



HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

First Session, Forty-fourth Parliament, 1993–96

Parliamentary Debates

(HANSARD)

Volume 554

26 March to 2 May 1996

MR SPEAKER: An address from the House of Representatives to His Excellency the Rt Hon. Sir Michael Hardie Boys, Knight Grand Cross of the Most Distinguished Order of St Michael and St George, Principal Companion of the Queen's Service Order, Governor-General, and Commander-in-Chief in and over New Zealand: YOUR EXCELLENCY--- We, the House of Representatives, acting pursuant to section 17 of the Public Finance Act 1989 and being desirous that sufficient provision be made for Offices of Parliament, respectfully request--- That Vote Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment for the financial year ending on the 30th day of June 1996 be altered as follows, namely, by--- Increasing the estimate of costs in respect of Class of outputs D1 by \$12,375.

Address agreed to.

MOTION---NATIONAL COUNCIL OF WOMEN OF NEW ZEALAND: CENTENARY

Hon. JENNY SHIPLEY (Minister of Women's Affairs): I move, That this House congratulate the National Council of Women of New Zealand on celebrating the centennial of its inaugural meeting on April 13, 1896 in Christchurch; and note that over the last 100 years the National Council of Women has been a strong advocate for promoting progress for all New Zealand women and to this day they continue to play a vital role in ensuring that a woman's voice is heard in the parliamentary environment; and further note that the Government, in recognising the valuable contribution the National Council of Women make to the process of policy development, and to mark their centennial, has presented the council with \$300,000 to ensure they continue as a strong organisation into the 21st century.

It is with great pleasure that I move this motion this morning and I think that it is timely that the House reflect on the extraordinary contribution that the National Council of Women has made to the development of women in this nation over the last 100 years. Looking back in history one sees that the council had an extraordinary beginning. This House noted that beginning in 1993, when we celebrated the Suffrage Centennial Year in this country.

It is out of that suffrage achievement that the National Council of Women was born. When we look at the history during the period 1893 to 1896 we see that it is clear that the women of that time, having won the right to vote, suddenly realised the importance of then going on to set the agenda through which women would continue to try to establish ideas---and, indeed, to put forward concepts that would advance the status of women in New Zealand.

Perhaps the history of the National Council of Women is best captured in a book released recently by Roberta Nicholls, in which she talks about the "women's parliament". The council was, in fact, known as the "women's parliament". The whole concept of the National Council of Women was originally couched in terms of women in Parliament and the women's parliamentary set of ideas, to provoke the Legislative Council and the Parliament of the day. That was one of the main aspirations of the women in the council at that time.

I think that there is also another important thing to be noted by this House this morning as we consider this matter. That is, it is quite clear that the feminists of that time had a very clear desire to strive to---and I quote from the book---"remove obstacles or disabilities which prevented them from pursuing all activities open to the men", but "they had no desire to alter traditional gender roles within the family". I guess that if there is a major difference between the National Council of Women of today and that of yesteryear, it is not in relation to the business of advancing the status of women and the matters that interest women---I think it is true today that the National Council of Women continues to project that intention---but that when we go back 100 years the women of that time had a very strong sense of moral code that overlay everything they did.

It is important to note in this House this morning, as we celebrate 100 years of development, that the early years of that feminist movement were couched very much in terms of the Church and the values associated with the Church, and also in terms of the Women's Christian Temperance Union, which sought to have moral values placed on almost all public policy.

This history covers a whole series of the programmes that the National Council of Women has been involved in, and it may take away the breath of some New Zealanders to look at one or two of the things that even people like Kate Sheppard were involved in promoting, around the turn of the century. I quote from a section of the book that mentions some work that she was involved in. It talks about the declining birth rate in the early period just after the turn of the century. She was arguing, and I quote: "not to increase the birth rate but to have an ethical code regulating the birth of children according to wise restriction of the natural law. We want a purposeful maternity that would scorn the production of inferior offspring. We want men and women to regard sexual relations as the given means to a highest end, i.e. the re-peopling of the world with sane, healthy, moral agents capable of forwarding the higher evolution of the race."

I suspect that that captures much of what drove those women, who were part of a society whose members could afford to be active in the women's movement at that time. I think that is also something that separates the early evolution of the women's movement from the women's movement as it is today, which is open to all women who wish to have a voice in setting the agenda for the future of women in New Zealand. It is clear that the women who drove both the enormous achievement of getting women the right to vote, and also the moral agenda and the political agenda of that time, were a unique and very significant group of women, but they had a very particular moral attitude. I suspect that if we look at the feminist movement today, we see that it has every similarity to the movement of earlier times in terms of activism and in terms of being clear about what it seeks to achieve for the women of New Zealand. But what is quite different about the National Council of Women today is that it does not generally seek to impose a moral code on society as we know it, but rather to leave that to this Parliament. In that lies an enormous challenge that I as Minister of Women's Affairs would wish to note today as we celebrate the centennial.

The challenge is that to some extent it has become unfashionable to moralise and to have a strict moral opinion that one seeks to set upon a nation, but it is worth reflecting on the evolution of society over 100 years, and on whether women, as they speak, should be seeking at least to portray some values---whether they are moral values or a moralistic set of values. The moral value that is very clearly seen in the early writings of the National Council of Women is something that still challenges a nation like ours today to try to form a view as to where justice prevails and where common sense prevails, and perhaps where the interests of our future society rest. As we celebrate 100 years of this council I think this Parliament could perhaps reflect on where we seek our values today, compared with the way that women sought their values 100 years ago in bringing those values to legislative programmes that they sought to have enacted. There is another piece of material that I would like to table for the interest of the House this morning. It is a copy of the first agenda that the National Council of Women considered in 1896 at its April meeting. It is a delightful document and it is worth every member of the House taking time to read it, if they are so inclined. It shows all the remits that were considered by those women during the week that they met. I have to say that there is an overwhelming similarity in some of the issues that perplexed the women of that day and that perplex us as a society today. It will not surprise the House to know that issues of poverty were considered in that first meeting. It may interest the House to know that they were arguing for a more proportional system of parliamentary representation.

