

**Mrs. Jan Brown (Calgary Southeast):** Madam Speaker, today is a special day, International Women's Day.

It is a day to acknowledge together the wonderful opportunities that we have as Canadians as we strive to reach our full potential regardless of race, language, culture, religion or gender.

As I speak today I look to the vision and effort of the women who preceded me in the House and in politics in general. There were some courageous souls who toiled long and hard for the

betterment of this wonderful country. Nellie McClung and Agnes Macphail are two of the more famous names that come to mind. These are women of strong character, strong will and moral integrity.

(1020)

With role models like these, it is not surprising that women have aspired to accomplish great things. Women everywhere should be proud of their roles as homemakers, lawyers, bankers, university presidents, welders, prime ministers, hockey players, pastors, members of Parliament and many more.

When we remember Nellie McClung we remember the tireless effort to get women declared as persons, to get women the vote, to get women elected to provincial legislatures. These are the things we take for granted today but were hard fought for a mere 70 years ago.

Agnes Macphail broke ground for us in the House of Commons. She was a woman of vision who spoke for her constituents passionately and effectively. Agnes Macphail did not see issues as gender specific as she argued on behalf of all of her constituents: children, women and the coal miners she served.

There is no doubt that in our society women face numerous serious social challenges. However, special consideration has a weary habit of turning inward on itself. It does not guarantee equality but rather may generate resentment and hostility toward those who do make advancements, thereby diminishing their true potential.

It is a fundamental Canadian belief that all persons should have the right of equality of opportunity and the right to not be discriminated against in the workplace or society at large. This is not to negate the fact that women do face discriminatory practices in the workplace, child care concerns and violence within the family unit. The net effect of these concerns has implications not only for women but for all of society and therefore requires societal solutions.

Members of the House will notice that today the approach of the Reform Party to women's issues is different from what we will hear from others. We believe all Canadians, men and women alike, are entitled to equal rights. We also believe that the concerns of economic renewal, the deficit and job creation, the major themes of the government, belong to all of us.

Instead of setting up barriers to equal opportunity by picking out special interest groups, we should provide opportunities for women, ethnic minorities and the disabled by improving education, emphasizing individual achievement and dismantling unfair systemic barriers to advancement.

In 1982 Pierre Trudeau did just that. He patriated the Constitution to help eradicate injustices. Having done so, we have been given the opportunity to look beyond gender.

*Routine Proceedings*

The secretary of state has cited the problems of poverty for single parent families led by a woman. Resolving such a difficult issue demands more than merely thinking there is a political will for change. We need to get to the root problems and take action.

It is time to look at our taxation system to see why it penalizes family when one parent chooses to stay home to raise the children. It is time to look at our judicial system to see why the families of divorce and the children of single parents are living in such abject poverty because of poor enforcement to secure maintenance payments.

It is time to look at our criminal justice system to see why abusers are permitted to continue to abuse rather than being removed from that situation. It is time to look at our education system to ensure that all students are given the same encouragement and support to pursue their dreams and their goals.

These issues, while most often affecting women, are not issues that fall exclusively to women. The Constitution values the importance of all Canadians and so should we as parliamentarians. The secretary of state for the status of women claimed that we are elected by the women of Canada to represent their needs and concerns in all of our decision making. The constituents of Calgary Southeast elected me to represent them collectively, not just the women. In all the debates and for all the issues that I will consider I will always consider all my constituents in my riding. They expect nothing more from me and nothing less. That is the point of difference in the 35th Parliament.

\* \* \*

(1025)

#### SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1993-94

##### REFERENCE TO STANDING COMMITTEES

**Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure):** Madam Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 81(5) and (6) I wish to introduce a motion concerning referral of the estimates to the standing committees of the House. There is a lengthy list associated with the motion and if it is agreeable to the House I would ask that the list be printed in *Hansard* as if it has been read. Therefore I move:

That the supplementary estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1994, laid upon the table on March 8, 1994, be referred to the several standing committees of the House in accordance with the detailed allocation attached.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** Is it agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

[*Editor's Note: List referred to above is as follows:*]

To the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development

Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Votes 1b, 5b, 6b, 10b, 15b, L20b, L25b and 35b.

To the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food

Agriculture, Votes 1b, 5b, 10b, 15b and 25b.

To the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage

Communications, Votes 1b, 10b, 15b, 35b and 100b.  
Environment, Votes 20b, 21b and 25b.  
Western Economic Diversification, Vote 15b.

To the Standing Committee on Government Operations

Governor General, Vote 1b.  
Industry, Science and Technology, Vote 81b.  
Privy Council, Vote 1b, 5b and 6b.  
Public Works, Votes 2b, L21b and 26b.  
Secretary of State, Vote 10b.  
Supply and Services, Votes 1b, 2b and 5b.

To the Standing Committee on Natural Resources

Energy, Mines and Resources, Votes 1b, 3b and L33b.  
Forestry, Vote 10b.

To the Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development

Environment, Votes 1b, 5b and 15b.

To the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade

External Affairs, Votes 1b, 10b, 20b, 25b, 26b and 45b.

To the Standing Committee on Finance

Finance, Votes 1b and 40b.  
National Revenue, Votes 5b, 10b and 20b.

To the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans

Fisheries and Oceans, Vote 10b.

To the Standing Committee on Health

National Health and Welfare, Votes 1b, 5b, 15b, 20b and 25b.

To the Standing Committee on Industry

Consumer and Corporate Affairs, Votes 1b and 2b.  
Industry, Science and Technology, Votes 1b, 5b, 45b, 50b, 55b, 60b and 65b.  
National Health and Welfare, Vote 35b.  
Western Economic Diversification, Votes 1b and 5b.

To the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs

Justice, Votes 1b, 5b, 10b, 15b, 20b and 40b.  
Solicitor General, Votes 1b, 10b, 15b, 25b, 30b and 35b.

To the Standing Committee on Human Resources Development

Employment and Immigration, Votes 1b, 5b, 6b, 10b, 15b and 20b.  
Labour, Votes 1b, 10b and 15b.

To the Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration

Multiculturalism and Citizenship, Vote 5b.  
Secretary of State, Votes 1b and 5b.

To the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs

Parliament, Vote 5b.

To the Standing Committee on National Defence and Veterans Affairs

National Defence, Vote 20b.

To the Standing Committee on Transport

Transport, Votes 1b, 5b, 10b, 25b, 42b, 43b, 45b and 60b.

*Supply*

(Motion agreed to.)

\* \* \*

**PETITIONS**

## YOUNG OFFENDERS ACT

**Mr. Rex Crawford (Kent):** Madam Speaker, once again it is an honour to rise in the House pursuant to Standing Order 36 to present a petition on the Young Offenders Act concerning a private member's bill presented by the member for York South and seconded by the hon. member for Leeds—Grenville.

I had the privilege this morning on CBC "Newsworld" to debate the Young Offenders Act with the hon. member for Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing.

The petition from constituents of my riding states that crimes committed on society by young offenders are on a serious up rise and young offenders go virtually unpunished due to protection under the Young Offenders Act. They lack respect for the law and fellow citizens. There is no remorse or shame on the part of the young offender.

Therefore the undersigned your petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament to review and revise their laws concerning young offenders, empowering the courts to prosecute and punish the young lawbreakers who are terrorizing our society by releasing their names and lowering the age limit to allow prosecution to meet with the severity of the crime.

\* \* \*

**QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER**

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, I ask that all questions be allowed to stand.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Shall all questions stand?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

(1030)

[*Translation*]

**SUPPLY**

## ALLOTTED DAY—STATUS OF WOMEN

**Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Québec)** moved:

That this House urge the government to recognize the principle of economic equality between women and men and to implement measures, in areas of federal jurisdiction, to guarantee women equity in employment, wages and living conditions.

She said: Mr. Speaker, in 1967, the United Nations proclaimed March 8 International Women's Day. Today, 17 years later, this day of thought remains essential to the furtherance of the cause of women. While much progress has been made, women continue to suffer social, economic and cultural discrimination.

To make a progress report on the status of women as we celebrate Women's Day would be a colossal task, a real feat, especially considering that each and every woman in Quebec and Canada is living her status as a woman in her own way. Women have to fight for their rights and dignity in various ways depending on their socio-cultural environment, values, age, background and civil status.

At one end of the spectrum you have women who have chosen to stay at home and at the other end, women who have decided to combine career and family. In between, there is a large number of women who have no other choice but to stay at home for lack of adequate resources to get integrated in the labour market. Future generations will not accept such constraints imposed by outdated social patterns and attitudes, constraints which overlook the legitimate needs of 52 per cent of the population.

Constraints put on women take many forms, but all describe the same reality: inequity and disparities. My remarks today will deal with inequity in employment, wage disparities, inequity within the family, inequity in tax treatment. While the status of every woman may be different, each has already encountered this bottom line, inequity and disparities.

Countless speeches, reports, inquiries, petitions, briefs, testimonies and statistics have been presented to this House in support of women. All hon. members, past and present, have been made aware of their problems. One can wonder how many more economic inequities and acts of violence women will have to suffer and how many more barriers to autonomy they will have to encounter before the government takes concrete steps and fulfil its social leadership responsibility. For justice to be served, the government must pass proactive legislation to guarantee equality between women and men, while fulfilling its commitments to women.

Equality between women and men should first be assessed in economic terms. This is very basic. As we know, the most common source of income is employment earnings. Recent statistics show a \$11,000 gap between the average earnings of women and those of men. This discrepancy is explained mainly by the fact that the majority of women have low-paid jobs in retail, clerical and service trades.

In 1992, part time jobs represented 16.8 per cent of all jobs in this country and we know that more and more jobs are part time. Seventy per cent of part time jobs are held by women. The fact of the matter is that the main characteristics of these jobs, besides meagre wages, are a lack of career opportunities and a lack of training, as opposed to full time jobs. Also, it has been established that working part time reduced chances of finding

*Supply*

stable full-time employment after having been unemployed, thus increasing considerably the risks of joining the ranks of the non-working population.

In Quebec, in 1992, 24 per cent of working women worked part time, as compared to 9 per cent of men. Given the unavailability of full-time jobs, a certain portion of part-time work could be considered as hidden unemployment and in Quebec, for example, there are 113,000 women—twice as many women as men—in that situation. If these women were considered to be unemployed, their unemployment rate would climb from 11.9 per cent to 19.5 per cent, while that of men would increase from 13.4 per cent to 16.4 per cent.

(1035)

In its report made public in July 1993, the Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women noted that, although the media give more coverage to massive layoffs affecting men, women are in a particularly disquieting situation. Those who lose their jobs during a recession have less chance of finding new jobs afterwards. Between 1981 and 1984, 25 per cent of laid-off women did not return to the workforce, compared with 12 per cent of laid-off men.

I emphasize today that the creation of full-time, long-lasting and well-paid jobs must be among the Canadian government's top priorities. In this regard, I find it deplorable that this government's only concrete measure to create jobs is the infrastructure program. This so-called godsend will in fact contribute very little to the improvement of women's economic situation. Is this how the government demonstrates its interest in striking an equitable balance in job access? Let us be serious: the only jobs, even short-term jobs, likely to be created are almost exclusively in employment sectors traditionally dominated by men such as construction, transport and primary industry where heavy-machinery operators, road workers and labourers are needed.

We must also underline and condemn the emphasis put by the federal government on reducing labour costs. The freeze on salaries and levels in the public service as well as personnel reduction plans have had disastrous effects on the economic situation of women, who account for 45 per cent of all federal public servants. Between now and 1996, the government will make cuts totalling around \$1.5 billion. The Canadian Union of Public Employees predicts that women will be hit harder, since they are found in part-time jobs, even precarious, casual part-time jobs, in the Canadian public service.

For example, while women hold 41 per cent of jobs in the administrative and foreign service category, they accounted for 51 per cent of laid-off workers. In the technical category, 58 per cent of laid-off workers are women, who only hold 15 per cent

of all jobs. Women lose their jobs more often than men and their jobs do not pay as well.

We also learned that the government would close on March 31, 1994 the office of representation and employment orientation for women created in 1983 under a government strategy to increase women's representation at the management level. This office will be closed because an assessment conducted in 1993 indicated that the government had achieved its goals. The Public Service Alliance of Canada has challenged the conclusions of this assessment.

Allow me to express some reservations on these conclusions and to question the long-term effects of closing this office. All parents know how important role models are in teenagers' development. We have a right to ask how young girls who need such role models will be able to identify with successful career women if we water down the measures to increase their numbers in the public service.

It should be obvious that a responsible government must act to remove barriers to women's full participation in the workforce. To achieve this, the government should strive to eliminate job segregation still alive today, which is the main obstacle to job equity.

The need to act is all the more urgent, in job training for instance, that the key sectors for job creation in the medium term are identified as those traditionally dominated by men. In Quebec, this amounts to 80 per cent of the jobs that will be created in the next ten years.

(1040)

The government must show leadership and seek to increase the presence of women in all fields of employment and at all levels. It must continue to reduce wage gaps and encourage the adoption of human resource management practices based on equity. What does it say about our society when our own government does not respect the measures and laws in place!

In 1992, the previous government ignored the recommendations and rulings on pay equity rendered in 1991 by the Human Rights Commission. In 1993, an inquiry by this commission concluded that Canada Post paid its female employees \$2,500 less for duties, skills, responsibilities and working conditions that were identical to those of men. The Commission concluded that the Canadian Human Rights Act was ineffective and not credible.

Furthermore, at a press conference in March 1993, the Chief Commissioner pointed out that women in the Canadian Public Service earned 30 per cent less than their male colleagues. He also emphasized that economic disparities between men and women in Canada were a flagrant contradiction of our country's national and international commitments. I would remind you that in 1981 Canada ratified the United Nations Convention on the elimination of all forms of discrimination against women,

and under this convention Canada promised to respect the principle of equal pay for work of equal value.

At the United Nations World Conference on Women in Kenya in 1985, Canada also adopted action strategies to promote women, a project to ensure women's equality in UN member countries by the year 2000. Where are we today with these commitments? Is it not ironic that the theme chosen by Status of Women Canada is women's equality—towards 1995!

In that organizations's pamphlet, we read that this is also the time to ask what still remains to be done for women to become full and equal partners in society.

I dare suggest that the government implement these fine words with its own female employees. These women would hardly be surprised to learn that the United Nations human development index for 1993 puts Canada only in 11th place for the status of women, compared to 8th place before.

Tax legislation is another reason for women's economic inequality. Allowing alimony paid for children to be deductible from income tax is systemic discrimination against women, since women in most cases still have child custody. By taking that approach, the law in a way rewards the ex-husband who does not have custody of the children and penalizes and impoverishes the former wife who has custody. By extension, the children are also penalized. This law, which goes back to 1942, in no way reflects today's reality.

On behalf of all women, I call for the abolition of this tax measure. I also ask for a thorough study of the unfairness of tax legislation to families.

Having considered the economic conditions of working women with children, I will now deal with the economic situation of unemployed women.

The government's recent cuts and budget restrictions affecting unemployment insurance will very clearly have a negative impact on the living conditions of many low-income women. The Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women points out that many people affected by these restrictions are single parents and that only the poorest people will be entitled to have their UI benefits increased to 60 per cent of their salary.

(1045)

To be eligible to this tiny increase, women will have to declare their dependents and allow UI program officials free access to personal information regarding their family. I denounce this new form of interference in the private life of poor women. I denounce this form of humiliation that the government wants to impose upon them and which is tantamount to a violation of their dignity.

Another form of violation of the dignity of women is the violence to which they are subjected within the family. In its recent report, the Canadian Panel on Violence Against Women

### *Supply*

points out that this abuse is unlikely to stop, as long as women are not treated equally. The government will have to take that into consideration when it decides on the measures required to put a stop to violence against women. Is there any need to remind the House of the promises made in that regard? I have no choice but to say that those promises were certainly not implemented in the recent budget.

In this respect, we wonder about the impact of the 5 per cent cuts to the funds allocated to various organizations. I am thinking here of those 376 battered women's homes in Canada, which form the main support network for women and whose usefulness has been demonstrated. Women of all ages now speak out and denounce the violence to which they are subjected. But what good is that if the government makes cuts in the budgets allocated to organizations which are in a position to provide concrete help?

Police officers, judges and lawyers are also involved in the issue of violence against women. Did the government meet its commitment to allocate the necessary funds to train these people and make them aware of the need for a different kind of approach regarding these victims and their abusers?

In conclusion, I believe that the basic principle of economic equality between women and men is far from being a priority for this government. I am talking of course of real, not verbal priority. Indeed, one wonders if the government has the will to facilitate access to jobs for women and to help them keep working. The Liberals made a nice promise to the effect that they would create 150,000 day-care spaces. We now know that this will not be the case. Indeed, by imposing as a condition a 3 per cent annual growth for the GDP, the government has put this project on the back burner. Even the Minister of Finance admitted in the House yesterday that such growth would not occur for three years. Once again, the government shows how little it cares about family needs, and particularly the needs of women.

We must change the course of history which, unfortunately, tells us that it is events such as wars and revolutions which best promote the participation of women in the workforce. These conflicts force the government to call upon women to replace men at work. When this happens, women are offered training sessions to become mechanics, welders or electricians. The skills of women are then put to full use. Daycare centres are created to make it easier for women to go to work. However, once those conflicts end, the men come back and politicians send the women home, offering them minimal compensation in the form of allowances to encourage them to do so.

We want economic equality between women and men. We want the recognition of the principle of equality but, more importantly, we want the implementation of the necessary measures to ensure that equality now.



*Supply**[English]*

**Hon. Sheila Finestone (Secretary of State (Multiculturalism) (Status of Women)):** Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of interest to my colleague's discourse.

Many of the issues with which she has indicated a serious concern are priorities we have enunciated in the red book, in the speech from the throne and will also be found in the budget.

I would particularly bring to her attention the explicit undertaking by this government concerning child care spaces which we also recognize as the primary building block. When 3 per cent of GNP is arrived at we will be investing another \$50,000 a year. We already subsidize over 633,000 child care spaces.

(1050)

*[Translation]*

I want to thank the hon. member for Québec for her motion, because in it she asks this House to support a principle which is dear to my heart: economic equality between women and men.

I want her to know that I have been active in women's groups for 30 years, and there is not a single objective we have pursued with as much energy and dedication as that of economic equality for women. The process is a slow one, and I believe there are other women in this House who would agree and who have fought these battles for many years. The process did not start with this generation. It started much earlier.

The economic problems of the past ten years and the priorities of our Conservative predecessors caused the circumstances of many women to decline, often forcing them to live in poverty and dependency.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Order, please.

I would like to know whether the minister is taking part in the period for questions and comments after the speech by the hon. member for Québec.

*[English]*

Is the hon. minister speaking on debate?

**Mrs. Finestone:** On debate.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** I am wondering if I could oblige. Following the intervention by the hon. member for Québec, there was a 10-minute period of questions and comments.

*[Translation]*

**Mrs. Tremblay:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Order, please. Today, pursuant to Standing Order 81(22), all members have a 20-min-

ute maximum and speeches are subject to a 10-minute period of questions and comments.

A point of order was raised by the hon. member for Rimouski—Témiscouata.

**Mrs. Tremblay:** Mr. Speaker, we were advised that since the hon. member for Québec was the mover of the motion, there would be no limit on her speaking time and no period for questions and comments. Subsequently, the secretary of state would be able to speak to the motion as well, and then other members would have a 20-minute maximum, and so forth. That is what we were told, if I am not mistaken.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** With respect, I was simply following the Standing Orders. If the House agrees to proceed in this way, the Chair will of course interpret this as being the will of the House, and we will proceed accordingly.

Is it agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** I will now recognize the secretary of state, and I apologize for interrupting.

*[English]*

**Mrs. Finestone:** I am sorry, I missed that.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** I wanted to tell you that the Chair was simply applying the applicable standing order. If it is the wish of the House to continue as has been suggested by the secretary of state and hon. members opposite, certainly the Chair will adhere to that. On debate, the hon. secretary of state.

**Mrs. Finestone:** Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this very important day and the excellent choice of the opposition day subject matter encourages us to allow as many people as possible to speak in the House. Presumably that is why we went ahead with what would seem to be a contradictory situation. I thank you for your openness in accepting the decision of the House.

*[Translation]*

I think the time has come to renew our commitment to women's economic self-sufficiency and become even more dedicated to achieving economic equality and equity in the labour market.

(1055)

It is a fact that women's equality, and equity and justice for all can only be achieved through economic independence. We are also aware that economic equality is both the basis and the measure of the status of women in our society.

Women must have a place in the job world, receive equal pay for work of equal value and contribute their fair share to our collective wealth.

[English]

I feel privileged to be part of a government which is determined to accelerate the advancement of economic opportunities for women. I am honoured to serve under a Prime Minister who is committed to that goal.

The Liberal philosophy has always been based on fairness, equity and social justice. The Liberal tradition is rich in accomplishments and success toward women's equality.

The last Liberal government brought us the Canadian Human Rights Act, the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms and initiated the Royal Commission on Equality in Employment in 1983. The same government appointed the first woman to the Supreme Court of Canada, the first woman Speaker of the House and the first woman Governor General of Canada.

Now in a little more than 100 days our Prime Minister has appointed the first woman Deputy Prime Minister, the first woman Government Leader in the Senate and the first woman Clerk of the Privy Council.

For the first time we have had a government sensitive to the different impact of programs and policies on women. It is a government willing to ensure that gender perspective is taken into consideration in all the proposed changes whether they are fiscal, social or juridical in nature.

[Translation]

We are aware that women make a tremendous contribution to our society and our economy. The economic disparities that affect women however, are related to a number of factors.

First of all, women do much work that is not remunerated. Whether they do volunteer work in the community or take care of elderly parents, all women spend a significant part of their lives helping others without payment, out of love and dedication.

Second, women today still shoulder more than their share of the responsibility for their families and their homes. I am often amazed to see how young men, and especially young fathers, share parental and household tasks. According to the statistics, however, women still do most of the work.

The third disparity hinges on the kind of jobs where women tend to be concentrated, the so-called pink ghettos. In employment sectors like office work, sales or services, 80 per cent or more of the employees are women. Generally speaking, these jobs do not pay as well as jobs in sectors where men are more numerous.

Finally, women face attitude problems. When they mention cases of clearly discriminatory behaviour, the answer is often: "I do not see what the problem is". I am afraid people will have to learn to see, and this is particularly true in cases of sexual

*Supply*

harassment and sometimes even in cases of violence against women.

[English]

I hope that every member in the House realizes how important it is for our country that women achieve economic equality. It is a matter of fairness and justice but it is also a true economic issue for all Canadians. In times of economic restructuring and increased international competitiveness, we have to make use of the full potential of all our citizens.

I wish my hon. colleague had included in her motion the other designated categories of Canadians who are also struggling on the road toward equality, both socially and economically. I am referring to visible minorities, aboriginal peoples and persons with disabilities. Those are areas where I must be an advocate at all times and members will agree being an advocate for those people is very important. In each one of these groups there are women who must face double and sometimes triple factors of discrimination. Women politicians have a particular responsibility and a special opportunity to break down these barriers.

(1100)

We can reach out to other women. We can help level the political playing field for them. We can call for action and get action. It may not always be as fast as we would wish. We can do this in partnership with men and we can do this from both our riding perspective as well as the perspective of our province and our country. That is our job. The total country is ours.

[Translation]

That brings me to the second part of the motion presented by my friend from Quebec, who is asking the government to implement measures, in areas of federal jurisdiction, to guarantee women equity in employment, wages and living conditions.

First, I would like to remind my colleague that, in our famous red book, we made three definite commitments in that respect.

To start with, for the Employment Equity Act to be really effective, it must apply to the largest number possible so as to broaden its impact. I believe that members will agree with me on that. Now, for my second point.

[English]

We will through our human rights legislation enlarge the legislative authority to initiate investigations of employment equity issues.

Third, federal contractors should be subject to mandatory compliance with the principles of the Employment Equity Act.

I remember when that act came into the House. It had some very big holes in it. I hope, as we put in a mandatory review period which is coming up shortly, that we will have filled those

*Supply*

holes with legislation before we even get to the review stage because they were very obvious by their absence.

We believe that the federal contractors program presents a good opportunity to demonstrate our commitment to the principle of employment equity. The message is loud and clear. If one wants to do business with the federal government, one must implement employment equity in the workplace. That means fair jobs based on merit and those based on merit will get a first choice and open access to that job application.

As I have mentioned before in the House, this rule applies to our infrastructure program as well. Our representatives at the selection committee have all been instructed to look into the employment equity aspect of every project and to take this into account in their final recommendations.

I believe that this plan toward a more equitable working environment for women answers my colleague's motion for the most part. She knows, like every Canadian knows by now, that if it is in the red book it will happen because we are now quickly turning our promises into action.

*[Translation]*

I believe that the plan I just outlined directly answers the request made by my colleague from Quebec in her motion.

However, I would like to add a couple of points. First of all, I firmly believe that legislation, agreements, regulations and policy statements are useful, if not essential, to bring us closer to economic equality and social justice.

Nonetheless, I am convinced that without a reasonable consensus among citizens and without the active participation of all Canadians, we will progress at a snail's pace. However, if we all strive towards the same end, in a joint effort, we will progress by leaps and bounds.

Therefore, I would suggest to Canadians that they put this International Women's Day to good use by drawing up a list of initiatives we could take to improve the status of women in our country.

*[English]*

Government cannot do it all. It takes everyone to participate, men and women in all sectors of our society.

*[Translation]*

After seeing, these last few days, business and union leaders jointly and severally approve a recommendation package aimed at improving women's working and living conditions, I cannot help thinking that there is light at the end of the tunnel. It is only a matter of time.

*[English]*

My second thought deals with a degree of opportunities. I am dedicated to pay equity and enhancing working conditions for women, but first women have to be able to find a job. This is where this government is being the most helpful to women. By making job creation and growth its top priority, the government is providing women with the basic essential opportunity to reach out for economic independence and equality.

I have to point to the small and medium sized business undertakings in which we are going to ensure access to capital, where over 30 per cent of those businesses belong to women, where they are twice as successful as men and where 85 per cent of all new jobs are created in the country. This will indicate to everyone that we have a strong commitment to women.

(1105)

We on this side of the House believe that a strong economy is the key to women's economic independence and we believe that a strong economy is based upon the full and fair participation of all our citizens. It is true that the greatest resource we have in the country is grey matter, intellectual property, and 50 per cent of it rests in the heads of women.

This government knows that for Canada to prosper it must take full benefit of all the talents of all of our citizens and ensure that all Canadians are treated with fairness and equity. This is precisely what we intend to do.

On February 7, 1994 the leader of the government in the House set forth the principle that the decision of this government as to how to vote on any motion would be determined on the basis of the merits of the motion. In accordance with that principle, in accordance with openness and right of obligations and actions in this House, and in keeping with the spirit of parliamentary reform, I am happy to inform the House that it is the intention of the government to support the motion now before us.

**Mrs. Daphne Jennings (Mission—Coquitlam):** Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the whip of the Reform Party, I would like to advise the House that pursuant to Standing Order 43(2) our speakers on the motion will be dividing their time.

In speaking on today's opposition day motion which addresses the economic equality between men and women, I am drawn back to my 30 years in the classroom where I hope I successfully taught our young people that they did not deserve special treatment because they were women or that the young men did not deserve special treatment because they were men. I hope I set high standards in my classroom. The only qualifications for achievement were hard work, the ability to respect all fellow students and the ability to accept responsibility.

*Supply*

By now it is obvious that while I hold women in high regard, I also hold men in high regard. Part of this respect comes from my father, a military man of four wars: the Irish rebellion, the first world war, the Palestine uprising and the second world war.

I do not remember him telling any of his nine children, six of them girls, that there were any restrictions on what they could do with their lives. I only remember one strong message given to each of his children: a man or a woman is worthy of their hire. Do not be asking how much pay you are going to get. Work hard, your employer will like your responsible attitude. If you treat others as you wish to be treated, this usually holds true.

My mother never went out to work, enjoyed her home, raising her children, president of the PTA, and encouraged all her children to work hard. Although she never learned to drive, she encouraged her children to, and her daughters to carry their own weight in society. I remember while she was on the PTA our school board served hot lunches every day to each student through the help of volunteer parents and the community. The government did not pay for these hot lunches.

Why am I saying all this? There are a lot of members in this House who, like me, are over 50 and who can attest to these strong teachings given to us by our parents of all cultures and all nationalities. These parents if still alive are grandparents and some great-grandparents. Many of us here today are grandparents. 1994 is the year of the family and I can think of no better way to celebrate International Women's Day than to pay tribute to grandparents around the world.

In many cultures our senior citizens are treated with much more respect than here in Canada. They are given a position of honour and respect in the family. If we look at various cultures around the world we see the importance of grandparents in raising children. With the British Columbia Indians, for example, traditionally the grandparents raise the young people. Also in the Chinese culture and many other cultures around the world.

Throughout the history of mankind societies throughout Asia, Europe and North America, all of them, had concerns for the children. Throughout all these societies, whether a modern society or aboriginal people, there was always a place in the old days where the elders were respected. The elders helped train the children. They passed on tradition, culture and heritage. It went way beyond that. It went to the point of giving the feeling of security, the feeling of love and warmth.

(1110)

In today's world of broken marriages and single parents we need the support and the stability of our grandparents more than ever before.

In this year of the family there are no special interest groups. Rather we must look at the whole family from the youngest to

the oldest. It is very significant that grandparents seem to have a real natural regard and concern for grandchildren.

Not so long ago this subject was debated in the Alberta legislature. Mrs. Hughes quoted a study by Jim Gladstone at the University of Guelph. He conducted a study in 1986 that reinforced the importance of grandparents to grandchildren. The report concluded that when marriages break down grandmothers have more contact with their grandchildren than perhaps ever before. Gladstone believes that this means that grandparents have an innate tendency to respond to the needs and the emotional upheaval of their grandchildren and their children.

Previous research on children of divorces suggested that young children have very little opportunity to talk about the breakup.

Gladstone goes on to say that through the child's unique relationship with the grandparents they can obtain the kind of counselling, comfort, reassurance that they need providing they have access, continuous access.

Therefore there is a necessity for creative legislation that protects access for both grandparents. We can see that grandparents have a great deal to contribute to the life of these children of broken marriages.

I understand that article 611 of Quebec Civil Code states:

In no case may the father or mother without serious cause place obstacles to personal relationship between the child and grandparents.

This is in Quebec civil law. It is the only province thus far that has enshrined it in law.

We also need to look at precedents in legislation. For example 50 states in the United States have similar types of legislation. Last week I had the honour of meeting with Nancy Wooldridge, president of Canadian Grandparents Rights Association, British Columbia Branch, formed in 1986. Nancy Wooldridge successfully defended her rights as a grandparent in the courts in 1984.

The purpose of the association is to promote, support, and assist grandparents and their families in maintaining or re-establishing family ties and family stability where the family has been disrupted, especially those ties between grandparents and grandchildren.

We could give many practical examples of how grandparents have been obstructed through the court system from contacting children when they could have had a very positive effect on them. The Grandparents Rights Association has many documented cases.

Again because of time we are not going to go into them today. In many cases it is a personal tragedy for the grandparents but more important for the grandchildren who are deprived of this most important asset.

*Supply*

Therefore it is important that we have legal protection for our grandchildren. We can recognize that all grandparents are not beneficial to grandchildren but there are times when they should have direct access. However this can still be established by the courts. We do not suggest we change this.

This would be a very positive step toward protection and development of the child. It is something that lawmakers in Canada could contribute to. I am asking the government in any consideration of future legislation to consider including the rights of grandparents in a fair and legitimate manner.

I would be remiss if I did not recognize the past efforts of other parliamentarians who have brought to the House the concerns of grandparents. The hon. member for Ottawa West, one of our Liberal members, presented petitions and Stan Wilbee of the last Parliament presented Bill C-332 to amend the Divorce Act to protect the rights of grandparents as well as grandchildren. Now is the time for all members of the House to recognize the rights of the complete family in this 1994 year of the family.

Tomorrow I will be presenting a petition containing over 3,000 names in continuing support for the complete family and in support of our grandparents. At this hour I am awaiting news from British Columbia that my seventh grandchild has been born.

I would like at this time to move:

That the motion be amended by adding immediately after the word "conditions" the following:

"through measures that support equality of opportunity without resorting to gender discrimination of any kind"

(1115)

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** I wonder if I could ask the assistance of the member for Mission—Coquitlam to be assured that I understood clearly the terms made by the secretary of state regarding the agreement between parties on the intervention by the member for Mission—Coquitlam. I believe the member for Beaver River will have five minutes of questions and comments. Is that in the next round?

**Mrs. Jennings:** That is correct, Mr. Speaker, five minutes questions.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** The amendment has been deemed receivable.

**Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River):** Mr. Speaker, I know we are not allowed to talk about who is not in the Chamber, but let me flip that around and say that on this day of women's issues I will make mention perhaps of who is in the Chamber. Before I started I counted 16 men and five women. I am proud to say that three of the women are Reformers here in this caucus. When we talk about women being important, we think we are. We would encourage all to be here and listen to this.

I grew up in a single parent family in the greater Vancouver area. I would like to pay particular mention and tribute to my mother who raised, probably by the scruff of the neck, four daughters and one son. I pay tribute to her today because things were difficult back in the sixties doing that. It was the anomaly back then to be a single parent family. It almost seems like today we are strange if we grow up in a two parent home.

In honour of my mother, Joyce Levy, I thank her for the job she did of raising four girls and one boy in greater Vancouver in the sixties when times were tough. It was difficult.

I believe that any success our family would experience was because my mother said: "You are special regardless". She had four girls and one boy, but we were all treated equally. The success that any of us has experienced in our lives today is because she said: "If you think that you can do something, I believe you are competent, I believe you are able, go for it". It was not: "You are a girl, so we think you should have special status".

I am grateful for that. I am sure that all of us here who were treated that way in a family when we were growing up are grateful. We are not here in the Chamber today because we are women necessarily.

I can think of nothing sadder than my campaigning in Beaver River, going door knocking and saying: "Hello, my name is Deborah Grey. I am your candidate for the Reform Party. Please vote for me because I am a woman". Nothing would be sadder for any of us in this Chamber, whether male or female, than to be able to appeal to the pity of someone to vote for us on those grounds.

The secretary of state mentioned in her remarks that she was elected by the women of Canada. We as women in this House were not elected by the women in our ridings. I do not think there would be enough to carry the vote, frankly. I live in rural Alberta and I know that as many women as men voted for me.

I was not elected to the Chamber by women to talk only about women's issues. I am here to talk about the economy, fiscal restraint, farming, the oil industry and everything else that we think is important in the constituency of Beaver River and all across Canada.

