

Supply

justified than that of Canadians who want to be protected and to protect their family against such a shameful exploitation?

Thirteenth, sexual harassment in the work place. This problem has been kept secret for too long. Women did not want to speak about it for fear of losing their jobs. Although the Liberal Government brought forward guidelines to prevent this kind of abuse in the Public Service and victims are now free to appeal to the Human Rights Commission, the fact is that the problem remains and particularly so in the private sector.

In 1982, the CRTC issued guidelines to eliminate sexual stereotypes in the media. Thanks to voluntary implementation, the issue of sexist stereotypes in the media has been publicized but projected results were not achieved. The funds allocated to Media Watch, a monitoring agency, are not sufficient. As this program will be implemented by states a continued follow up is necessary.

Fifteenth, I hope that the Budget Speech of next Thursday will take into account the new movement of Canadian women who have the courage to start businesses, thus contributing to the development of the small business sector. I hope that the Budget, next Thursday, will give them the push they need.

Canadians who have been following the debates of the House last week may have wondered why the Official Opposition spent a whole afternoon tabling petitions that opposed Bill C-26 under consideration. We have asked hundreds of groups of elderly citizens throughout the country, from Newfoundland to Vancouver, what they thought of Bill C-26 and they are all opposed to its passage. Unless that Bill is amended according to the wishes of thousands of Canadians, it will grant a pension to needy widows and widowers but will refuse the same benefits to others who may be separated, divorced or single.

In reply to a question I asked the Prime Minister barely a month ago about systemic discrimination, he said he knew that type of discrimination against women existed, but he himself is now imposing upon us legislation that will legalize systemic discrimination within his own Government. It is a blatant social injustice to grant a pension to the needy between the ages of 60 and 64 on the basis of their marital status only. Here is an hypothetical case that should show how nonsensical that legislation is. A woman is widowed at age 58. According to the legislation, at 60 years of age, she should get a pension, if she is in need. She decides to remarry at 59 years of age. She realizes later on that she made a mistake. If she were to separate from her husband, I presume she would no longer be entitled to the pension; if she were to divorce from her husband, would she return to the status of a widow or would she be considered single? If she were considered a widow, she would be entitled to a pension. If she were considered a single person, she would get nothing. Has the government opposite reflected on all those details? That is awfully important for a person concerned.

Anyone who cares to check the unemployment insurance record about the way women have been treated since this

Government came into office, will find out that women have been glaringly discriminated against with the implementation of new rules by the Department of Employment and Immigration. Without giving the matter much thought, the Minister bought the hodgepodge that public servants had tried to sell us when we were the Government. Since March 30, to be eligible to unemployment insurance benefits, a claimant must have used up all the amounts he received in severance pay, vacation pay, repayment of accumulated sick leave, and so on.

To show how this new Government guideline is especially unfair to women, I would like to tell more about the problem experienced by a woman in my riding. This woman, who is 57 years old, a teacher, single, and who suffers from Parkinson's disease, has to stop teaching. She does not qualify for an invalidity pension because her condition is not serious enough. She must wait until 65 before getting her old age security pension. She has no personal savings, and in fact she intended to invest the money she expected to get, but the Government opposite is pitiless and has decided that she and all other Canadians in such a situation will have to spend all the amounts accumulated before collecting one cent in unemployment insurance.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of all the delegates to the National Action Committee Convention on Parliament Hill and all Canadian women, I ask the Government not to take part in any arms race escalation or in the star wars project. It is on behalf of future generations that Canadian women oppose star wars. They view nuclear disarmament and star wars as the number one priority.

The Canadian Government should pursue more vigorously the peace initiative initiated by the former Prime Minister, the Right Hon. Pierre Elliot Trudeau, to eliminate conflicts which threaten our national peace.

I would not want to close without mentioning the concern of Canadian women about the threat to the environment caused by acid rain, chemicals and nuclear waste. It is once more on behalf of their children and grandchildren that Canadian women ask the Minister of Finance to include in his Budget next Thursday a budgetary envelope for research and development on nuclear waste disposal. We have created a monster and do not know how to get rid of it.

The Government has a duty to protect the quality of life of the generations to come and it should view this issue as a priority.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I regret to interrupt the Hon. Member, but her allotted time has expired. Questions and comments. The Hon. the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mr. Hudon).

Mr. Hudon: Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate my colleague because, in that same twenty minute period, she