So, on the very day that the National Council of Women began as an organisation, it was promoting the idea that Parliament should consider policy issues of the time that were going to form the basis of New Zealand law and a platform for New Zealand society, and that Parliament should be convened with people capable of taking responsibility for those decisions.

I guess the thing that struck me in this document was that in the remit the question of the moral code is again very visible. These women were not women simply beating a drum. They had a very clear set of values, and they sought to see that the Parliament of the time captured the sense of those values with a great deal of purpose. What is clear is that politics in the sense of "party designation" was absent. Indeed, in those days when they established the National Council of Women, they decided to put party politics aside and to set an agenda for the moral improvement and social development of this nation, which they saw as being overwhelmingly important.

Finally, I want to note in relation to the early history of the National Council of Women that there were periods when the agenda had been achieved to such an extent that the National Council of Women went into recess. There was a period during the decade from 1906 when the National Council of Women was not active in New Zealand. However, I am pleased to say that from the time that it was reconvened the National Council of Women has made an outstanding contribution in particular to the quality of legislation that has passed through this House. As a member who has been here in the last 9 years, my observation is that if there is one group of people that consistently turns up in front of select committees to make quality submissions representing not only women but also the interests of society in general, it is the National Council of Women.

It was because of this that Government believed that it was appropriate to provide a contribution towards the capital fund of the National Council of Women, so that it had the freedom to continue to do this work. I congratulate the National Council of Women for the success of the last 100 years, and I wish the council well as it strives and contributes in the next 100 years. The National Council of Women is worthy of the time of this House.

I seek leave to table the agenda of the first meeting. I hope it will be of interest to the House.

[Document, by leave, laid on the table of the House.]

DIANNE YATES (Hamilton East): I also wish to congratulate the National Council of Women on its 100th birthday and on 100 years of excellent work. Since the women's suffrage movement, having won the vote in 1893, set out to achieve fuller participation in our society for New Zealand women, the National Council of Women has played a major role. We Labour women in particular---all 13 of us, and nearly 30 percent of our caucus---congratulate the National Council of Women on its 100 years of service, not only to New Zealand women but to New Zealand society as a whole.

We congratulate the National Council of Women, Kate Sheppard, Ada Wells, and that band of women in the 1890s on having what I will call the "mad cow disease" of the 19th century. I have just come across a cartoon that shows that when the National Council of Women was set up it was called "National COW"---National Council of Women---and it was depicted as being mad. I thank the council for that madness. I thank the National Council of Women for its persistence, tenacity, and commitment---a commitment that I wish I could see in our present Minister of Women's Affairs.

She has managed to give \$300,000 to the National Council of Women. In Wanganui in October 1995 at the National Council of Women conference she gave \$300,000 to its centennial fund. I will report to date that the council has received only half of that amount---\$150,000. In fact, I think that the Minister is getting a really good deal here. She is basically giving the council twice her annual salary

and allowances to do her work for her. Let me look at the usual contribution to the National Council of Women. Do members know what its annual funding is from the ministry? It is \$30,000. That is below the minimum wage for all the wonderful work that those 200,000 women do in this country.

Two hundred thousand is a good figure because that is the amount of money the Minister of Women's Affairs got in the last financial year for speeches. She made six speeches. Do members remember when we looked at the review of the Ministry of Women's Affairs and she had \$200,000 allocated to make speeches, and we asked her how many speeches she had made? The answer was: "In that year, six." We remember. So she gives \$30,000 a year to the National Council of Women. But it is funny that with election time coming up the council suddenly gets \$300,000. I would say that is a bit ironic, because we have Kate Sheppard on our \$10 note. One sees this wonderful \$10 note with Kate Sheppard on it. Poor Kate Sheppard! She must be rolling in her grave to think she is on the \$10 note and yet all we can come up with for the National Council of Women is \$300,000.

I see the previous "Minister of Early Childhood" over there grinning and making comments. Would he like to have a look at how far \$300,000 would go for Plunket, when this Minister of Women's Affairs and that Minister over there could not come up with even \$800,000 for a hot line for Plunket? This Minister, one who knows what it is like living in a rural area with young babies, cannot even come up in the Budget with \$800,000 for a Plunket hot line.

Hon. John Luxton: We gave \$20 million to Plunket---get the facts right.

DIANNE YATES: That Minister also knows that Plunket in the Waikato has been cut. Karitane Family Service care in the Waikato has been cut by \$300,000. The Minister has probably taken it from Plunket to give it to the National Council of Women. So where are we going in order to help women and children in this country? The Minister cuts \$300,000 off the service and puts \$75,000---a little bit of money---into helping a nurse get around the country, when that is not what women said they want.

So we thank Kate Sheppard, because in 1896 she did not want only a women's parliament---an alternative parliament where women could be put to one side and consulted when need be---she wanted full participation, and she wanted more women in Parliament. I am glad the Minister of Women's Affairs has made a comment about moral issues, because we know she has a good Presbyterian background. Well, so have I, and I know that when the baptismal vows are taken in the Presbyterian Church, the whole congregation stands up and honours and vows to care for the children in that community. Those are the kind of moral values Labour still has that care not for the individual and pushing the individual, but for the community, and for women and children in the community collectively. Those are the kind of moral values society has lost, with the complete obsession with "me, me, me" in this present generation and with this present Government with its silly tax cuts that do absolutely nothing to help women.

Neither do a lot of the other things that the Minister of Women's Affairs has let go through, like losing pay equity, and the 1991 benefit cuts. The other side of the House should not talk drivel about moral values and the care of children and poverty, because it is absolute drivel. The Minister of Women's Affairs cut benefits in 1991 and voted to get rid of pay equity, and I do not think she could see poverty even if she had glasses on. She spent \$200,000 on speeches of which I have not heard even one. She can go to a business lunch in Hamilton to launch a National Party campaign but she will not face up to Plunket.