Let us not continue to make these ridiculous delineations between women's issues and men's issues. I suspect that some guidelines and some division lines have been drawn.

(1120)

Let me refer a little more closely to what the Reform Party feels about the traditional lines of women's issues. We believe that our party's position is quite different from the traditional parties' positions in that we do not maintain a separate organization for women members. In the Reform Party women are dedicated to the same goals as men. These goals are fiscal, political and constitutional reform. I do not think there are any

lines to be drawn between women and men when we look at the things that are happening across the country.

Reformers prefer to work together on these issues, searching for realistic solutions which are practical and acceptable within the framework of a democratic, individualistic society.

Our party does not regard any political questions as being purely women's issues. Child care is not gender exclusive. It is a social, family and financial issue. Job and pay equity are not gender, age or ethnic exclusive. They are employment issues and should be dealt with as such.

If we see ourselves going down the road to talk about affirmative action, pay equity, special status for some, we can see where that road would lead us. Let us back up to the fork in the road and say these are issues we need to deal with in terms of absolute equality for all Canadians. It is a slippery slope that we go down if we say child care, job and pay equity are specifically women's issues.

What about sexual and domestic violence? They are not gender, age or ethnic exclusive. They are purely criminal and law enforcement issues and we should deal with them as such, not just breaking them off as women's issues. Then we see that it becomes a special interest group and dear knows we have enough of those in the country. I am not part of a special interest group. Let me make that very clear in *Hansard* forevermore.

The Reform Party believes that the issues of child care, job and pay equity and family violence are of equal concern to the majority of both men and women in society and we should start treating them as such. The other federal parties prefer to separate many important issues into specifically women's issues. This approach has led to the segregation of women into a special interest group.

I am not a special interest group. Let me say it again because I feel that strongly about it. I am a woman and I am proud to be a woman. First and foremost I am a Canadian and I would like people to think in this Chamber as well as in Beaver River and right across the country that perhaps I am here because of some capabilities and some abilities and specific skills, not just because of my gender. This place will sink when that happens.

I resent being told that because of my sex I am entitled to special considerations. For what? It is demeaning. It is an insult to my intelligence and a presumption that I am unable to compete on my own abilities.

I would like to expand on my statement on child care. We recognize that since only women bear children they often make choices about their lives that are different than those of men. For women who wish to devote their energy to child raising, a public policy framework sympathetic to families is necessary. My

### Supply

colleague talked about this being the international year of the family.

Let us look at the family. The family is the basic unit of our society, far more natural than it is to just hunker down with the women and say that we will look at those issues specifically. This should include generous maternity leave and re-entry provisions to make it possible for women to combine a career and family.

Our party supports child care programs that are based on financial need, not the method of child care chosen; programs that subsidize children and parents, not institutions and professionals. Therefore when we are always labelled as being anti-day care that is not the truth. We are in favour of child care but let us target it to the people who need it most and to people, not institutions and the professionals.

While some parents believe that day care is a viable option others prefer to care for their children within their home. The Reform Party advocates policies which permits parents to decide how best to care for their own children. We believe they should have that right.

For those unfortunate cases in which families break down, and I realize that they break down and I alluded earlier to the fact that I come from a single parent home, the federal government should assist provinces in developing reciprocal arrangements for enforcing realistic support payments from non-custodial parents.

Initiatives in this direction would be in line with the Reform philosophy of individual responsibility and would help reduce the dependence of single mothers on family assistance.

I turn to the issue of women in the workforce as we are in the Chamber, which for economic reasons includes a large majority of Canadian women. The Reform Party advocates a free and open labour market in which people are judged on their personal achievements.

(1125)

Promotion on the basis of merits, not quotas, should govern the advancement of both men and women. This quest for statistical parity between men and women damages the very fabric of our society by compromising the merit principle.

Let me say again that any woman who sits in the Chamber, at the table, in the chair or in a seat as a member of Parliament should be here on merit and not because of some hiring false quota that says we will have so many women sitting in the Chamber, at the table, in *Hansard*, in the translation booth or whatever. We advocate enlightened personnel policies to end condescension and harassment toward women and to develop mutual respect in the workplace.

The Reform Party consistently supports the philosophy of treating people according to their individual merits and

*Supply*

achievements. Our goal is to maximize individual freedom for all Canadians within the restraints of responsible citizenship.

I will say a few words with respect to sexual and domestic violence in closing. The Reform Party believes these issues should be dealt with by a legal system based on common law principles in which sentencing is a more adequate penalty and deterrent. We have spoken at length in the Chamber about what inadequacies there are in the laws and regulations in our country. We need to tighten those up so that there are really serious deterrents for people who are tempted to go after spouses and batter them or whatever.

We are looking forward to the day when all Canadians are treated equally and able to strive for their fullest potential regardless of race, language, culture or gender. Let us move ahead. Let us not get hung up with terminology. Let us move ahead to find real solutions to these issues that affect all of us, men and women alike.

**Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough):** Mr. Speaker, I have heard a good deal with which I can agree but I became a little confused by the amendment. I listened to it as carefully as I could. Perhaps I did not get the full sense of it but any action we might take with respect to the motion on the Order Paper today might not involve gender bias. That is how I understood it.

The member was speaking of directing our efforts toward the people who need our help most. It seems to me that when we talk about child care, apart from the children, the people who need help most are women. When we talk about single parents we know the vast majority of single parents are women. Therefore they are the ones who need support.

We think of some of the areas that the members opposite mentioned in which women are moving and making progress but in which they are still behind. An example would be in science and technology, in colleges and universities and in the workforce.

It seems to me that at the moment, although goodness knows we do need improvements in science and technology and education of all sorts, the people most in need are female students. They have moved in other areas such as the arts and the humanities but they have moved least in science and technology.

Similarly, if we look at the professional schools of all sorts, we would discover that women are still in the minority. I realize that there are other groups that need our support but women are the people who need our assistance most.

In the general area of income, we can obviously break out all sorts of groups that are in the below average income category. However here is this mammoth group which is the majority in the country, females, and the statistics all show that it is significantly behind the other large group which is males as far as income is concerned.

In my constituency, over two-thirds of women with children of school age work at the present time. They represent a low income group in my riding. I wonder if the member or the members opposite would care to comment on this point. How do we proceed on these matters without identifying women as people who are at the present time in need of support so they can move forward in these areas?

(1130)

**Miss Grey:** Mr. Speaker, in the time remaining I want to thank the member for his question but mostly for his comments.

In terms of our amendment we need to come up with what we think is a sensible definition and in fact the interpretation of employment equity.

Where I live in rural Alberta it is very difficult to find the exact slots for people who are qualified, who have merit and who have some personal achievement in some of these areas. The minister referred earlier to the fact that in this whole infrastructure program we need to make sure every category is filled by employment equity. That is very difficult to do in many parts of rural Canada. Therefore let us determine what our interpretation is.

I disagree with the fact that we should have artificially imposed quotas on employment equity right across the country. The hon. member made reference in his comments to the sciences. Let us make sure we realize that women are very capable in the sciences.

Maybe we should have educational programs and teaching faculties to say that women are very qualified to be engineers and scientists. Let us make sure that is permeated through society. I do not know the problem would be solved by saying that we demand  $x$  number of women in those faculties. We in the Chamber need to make sure our legislation and regulations are sensitive to that, but I do not know that imposing artificial quotas will go the distance in terms of finding real answers to it.

The member also commented on the fact that women are in lower paying jobs generally. We have seen all the studies. We have looked at both sides of the issues. Let me just sum this up by saying the following. I am a high school teacher by trade. I believe many women, myself included, choose to go into careers that are more humanities oriented. Perhaps it is because of our individual and special gifts we as women bring to a situation, the idea of consensus building rather than confrontation.

Many of those are low paying jobs. Therefore we need to realize that we do not just look at the numbers on these charts but we look at some of the reasons behind it. Women as child bearers obviously take a particular time out of the workforce. Maybe they are not anxious to get into careers that have to come before family, children and husbands. We need to pay particular attention to that.

*Supply*

Maybe that is one reason there are not as many women in the House as some people would demand. It is very difficult to be away from home. I know it is hard for every member but I find it particularly difficult to get on the plane every week and come here to Ottawa. I do not know if that is because I am a woman or because I am a homebody or because I am a newlywed. Who knows. I am finding it more and more difficult every week. However we need to be careful about the reasons there are not as many women in the Chamber rather than say we are going to fix the problem from on high.

The problem needs to be solved with each of us in our home communities. We need to encourage women to choose careers in the sciences or perhaps politics, not because they are women but because they are capable and have real abilities in those areas.

**Mrs. Daphne Jennings (Mission—Coquitlam):** Mr. Speaker, I know it is unusual for me to answer after I have spoken and someone else has spoken on debate after me, but I understand the hon. member wanted to hear from both members.

Last year I listened to a woman with a career very high in the workplace speak on women's issues and their importance in the workforce. The item I picked up more than anything else is that those figures are grossly distorted. The reason is that women work part time in most cases. For many of them it is because they have to and for others it is because they choose to stay in the home and their only opportunity is to work part time. This pulls us way down when looking at those statistics. They are way out of whack and we have to look at them all carefully.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Before resuming debate, I am going back to the earlier intervention by the member for Mission—Coquitlam. I was touched when she shared with us that at some time during the course of this day she might once again be a grandmother. If I recall correctly it will be the seventh time. I join members on both sides of the House in saying congratulations and best wishes to mom and dad. We wish your new granddaughter or grandson a long, happy and healthy life.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gilbert Fillion (Chicoutimi):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to mention the presence in the gallery of my wife Louise and two of my daughters, Marie-Hélène and Marie-Christine. I should also add that my other daughter, Isabelle, a student at McGill University, and my son Jean-François join me in stressing the importance of this day for all Canadian women.

(1135)

On this day, March 8, I would like to talk about an issue of extreme importance to women and which we have to address if we are to give a true meaning to the word equality. I am referring to violence against women.

The very existence of this violence shows clearly that there is a power relationship underlying a serious imbalance and the absence of effective equality. Violence against women is an integral part of our social structure.

The tragic massacre at the École Polytechnique on December 6, 1989 brought back to the fore a brutal and far reaching reality and we are still torn apart by the whole thing.

This situation required action. In August 1991, the federal government set up a Canadian committee on violence against women. This committee was co-chaired by Mrs. Marthe Vaillancourt, a respected person in the field and also the director of the Centre d'aide aux victimes d'actes criminels in Chicoutimi, and by Mrs. Pat Freeman Marshall.

The committee did a lot. Hearings were held all over Canada. A final report was submitted in July 1993. From these hearings in 139 communities across Canada, as well as submissions and research documents, we gained a better picture of the situation of women. The committee proposed 494 recommendations in a 500-page document.

A framework had to be established and the committee defined violence against women as all forms of violence committed by men, as opposed to marital and family violence.

Violence takes different forms. It can be psychological, sexual, physical, financial and spiritual. Some aspects are unfortunately more familiar than others. There is no hierarchy in that list of various forms of violence; all forms of violence against women are to be banned, whether they are threats, rape, incest, unrequested sexual fondling, blows, withholding of money, contemptuous attitude towards one's personal beliefs, etc. Our tolerance of violence against women generates costs, human, financial and social costs.

Let me quote the final report of the committee: "A Quebec study compared the health of a sample group of women and children who had left a violent environment with women and children of a comparable group who had not experienced violence. It concluded that: The health of these women and their children was distinctly different from that of the general population, and they were affected first of all by problems of mental health".

We can see also that there are no case detection measures and that diagnostics are often false. Financial costs impact on health care and work-related costs and also on the judicial system. Let me quote the report again: "The costs of one sexual offence,



*Supply*

where the offender serves three years in prison, can be very conservatively estimated at more than \$200,000". The Final Report of the Canadian Panel on Violence Against Women first describes the problem and its various aspects and, in a second part, presents a national action plan.

(1140)

That national action plan comprises an action plan for equality and a zero tolerance policy. The action plan for equality makes recommendations on two main aspects of the issue: on the one hand, improve the economic status of women which is directly related to violence against women and, on the other, acknowledge and treat women as independent persons. Emphasis is to be put on eight specific areas: right to equality, equal access to the legal system, equal participation in politics and the civil service, improvements to process aimed at promoting equality for women, economy, family, taxation and transfer payments.

Finally, the zero tolerance policy involves a responsibility structure for the implementation phases and an application model. This policy is based on the premise that no form of violence is acceptable and that sufficient resources must be allocated to eliminate violence against women.

In my riding, according to the 1992-93 statistics released by the Centre d'aide aux victimes d'actes criminels of Chicoutimi, spousal abuse and sexual assaults make up close to half of all complaints made pursuant to the Criminal Code. Note that 82.3 per cent of crimes are made against women.

At the national level, a comprehensive survey of 12,300 Canadian women conducted by Statistics Canada and made public in November 1993 provided eloquent information about violence against women. In Canada, more than one out of two women suffered physical or sexual abuse at least once during her adult life. In a great majority of cases, the assailant was known to the victim. The definition of an act of violence which was used refers to actions considered offences under the Criminal Code of Canada.

According to Statistics Canada, physical assaults vary from threats of imminent bodily injury to assaults causing serious bodily harm, while sexual assaults vary from sexual interference to violent sexual assaults causing serious injury to the victim.

This survey also shows that one in four Canadian women reported being abused by her current spouse or a previous one. The most recent national survey conducted in 1980, which was highly criticized for being speculative, indicated that one in ten women had been physically abused by her spouse.

Most of the 10 per cent of women who declared being victims of violence in the 12-month period preceding the survey were young women, between the age of 18 and 24.

The survey also shows that men tend to be more violent if they were witnesses to violence against their own mother.

(1145)

Alcohol plays a major role since, as the study indicated, the assailant is intoxicated in more than 40 per cent of violence cases. One in five acts of violence mentioned in the study was severe enough to cause injuries, a quarter of which demanded medical attention. It is also noted that nine out of ten assaults not only caused physical injuries to the victim but left emotional scars as well.

Fear is on the mind of a good number of women whose spouse is violent. It is made worst by the prospect of finding themselves in a potentially violent situation. Thus, 83 per cent of women reported being afraid to enter alone an underground parking lot. Seventy-six per cent are afraid to use public transportation at night. Sixty per cent do not feel safe walking alone in their neighbourhood at night. Only 14 per cent of violent acts and no more than 6 per cent of sexual assaults were reported to police. In only a third of the reported cases, charges were laid against the assailant.

Further to this study, the Secretary of State responsible for the Status of Women stated that her government would launch a national campaign to heighten public awareness and take steps to force the violent spouse to leave the marital home. She promised in the same breath to better finance organizations for battered women and their children. As we say, desperate times call for desperate measures. One does not put a poultice on a gaping wound. These figures are very revealing and we deplore the fact that such a sad situation can exist in a country like Canada.

The budget allocated to the Canadian Panel on Violence Against Women was \$10 million. A great deal of money and energy has been invested in this initiative, and the situation as it is depicted requires a follow-up on this report. Furthermore, the survey conducted by Statistics Canada, at a cost of \$1.9 million, shows the extent of the problem.

Violence against women can now be measured. It is a serious problem that we must address despite its complexity. Community groups have shown us the way. At the moment, there are 360 shelters for battered women across Canada, and waiting lists to get in these shelters are often very long. The services provided are sensitive to budget cuts. Eighty per cent of these shelters were opened after 1980 and 95 per cent of them have less than 20 beds.

In the vast majority of cases, the services provided are short-term, as 70 per cent of the women remain in these shelters less than 20 days on average.

*Supply*

(1150)

Beyond emergency services, we must offer more to women. We need to adopt a more reactive approach. The status of women in our society is directly related to their economic situation, among other things. Equality is also a matter of money. Let us take, as an example, pay equity and access to housing.

Women deserve the same treatment as men, and the violence that they have to suffer in our society clearly indicates that we have a lot of work to do. We must not think that it is a present-day problem. Let us remind ourselves of the suffragettes who fought for the formal recognition of women's political rights.

In 1931 and 1964, successive reforms to the Lower Canada civil code guaranteed full legal capacity to the married woman. In fact, in 1931, the introduction of reserved property allowed a woman to administer the proceeds from her work because it was said that many men would go off and drink their wife's savings. Unfortunately, there are numerous examples and, not too long ago, women had to fight for their rights.

The violence that they experience is a dramatic situation to which we cannot remain indifferent. It is very tempting to be legalistic, but we must go beyond that. To a systemic problem we must bring systemic solutions.

In the 1994-95 Estimates, Status of Women Canada plans to launch the following project: Co-ordination of the preparation of the federal program concerning the equality and security of women in co-operation with federal departments and other partners. This will incorporate the government response to the report of the Canadian Panel on Violence Against Women.

Status of Women Canada was given the mandate to produce the government response to the panel. That response will be submitted in the form of a federal program concerning gender equality and women security.

Finally, the co-ordination of a national public information campaign geared towards prevention will be pursued in order to eliminate the circumstances that promote violence against women. In view of the magnitude of the problem, the proposed action only allow the government to make an act of faith.

We are no longer trying to prove that there is violence against women; people are convinced that it exists. The consultation exercise has taken place, the problems have been identified and solutions have been suggested. What is the government waiting for to implement the national action plan that was tabled here in this House?

**Mr. Bill Graham (Rosedale):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the hon. member for Chicoutimi for his speech.

Surely I can say that all members here agree entirely with his comments on violence against women and the measures we should take to prevent such violence.

What I would like to tell the hon. member is this: I believe he is right when he addresses the issue from a national perspective. He referred to Canadian activities to lessen the problem. He did not separate the women from his riding or his province from the other Canadian women. What I would suggest to him is that the women of his province or Canada should not be separated from the world they live in. I come from a riding where there is a high proportion of immigrants, and we know that the problem is international as well as national or provincial.

(1155)

Therefore, my question to the hon. member is this: Given the complexity of the problem and the fact that it is a national and an international as well as a provincial issue, does he not agree that the initiatives required to correct the situation and better protect the women of Quebec and Canada should not be measures co-ordinated at the provincial, national or international level, but federal measures taken right here, together, because it is our responsibility?

**Mr. Fillion:** Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague for his question and comment. I must stress that in my presentation on the status of women, I have not taken a provincial political point of view because some would have said that the Bloc Quebecois wanted to use the issue to its advantage, that it wanted to score some political points.

When I speak about the status of women, in my mind I know that problem concerns the riding of Chicoutimi, the ridings of my friends from the other side, all my colleagues' ridings, the province of Quebec, all the provinces in Canada and Canada as a whole. Given the amounts spent on the preparation of that report dealing with many subjects, which was requested by the Canadian government and cost \$10 million, at a certain point we should use that document as a basis for discussion and as a basis for dealing equally everywhere with violence against women.

Now how should we go about addressing the issue for all of Canada? What kind of committee could we create to make sure we are more alert? I leave it to those who will speak on the issue today to make some suggestions. I think that such a process is an important one; it is important to find solutions to the problems women are faced with.

**Mrs. Pierrette Ringuette-Maltais (Madawaska—Victoria):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few moments, not to ask questions, but rather to make a few comments following the remarks I just listened to.

I would point out that the fact that these gentlemen rise and talk about violence against women is proof that it is a societal

*Supply*

issue and not a women's issue. In the eyes of any self-respecting man or woman, this issue concerns us all and not only feminists.

I would also like to say how pleased I am to see the Bloc member going beyond party lines when talking about abused women. I do hope that in future debates on common issues, we will be able to count on their support.

I would like to conclude by telling Canadian men that the respect they feel for themselves automatically translates into respect for us, women.

**Mr. Fillion:** I thank the member for her remarks. You can be sure, Mr. Speaker, that what I said is not a one-day thing. I made my career in teaching. I spent 34 years of my life with teenagers. Through the years, I met a great number of parents who would come and confide in me regarding the many different kinds of problems their teenage daughters were experiencing and I always listened very carefully to them. My job as a teacher taught me that, beyond political partisanship, everybody must join the fight against violence.

(1200)

In any case, I am grateful for a job which allowed me to celebrate every day, 365 days a year, for 34 years, this event we mark once a year, on March 8, Women's Day. Thus, I directly carry this over into my family life, with my three daughters, my wife and my son. As you can see, I am in very good company.

**Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough):** Mr. Speaker, I have a very short question to ask. I also want to congratulate the member for Chicoutimi on his speech. I am very interested in what he had to say, since I too have a daughter, who studied at McGill University.

My question is about comments made by Reform Party members. Does my colleague believe that the issue of violence against women only implies a need for more or less organized action, or that it is rather a matter of legislation and policies giving the preference to women?

**Mr. Fillion:** Mr. Speaker, if I understood the question correctly, I must say it is not a question of giving preference to women in legislation, but simply of wishing to ensure their equality with men in every sector of society. Then, whether we are looking at wages, social housing or equity in employment, the main thrust will be that our legislation must reflect the equality of men and women once and for all. At some point, men and women should be considered simply as human beings.

I want to mention in passing that I have relied heavily on data prepared by Statistics Canada since some had criticized the figures contained in the report on the status of women. These figures were later adjusted, to a certain degree, to reflect today's reality and the data available from Statistics Canada.

[English]

**Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure):** Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity this motion gives me to salute International Women's Day. It is important for the House to mark this day and to recognize the significant progress that has been made in Canada over the years toward greater equality of women and men.

[Translation]

So, I am very grateful to have an opportunity to mark International Women's Day.

[English]

I can assure hon. members of my government's commitment to continued progress in the field of equality. That commitment is clear from our red book "Creating Opportunity". Whether we talk of women and health, or of streets that are safe for women, or of day care, the underlying principle is one of equality between women and men.

Basic to all progress is the prosperity of Canada, and pleased is the minister responsible for infrastructure to be implementing, in co-operation with other levels of government, a program that will put many Canadians to work. Directly and indirectly this program will contribute in the short term and through long lasting benefits, to the economic growth which will ensure the greater equality of men and women.

(1205)

I want to talk today most especially about employment equity within the federal public service and particularly about employment equity and women.

[Translation]

In this context, I would like to pay tribute to a particular woman, namely my parliamentary secretary.

[English]

Members of the House will be aware Treasury Board has legislated responsibility for employment equity within the public service because of the persistence of my parliamentary secretary, the hon. member for Ottawa West. She was in very large measure responsible for ensuring that the Public Service Reform Act passed in December 1992 contained an amendment providing specifically for employment equity.

This amendment is important in its own right because it will advance employment equity throughout the public service. It has however a further importance. The Government of Canada has an obligation to serve, I would suggest, as an example in such matters of great significance. The amendment conveys a message to all Canadians, women and men, that equity in employment is crucial to the full economic and social development of Canada.

*Supply*

The law sets out four designated groups that have encountered employment barriers. These are women, aboriginal peoples, persons with disabilities and visible minorities. Women are a designated group in their own right, but they are about half of those other three groups as well.

If we discuss employment equity for aboriginal peoples we include aboriginal women. Progress for women as a whole must also be progress for any group that is disadvantaged.

The point of employment equity in the public service is to increase the representation of members of designated groups in those jobs in which they are currently represented to a lesser extent than their participation in the Canadian labour force.

It was a Liberal government that introduced one of the first programs designed to achieve this goal within the public service. The special measures program, as it is called, put in place in 1983–84 has contributed in a major way to increasing the number of women, and of men and women of the three other designated groups within the public service. The special measures program has continued over the years as a motor of the employment equity program.

Last December I had the honour to preside over a meeting of Treasury Board that approved the continuation of this program over the course of the next four fiscal years. In total almost \$70 million will be allocated to the new special measures initiative program as it is now called.

[*Translation*]

I strongly believe that the renewed program will help to ensure employment equity within the public service.

[*English*]

Two particular programs have been of importance to women. First, the women's career counselling and referral bureau of the Public Service Commission counsels women who have the potential to rise into the executive ranks. It evaluates their management skills and refers women to appropriate competitions. The bureau cannot of course claim credit for all the progress that has been made, but there has been a real and notable increase of women in the executive group of the public service.

In 1983 women were 5 per cent of the executive level. By 1988 women's representation had more than doubled to 12.3 per cent. As of March 31, 1993 women were 17.6 per cent of the executive group, including a good number at the second highest level.

In addition there has been a steady increase in the number of women in what is called the feeder groups, that is standing in the wings and waiting to take over from the executives who will be retiring in the coming years. The public service is providing

leadership in this area not just for the government but for the whole country.

The second aspect of the special measures programs designed especially for women is the OPTION program. The purpose of this program is to encourage the recruitment of women for what are called non-traditional occupations. A non-traditional occupation is one where the representation of women is under 30 per cent. Again there has been encouraging progress. In all these areas progress has been made but there is still a lot more work that needs to be done.

(1210)

The progress is not always measured by numbers alone. The program has particular importance because through strategic placements, the way is open for women to become employed in areas that traditionally were almost closed to them. Let me give an example of what can be done in the area of non-traditional occupations.

In 1992 the former Department of Energy, Mines and Resources received an employment equity award for its achievement on the recruitment of women in the science sector. Under its young scientists program that department has increased the number of women scientists by 63 since 1989.

Various departments also have bridging programs for women. Women occupy the vast majority of positions in the administrative support category. However it has not traditionally been an easy matter for a woman to move from the position of a secretary to a junior administrative officer and so on up the ladder. Bridging programs provide women with the training and the skills necessary so they can compete for more responsible positions.

[*Translation*]

It is essential that women be given access to the training which will help them secure the advancement they deserve.

[*English*]

The renewed special measures initiatives program will provide even greater encouragement to employment equity within the public service. Programs that were successful in the past such as the OPTION program are being continued. A new flexibility has been introduced so that individual departments can receive the assistance they require to carry out on their own individually tailored programs to assist women and members of all those other designated groups to achieve better representation within the public service.

Employment equity is all of these things but it is more as well. It is an attitude. It is a recognition that women and men are equal and that each of them can in her or his own way provide high quality service to the Canadian public as a member of the public service. It means that a man can easily take orders from his boss, a woman, that a woman has an absolute right not to be harassed

*Supply*

in any circumstances, that a secretary could be a man and that all women and men are treated with dignity.

We recognize that employment equity must be an integral part of human resource management. It is not something separate to be considered only after essential matters have been taken care of.

Managers are being trained to understand that Canada today is a diverse country. That is its strength and the public service must reflect that diversity if it is to serve the Canadian people intelligently and well.

For women there are other factors as well and legislation and policies are in place to provide for them. For example, pension provisions that discourage part time work and the taking of child rearing leave have been repealed.

Flexible work arrangements are in place in recognition of the fact that it is women who still carry the major burden of household responsibilities. Telework may be of substantial help to women whose situation makes it difficult for them to leave the house for extended periods, for example.

Job sharing may provide for many women an opportunity to participate in the public service that they otherwise would not be able to do, or elsewhere in the economy that is not available to them at this point.

Let me say that these are not concessions that are being made to women or to any other members of any of the designated groups in the employment equity program. Employment equity implies that barriers to the employment of any member of society have been dismantled and all can compete on an equal footing.

(1215)

With employment equity we in the federal government still expect to recruit the best and the brightest, but we shall be ensuring that the candidate pool is as diverse and as rich as possible and reflects what this nation's composition is all about.

If some training is required to diversify and enrich the candidate pool, we will provide it where we can. That is the meaning of employment equity and of equality.

We will have other occasions in which to discuss the growing role and equality of women in Canadian society and within the public service. I want to assure the House today of my own personal commitment, a commitment that goes back through the years that I spent in municipal government, to the principles of both equity and equality for women. I am pleased to have had the opportunity to participate in this debate today.

[*Translation*]

Thus, I am very pleased to reiterate in the House my commitment to employment equity, and equality between women and men.

[*English*]

**Mrs. Jan Brown (Calgary Southeast):** Mr. Speaker, I acknowledge the hon. minister's comments. I would like clarification on one part of the hon. minister's analysis. To me there seems to be something of a flaw.

The hon. minister related a whole host of impressive statistics regarding the executive group of the public service from 1983 to 1993. They show an impressive movement for that executive group. The minister went on to say that men and women are equal. If we are equal I would like to ask the hon. minister why we as women must be strategically placed. That does not necessarily explain that enhanced equality of opportunity and recognition based on merit is achieved through strategic placement. I would like the hon. minister to comment on that part of his discourse.

**Mr. Eggleton:** Mr. Speaker, I used those statistics to indicate that we have advanced a fair bit. I also said at the point where I gave those statistics to the House that we still have a long way to go.

Obviously we want to put the most qualified people in all of our jobs. We want to make sure that those who have experienced barriers to those opportunities have those barriers removed in order to provide the kind of training and preparation that is necessary to give them every opportunity to be able to advance into those ranks.

The statistics indicate that we have come a fair direction but we still have a fair direction to go. I certainly would welcome the hon. member and any other member of the House giving suggestions and ideas about how we might better achieve that.

This has been a learning process for all of us over the years. Perhaps it has been rather slow in appearance to many people, perhaps these changes have been too slow to come about. Certainly there is an increasing acceleration, as the statistics indicate. On top of that, there is a greater awareness and desire to find new mechanisms, new methods and new means of training and preparation for providing, as I said in my remarks, that pool of people from all of the different employment equity groups—women, aboriginals, disabled and visible minorities—in order to have a public service that better reflects the composition of our population.

**Mr. Dick Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley):** Mr. Speaker, I just have a couple of comments.

First, as a member of the Reform Party caucus I am proud to serve in Parliament alongside the women members of the Reform Party, women who were elected as MPs to serve in Parliament not because they are women but because of their ability, determination and ambition. I feel very proud to say that I regard the women members of the Reform caucus first as members of Parliament and second as women. I appreciate them very much.

*Supply*

(1220)

In listening to the hon. member's comments I heard phrases about employment equity, equality, et cetera. Really what I heard was quotas. I heard affirmative action. I heard about concessions.

I suggest that quotas have nothing to do with equality and everything to do with political correctness. If the government were serious about equality it would concentrate more on breaking down the barriers wherever they exist and inviting people of both genders, visible minorities, aboriginals and the disabled, to apply for jobs based on their ability, merits and qualifications for the job rather than talk about providing specific training for members of these four groups the hon. member mentioned so that they can be encouraged to fill some sort of quota that the government may have in mind for the public service.

I submit and suggest to the hon. member that the government would be far better off to look solely at the abilities of people when it comes to filling public service jobs rather than the gender or cultural heritage or whether or not they are disabled. That is what Canadians are all about, the equality of all, which is understood to be a given. The thing that has been most destructive in our country has been the separation into different groups by governments past and caused dissension amount the Canadian people.

I suggest that embarking on a path such as the hon. member has suggested is a path that leads to affirmative action and quotas in hiring. If we take a lesson from the United States we can see what kind of social problems that has caused. I hope it does not happen in our country.

**Mr. Eggleton:** Mr. Speaker, I am astounded at "understood to be a given" that equality exists in the country. Unfortunately there have been a lot of barriers for visible minorities, women and disabled and aboriginal people. They have not had the opportunities.

We have a composition in the public service that in past has not represented the composition in the population. There have been barriers to employment and barriers in terms of pay opportunities. These are facts that do exist and have been substantiated time and time again by many studies.

We are simply trying to break down those barriers. I never said quotas. I never used the word quotas at all. I talked about training. How do you equate training and quotas? Training is to help people. Training is provided for all people, men, women and all of the target groups I talked about today, training to help prepare them for jobs that can help them to rise higher in the service, to be able to perform to the best of their abilities.

Surely there is nothing wrong with that. How does the member equate that to quotas? I never said anything about quotas. We are trying to prepare people to do the best they can,

to be able to advance in the public service and to give them the kind of training and support they need so that we will have an even bigger talent pool to draw from when we need to advance people. That surely is going to be to the benefit of the people of the country in terms of the public service we would provide.

(1225)

*[Translation]*

**Mrs. Maud Debien (Laval East):** Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to wish a wonderful International Women's Day to all my female colleagues in this House.

I am proud of the solidarity which unites us today, in this House, where we wanted to be elected because we believed we could influence political decisions and protect the interest of the population of Canada and of Quebec.

Women make up 52 per cent of our population. I firmly believe that it is the duty of a responsible government and members who were elected to represent their constituency to respect and guarantee equal opportunities and equal rights for men and women. The fact that there are not as many women in this House as there could be, shows how difficult it is for women to get into politics.

I am also very pleased to make my first speech during a debate held on the International Women's Day. The status of women has always been a main concern of mine and my involvement as a founding member of the Centre des femmes de Laval gave me the opportunity to better understand the daily problems and the dramas some women have to deal with. Often, these women can only rely on the community resources made available to them by the women's groups to help them to take charge of their life to become independent and more aware of their own situation.

Allow me, on this special day, to reiterate my support and send my best wishes to all women in Laval, and especially to my female constituents in Laval East. I would also like to mention the wonderful work done by women organizations in Laval and all the volunteers who care for the well-being of women in Laval.

Like several other organizations, women's groups play a primary role by advocating changes to improve the standards of living of women.

I was able to appreciate the quality of services provided to women in need, such as crisis centres, counselling services, referral services, shelters, health services, training, emergency services, and the list could go on and on.

It is also the first time in federal political history, that Laval has female MPs. I want to take this opportunity to pay tribute to those women who work with such dedication at La Maison Le Prélude, Le Centre des femmes, Le Centre d'accueil pour les femmes victimes de violence, the AFEAS, Le Cercle des

*Supply*

fermières, Le Club des femmes d'aujourd'hui, Laval au féminin, Pause Carrefour-Santé, and other centres.

I want to thank the volunteers and the workers of those various organizations which offer women a place where they can feel a sense of belonging and solidarity.

The active contribution made by women to improve the quality of life for Canadian and Quebec societies takes many dimensions. In the past, women have shaped Quebec and Canadian societies, whether by making an economic and social contribution with their work at home or in the workplace, or through their entrepreneurship, their initiative, their dedication and their skills. Today, women are increasingly more present in all sectors, thereby continuing to play a major and active role to ensure the collective prosperity of our societies.

Throughout history, the movement to promote women's status has always sought a greater recognition of the principle of equality between men and women. If the status of women has improved over the years, although a lot remains to be done, it is because of the efforts and initiative of women's groups. Let us not forget that women fought hard to have their rights recognized.

Women often had to fight powerful religious and political institutions, as well as the press of the time.

(1230)

Women's groups have been the driving force behind change in the area of social, political and economic justice in our societies.

The first women's organizations called for basic rights: the right to a higher education, the right to equality before the law, the right to vote. Great Canadian and Quebec women laid the groundwork for equality and for the right of women to participate in all spheres of activity. Their tenacity, commitment and determination gave rise to new hopes, struggles and victories. While some of these women's names are inscribed in the history books, others still echo in this noble House, reminding us of the ideal to uphold and encouraging us to continue following in their footsteps.

