

Supply

federal Public Service employers. Who else can boast this claim in this country?

"Canadian Women and Job-Related Laws, 1981" provides excellent analyses on the subject, and I suggest to the Hon. Member for Kingston and the Islands and indeed to all Hon. Members of the House that they read this pamphlet. In fact, I suggest to them that they read much of what has been published in the last year. I doubt very much whether many Hon. Members of the House have read "Better Pensions for Canadians—Focus on Women", which was recently published. How many Hon. Members have read "A Working Majority. What Women Must Do for Pay", funded again by the federal Government? If Hon. Members had read this book they would know that only 10 per cent of the women in this country come under federal jurisdiction. How many have read "Reproductive Hazards at Work", again published by the Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women? I suggest that Hon. Members take the time to read the publications which have been funded by this Government which explore in depth the problem of women in our Canadian society.

My colleague, the Hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Caccia), this year had the first national conference on the impact of microelectronics on the individual work environment. Resulting from the conclusions of this conference, the Minister of Labour established a task force on microelectronics and employment, chaired by Dr. Margaret Fulton. The task force heard from a great many women's groups and women representing industry and Government. Some very important findings were reported in the task force report. We have established a commission of inquiry into part-time work, also under the leadership of the Minister of Labour. This commission, chaired by Joan Wallace, showed that 25.1 per cent of working women work part-time. This has wide-ranging implications on such things as pensions and unemployment benefits, and we are anxious to see the findings of this commission.

The Government funded a conference on daycare in Winnipeg—the first national conference on daycare—to the tune of \$100,000, and I emphasize as well that while daycare remains under the Welfare umbrella, it will be stigmatized and not recognized as the universal service it must effectively become. The federal Government funds daycare centres across the country through the Canada Assistance Program and, again, showing leadership, it is establishing daycare centres for its own employees. Last year, the Department of the Environment opened its Sunburst Children's Centre in the Environment Canada building in Downsview, Ontario. This daycare centre was the second of such facilities in Canada, second only to our own centre here on the Hill for use by House of Commons employees.

As the report of the Royal Commission on the Status of Women stated 13 years ago:

We consider the tax system unfair, not because it over-taxes indirectly the incomes of married women who work outside the home, but because it under-taxes the incomes of those taxpayers without dependent children whose wives work at home.

The fact is, and Hon. Members of this House who are familiar with the issues know this, that the family has changed dramatically in the last 20 years. No one in this House or in this country would disagree that the family as we knew it in 1919 is not the family as we know it today. Why do I use the year 1919 as an example? Because this is the year in which the Income Tax Act came into effect. Yet when this Hon. Member suggested it was time for a change, there were howls of protest from the other side of the House and from across the country. But the fact remains that one out of three marriages ends in divorce. We have an increasing number of single parent families—something like 58,000 at the last count. Furthermore, 40 per cent more families would be below the poverty line if there were not two earners in that family.

Therefore, I would like to recommend to the Hon. Members of this House, as part of their process of education—and I suggest to the Hon. Member for Kingston and the Islands that she has a great deal to do on her side of the House in educating her Members—that they read the report of the Royal Commission on the Status of Women, a Commission which, I might add, was set up by a Liberal Government. I suggest for reading as well the report of another of this Government's Commissions, that of the International Year of the Child, in order to obtain a really true picture of the family in today's society. As committed, concerned Members of Parliament, we must read these reports.

• (1220)

It has become increasingly clear to me that there is little understanding of the nature of the role of the status of women in Canada. Let me explain briefly. It is my role as Minister responsible for the status of women, and the role of my Secretariat, to examine Cabinet documents and be involved in all discussions on policy issues, whether it be economics or social development policies, changes to the Labour Code, the Human Rights Act, or matters pertaining to the Divorce Act. Status of women in Canada is present at these discussions, and that is happening here at the federal level. But I ask Hon. Members, are there people at every level of provincial Governments, for the most part confrères of the Hon. Opposition, examining documents and questioning the impact of these programs and policies on women? I have seen no evidence of it. There is no such machinery of Government in place in the Provinces with the exception of Quebec. Yet without that machinery of Government we cannot expect to see the impact of provincial policies pertaining to the status of women.

It will be very interesting for me when I come to the second meeting of the Ministers responsible for the status of women, my provincial counterparts who were so hard to find last year. Once they were named or routed out, however, they came full of good intentions; but did they, in the year since that last conference, put into place that machinery we have at the federal level?

As to other alleged areas of apathy, let me merely touch on some for they are subjects which my colleagues will address more completely in the course of this day. We have affirmative