Let us look at the agenda of the National Council of Women in 1896. Yes, it addressed poverty. Yes, it addressed conditions of work for domestic workers. What else was on the agenda? Women's health was. Yes, it addressed proportional representation. That is not new, Mrs Shipley. We all know---at

least Labour women know---that has been on the agenda since 1896. Yes, it addressed matrimonial property. It is funny that the Minister left that one off when she put out the agenda. Yes, it addressed women in higher education, but she has cut the tertiary incentive allowance for graduate students. Yes, it addressed the issue of women on juries. Yes, it addressed the issue of women in relation to judicial and political equality. We have 142 judges in New Zealand. Only 19 of them are women, which is 13 percent.

Yes, it did address the whole issue of reproductive technology. Yet I was on television the other night and they asked me what the Minister of Women's Affairs thought about my member's Bill on reproductive technology. She said nothing. She referred them to the Minister of Justice. I have been writing letters to the Minister of Women's Affairs for about 2 years asking her to pick up this Bill and to address what is a major issue for women in this country---that is, the whole area of technology and what is happening in the present world.

Honestly, this Minister of Women's Affairs! Gosh, I cannot get the words out, I am so angry with her. I am one of those mad cows, and thank God that I am. This Minister is not even facing up to reality in terms of women in this country.

Hon. John Luxton: Mad cow---what a sexist comment!

DIANNE YATES: I do not mind. The Minister knows a lot about cows, and they are damned good things and they make a lot of money for this country. But let us look at the conditions of work and at what is happening to women. Let us look at the casualisation of labour. Let us look at the fact that we are \$188 a week behind every man. Let us look at how nothing has improved since this Government has been here. Let us look at the whole area of women's health. Let us look at the area of proportional representation. I think the Minister is about the only woman on that side with a safe seat so what on earth is she doing as a role model to help women get into this House?

Let us look at some other of these National Party women over there who have done so much to support the National Council of Women! Thank God for the National Council of Women. We have Joy McLauchlan, the member for Western Hutt, talking about pushing babies uphill against the wind. I have never heard such a ridiculous speech in this House in all my life.

Joy McLauchlan: It's a tremendous issue.

DIANNE YATES: Tremendous! But what about Plunket? What about putting \$300,000 and \$800,000 into Plunket instead of into silly speeches about how to push a baby uphill against the wind? It is a waste of time that particular person being in this House. It is about as silly as her colleagues speech about men inventing vacuum cleaners. So let us put some money into Karitane services in this country. And let us also look at what is happening to women's refuges in this country.

Let us look at the fact that the Minister of Housing makes women's refuges jump through 3,000 hoops just to get a women's refuge because he has something called ``the business model'' a women's refuge has to have a resale value. I ask you! In Hamilton he will not buy a house because it is the most expensive house in a poor area and does not have a resale value. I put a challenge out to the Minister of Women's Affairs and the Minister of Housing to listen to the National Council of Women in helping women's refuges. Let us have some purpose-built women's refuges if that is the case and they do not have a resale value and they do not fit the business model for the Minister of Housing.

Let us look at the Study Right scheme, let us look at women in education, and let us also look at the 37.2 percent of young Maori women in this country who are unemployed. What is the present

Government doing, and is it listening to the National Council of Women on these issues? I say a big thank you to the National Council of Women for its constant submissions.

LIANNE DALZIEL (Christchurch Central): I too wish to speak in support of the motion. I am utterly amazed that the Government has put up only the Minister of Women's Affairs to speak to what is a very important motion, and one that all the members of this House, not just the women but the men as well, support, because the contribution of the National Council of Women is such that they represent the views and interests of women but that is because they represent the views and interests of all in New Zealand. The advancement of women's rights, I have always said, is the advancement of the well-being of the nation. It is not exclusive; it is inclusive. I think it is incredible that a party that has only four women MPs in this House puts up only one speaker on a motion such as this.

I was shocked at the speech made by the Minister of Health. I heard part of it up in my office and I heard the rest when I came down. I was fascinated with her decision to latch on to the promotion of the spiritual, moral, civil, and social development of the community, which is one of the many aims of the National Council of Women. But it was focus on the moral that she decided to raise in the House this morning. She omitted the very important word that is part of that phrase, and that is "community"---the development of the community. The focus on individual responsibility to the exclusion of the collective, to the exclusion of the community, is the fundamental problem with this National Government's approach to the health and well-being of this nation.

The mentality that we are getting from the Government is that of blame the victims. That is something the National Council of Women does not have in its goals and ambitions. The Government blames the children. It says: "Let's punish the children."

Hon. John Luxton: No.

LIANNE DALZIEL: It is because those children were not as fortunate as the Minister who interjects across the House and who will not take a call in this particular debate.

Hon. John Luxton: I just might yet.

LIANNE DALZIEL: I hope that he does take a call.

Hon. John Luxton: Let's see how many men from the Opposition will speak.

LIANNE DALZIEL: We will have men speaking in this debate, but I do make the point that we have 13 women members of Parliament and the Government has four. I think that he should be a little bit cautious about the comments that he makes. Of course, with the coalition partner they now have five.

Joy McLauchlan: Six.

LIANNE DALZIEL: I forgot, yes, of course, there are six. The children do not choose the families they are born into, and yet the Government says to punish them anyway. It says: "Let's not help them. Let's not ensure that Plunket is the well-resourced organisation that it used to be. Let's ensure that the children don't get a good start, because we can just blame their parents for it." What I am telling this Government is that all it does is ask the next generation to pay the price for its total and complete inaction.

The Minister of Women's Affairs did not repeat in this House the comments that she made to the social work department at Canterbury University at the time she slashed the benefits of the lowest-income people in this country. What she said at that meeting, and I do not need the quotation in front of me because it is etched in my mind, was: "The welfare State represents the warm lap into which

you crawl, and the skirt to which you cling in times of need." That is what Jenny Shipley said at the time she was slashing benefits. Cutting benefits was about creating independence and getting rid of dependence.

Hon. John Luxton: Correct.

LIANNE DALZIEL: The Minister agrees with the Minister of Social Welfare that the welfare State is "the warm lap into which you crawl, and the skirt to which you cling in times of need." That is why this Government has introduced an independent family tax proposal, and it is not going to give that same benefit to the children of people on benefits. That is disgraceful. What sort of country is this Government trying to divide us into? That is not what the National Council of Women, formed 100 years ago, stood for, and it is not what it stands for today.