At this time, I would like to recall several of the women's groups and pioneers who, through their dedication, sense of justice and fairness, were responsible for the emergence of important women's rights movements. They include Thérèse Casgrain of the League for Women's Rights, Marie Gérin-Lajoie of the Provincial Franchise Committee for Women's Suffrage, Carrie Derrik of the Montreal Suffrage Association, Grace Ritchie England of the Local Council of Women of Montreal, Idola Saint-Jean of the Alliance canadienne pour le vote des femmes, Laura Sabia of the Voice of Women, Léo Roback, the well-known feminist and activist, Laurette Slone of the League of Women, Madeleine Parent of the textile union, Azilda Marchand of AFEAS, the women's association for education and social action, Nellie McClung who fought for

women's suffrage in Western Canada, Bessie Starr and Emily Stowe who, as early as 1888, spearheaded the drive for the recognition of women's rights, and, last but by no means least, the celebrated Agnes Macphail.

However, the history of women quickly brings us back to reality. Despite the major gains made, women's groups still must fight today, in 1994, to maintain what they have achieved and to have their rights recognized. Indeed, in the past few years, under the guise of deficit and debt reduction, we have witnessed an unprecedented conservative backlash and a move to push women back, whereas they still have substantial gains to make.

In their day-to-day lives, women are still confined to job ghettos where, of course, they earn lower wages. According to the report of the Canadian committee on the status of women, one in seven women, or 71 per cent—works in one of five professional categories: teaching, nursing and other health care professions, office work, retail and the services sector. The percentage of women working in non-traditional sectors such as manufacturing, construction trades, transportation and communications and handling in fact dropped from 13 per cent in 1981 to 10 per cent in 1991.

This same report also mentions that 85 per cent of salaried women work in service industries, as compared to 62 per cent of men. Moreover, 14.8 per cent of the female labour force works in production sectors. Not only are women confined to job ghettos, but in cases where they perform similar work of equal value to the work done by men, they are paid far less.

Another example of disparity is access to the job market. If accessing the job market is difficult for men, it is even more so for women. Among other things, the provisions aimed at facilitating the entry of women into the labour force are inadequate. For example, daycare services are inadequate and there is a lack of alternative measures such as more flexible work schedules, adapted career paths and family leave.

(1235)

The result of the difficulty for women to access the labour market is dramatic: 55 per cent of the poor are women and, among them, the poorest are single mothers. Statistics show that one Canadian family in five is a single-parent family, 82 per cent of which are headed by a woman and 61.9 per cent are living under the poverty line.

Do you know, Madam Speaker, what the annual income of unemployed single parents was in 1991? Scarcely \$12,000, which puts them well below the poverty line. These are generally women like those you will find in shelters and transition centres, who have to rely on support agencies.

Here is another fact. Our seniors who, through their hard work, sacrifices and generosity, have helped build this country find themselves in a similar situation. The report I quoted earlier

indicates that nearly 50 per cent of women 65 years old and over have less than minimum subsistence income. While 85 per cent of older men receive pension benefits, only 50 per cent of women in the same age group do.

The list of cases where women invariably come off the losers is long: violence, inadequate job training, social housing shortage, unfair taxation. Allow me to say just a few words on the subject of taxation, as it speaks volumes.

We all know that actions are planned regarding tax women have to pay on support payments which, sadly, they all too often do not receive. On the other hand, their estranged spouses can claim a deduction for all amounts paid in alimony. How can such inequity be justified? We often hear that it is intended for men, to induce them to obey alimony orders. I would like to remind this House that about 75 per cent of estranged spouses still do not pay.

With the recession, deficit and debt always looming in the background, the dominant economic discourse would have us believe that excessive costs associated with social needs are the cause of all our problems. But this premise is incorrect. The cost of our social programs has not increased in over ten years. Social programs are not responsible for the skyrocketing deficit and debt. The Canadian debt crisis was brought about by government mismanagement. The deficit is growing because the government refuses to put in place a fair taxation system, because its monetary policy maintains interest rates artificially high, thus making the debt service charges increase and creating more unemployment, and because the government refuses to reduce waste and overlap.

The women and women's groups mentioned earlier decided to get organized and to act to get equal rights. They showed the way. If women have been able to find help, comfort and justice, it is thanks to other community groups that have since joined in. As I said earlier, in 1994, women's groups still have to fight for their survival. The budgets and attitudes of the previous government, which seems to be the source of inspiration for this Liberal government, jeopardize the very existence of such groups. We have as evidence the 5 per cent cut announced by the finance minister in various support programs, in addition to the 25 per cent reduction these groups have sustained since 1989. Their budget was slashed from \$12.5 million in 1985-86 to \$10 million in 1993-94, and it will be even less if we believe the Minister of Finance. This is unacceptable, as the initial funds provided to these groups were already clearly insufficient.

(1240)

The 400-odd women's groups are active in many areas—including physical and mental health, employment, single parent-

### *Supply*

hood, violence, and aging—which would cost a lot more to manage if the government was directly responsible.

By pulling out and encouraging groups to get funding from other groups, the government shows its ignorance of the realities in these organizations. Most of the time, this forces women to spend a lot of time and energy on fund-raising, when this time and energy would be better spent on improving women's living conditions and, in the end, the well-being and quality of life of all Canadians and Quebecers.

True, the private sector sometimes supports women's groups and associations, but only as long as they provide direct assistance services to the population. But what about awareness groups demanding economic equality, equity in employment and wages, parental leave, preventative withdrawals, child care services, in short, better living conditions for families? The private sector rarely subsidizes lobby groups. By gradually withdrawing their financing, the government once again penalizes the most disadvantaged, a group where women are in the majority.

Is it not important to question the cuts introduced by the previous government, that the current government apparently wants to maintain and even deepen? Is this not a disguised way of muzzling women's groups that make claims and exert pressure? Should we not question the gag method designed to prevent them from criticizing government policies?

I would now like to make a comment about interest groups. Contrary to what some people think, women's groups are not interest groups. As the National Action Committee on the Status of Women rightly stated, the interests of 52 per cent of the population are not special interests but public interests. The promotion of social, political and economic justice does not have anything to do with the lobby for multinationals, banks, family trusts and businesses that do not pay taxes.

In its throne speech of January 18, the government expressed its intention to change its relations with lobbyists. Canadian and Quebec women would like the government to clarify what is a lobby and what is an interest group and who are their members.

Finally, I would like to say that the involvement of both levels of government in the area of subsidies to women's groups and organizations in Quebec, like in many other sectors affecting women's lives, creates overlap and duplication in programs and structures, leading to a waste of public funds.

I personally think that Quebec women's interests would be better served if there were only one level making decisions and distributing funds. It also makes it impossible for Quebec to develop a consistent policy on the status of women.



*Supply*

(1245)

For example, the dual jurisdiction in family law often leads to inconsistencies. The federal Parliament has jurisdiction in marriage and divorce matters, while Quebec can legislate on solemnization of marriage and on property and civil rights. Quebec cannot in these conditions initiate a reform process that could give it a unified family court.

In closing, I hope that this day of reflection and debate on the status of women will allow women to continue their long march towards equality and independence.

*[English]*

**Hon. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak on today's motion especially because it is International Women's Day. All members should keep this very important motion in mind.

I would like to make some comments today about the economy and women's place in that economy, not the place that is defined for us, but the place we define for ourselves. It is a place that is equal, just and co-operative. It is one that gives us choices and allows us to determine our own vision of who we are and who we want to become as individuals in society. I want to talk about what we can do as parliamentarians, as men and women in the House to bring about the fundamental change which is required if we are to make that vision a reality.

Many people get nervous when we talk about fundamental change. It is very threatening to some. All kinds of excuses will be put forth as to why we cannot bring about real change. Sure, maybe there can be a program or two, a pay raise here or there, but tamper with the big stuff, talk about structural change and the alarm bells go off. Obviously someone has a good thing going but it sure is not the women of Canada.

This is not to suggest we have not made extraordinary gains. International Women's Day is about some of those gains.

Today we look at our universities with some satisfaction. Half the undergraduate students are women. Forty-one per cent of medical students are female; 48 per cent of law students are women; and 47 per cent of business students are women. One-third of all businesses started in Canada are started by women. The success rate of those businesses is very high and exceeds those started by men.

In all other areas however, women still lag far behind. Only 17 per cent of university professors are women. Only 18 per cent of members of Parliament are women. Only 1 per cent of corporate executives are women and one of them was so successful she was named "Man of the Year". Women also continue to be grossly underrepresented in engineering and in the sciences.

Sometimes people ask me why we need to have 50 per cent female politicians, 50 per cent female engineers and so on. It is

just common sense to me, common social sense and common economic sense. Our society can no longer afford to ignore the expertise and knowledge of half of our population.

Women have always played a key role in the economy as unpaid labour. This invisible cheap labour feeds and cares for the family, for the male paid workforce and raises future workers. It is called a labour of love. We know love is a part of it but so is exploitation.

Money too often has been the measure of worth in our society and because women's labour has not been paid it has been historically undervalued. Because that work has been undervalued, far too often women have not been valued. That lack of worth has a whole array of consequences going beyond our lower paycheques. Women still make 69 cents on the dollar of men in our society.

(1250)

We see it as well in the lack of commitment to women's health care needs and the controversies over breast implants, breast cancer and the overmedication of women. We see it in continued violence against women, victims of abusers in a too often abusive society. We see it when a woman cannot get the police to enforce a peace bond against her violent partner, yet the laws are always there to protect property in times of strikes. We see it in the twisted notion that somehow rape is not a war crime. That is changing to some extent but we recognize how much more there is to do. We see it in sexual harassment being treated as a joke by some.

That is the kind of thinking which has to be challenged and changed. Who is making the rules? Who says it has to be this way and who says it cannot be changed? Many people who have profited from the way things are are the ones who are saying it cannot be changed.

Some people will remember when slightly under 10 years ago former member of Parliament Margaret Mitchell mentioned in the House that one in ten women suffered from spousal assault and many members laughed. We have a way to go. Today people would not laugh. We have to go beyond the rhetoric to implementing real programs and take the trend in attitudinal change into real action. The reality is that the world has changed in many ways. Society has changed. It is time for politics to catch up.

We know child poverty is a tremendous problem and shame to Canada. We have been sanctioned by the United Nations for child poverty. Poor children have poor parents. In Canada unlike many of our trading partners 58.4 per cent of single parents, the vast majority of whom are women, still live in poverty. Opportunities and choices are too often denied to them. It is not because people say they do not value the family. It is because the structural changes that would fundamentally attack these issues in our society have not been made.

There are three important ways to broaden these choices and to expand those opportunities. They are pay equity, employment equity and a national child care program.

I would like to deal with the issue of child care. No doubt there is a link between the ability of women to participate in the workforce and the availability of accessible, affordable child care.

In a past career I worked for a children's aid society. After a number of years I was struck by the view that our society is not a very child loving one. We do not structure our society in a way that values our children and our future. The lack of this reasonably rich and resourceful country to come to terms with the need for affordable, accessible child care is one example of our failure to value families and children.

Child care is not a charity issue. In many ways it is not a social issue. It is an economic issue. It must not be seen solely as a woman's issue. Child care is the responsibility of everyone in society. It is central to the functioning of our economy. Looking at studies from other countries it is very easy to see the correlation between the availability of child care and the ability of women to participate in the workforce.

Other important steps can be taken to ensure women's economic equality. Labour legislation can be passed making it easier for workers to organize in sectors where women predominate and where work is very often part time, casual or temporary.

(1255)

We can take it upon ourselves as legislators to see that part time workers, whose numbers are increasing and a large percentage of whom are women, receive adequate pensions and other benefits to ensure a more stable future.

There can be labour standards with flexible and comprehensive leave policies that recognize family responsibilities and the rights of same sex couples.

We hear much from different parliaments, not just in Canada but abroad as well on the question of family values. I ask each person today to examine their consciences in terms of how our actions show we care about families. If we really cared about families we would have child care. We would have appropriate labour legislation. We would ensure the family is valued not by rhetoric and not by simply longing for the long past nuclear family, if it ever existed, but by recognizing the situation as it is today and valuing the choices people make and valuing our children.

We can have a clear definition of sexual harassment in labour legislation. The legislation can set clear policies for handling complaints and discipline.

### *Supply*

On the economic front we can make low interest rate loans more readily available to co-operatives and small businesses, many of which give women a greater say in their own economic future.

We can find ways to value unpaid work. We can encourage young women and girls to study math and science. We can include women's studies as part of core curriculum and ensure post secondary courses accommodate women's needs.

We can provide training programs to move women into trades and technologies. Those programs can be made available to women in both rural and urban areas.

I would like to say a word about the focus needed for women in rural areas. The availability of training and educational opportunities is often more difficult. It is something our society has not really come to terms with. Our rural economy and the needs of rural women must be a focus for members of the House.

We must ensure as well there are adequate old age security and income supplements so that older women do not have to live in poverty. Older women make up a disproportionately large percentage of those living in poverty.

We can build more low cost housing so that women have a safe place to call home. We can make sure that health care meets the needs of women, not just those of drug companies. Women must be given choices in those health care needs. That means more funding for planned parenthood, more research into safe and effective contraception and ensured access to abortion services not just in urban hospitals but in community based clinics across Canada.

True economic equality for women will come about only through these and other initiatives. That economic equality will go some way in addressing the imbalance of power between women and men in our society, an imbalance that contributes to violence against women.

We will not be safe, be respected, get child care, get equal pay or get better health care unless we as women and men, as parliamentarians and decision makers, take leadership on these issues. Too often there has been a tendency for the House not to take leadership on these issues.

I must say many men in this House have supported the kinds of equality measures I am talking about. It gives me great hope that together we can accomplish the kind of equality which will enhance our society, our families and our country. Equality and social justice require a true commitment not just from governments, not just from parliamentarians but from society as a whole. As parliamentarians we have a role to play. We help to formulate legislation which very often not only addresses inequities but leads the way. It takes more than that; zero tolerance for violence in our society for example.

*Supply*

(1300)

There is much we can do outside the House to support and promote equality for women. As women, we have to value our own experiences because sometimes we undervalue them, and recognize that someone who runs a home can very likely run a business or a country.

Second, I would say that those of us who have had some small success in our careers have a responsibility to be mentors to younger women who will follow us. It is by our example that we can begin to redefine what is of worth in our society.

I have had the opportunity to speak over the last six years on International Women's Day, both in the House and across the country. We have seen many sad things in the House as well that we have acknowledged having taken place. All of us remember the Montreal massacre, and it was of credit to the House that members supported December 7 as an official day of mourning.

These are important statements that have been made by parliamentarians. Today is the day we should rededicate ourselves, men and women, to use the power we have, in the House and outside, to promote true equality.

I have been involved for many years in the women's movement and I know that words do not change much, but the language we use can change the way we think about things. We have had some rather regrettable examples in the House of Commons where people forgot that. It does matter what we say; it does matter what we do.

I believe the issue of women's equality is inextricably linked to the equality of everyone in our society—aboriginal people, visible minorities, persons with handicaps—and that when we tolerate structural inequality, as I believe we have at the moment in our society, we are ignoring a very basic political fact. Today we look at what is happening in South Africa where racial injustice was not only ignored but was promoted for many years. It affected every person in that society. It affected international relations.

We do not necessarily have a sterling record on women's equality internationally. Members will remember that last year Canada was deemed the number one country by a United Nations report, the best place to live under a whole series of criteria. It also added that if the status of women was factored in we dropped to eighth.

As the debate went on, I noticed that report was used to say, quite rightly, that we are that kinder, gentler society that others might long for. I rarely heard anyone mention the equality of women and the second part of the report which made a very negative observation about our society.

My party supports the motion put forward by the Official Opposition. However we would like to see parliamentarians do more than simply support it verbally by giving speeches, but by what we do and what we undertake to do as individual members of Parliament and as political parties.

People will recall that during the previous session of Parliament some of the recommendations of the Electoral Reform Commission were accepted. One section was not and I would like to suggest to the government that it show its commitment to equality. The Electoral Reform Commission recommended that political parties receive a rebate based on the number of women they nominated as candidates. That acknowledged an acceptance of the fact that we do not have sufficient numbers of women in political life.

(1305)

I would also like to see the government restore core funding to women's centres that provide many of the services, often sadly at a fairly low wage rate, to the communities across the country which help to deal in preventive, educative and counselling ways with the issues which most people here I am sure will say they are concerned about: violence against women in our society, poverty, and so on.

I would make a plea for the government not just to give a nice speech today but to acknowledge the contribution of women: women who run transition homes, women's centres, counselling centres, and what that means to our society as a whole.

In conclusion, in supporting the motion I would like to say that International Women's Day is not a day simply for women. It is a day when we can recommit with actions, and in this forum with legislation, that truly will work toward redressing the imbalance between men and women in society.

We have seen positive changes over the years. I am pleased that many men share the goals that we who have worked in the women's movement for equality for many years have promoted. Only together and through our role as parliamentarians can we show the rest of the country that the leadership, the elected members, take the motion seriously, will act on it and not just support motions but support legislation when needed.

**Mr. Dennis J. Mills (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by saying to the leader of the New Democratic Party that I support everything in her remarks. I was listening to her speech in my office while working on another issue and I came over here because I felt that she, as always on this issue, is right on track.

I would like to comment on a particular part of the hon. member's speech where she talks about women in business. In the United States right now women owned or partnered businesses employ more people than all the *Fortune 500* companies combined. The emerging force is women as the real leaders in entrepreneurship in North America, not just in words. It is reality. The facts and statistics are there. It is one of the reasons

why the Minister of Human Resources Development is going to be supporting momentarily the opening of Canada's first women in business centre in downtown Toronto. We can see the tremendous success that is emerging from women owned or partnered businesses.

We are finding that one of the most difficult issues facing women who are either starting a home based business or moving from a home business into a larger business is that the financial institutions, the banks, do not get it or cannot seem to read the statistics of success. Canadian bankers will say that women repay loans better than men. This is all statistically recorded. Still we hear that women owned or partnered businesses have a very difficult time in accessing capital.

(1310)

In the member's opinion or because of her experience, could she give us some reasons why financial institutions are so restrictive in their attitudes when they are loaning money to women who want to start or expand their businesses?

**Ms. McLaughlin:** Mr. Speaker, I guess I could give a psychological analysis as well as a financial one.

Part of it comes back to the fact that historically as well as to some extent now, women's work is not valued. Some decision makers in financial institutions, men or women, are having a bit of trouble making the link that women can actually be successful in a variety of areas. As my friend says, we know the statistics about the success of women in business.

I have heard this from my constituents and had the experience myself perhaps seven or eight years ago where I could not get a credit card unless my spouse signed to say that I was a good person, a good financial risk or something. The fact that I was divorced seemed to be not understood by the people who were asking.

It is attitudinal in our society. It is one of the attitudes we have to address. I speak to many women across the country, professional women, women who are moving from home base to larger enterprises. They have a terrible time getting funding. It is a very real problem.

I would say to my friend that there are many analyses I could make but the best would be for the government which according to the budget is going to be sitting down with financial institutions to make sure that it raises this very important issue for funding for women entrepreneurs. I am sure if my friend is there he will do that. I ask that the government make this a priority as well.

I was struck, and I mentioned it briefly in my comments, that at the end of last year the *Financial Post* put out a magazine that had 200 of Canada's top executives. We have to remember that the most influential chief executive officers of the country

### *Supply*

probably carry some political clout as well as business clout. Two of them were women.

This is also illustrative of the business community as a whole, not just the financial community. It has to recognize two things, not just the value of women but the reorganization of the work place that values—it would be of advantage to men as well—family roles.

That would go equally for the House. We might think about how schedules are arranged and those with family responsibilities, men and women, can be assured that there is more time to carry out family responsibilities by the very schedule we set here ourselves.

I have spoken to many women who are concerned, particularly in business and in politics, about taking senior positions because of the kind of humanless work environment that tends to be constructed in our society. That is a real issue for the future which all of us might want to give some attention to if we truly believe in involving more women in both of those arenas.

**Mr. Jim Silye (Calgary Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the opposition's motion encouraging the government to recognize equality between men and women and to implement necessary measures to ensure this in the area of federal jurisdiction.

(1315)

On this International Women's Day it is truly a privilege for me to address such an important issue here in the House. However before I begin I would like to thank my mother, Irene Lemak, for deciding to have me, raising me, putting up with me, looking after me and loving me. Thanks, Mom.

Back to the motion, it is our duty as members of Parliament to address the problems of equality that women face in the workforce, encourage co-operation and protect the rights of all Canadians.

Economic equality can only exist between men and women when employment in the country is truly based on individual qualifications, experience, motivation and not gender. In this system the individual who is best qualified for a job, male or female, would get the job.

However the fact of the matter is that true equality in this form remains an ideal in Canada and not a reality. It is time for women in the country to be given the respect, the pay and the opportunities they deserve. This means that as a government, members of all parties should work to review the problems associated with sexual harassment and discrimination in the workplace and correct any wrongs that surface as they are discovered.

We must explore the problems associated with maternity leave and the difficulty that many women face in re-entering the workforce. It must be a balanced approach with the needs of the

*Supply*

employer also factored in. Currently the system that exists seems to recognize the problems and it seems to work.

Before I became a member of Parliament I ran businesses for 25 years. A lot of times this problem surfaced and by allowing the women to have maternity leave, have their baby and holding their job open to them for a period time of three to five months to make a decision as to whether they wanted to come back, this seemed to work. Out of six such pregnancies I had four female employees who decided to stay at home and two who came back. Perhaps a system like this has improved.

We must examine the discriminatory problems associated with child care and the rights of stay at home parents who are not entitled to the same rights as those who pay for child care outside the home. We must acknowledge the fact that there is a social stigma attached to stay at home mothers which implies that they are not on the same level as those who work outside the home. We must recognize the value of the contribution of those women who work at home and give them the opportunity to pursue any direction they choose.

Having a child should not be directly influenced by the government with various incentives through legislation. For instance, Calgarians Jim and Laurie Boland were recently told in Federal Court by a judge who had to make the decision that a parent who chooses to be at home with their child is not entitled to the same privileges as those who pay for child care.

The Income Tax Act admittedly denies the Bolands equal benefit under the law, but because stay at home parents are not a "a discrete and insular minority", as used by the judge they are not protected by the Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

This is legal discrimination and this must stop. If the motion today is intended to address problems like these, I would encourage the government to get on it right away and introduce legislation to make a judge's ruling unnecessary in situations like this one.

Parents should be free to choose the form of child care which best suits their situation as opposed to having government reward one choice over another.

In this International Year of the Family it is my intention before the year is over to introduce a private member's bill on the topic of equal financial assistance to all families regardless of the type of child care arrangements that they have made.

Let us build a country in which taxation and the options for employment are fair, a country in which opportunities flourish for individuals and employment is based on qualifications, experience and motivation, not gender.

If the motion suggests that affirmative action should be legislated in the workplace as a fixed percentage then the Reform Party opposes it. A lot of speakers earlier today pointed this out.

(1320)

Women are not a special interest group. My caucus colleague from Beaver River mentioned this number of times. She said it twice and so I will follow her leadership and mention it twice as well. Women are not a special interest group. Affirmative action leads to reverse discrimination and not equality. Women are people just like men and should be respected as such.

It is time that extremes, the extreme males who are called male chauvinists and the extreme females who are called feminists, come together and eliminate that hardness and that extremism from both ends and come together and recognize each other as human beings. Respect and understanding are key.

In conclusion, I believe that women in the home, in the workplace and in general deserve more respect, not quotas. Perhaps a good beginning would be, especially in this year of the family, a definition of family in which we subscribe to some of those values in an ever changing world that existed in prior years when we had commitment and we had a sense of direction.

Perhaps a family could be defined as two people who are related by blood or through marriage or through adoption. This would cover a lot of the situations for single parents, for marriages and other situations in which the parents are deceased and siblings live together. These are the things I feel we should address this year.

As my final words, I do not think we should gloss over the problems that exist between men and women. I believe we should recognize them, face them head on and try to resolve them through respect and understanding, rather than through legislation and affirmative action.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Before resuming debate I wish to inform the House that, pursuant to Standing Order 33(2)(b), because of the ministerial statement Government Orders will be extended by 18 minutes later this day.

**Mr. Grant Hill (MacLeod):** Mr. Speaker, the motion in front of the House today is one that someone may wonder about, specifically why a male would stand on this issue at all, thinking that it might be an issue only for women. I would like to state initially that as a Reformer I believe in equality of opportunity for every single Canadian but not equality of outcome.

I would like to comment on what qualifies me to speak on this issue. First, I was raised by a wonderful mother. Second, I have a sister whose love and affection I value. Third, I am a husband of 28 years, very happily married. Fourth, I am a father of seven children, only one a daughter. I have six sons, an imbalance

maybe in my life. Finally I have professional qualifications which have allowed me to be close to women and their problems for all my adult working life.

I would like to make some observations. One observation is that women live seven years longer on average than men. I have wondered in one sense why women would want to be equal to men in that regard. We have a shorter lifespan than women.

The second thing I would like to comment on is an observation that I have made from my time as a student in university. In my initial class there were 106 of us, but 14 of my classmates were women. I graduated back in 1968. I have watched the enrolment in university in my faculty very carefully. Today I find that the enrolment in the faculty is virtually equal.

(1325)

I have asked myself what the change has been since 1964 when I entered college and today. Has it been a legislative change? Has there been a change in legislation that would require the university to have men and women treated as equal? There has not been such a legislative change at all. There has been what I call an educative change, a change that has allowed us to recognize that women's qualifications in the faculty that I graduated from are absolutely equal.

Another observation I would like to make is in a sense a bit of a myth exploder. I have heard figures bandied about that women are paid much lower than men on average and that for equivalent work they do not do as well as men. One thing that is missing from this equation, however, is if we compare men who were never married with women who were never married, the results are virtually equal for pay and have been in that regard equal for a long time. Those observations I would like to leave with the House at the start of my comments today.

I would like to address what marriage does to the equation. I look back to the days when my grandparents were raising their family. It was a traditional, old time Canadian family. My grandfather worked on a dairy farm, outside. My grandmother was the housekeeper and worked inside. She did the gardening, the housework, the cooking, the sewing, the yard chores, the house renovations, gave piano lessons, prepared for church. There are some who say that those duties were not at all equal. There are some who say there was an equality there. I asked my grandmother whether she felt there was any inequality there. She said there was an inequality, my poor granddad had all the hard work and she had all the enjoyable work.

In the modern family today things have changed dramatically. There are often two working parents who have to leave the home, go outside the household, and it is very difficult for a mother to nurture the children and do that only. With those working parents when they get married the most natural thing that happens is that they decide to have children. When the children come along there are certain negatives that relate to the

### *Supply*

mother as far as the job situation is concerned. When she is pregnant often morning sickness comes along and she has difficulty even getting to work during that period of time. She goes through childbirth and there is a period of time, some six weeks plus, in which she is incapable of working. In many cases there are mothers who decide that they will stay home and nurture the baby, breast feed, care for in a way that only a mother can care for the newborn baby.

There are cases in which there are medical problems that crop up. High blood pressure can be a problem with the post-partum period. There are other issues, problems with the placenta, problems that require the mother to be out of the workforce for a fairly long period of time.

When these issues ensue the mother automatically takes a drop in income. The father generally goes out and may even find extra work. The statistics I hear which say that men and women are not equally treated in our society in some cases are aberrations. I would rather have the statistics of never married men and women compared to see if we have equality.

I hear from both the Liberals and the Bloc members a desire to engineer socially, to move toward what I think are very well meaning principles. I do not agree with the final result but I know that the motives are good.

I want to bring up an example of a type of social engineering that I came across which I think is wrong headed social engineering.

(1330)

With regard to social engineering, in the early 1900s there was a small community in Alberta called Brule. This community was based on coal mining and coal mining alone. It was a thriving community. In fact when the first world war came along the community boomed. People moved in, built homes, and had a real solid community. They had enough access to humanity. There was a theatre and a bowling alley.

The future of Brule looked very bright. However the coal reserve ran out. The very fine seam of coal they had literally ran out. It took six months until the community of Brule was non-existent. Everyone had moved away. They sought employment where employment was.

I wonder what would happen to Brule today if exactly the same thing occurred. I imagine that Brule would have had an influx of social workers who would come in to take care of the problems of alcoholism that would ensue from unemployed miners who wanted to stay exactly where they were because they had nice homes and all the amenities. I am quite convinced we would have a department of all kinds of things looking after the social needs and concerns and worries of the people of Brule. We would need somebody there for economic displacement, somebody to make sure the post office was looked after and

*Supply*

somebody to make sure that the school had all the advantages of the schools in the larger communities.

The social engineering that would keep Brule there today did not keep Brule there when it died. The community of Brule today is non-existent. Even the homes were taken down, disassembled, and taken to a community fairly close by. Brule was literally gone.

I think in our haste and great desire to do well that we sometimes socially engineer ourselves into the corner.

I would conclude my comments by saying as I said at the start, that I heartily support the equality of opportunity for everyone in Canada. I do not support the equality of outcome. My desire is to make sure that we do everything we can to prevent the impediments that will prevent the equality of opportunity. That goes for every single Canadian, man or woman.

**Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South):** Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to the member's comments. I thought I would suggest one initiative that Canadians might consider to see the member's reaction.

Very typically when we have two spouses working and there are dependent children which require day care the net income to the second spouse entering the workplace after day care costs is very nominal.

Given that the value of the net pay to that second spouse does not generally reflect the value of the work provided in the workplace, I wonder if the member would consider the merits of an arrangement whereby a working spouse could either transfer income or pay a salary to a spouse in the home who is managing the family home and caring for dependent children. In that way there would be earned income in the hands of that second spouse, allowing them to have economic independence and the ability to purchase RRSPs, et cetera. Also it would free up a job, free up a day care spot and maybe recognize for the first time in our Canadian society the value of a spouse in the home.

I wonder if the member might comment on the general merits of recognizing the value of the woman in the home.

**Mr. Hill (MacLeod):** Mr. Speaker, I would prefer, rather than recognize the woman in the home or even in fact the man in the home by paying or doing something of that nature, making sure that the income tax system did not downplay the contribution of the spouse in the home.

(1335)

The Income Tax Act is discriminatory for those who have a spouse at home. My preference would be to do this the least legislative way as possible. In my mind the use of the Income Tax Act in that way would be more appropriate. I thank the member for the question.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Eugène Bellemare (Carleton—Gloucester):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the hon. member of the Reform Party. Did he actually say that men and women who never got married and do the same job have equal pay?

Does the hon. member believe that male and female nurses get the same wages, that female lawyers are paid just as much as male lawyers in some firms, that female and male physicians earn the same income, that female and male employees doing the same clerical work are paid the same salary, that female and male partners in a firm reap the same benefits? In short, does he think male and female employees doing the same job have equal pay throughout Canada?

[*English*]

**Mr. Hill (MacLeod):** Mr. Speaker, never-married men and never-married women statistically have exactly the same earnings Canada-wide. The member is correct and that is what I said.

**Mr. Dennis J. Mills (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry):** Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have the opportunity to participate in this opposition day debate on a motion that we all support.

There is no question about the fact that we in this House are constantly working at initiatives that bring knowledge and sensitivity to providing economic equality between men and women.

To begin with, I would like to talk about a personal experience that I had in my riding about a year ago. A group of women from the riding came to see me on a Saturday morning. Most of them were on social assistance at that time. They were telling me, first of all, that they were all educated but were victims of a rather rough economy in the last few years. They had their own strengths in terms of entrepreneurship and felt with a little bit of assistance they could start their own business. They asked whether our office could give them some help in starting their own business.

I was not really equipped at that moment in time but said that I would look into what the Federal Business Development Bank did in terms of supporting women who wanted to start in business. Within a month we set up a little conference, women in business, on how to start one's own business.

We expected that at the first meeting perhaps 40 or 50 women would show up, women who would be interested in starting their own home based business, a corner store or a specific craft that they wanted to market or sell.

About three days before the event we started getting letters, applications and requests to come to this meeting. Over 500 women showed up for this women in business conference on how to start a business. During the question and answer period I listened to the frustration that women have in starting their own business. Our educational system is not geared toward being

*Supply*

sensitive on how to help women get into business. Our financial institutions are not geared toward helping women who want to start their own business.

(1340)

In the statistics in terms of women who are either leaders or at the board level of our major businesses in Canada, as a country we have really not supported women in senior positions in this country.

This first meeting led to subsequent meetings where we brought in executives from among the few women around our city who were experienced in business. We asked them if they would be mentors for others who wanted to start, who wanted to learn, who wanted to advance or who wanted to upgrade their skills. We developed a series. After about four or five of these meetings, and I do not think we had a meeting with less than 300 women, we discovered that this need for a business centre for women was absolutely essential if we were going to really give this area of women's entrepreneurship a real solid footing.

The Minister of Human Resources Development in the last couple of weeks has given us some tentative support for getting this going. It is an example of a concrete initiative.

Right now women owned or partnered businesses employ more people in the United States than all the *Fortune 500* companies put together. When we are facing a period of deep unemployment in our country I believe that by making sure that the resources that will support women getting into business are there will go a long way in getting people back to work.

We talked in the last budget about all the initiatives related to small business. We have to be very specific when we go into these various areas that we are sensitive to making sure that whether it be in the banking area or whether it be in special education or retraining that the whole area of women in business is looked at.

As the leader of the New Democratic Party said earlier today, this is an area where all of us are going to have to work at with a little bit more focus. I do not think that there is any way that we can be proud of the record in this area right now.

My remarks are going to be very short today. The message is that we are going to do our best in our industry committee, especially in the area with banks. We will make sure that all of these issues that are related to small business have very special focus, especially on the needs that women require in order to get into the area of entrepreneurship.

**Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops):** Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest, as I always do, to my hon. friend's comments. I find myself once again agreeing with much of what he had to say. I

know that he is concerned, dedicated and very committed to the points that he makes.

I wonder if I could make a suggestion. Part of the mandate of the new government and perhaps the new Parliament is to review the Federal Business Development Bank's operations and to ask questions about the kind of job that it is doing, the kind of emphasis that it places in terms of its lending portfolios. I think a lot of us have concerns about the role that it is presently playing and would like to see it in a whole new mandate.

(1345)

I think one of the more positive initiatives is the CASE program, the counsellor assistance program, where experienced entrepreneurs, experienced business people, assist and lend their expertise and talents to those starting up new ventures and new businesses and the like.

Does the hon. member see a role for the FBDB to play in providing support, particularly for women entering the world of business and entrepreneurship, and could this be a leadership role that that bank could take on that would then encourage the other lending institutions of Canada to follow suit in one way or another?

