

The Address—Mrs. Mitchell

tionable is that their position purports to alter the ownership rights of provinces only with respect to oil and natural gas, leaving the provinces' ownership rights over other natural resources as they are now. It is obvious that we have a dilemma in Canada. Let us hope that we, as a national federal party, can draw these two conflicting views together, and I believe that we can do so.

Let me, in closing, share with hon. members the honour which I feel to have had the opportunity to be elected to this Thirty-first Parliament, and to share with you again, as I did in my maiden speech in 1974, my comments, that I will dedicate myself to serving the needs of all Canadians but, naturally, the majority of my interests will lie with that constituency which put me here in Ottawa. I thank my constituents for that opportunity to represent them in this House of Commons.

Mrs. Margaret Mitchell (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, I am honoured tonight to stand before you as a new member in this House. I am very proud to be following in the tradition established by Harold Winch, who represented the great riding of Vancouver East for almost 20 years. I congratulate you, sir, on your recent appointment, and also my colleagues, particularly those who were elected for the first time.

I especially want to congratulate the nine women members who were elected to this House, and I would say to the last speaker that this does not include "the seven sisters", one of them named Esso. I am sure from my own experience that these women have worked very hard, perhaps twice as hard as our male colleagues, to be nominated and elected. As women candidates we convinced the electorate that a woman's place is in the house, House of Commons. I think, however, we still may have to convince this House.

I say this having recently completed an orientation workshop for new members, where many excellent panelists, all of them men, consistently referred to members as "he" and to spouses as "she". As a result my husband is now demanding equal access to the parliamentary women's lounge! Despite those male biases, however, I want to commend the organizers of the workshops. They were very helpful to new members. Undoubtedly under present government policy there will soon be an equal number of top women civil servants to sit on such panels the next time around.

● (2140)

Because we are celebrating the fiftieth anniversary of the person case when women, were finally recognized as persons under the British North America Act, I want to raise several related questions from my impressions as a new member on the Hill.

Why, for example, Mr. Speaker, are there only male security staff, and only female servers in the parliamentary dining room? Why is there no daycare service for parents who work here? How can a woman messenger, whose take home pay is \$380, support six children? Why should the staff on this Hill

[Mr. Elzinga.]

not be unionized and have decent rates of pay similar to civil servants?

It seems to me that what is done on this Hill should be a model for the nation. If we are committed to equal rights for all Canadians I wonder why we are not leading the public service and public opinion by adopting an affirmative action program. Surely affirmative action and collective bargaining rights for workers are long overdue.

I want to concentrate tonight on two main topics raised in the Speech from the Throne. These topics are vitally important to the future of Canada as well as to the people of Vancouver East, my riding.

First of all, as immigration critic for the New Democratic Party I will speak to the need for a more just and fair immigration policy that will protect the rights of Canadians and that will provide adequate funding for settlement services for new Canadians.

Second, because I am told that a maiden speech may cover the waterfront, I will raise important issues related to the Speech from the Throne proposal to build an effective Canadian merchant marine.

We need a more just immigration policy that will protect the rights of every Canadian as well as every immigrant; that will provide realistic settlement services for new immigrants, and that will treat refugees fairly regardless of their country of origin. Every person in this House, except one, is either an immigrant or a descendant of an immigrant. The exception, of course, is the hon. member for Nunatsiak (Mr. Ittinuar), who has aboriginal rights. So other members had better listen to him carefully when he speaks on self-determination.

Our history shows that Canada has grown and flourished after every major wave of newcomers. I am told that every immigrant creates 1.5 jobs. Immigrants work hard, repay many costs, bring skills, have strong family ties, and contribute richness to our culture.

I have lived for 20 years in a neighbourhood in Vancouver East that has over 18 nationalities on our two short streets. People work hard to purchase and improve their homes, to educate their children, and to improve their neighbourhoods. There is mutual respect between new and old Canadians because people know and help each other.

Why is it then, that the question of immigration and particularly of refugees, is the most emotionally charged topic on every hot line show across this country?

During times of high unemployment and economic insecurity, prejudice flares. People fear their jobs will be threatened by newcomers who may work for lower wages and longer hours. Labour feels that unions will be undermined and workers exploited. What does government do? Instead of creating more union jobs for unemployed Canadians and refugees, instead of at least maintaining Canada Works jobs to help provide services for newcomers, the present government has cut Canada Works funds at the worst possible time. In Vancouver East funds were cut from \$1.2 million to \$35,000—from over 150 to a mere three jobs. Mr. Speaker, Vancouver East is an