There is a particular area, in terms of the National Council of Women, that I do want to pay tribute to, and that is its parliamentary watchdog committee. The National Council of Women undertakes tremendous work to ensure that all legislation is monitored by an organisation that has women's interests at heart, but, as I said before, it means that it has the interests of the nation at heart. It is not an exclusive interest---in fact, it is an inclusive interest. I believe there is a good opportunity for this House to thank the National Council of Women for the watchdog role that it plays.

I was very interested in the comments made by the Minister of Women's Affairs when she thanked the council for its contribution, when her Government has failed to listen to just about every submission it has made since it took office. The council opposed the benefit cuts. It opposed the repeal of the employment equity legislation. It opposed the Employment Contracts Act. It opposed the change to market rents. It opposed the so-called health reforms. It opposed the removal of teacher registration. Where it matters, that Minister of Women's Affairs does not listen. She never listens to the concerns of those organisations.

I actually do not know whether the general public is aware of how much time, effort, and resource is required for the National Council of Women to fulfil this important role of parliamentary watchdog. The Bills that are introduced are sent to the National Council of Women. It does not get that service for free. In fact it has to pay for all the Bills they are sent from this House. I want to come back to that shortly. Those Bills are then read and the key points are circulated to branches for comment. The feedback from branches is collated and sorted and the National Council of Women produces a single submission.

They make submissions on everything. I have just picked up the latest cache from recent times. Submissions were made on the Budget Policy Statement, the Department of Conservation visitor strategy document, Ministry of Health standards, and various other things. It makes submissions on just about everything and tries to introduce a particular perspective. The feedback is collated from the branches so a lot of input comes from around the country. This requires a significant commitment and an equally significant contribution to the work of the select committee, and ultimately to the lawmaking process itself. I do not think we could overstate in this House the value of the contribution made by the National Council of Women.

I return to the cost associated with Bills because I want to use this opportunity to draw to the attention of the House an unintended consequence of the new Standing Orders as they relate to the National Council of Women, and presumably to other organisations as well. In the past, once Bills had their first reading they were sent to a select committee. As members would know, Bills now have their first reading by way of tabling in the House and it is in fact the second reading that determines whether they will proceed to the next stage of select committee referral. That is a very positive change because

it does give us notice. I certainly recall occasions when I have received Bills as the Minister has risen to his feet to introduce the Bill. It is an important change that has been made and it should be welcomed.

But for the National Council of Women it represents a new cost, and nobody has taken this into account. It now receives Bills when they are introduced but it does not know whether that Bill will proceed to a select committee, and will not find out until the following week. This is particularly the case with members' Bills as opposed to Government Bills. But the reality is that it does not know whether a Bill would pass the vote for introduction or for referral onwards until a week later. That means that an organisation has had to pick up a new function, and I do not believe it was the intention of the House to put an additional burden on an organisation such as the National Council of Women. So I do raise this matter for the attention of the House and I hope that, as a result, somebody will take it up and ensure that the council is able to continue its very excellent work.

Looking at the history of that organisation, I noted that its early concerns were adequate education, marital property rights, and political equality. It actually caused me to think that little had changed in 100 years.

JOY McLAUCHLAN (Western Hutt): I rise in support of the motion to congratulate the National Council of Women on its 100 years of active involvement in New Zealand society, right from the grass-roots community level through to what it has done at Government level. I wish to place on record my huge debt of gratitude to our great grandmothers, our grandmothers, and our mothers, for the work that they have done to ensure that there has been a constructive and loud and visible voice---a voice can be visible because the organisation does a lot of writing---for women and children in our community. I thank it very much and congratulate it on the 100 years of fine work and wish its members well for another 100 years.

It is extremely noticeable that when members on this side of the House speak we are faced with a barrage of interjections, whereas when members on the other side speak they are given the courtesy of being listened to, particularly in this area, on which one would have thought there would be unanimous support to congratulate the 100 years of the National Council of Women. No one objected until the member for Christchurch Central came in, and then she started to object on the Minister. I did note that.

It seems to me that we have another illustration that socialist or Labour women seem to think they have the mortgage and the intellectual property rights on compassion. That is entirely untrue. This Government has an enviable record of the sort of legislation that has been brought in to assist women. Labour women have talked a lot about it, but it has been up to this Government in its various terms to implement the appropriate legislation.

I go back to the Equal Pay Act of 1972 and the Matrimonial Property Act of 1976, both very good Acts that had their genesis in the minutes of the National Council of Women 100 years ago. There were the Human Rights Act of 1977; the Family Courts Act of 1980; the Domestic Protection Act of 1982, updated in 1995 by the Domestic Violence Act; the Child Support Act, admittedly talked about by the previous Labour Government in 1990; the Human Rights Act of 1993; the Films, Videos, and Publications Classification Act---the pornography Act that the Labour Government had 6 years to do something about, but it did not happen until we came into Government; the Cancer Registry Act; and in 1994 the Health and Disability Commissioner Act, which ensured a way for people to have confidence and be able to complain and go through a recognised process if they have areas of concern in the health and disability fields. It is an enviable record that this Government brings to the House.

We have shown that we have a commitment to education and to health that our original conservative foremothers who started the National Council of Women would be proud of today. It is quite interesting to go back to the very first meeting of the National Council of Women and note that it mentioned that it is inappropriate for the council to have any reference to party politics. I am proud to say that in the Hutt Valley today that is still the case.

I was pleased and delighted to go to the council celebrations in the Hutt Valley on Sunday at the Trentham Racecourse. A huge number of women were present and it was a wonderful celebration. The organisation has been domiciled---if that is the appropriate word---in the Hutt Valley for about 40 years. Prior to that, women from the Hutt Valley area were members of the Wellington branch. In the 1950s it was deemed appropriate for them to set up their own branch in the Hutt Valley. Travel costs into Wellington were mentioned as one of the hindering aspects to attending the Wellington branch, and that became a reason for the Hutt Valley having its own branch. But, basically, it was timely. The Hutt Valley had sufficient organisations for women to start their own branch, and now some 27 organisations are involved.