**Mr. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for his question. He raises a good point.

The Federal Business Development Bank right now is doing some work in the area of assisting women in business. I cited the example that we had in the riding. They provide this service for any member of Parliament who would like to have a town hall meeting to assist women who want to start their own business. The Federal Business Development Bank will assist any member of Parliament who wants to take on that initiative.

Their counsellor assistance for small enterprise is a good program, but the problem is that it has limited resources. Even though the counsellor assistance for small enterprise charges the business approximately \$40 an hour to operate, it costs approximately \$80 an hour to manage this particular section of the Federal Business Development Bank. With the budget constraints, that program which is so vital is really restricted in terms of its ability to serve the needs of small enterprise.

I believe, and I think this deals directly with the member's question, that the Federal Business Development Bank's role has been too restricted. I know that there are many members of that bank who would like to be full-fledged competitors of the major financial institutions in the country. We are certainly going to listen to them in the industry committee over the next 60 days.

Whether it be the Federal Business Development Bank, mutual funds, pension funds, le Fonds de solidarité, any funds that can assist women in business, small business in general, any



*Supply*

funds that can compete with the traditional financial institutions in this country, I would support amending the legislation in a way that would allow them to compete with the banks.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint-Hubert):** Mr. Speaker, all judges of superior courts and courts of appeal in all Canadian provinces and territories are appointed on the recommendation of Cabinet. The Cabinet also designates the judges of the Supreme Court, the Federal Court and the Tax Court of Canada. The government therefore has the political responsibility for appointments to courts of superior jurisdiction across the country.

Today, there are 951 federally-appointed judges. Of that number, 123, or less than 13 per cent, are women. Statistics obtained from the Office of the Commissioner for Federal Judicial Affairs reflect the level of egalitarian concern shown by successive governments during the past 30 years. In the Supreme Court of Canada, which rules on issues of national importance, only two of the nine justices are women. In the Federal Court of Canada, which was established to judge cases involving federal legislation and federal responsibility, both in first instance and on appeal, only five out of a grand total of 35 judges are women.

(1350)

In the Tax Court of Canada, which may be asked, for instance, to rule whether a woman employed by her spouse is eligible for unemployment insurance, only three of the 25 judges are women. In the country's ten appeal courts, out of a total of 126 judges, the government appointed only 23 women.

In the case of the Quebec Superior Court, the Courts of Queen's Bench of Alberta, Manitoba, New Brunswick and Saskatchewan, the Supreme Courts of British Columbia, the Northwest Territories and Yukon, and the trial divisions in Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island and Ontario, the figures are even more telling: out of 756 judges, only 90 are women.

There are no women on the New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island Courts of Appeal. The five judges of the Superior Courts of Yukon and the Northwest Territories are all men. In New Brunswick again, only two out of the 32 judges on the Court of Queen's Bench and the Appeal Court are women.

Even in Ontario, which has more than 25,000 lawyers, Liberal and Conservative governments appointed only 34 women out of a total of 277 judges of both courts.

One could say that judges are lawyers and that far more men than women belong to the provincial bar associations. This was indeed true in the fifties and sixties, but in any case I would say, first of all, that male/female ratios among lawyers are not relevant when appointments are supposed to reflect society as a whole.

I would also say that this particular argument is becoming less and less factual. The Barreau du Québec has 17,000 lawyers, of whom 35 per cent are women, while the Ontario Bar Association has more than 25,000 members, 20 per cent of whom are women, the ratio increasing to more than 45 per cent among lawyers who have practised law for less than 10 years.

In future, we could assume that the government should have no trouble finding 100 women among the 42,000 lawyers in both provinces for the positions that become available.

Mr. Speaker, the present profile of Canada's judiciary reflects the intolerable discrimination suffered by women in the law profession in this country. One wonders whether this discrimination arises from a political will to keep women out of the judiciary or simply from a mistaken conviction in our society that women had no place in the courts.

In any case, the result is the same, and it is high time we corrected this imbalance by systematically appointing women to the positions that become available in the future.

Ontario was the first Canadian province to admit women to the bar, when it passed special legislation for the benefit of Clara Brett Martin on February 2, 1897.

Quebec was the last province to amend its statutes to admit women to the bar in 1941. It is hard to imagine in 1994 that in 1940, it was perfectly normal and natural to exclude women from social life. It was a time when discrimination was institutionalized. Most women themselves felt it was necessary, and the fact that they were excluded from important positions was accepted as a matter of course.

We cannot explain the imbalance in the ratio of men and women in the judiciary on the basis of their actual numbers within the provincial bar associations. This argument is irrelevant, because there are so few positions to fill that the government can easily find suitable women among the thousands of female lawyers.

(1355)

Who could argue that it would be impossible for the government to find the right persons among the 6,500 female lawyers in Ontario and the 5,000 in Quebec?

The role of higher Canadian courts is to sanction the laws, to interpret the fundamental texts and very often to decide on controversial issues in our society.

It is totally inconceivable and unacceptable that women should be almost systematically excluded. I urge this House and the government to recognize that time has come to correct this historical aberration.

I urge the government to select and appoint at least 80 per cent women to the positions which will become vacant in the magistrature under federal jurisdiction over the next few years. I am asking for a policy and a law that would facilitate access of

women to the bench, in order to correct the imbalance that has existed since Confederation.

I am only repeating a principle of our law: That justice be rendered and that it appear to be rendered in the eyes of both men and women of Canada.

**Mr. Eugène Bellemare (Carleton—Gloucester):** Mr. Speaker, I rise with pleasure to congratulate the member for Saint-Hubert on a speech for which she did a lot of research, a speech which dealt with the number of judges in Ontario, Quebec and throughout Canada. I commend her for her research and I support her when she says that the federal government should appoint more and more women judges so that justice is done for everyone, women as well as men.

I congratulate the hon. member for Saint-Hubert.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mrs. Venne:** Mr. Speaker, after so much praise, I must tell you that I do not know what to say to my colleague. Of course, I thank him. I think that he got the message.

Earlier, behind me, someone was whispering to me that I did not talk about notaries, although I am a notary, quite simply because now lawyers are appointed judges, but I could also ask the Minister of Justice to appoint notaries—that would not embarrass me at all.

[*English*]

**Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for the comments. They were most interesting. In my experience I have heard what can best be described as blatant discrimination in terms of appointees with regard to the old boys networks such as the legal profession and the appointment of judges.

Would the member please comment on the realities of our society? When I go into a bank the majority of tellers are women. When I go into a corporation and look at the secretaries, the majority are women. When I go into a supermarket and look at who the clerks are, the majority are women. I suppose the examples go on and on, classical stereotype positions that seem to be prevalent in our society.

I wonder if the member feels that equity for women in our society is something to be legislated or mandated on the basis of a quota system or whether it should take into account primarily the ability to do the job. Perhaps the member would comment on that.

(1400)

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Venne:** Mr. Speaker, in some cases, like the one I mentioned about judges, yes, I propose that in future at least 80 per cent of the judgeships that become open be filled by women. You can call that a quota, although I hate the term, but it can certainly be used.

*S. O. 31*

In other cases, of course, if the same number of people apply for a position, the qualifications of each applicant can certainly be evaluated, as one should always do.

We have always been given the following objection: “Oh, you want to favour women, but you do not want them to be as competent as men”. Unfortunately, I am often inclined to say “as competent as males”, because I find using that kind of argument very sexist. Of course women are as competent as men, in all fields.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** It being two o'clock, the House will now proceed to Statements by Members, pursuant to Standing Order 31.

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*English*]

### INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY

**Mrs. Elsie Wayne (Saint John):** Madam Speaker, on this International Women's Day I appreciate the opportunity to recognize women from my riding who have contributed to the success of their community.

Dr. Eileen Travis was the first president of the Saint John Board of Trade; the Hon. Shirley Dysart, the first woman Speaker of the Legislative Assembly of New Brunswick; Mrs. Mary Munford, the first female Common Clerk of the first incorporated city in Canada, Saint John, New Brunswick; and Mrs. Anna Boyle, a woman with 12 children who works tirelessly to improve the quality of life for persons with disabilities. The Sisters of Charity of the Immaculate Conception provides vital outreach and support for social services.

As 1994 is the International Year of the Family it is important that I mention the work of the Saint John Council of Women. The council is constantly striving to improve the health and well-being of families in Saint John.

Finally it gives me a great deal of pleasure to inform the House that the first YWCA was established in Saint John, New Brunswick, in 1870 by Agnes Blizard.

\* \* \*

[*Translation*]

### DAY CARE SERVICES

**Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie):** Madam Speaker, day care services do not meet the growing needs of families in Canada and Quebec.

The lack of day care spaces and the cost often prohibitive of this essential service is causing a prejudice to women. In many cases, they cannot work outside the home. Not only are they deprived of their right to work, but also, for those who are single parents, they are being condemned to poverty.

*S. O. 31*

However, I want to pay tribute to the courage and dedication of the day care employees who do a tremendous job looking after our children, and this for far less than adequate wages.

In this year of the family, it is high time that government acts and invests in a day care network rather than keep saying it is important.

\* \* \*

[English]

### JUSTICE

**Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley):** Madam Speaker, I would like to address an issue of concern to all of society.

In British Columbia three recent murder trials have produced a very disturbing trend. In each instance those accused were acquitted or convicted of a lesser charge of manslaughter because they had been under the influence of drugs or alcohol. In at least one current murder trial this defence will likely be used.

Unfortunately, not only is the substance abuse defence in vogue for current trials, but individuals already convicted of murder are now appealing their conviction, citing this defence. If this trend continues it will be difficult to get a murder conviction in Canada.

While the legal profession may defend this trend as being in step with the current law and legal precedence, the general public is outraged.

If the government were serious about its promise to protect women and children from violence it would change the law to make people responsible for their actions.

\* \* \*

### INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY

**Mrs. Bonnie Hickey (St. John's East):** Madam Speaker, I want to take this opportunity today, International Women's Day, to speak on the future of young women in Canada.

(1405)

Young women face the same pressures as their male counterparts when they consider their future. They are concerned about obtaining a quality education and about having employment opportunities. However they face the added pressures of being women in a society that is not always receptive to their needs and is often hostile.

I urge the government to take into account the unique needs of young Canadian women as it addresses the overall social and economic needs for our society.

If we are ever to obtain full equality we must first obtain economic independence. We must improve our education and training opportunities for women and we must provide them with employment opportunities.

### INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY

**Mrs. Beryl Gaffney (Nepean):** Madam Speaker, today is International Women's Day. I would like my colleagues to join with me in giving special prominence to the dedicated work carried out by stay at home mothers.

Women at home with children must deal not only with the isolation and stress of 24-hour a day child care responsibility, but also with the invisibility of their work.

Stay at home mothers are dismissed by employment experts as persons with no employment record, no history of promotion and no record of job skills. They have no set hours, no holidays, no sick leave, no pensions, no safety regulations and no rights to negotiation.

Census statistics provide the data used by all levels of government to develop policies and programs for society. Yet unpaid work in the home and in the community is not included in the national census.

As a result few community resources have been available for women caring for children because such caring is neither recognized nor understood as work.

Mothers at home clearly have rights and these rights must be recognized.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY

**Mrs. Pierrette Ringuette-Maltais (Madawaska—Victoria):** Madam Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to salute all women and young girls who choose to fulfil their potential.

I want to mention the presence in our gallery of my daughter, Andrée-Julie, who, even at her young age, sees the future from a different perspective than I or my mother did.

In 1994, we will be celebrating the 75th anniversary of the right to vote for women in New Brunswick, a right they acquired on April 17, 1919. Forty-eight years later, a woman was elected for the first time in our province and 68 years later, two francophone women were elected members of the New Brunswick legislature.

I encourage women to participate in politics. There are no women's issues, as there are no issues concerning only men; there are only collective problems which must be addressed collectively.

\* \* \*

### INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY

**Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval):** Madam Speaker, on this International Women's Day, the Bloc Québécois members want to acknowledge the exceptional work of all those who decided to

help women and children victims of violence by establishing a great network of shelters.

These women have given our society an absolutely essential kind of resource and they continue to give generously of their time and energy so that this network may really play its role in supporting women and children who are victims of violence.

What a marvellous thing to devote one's talents and resources to justice and human dignity. Hats off to all the women who give of themselves to establish and operate these shelters for victims of violence.

The members of the Bloc Quebecois want to assure you of their total support in your efforts to reach your goals.

\* \* \*

[English]

#### INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY

**Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary North):** Madam Speaker, I rise on the occasion of International Women's Day to express my personal appreciation for the opportunity to live and work in Canada, a country in which citizens have the freedom to pursue personal and professional goals with few systemic barriers based on distinctions such as gender or racial and linguistic background.

Where our laws and the actions of our governments discriminate against anyone today, let us change those laws and actions and pursue the goal of equal treatment for all Canadians.

Our pursuit of fairness and open opportunities for all Canadians should command our strong support and commitment, not because we are women or men or happen to have any other identifying characteristic, but because we are Canadians.

(1410)

I urge all members of our society to continue to work together to move away from an emphasis on difference and special status. It is my belief that our proudest moment will be when we as Canadians can truly celebrate equality of citizens day.

\* \* \*

#### INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY

**Hon. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon):** Madam Speaker, today on International Women's Day I ask the House whether women are truly advancing in our society.

I use three key measures through which we might decide the answer to that question. The first one is with regard to poverty and women. Latest statistics demonstrate that over 58 per cent of female led single parent families live in poverty and over 45

*S. O. 31*

per cent of unattached elderly women continue to live in poverty.

The second measurement is violence against women. Every 17 minutes there is a sexual assault committed in Canada, 90 per cent of those victims are women, the rest are children. That means three assaults during the time of question period.

Finally turning to employment and women, women in full time work still earn less than 70 per cent per hour of what men earn. We must have, and I challenge the government to bring in, a full national child care program to assist women and men in our society and to put special emphasis on visible minority, aboriginal and immigrant women who suffer double discrimination in our society.

\* \* \*

#### SHEILA GENAILLE

**Mrs. Anna Terrana (Vancouver East):** Madam Speaker, today on the occasion of International Women's Day we have in the House Ms. Sheila Genaille, president of the Métis National Council of Women.

Ms. Genaille is sixth generation Métis and a strong advocate of Canada and aboriginal peoples. She has a long experience in federal, provincial and Métis government processes.

The research director of the Métis Nation of Alberta, Ms. Genaille has been instrumental in helping the Métis find their proper place in history by managing the Métis Cultural Centre and developing and collecting historical and cultural information pertaining to the Métis.

Ms. Genaille has been the president of several organizations, including the Louis Riel Historical Society and the Edmonton branch of the Alberta Geological Society. Currently Ms. Genaille is the Minister of the Status of Women and Minister of Culture for the Métis Nation Provisional Government.

On International Women's Day it is an honour and a privilege for me to pay tribute to a woman who has performed in an outstanding manner not only for her peoples but for all Canadians.

On behalf of all my colleagues in the House I wish to congratulate and thank Ms. Genaille for her efforts and commitment.

\* \* \*

#### WOMEN IN SPORT

**Mrs. Georgette Sheridan (Saskatoon—Humboldt):** Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to address the House on International Women's Day on behalf of women in sport.

*S. O. 31*

Saskatchewan's Sandra Peterson served as my inspiration. This past weekend Sandra's rink won the national women's curling championship, the Scott Tournament of Hearts, for the second consecutive year.

As the only female MP from Saskatchewan, it gives me great pleasure to extend my congratulations to Sandra Peterson, Jan Betker, Joan McCusker and Marcia Gudereit.

The Peterson victory made the front page of the Saskatoon *Star-Phoenix* sports section in colour. Public recognition is crucial to the advancement of women in sport to provide self-validation for the individual and role models for our young girls, to enhance public funding and economic opportunities for women in professional sports.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY**

**Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition):** Madam Speaker, today I would like to join my colleagues in stressing the invaluable role women play in society and in our private lives. Far from being a day to give men a clear conscience, March 8 must go beyond symbols and remind us of how much remains to be done for the women's cause.

It is fitting to stress achievements, but it is even more important to renew our commitment to bring about this long-awaited sex equality. Democracy, justice and humanism require the implementation of economic and social conditions which will enable women to reach their full potential and reconcile their many roles.

This new awareness is even more important for us, MPs and party leaders, in a House where only 18 per cent of seats are held by women. Let us recognize in that figure a deficiency of our democratic system and a serious political failure that must be addressed urgently.

\* \* \*

(1415)

[English]

**SARAJEVO**

**Mrs. Jan Brown (Calgary Southeast):** Madam Speaker, this is written to acknowledge our collective responsibility to the human good.

It is called:

And Sarajevo Makes Me Cry

Hatred is not a contradiction

But a gruesome paradox

Cultures squeezed together no longer benign but malignant

Enmeshed in the bloodied pulp of accusation,  
The living and the dead.  
After-burner eyes that hold such surprise  
A brief shock of pain  
The sweet breath of fire  
Savage passions, indecent, finally expelled  
Like torched paper  
To blow apart in the wind  
And emerge as blood-pools  
This withered generation  
Small sad voices.  
Our world sits on its haunches  
Watching Evil's root  
Envelop the thin veneer of civilization  
And the deadly seeds of war scatter our history  
Conflict becomes a relationship of severed parts  
choking on its grief.  
Our world of relevance gone mad  
Where even the onlookers  
Fully misunderstand.

\* \* \*

**INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S WEEK**

**Ms. Judy Bethel (Edmonton East):** Madam Speaker, during International Women's Week it is important to recognize the achievements of women who have come to Canada from different parts of the world. The story of immigration in Canada is the story of Changing Together, a centre for immigrant women in Edmonton.

This year the centre will celebrate 10 years of service. It is a place where immigrant women come together to help each other realize their full potential through active participation in Canadian life. It is women helping women through English language classes, job training and search skills, information and referral services and cross-cultural friendship.

\* \* \*

**INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY**

**Ms. Paddy Torsney (Burlington):** Madam Speaker, Canada is on the cusp of change.

Increasingly Canadians are aware that our country must evolve to the point where women are recognized and accepted as full and equal partners. Raising awareness is the first step but concrete action must follow for Canada to progress.

As a woman member of Parliament I encourage all of my colleagues to recall the positive changes taking place as the participation of women in this Chamber has increased.

I am awestruck when I think of our foremothers, Nellie McClung, Agnes Macphail, Therese Casgrain, their work and their sacrifices as they struggled to acquire the vote for all Canadians, to have us recognized as persons within the

*Oral Questions*

Constitution and the challenges they faced as solitary women of Parliament.

What has been achieved to date must not be forgotten. While women are present at every level of government, I must remind everyone that only 120 of the 3,771 MPs who have been elected since Confederation have been women and 53 of us are here today.

Today is International Women's Day and as members of Parliament from every region let us work together for equality for all Canadians.

---

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[Translation]

### STATUS OF WOMEN

**Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata):** Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Deputy Prime Minister.

Liberal unemployment insurance reforms will set us back 20 years, because to establish benefit levels, public servants will have to determine the number of dependent children. This means that women on low incomes will be the first to suffer as a result of these reforms.

Would the Deputy Prime Minister agree that these changes aggravate the injustice to women by putting the onus on them to prove they have dependent children?

**Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment):** Madam Speaker, the reason why we are increasing unemployment insurance benefits by 3 per cent for low-income individuals is that many women who are single parents should be getting more unemployment insurance benefits. That is why the Minister of Human Resources has increased disposable income for women, and especially for single parents whose responsibilities are considerable.

**Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata):** Madam Speaker, does the Deputy Prime Minister realize that her reforms will reduce to 55 per cent, not raise to 60 per cent, the level of benefits for unemployed women, since their incomes are often the family's second income?

**Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment):** Madam Speaker, most women who are single parents have only one income. That is why they are single parents. And these women will receive 60 per cent.

(1420)

Before the election, they were getting only 57 per cent. However, thanks to the Liberal Party's reforms, people on low incomes will get an increase, and this is being done to help

women who are single parents and carry a considerable financial burden because they are raising their children on their own.

**Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata):** Madam Speaker, the Deputy Prime Minister will agree there are women in Canadian society who are not single parents. There are also women on low incomes, or who are unemployed, in households where the man is the sole bread winner. With this reform, the government perpetuates the myth that a woman is financially dependent on her spouse. Will the Deputy Prime Minister admit it and say so, once and for all: yes or no?

**Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment):** Madam Speaker, the hon. member seems to be talking out of both sides of her mouth. We have introduced reforms that will increase amounts paid to people on low incomes. People who have a second family income will get 55 per cent. But all individuals who are below the average, in other words, most women now receiving unemployment insurance benefits, will get an increase, thanks to Liberal reforms that reflect the recognition that those who are less well off should get more.

**Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Québec):** Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance.

Not only does his budget attack the Unemployment Insurance Program, but it is completely insensitive to unemployment and job instability affecting women in particular. In March of 1993, the actual rate of unemployment among women was over 20 per cent.

Does the Minister of Finance not agree that his budget not only reduces UI benefits to women but also contains no job creation strategy to give them a glimmer of hope?

**Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Québec):** I want to take this opportunity, on International Women's Day, to congratulate you, Madam Speaker.

First of all, this budget does foresee job creation, and women are certainly included. When you look at all the funds going to training, the pilot projects often referred to by the minister and the rollback of UI premium rate, which will foster job creation, you can really see this budget truly creating employment, and employment for women, Madam Speaker.

**Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Québec):** Madam Speaker, will the minister stop burying his head in the sand and admit that his infrastructure program, which is creating mostly temporary employment, gives absolutely no hope to women seeking employment?

**Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Québec):** On the contrary, Madam Speaker. First of all, many women do find work in so-called conventional infrastructure. And within the broader definition given by the President of Treasury Board, if you think of the much broader definition of

*Oral Questions*

infrastructure used with regard to Atlantic Canada for example, there are many jobs open to women, in tourism for instance.

On the other hand, we must not forget that the majority of businesses starting up, the small and medium-sized businesses, are run by women and that they are more successful. So, basically, in our budget, the emphasis is on small business creating jobs for women.

\* \* \*

[English]

### MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT RETIRING ALLOWANCES ACT

**Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River):** Madam Speaker, my question is for the Deputy Prime Minister.

Yesterday my colleague from Calgary Centre asked the Prime Minister about the gold-plated pension plans for MPs. In his response when the Prime Minister talked about salaries for MPs and NHL hockey players, he failed to mention one important difference: NHL hockey players do not have five-year no-cut contracts.

(1425)

The question was about pensions, not salaries. Does the Deputy Prime Minister believe that after just six years of service MPs deserve a pension for life?

**Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment):** Madam Speaker, I am really happy to receive the question, in particular on International Women's Day.

One of the things that makes the presence of women in the House so unique this time is that we can use lots of analogies. Hockey may be one we want to stay away from because many hockey players get no-cut contracts.

**Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River):** Madam Speaker, we have noticed that pension payments for members of Parliament who served in the last Parliament have increased dramatically. We need to come to terms with this regardless of how amusing it may seem.

The Prime Minister often boasts of the swift action he took on the EH-101 helicopters and the Pearson airport deal.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Miss Grey:** When may we on this side of the House applaud just as uproariously when the government acts swiftly on the outrageous cash-for-life pension plan for MPs?

**Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment):** Madam Speaker, the public is rightly concerned about the compensation of members of Parliament

and I in no way intend to diminish that debate. That is why the very first action of the President of the Treasury Board was to set up a parliamentary committee so all members could have input into this most important issue.

However the member and the new members who are getting a handle on the workload of this place do a disservice to the Canadian public when they leave the impression that somehow we are here because of a cash-for-life lottery.

If I wanted to make money, I would take my talents and brains and apply them in lots of other places where I would not be dependent on a pension but would be remunerated far more per hour for the work than I do in this place.

**Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River):** A further supplementary question, Madam Speaker. We are talking about fairness of pension plans in the public sector as well as fairness for members of Parliament. There is a huge difference.

Statistics Canada reports that a 30-year old working Canadian may reach retirement and find there is no money left in the Canada pension plan to offer him or her a secure retirement. Is the Deputy Prime Minister prepared to stand in the House and tell that 30-year old Canadian that untold millions of dollars will be made available to MPs for gold-plated pensions but there will not be enough for people who worked far more than six years in other professions?

**Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment):** Madam Speaker, I have a six-year old Canadian who I fully expect to be working outside the home for most of her adult life. Obviously I and every other member of Parliament want to make sure that she has the security she needs and deserves. That is why we have promised to take a look at the issue.

The hon. member is throwing around these figures about the way we are making ourselves rich in Parliament. Obviously her colleague right behind her is in receipt of two pensions and we want to make sure that when we do parliamentary reform it is fair. We want to involve all members in the discussion to ensure that issues like double dipping are dealt with and make sure that pension reform is fair. It is important to restore the public's faith in the system.

We are not in this place to make a buck. I wish the Reform Party members would start to understand that.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### COLLÈGE MILITAIRE ROYAL DE SAINT-JEAN

**Mrs. Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral (Laval-Centre):** Madam Speaker, my question is for the minister of defence.

*Oral Questions*

The government is using the fact that it must significantly cut Canadian military expenditures to justify the closure of the Collège militaire de Saint-Jean and the transfer of training activities to Kingston.

(1430)

Does the Minister of National Defence not recognize that budget cuts are no justification for the government's decision since activities are not being eliminated, but merely transferred from Saint-Jean to Kingston?

*[English]*

**Hon. David Michael Collette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs):** Madam Speaker, that is not quite accurate. The hon. member knows we have been decreasing the size of the armed forces. In fact in the recent budgetary statement the size of the armed forces will go from about 76,000 at present to 66,700. It goes without saying there will be a reduction in the number of officers required.

It is not true to say it is simply a rollover, taking the people from St. Jean and putting them in Kingston. There is an overall reduction. That is why we need to centralize in one particular location.

*[Translation]*

**Mrs. Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral (Laval-Centre):** Madam Speaker, can the minister tell us clearly what kind of savings the current government intends to realize by transferring activities from Saint-Jean to Kingston and can he give us some figures?

*[English]*

**Hon. David Michael Collette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs):** Madam Speaker, I would be pleased to show the hon. member the figures if she would come to the standing committee next Tuesday when I will be appearing and defending the estimates for the Department of National Defence. She can have all the answers she wants.

\* \* \*

**PENSIONS**

**Mrs. Sharon Hayes (Port Moody—Coquitlam):** Madam Speaker, my question is for the President of the Treasury Board and was inspired by a large group of women and men, the Armed Forces Pensioners Association of Canada.

The issue facing them has been festering since October 1992. That issue is the stonewalling of their many attempts to gain approval from Treasury Board for a group dental plan paid for by payroll deductions. This will not cost taxpayers one cent but simply will allow these pensioners to have a better and more efficient system.

In the 50th anniversary year of D-Day, is the President of the Treasury Board prepared to implement this plan on behalf of those who have served our country so well in the Canadian Armed Forces?

**Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure):** Madam Speaker, I thank the hon. member for advance notice of the question.

Over the years in addition to statutory deductions made from the payroll there have been numerous requests with respect to charitable organizations, social recreation associations, credit unions, et cetera, for deductions to be made at source. It is to the point where it has stretched the limit of our personnel resources to be able to cope with them.

My officials have undertaken a comprehensive review of these deductions requested by third parties. That review is just about complete and will be coming shortly to my attention. We will certainly take into consideration the concerns of the pensioners from the armed forces group and others who have very worthwhile causes and terrific needs to be met on behalf of former employees.

**Mrs. Sharon Hayes (Port Moody—Coquitlam):** Madam Speaker, just as a reminder, the hon. minister's own colleague, the Minister of Finance, stated in a letter dated January 25, 1994 that he too recognized the association's desire for a prompt resolution and decision.

I would ask that the minister be specific as to when these armed forces pensioners can expect to have an answer and their plan implemented.

**Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure):** Madam Speaker, I expect we will be in a position to answer that question in the very near future. As I indicated a few moments ago the study is nearing completion. It will be examined shortly by Treasury Board and we will give it every consideration.

I again thank the hon. member for the question.

\* \* \*

*[Translation]***STATUS OF WOMEN**

**Mrs. Pauline Picard (Drummond):** Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Justice. In a report published today, the Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women is concerned about the considerable increase in applications for excision in Canada, excision being the sexual mutilation of girls.

Does the minister intend to follow up the recommendation of the Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women to ban by law any genital mutilation of girls?



*Oral Questions*

(1435)

**Hon. Sheila Finestone (Secretary of State (Multiculturalism) (Status of Women)):** Madam Speaker, any act of violence against women is unacceptable in Canadian society. We are committed to put an end to this form of discrimination and violence against women. I assure you that we read the report that was released and that we will educate women in those communities through the Department of Health so that they know what practices are acceptable and what practices are not here in Canada. I hope that they will understand that it is not acceptable, here in Canada or anywhere else in the world.

**Mrs. Pauline Picard (Drummond):** Madam Speaker, does the minister not think that a specific law criminalizing the practice of excision would be more advisable?

*[English]*

**Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada):** Madam Speaker, it is the advice of the Department of Justice and indeed my own initial view that the present sections of the code are sufficient to prohibit the conduct described and to render it criminal activity.

I agree with the hon. Secretary of State for Multiculturalism and the Status of Women that our focus should perhaps be on education and proactive steps to alert health care professionals and others who see evidence of this conduct so that it is brought to light, investigated, punished and thereby prevented.

May I say that in view of the statistics presented by the council in its report released today and in view of the case that it makes for a specific prohibition in the code, I am happy to take a fresh look at the question. England has a specific prohibition against such practices. I shall look at it afresh with the Department of Justice.

I will be happy to let the hon. member know within the month what position we take concerning the suggestion she has made.

\* \* \*

**DIVORCE ACT**

**Mrs. Daphne Jennings (Mission—Coquitlam):** Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Justice.

In view of the fact we are in the year of the family and the roots of families who now have small children have begun with grandparents, would the minister consider bringing in an amendment to the Divorce Act which would require judges to consider the access rights of grandparents to children in a divorce action?

**Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada):** Madam Speaker, let me first express my grati-

tude to the hon. member for Mission—Coquitlam for her consideration in furnishing advance notice of the question.

I acknowledge the importance of the subject matter. Sadly, given the incidence of dysfunctional families in this country today it is often the grandparents who are the principal source of stable and continuous guidance and care for children. That must be recognized.

Last year the Department of Justice initiated a broad process of consultation concerning the custody and access provisions in the Divorce Act. That process ended on December 31 by which time we had received hundreds of submissions. Among them were submissions that went directly to the point raised by the hon. member. We are now in the process of examining those submissions.

There will be a federal—provincial—territorial meeting with attorneys general and ministers of justice from the provinces toward the end of March. This subject is on the agenda. We will give it consideration. I am certainly open to the suggestion. I will keep the hon. member abreast of the developments in respect of the issues she has raised.

**Mrs. Daphne Jennings (Mission—Coquitlam):** Madam Speaker, I will be presenting over 3,000 petitions tomorrow in support of this.

Would the minister also consider a further amendment to the Divorce Act that would give the grandparent who is granted access the right to make inquiries and to be given information as to the grandchild's health, education and welfare?

**Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada):** Madam Speaker, I will be happy to add that to the matters under consideration. Again I will let the hon. member know what it is we discuss with our colleagues at the provincial level.

\* \* \*

*[Translation]***STATUS OF WOMEN**

**Mrs. Francine Lalonde (Mercier):** Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister responsible for Public Service Renewal. One of the most important questions for Canadian women is that of equal pay for work recognized to be of equal value. There is even an act forbidding any discrimination of this type in Canada. As an employer though, the federal government does not abide by it. A study has clearly shown that more than 80,000 women in the public service are not receiving as much as men for work of equal value.

(1440)

Is the government planning to give the proper example to employers on the subject of pay equity by committing itself to true wage parity between men and women working for the public service?

*Oral Questions**[English]*

**Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure):** Madam Speaker, pay equity is a priority of this government. We want to ensure that women in fact all people are paid in a fair and equitable fashion according to the duties and responsibilities they carry out. We are a pay equity employer.

There is a dispute on the extent of some of the back pay required to bring some of the classifications up to date. That matter is before a tribunal and also is the subject of some examination at Treasury Board. It is hoped we can bring about a settlement with the bargaining agents of our employees.

However we believe in and give priority to pay equity.

*[Translation]*

**Mrs. Francine Lalonde (Mercier):** Madam Speaker, given these conditions, does the minister recognize that in freezing all government employee salaries by means of the budget, the government is penalizing Canadian women even more because it is thereby confirming imbalances that already exist within its own compensation structure?

*[English]*

**Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure):** Madam Speaker, when my colleague delivered the budget to the House he indicated in bringing the deficit down it was necessary to freeze salaries for a further two years.

We are anxious to bring that to an end sooner if at all possible by finding efficiencies in the delivery of programs and services, and to examine roles and responsibilities as my colleague to my right is doing. Hopefully we will be joined in that exercise by our employees and their bargaining agents so that we can at the earliest possible time restore the opportunity for all of our employees to enjoy salary increases.

I might add that over the last few years even though there has been a salary freeze in three of the four years, because of the incremental increases on average increases of about 3 per cent have been going to our employees.

*[Translation]*

**Mr. Nick Discepola (Vaudreuil):** Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Public Works and Government Services. In my riding, which has a population of 110,000, 80 per cent of whom are francophones, there is no emergency shelter for abused women and children. For the moment, battered women must seek refuge on the West Island, a mostly English area, and far from the family environment.

*[English]*

I implore the minister to recognize that measures must be taken to rectify this urgent matter. On this International Women's Day will the minister assure the battered women of the riding of Vaudreuil that they will obtain the necessary support

for the construction of a desperately needed women's shelter with the shortest possible delay?

*[Translation]*

**Hon. David Dingwall (Minister of Public Works and Government Services and Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency):** Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for his interest in this important issue.

*[English]*

The hon. member raises a fundamental question all members of this House must confront. Canada Mortgage and Housing has been at the forefront of providing financial assistance with regard to emergency shelters as well as self-contained units. At the present time we are in negotiations with the province of Quebec regarding eight additional shelters. I would be happy to take the hon. member's representations on notice.

I do want to say to all members of the House that as legislators it is time for us to look at all possibilities in terms of those who are the victims of family violence.

(1445)

I find it passing strange that women and children must leave the family unit while the spouse, the husband in most instances, remains in the family unit. I think it ought to be the other way around.

\* \* \*

**FARM CREDIT CORPORATION**

**Mrs. Jan Brown (Calgary Southeast):** Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture. My concern is for the small business sector, specifically the family farm.

The Farm Credit Corporation is designed to provide financial assistance to Canadian farmers to help establish viable farm enterprises. This purpose is strangely at odds with the outrageous statistic that the Farm Credit Corporation, a crown corporation, owns 1.250 million acres of indebted farmland.

