

who phoned and who phoned back what we have heard in this House.

It might be interesting to look at some of the accomplishments and some of the things that are happening in this country. Win Gardner said something rather important in her statement. She suggested we look at our divorce laws, at child care, at maternity leave, at the real problems facing women of this country. Lord knows we need day care centres. We have not addressed half of the problems that need addressing if we intend to look at the role and at the status of these women. We have dealt with the problem of the charter and we have dealt with it very positively. The Advisory Council on the Status of Women did that very effectively. Now let us go on to deal with some of the very real problems which I feel the women of Canada are demanding. This sort of petty bickering leads us nowhere. We must get on with the job and dispense with the silly issues which are being raised here by members opposite.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

[Translation]

**Mr. Bill Clarke (Vancouver Quadra):** Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to take part in the debate on the motion of my colleague, the hon. member for Waterloo (Mr. McLean), which reads as follows:

That this House condemns the blatant interference by the minister responsible for the status of women in the plans of the Advisory Council on the Status of Women to hold a constitutional conference, demands the resignation of the minister, and urges that the mandate of the advisory council be changed to enable it to report directly to Parliament, as recommended by the Royal Commission on the Status of Women in 1970.

Mr. Speaker, allow me to quote a few words heard at the world Conference on the UN Mid-decade Conference for Women which took place in Copenhagen on July 15, 1980:

We have to act right now with determination with a view to maintaining our efforts to achieve our objective, namely that 1981 will end the oppression of women at the economic and social level.

Mr. Speaker, those were the words spoken by the employment minister in July 1980 at that conference in Copenhagen.

● (1740)

[English]

Things have changed a lot since the minister uttered those words in Copenhagen. Anyone watching television in Canada today might have seen an interview with two writers, Joanne Kates and Eleanor Wright-Perline over the CTV network. The interviewer asked:

What kind of track record does Lloyd Axworthy have anyway? I mean, Doris Anderson is saying that he is the one that ought to resign. What do you think?

Joanne Kates replied:

He has got a miserable track record with respect to women. As minister responsible for the status of women, he hasn't facilitated or done anything that improves our rights in any way.

Eleanor Wright-Perline admitted that the minister had a lot of good intentions, that a lot of sympathy had been declared over and over again with a lot of "charming smiles". We have

### *Status of Women*

seen them from over here. She also stated that he had given explanations, saying things like "you will understand my position" and "these things take time". She went on to say:

—there is no point in having the ear of the government unless you also have the government's active support. Look at the record, look to see how few of the recommendations of advisory councils have been implemented by the governments which appointed them.

Miss Kates went on to say:

—the federal government has stubbornly refused to give funding to those women's groups so that they can do things like get to Ottawa and make presentations to the government.

Those could hardly be seen as positive actions on the part of the minister who made such a profound statement at the world conference in Copenhagen just six months ago. That does not surprise anyone, certainly not those on this side.

The Liberal government in 1977 brought in a bill to make major changes to the unemployment insurance program in this country. It had far-reaching effects on all Canadians, particularly women. The Advisory Council on the Status of Women appeared before the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration and told that committee that the government had not consulted the council before drafting and presenting the legislation. What is an advisory council for if it is not permitted to advise?

On the constitution, the government brought in the resolution which still has not been reported back to this House. The plight of women and other women's issues were ignored in the proposals put forward by the government. When the Advisory Council on the Status of Women was finally invited to appear before the constitutional committee, it stated it had not been asked, until the second round of meetings, to have any input into the constitutional proposals.

The members of the advisory council were not the only ones to be ignored; there were other groups such as the handicapped. In fact, many groups appeared before that committee and complained that they had been ignored. What can we expect from a government with a leader who only yesterday responded to female members on this side of the House in one way and to male members in another?

At page 6409 of yesterday's *Hansard*, when answering the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands (Miss MacDonald), the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) said, "I think the hon. lady opposite—". In replying to the hon. member for New Westminster-Coquitlam (Miss Jewett), the Prime Minister said, "—as regards the preamble which the hon. lady put to her question—".

**Mrs. Mitchell:** He is a sexist.

**Mr. Clarke:** The hon. member says he is a sexist. At page 6413, replying to the hon. member for Selkirk-Interlake (Mr. Sargeant), the Prime Minister said, "—the hon. member refers to a news report of yesterday". Therefore, we have two classes of members acknowledged by the Prime Minister, the head of the government. We have hon. ladies and hon. members. I do not know why the Prime Minister cannot refer to all of us as hon. members.

**Miss MacDonald:** Hear, hear!