During that time, the branch has changed from having morning tea to having coffee and dessert. That may seem a fairly bland sort of statement, but embodied in it is the suggestion of a huge change from the time women worked at home with their families, often playing the role of wife and mother, to now when they still play that role of wife and mother and work in the home area but both partners work in paid employment. So the meetings now tend to be in the evenings and are centred on coffee and dessert. That in itself shows that in a 40-year period there has been a huge change in the role of women. Some would condemn that and say it is wrong, but I personally would not. It is wonderful that women now have the choice to do that. Also, it is a big commitment for them to go out in the evening to spend their time voluntarily giving to a great---

Dianne Yates: They don't have a choice.

JOY McLAUCLAN: Of course women now have a choice that they did not have in the 1950s. It is interesting to note that the member for Hamilton East continues to deride me for making comments about pushing babies in a pram uphill into the wind. It shows very clearly that if people have never stayed up all night with a baby who has sore ears or a cold, then they do not know---[Interruption] One can do it oneself, without the Plunket hotline, if there is the ability to know that it is inappropriate to push a baby into the wind in the middle of winter without suitable protection.

Getting back to the celebrations we are acknowledging today, I again offer congratulations to all the women who have been involved. In relation to the resolutions, they have, for instance, spent many years trying to get equal pay---from 1897 through to 1967. In fact, it was not until 1972 that that was fully implemented. It was in 1967, I remember, that we started to get equal pay.

The Contagious Diseases Act was an interesting Act. It did not apply to the chaps, whereas the chaps were the ones who tended to take such diseases as gonorrhoea and syphilis home to their unsuspecting wives. The equality in marriage law was something the women worked for right from the very beginning. In fact, they defined amounts they felt should be given over to women, as long as, of course, they had already taken care of their mothers and sisters as well if those members of their family were not otherwise supported. So there was always a balance in what they did. But they certainly looked forward as well as endeavouring very much to take care of the women at the time.

The Hutt Valley National Council of Women is a very active group, and I have a lot of time for it. During the Suffrage Centennial Year celebrations in 1993, I asked other elected women in the Hutt Valley whether they would be interested in forming an education trust for women who were either

returning to education or leaving school to apply for assistance for their tertiary fees or living expenses. I know that the member for Southern Maori, the Hon. Whetu Tirikatene-Sullivan, has also been closely involved with that trust, as she is obviously an elected women in our area.

As a result the "SHE Trust", as it is now known---Suffrage Hutt Education Trust---is now in its fourth year. We have been delighted with the response we have had from the local community to build up a capital fund and we have been able to give out \$1,000 a year. It has been given both to young women straight from school and, in a couple of instances, to mothers to assist them with child-care when they return to further their education.

The woman who received the scholarship fund this year is a young mother of four children who left school with only one or two School Certificate subjects. She is using the money to provide for care for her children while she attends a kindergarten teachers qualification course. Last year's recipient was a mother who was on the domestic purposes benefit and who has gone back to Victoria University of Wellington. She also used her money to have her children looked after. I congratulate the National Council of Women and wish it well.

RUTH DYSON (Lyttelton): I wish to support the motion. I am very disappointed in the Government, which, at the best of times during this debate, has been able to provide only three Government members in the House. That is an indication of its lack of commitment to the National Council of Women, and it is insulting. I believe that the council has provided the most valuable input from a wide-ranging representative group into the parliamentary process, and certainly into other procedures throughout the country.

As a Christchurch woman member of Parliament, I am particularly pleased to participate in this debate. The first meeting of the National Council of Women was held in Christchurch 100 years ago this week, and both Lianne Dalziel and I, as Christchurch Labour women, are very proud to participate for that reason.

The National Council of Women presents very well considered and thoughtful submissions regularly to Parliament. It is a consistent disappointment to me that those submissions, having been thoroughly prepared, and the women having taken the time and effort to present them personally to the select committee and having well considered debates with the members of the select committee, are then totally ignored by the Government. That flies in the face of democracy, and I find it very insulting to the National Council of Women. The House should note, and commend the National Council of Women for, that participation and ask it to remember that later this year it will have the opportunity to further its input with a Government that will respond and engage properly in the debate.

When the National Council of Women was originally established, its aim was to improve the input of women in the trades area, in the professional area, and in social and political work. That was the obvious extension to the achievement of giving women the right to vote in New Zealand. That was the next step of the women's movement in New Zealand. It is useful for us to review what has happened to women in those particular areas in New Zealand over the last 100 years.

It is a disgrace that the first thing the National Government did after the 1990 election was to scrap Labour's equal opportunities and pay equity legislation. The Government's very first act was to destroy the opportunity that women had worked for for so long to improve their status and the recognition of the work they do in the paid employment area. Women, on average, earn less than 81 percent of men's earnings per hour in paid employment in New Zealand. That is not because the work that women do is not worth very much. It is because that work is not valued.

That attitude is clearly led by a Government that does not value the contribution that women in our society make in paid employment, in unpaid employment, and in the voluntary sector. Certainly, the repeal of Labour's employment opportunities and pay equity legislation was a clear demonstration that the Government does not value the work that women do in the paid workforce.

The areas of the workforce that are dominated by women---for example, early-childhood education, child-care work, primary school teaching, cleaning, nursing, caring roles such as home help support, and that sort of work---are very poorly paid. Once again, I have to say that that is not because those jobs are not worth much, as the Minister of Labour would try to tell us, it is because they are not valued. Women remember that sort of treatment. I think it is about time this Government started looking at the real role that women play in our society.

The Government then took another great leap backwards as far as valuing women is concerned, and introduced the Employment Contracts Act. Again, that has done for women exactly the opposite to the goals that the National Council of Women promoted 100 years ago. Once again, it showed that the Government thought very little of the value of the work of women.

Every day in the voluntary sector, women work to keep our communities going. Voluntary workers do not work for reward. They work in the voluntary sector for the good of other people, for the good of their families, their communities, and our society, and to give something back to people in times of need. They work for sick people, for elderly people, and for people who might need some companionship, and that type of thing. They do it for others.