Will the minister agree in the House today, based upon his election promise, to immediately undertake the long awaited review of the Farm Credit Corporation and put a stop order on further evictions until the review is completed?

**Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food):** Madam Speaker, I thank the hon. member for her question and thank her for her courtesy in providing me with advance notice of the question.

During the 1980s almost \$1 billion in accumulated farm debt in the Farm Credit Corporation was effectively written off by the Government of Canada. This was followed by a policy review beginning in 1989 which resulted in a new mandate for the Farm Credit Corporation which was accepted I am told with broad support in the House of Commons at that time and brought into effect in the spring of 1993. That new mandate includes the

*Oral Questions*

enhancement of rural Canada by providing specialized financial services that are related to farming.

In our election platform last fall, we proposed three new financial instruments to assist farmers: an agricultural equity development program, a vendor loan guarantee program and a long term mortgage program, including certain protections against interest rate fluctuations.

I am pleased to tell the hon. member that the Farm Credit Corporation is now making substantial progress in devising the details of these new instruments, as we had undertaken to do in the fall of last year. I hope to be in a position to make some specific announcements this spring.

**Mrs. Jan Brown (Calgary Southeast):** Madam Speaker, I thank the Minister of Agriculture. I have a further supplemental. This is quite a specific issue.

Today in New Liskeard, Ontario, a family is living a nightmare as they await eviction from their family farm on Thursday, two days from now, March 10. This business enterprise represents a perfect example of a system gone wrong when 117 per cent of the farm's value has been offered but has been refused by the Farm Credit Corporation and no reason has been given for such a refusal.

Will the minister agree to an immediate cessation of any further action on this particular eviction until a full review with all of the parties present is held?

**Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food):** Madam Speaker, I am sure the hon. member will appreciate that it would be inappropriate for me to comment on specific FCC cases on the floor of the House of Commons.

I do want to assure her that I will insist that the Farm Credit Corporation deal with all of its clients in a fair and balanced way, taking into account the legitimate rights and interests of the farmer clients involved and also taking into account the fiscal integrity of the corporation which I am sure is important to the hon. member in the Reform Party.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**STATUS OF WOMEN**

**Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides):** Madam Speaker, my question is for the Deputy Prime Minister. In its recent budget, the government imposed a five per cent cut on all Canadian volunteer organizations. When she was in the opposition, the Deputy Prime Minister vehemently opposed cuts imposed by the

previous government to volunteer agencies, including of course to centres for women who are victims of violence.

Now that she sits on the other side of the House, does the Deputy Prime Minister intend to fight with the same determination the despicable cuts imposed by her government to volunteer organizations in its last budget?

(1450)

**Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment):** Madam Speaker, obviously when Canadians ask the government to tighten its belt, it creates problems. It was not easy to close military bases; it was not easy to impose a salary freeze to federal civil servants, including women who are at the bottom of the wage scale.

Our job is certainly not an easy one but we have to do it. If Canadians have given us a mandate, it is because they want us to make the right decisions, given the financial situation in which we find ourselves right now.

**Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides):** Madam Speaker, how can the Deputy Prime Minister think she is credible when her point of view and her attitude change completely, depending on where she sits in the House?

**Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment):** Madam Speaker, if there is a woman who has been defending the rights of women in this House it is certainly not the one opposite who does not even want to be there. I think it is important that we work together to ensure that women have their place everywhere, including in the House of Commons. This is what the Liberals fought for before the last election, unlike the party opposite.

I might add that, thanks to the initiative of women such as the hon. Secretary of State, no cuts will be made to budgets for women's programs. Indeed, not one penny is taken out of the budget allocated to the minister responsible for the status of women, and I have this information directly from the minister responsible, because women in our caucus do a good job.

\* \* \*

[English]

**ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE**

**Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley):** Madam Speaker, my question is for the Solicitor General.

One provision of the government's budget was to eliminate the incremental pay increases. While most people can accept this for senior employees and managers, in some areas it hits particularly hard.

One of the hardest hit groups will be the recent RCMP recruits who when they leave Regina are paid approximately \$30,000.

Prior to this freeze incremental pay would see their salaries rise every six months, recognizing their training so that at the end of three years they would be making a first class constable's salary of approximately \$50,000. With this budget the new recruits will be frozen at approximately \$30,000 for two years.

Does the minister find it acceptable that this budget targets the low salaries of junior members of the RCMP as an area to save money?

**Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada):** Madam Speaker, I do not accept the hon. member's premise that this budget targets the salaries of RCMP constables. The budget deals with a freeze of salaries of public servants generally while maintaining their employment which is not the case for a lot of people in the private sector, although we are working to create jobs for Canadians generally.

I will be happy to review the situation with the President of the Treasury Board.

**Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley):** Madam Speaker, recently a 35-year veteran of the RCMP described to me that this policy is the greatest attack on the morale of the RCMP members that he has seen in his career.

Is the minister prepared to accept the inevitable drop in the morale of Canada's police force as a result of this effort to save money on the backs of those members who can least afford it?

**Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada):** Madam Speaker, I again reject the premise of the hon. member's question. The budget is not an attack on RCMP constables or any group of public servants.

However, I will be happy to review this matter with the President of the Treasury Board. I have greater confidence in the morale of the RCMP than the member. I am sure that is the case for all members on this side of the House.

\* \* \*

#### CENTRES OF EXCELLENCE

**Mrs. Sue Barnes (London West):** Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Health.

During the fall election campaign many members of the Liberal Party campaigned on the creation of a network of centres of excellence on women's health. We need to develop a women's health curriculum, promote and conduct research on women's health issues, develop health policies and recommend health programs.

(1455)

On behalf of the men and women of Canada I would like to ask the Minister of Health what steps has she taken to date to implement this very important agenda.

#### Oral Questions

**Hon. Diane Marleau (Minister of Health):** Madam Speaker, we are proceeding with the centre of excellence for women's health as outlined in the red book.

Right now we are in the process of outlining specific criteria and an application process. We expect to issue the call for application by June and to select a successful applicant in the fall. We would like the first centre to commence its work early in 1995.

One of the centre's initial tasks will be to determine the most important health issues for women and then to undertake further work on these issues. The ultimate objective of the centre is to increase the responsiveness of the Canadian health system to the health needs of women.

It is a known fact that only a small percentage of medical research funding in Canada has been directed toward women's health research. While the centre will address this problem, we also want to work more closely with other research funding bodies in order to encourage them to send money in the direction of research as well in women's health.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

#### STATUS OF WOMEN

**Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint-Hubert):** Madam Speaker, according to the Office of the Commissioner for Federal Judicial Affairs, as of March 1, 1994, the federal government had appointed 951 judges to Superior Courts and Courts of Appeal. Of these 951 judges, only 123, less than 13 per cent, were women. This situation shows a total lack of foresight within the process used until now to select and appoint judges to the bench.

**Mr. Young:** That is terrible.

**Mrs. Venne:** Madam Speaker, I would like to be able to put my question.

**Mr. Bouchard:** It is the Minister of Transport.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** Order, please. The Minister of Transport.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** Order.

**Mrs. Venne:** Madam Speaker, my question is not for the Minister of Transport, but for the Minister of Justice.

To what extent do the minister and the cabinet intend to encourage from now on the appointment of women to the bench?

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** I think the hon. member knows she did something usually considered unacceptable.

I would ask the Minister of Justice to answer the question.

*Oral Questions**[English]*

**Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada):** Madam Speaker, the question that has been raised is important.

We are not going to preserve and maintain the confidence of the public in the system of justice and the judiciary unless we have a bench that is representative of Canada not only with respect to gender but also with respect to the diversity of Canada's society.

As the minister in this government responsible primarily for bringing forward recommendations to cabinet for judicial appointment, I shall make it my business to ensure that we bear in mind the need for gender balance as well as the reflection of diversity on the bench in Canada.

It is true to say that there are not enough women judges in the federal courts today and that perhaps reflects the appointment practices in the past. So far as this government is concerned we are going to bear in mind the need for gender equality as well as representativeness generally in appointing judges to the federal bench.

*[Translation]*

**Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint-Hubert):** Madam Speaker, the gap is so significant that to fill it we would need to award all new appointments to women, but I am not asking for that much.

Will the minister recommend that, for the next several years, at least 80 per cent of all positions becoming vacant be filled by women?

*[English]*

**Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada):** Madam Speaker, I do not think the answer lies in attaching specific numerical or mathematical quotas in terms of the appointment of judges and I do not propose to approach it from that perspective.

(1500)

I give the House my assurance that gender equality and representativeness are important considerations that will be brought to bear every time we make recommendations to cabinet. May I invite the hon. member's attention to the appointments made by the government to date. May I ask her to observe that fully half of those appointed since we took office are women.

\* \* \*

**CANADIAN FLAG**

**Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary North):** Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Foreign Affairs.

When an official news conference is held at one of our embassies or high commissions is the display of the Canadian flag discretionary at such an event?

*[Translation]*

**Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of Foreign Affairs):** Madam Speaker, it seems to me quite obvious that the Canadian flag should be on display.

\* \* \*

**CENTRE OF EXCELLENCE FOR WOMEN'S HEALTH**

**Mrs. Maud Debieu (Laval East):** Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Health.

The government has announced on several occasions—in the red book, in statements by the minister and in the budget speech—the creation of a centre of excellence for women's health, without giving further details. A short while ago, she was asked about this centre, but she could not provide a satisfactory answer.

If the minister cannot talk about the mandate and priorities of such a centre, could she tell us what its budget will be?

**Hon. Diane Marleau (Minister of Health):** Madam Speaker, we are presently preparing the criteria for the first centre of excellence for women's health. It will only be the first of several we want to establish in the near future, because it is essential that we deal with the question of women's health.

\* \* \*

*[English]***ETHICS COUNSELLOR**

**Ms. Margaret Bridgman (Surrey North):** Madam Speaker, my question is for the Deputy Prime Minister.

It is reported in the *Globe and Mail* today that Mitchell Sharp is expected to be appointed as the government's first ethics counsellor.

During last fall's campaign the party opposite promised to consult with the opposition parties prior to appointing an ethics counsellor. Can the Deputy Prime Minister inform the House if there will be consultation with both opposition parties prior to this appointment?

**Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment):** Absolutely, Madam Speaker.

\* \* \*

**INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY**

**Hon. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon):** Madam Speaker, my question is for the Deputy Prime Minister.

On International Women's Day there are many things the government could do to improve the equality of women but I

want to propose to the Deputy Prime Minister that her government undertake two very simple things that could be done right now.

They concern two actions of the previous government. First, would the government agree to withdraw the appeal of the previous government on the ruling of the Canadian Human Rights Commission that the federal government be ordered to institute the pay equity settlement to female public sector workers. Second, the previous government denied the right of employees of members of Parliament to collectively bargain. A large majority of those employees are women. Would the government act on that issue as well?

**Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment):** Madam Speaker, first I would like to congratulate the member who is the first woman leader of a national political party. She has been a role model for all women in Canada.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Ms. Copps:** Second, on the issue of the specifics of the court challenge we are exploring the possibility of discontinuing that challenge. The matter is now before the President of the Treasury Board.

On the issue of employee bargaining I can assure the hon. member that each member of Parliament is free to address this matter in his or her own way. In fact in the last Parliament the assistant in my office was one of those who was very active in the organizing process.

The member would agree that on the issue of freedom of a member of Parliament's office I do not think it is the responsibility of the government or a particular political party to decide for the whole House but rather individual members of Parliament have the right as any Canadian does for their employees to seek to organize.

\* \* \*

(1505)

[Translation]

#### WOMEN REFUGEES

**Mrs. Eleni Bakopanos (Saint-Denis):** Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration. In the red book, the Liberal Party of Canada committed itself to extending refugee status to women persecuted on gender grounds. Previously, women refugees victims of violence and abuse in their country of origin were deported and forced to return to this dangerous environment.

[English]

In the context of International Women's Day I wish to ask the minister what the government is doing to fulfil its commitment to refugee women.

#### Government Orders

[Translation]

**Hon. Sergio Marchi (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration):** Madam Speaker, I would like, first of all, to thank my colleague for Saint-Denis for her question and her interest in immigration and refugee matters.

[English]

First, I am very proud that Canada is the only country with guidelines in its refugee determination system that permit women to make claims based on gender persecution. One hundred and fifty women have made such claims. Over 70 per cent have been accepted.

Second, since 1988 we have had a women at risk program that allows us to select those women who are most at risk and most vulnerable in their societies in our overseas selection of refugees. The international community has much more work to do because the majority of international refugees are women and young children, while the majority of refugees selected by countries are male. We have miles to go before we sleep.

\* \* \*

#### PRESENCE IN GALLERY

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** I wish to draw to members' attention the presence in the gallery of Ms. Bettie Hewes, Deputy Leader of the Opposition of the Legislative Assembly of Alberta.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** I would also like to recognize the presence in the gallery of the Mayor of Edmonton, Ms. Reimer.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

### GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[Translation]

#### SUPPLY

##### ALLOTTED DAY—STATUS OF WOMEN

The House resumed consideration of the motion and the amendment.

**Mrs. Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral (Laval-Centre):** Madam Speaker, it is on March 8, 1911, that for the first time ever, many countries decided to pay tribute to the courage and tenacity of women.

This acknowledgement of women's role in our society did not happen by chance; it was due to the relentless efforts of female pioneers who had decided to fight the poverty, inequity, and violence their sisters were faced with every day of their lives.

*Government Orders*

I want to salute the relentless efforts of these women who have been and are still fighting so that equality among human beings, men and women alike, may one day be a reality.

I want to wish all Quebec and Canadian women, and especially the women in my riding of Laval-Centre, a very happy day. They can count on my unfailing commitment to promote and fight for their rights. We still have a long way to go.

Women's economic situation, in Canada as well as in Quebec, is tragic. They are the first ones to be affected by the ravages of poverty, this scourge which has become rampant in our so-called developed society.

(1510)

The situation is even more tragic for women who are single parents. More than anybody else, they bear the brunt of the present economic crisis.

We can only paint a rather dismal picture of the situation. Statistics and columns of figures show the extent of the problem. However, figures do not reflect the increasingly desperate situation of these families, these women who are fighting for their survival and their children's. Spurred on by the economic crisis, the government goes to war, but instead of targeting poverty, it targets the poor.

The latest budget speech and the planned reform of social programs are blatant examples of this. The government seems to remain insensitive to the plight of the hundreds of thousands of women who are the sole support of their family and who do not have a hope to make it without the government's help.

Very often, if they work outside their homes it is because financially they have to. It is to be able to survive that these women, who support their families, have to rely on the government's assistance. According to the latest figures—

*[English]*

**Mrs. Wayne:** Madam Speaker, I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but I would ask a question of Madam Speaker.

All through question period I waited to ask a question. I have not been afforded an opportunity to ask a question in the House since I was elected. You had said—

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** I am sorry, I do not find this to be a point of order. I remind the hon. member that she was on statements. She was eighth on the list for questioners and we did not get to number eight. I tried everything I could to get as many people on as I could today. We went over the time for question period by almost five minutes. I am sorry but I did everything I could. I do not think we should interrupt debate. That could have waited until after the hon. member had finished.

*[Translation]*

**Mrs. Dalphond-Guiral:** Madam Speaker, according to the most recent statistics available, in 1991, there were 1,883,140 families in Quebec. Of that total, 268,000 were single parent families and, of those, 82 per cent were headed, as you have guessed, by women.

In Canada, the situation is similar; Statistics Canada data indicate that one family out of seven is a single-parent one. Women who are heads of single-parent families are more likely to be poor than men or women living in any other types of families: nearly 62 per cent of them live below the poverty line. In 1990, female single parent families had the lowest income, on average \$26,906—gross income of course—compared to \$42,953 for single parent families headed by men. The incidence of poverty in single parent families headed by women is clear. Within a mere two years, the income of these families has dropped by about \$3,000.

Single mothers must often take on complete responsibility for the physical, material and psychological well-being of their children. Such a reality explains why the recent trend reveals that some important changes have occurred in the social fabric of Canada and Quebec.

(1515)

According to Statistics Canada, being a single parent usually results from the failure of a marriage and from child care being entrusted to the mother. These mothers are often younger and their education level lower than that of fathers who head single-parent families. These young mothers must work to support their children and therefore, have to leave school. They cannot acquire the necessary skills to get good quality jobs and consequently, cannot hope for a better income. They find themselves limited to low quality types of jobs.

According to the National Action Committee on the Status of Women, a staggering number of unemployed single mothers were living on a gross annual income of barely more than \$12,000. These are 1991 figures. Everyone will agree that this is well below the poverty level.

Almost all the available income of these women came from the state, in the form of family allowances, unemployment insurance benefits, social assistance, retirement pensions and other types of benefits.

Poverty is a vicious circle which is very difficult to break without outside help, particularly if you are a woman who is a single parent and who must work to ensure her survival and that of her children. Yet these women are most likely to find underpaid jobs. They are classic victims of the precariousness of employment and the division of work, a modern calamity for a society in constant evolution which strikes young workers and women.

*Government Orders*

Another economic burden supported by single mothers is the excessive cost of housing. According to Statistics Canada, 54 per cent of single parent families were renting the dwelling in which they lived. The rate is much lower for men who are heads of single parent families, since it is around 37 per cent. What is alarming is the fact that 56 per cent of single parents who are women spend more than 30 per cent of their income on housing, while, and so much the better, only 32 per cent of single parents who are men spend the same proportion of their income on housing.

Today, on March 8, we must acknowledge that the situation of women is tragic. The era of collective impoverishment has very much arrived and the question is how long it will last. In the meantime, Canadian women are paying the price. Everyone in this House agrees that poverty is a problem which must be solved. We must go to the root of that problem right now. The government has not only a political and administrative responsibility, but also a moral responsibility towards Canadians. Wishful thinking, white books, sham policies and political programs which turn from red to blue with every possible nuance no longer have their place in 1994.

This government can, if it wants and especially if it so believes, show the way by facilitating access to education and employment for single mothers, and that includes, among other initiatives, the setting up of a national day care network which would be primarily available to those families who need it the most. And, Madam Speaker, as you know, these families are the ones headed by women.

(1520)

Another measure could be taken to improve the financial situation of single mothers. An increasing number of women are being economically discriminated against because of a provision of the Federal Income Tax Act concerning the taxation of support payments made to the parents who are given custody of the children and who are women for the most part, as we well know. We will not have to mention it anymore, since it is becoming so obvious. Right now, the tax reform undertaken by the government does not address the issue.

The principle according to which any deductible amount for the payer, that is the ex-husband, is added to the income of the recipient, that is the single mother who has custody of the children, dates back to the 1940s. At that time, Madam Speaker, we were both quite young.

Everyone will agree that our society has changed significantly during the last 50 years. The government must accept its responsibilities and reconsider this principle which greatly affects the financial security of single mothers. Those are only a few of the measures which could improve the financial situation of women, of their family and of all members of our society.

The wealth and the vitality of a society largely depends on its concern for the young. Healthy kids make for healthy families. The basic needs of an individual must be fulfilled for him or her to grow. Our young people need to be well-fed, to be well-housed, to have some place warm to go, and to be loved in order to grow and become reliable and happy adults.

During the Year of the Family, I think it is the responsibility of members of this House and of this government to do whatever they can to ensure all families in Quebec and in Canada enjoy the best health possible. I am convinced that on this day, March 8, our leaders have listened a bit more carefully to the needs of our society.

Madam Speaker, what I should have told you earlier is that, starting with my speech, our interventions will last ten minutes.

*[English]*

**Mrs. Marlene Catterall (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board):** Madam Speaker, I am very pleased today to join my colleagues in saluting International Women's Day.

*[Translation]*

I am very pleased to join you today to celebrate the International Women's Day, which gives us the opportunity to acknowledge all the progress made by women as well as the improvements yet to come. We are lucky to live in such a prosperous country as Canada, but Canadian women still have a long way to go to live in all the comfort enjoyed by Canadian men.

*[English]*

While we celebrate the achievements of women and generate new energy and co-operation for continued progress and growth, our commitment to a goal of economic equality for Canada and everywhere in the world must remain strong. We want Canada to continue to be a world leader in the pursuit of this goal.

Canada will continue to set an example for the world in its defence and respect of the rights and freedoms of individuals. The right of women to be treated equally with men without discrimination is enshrined in the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms and specified in the Canadian Human Rights Act.

(1525)

As we speak about equality, we speak often about social equality and we speak often about political equality. Increasingly however we as policy makers and we as women realize that political and social equality will remain elusive goals until we have economic equality.

In recent years, the pursuit of economic equality for women has been linked to a simple but important concept, equal pay for work of equal value. This concept goes beyond the notion that



*Government Orders*

men and women should be paid the same when they are performing the same work.

The reality is that men and women tend to do different kinds of work, for whatever traditional reasons that has happened, that is the reality. Whether they are performing the same or different work, they deserve to be paid fairly. We need to find ways to measure and compare the value of work that is significantly different.

I have to ask a question. Why is a dog catcher paid twice as much as a child care worker? How does the work performed by a secretary compare to that performed by an electrician? Is it worth more or is it worth less? We now have the tools required to make that assessment and to ensure that when jobs are found to be of equal value appropriate wages, equal wages, are provided.

The federal government is the largest employer of women in this country. For that reason this government wants to show employers across the country that it is simply good business to pay men and women fairly and to pay them equally if they are performing work of equal value.

After all, a fair wage will allow employers to recruit and retain qualified workers who will contribute to the quality of their service or product into their competitive edge. More important perhaps, a fair wage will enable women to become full partners in the economic growth of our country.

Women expect to receive fair wages for the work they perform. They deserve to receive fair wages for that work and this government is working toward that goal.

Since the proclamation of the Canadian Human Rights Act in 1978 that enacted and enshrined the principle of equal pay for work of equal value or pay equity, the government, the Canadian Human Rights Commission, unions and employees have worked toward making it a reality.

Many complaints have been resolved co-operatively. Many others and far too many others have been the subject of long and bitter battles. This has been a period of learning, a period of trial and error. This government wants to build on these experiences and ensure that equal pay for work of equal value is achieved through the joint efforts of all interested parties.

In 1985 in the public service a joint union-management study on equal pay for work of equal value was undertaken in the federal public service. Today the results of the study are being contested in front of the Human Rights Tribunal. I do not need to tell anybody who is familiar with the whole progress of that case that it has indeed been long and contentious and that we sitting on the other side of the House objected to the strategies and tactics of the previous government in what we felt was delaying the work of that tribunal.

However the Human Rights Commission does have the responsibility to investigate all complaints of violations of the Canadian Human Rights Act and to order corrective actions where it concludes that violations have occurred.

This Liberal government fully endorses the important role of the Human Rights Commission and of human rights tribunals in protecting Canadians from discrimination and eliminating discriminatory practices.

In spite of the continuing debate, a lot of good came from the joint union-management initiative on equal pay. It was the first time that a joint endeavour had been undertaken to implement section 11 of the Canadian Human Rights Act.

A great deal was learned. Until now 70,000 employees in predominantly female occupational groups received approximately \$317 million in retroactive equal pay adjustments. Approximately \$81 million is paid in ongoing annual adjustments.

(1530)

Overall since the enactment of the federal equal pay legislation over \$500 million has been paid in equal pay adjustments in the resolution of various complaints. Much has been achieved and much has been learned. We as a government continue to work toward a full resolution of the issue.

The achievement of equal pay for work of equal value requires the use of a common tool to evaluate all jobs whether they are performed predominantly by men or by women. That tool must be gender neutral. It must not be based on the traditional differences in what roles women have assumed and what roles men have assumed. It must recognize the value of all aspects of the work performed whether traditionally by men or by women.

This is why this government will pursue efforts undertaking to develop a universal classification standard in the federal public service that is gender neutral. Many dedicated persons have already committed their time and effort to this project. It is not an easy task to revamp the whole job evaluation system of an organization the size and complexity of the Public Service of Canada.

We want to ensure that the universal classification standard is the right tool to achieve our goals of simplicity, transparency and fairness. When we are satisfied that it is, we will implement it to ensure we have a durable basis for the resolution of pay equity issues.

After the Canadian Human Rights Act was passed in 1978 many provinces followed suit and enacted legislation on equal pay for work of equal value. The more recent provincial models are more prescriptive and specific than the model we adopted early on at the federal level.

As a result of the growing interest across the country in the achievement of pay equity, there is a growing library of ideas, experiences and jurisprudence in this field in Canada today.

*Government Orders*

However, equal pay for work of equal value remains a field rife with controversy. Parties in every part of the country debate over the right evaluation tool or plan, the right job data, the right wage comparison methodology.

I can assure hon. members today that this government is interested in results. Government is looking for real, realistic and realizable means of achieving this important goal for the economic equality of Canadian women. We are continuing to address equal pay for work of equal value complaints and issues as they arise. We will use whatever creative means are necessary to ensure that fairness and equity are achieved.

Already the President of Treasury Board has engaged in dialogue with public service unions. We welcome their suggestions on any matter that may enable us to reach a definitive and co-operative solution to pay equity complaints.

[*Translation*]

Indeed, this government wants to establish ties of co-operation and trust with union representatives in the federal Public Service. We are going through hard economic times and we must co-operate to minimize the impact on employees, while continuing to provide quality service to all Canadians.

[*English*]

Some hon. members know the Canadian Human Rights Act applies to employees of the federal government, crown corporations and private companies under federal jurisdiction such as banks and telephone companies. It covers approximately 300,000 women workers. I am confident the implementation of equal pay for work of equal value in the federal public sector will set a precedent for similar progress in industries across the country. That is why it is so important we get it right.

On this important day I am pleased to play a part in the resolution of the economic concerns of Canadian women. I am determined to help make progress toward the economic equality of women with their male co-workers. Equal pay for work of equal value is only one step, albeit an important one in achieving this economic equality.

(1535)

I have long been appalled by the wage gap reported in an industrialized country as prosperous as ours. Full implementation of equal pay for work of equal value will not fully close that wage gap, but it will go a long way. Unequal wages do not fully explain the wage gap.

One of the major problems is the concentration of women in certain occupations which are usually low paying. Women remain concentrated in traditionally female jobs. In 1991 over 50 per cent of women in Canada were concentrated in clerical, sales and service jobs whereas just over 20 per cent of men were

in those occupations. Coincidentally these happen to be among the lowest paid jobs in our society.

To achieve economic equality equal pay for work of equal value programs need to be coupled with diversification in the work choices available to women. Just as important is the need to eliminate all types of employment discrimination so that women have equal opportunities based on their ability to move into management, to move into any kind of job that is suited to their talents, their abilities and their interests.

We often hear and there have been comments to this effect in this House today that employment equity is discriminatory. Employment equity eliminates discrimination. Employment equity ensures that only one's ability matters in whether one gets hired or promoted or advances in employment.

[*Translation*]

Economic equality for women in Canada and elsewhere can only be achieved with a combination of programs such as pay equity and employment equity. I personally intend to play an important role in these fields and to challenge all employers in Canada to be models for the whole world of employers who treat their female employees equally.

[*English*]

I thank you for your attention. I compliment all my colleagues who participated in this debate today.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup):** Madam Speaker, I listened carefully to the hon. member's speech and I was particularly interested in the whole issue of employment equity for women because I have two daughters who will be in the work force in a few years and, after the question period we just had, I was wondering what message we were sending to young people growing up when we say that the fight against the deficit is preventing us from correcting pay inequities.

A moment ago, the deficit was given as a reason for not acting and not correcting an unacceptable situation. Fifteen years ago, other reasons were given and in ten years, still other reasons will be given if we do not correct the situation immediately. So for the sake of young women now in the education system who will be on the labour market in the 21st century, could you not tell us publicly that your government's present position should be changed and corrected to put equity ahead of the deficit?

**Mrs. Catterall:** Madam Speaker, I have the pleasure to inform the hon. member that I too have two daughters who work in professional jobs and I hope that their future will be a little more comfortable than what the previous generation had to put up with. So we share an interest in women's future prosperity. I think that the President of the Treasury Board clearly indicated in this House that pay equity is not an option. There is no choice between pay equity and fighting the deficit. The two are separate. We are looking for ways to correct that. As I just said,

*Government Orders*

we invited the unions to talk with us about finding a solution for pay equity. I hope that they will come and meet with us to pursue these discussions in order to come up with a solution finally. We did not use the deficit as an excuse for not solving the problem.

(1540)

[*English*]

**Mr. Dick Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley):** Madam Speaker, I listened with great interest to the hon. member's comments. For the most part I appreciate what she had to say.

I do have a concern in one area. It is when the hon. member talks about pay equity for jobs of equal value. The government is embarking on a formidable task. As I understand the proposal the government is intending to defy decades upon decades of experience where the marketplace has established the level of wages to be paid in any particular occupation.

To give an example of this, my wife works part time in a ladies fashion store in my home town of Prince George. She works very hard and puts in long hours. In my opinion she gets paid about one-third of what she is worth. Nevertheless she likes the work so she does it. I believe she works every bit as hard as an electrician for example who earns \$25 an hour plus benefits.

The question is: Could that retail store afford to pay her \$25 an hour if my opinion stands that she works as hard as an electrician? The answer of course is no.

This idea of trying to equate the wages a tradesperson makes with the wages of someone in a totally different job category where the wages have been determined by years of market experience is almost an impossible task. One cannot say a secretary should make the same as a painter because they are two different occupations and the level of the painter's wages has been set by the market.

Another interesting point is it seems to me when all these commissions come up with their findings they never ever say the wages in a particular category are too high and should be lowered. It is always the other way around. It is remarkable there has never been an instance in my understanding where the pay scale has been overvalued in a job and that pay scale should have been brought down to match a job of equal value. It is always the other way around and wages are raised.

I am not saying people should not earn as much as they possibly can. As a matter of fact because of our tremendous deficit and debt which has been incurred with the help of this government and the previous government people have to earn

more money. The taxation levels are so darn high that the disposable income is now hardly enough to get by.

(1545)

It is not a question of high wages. We are talking about job valuation. I believe the government is attempting to defy years upon years of market driven levels. It is embarking on a formidable task. I believe that it is going to be almost impossible to come up with a plausible conclusion to this study.

I would like to ask the hon. member if her government intends to try to defy all this history and come up with this new formula, reinventing the wheel, so to speak.

**Mrs. Catterall:** Madam Speaker, perhaps I can give the hon. member some specifics on this history that I think we intend to defy. Since 1978, over a decade and a half, equal pay for work of equal value has been the law in this country but it is still far from the reality.

We intend to defy history. Why should this government be exempt from legislation that applies to every other employer in the country?

We intend to defy the tradition that has ensured that women are poorer than men throughout the country; that has ensured that women are concentrated in the lowest paying jobs in this country; that has ensured that the largest percentage of single parents, women, live in poverty as well as their children. We intend to defy those traditions.

The member has commented that the market has determined these things. He mentioned a personal example. It may be fine for his wife, if he wants to bring her into the debate this afternoon, to work for less than a living wage. It is not fine for a woman who has to support her children.

Perhaps the member can tell me why a dogcatcher gets paid more than somebody who looks after the welfare of children, twice as much I might say. He might have a reasonable explanation for that.

The fact is that we have traditionally had a society in which men have done most of the money making work and in which women have traditionally done most of the unpaid work. That unfortunately has carried over into the labour market in which the work most often performed by women is seen as less valuable; in which the salaries of women have been seen as peripheral to the economic well-being of the family. For many families that is no longer the case. The exploitation of women doing work of equal value for less pay is no longer acceptable. It is not.

The market does not always establish fairness. It is up to a society to take some leadership in establishing fairness.

*Government Orders*

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides):** On this International Women's Day, it is with great pride that I take the floor in this House. This day set aside for us is, in my opinion, essential and it has the added advantage of providing an opportunity to reflect on the situation of women in our society.

Those 24 hours devoted exclusively to women increase the awareness of people and make us more aware of our problems—those very real and numerous problems we are faced with every day.

In a letter dated February 8 to the Prime Minister, the Advisory Council on the Status of Women provides a list of 17 priorities requiring analyses and policies at all levels of government in order to set up a framework based on equality. Equality is the operative word that we should always keep in mind when we are called upon to take a position, to make a choice, to set policies or to initiate action.

(1550)

These 17 points proposed by the Council deal with well known areas. However, when you group them in some ways or when you try to relate them one to another, you realize that being a woman in our society is a major handicap. Job creation, safety at home and in the community, status of native women, women's health and health care, income security, wage parity, daycare services are areas where we suffer unfairness, iniquities and indifference.

As a woman member, I consider myself privileged to have the tools which allow me to protest on behalf of my sisters. Every opportunity I get, I consider it my duty to draw the attention to the situation of women. I believe all women members should do the same. Moreover, our actions within our caucuses should always be aimed at improving the condition of women.

Despite our demands and our actions, despite the efforts of women's groups, the situation is not improving very fast. The slow pace of reform and the lack of strong and specific measures to deal with urgent problems clearly demonstrate that decision-makers are very reluctant to promote women's causes.

What bothers me most with this passive and indifferent position towards women is that we are failing to respond to the legitimate expectations of 52 per cent of the population. Women are a majority in our society. Given this 4 per cent majority over men, I feel that we have an obligation to meet women's needs. Alas, in actual fact, the reality is something else entirely.

This situation brings us to question the role of women in the system. Power and representation, particularly at the political level. Our presence in legislative bodies.

First finding: 53 out of 295 members of this Parliament are women. Since 1980, our numbers have increased. We went from 17 female members of Parliament to 27 in 1984, 39 in 1988, and 53 today. It is an interesting increase but one that is clearly insufficient.

While women make up 52 per cent of the population, we only constitute 18 per cent of members in this House. On the other hand, while 48 per cent of the population is composed of men, our male colleagues account for 82 per cent of members in this House. These figures show that the current Parliament and those of the past—when numbers were even more disproportionate—do not reflect at all the male–female ratio in the population.

This underrepresentation clearly puts women at a disadvantage. It also raises the whole issue of women's political representation. Before going any further on this, I want to point out that this imbalance also exists in the Cabinet. Only 6 out of 31 ministers and secretaries of state are women. This underrepresentation also prevails in every major sector of activity. Power is certainly not in the hands of women.

Faced with this statistical evidence, this Parliament is certainly not a microcosm or miniature version of our society. This numerical imbalance, combined with long-standing male dominance, affects all women's issues. It has become imperative for us women to show our feminist beliefs and to politically represent women if we want our lot to improve.

Our male colleagues are rather reluctant to embrace the idea of representing the female population.

