

ment in the previous fiscal period. That budget went from \$740,000 to \$1,400,000, and \$401,000 was added for the "statut de la femme Canada" that organization in the bureaucracy. It is interesting to note that while the government opposite gave \$740,000 to the advisory council, the government of Quebec gave its women's council, le Conseil de la Femme, \$1.8 million, well over twice the amount.

The legislative reality of our government's six months in power is Bill C-6, which extended the spouse's allowance beyond the death of the elder spouse; the proposed sexual offences legislation was going through cabinet committee and was ready for drafting; some of the Outreach funding which had been cut off by the former government was restored and that program was under review when our government fell; amendments to the Income tax Act to recognize women's contributions in unincorporated businesses and farms had been proposed and only because of our defeat, was stopped; an employment strategy was ready for cabinet, and the list goes on and on. I see that time will not permit me to go on with them but I have four pages of accomplishments here.

Perhaps I could just finish with one sentence. In addition to the motion which suggests that the minister should resign, with which I agree, perhaps I could conclude by recommending, among other changes, that the advisory council be given new terms of reference which would enable it to report directly to Parliament on its own initiative, that is, from time to time whenever it felt necessary, and also that new members of the council be vetted by the council itself and that present council members be given the right to veto appointments of members. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mrs. Ursula Appolloni (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence): Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Unfortunately time is limited. I am distressed today that I have to stand up in the House under these particular circumstances. I am outraged as a Member of Parliament and as a Canadian woman at what is happening today, at the way the women of Canada are being manipulated for crass political purposes and not for the benefit of the women of Canada. This is so that the opposition parties can take cheap political cracks at the minister responsible. This in no way helps the women of Canada. I want to put on record as a woman of Canada that in no way do Canadian women approve of being used for cheap political purposes.

The whole point of the argument is that women do not allow themselves to be demeaned by what is happening in the House today. Those women of Canada who preach democracy will live by democracy. The implication of the debate in the House today is that those women who preach democracy cannot bear to abide by its rules and cannot exercise their freedom of speech. By the way, freedom of speech is given to a minister of the Crown just as it is to any other Canadian. He must be given the freedom to voice his views. With democracy, as the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands (Miss MacDonald) should remember, comes the responsibility to accept the will of

the majority. In this case a vote was taken and a majority of that council decided to postpone the meeting. What happened? A few people took up their buckets and spades, refused to play the game and ran home. I admire Doris Anderson. I would have admired her a heck of a lot more if she had stood by her guns and had seen the fight through. What she did was provide another excuse for a very facetious and stupid debate in this House today.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): I regret to interrupt the hon. member but, it being six o'clock, I do now leave the chair until 8 p.m.

At 6 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Order, please. When the debate was interrupted at six o'clock the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence and hon. member for York South-Weston (Mrs. Appolloni) was in full flight.

Mr. Kempling: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Did the hon. member who was speaking call it six o'clock?

Mr. Cousineau: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): I called it six o'clock. It was in fact about thirty seconds after six. Accordingly, I interrupted the hon. member pursuant to the Standing Orders. Someone later asked me whether that might indicate that the hon. member had been deprived of her ability to continue at eight o'clock, and I know of no reason why she should be.

Mrs. Appolloni: Mr. Speaker, I hope the foregoing interruption does not mean that the Tory members, who have brought forward this motion in order to protect the rights of women, are really trying to stop this woman from speaking.

When we stopped for our dinner break I was talking about quitters and about my anger with respect to quitters. I was talking also about my sadness at the fact that these same quitters did not have the sense to realize that, far from making them heroic defenders of women's rights, their actions reduced them to mere pawns in this political process and this game of embarrass-ty-neighbour, particularly if the neighbour happens to be a minister of the Crown. That is in fact what happened. The whole purpose of today's debate is not to promote the status of women in Canada; it is to try to embarrass the minister responsible for the status of women. Why should we embarrass him? He was elected by the people of Canada. His party was elected by the people of Canada to govern the country. My Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), in whose judgment I have perfect faith, appointed that man to look after the status of women. What has he done since that time?