How are those people in the voluntary sector being treated by the National Government? What is happening in the real world, outside the Minister's little office in the Beehive, is that the Government is providing community organisations with fewer and fewer resources. Every year the competition for money gets harder. The Government is giving less and less to the organisations. In addition, the Government is giving them more and more work to do, as it pulls out of its legitimate role of providing services to our society. The Government is dumping that work on the voluntary sector, and providing fewer resources to do it. It is nothing short of an abuse of the goodwill of women primarily, but also of men, who work in the voluntary sector.

That voluntary work will be done because we care about each other in New Zealand. We would not say to the Government: "This should be your job; we won't do it." but we do say: "This should be your job." The Government should be responsible for providing services in health, in education, and in housing, which it is currently not providing. The Government is dumping that work on to the voluntary sector and not giving it any recognition or proper resources for it. That will be remembered. I know that on election day people who work in the voluntary sector will understand exactly how much their goodwill has been abused by the National Government.

It will be interesting to look at what protections are offered for voluntary workers. Most people who are volunteers in New Zealand think they are covered by standard legislation. Voluntary workers in New Zealand are not covered by occupational health and safety legislation. Most think that they are covered. But the Government does not care about the health and safety of voluntary workers. The Minister of Labour has been urged by Labour members of Parliament to include workers in the voluntary sector in occupational safety and health coverage, but the Minister said "No."

Voluntary workers can work in unsafe, unhealthy environments. They can endanger their own safety and well-being, because this Government does not care enough to extend occupational safety and health legislation to protect those workers. That is an outrage; it is a disgrace. It is something that I hope will not be reflected on the Government by any serious physical damage to a voluntary worker.

Those people deserve basic protection. They deserve recognition for the valuable work they contribute to our society.

In supporting the motion, I say that it is an absolute wonder to me that the Government could be part of moving such a motion, when every single one of its actions has undermined the goals that the National Council of Women set out to achieve 100 years ago. The National Council of Women has clearly and consistently tried to promote the views, concerns, and well-being of women in New Zealand.

At every possible point the Government has worked against those goals. In the paid employment area, the casualisation, the insecurity, and the low wages that have come about with the Employment Contracts Act have most negatively impacted on women. In the unpaid workforce, by slashing benefits and cutting access to child-care subsidies, the Government, once again, moved most negatively against women. In the voluntary sector, there is the absolute abuse by this Government of the goodwill of women in our community. Those three areas, amongst many others---paid employment, unpaid employment, and the voluntary sector---show exactly what this Government thinks of women in our country.

I do support the motion. I support the work of the National Council of Women, and I value its contribution, particularly as a parliamentarian, to our legislative process. Whilst supporting the motion I do urge the House to note that the major aspects of the Government's economic policy and its "social reform" legislative process have not only undermined the work that the National Council of Women has tried to do but at every point have undermined the opportunities for women to participate fully and to be recognised for that participation in our communities.

PAULINE GARDINER (Wellington-Karori): I also wish to support the motion; to pay tribute to the National Council of Women, and to congratulate the council on the celebration of its centenary. I also attended Saturday's celebration of its founding; I was fortunate to be able to host the Wellington branch of the council in Parliament, to celebrate that particular day.

I offer my contribution today much in the spirit that prevailed at that first meeting of the National Council of Women 100 years ago. My appetite was whetted on Saturday when some of the resolutions, notices of motion, and things like that that were passed 100 years ago were read out. They really offered food for thought.

The following resolution, previously tabled by Mrs Williamson and seconded by Mrs Doherty, was carried unanimously: "That at the present and future sittings of this council any reference to party politics should be immediately suppressed." I find that that is current today within the National Council of Women. I think it is what encourages and engenders women to go along and support the council; it is a forum in which women are able to express views and not be jumped on or criticised or categorised in any particular left/right scenario.

Judy Keall: Could the member read that resolution again?

PAULINE GARDINER: Yes, I will. It is quite interesting. It states: "That at the present and future sittings of this council any reference to party politics should be immediately suppressed." I think that is probably why the council is able to produce such good documents as are presented to Parliament today.

It would be interesting for us to have a look at some of these resolutions. I feel it is a pity that we do not have a full House today. I know I am not meant to make reference to the absence of members, but I wish people in Parliament, particularly blokes, could put aside their emotions about some of the

things that women advocate, and could take a look at them. I believe, when I read these resolutions, that we have actually wasted 100 years of common sense and goodwill and practical solutions. When one reads through these minutes one could be reading any Order Paper for a particular sitting of our current Parliament. I shall just touch on some of them, because they are rather interesting.

The council had a week-long conference, which in itself was pretty much a feat of endurance. Some of the women came from afar. Lady Stout was from Wellington---of particular interest to me---but people came from as far as Auckland, Gisborne, and Wanganui. Imagine what they would have had to do to get down to Christchurch in those days, in 1896!

Among the issues that they discussed were marriage and divorce. Parliament now is looking at de facto relationships and issues relating to marriage, divorce, property settlements, etc.

They looked at things like pauperization. It was proposed by Mrs Blake, seconded by Mrs Williamson--she seemed to be pretty active---and carried unanimously: ``That this council expresses its dissatisfaction with the present system of charitable aid on the grounds that its tendency is to encourage rather than lessen pauperism, and the council is strongly of the opinion that women should take their seats on all local bodies having to do with the distribution of charitable aid funds." I do not think that they were saying that charity was a bad thing; they were saying that the philosophies behind the provision of charity could be improved, and that the practical, common-sense application that women could provide would be of some help.

If we look at Thursday morning's agenda, one of the resolutions regarded the licensing Act. The House last night was discussing the Sale of Liquor Act. Nothing much changes, it seems, over a century. The resolution stated: ``That in the opinion of this council every political question should be decided by the majority of voters that go to the poll; that any deviation from this rule is subversive of great political principles and recognition of supposed right of government by minority." That is quite current as we move into a new political system because the old one was perceived not to provide that principle of government by minority.