(1555)

For the purposes of a study conducted in 1993 by Manon Tremblay and Réjean Pelletier, 24 elected female representatives and 24 elected male representatives were interviewed. Sixteen of the 24 women, or 66.7 per cent, agreed that they had a special or additional duty toward the female population. As for the men, more than three in five, or 60.9 per cent, felt that women representatives had no obligation to maintain closer ties with women voters.

Since the majority of male representatives believe that we, women elected representatives, should not give greater consideration to women, we can only imagine how they must view women in general. The status of women is surely not at the top of their priority list. Far from it.

I also read with interest in the 1993 annual report of the Lobbyists Registration Act that women's issues rank 42 out of 52 in terms of the number of times raised by lobbyists. In other words, this issue is not very important to them. Women's issues do not, therefore, benefit from this important access to the government. While it may be true that women's groups do not have vast financial resources, it is equally true that lobbying is a predominantly male field.

*Government Orders*

I will say no more about the ability and willingness of men to espouse women's causes. I know that some of my colleagues are not part of the statistics quoted here and are staunch supporters of our cause. However, the fact remains that on a daily basis, women are confronted with serious problems to which no solutions are being advanced.

I have no doubt that if women held 52 per cent of the seats in this House, things would be quite different. Some studies indicate that women show more humanism and develop ethics of responsibility in the performance of their duties. This concern for the person is evident from the remarks of this female member of Parliament who was quoted in the Tremblay and Pelletier report as saying that: "Our management of political power relies much more on understanding and feeling for the human element, the people, I would say, and we are more aware of the consequences of our actions—We see things differently. Our femininity comes into play and gives a much more humane quality to politics".

There should be more women in politics. It is becoming imperative, if we are to see more humanism and feminism in politics, with humanism setting the human being and human values above everything else and feminism seeking improvement of the condition of women in our societies.

When they look at the situation in their ridings, all the hon. members of this House can see that the country is in dire need of humanism and feminism. Poverty, misery, violence and isolation affect an increasing number of people. They are becoming pervasive and, if nothing is done, the process will soon be irreversible. Soup kitchens, shelters for battered women, child abuse centers, housing problems facing families, street children as well as lonely and less and less cared for older people speak loudly of unfeeling governments and their lack of regard for human values.

These serious problems did not crop up overnight. They have been around for far too long already. Lawmakers are aware of them, yet they do not act on these inhuman conditions often, actually very often, affecting the status of women. One day, it is all going to blow up in our faces. And governments will reap what they have sown.

Let us face it, and studies back up this statement, we would be facing a very different situation if more women were and had been in power. Let us have more women in power, by all means. Imagine a Parliament, the make-up of which would be the opposite of this one, a Parliament with 82 per cent women and 18 per cent men. Why not?

(1600)

The truth of the matter is that women continue to face gender-based obstacles. That is why the Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women recommended the reactivation of the Royal Commission on Electoral Reform and Party Financ-

ing, with a mandate to review and report on matters raised by women groups in their briefs to the Commission.

In closing, here lies a colossal challenge that we must take on. Fundamental changes are required, and what better place than Parliament to act upon society as a whole! It is up to us, men and women who are not blinkered, to make it happen.

[English]

**Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay West—Revelstoke):** Madam Speaker, the hon. member who just spoke has obviously spoken with a lot of personal passion as to her feelings on this matter.

Although there have been many inequities in the past and no doubt some forms of discrimination, one cannot make that right overnight. It has been suggested that 52 per cent of the constituents in this country are women. Why do they need special concessions in order to have the amount of elected representatives proportionate to the number of people who are out there if they have 52 per cent of the vote?

It seems that women get to make these choices as well. There should be no obstacles placed in front of a candidate seeking election, male or female. However, given that 52 per cent, the majority of all the voters, are women why then do we have to provide special incentives and special clauses for women in order that they get elected?

There were some suggestions made that I heard a number of times that one has to have more women as members of Parliament since one cannot have representation for women with men since men are not able to properly represent women's issues. Does that suggest that wherever we have a riding with a woman representative the men's issues are not looked after? I think not and I would not agree with that any more than I agree with the latter.

It was suggested that lobbying is a male occupation. Lobbying is also something that is kind of looked down upon now and we are trying to cut down on the number of people who are lobbyists. Why would women want to get into a profession that we have been trying to squeeze out and put down because it is simply not one that is appropriate for this day and age of Parliament?

I would suggest that the right way for us to go is to end inequities, to give the same opportunity for all people. By all means, women should have every right to reach whatever their potential is. There is absolutely nothing that says in a free society in which there is absolutely no discrimination that there will be equal numbers of men and women in every occupation. That is absolutely absurd.

There are things that women do better than men in some areas and there are things that men do better than women in other areas because of physical attributes or because of many other different things in their make-up. I would suggest that what we have to do is be equal, give them the same opportunities. Whatever is the

*Government Orders*

proper proportion will evolve. We cannot change the system overnight.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Guay:** Madam Speaker, I would not want to be the hon. member's spouse because the relationship would not last very long.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Mrs. Guay:** I have full proof that a lot remains to be done before women can have their place in society, and particularly in politics. This is the only comment I will make, but I do hope that the hon. member has a wife who will teach him to respect women.

**Mr. Osvaldo Nunez (Bourassa):** Mr. Speaker, on International Women's Day, I want to offer my best wishes to all women in Quebec and Canada, and also to the millions of women throughout the world, and particularly in Latin America.

I especially want to pay tribute to women who are union activists, who are immigrant in Quebec, and to the women in my riding of Bourassa, in the north of Montreal, who are very involved at all levels of the political, economic, cultural and community fields.

(1605)

Last week, I visited several community organizations headed by women, including the Centre d'action bénévole de Montréal-Nord, which just celebrated its tenth anniversary. I feel honoured to have been asked to preside the ceremonies as honorary president and I want to congratulate the director of that centre, Mrs. Josée Aubertin, for her excellent work.

I also met Mrs. Lise St-Jean and other officials representing Halte-femmes in the north of Montreal, an organization helping women who have been or who are victims of domestic violence. Halte-femmes offers these women various activities and services such as a hot line and meetings to discuss issues, escorts to court or to visit professionals, awareness workshops on violence against women, information meetings, a documentation centre, outings, special activities for immigrant women, etc.

I also want to salute the members of the Montréal-Nord chamber of commerce who had the wisdom to elect Mrs. Micheline Gervais as their president, thus benefitting from her initiative and great skills.

Allow me to mention two more organizations which are doing a remarkable job in my riding: first the Association Entre-Parents, a support group for parents in the north of Montreal, which has set up a day care centre and a community kitchen, under the

co-ordination of Mrs. Louise Cossette, and second, the Impulsion-Travail Group, which under the direction of Mrs. Johanne Joly, tries to help women with work-related problems to find a job or return to the labour market.

I would also like to acknowledge the contribution of the FTQ, its labour councils and affiliated unions, as well as its status of women service. Last December, the FTQ held its biannual convention in Montreal, where I had the opportunity to speak to more than a thousand delegates.

During this convention, the FTQ approved a policy statement on violence against women, in which it mentions that, as the central labour body in Quebec, it is very concerned about the increase of violence in today's society. More and more tragedies, like the one which occurred at the University of Montreal's École Polytechnique, have forced us to realize that we have to take action.

As opposition critic for citizenship and immigration, I would like to mention the significant contribution of immigrant women to the Quebec and the Canadian societies, especially those women faced with three times the challenge since they are women, workers and immigrants.

It is a well-known fact that, on average, women earn much less than men. What is not so well known is that immigrant women earn 80 per cent of the average wages paid to women in our society.

There are about 20 millions refugees in the world and 80 per cent of them are women and children. Recently, the whole world was horrified to learn that rape had become a general practice in Bosnia.

I want to take this opportunity to send a message of solidarity and, inasmuch as I can, a message of hope to those women. Today, I ask the Canadian government to be more compassionate towards the women of Bosnia who are persecuted and create special assistance programs in order to help them.

More specifically I ask the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration to accept a greater number of refugees from the former Yugoslavia and to give special consideration to women who were raped.

I would also like to bring to your attention the special problem of women who request refugee status because they fear persecution based on their gender. Unfortunately, in the Geneva convention of 1951, gender is not mentioned as a specific reason for fear of persecution justifying the granting of refugee status. But in certain countries, women are in fact being harassed simply because they transgressed some rule, regulation or religious custom which is discriminatory towards women.

*Government Orders*

(1610)

The religious precepts, social traditions or cultural standards women are accused of not respecting vary greatly.

Canada must do more to guarantee better protection and hospitality to those women, particularly women from countries where such dramatic situations occur. I want to emphasize that this effort should be inspired by the fact that the UN declared 1994 the International Year of the Family.

Finally, I would like to raise a very serious question concerning the mutilation of women's genital organs. I strongly support the request of the Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women urging the federal government to show leadership in ensuring that female genital mutilation does not happen in Canada and to ensure assistance is available here to women who suffer the long-term health effects of such a practice.

Such violence against young girls and women must be vigorously denounced. It is clearly a violation of their fundamental right to physical integrity.

Several countries, including Sweden, Norway, Belgium, Great Britain and certain American States, have already taken steps to that effect, adopting policies to stop female genital mutilation and passing legislation banning the practice on their territory.

Between 1986 and 1991, nearly 40,000 people from East and West Africa settled in Canada. In view of the fact that female genital mutilation is widespread in these areas, the risk that this cultural practice is being brought into Canada is very high.

On this issue, the Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women made several recommendations which I want to repeat here, the most important of which is that the federal government introduce a specific law banning female genital mutilation in Canada.

As you can see, a lot remains to be done to redress injustices against women. Therefore, I salute the courage and tenacity of the women who are fighting this battle in Quebec and Canada and I assure them of my support and solidarity.

[*English*]

**Ms. Mary Clancy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to take part in this debate today. I want to begin by complimenting the movers of this motion from Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition. I want to say, however, that there are a few home truths that need to be reiterated on the whole question of gender equality and the topics that we are debating here today.

First of all, I want to say that in this party on this side of the House there is a history of feminism. I speak that word proudly and loudly, again and again. I think of members of this House such as the Deputy Prime Minister, such as the Secretary of State

for the Status of Women, such as the Minister of Natural Resources.

I think of members such as the hon. member for Ottawa West, the member for Nepean, former members such as the member for South West Nova who was here today. I think of the former member for St. Paul, Aideen Nicholson, who was here visiting with us today on International Women's Day. I think back to the first woman Liberal to sit around the cabinet table, the Hon. Judy LaMarsh, who gives her name to a fund that raises money for women who run for public office in our party.

I am proud of the tradition of feminism in the Liberal Party. I am proud of the women I have been fortunate enough to sit with in the House for nearly the last six years. I am proud of the new female members who have joined us this time. I am also proud of my male colleagues, but today is a day to celebrate women and I want to celebrate women. Women have not had a whole lot to celebrate. The fact that we are making some small breakthroughs should not, for even the shortest period of time, allow anyone to stand in the House and suggest that the status of women in this country has achieved equality because it has not.

(1615)

There are a number of us fortunate enough to be here today who because of accidents at birth, hard work and education have managed to make it here. There are thousands, millions of women in the country who suffer every single day from abuse, from poverty, from fear, from cold, from hunger, from things that we should not accept. Every one of us, of whatever political stripe, bears a responsibility for the fact that in a country like Canada in the last decade of the 20th century, that is still happening.

Equality will not exist until women can be free from fear; in their own homes, in their neighbourhoods, in parking garages, in the streets and in malls. Women are dying in those places. Women are being abused, and beaten, and hurt, and left for dead. There is an epidemic of violence against women that is beyond the level of tolerance in a civilized country.

I heard the hon. member across the way—I am sorry I forget her riding, but I know her spirit on this—speak eloquently about Bosnia earlier today. Women in Bosnia are being raped and beaten and degraded on a daily basis, but so are women in Canada, so are women in the United States, so are women in Britain and the European countries. It is a world-wide epidemic and we are not immune.

It is a number of years—and thank God it will probably never happen again—since men in this Chamber laughed when an hon. member brought up the question of violence against women. They laughed. I remember that. I suspect you remember it too, Mr. Speaker. I was not here at the time but I think that perhaps some of the reason for that laughter may have been nervous tension. It may have been, I hope, a total misunderstanding of the situation. That is what I as a feminist and as a member of Parliament and as a woman think is at the root of the problem; a

lack of comprehension by some men and some women. It is a lack of comprehension.

For many good people of both sexes the idea of the abuse of women, violence against women, sexual harassment, sexual discrimination, all of the things that women deal with, if it does not come up and face you, or your wife, or your daughter or your sister on a daily basis, then perhaps it is hard to understand. It is hard to know that it takes place.

Let each and every one of us who are women in this House tell you that you must begin to understand it because it is there. It is your responsibility, each and every one of you, through you, Mr. Speaker, to do something about it, not to merely mouth platitudes, not to merely say something like: "Well, it can't be true that we should have more women because men can't represent women or women can't represent men", or some such balderdash which begs the question.

Until we have a significant, and by significant I means upward of 50 per cent of women in all the legislatures in the country, we do not have true representation. It does not mean that a man cannot represent a woman or a woman cannot represent a man. It means that the way our society reacts is that if women are not there in sufficient numbers, then what is essentially a male patriarchal society decides they are not to be listened to in any louder a tone than their proportional representation allows.

(1620)

That is not happening by accident. That is not happening because the women who sit in the House in all three parties want it to happen. It is happening because of the way all of us have been brought up. It is happening because of the way life has evolved to this point in the latter part of the 20th century.

It does not mean that we put up with it, and it does not mean that we accept it as the kind of situation that Canadians and those people who we all represent feel is correct.

Men can represent women and do on both sides of the House. Women can represent men and do on both sides of the House. But until all of us take very seriously the whole question of gender inequality, then those who do not take the question seriously, those who do not comprehend it viscerally, are not representing their constituents, male and female, to the very best of their knowledge and ability. That is what every one of us wants to do. We want to represent the people who put us here and even the people who voted against us.

### *Government Orders*

The question of pay equity, the question of employment equity, the question of equality before the law, the question of freedom from fear, freedom from violence, are so basic that when I hear them discussed as debatable issues, if you will, I become very angry. That may have shown itself from time to time both in the House and outside once or twice.

The other day I was having lunch in my riding with a woman activist who happens to be black. We were discussing an article in a national magazine about racism and sexism. I said to her that a young black woman activist in the United States said that sexism made her angry but that racism enraged her. My friend said that put it about as well as she had ever heard it. She said that is how she felt. As a feminist, as a black woman, sexism makes her angry but racism enrages her. I understand that too but you take your battles and I guess you apportion your passions where best you can fit your own beliefs.

We can all understand to some degree another person's pain but I cannot truly understand, or truly experience, anti-Semitism or racism, at least in the context in which we know it in this country. I can and have and continue to experience sexism.

The other *isms*, if you will, make me very angry but I guess for me the most visceral is still sexism and sexism enrages me. It enrages me because I know the abilities, the hard work, the dedication of so many women who are voiceless; the women who raise their children, run the volunteer organizations, the churches, the PTAs, the home and school associations, the United Way, the volunteer groups all across the country. Yet all of them to some degree walk out of those volunteer offices and suffer from discrimination in the workplace. Almost all of them will suffer from discrimination in the workplace of one kind or another. Over 50 per cent of them will experience some form of violence, and 25 per cent of them will experience significant violent behaviour, usually more than once in their lifetimes.

(1625)

We have a culture in this country of blaming the victim. We have a culture in this country of wanting to sweep it under the rug. We have a culture in this country of saying it is not as serious, it did not happen, it could have been avoided if she had behaved in a different way.

As with almost every evil under the sun, it is rooted in fear. For some it is a fear of sharing power, for others it is a fear of job loss, for a third group it is a fear of seeming to lose face, if you will, in the power structure that is the family, as wonderful an institution as it may be. In some the power structure becomes the answer as opposed to the loving family that all of us believe in so strongly.



*Government Orders*

Essentially what we are discussing today is an issue of fairness. What makes me so angry, what enrages me so much, is that sexism, discrimination against women, is unfair and a waste. It is a waste of talent, a waste of ability, and a waste of women power that could be put to work to make this country so much more than it is today.

I have been talking about this a lot in the last couple of weeks to journalists, student groups and young people across my riding and in other parts of the country. I have talked about the fact that the increase in the number of women in this House has made it a different Parliament. It is a different Parliament for a whole variety of reasons and I have talked about a certain *joie de vivre* among the women, certainly in my caucus, but I feel it across the way as well. We have reached the numbers if you will, not sufficient by any means, but we have reached at least a level where I believe, Madam Speaker—and may I compliment you on your first Question Period—that we have passed at least the level of tokenism. It is still not enough, we still are not representative, but we have passed the level of tokenism.

It was particularly edifying today to see you in the chair, to see all women at the table, with no disrespect to the gentlemen who occupy those seats right now, and to note that our pages in front of the Speaker's chair were for the most part all female during Question Period. It was interesting to note that with the exception of one token gentleman on the government side, the questioners on the opposition side and on our side were female.

Some people will say that is not necessary, or why do you want to do that, or why do you only do that on International Women's Day. I say, Madam Speaker, that we do that kind of thing because symbols are very important. It is important symbolically that women stand up on this day and speak for each other in support of those things that matter to us. We know they matter to men as well. But it is also important that we stand and speak in our own voices without the necessity of speaking through our male colleagues. It is important that young people—and there were a number of little sisters in the House of Commons today who were shadowing many of the women MPs—see women use their voices on a whole variety of issues, economic and social, today. Each one of us bears the responsibility of communicating to the young women of this country that this Chamber is their place too.

(1630)

Someone once told me that she did not get involved in politics because it was not a very ladylike occupation. I agree that it is not very ladylike. I guess I am fairly glad it is not.

I heard a laugh over there. Thank you. I am not quite sure what it means but I can hazard a guess.

**Mr. O'Brien:** I support you, Mary.

**Ms. Clancy:** Thank you. We were born on the same day. That is why he does that.

The importance of politics not being ladylike is that it must be shown, however, that it is not unwomanly. This House is the place for women. It is the place for as many women who have the desire, the nerve and the ability to get here.

It is also important to note that it is the place for women who hold a diversity of views. That is right also. Just as every man in this House does not believe the same way as every other on a variety of issues, neither does every woman and neither should every woman.

There are members on the opposite side with whom I disagree most vociferously on a variety of issues. There are members on the opposite side with whom I might agree just as vociferously on certain other issues. The point is that this is the House of our nation's debate and the voices of women must be heard here and they must be heard as strongly and as passionately and as frequently as the voices of men.

If we do not pay more than lip service to this, if we do not ensure that the pathways are open for women to get to this House, then we are equally not making sure that the pathways for women are open in all occupations and professions in this country. The bottom line is that is what the resolution we are speaking to is about.

I opened my remarks by saying that I was very proud of women I have served with and continue to serve with in this House. I am proud of my party's record on the status of women. Most of all, I am proud of what we are going to do in a whole variety of areas. I am proud of the blueprints in the speech from the throne and in the budget. I am proud that my colleagues were tough enough to make the hard decisions so that this country will continue but it will also thrive and flourish because of policies.

I am most proud because I know that on this side of the House with the wealth of support for women we will continue to ensure that women are full partners because anything less is simply unacceptable.

**Mr. Elwin Hermanson (Kindersley—Lloydminster):** Madam Speaker, I appreciate the comments of the hon. member opposite. I was interested in her comments regarding the involvement of more women in the House and the feeling of our population, especially the female side, that they could effectively operate within the atmosphere of this House.

I was involved with my party in the nomination process and in the election process perhaps more than some others. I am happy to report that the Reform Party was more successful in electing their women candidates than they were their men candidates, if one looks at the proportion nominated and the proportion elected.

I was also involved with the recruitment of candidates. We certainly encouraged women to seek a nomination in our party.

*Government Orders*

(1635)

I found that one of the factors that made women most hesitant in seeking nominations for election to Parliament was the dignity and decorum of the House itself. The member alluded to the fact that perhaps the atmosphere was unladylike but that one could be womanly in the House.

I found that many outstanding women candidates were very reluctant to place themselves in a position where they would be heckled, cat-called and the like in this Chamber. They felt that they would rather assist and work for their country in other avenues.

I wonder what the hon. member opposite would give me by way of suggestion as to how we could improve the decorum of the House so that we could reduce the number of cat calls. I understand it is much better in this Parliament than it was the last Parliament.

I know sitting on the opposition side we have been subjected on occasions to a lot of hoots and hollering that even as a man I find objectionable. I have heard from many women who also find that atmosphere to be very objectionable. It has been a hindrance to their involvement in politics.

**Ms. Clancy:** Madam Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question.

Actually and this is only half in jest, wholly in earnest one of the best things that we did for improving the tenor and behaviour in the House was electing a new government

**An hon. member:** Hear, hear.

**Ms. Clancy:** Okay, a little response here from these benches. Obviously the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands is not paying attention.

Very seriously, there were some very serious breaches in the last House, no question. I will not demean the honour of this House by repeating them but most of the members know the incidents that I refer to.

There were numerous sexist slurs and at least one very totally unacceptable racial slur. It gave rise to a committee that sat in the last Parliament and dealt with the questions of racism and sexism. I am extremely hopeful that the recommendations of that committee will be coming forward as part of a reform package in the House of Commons.

I would like to make another point because I am a very strong believer in the value of debate, of reasonable but not necessarily totally cool debate. There is a place for passion in the deliberations of a nation. If a member on the opposite side makes me angry, I should display that anger, always within the bounds of the decorum that this House deserves and needs.

I recall my good friend and colleague, the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board, saying at one point in the last House that he would take any insult as long as it was gender and race neutral. There is a tradition coming down to us from the Mother of Parliaments and the tradition in this House of salient debate, of back and forth between members that can add to the whole tenor of the debate if you will. I agree with the hon. member that cat calls and what I can only call dumb stuff is not part of that.

However I would not for an instant want to see us so bland that we would not respond with fairly strong language, not insulting, never racist, never sexist, never pejorative, but there is a place for saying that one thinks that is a pretty dumb thing to say and that that member is going to therefore say it is a pretty dumb thing to say. Maybe the word dumb is unparliamentary. I am not certain.

**Mr. Milliken:** No, it is not.

**Ms. Clancy:** Thank you. Pious windbag—

**Mr. Milliken:** Oh no. That's not good.

**Ms. Clancy:** That is not good. I am just using these as examples.

I would not want us to totally iron out our debate if you would. There is a place for the proper use of the English and the French languages in all their majesty in this House with their use of insult as well. I think there is a place for that.

(1640)

With regard to recruiting women, I was very involved in that process in my party. I am delighted that we were so successful. I think that the language was certainly part of what would have precluded many women from thinking that they would run. However, there is more to it than that. There is more to this being user friendly for women than just the language in the House of Commons.

Sometimes a devastating personal attack can take place in this Chamber with language that one could use in the pulpit of any church in this land. It is not merely what is said. It is how it is said, who is saying it and how it is delivered. I guess I would say that the women who sit in this House, be they Liberal, Bloc, Reform or independent, are probably not frail flowers in the long run. I would suggest to members that any one of us on either side of the House could take anything thrown at us and probably lob it back with pretty good response.

That is not what we should be about here. However, women have to understand that it is incumbent upon them to be here to ensure that the level of debate stays high and does not pander to the kind of thing that we are talking about. If they do not come at all it is never going to happen.

*Government Orders*

[Translation]

(1645)

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Madam Speaker, I believe that there will be unanimous consent for passing two motions.

[English]

I move:

That, if a division on the budget debate is demanded on Thursday, March 10, 1994, the vote on such motion shall be deferred until Wednesday, March 16, 1994 at 6.30 p.m.

Second, I move:

That, on Wednesday, March 9, 1994, the House shall continue to sit past the ordinary hour of daily adjournment for the purpose of completing consideration of report stage and third reading stage of Bill C-3, an act to amend the Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements and Federal Post-Secondary Education and Health Contributions Act; and

That, if a recorded division at third reading be demanded, the same shall stand deferred until Thursday, March 10, 1994 at 10 o'clock a.m. provided that the time taken for the bells and the vote, if any, shall be added to the time provided for government orders in the same sitting, and the ordinary hour of daily adjournment shall be extended accordingly.

(Motions agreed to.)

**Mr. Art Hanger (Calgary Northeast):** Madam Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to speak on International Women's Day to a motion by my hon. colleague to the right which reflects the decidedly left wing politics of Her Majesty's Official Opposition. Despite the good wording of this motion and the good intentions of my colleague, the implications of this statement in public policy are not entirely positive.

For too long in this country debates over equal rights have been confused with demands for special treatment. We have seen emerge a special language of rights, a language which uses the vocabulary of rights along with the good intentions of those who began Canada's tradition of human rights, to further narrow political interests.

While the intentions of people like my hon. colleague may be good, the road to hell is paved with good intentions. The words rights and equality have been stripped of their old meanings. Whereas one used to know that a right had been violated when, for example, one was put in jail without cause, now many feel that a right has been violated when two people with different resumé's, different lifestyles or different biologies do not earn exactly the same income. Whereas the right of equality used to mean the right to be subject to the same laws as, for example, members of Parliament, now the right of equal treatment is taken to mean that each Canadian should receive exactly the same amount of government subsidizing.

While intentions of the social planners and the lobbyists who push for changes in our political vocabulary and the alteration of our political traditions do on the surface display a genuine commitment to the common good, the net effect of their political actions are limiting of freedom, the strangling of private initiative and an attack on the very diversity that is cherished and demanded by the left.

A first broad reading of this motion reveals only a vague purpose. What one needs to do is look at each demand that this motion makes and examine what the real impact of these demands would be. First, the motion demands that this government recognize the principle of economic equality. If we accept that men and women must achieve perfect economic parity, then we have moved beyond equality of opportunity and into equality of result. This motion goes beyond equality of opportunity since equality of opportunity and equality under the law is guaranteed by the charter and by Canada's common law tradition.

That is not good enough for some. For some equality of opportunity really means that minorities, including women, despite the fact that women account for more than 50 per cent of the population, are being systematically singled out and are being restricted from achieving their fullest potentials.

Who is perpetrating this oppression? As usual white males are the culprits of choice. It is said that white males are institutionally advantaged and are maintaining their advantage in the market by excluding others. It is claimed that government programs are being unfair to minorities by not adequately dividing up the pie of federal revenues in a way that ensures the maximum equality of as many people as possible, especially women and visible minorities.

Do these all boy networks exist? Perhaps, but so do female networks and minority networks. Is there a failure of social programs to redistribute wealth in a manner that creates total equality of condition? Yes, and that is as it should be. Social programs were created to act as social safety nets and nothing more. When government makes a decision to change the mission of its programs from safety nets to tools of social change then we have moved away from democracy, given up freedom and sacrificed liberty for the sake of pie in the sky equality.

Is this the price we want to pay for economic equality? I do not think so and I am confident that the vast majority of Canadians do not think so. I am just as sure that there is a contingent of very active, very vocal and very misguided lobbyists and politicians for whom equality of opportunity is not enough. Those people have had their perceptions of reality so clouded by ideology that they cannot see beyond the trees of good sounding intentions and into the forest of an authoritarian welfare state.

*Government Orders*

Next, this motion asks government to ensure equality of employment, salary and living conditions. How exactly can government achieve such noble sounding goals? I am sure the sponsor of this motion has a plan of action in mind and this plan of action undoubtedly includes a redistribution of wealth, hiring practices that discriminate against one group to make up for the alleged discrimination of another.

Government could legislate pay scales. Government could pass a law requiring free housing to be made available for all women. Would these measures work? Would they achieve equality? Yes, in a way. For if government were to engage in this kind of social and economic engineering the result would be a form of equality. We would be equally burdened by poverty as government saps the initiative of entrepreneurs and the capital of business. We would be equally deprived of liberty as government regulates more and more into our lives. We would be free from having to make moral and responsible decisions for ourselves as government in its wisdom takes that decision making power away from us.

(1650)

While it may not be apparent to my colleague in Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, there is an alternative to the equality that comes from massive intervention in all areas of human endeavour. The alternative is equality under the law, equality that comes from equal protection by government from true threats to personal achievement and success.

Canada used to be committed to this vision of equality. Canada used to be a nation in which all individuals were free to participate in the workforce, to succeed economically, to start and develop a strong family unit and enjoy the security, freedoms and equality that come from a good job that can support a strong and intact family.

That vision became unacceptable to the intellectual and political elite in Canada. For the last 20-odd years our elite have been more interested in pushing an agenda of radical change than an agenda for preservation of what works.

An example of what works is creating equality under the law by ensuring that the criminal justice system is able to effectively protect all people. What use is it to demand the right to equal pay when women are afraid to walk the streets alone? What good is it to try to create equality in housing when women often live in fear of abusive partners?

It seems to me that our priorities have become very confused indeed. Further, Canadians are increasingly becoming aware of the inability of government to take over the roles that have been traditionally played by the family. Government, as a result of the very initiatives that are proposed in this motion, has tried to

adopt the role of primary parent, primary guardian of children and even principal breadwinner for many families.

What has come of this?—an over burdened and bloated government, children who are neglected in government subsidized day care rather than being taken care of by parents.

Parents today often have to leave their children with caretakers because taxes take so large a bite out of salaries that one pay cheque is no longer enough to support the in home care of children by a parent.

Again, there is a degree of equality being forced upon us here, an equality of mediocrity, an equality of fear that our justice—

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** I am afraid the member's time has expired.

**Ms. Mary Clancy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration):** Madam Speaker, I have a reality check that I would like to bring in. It may well be that a lot of women, and I have said it myself and I could not agree with the hon. member more, are unsafe in their houses.

That does not mean they should live in houses that are unsafe in and of themselves. It does not mean that we should merely fix one problem to the exclusion of another. It does not mean that if we solve crime in the streets we go on to solving the problems of poor housing.

One of the difficulties of governance is trying to solve more than one problem at a time, lest as we throw out the bath water we are also throwing out the baby.

Those of us on this side of the House, those of us who call ourselves feminists, are also proud to call ourselves people who believe in families. I have a family. Most of us have. I love my family and I believe deeply and passionately in the family.

I have another reality check. This may come as an overwhelming surprise to some people. Women work because they want to. They work because they like to, because it gives them personal satisfaction. They work because they often need a second pay cheque but one can be a working woman and be a good mother.

My father had the bad grace to die when I was seven years old and my mother went out to work to support the family which would probably be acceptable in certain circumstances. Let me say very strongly that my mother, who was a very good mother, loved her job. She enjoyed going out and working. God knows her only child grew up to be a member of Parliament which in some cases may be tantamount to ending up in jail but she thought it was a fairly successful resolution to the bringing up of her only child.

Most of my friends, practically all of my closest friends, classmates, women I went to school with, both work and have children. Their children, contrary to the opinion of some people, are not on crack cocaine or robbing stores or doing any of these things. One of them is taking a course in western civilization at the Sorbonne. Another one is in first year medical school and is

*Government Orders*

also holding down one of the first SSHRC grants ever to be given to a young student. His mother worked from the time he was an infant.

(1655)

Their name is legion, the mothers and children in this country.

Madam Speaker, I believe you raised four sons. My God, I believe you also went out to work.

It is time we rid the myth that working mothers are responsible for the social problems in this country. Right now the vast majority of women, mothers of families, work because they have to to maintain a certain standard. That is true. They do not work for the colour televisions and the trips to Hawaii, they work to make sure that their families have the standard of living they deserve.

Every woman has the right to self-fulfillment. She has the right to go out and earn a living. She has a responsibility and it is usually shared with the father of those children, if he happened to stick around. In most cases they do stick around and go to work as well and they do good jobs.

I am told my time is up and I hope that this will be the last paid political announcement from this side.

**Mr. Hanger:** Madam Speaker, I believe that mothers should have a choice. I never said that they should not. They should have a choice to work. I also believe they should have a choice to remain in the home. I believe that opportunity is rapidly diminishing. I think this is where the government comes in. Its intended expenditure over the next years is going to put greater demands on the family, on mothers and on fathers. It is here that I believe the choice is going to be lost.

In reply to this equality balance, I believe that it is diminishing whether we like it or not. Governments should quickly do something about it and can do something about it in this Parliament.

**Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary North):** Madam Speaker, this is a very interesting debate and I congratulate the members of the Official Opposition for raising these issues. They are very important to society and should be properly examined. Sometimes they generate more heat than light, but I believe the quality of the debate today was very good.

I think the principle we are talking about today is important, one of equity and equality. It is something clearly that many members of this House, probably all members of this House, believe in very passionately and very fundamentally. I think it is sometimes in the interpretation of how this can be delivered that we have different ideas and legitimately so.

The Reform Party has proposed an amendment or an addition to the motion before us. Measures to support the desired outcomes that are set forth in this motion will be provided, will be delivered through providing equality of opportunity without resorting to gender discrimination. I believe that is an issue worth thinking about and worth debating.

The Reform Party does advocate equality of all Canadians regardless of gender. It also supports equality of opportunity without demanding equality of outcome. These are difficult concepts sometimes because they might seem mutually exclusive.

As Canadians we need to decide what kinds of personal choices and freedoms will play a role in what decisions and policies we put in place.

(1700)

Individuals have the right to make choices for themselves. It enhances their dignity. It is sad that many men, women and children in our society who do not have the same freedom of choice live in very disadvantaged conditions. When these disadvantaged conditions are predicated solely on gender, age or ethnic and linguistic background, it is something we ought not to tolerate. Those kinds of distinctions should not determine the choices or opportunities we have.

Sometimes we simply do not make good choices. It has nothing to do with gender or any other kind of background. Our own involvement in life if you will has brought about those results. I sometimes wonder whether those choices should be corrected and compensated by the hard work and money of other people simply because those making the choices might happen to be women or in some other category seen to be disadvantaged.

We should help those people who need it, those who are truly unable to help themselves or have suffered misfortune. That has been a product of civilized society for centuries. However we must be careful in asking for special protection or special consideration based on things like gender. It could amount to an admission of inability to succeed on a level playing field with other members of society, to make good choices, to advance through competence, diligence and hard work, experience, learning and correcting our mistakes.

It is unfair to women to say they somehow cannot compete on that level. It is unfair to say that because of that they must be provided with extra money because someone has decided what they are doing is just as valuable as what a higher paid individual is doing, or someone has decided they must be given a particular level of housing through public contributions. It is untrue that women in this society through their own competence, ability and hard work are unable to provide these things for themselves and their families.

There may be issues that society needs to work on to make sure that women are not unfairly disadvantaged. One example is a woman being left with child care responsibilities when the other parent sails off into the wild blue yonder without carrying

*Government Orders*

those responsibilities. However, that is far different from setting artificial standards and saying that no matter what you do, no matter what your level of effort, no matter what your level of input, no matter what choices you make, other people are responsible for giving you those things. That is unfair and unwise in our society.

