

S. O. 31

The senator was trying to say that if the Charlottetown accord had gone ahead with a provision for an elected Senate, that she would have ran at that time and felt she had a good opportunity to be elected. However, it would not have been because she was a woman but because she was good at her job and would have run on that basis.

I ask the hon. minister to actually cite some statistics and some examples of where the people of Canada support this type of reverse discrimination.

Mrs. Finestone: I suggest you read the standing committee report. You will find—

The Speaker: Order. The hon. secretary must always address the Chair. I get lonesome sometimes.

Mrs. Finestone: Mr. Speaker, I want to remind my hon. colleague that of those who appeared before the standing committee, 90 per cent supported employment equity.

I would also like to bring to the attention of the hon. member that Senator Pat Carney is a very staunch supporter of qualified women. At no time would anyone on this side or anyone who believes in fairness and equity suggest that factors other than quality and merit be taken into consideration. I would like to tell the hon. member that there are as many, if not more, competent, qualified women as there are men.

Last but not least, if someone has reasonable job qualifications, competence and equivalency, there is no discrimination in the ultimate selection. In short, with numerical goals a key ingredient of employment equity legislation is aimed at fighting rather than facilitating unjust discrimination and lack of representation.

Women make up 52 per cent of the population. I guarantee we can find competence among that—

The Speaker: It being 2 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 30(5) the House will now proceed to statements by members.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[English]

INFRASTRUCTURE

Ms. Mary Clancy (Halifax, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as a member from Nova Scotia I rise today to congratulate the Nova Scotia government for demonstrating vision and leadership with its solution for the redevelopment of Route 104.

In these times the Nova Scotia solution to highway 104 offers the safest redevelopment possible and safety is the most important issue here.

The \$29 million federal-provincial investment will kickstart a \$110 million private and public partnering project that will create over 800 jobs and ensure that this dangerous stretch of highway is developed in only two years, contrasting sharply with the public sector only alternative which would see redevelopment over seven to ten years.

The safety of Nova Scotians cannot be put on hold for 10 years. It is irresponsible to even suggest it can be. However, this is exactly what the western based Reform Party is calling for and so are the Tories, Brian Mulroney's friends in the other place. It is a shame these out of touch parties are willing to play old style politics with the safety of those travelling the Nova Scotia highway system. Nova Scotians want immediate action. They deserve nothing less.

The province should be congratulated on its innovative solution, which offers the quickest, safest and most cost effective redevelopment possible.

* * *

[Translation]

ACCESS AWARENESS

Mr. Maurice Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that it is National Access Awareness Week.

One of the things that this event permits us to do is to take stock of the headway made over the past few years in the area of accessibility for handicapped persons. In fact, fortunately, our society has recently taken strides towards the social and professional integration of handicapped persons. There remain, however, many more physical obstacles and wide-spread prejudices to overcome.

We must go beyond merely examining our consciences and actually ensure that concrete measures will be taken to permit these people to take their rightful places in our community, especially at this time when the federal government has committed itself to reviewing the Employment Equity Act.

* * *

[English]

GUN CONTROL

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the legislative measures proposed in Bill C-68 imply that gun owners are a risk to both themselves and to others and thereby a threat to public safety.

The Minister of Justice is unable or unwilling to provide empirical evidence to prove that gun owners present a greater risk to themselves, to the people they live with or to their neighbours.

The Library of Parliament has been in contact with the Canadian Life and Health Insurance Association and the Insur-