The following motion moved by Mrs Alley stated: ``That the transactions of the National Council be printed in their entirety for distribution to their respective societies and for sale to the public." That, again, is a matter of foresight; to keep people informed, and to communicate with the public and with people who have an interest in that particular area.

I have been able to help the National Council of Women with just such an issue. My association with the council seems to be more practical than anything else. At a meeting of the National Council of Women with local women members of Parliament, we exchanged views on how we could help each other in terms of presenting legislation and participating in the parliamentary and select committee process. I complained to the council about its screeds and screeds of documents, very poorly typed, closely typed, and very hard to read late in the evening. The council said it could not afford new equipment. My office was able to beg, borrow, and scrounge a computer, which now adorns the head office of the National Council of Women, and which the council uses very gratefully.

It is interesting to note that there was talk at that first meeting about the principle of referenda: ``That the council is also of the opinion that some reform is necessary in the constitution of the Legislative Council. It heartily supports the principle of the referendum and trusts that these reforms will be carried out at an early date." I do not know whether 100 years later is regarded as an early date! I could be looking at any Order Paper in this current Parliament.

The council also stated: "It is the opinion of this council there is abundant evidence to show that our present treatment of criminals is not satisfactory either as regards the criminals or society." The following resolution was proposed by Lady Stout, seconded by Mrs Tasker, and carried unanimously: "That no system can be satisfactory which does not distinguish and classify the different kinds of criminal and aim at individual reform; that in the opinion of this council all sentences for serious offences should be indeterminate, i.e., decided as to duration by the reform of the criminal."

That is good common sense. I was out at Arohata Women's Prison the other night, and one of the prison officers was saying exactly the same thing. To classify prisoners as medium security, maximum security, or whatever is not the issue. There are women in maximum security who have attracted the greatest punishment for, say, murdering a partner for, one might say, understandable reasons. They will never offend again and never offended before, yet they are subject to the most strict regime within prison, rather than, as these women suggested 100 years ago, their reform or possible reform being looked at.

I repeat again it is a pity that we do not listen to some of these proposals put by women 100 years ago. They are not dissimilar to the proposals put by women in the House today. I agree with the Labour members that quite often such proposals are given scant regard when in fact we should be sitting down, putting our emotions in our pockets, and looking at what practical applications could apply.

There is another resolution here regarding immigration. It is a pity that Winston Peters is not here, because I must say that these women were discussing this issue 100 years before his time. There is also a resolution on the police.

In terms of immigration, another pointer to the ridiculous application of some of our immigration regulations relates to a meeting of the International Council of Women currently in progress in Auckland. Women from all over the world are attending. It seems that the Nigerian women were stopped at the border, so to speak, by immigration officials, because it is commonly thought that Nigerians who come to New Zealand seek to stay. Those women's visas were denied. The three women, including a retired judge of the Nigerian supreme court, were regarded as a high risk. On Monday I was very pleased to be able to get those visas for the National Council of Women, after begging, pleading, and telling the Immigration Service that it was being slightly over the top.

I again congratulate the National Council of Women and ask it to keep those submissions coming to select committees. Contrary to what my Labour colleagues say, I, as do others on the committees on which I sit, certainly pay great attention to submissions from the National Council of Women.

Judy Keall: We do, but they do not get what they want.

PAULINE GARDINER: They do not always get what they want, but nor do I. Many, many parts of their submissions are taken up. I wish the organisation well.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before I call the next member can I just say that, in relation to the new Standing Orders, we have changed the manner in which one member addresses another member. It is not in order to refer to members just by their Christian name; it must be by either their full name, their electorate, their portfolio, or whatever.

JILL PETTIS (Wanganui): I am pleased to join this debate in support of all that my colleagues on this side of the House have said in support of the National Council of Women. It is an excellent organisation, and I want most sincerely to congratulate it on the many achievements it has made on behalf of many women in New Zealand.

The National Council of Women was established in April 1896, in Christchurch, as my colleague the member for Lyttelton just said. I have been a member of the National Council of Women in the past myself, but, regrettably, because of the time constraints that we in this job suffer, I am not able to attend as many of its meetings now as I would like.

Kate Sheppard, who is among the most famous New Zealand women and was the first President of the National Council of Women, said in Christchurch in 1897: "It is quite possible that it may be said that as our council is composed entirely of women we should confine ourselves to subjects which affect women only." She went on to say: "With this I have no sympathy. We are human beings as well as women, and our humanity must take precedence over our womanhood. We are New Zealanders and therefore citizens, and whatever affects the well-being of the Commonwealth is our concern." Of course she was absolutely right. Kate Sheppard is remembered for many wonderful things, and I am very pleased to have read out that statement of hers.

I have a statement hanging on my office wall upstairs, here in Parliament. It was one of the very first things I put up when I came into this job. It is from Rebecca West, another famous feminist. Rebecca said: "I myself have never been able to find out precisely what feminism is. I only know that people call me a feminist whenever I express sentiments that differentiate me from a doormat."

The National Council of Women has been a staunch advocate for New Zealand for many, many years. In fact, this year is its centenary, and that is why this motion has been moved. The National Council of Women received a sum of \$300,000 in Wanganui this year to mark its centennial. It had its annual conference in that city, in the electorate that I represent. I am delighted that the National Council of Women received such a significant sum of money.

But I have to say I am particularly disturbed that, as some of my colleagues on this side of the House have mentioned earlier, although the National Council of Women spends hours and hours of time preparing well-researched submissions, which it presents to a whole range of select committees, most of those submissions are ignored. The women of the National Council of Women are meticulous in their research, and I always look forward to reading their monthly circulars and the submissions that they make. It saddens me greatly that many of their submissions on behalf and in support of women in New Zealand are ignored by this Government, and have been ignored by National Governments in the past.

The fact that we are celebrating the centenary of the National Council of Women this year is significant, as was the fact that we celebrated the centenary of women's suffrage in New Zealand in 1993. That was particularly important to me and many other of my women colleagues because that was the year when we first came into this House. Suffrage Centennial Year will be a significant year for women for ever, but particularly significant for those of us who came into the House for the first time in that year.