Others have mentioned Agnes Macphail, the first woman ever elected to Parliament. I have been reading some of her speeches. Like many women in this Chamber today, she certainly was no shrinking violet. She summed up her attitude toward the subject of today's debate with these words: "I want for myself what I want for other women, absolute equality". That to me says it all. Equality is not other people suggesting that women cannot make it on their own and therefore they have to be given a lift or a leg up any more than we would do for any other member of society. Yes, we should do that for people but not because they are women or because they are from a particular linguistic or cultural background but simply because we help each other as members of society.

(1705)

When we look at today's amendment and our support for it, it is very important to establish a decision and a deliberate policy of not making gender discrimination. When we help members of society and when we decide the level of support we give to people, that decision must be based on need and not on other identifiable characteristics.

We ought not to compartmentalize society into different groups and marginalize people based on physical characteristics. We should deal with the issues that affect and hurt us all, that cause us pain and dislocation and that have broad implications for everyone in society. We need to treat them as people issues, as issues that are important to us all.

I urge this House to support the amendment we put forward.

**Mr. Julian Reed (Halton—Peel):** Madam Speaker, I have listened to the last three debates with great interest.

I heard the passionate debate by the hon. member for Halifax pointing out that the struggle for equality and the struggle for the ability of women to freely make their decisions are not finished yet. I listened to the hon. member for Calgary Northeast whose vision of this motion seems to be that the socialist hordes are waiting outside the door ready to trample a civilized society. Of course, the most recent speaker tried to inject some fairness into the whole debate.

I would like to tell a little story which exemplifies how slow this process has been over the years. I had the privilege of

growing up in a household with a mother for whom equality was taken for granted. She was a modern language teacher educated in Paris during the 1920s when that was not supposed to happen. Her sister, my aunt with whom I talked about an hour and a half ago is a retired anaesthetist.

There was no question of income equality or gender discrimination. They were both at the top of their fields. They did what they did and were the very best at it. They were pioneers. The reason they achieved what they did was because their mother understood the importance of seeing they got an education to the utmost extent of their ability. They had the ability to make their own decisions freely and clearly then without being shackled by the things which are presently holding women back. That process has been very slow. If we do not make some kind of change or some kind of move we may be looking at the same kind of evolution 50 years from now.

A motion like this does not develop a gathering of the socialist hordes. Rather it recognizes that women who are on the move need to have the freedom to make those decisions on their own. Hon. members will be able to relate to many situations right now of women who are precluded from deciding their futures on their own terms.

(1710)

Does the hon. member not agree with the necessity of being free to make decisions? Does she not agree that all women do not yet have that capability and that perhaps we in this House have some opportunity to advance their cause?

**Mrs. Ablonczy:** Madam Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his comments. I believe we think in the same way. I would fight to the death for freedom of opportunity and to have equal respect with anybody in this House, in business, in the professions and in society. That is a fundamental entitlement to any individual.

It is probably not true to say we all have complete freedom to make decisions. There are a lot of limits on the decisions we can make as individuals in this society. We have to recognize that and live with it. Gender or physical characteristics should not limit our freedom to make decisions.

More than any other country Canada has tremendous freedoms and we should be proud of that. As women we have demonstrated we can contribute significantly in all levels of society on a level playing field. Abraham Lincoln said that if you have what it takes, people will take what you have. It is pretty clear in Canadian society we have a tremendous opportunity no matter what our gender is to bear the truth of that out.

We must give people those chances and the results will speak for themselves.

*Government Orders*

**Mr. Pat O'Brien (London—Middlesex):** Madam Speaker, first may I join the other members in congratulating you for presiding over Question Period for the first time today.

On this International Women's Day it is my pleasure to stand proudly as a Canadian man and member of this House of Commons to support the opposition motion. After a couple of the recent speeches I hardly recognize the motion as was said earlier by one of my colleagues. What we are actually speaking to is:

That this House urge the government to recognize the principle of economic equality between women and men and to implement measures, in areas of federal jurisdiction, to guarantee women equity in employment, wages and living conditions.

The hon. member for Calgary North quoted a famous Canadian woman. The key word was equality and that is the key word in the motion. Yet we hear fears from members opposite particularly I am sad to say from certain members of the Reform Party.

We hear fears about quotas and these artificial numbers that are going to be set up to guarantee women these opportunities. I do not read the word quota anywhere in the motion in front of us and I do not read it in the amendment proposed by the Reform Party.

I share the view that frankly it seems some members opposite do not understand the motion before us. I do and I am going to be very pleased to support the motion when the opportunity comes.

The hon. member for Calgary North mentioned that certain issues may have to be dealt with concerning equal opportunity for women. I would suggest the word to use is not "may". A number of problems still exist in our society that need to be addressed. I would like to take a few minutes to give an overview, as I see it, of the barriers that women face in 1994.

(1715)

The biggest barrier is an attitudinal one. We can see this in the history of this country. During the Olympics we all very proudly recognized and applauded the efforts of Canadian women and men in winning a number of medals and in conducting themselves so wonderfully on the international athletic stage. We need look no further than the sport which attracts us so much, ice hockey, and the fact that for a long time it was seen as strictly a sport for men.

I come from something of an athletic background. I cannot help but make that reference. Hockey was not for girls. It was thought to be too rough and too fast, which is nonsense. The fastest growing amateur sport today is ice hockey for women; for girls, young women, and women of all ages. I am sure that Madam Speaker is probably very adept on skates out on the canal, as I would like to try to experience myself. One needs go no further than that particular sport to know a myth has been

debunked very effectively by Canadian women who have won world championships in hockey the past several years.

Another major problem is that of behavioural discrimination. We have been taught too often that boys must be aggressive, tough and outgoing but girls must be passive, docile, "ladylike" and not get themselves dirty and be involved in aggressive activities, athletic or non-athletic. That is a very destructive attitude and it is one that as a parent I have done everything possible not to inculcate in my own three children, and my wife has been very supportive in that.

The right to vote is worth reconsidering. It was not until 1918 that women got the right to vote in federal elections. We heard earlier some members of the Bloc castigating the government for the fact that it is not doing enough to assist women. Sadly I have to recall for all members of the House that the last province to give women the right to vote was the province of Quebec. I know that province has come way since that time, as we all have, but I do not think there are a lot of lessons for the government to learn from members opposite, some of whom unfortunately appear to be a little ignorant of their history around women's issues and the right to vote.

Before I was honoured with election to this House I was in the field of education. It is a historical fact, unfortunately, in Canada and in many countries that there has been significantly less encouragement of girls and women to pursue their education. All too often that has been sad reality.

There has been the myth that young women could only pursue certain fields of study, that somehow they were not equipped to go into particular areas that were somehow reserved for men. It has been a very negative attitude and one that has been very limiting to women in Canadian history. Thank goodness it is fast finding its place in the reality ash heap where it belongs. It simply bears no semblance to truth.

I would like to talk about employment opportunities for women. I recall there have been and still are unfortunately some very real barriers. We all know about the language referring to policeman and fireman. We are making very important strides in changing this kind of sexist language. As a city councillor I well remember in London, Ontario, just a few years ago supporting a motion to do away with the historic term "alderman" and to go with the more neutral term of "councillor". We heard the wails and the cries from some people that we could not change the historic term "alderman" and that somehow the heavens would fall down on us. That was silly. Now it is very commonly accepted and the more appropriate term is in place.

(1720)

My municipality of London, Ontario very recently hired its first female firefighter. This is the appropriate term for such persons. We can see that firsts are being made every day in our

*Government Orders*

society and they are a long time overdue. There are, not may be, real employment limitations still on women in our society today.

What we need is a revolution in our attitudes as a Canadian society about what is the proper place of women. I am very pleased to have seen and heard reference to the statement that the proper place for women is in the House. I am sure everyone has seen that. It is under a picture of this Chamber. I applaud that and got a great kick out of it, as I am sure most men have. We know that women should have every opportunity and certainly have every ability to represent Canadians just as well as any other person. It should not be a factor of gender, race, religion, et cetera. Very slowly we are coming around to some of the attitudinal changes that are needed.

It is a sad reality that women are too often working only in clerical, sales and service jobs. In 1991 over 50 per cent of working women were in these jobs, whereas for men that figure was only 30 per cent.

Again I say it is not that there may be limitations on equal opportunity employment for women. Anyone who looks at the reality knows there are limitations that have to be addressed and finally are being addressed. The government intends to move forward very aggressively in that regard.

I am sure we all accept that by and large women bear much more the responsibility for the Canadian family. I well recall my own mother being the backbone of our family. I pay tribute to her for her love, courage and support of our family over the years. My wife shoulders more responsibility for our family than I do. She is making a sacrifice as many of the spouses of people in this House today are, male and female spouses both.

In my case, my wife is making a significant sacrifice and is taking on greater responsibility so I can have the opportunity and the privilege of serving the people of London—Middlesex in the House of Commons. I thank her for that and I appreciate the sacrifice. This is normally the role that women find themselves in. The sacrifices in the interests of the family far more often come from women than men. That ought not be made light of. It ought to be acknowledged as a reality and ought to be appreciated for what it is.

My wife and I have two sons and one daughter and it is very important to us that they be treated equally and encouraged to live their lives fully with no restraints based on gender for any of them. I heard hon. members earlier today express that was their experience and I applaud that. It is certainly the experience that we were trying to make sure our children live. However, all too often it is not the Canadian experience and we have to do more in that regard.

I come also from a municipal councillor background, as I mentioned earlier, and it is a sad fact that single parent families, by and large, are led by women. In 1991, 62 per cent of

women-led families were below the poverty line. That is an incredible number, an unacceptable number and it has to change.

One need only look at the media to recognize that they fall far short of the mark in trying to make an attitudinal shift toward this issue. There is little interest shown in the activities of women in the media. I well remember many times, women's athletic teams complaining that they were not getting equal coverage. All too often I recall women councillors on city council feeling that they were somehow not receiving fair treatment. These were not exaggerations; you really had to support what they were saying because the reality was there for all to see.

(1725)

On the issue of pay equity, women receive on average 72 per cent of what men earn. I would think that anyone who is fixated on financial matters, as my colleagues from the Reform Party are, and that is not necessarily a bad thing, how can they then not realize there is a pay equity problem is beyond me. From some of the comments I heard earlier it seems to be getting by some of the members, and I just do not understand how it can.

The issue of violence against women is a huge problem in the country today. The issues of family violence and sadistic pornography need to be addressed now.

When Canadian women cannot feel as safe as men on the streets, then obviously there is a problem. When your feeling of safety and your real safety is different because you are a woman, it is a national problem that needs to be recognized as such and should be addressed.

The question of political leadership has been raised several times by previous speakers. I fully support the fact that we will see more women as members of Parliament over the next few years. It is a very positive step that we have record numbers of women in the House right now. Our party has done everything it possibly can to ensure it takes place.

Only by aggressive action are we going to address these issues. I am proud, as a Liberal member of Parliament, to be a member of a party that appointed the first woman Speaker to the very seat that you occupy now, Madam Speaker. The first woman Governor General, the same woman, the Right Hon. Jean Sauvé was appointed to that position by a Liberal government. The same Right Hon. Madam Sauvé is being honoured today, as we all know, by the issuing of a Canadian stamp in her honour.

Many, if not most, of the first actions taken by governments in Canada to advance the cause of women I am proud to say were taken by Liberal governments. On our side of the House today we see the Deputy Prime Minister several cabinet ministers who are women.

Strides have been made, but further change will only be made by aggressive action by political parties and all Canadians who sincerely believe that this issue has to be addressed, that it is not going to go away and solve itself. As was mentioned earlier,



*Government Orders*

fully 50 per cent of appointments by the Liberal government since the election to various positions have been appointments of women.

It is important we encourage women of all ages to reject limits on their full and equal participation in our society, including governments, maybe especially governments. Canadians of all races have found out that the way to stop discrimination is by getting hold of the levers of power. My background is Irish Canadian and Irish immigrants to Canada found that out. Immigrant groups throughout our history have learned that lesson: You stop discrimination by becoming those who make the laws. Women are learning that lesson and I applaud that. I hope to see far more than 18 per cent of members of Parliament as women MPs some time in the near future.

I am pleased that one of the members of Parliament is part of the London, Ontario Liberal MP team, the member for London West. It is important that a full co-operative effort be made by men and women members on all sides of the House to work together to improve the decorum of the House, which I think is better but certainly could still be improved. In the various committees and in all the responsibilities of a member of Parliament it is very important that a teamwork approach be taken and that women members be fully included as equal partners because they are. They have been equally elected, they are equally talented and able, and it is very important we conduct ourselves in that way.

I can only relate to my own experience in 13 years of municipal government. Some of my best supporters and workers in campaigns were women. It has been my pleasure to encourage and help several women to run for office in London and I intend to do that again this fall when our municipal elections are held in Ontario.

(1730)

It is important that we realize that politics and government is not a profession somehow limited to men. No profession should somehow be reserved for men. Unfortunately, that still is the case in the minds of many Canadians.

Our Liberal red book has made important commitments and our government has started to see these through already; the need to ensure equal opportunity for women, a strengthening of the employment equity act, the need to do more in the area of research for women's health care. It is a fact that women's health care has been short-changed in funding. The red book addresses that need and the government will see that commitment through. There is a need to do more in the area of child care, a need to do more in the area of small business where women are twice as successful as men. That is very important. These are all red book

commitments that I am proud to say this government will certainly see through to fruition.

In closing, I say that we need some changes and we need them now. We need changes in societal attitudes. We need changes in law. We need changes in government. There are problems and we must find the solutions. I want my daughter and all Canadian young women to have every opportunity just the same as my two sons, the same opportunity to pursue whatever career they want in this country with no restrictions, no limitations. Only then will we really fully realize our potential as a nation.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral (Laval-Centre):** Madam Speaker, I listened carefully to my hon. colleague who provided a detailed presentation of the many problems faced by women. I was surprised to hear him say, in reference to some of my colleagues' remarks, that this government did not have to take any advice from the Official Opposition, if I understood correctly, since Quebec was the last province to enfranchise women. I want to remind my hon. colleague that the right to vote, both in Canada and in Quebec, was won by women who valiantly fought for it and that it was men who granted that right.

Of course, in those days, Quebec was going through what historians called the dark ages, but I want to point out that since 1960, since the quiet revolution, Quebec has progressed by leaps and bounds, to the extent that impartial, and often enlightened, observers recognize in Quebec a leader in many areas.

Since today is International Women's Day, let me highlight a few measures in favour of women, such as the lump sum payment at birth, the preventive withdrawal of pregnant women from the workplace, and the right for these women to receive their salary in the meantime. There are many more measures I could tell my colleagues about, but I am sure that other members have comments to make. So, in conclusion, I would add that the day Quebec holds the reins of its destiny, women there will receive their fair share in accordance with their contribution to society.

[*English*]

**Mr. O'Brien:** Madam Speaker, I did not hear a question but I still appreciate the hon. member's comments. I am glad that I was correct and I am sure I was in relating the fact that unfortunately Quebec gave the provincial vote last to women. I did not say that as any kind of a condemnation of Quebec. I am very fond of visiting Quebec. I have many Quebecers as friends and I hope to always be able to go to Quebec. It is a very lovely part of this great country we call Canada.

I am pleased that there have been strides made in Quebec as there have been in other provinces.

*Government Orders*

(1735)

My point is that when one points a finger, as unfortunately a member of the Bloc did a little earlier in the debate, that is not being careful to regard the whole scope of our history. We should be a little more sensitive to the fact that all parts of Canada have been negligent in this regard. All parts of Canada are moving forward. I am pleased that Quebec is as well.

**Mrs. Jan Brown (Calgary Southeast):** Madam Speaker, this indeed has been a very long day. I have sat here for many hours listening to this debate. I have been quite impressed on all counts and the hon. member's comments are well received by myself.

I wish to ask the hon. member a specific question regarding pay equity. I stand here proudly as a humanist. I am not a feminist. In that view I present this question to the hon. member.

The whole pay equity issue is tied to the fundamental debate behind equal opportunity of employment. I cannot understand how we can separate the pay equity issue from several things, and I am going to mention these to the hon. member. Then I am going to ask how the hon. member can exclude these expectations from the whole concept of pay equity.

Our party, the Reform Party, believes that the improvement of education is a key to accessing an employment opportunity. One does this by giving greater priority to the development of skills, particularly those that provide for future job flexibility. That is my first point.

My second point is on the emphasis of individual achievement. Employers must treat people, that is men and women, as individuals in all phases of the recruitment process based on their merit, skills, capacities, and experience in order to fulfil a job function. It cannot be on the basis of one's gender.

I will leave with that and I ask the hon. member to respond.

**Mr. O'Brien:** Madam Speaker, the hon. member is making the point that there ought not to be artificial quotas imposed in order to level the playing field, if you will. I can support that.

We can achieve equity in opportunity without doing that. I fully agree and support several women MPs whom I have heard in the House that they want to be treated and regarded as an equal and that in getting to their spot in this place they sought support on the fact that they were the best candidate, not that they were a woman. I fully support that.

The issue of quotas and pay equity are separable, and I can address it this way. There have been a number of surveys done that would show that a man and a woman doing the exact job, even in some cases in the same firm in the private sector, with

the same qualifications were getting a difference in pay. I can let members imagine who was making the lower pay.

My background is education. A woman as qualified as I was when I was teaching with the same years of experience was guaranteed the exact salary. I would not have it any other way. Unfortunately it is not that way in many cases still in this country.

I would share with the hon. member at another time if she wishes some of the studies that prove that sad fact.

**Mr. Dick Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley):** Madam Speaker, I listened to the comments of the hon. member.

It appears perhaps that a little earlier he missed the point of some of the things that some members of the Reform Party were saying. So that the point is clear, I would like to state again that the Reform Party members have continually today applauded the achievements of not only the women MPs in this House, but the achievements of women throughout history, not because of the fact that they are women but because of their achievement in the same ways that we would applaud the achievements of men.

(1740)

I want to make that very clear. We do not distinguish by gender the magnitude of the achievement but rather the achievement itself.

I would like to go back to some comments that the member made earlier in regard to some of the names we give to people in the workplace, such as policemen. He made a comment on that. He indicated that he found that term objectionable. I would like to ask him and maybe he could reply if he finds the term policewoman objectionable as well or should we be calling the person a policeperson. We could get carried away with this in the same way there is a suggestion that we begin to call manhole covers personhole covers. Where does it end?

Even in this House we differentiate between the terms Mr. Speaker and Madam Speaker. Does the member find these terms objectionable?

I talked about quotas earlier and certainly the government has not made mention of quotas. Let me say that the affirmative action groups in the U.S. began in the same manner. They did not mention quotas. They used terms like pay equity and job equity. In fact they were talking about quotas. That was their hidden agenda. That agenda would not fly in the early days so they chose to use softer, gentler terms.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** The time has expired, but the member for London—Middlesex may want to give a brief response.

**Mr. O'Brien:** Madam Speaker, I would because the hon. member has raised some very important points. I will try to be brief. It is tough to do. He has raised several points.

*Government Orders*

It seems to me in listening to the debate, with all due respect, that the Reform Party's premise is that there has not been discrimination in Canada against women. That seems to be its premise. That is absolutely and totally incorrect. I do not know how any reading of Canadian history can deny that fact.

Therefore when there has been discrimination there is an onus on society to be proactive in trying to address that discrimination. That is why this party has been very proactive in trying to find women candidates and help them raise funds to do the nitty-gritty things that you have to do to become a member of Parliament.

The hon. member does not know me well or he would not suggest that I am an extremist on language. Far from it. I would find ridiculous personhole covers and so on. I do not find ridiculous the fact that some of my former colleagues on London city council, female colleagues, were uncomfortable with the name "alderman". I was at groups with them. There was no problem in introducing me as an alderman but the person introducing the female alderman and the woman being introduced were both uncomfortable. Hence the better name councillor.

I would say to the hon. member that perhaps firefighter is a far better term than fireman. It can in some case give a wrong signal to women that somehow this is not a profession for them. That is absolutely and totally the wrong message that we want to send in my view.

I thank the hon. member for his comments.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gaston Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe):** I rise in the House today to reflect as a man on the various emotions and feelings that are set off by this kind of debate. There is joy and pride but also a sense of urgency when we reflect on the injustice suffered by women and their long struggle which is not over yet and must be taken up again every day.

I want to share this realization with my colleagues, with the women in the Bloc Québécois, and I also want to salute all women and show my solidarity with their cause. I particularly want to salute our differences as men and women, our different ways of seeing, of feeling, of looking at problems, of approaching life and the joys it offers us. And I especially want to salute the women of the Eastern Townships whom I have met on many occasions in various organizations, and also the women in my riding who are very active in all areas as they usually are in our society. I want to salute all the women who were elected to the House of Commons, and especially my colleagues in the Bloc Québécois. And I also want to say a special word to my women friends, whose friendship and understanding I have valued for so many years. Finally, I want to salute the love and understanding of the woman I cherish, and the birth of a child conceived in love.

(1745)

In today's debate which is about women and women's rights on International Women's Day, I believe that men can bring to this debate an element of solidarity with all women.

In the course of my speech I would like to mention a few key moments in the history of women. I would like to start by saying that we have come a long way since March 8, 1875, when for the first time in North America, women rose up against male capitalism and went on strike, and I am referring to the garment workers strike in New York.

Since then, a series of laws have been passed, especially during the past 30 years, to promote women's equality in the home and in the economic, political and public spheres of our society.

In 1893, the first feminist association in Quebec was established: The Montreal Local Council of Women. After 14 years of struggle on the part of suffragettes, women obtained the right to vote in Quebec in 1940. The Fédération des femmes du Québec and the Women's Association for Education and Social Action arrived on the scene in 1966. International Women's Day was celebrated for the first time in Quebec on March 8, 1972. The following year, Quebec's Conseil du statut de la femme and the Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women were created. During the 1980s, Quebec women moved confidently into various fields of endeavour. Buoyed by the experience of the women who came before them, they demanded that they be given a place in all sectors of activity traditionally reserved for men.

For example, not so long ago, it would have been unthinkable to have women practising certain trades or professions. Sexism was so prevalent that women were literally prevented from holding certain jobs which, more often than not, also happened to pay more. The fact that women today work in fields which were once the traditional domain of men is undoubtedly a major victory in the struggle for the recognition of women's equality. This victory shows that women are capable of performing jobs from which they were unfairly barred from generation to generation. If we were to take as an example the Eastern Townships, throughout the 1980s and in the early 1990s, we have seen women take their place within the labour force as scientific researchers, well-known authors, business leaders, bus drivers, police officers, surgeons, lawyers, engineers and so on.

We are approaching the next century and, at a time when a woman's right to vote, her right to an education and her right to obtain an abortion are recognized, and at a time when various charters of rights and freedoms prohibiting all forms of discrimination based on gender confirm that mores have indeed changed, we must ask ourselves the following questions: Have we achieved true equality between the sexes? Has society, in Quebec and Canada, achieved a gender balance which confirms

its emergence as mature, harmonious society? Unfortunately, the answer is no.

(1750)

In the very brief history of women's liberation I just made, a very dark day stands out, a day on which hatred for women was expressed in a very violent way. In 1989, as everyone will remember, we were stunned by the massacre at the École Polytechnique in Montreal.

In spite of all the progress made, of the unanimous recognition of the right of women to decide for themselves, which was again and again reaffirmed, another message emerged. The game of life is played according to strictly male rules. As professor Maria de Konninck said, while she held the Chaire d'étude de la condition des femmes at Laval University, and I quote: "The progress made by women is based purely on deep structural changes which significantly affect the place women hold as a social group".

The truth is, even if women represent 52 per cent of voters, they still hold 66 per cent of part-time jobs, earn less than 70 per cent of wages paid to men and have only 15 per cent of the action-oriented jobs. According to a press release of the Canadian Department on the Status of Women, in 1993, less than 5 per cent of heads of state, CEO's of major corporations and leaders of international organizations were women. According to this same press release, women are poorly represented in executive positions and at the policy-making and decision-making levels.

Many polls conducted in the United States show that women keep saying that equality at work and at home is still one of their major concerns. Statisticians at the Roper Organization, an American statistical body, indicate that men's opposition to the equality of women is a major source of ill feelings, stress and irritation for most of women today. Also in the United States, towards the end of the last decade, the proportion of women who believed they were not getting equal career opportunities or equal pay reached 80 to 95 per cent.

Again in the States, during the same ten-year period, complaints of sexual harassment at work more than doubled. This situation is without any doubt alarming and harmful, since sexual harassments can affect the physical and psychological well-being of the victims. Earlier in today's debate, we heard an absolutely horrifying description of violence against women and, as a man, I feel—and I think that all hon. members will agree with me—that we must show zero tolerance for violence. This abuse of power is demoralizing and counter-productive and undermines the equality of the people affected, and eventually leads to the loss of competent workers and to a decrease in work productivity and efficiency.

### *Government Orders*

In North America, the number of battered women taking refuge in special shelters jumped by 100 per cent between 1983 and 1987. Declared rapes have doubled since the early 1970s, are twice as common as other types of assault, and are increasing four times faster than the overall crime rate in the United States. While the homicide rate is down, sex murders have jumped by 160 per cent. In 1978, women were victims of violence in 10 per cent of Canadian homes; in 1993, there was a 25 per cent increase in that number.

This government's lack of family policy—I am almost finished—shows the electoral opportunism of its party platform and its lack of a long-term vision that could foster a real equality between men and women. These serious shortcomings bring into question the progress of women in Quebec and in Canada. As we have seen from the position taken by the minister today, we must wait another two years for wage equity in the public service; the men responsible for finance, for human resources, and for employment and immigration say that we must wait another two years. Where are the women in the party who will support the fact that action on pay equity is urgently needed in the public service?

(1755)

In conclusion, Madam Speaker, to ensure a continued evolution towards role equality, freedom from all aggression, be it physical or psychological, and a balance crucial to the stability of Quebec society, and acknowledging that to be fair is to recognize our differences, the Bloc Québécois, within its own perspective, which is Quebec's political autonomy, suggests we recognize and implement employment and pay equity, and concrete measures to redress and correct the distressing situation of women.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Mahau):** Order, please. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but his time has now expired.

The hon. member for Mississauga-South.

[English]

**Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South):** Madam Speaker, after several hours of debate many hon. members have raised the issue of women in the context of violence. I feel compelled to comment on the incompleteness of the thought. Having spent five years on the board of the shelter for battered women in my riding, I can say that violence against women is really only one part of it. Really the aspect is abuse. I want to share this with members.

Abuse against women includes violence but it also includes non-violent abuses, the economic abuses in which the financial purse strings are controlled by one spouse to the detriment of the other, taking away that financial independence. The second aspect of it is psychological abuse. There exists that authority and that power as a result of the position of the man in the household, an abusive man. A woman does not have the dignity

*Government Orders*

and respect she has earned by being a partner within that marriage.

I want this to lead into a point that I raised earlier in the day because I feel so strongly about it. It has to do with one of the most honourable professions that anyone could aspire to that is available only to women, a mother; flowing from which is the ability to be the manager of the family home and providing that care.

There is a tremendous inequity in our society today. In this House throughout the day people have talked about women leaving the house and going to work. Who in this House honestly believes that being a spouse in the home is not a job, is not work, is not an honourable profession to be recognized and to be compensated?

That is one of the reasons I presently have a private member's bill in the works. I would like to see one day Canadians recognizing the value of a spouse in the home, managing the home and providing parental care and being compensated. That private member's bill will propose amendments to the tax act which would allow one spouse to pay or to transfer income to a spouse working in the home and taking care of the family home and the children.

I think we have to open up to the fundamentals within our society and realize that there is a very important role for women to play in certain aspects and that being in the home is a job to be respected.

Possibly the member has some comments.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe):** Madam Speaker, in support of my colleague's comments, I would like to quote from a report published in 1992 by Statistics Canada which says that in 1986, women's activity in the homes was equivalent to about a third of business activity as expressed by the Gross Domestic Product. Such housework was then valued at \$199 billion. So, you are quite right.

To remedy the problem of economic violence, the Liberal government should start implementing pay equity in the public service without any further delay.

(1800)

[*English*]

**Mr. Ovid L. Jackson (Bruce—Grey):** Madam Speaker, I would like to respond to the member from Richmond and say to him that as the member for Bruce—Grey I came from the place of the historic women mentioned previously, Agnes Macphail and Nellie McClung.

In 1994 women are still suffering from the trauma of abuse in the home, not being able to walk the streets and of stalking. They are still not receiving their child support payments.

I welcome this motion from the members of the opposition. I think it is fitting that today, International Women's Day, we discuss this.

However, I am not here to talk about the history of what happened. I think today we should act.

I was mayor of the city of Owen Sound. I made proposals then and we should make similar proposals now. There are costs. Part of the problem that we get as we try to move women into positions they should be in where they are not disadvantaged is that every time we want to make a move with this pay equity there is a lot of pressure. In my force, for instance, there were 35 males and we had to try to make it equitable. The last five people we hired on that force were women.

However, I received a lot of pressure within my community about that. At that time I advocated that perhaps what we should do right there and then was split the thing in half so that we would retire those people who were older and probably looking at retirement anyway and make it right, rather than every year when a vacancy came up going through this whole process again.

I would like to ask the hon. member from Richmond what he thinks of that proposal. It is great to talk about that kind of stuff in this House but nothing will occur because of the pressure of the wage situation we have.

There is also pressure within society with males. Men are still quite macho and all that. A lot of us in this House get up and talk about this but in the end nothing happens. Therefore, I would like to ask the member if when we try to look for this equity whether we do not split the thing right down the middle and get on with it rather than every time we come to this pressure point we talk about it and then it goes away.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe):** Madam Speaker, if the hon. members from the Liberal Party confirm their intention to act, as a female member was saying earlier, we now have a definite point that was raised today: wage equity for women in the public service. Do we want to prevent those responsible from imposing a two-year wait and force them to take action right away? I urge you to do it within your own party and to exert pressure on the ministers involved to resolve immediately the issue of wage equity for women in the public service.

**Mr. Pierre de Savoye (Portneuf):** Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to address the House today on such an important issue. It is important as this issue, the status of women, affects 50 per cent of our population.

In the last few weeks, I had the opportunity to address this House many times on various issues I was not very familiar with, on which I had to do extensive research in order to talk about them in an appropriate fashion. Today, I am dealing with a subject I have been familiar with since I was born because, just

like the other gentlemen in this House, I live with the other 50 per cent of society, the fair sex.

I have known various eras. I experienced Quebec's dark ages before 1960, when we had an extremely limited vision of the role of women in society. I went through the period from 1960 to 1970, when these values were first challenged, of course by women but also by men.

(1805)

In the seventies, I had the pleasure and the privilege of teaching with colleagues from both sexes. That gave me the opportunity, and it was indeed an opportunity, to be put in my place on several occasions and to eventually learn that our society is equally made up, from an intellectual, moral and physical point of view, of men and women.

At this point, I would like to share some of my experiences, as well as the conclusions I have drawn from them. In the next few minutes, I will address male Canadians and Quebecers, but female Canadians and Quebecers are certainly welcome to listen.

I believe that the real challenge lies not so much in major pieces of legislation or great principles but, rather, in every day life. The real challenge has to do with our individual behaviour every minute and every hour of the day. It is somewhat like the environment, in the sense that you have to start respecting it at home. The same is true in the case of women: it is in our daily activities that we must begin to respect them as he should.

How many times have I seen people, including myself, use the masculine form to refer to doctors, lawyers or musicians. How many times have I heard teachers, including myself, use the masculine form to discuss a whole range of issues. Thank goodness, I was lucky enough to have female colleagues to bring me back to that marvellous reality that the world is indeed made up of both the masculine and the feminine genders.

I learned, and it was not easy, to use both the masculine and the feminine, and to say in French "il" and "elle", "celui" and "celle", and in English "he" and "she", and "his" or "hers". But that did not come naturally. I had to work at it. One must especially be careful not to fall in a trap and decide that, in order to make a text simpler, only the masculine form will be used, being understood that it also includes the feminine gender.

This is real streamlining since it is tantamount to eliminating 50 per cent of the population. I am sorry, but it is a rather poor argument.

I am relating my personal experience. I have made it my duty, when I write, to go the long way and say in French, "le musicien et la musicienne", and not "le musicien-ne". It is quite long to write "le musicien et la musicienne". It requires a greater

### *Government Orders*

effort, but I think it shows a greater respect of our reality. After all, if we do not start at that level, where will we start?

If collective agreements had been written using both the masculine and the feminine genders, we would not have to now talk about pay equity and equal pay: it would be implicit. But it is not, and this brings me to the issue of labour market experience.

(1810)

Men, in groups or individually, commonly use stereotypes to put down what a member of the opposite sex is saying, to lend weight to the so-called male stand. It is not easy, Madam Speaker, to refrain from doing this. Why not? Because that is the way we were brought up. Because the way we, modern men, have been raised reflects values that I was about to describe as from another century but, goodness me, it was only a few decades ago that we started off down the road of change in terms of respect for women. We were raised in a way which was appropriate for our fathers and ancestors, but is now inappropriate. So, we have to change our ways. We must do so, if we are to achieve our goal, that is to say equity with regard to persons of the female gender.

I would like to point something out to this House, and the public watching us at home, especially mayors and municipal aldermen and women, may understand what this is about. We are presently receiving applications under section 25 and DEP, asking for certain types of jobs to be subsidized. Interestingly, when you go over some of these applications, you realize that there is gender-based inequity in wages.

One of the actions I intend to suggest to my employment center is to start refusing applications that do not reflect wage equality or returning them, asking that appropriate changes be made. I think that it is through everyday actions like this—and I will close on this—that little by little, in time, we will fill the gender gap.

[*English*]

**Mr. John Bryden (Hamilton—Wentworth):** Madam Speaker, I appreciated the remarks of my hon. colleague across the way. I wonder if he could answer a question that I must admit deeply troubles me. I think members from all sides of the House would agree that there should be fairness and equity among the sexes as there should be among all Canadians.

One thing that troubles me is the cost of undoing the wrongs of the past. I put it very simply to the hon. member. If it were a matter of redressing the wrongs of the past in the civil service with respect to women, would he be prepared to add a billion dollars to the deficit in this next year or so?

**Mr. de Savoye:** Madam Speaker, that is an interesting question indeed. The bulk of my speech was not on that subject as the member will realize. I mentioned that people should start

*Government Orders*

addressing this issue at their own door steps, every day in whatever they are doing, the way they talk, the way they address women.

On the specific issue, if men would accept lower salaries by a global amount equal to the one that is needed to raise women's salaries until we reach it mid way, would the member accept that? I would.

**Hon. Ethel Blondin-Andrew (Secretary of State (Training and Youth)):** Madam Speaker, I rise today to respond to the opposition motion urging the government to recognize among other matters the principle of economic equality between women and men and to implement measures to guarantee women equity in employment, wages and living conditions.

(1815)

[*Translation*]

To begin, I wish to commend the opposition for raising these issues in the House on International Women's Day. This inspiring day is a time for celebration but also for reflection. We are inspired by the significant progress made recently by women in all areas of life. We celebrate their successes and their substantial contributions to our economy and our quality of life. But we also reflect on the inequities that still exist.

[*English*]

This government welcomes a debate on issues which affect women, a very important debate. This government is prepared to build meaningfully on past accomplishments. In that context it is committed to expedite the process of full and lasting equality for women in every avenue of human endeavour.

We must grasp the socioeconomic realities of the global marketplace. It places increasingly competitive pressures on successful industrialized nations. It also dictates that we forge ahead in eradicating inequality, not only for the inherent essence of fairness but also because Canada needs to promote full development of all its human resources. Only then can it continue to provide its citizens with the prosperity and promise to which they have become accustomed.

[*Translation*]

On the threshold of the 21st century, our nation must face many challenges. One of the most difficult is to ensure equal participation of women in all aspects of Canadian society. Although our government is proud that it has always contributed to the betterment of women in our country, we are the first to admit that much still remains to be done.

[*English*]

For example the feminization of poverty is a disturbing issue. Single parent families headed by women are the most afflicted. Close to 60 per cent of such families live below the poverty line.

The poverty rate for elderly women is double that of elderly men.

Women also suffer from discrimination in the workplace. For example in the Northwest Territories 43 per cent of all workers were women in 1992. However the average income of women was 63 per cent of the average income of men. Women are overrepresented in low paying part time jobs and are often denied promotions, job security and standard employee benefits. This is not only unfair, it is unacceptable.

The achievement of equality in the workplace is an absolute necessity and cannot be compromised by dated arguments and head in the sand thinking. Equality is one of the core values of Canadian society and we cannot tolerate exceptions under any circumstances.

[*Translation*]

Our government is committed to ensuring employment equity and will strive to offer all Canadians better social and economic conditions. Women are entitled to their fair share of economic power and equitable participation in political decision-making.

We cannot have an egalitarian society if we are indifferent to some segments of our population. We quite simply cannot allow the disadvantaged to be left to their fate while the privileged prosper.

[*English*]

More than 10 years ago a Liberal government, in fact the current minister appointed the Royal Commission on Equality in Employment, the Abella commission. In response to that report the previous government brought in the Employment Equity Act. We were critical of the act in 1986 and we have not changed our minds since.

(1820)

When the act was first proclaimed its stated purpose was to eliminate systemic barriers to employment faced by women, aboriginal people, persons with disabilities and visible minorities. While there have been success stories and individual employers who have set exemplary precedents, progress for women has not met expectations.

[*Translation*]

The law now applies to about 350 employers with over 600,000 employees in banking, transportation and communications. Since 1987, the proportion of women has grown by nearly 4 per cent and is now the same as their representation in the Canadian labour force. Nevertheless, women's employment is still highly concentrated in office work, sales and services.

[*English*]

Under the circumstances I am sure hon. members will understand this government's commitment to strengthen the employment equity legislation. It flows directly from our pledge to improve the laws and social programs which form the basis for

*Government Orders*

fundamental fairness and decency within which Canadians must be able to pursue their individual goals.

We are concerned about the existing act which has done little to improve the lot of women along with visible minorities, aboriginal people and persons with disabilities. We want to ensure that opportunity is distributed more evenly so that a broader spectrum of our society can aspire to earn a decent wage and live with dignity and respect.

[*Translation*]

In the red book, our government made three specific commitments on employment equity. First, the principles of employment equity must apply in the federal public service and federal government agencies and commissions. Second, we want to give the Canadian Human Rights Commission authority to investigate issues related to employment equity. Third, federal contractors should be required to comply with the established principles.

The Minister of Human Resources Development has indicated on several occasions that our government would see to it that specific action was taken over the coming year to strengthen employment equity legislation. Indeed, our government intends to establish a broader and more solid legislative base for employment equity, which will provide for better representation of designated groups in the labour force.

[*English*]

Employment equity means more than simply hiring women, aboriginal people, persons with disabilities and members of visible minorities. It means developing creative strategies to ensure that scarce jobs are filled according to the principles of sound human resource and equity planning. The focus must be on developing training and retention programs that allow longer term internal changes to take place in the workforce.

Employers can be expected to make more progress toward an equitable workforce during periods of economic growth than during periods of restraint. Under bullish economic conditions employers have more opportunities to hire and promote members of designated groups such as women. Therefore they may achieve good results without actually extending much effort. In times of restraint however the best efforts of employers may go unrewarded. Low proportions of designated groups hired and promoted in the workforce may reflect difficult economic times rather than a lack of effort on the part of employers.

(1825)

In assessing the results we must take economic conditions into account. These variables require all partners; business,

unions, designated groups and governments to collaborate to meet workforce equality objectives.

[*Translation*]

I think it would be remiss on my part if I did not let hon. members know about the excellent record of the federal Public Service on employment equity. The Department of Human Resources Development, which employs about 27,000 persons since its recent reorganization, is a good example.

[*English*]

Despite the anticipated challenges associated with restructuring and downsizing and the potential impact on employment equity, no group has been disproportionately affected. While concern over the possible negative impact in these hard times is quite legitimate, much of the progress achieved to date in employment equity has occurred under trying conditions as well.

[*Translation*]

Human Resources Development Canada now administers the programs and services of originating departments, including Employment and Immigration, Health and Welfare, Labour, Multiculturalism and Citizenship and the Department of the Secretary of State.

[*English*]

The consolidation of these programs and services can only have a positive impact on the future of employment equity. In Human Resources Development Canada the department's role will be greatly strengthened in this domain since it has already gained much in-house expertise with the addition of new programs and services.

Human Resources Development now offers a wide variety of activities and instruments which can be brought to bear to accelerate employment equity in the workplace. As a large employer in this nation and with a corresponding budget to generate social progress, the department will have unprecedented opportunities to induce a ripple effect in both the federal and private sectors. This holds true particularly with regard to employment equity.

Rather than get mired in complex details and statistics I believe it will suffice to say that there is a significant representation of women in senior positions of Human Resources Development Canada. The government is committed to ensuring that women and other designated groups will not be disadvantaged by downsizing and restructuring.

The department will be in a strong position to react promptly to any negative plans and could well serve as a barometer for excellence in the rest of the public service and beyond.



*Government Orders**[Translation]*

I would now like to address the issue of pay equity. The Canadian Human Rights Act considers that not giving men and women equal pay for work of equal value is a discriminatory practice.

The Canada Labour Code authorizes officials of the Department of Human Resources Development to audit the pay equity practices of companies. These officials may also submit cases of alleged discrimination relating to wage parity between men and women to the Canadian Human Rights Commission.

*[English]*

Audits are conducted to verify that pay equity implementation by employers has taken place. Refusal to act results in referral to the Human Rights Commission for further investigation and resolution. This inspection program has resulted in three cases being referred to the Human Rights Commission since 1989. Two of these cases have been resolved with wage adjustments of some \$125,000. Two additional inspections have been initiated and should be completed this summer. These decisive, no nonsense responses demonstrate very clearly that pay equity legislation cannot be flouted or ignored.

*[Translation]*

Most employers are anxious to comply with pay equity guidelines, and under a new program it will be possible to examine an employer's implementation program, find any problems that may exist and deal with them quickly, without having to submit the case to the Canadian Human Rights Commission.

*[English]*

There have been some positive results emanating from pay equity compliance measures. Between 1971 and 1992 the wage gap between men and women has narrowed about 20 per cent. In addition, in 1992 women working full time earned an average of some 72 per cent of what was earned by full time working men. This represents an improvement of about 3 per cent over the previous year.

While these figures do not represent satisfactory levels of change, they do indicate some tangible movement. They also illustrate that equal pay compliance programs have resulted in industry-wide pay equity initiatives in the federal jurisdiction. These steps have often been promoted and sponsored by employer associations which set a standard for less sophisticated and less aware employers.

With the recent advent of labour-management partnerships directed at involvement in the pay equity implementation process, there is evidence that greater strides than ever before will be taken in this area.

*[Translation]*

Finally, Madam Speaker, considering the symbolic importance of International Women's Day, I would like to take these last few minutes to recall the recent advances which have been made by women. Their employment situation has developed spectacularly during the past decades, while the significance and diversity of their roles have also increased considerably.

We all know, unfortunately, that women who succeed still have trouble being accepted by many of their male colleagues.

*[English]*

For a long time women were rarely encountered in other than support positions. There was also tokenism of the most blatant kind. In the 1970s a disproportionately large number of women were concentrated in secretarial and clerical positions. Since then some of these imbalances have been corrected and many women have increased their career opportunities and some have advanced to executive levels.

It must be recognized that many women workers had to sacrifice personal lives for the workplace. Secretaries followed their bosses up the corporate ladder and became more trusted than senior advisers, yet were never given pay and positions commensurate with their worth.

*[Translation]*

Women who aspired to management positions either hit a glass ceiling or were removed from the decision making process. Many talented women found themselves excluded from the "old boys' network" in their job environment and were never really accepted, even on a purely professional level, as women doctors, lawyers or engineers.

However, Madam Speaker, there is a bright side: the position of women on the labour market has changed dramatically. According to 1991 census figures, women represented 45 per cent of wage earners in Canada, compared with 35 per cent 30 years ago.

*[English]*

In addition, as noted earlier, there has been significant improvement in the representation of women in management. We in this House are becoming increasingly aware of the impact women are having in all parts of the workplace.

Coincidentally 1994 is the 40th anniversary of the women's bureau. The women's bureau has much to be proud of. Since its inception in 1954 it has contributed significantly to the increased awareness of issues related to women in the workplace as to the removal of remaining barriers. The bureau interacts closely with key partners to change workplace policies and practices. It has helped considerably to move Canada forward as a country which promotes the advancement and well-being of all its workers.

*Government Orders*

[Translation]

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** I think the secretary of state was not quite through, but I had to interrupt her because it is 6.33 p.m.

[English]

It being 6.33 p.m., it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the business of supply, pursuant to Standing Order 81(16).

The question is on the amendment. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** All those in favour of the amendment will please say yea.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** In my opinion the nays have it.

*And more than five members having risen:*

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** Call in the members.

(The House divided on the amendment, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 7)

**YEAS**

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Bridgman
Brown (Calgary Southeast)	Chatters
Duncan	Epp
Forseth	Frazer
Gilmour	Gouk
Grey (Beaver River)	Grubel
Hanger	Hanrahan
Harper (Calgary West)	Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Harris	Hart
Hayes	Hermanson
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoepfner	Jennings
Johnston	Kerpan
Manning	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield	McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Meredith	Mills (Red Deer)
Morrison	Penson
Ramsay	Ringma
Schmidt	Silye
Solberg	Speaker
Stinson	Strahl
Thompson	Wayne
White (Fraser Valley West)	White (North Vancouver)
Williams—49	

**NAYS**

Members

Anawak	Anderson
Arseneault	Assad
Assadourian	Asselin
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bachand	Baker
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bellehumeur
Bellemare	Berger
Bergeron	Bernier (Beauce)
Bernier (Gaspé)	Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Bertrand	Bethel
Blondin—Andrew	Bodnar
Bonin	Bouchard
Boudria	Brien
Brown (Oakville—Milton)	Brushett
Bryden	Bélair
Bélisle	Calder
Campbell	Cannis
Canuel	Caron
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chrétien (Frontenac)
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	Clancy
Cohen	Collenette
Collins	Comuzzi
Copps	Cowling
Crawford	Crête
Culbert	Dalphond—Guiral
Debien	de Jong
de Savoye	Deshais
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dingwall	Discepola
Dromisky	Dubé
Duceppe	Duhamel
Dumas	Dupuy
Easter	Eggleton
English	Fewchuk
Fillion	Finestone
Finlay	Flis
Fontana	Fry
Gaffney	Gagliano
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)	Gagnon (Québec)
Galloway	Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier)
Gerrard	Godfrey
Godin	Goodale
Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
Grose	Guarnieri
Guay	Guimond
Harb	Harper (Churchill)
Harvard	Hickey
Hopkins	Hubbard
Ianno	Iftody
Irwin	Jackson
Jacob	Jordan
Keyes	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Kirkby	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	Landry
Langlois	Lastewka
Laurin	Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Lavigne (Verdun—Saint-Paul)	Lebel
LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Lee	Lefebvre
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	Leroux (Shefford)
Lincoln	Loney
Loubier	MacAulay
MacDonald	MacLaren (Etobicoke North/Nord)
MacLellan (Cape Breton—The Sydneys)	Maheu
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Marchand
Marchi	Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Massé
McCormick	McGuire
McKinnon	McLaughlin
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)	McTeague
McWhinney	Mercier
Mifflin	Milliken
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Mitchell
Murphy	Murray
Ménard	Nault
Nunez	O'Brien
O'Reilly	Ouellet

*Government Orders*

Parrish	Paré
Patry	Payne
Peric	Peters
Peterson	Phinney
Picard (Drummond)	Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Pillitteri	Plamondon
Pomerleau	Proud
Péloquin	Reed
Regan	Richardson
Rideout	Riis
Ringuette—Maltais	Robichaud
Rocheleau	Rock
Rompkey	Sauvageau
Scott (Fredericton—York Sudbury)	Shepherd
Sheridan	Simmons
Skoke	Speller
St-Laurent	St. Denis
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	Szabo
Taylor	Telegdi
Terrana	Thalheimer
Tobin	Torsney
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	Tremblay (Rosemont)
Ur	Valeri
Venne	Verran
Volpe	Walker
Wells	Whelan
Wood	Young —216

## PAIRED MEMBERS

Augustine	Daviault
Gauthier (Roberval)	Minna

(1905)

**The Speaker:** I declare the amendment negatived.*[Translation]*

**Mr. Alfonso Gagliano (Saint-Léonard):** Mr. Speaker, seeing that there are four divisions to be recorded tonight and in order to save time and allow the staff to go home earlier, I think you will find unanimous consent to apply the vote just completed on the amendment but in reverse to the main motion.

(1910)

*[English]***The Speaker:** Is the House agreed?**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

(The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:)

*(Division No. 8)*

## YEAS

## Members

Anawak	Anderson
Arseneault	Assad
Assadourian	Asselin
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bachand	Baker
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bellehumeur
Bellemare	Berger
Bergeron	Bernier (Beauce)
Bernier (Gaspé)	Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Bertrand	Bethel
Blondin—Andrew	Bodnar
Bonin	Bouchard
Boudria	Brien

Brown (Oakville—Milton)	Brushett
Bryden	Bélair
Bélisle	Calder
Campbell	Cannis
Canuel	Caron
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chrétien (Frontenac)
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	Clancy
Cohen	Collenette
Collins	Comuzzi
Copps	Cowling
Crawford	Crête
Culbert	Dalphond—Guiral
Debien	de Jong
de Savoye	Deshais
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dingwall	Discepola
Dromisky	Dubé
Duceppe	Duhamel
Dumas	Dupuy
Easter	Eggleton
English	Fewchuk
Fillion	Finestone
Finlay	Fliis
Fontana	Fry
Gaffney	Gagliano
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)	Gagnon (Québec)
Galloway	Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier)
Gerrard	Godfrey
Godin	Goodale
Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
Grose	Guarnieri
Guay	Guimond
Harb	Harper (Churchill)
Harvard	Hickey
Hopkins	Hubbard
Ianno	Iftody
Irwin	Jackson
Jacob	Jordan
Keyes	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Kirkby	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	Landry
Langlois	Lastewka
Laurin	Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Lavigne (Verdun—Saint-Paul)	Lebel
LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Lee	Lefebvre
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	Leroux (Shefford)
Lincoln	Loney
Loubier	MacAulay
MacDonald	MacLaren (Etobicoke North/Nord)
MacLellan (Cape Breton—The Sydneys)	Maheu
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Marchand
Marchi	Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Massé
McCormick	McGuire
McKinnon	McLaughlin
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)	McTeague
McWhinney	Mercier
Mifflin	Milliken
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Mitchell
Murphy	Murray
Ménard	Nault
Nunez	O'Brien
O'Reilly	Ouellet
Parrish	Paré
Patry	Payne
Peric	Peters
Peterson	Phinney
Picard (Drummond)	Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Pillitteri	Plamondon
Pomerleau	Proud
Péloquin	Reed
Regan	Richardson
Rideout	Riis
Ringuette—Maltais	Robichaud
Rocheleau	Rock
Rompkey	Sauvageau
Scott (Fredericton—York Sudbury)	Shepherd

*Government Orders*

Sheridan  
Skoke  
St-Laurent  
Steckle  
Stewart (Northumberland)  
Taylor  
Terrana  
Tobin  
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)  
Ur  
Venne  
Volpe  
Wayne  
Whelan  
Young —217

Simmons  
Speller  
St. Denis  
Stewart (Brant)  
Szabo  
Telegdi  
Thalheimer  
Torsney  
Tremblay (Rosemont)  
Valeri  
Verran  
Walker  
Wells  
Wood

[English]

**Mrs. Wayne:** I wish to vote no against this, Mr. Speaker. I am changing to no, however that goes, and I do not know. It is no, no.

\* \* \*

**THE BUDGET**

FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF MINISTER OF FINANCE

The House resumed from February 24 consideration of the motion that this House approves in general the budgetary policy of the government; the amendment; and the amendment to the amendment.

(The House divided on the amendment to the amendment, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 9)

**YEAS**

Members

Abbott  
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)  
Brown (Calgary Southeast)  
Duncan  
Forseth  
Gilmour  
Grey (Beaver River)  
Hanger  
Harper (Calgary West)  
Harris  
Hayes  
Hill (Macleod)  
Hoepfner  
Johnston  
Manning  
Mayfield  
Meredith  
Morrison  
Ramsay  
Schmidt  
Stinson  
Thompson  
White (Fraser Valley West)  
Williams—49

Ablonczy  
Bridgman  
Chatters  
Epp  
Frazer  
Gouk  
Grubel  
Hanrahan  
Harper (Simcoe Centre)  
Hart  
Hermanson  
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)  
Jennings  
Kerpan  
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)  
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)  
Mills (Red Deer)  
Penson  
Ringma  
Silye  
Speaker  
Strahl  
Wayne  
White (North Vancouver)

**NAYS**

Members

Abbott  
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)  
Brown (Calgary Southeast)  
Duncan  
Forseth  
Gilmour  
Grey (Beaver River)  
Hanger  
Harper (Calgary West)  
Harris  
Hayes  
Hill (Macleod)  
Hoepfner  
Johnston  
Manning  
Mayfield  
Meredith  
Morrison  
Ramsay  
Schmidt  
Solberg  
Stinson  
Thompson  
White (North Vancouver)

Ablonczy  
Bridgman  
Chatters  
Epp  
Frazer  
Gouk  
Grubel  
Hanrahan  
Harper (Simcoe Centre)  
Hart  
Hermanson  
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)  
Jennings  
Kerpan  
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)  
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)  
Mills (Red Deer)  
Penson  
Ringma  
Silye  
Speaker  
Strahl  
White (Fraser Valley West)  
Williams—48

**PAIRED MEMBERS**

Augustine  
Gauthier (Roberval)

Davialt  
Minna

**The Speaker:** Pursuant to order made Tuesday, February 22, 1994, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred division on the amendment to the amendment.

[Translation]

**Mr. Gagliano:** Mr. Speaker, again, in order to save time, I think you will find unanimous consent in the House to apply the vote just completed to the main motion.

**The Speaker:** Does the House give its unanimous consent?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**NAYS**

Members

Anawak  
Arseneault  
Assadourian  
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)  
Bachand  
Bakopanos  
Beaumier  
Bellemare  
Bergeron  
Bernier (Gaspé)  
Bertrand  
Blondin—Andrew  
Bonin  
Boudria  
Brown (Oakville—Milton)  
Bryden  
Bélisle  
Campbell  
Canuel

Anderson  
Assad  
Asselin  
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)  
Baker  
Barnes  
Bellehumeur  
Berger  
Bernier (Beauce)  
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)  
Bethel  
Bodnar  
Bouchard  
Brien  
Brushett  
Bélair  
Calder  
Cannis  
Caron

*Government Orders*

Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chrétien (Frontenac)
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	Clancy
Cohen	Collenette
Collins	Comuzzi
Copps	Cowling
Crawford	Crête
Culbert	Dalphond-Guiral
Debien	de Jong
de Savoye	Deshaies
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dingwall	Discepola
Dromisky	Dubé
Duceppe	Duhamel
Dumas	Dupuy
Easter	Eggleton
English	Fewchuk
Fillion	Finestone
Finlay	Flis
Fontana	Fry
Gaffney	Gagliano
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)	Gagnon (Québec)
Galloway	Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier)
Gerrard	Godfrey
Godin	Goodale
Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
Grose	Guarnieri
Guay	Guimond
Harb	Harper (Churchill)
Harvard	Hickey
Hopkins	Hubbard
Ianno	Iftody
Irwin	Jackson
Jacob	Jordan
Keyes	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Kirkby	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	Landry
Langlois	Lastewka
Laurin	Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Lavigne (Verdun—Saint-Paul)	Lebel
LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Lee	Lefebvre
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	Leroux (Shefford)
Lincoln	Loney
Loubier	MacAulay
MacDonald	MacLaren (Etobicoke North/Nord)
MacLellan (Cape Breton—The Sydneys)	Maheu
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Marchand
Marchi	Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Massé
McCormick	McGuire
McKinnon	McLaughlin
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)	McTeague
McWhinney	Mercier
Mifflin	Milliken
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Mitchell
Murphy	Murray
Ménard	Nault
Nunez	O'Brien
O'Reilly	Ouellet
Parrish	Paré
Patry	Payne
Peric	Peters
Peterson	Phinney
Picard (Drummond)	Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Pillitteri	Plamondon
Pomerleau	Proud
Péloquin	Reed
Regan	Richardson
Rideout	Riis
Ringuette—Maltais	Robichaud
Rocheleau	Rock
Rompkey	Sauvageau
Scott (Fredericton—York Sudbury)	Shepherd
Sheridan	Simmons
Skoke	Speller
St-Laurent	St. Denis
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	Szabo

Taylor	Telegdi
Terrana	Thalheimer
Tobin	Torsney
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	Tremblay (Rosemont)
Ur	Valeri
Venne	Verran
Volpe	Walker
Wells	Whelan
Wood	Young —216

## PAIRED MEMBERS

Augustine	Daviault
Gauthier (Roberval)	Minna

\* \* \*

**BORROWING AUTHORITY ACT, 1994-95**

The House resumed from March 7 consideration of the motion that Bill C-14, an act to provide borrowing authority for the fiscal year beginning on April 1, 1994, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

**The Speaker:** Pursuant to order made Thursday, February 24, 1994, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred division on the motion at second reading stage of Bill C-14, an act to provide borrowing authority for the fiscal year beginning on April 1, 1994.

(The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division):

*(Division No. 10)*

## YEAS

## Members

Anawak	Anderson
Arseneault	Assad
Assadourian	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Baker	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bellemare	Berger
Bernier (Beauce)	Bertrand
Bethel	Blondin—Andrew
Bodnar	Bonin
Boudria	Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Brushett	Bryden
Bélair	Caldler
Campbell	Cannis
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Clancy	Cohen
Collenette	Collins
Comuzzi	Copps
Cowling	Crawford
Culbert	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dingwall
Discepola	Dromisky
Duhamel	Dupuy
Easter	Eggleton
English	Fewchuk
Finestone	Finlay
Flis	Fontana
Fry	Gaffney
Gagliano	Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Galloway	Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier)
Gerrard	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Grose
Guarnieri	Harb
Harper (Churchill)	Harvard
Hickey	Hopkins
Hubbard	Ianno
Iftody	Irwin
Jackson	Jordan
Keyes	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)

Kirkby  
Kraft Sloan  
Lavigne (Verdun—Saint-Paul)  
Lee  
Loney  
MacDonald  
MacLellan (Cape Breton—The Sydneys)  
Malhi  
Manley  
Marleau  
Massé  
McGuire  
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)  
McWhinney  
Milliken  
Mitchell  
Murray  
O'Brien  
Ouellet  
Parrish  
Payne  
Peters  
Phinney  
Pillitteri  
Reed  
Richardson  
Ringuelette—Maltais  
Rock  
Scott (Fredericton—York Sudbury)  
Sheridan  
Skoke  
St. Denis  
Stewart (Brant)  
Szabo  
Terrana  
Tobin  
Ur  
Verran  
Walker  
Wells  
Wood

Knutson  
Lastewka  
LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)  
Lincoln  
MacAulay  
MacLaren (Etobicoke North/Nord)  
Maheu  
Maloney  
Marchi  
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)  
McCormick  
McKinnon  
McTeague  
Mifflin  
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)  
Murphy  
Nault  
O'Reilly  
Pagtakhan  
Patry  
Peric  
Peterson  
Pickard (Essex—Kent)  
Proud  
Regan  
Rideout  
Robichaud  
Rompkey  
Shepherd  
Simmons  
Speller  
Steckle  
Stewart (Northumberland)  
Telegdi  
Thalheimer  
Torsney  
Valeri  
Volpe  
Wappel  
Whelan  
Young —162

## NAYS

### Members

Abbott  
Asselin  
Bachand  
Bergeron  
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)  
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)  
Brien  
Bélisle  
Caron  
Chrétien (Frontenac)  
Dalphond—Guiral  
de Jong  
Deshaies  
Duceppe  
Duncan  
Fillion  
Frazer

Ablonczy  
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)  
Bellehumeur  
Bernier (Gaspé)  
Bouchard  
Bridgman  
Brown (Calgary Southeast)  
Canuel  
Chatters  
Crête  
Debien  
de Savoye  
Dubé  
Dumas  
Epp  
Forseth  
Gagnon (Québec)

## Government Orders

Gilmour  
Gouk  
Grubel  
Guimond  
Hanrahan  
Harper (Simcoe Centre)  
Hart  
Hermanson  
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)  
Jacob  
Johnston  
Landry  
Laurin  
Lebel  
Lefebvre  
Leroux (Shefford)  
Manning  
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)  
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)  
Mercier  
Mills (Red Deer)  
Ménard  
Paré  
Picard (Drummond)  
Pomerleau  
Ramsay  
Ringma  
Sauvageau  
Silye  
Speaker  
Stinson  
Taylor  
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)  
Venne  
White (Fraser Valley West)  
Williams—105

Godin  
Grey (Beaver River)  
Guay  
Hanger  
Harper (Calgary West)  
Harris  
Hayes  
Hill (Macleod)  
Hoepfner  
Jennings  
Kerpan  
Langlois  
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)  
Leblanc (Longueuil)  
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)  
Loubier  
Marchand  
Mayfield  
McLaughlin  
Meredith  
Morrison  
Nunez  
Penson  
Plamondon  
Péloquin  
Riis  
Rocheleau  
Schmidt  
Solberg  
St-Laurent  
Strahl  
Thompson  
Tremblay (Rosemont)  
Wayne  
White (North Vancouver)

## PAIRED MEMBERS

Augustine  
Gauthier (Roberval)

Daviault  
Minna

**The Speaker:** I declare the motion carried.

(Bill read the second time and referred to a committee.)

**The Speaker:** It being 7.20 p.m., this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 2 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 7.20 p.m.)

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Tuesday, March 8, 1994

---

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### Supplementary Estimates (B), 1993–94

Mr. Eggleton ..... 1957

### Land Claims

Mr. Anawak ..... 1957

### International Women's Day

Mrs. Finestone ..... 1957

Mrs. Gagnon (Québec) ..... 1958

Mrs. Brown (Calgary Southeast) ..... 1959

### Supplementary Estimates, 1993–94

#### Reference to Standing Committees

Mr. Eggleton ..... 1960

Motion moved and agreed to ..... 1960

### Petitions

#### Young Offenders Act

Mr. Crawford ..... 1961

### Questions on the Order Paper

Mr. Milliken ..... 1961

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

### BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

#### Allotted Day—Status of Women

Mrs. Gagnon (Québec) ..... 1961

Motion .....	1961
Mrs. Finestone .....	1964
Mrs. Jennings .....	1966
Amendment .....	1968
Miss Grey .....	1968
Mr. Adams .....	1970
Mrs. Jennings .....	1971
Mr. Fillion .....	1971
Mr. Graham .....	1973
Mrs. Ringuette–Maltais .....	1973
Mr. Adams .....	1974
Mr. Eggleton .....	1974
Mrs. Brown (Calgary Southeast) .....	1976
Mr. Harris .....	1976
Mrs. Debien .....	1977
Ms. McLaughlin .....	1980
Mr. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood) .....	1982
Mr. Silye .....	1983
Mr. Hill (Macleod) .....	1984
Mr. Szabo .....	1986
Mr. Bellemare .....	1986
Mr. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood) .....	1986
Mr. Riis .....	1987
Mrs. Venne .....	1988
Mr. Bellemare .....	1989
Mr. Szabo .....	1989

## **STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS**

### **International Women’s Day**

Mrs. Wayne .....	1989
------------------	------

### **Daycare Services**

Mr. Duceppe .....	1989
-------------------	------

### **Justice**

Ms. Meredith .....	1990
--------------------	------



**International Women's Day**

Mrs. Hickey ..... 1990

**International Women's Day**

Mrs. Gaffney ..... 1990

**International Women's Day**

Mrs. Ringuette–Maltais ..... 1990

**International Women's Day**

Mr. Gauthier (Roberval) ..... 1990

**International Women's Day**

Mrs. Ablonczy ..... 1991

**International Women's Day**

Ms. McLaughlin ..... 1991

**Sheila Genaille**

Mrs. Terrana ..... 1991

**Women in Sport**

Mrs. Sheridan ..... 1991

**International Women's Day**

Mr. Bouchard ..... 1992

**Sarajevo**

Mrs. Brown (Calgary Southeast) ..... 1992

**International Women's Week**

Ms. Bethel ..... 1992

**International Women's Day**

Ms. Torsney ..... 1992

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

### Status of Women

Mrs. Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata) .....	1993
Ms. Copps .....	1993
Mrs. Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata) .....	1993
Ms. Copps .....	1993
Mrs. Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata) .....	1993
Ms. Copps .....	1993
Mrs. Gagnon (Québec) .....	1993
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard) .....	1993
Mrs. Gagnon (Québec) .....	1993
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard) .....	1993

### Members of Parliament Retiring Allowances Act

Miss Grey .....	1994
Ms. Copps .....	1994
Miss Grey .....	1994
Ms. Copps .....	1994
Miss Grey .....	1994
Ms. Copps .....	1994

### Collège militaire royal de Saint-Jean

Mrs. Dalphond—Guiral .....	1994
Mr. Collenette .....	1995
Mrs. Dalphond—Guiral .....	1995
Mr. Collenette .....	1995

### Pensions

Mrs. Hayes .....	1995
Mr. Eggleton .....	1995
Mrs. Hayes .....	1995
Mr. Eggleton .....	1995

### Status of Women

Mrs. Picard .....	1995
-------------------	------

Mrs. Finestone .....	1996
Mrs. Picard .....	1996
Mr. Rock .....	1996

**Divorce Act**

Mrs. Jennings .....	1996
Mr. Rock .....	1996
Mrs. Jennings .....	1996
Mr. Rock .....	1996

**Status of Women**

Mrs. Lalonde .....	1996
Mr. Eggleton .....	1997
Mrs. Lalonde .....	1997
Mr. Eggleton .....	1997
Mr. Discepola .....	1997
Mr. Dingwall .....	1997

**Farm Credit Corporation**

Mrs. Brown (Calgary Southeast) .....	1997
Mr. Goodale .....	1997
Mrs. Brown (Calgary Southeast) .....	1998
Mr. Goodale .....	1998

**Status of Women**

Mrs. Guay .....	1998
Ms. Copps .....	1998
Mrs. Guay .....	1998
Ms. Copps .....	1998

**Royal Canadian Mounted Police**

Ms. Meredith .....	1998
Mr. Gray .....	1999
Ms. Meredith .....	1999
Mr. Gray .....	1999

**Centres of Excellence**

Mrs. Barnes .....	1999
-------------------	------

Ms. Marleau ..... 1999

**Status of Women**

Mrs. Venne ..... 1999

Mr. Rock ..... 2000

Mrs. Venne ..... 2000

Mr. Rock ..... 2000

**Canadian Flag**

Mrs. Ablonczy ..... 2000

Mr. Ouellet ..... 2000

**Centre of Excellence for Women's Health**

Mrs. Debien ..... 2000

Ms. Marleau ..... 2000

**Ethics Counsellor**

Ms. Bridgman ..... 2000

Ms. Copps ..... 2000

**International Women's Day**

Ms. McLaughlin ..... 2000

Ms. Copps ..... 2001

**Women Refugees**

Mrs. Bakopanos ..... 2001

Mr. Marchi ..... 2001

**Presence in Gallery**

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu) ..... 2001

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

**Business of Supply**

**Allotted Day—Status of Women**

Consideration of the motion and the amendment resumed. .... 2001

Mrs. Dalphond–Guiral .....	2001
Mrs. Catterall .....	2003
Mr. Crête .....	2005
Mr. Harris .....	2006
Mrs. Guay .....	2007
Mr. Gouk .....	2008
Mr. Nunez .....	2009
Ms. Clancy .....	2010
Mr. Hermanson .....	2012
Mr. Milliken .....	2014
Motions .....	2014
(Motions agreed to.) .....	2014
Mr. Hanger .....	2014
Ms. Clancy .....	2015
Mrs. Ablonczy .....	2016
Mr. Reed .....	2017
Mr. O’Brien .....	2018
Mrs. Dalphond–Guiral .....	2020
Mrs. Brown (Calgary Southeast) .....	2021
Mr. Harris .....	2021
Mr. Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe) .....	2022
Mr. Szabo .....	2023
Mr. Jackson .....	2024
Mr. de Savoye .....	2024
Mr. Bryden .....	2025
Ms. Blondin–Andrew .....	2026
Amendment negated on division: Yeas, 49; Nays, 216 .....	2029
Mr. Gagliano .....	2030

## **The Budget**

### **Financial Statement of Minister of Finance**

Consideration resumed of budget motion, amendment and amendment to amendment .....	2031
---	------

## **Borrowing Authority Act, 1994–95**

Bill C–14 Consideration resumed of motion for second reading. ....	2032
--	------

Motion agreed to on division: Yeas, 162; Nays, 105 .....	2032
(Bill read the second time and referred to a committee.)	2033