Labour has a very, very proud history of leading the establishment of women in national politics. Right back in 1933 the first woman MP in the New Zealand Parliament was Labour's Elizabeth McCombs. In 1947 the first woman Cabinet Minister was Labour's Mabel Howard. In 1949 the first Maori woman MP was Labour's Iriaka Ratana, who represented the area of Western Maori, which includes the area in which I live. In 1972 the first Maori woman Cabinet Minister was the Hon. Whetu Tirikatene-Sullivan. In 1993 the first woman Leader of the Opposition---the first woman leader of a major party in New Zealand---was Labour's Helen Clark.

While we have made significant gains, I still have to comment on the fact that the way in which Helen Clark's leadership in particular has been portrayed in various media leaves an awful lot to be desired.

While women in New Zealand have made many gains, the treatment that Helen Clark has received shows that we still have a long way to go.

One of the issues in which I am particularly interested is health. As a former nurse I have a keen interest in that policy area. Last night I attended a meeting in Hawera. It was a meeting called by the Midland Regional Health Authority to talk about the provision of health services in southern Taranaki. The nub of the meeting was that the medical unit at Hawera Hospital will close. That followed on immediately from the notification we had received that, on the other side of the Wanganui electorate, the Marton hospital would now cease to be a 24-hour care facility and would operate only during normal business hours.

I mention that because women are high health-users. We are also dominant in the health industry in that most nurses are women. Certainly, and positively, men are entering the profession, but health really is a female-dominated occupation.

I was astounded to go to yet another regional health authority consultative meeting where there was no evidence of consultation whatsoever. We were talked at for the first half of the meeting, then when the community wanted to ask questions one of the Crown health enterprise board members kept on wanting to draw the meeting to a close. His plaintive cry was: "We have had enough questions. We have had enough questions." Well, the people of Hawera quite clearly indicated that they did not believe that they had asked enough questions.

I am absolutely appalled at what is happening in New Zealand's health sector today. Wards are closing in hospitals in the rural sector---a sector of our community that is already disadvantaged. Most people who live in the rural sector already have to travel a considerable distance to get to their rural hospital. What will it be like for them when they have to drive all the way to a city hospital, which may be hundreds of miles away?

Another issue of concern to me is pensioner housing. This area is under real threat, just like health care. It is another disaster looming on the horizon.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I suggest to the member that she is now getting into a fairly wide-ranging debate on other issues. We are debating the role that the National Council of Women plays. The member must abide by that.

JILL PETTIS: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Women are dominant in rental housing in New Zealand. I know that the National Council of Women has repeatedly made submissions on health. We could fill this Chamber with the paper that the National Council of Women has submitted on this important issue. Health is a women's issue, and so is housing. Most of the tenants of State housing, rental housing, and council housing are women.

There was a story in my local newspaper about pensioners fearing the sale of council housing. They are fearful because they know that they cannot afford State house market rents. Women are fearful of being able to maintain a roof over their heads. They are fearful that they will not have any security of tenure. I know that the National Council of Women has made submissions on this important issue because it is a women's issue, but the Government has once again chosen to ignore the very good submissions that the National Council of Women has made.

Hon. JOHN LUXTON (Minister of Maori Affairs): I am pleased to take the opportunity to speak on and to endorse the Government motion congratulating the National Council of Women of New Zealand on celebrating the centennial of its inaugural meeting on 13 April 1896 in Christchurch. It is worth noting that that meeting was chaired by the then President of the Canterbury Women's Institute, a

Miss Sherriff Bain. At that meeting it drafted the objectives of the new council as being: "To unite all organised societies of women for mutual counsel and co-operation, and in the attainment of justice and freedom for women, and for all that makes the good of the community, and to encourage the formation of societies of women engaged in trades, professions, and social and political work in connection with which no organised union at present exists."

I have stood up to support this motion because I believe that the National Council of Women does a very good job, and I have noticed that the Opposition seems to think that women's issues are solely the domain of women in the House. They get up and speak, rant, and rave, but unfortunately they often do not address the real issues.

There have been considerable advances in the last 100 years both within the National Council of Women and within this House. I want to commend the National Council of Women for its very good work associated with this House---the submissions that come through from right around the country and its working committees with which I have had quite a bit of correspondence over the years. I have always found them to be very polite and very searching in their questions, and whilst they do not always get their way neither should groups or individuals in our society always get their way on every issue they want to push at the time. We do live in a democracy even though some of the women on the Labour side would prefer that we followed only one particular ideology all the time.

I have had a long association with the National Council of Women---in fact, my mother had a very strong involvement as I was growing up. Many good people right throughout the community have sought to bring the voice of women together, and I note that the original concept was a women's parliament. I think in many cases they organise very well the often disparate viewpoints amongst groups that represent women into a common approach to try to make submissions in a genuine way and in a very thoughtful way on legislation before the House and also on other issues of the day.

I have heard from Labour members that every action by this Government undermines the goals of the National Council of Women. That is the type of generalisation that this House has to put up with, and I ask members of the Opposition whether they believe that the Equal Pay Act, passed by a National Government, or the Matrimonial Property Act, or the Human Rights Act, or the Child Support Act actually undermine every goal or principle of the National Council of Women, as Labour members have already said in this House this morning. Their arguments, quite frankly, do not stand up.

The other interesting thing is that we have not heard one suggestion for the future from the Opposition this morning about what it believes we should be doing for women in our society. I had the opportunity yesterday to have lunch in one of the corporate boardrooms of one of New Zealand's largest companies and I was very impressed to see that half the executives I met were young professional women. That is where the future of women in our society lies. It is not in the area that is continually the focus of the Opposition---the welfare net.

The whole ability to free up choices for women revolves around a growing economy and education. It does not revolve around increasing benefits and looking at the negative side of the actions in an economy. By far the opposite approach is necessary: grow the economy, give people opportunity, then people start to have choice whether they are men or women in our society.

Then we had some comments about the welfare system, and the member for Wanganui is interjecting about the welfare system. There are some very perverse incentives in the welfare system, and the Opposition makes a great fuss about the fact that the welfare system is not quite the same as it used to be. Well, let us look at what happened after the social welfare changes in 1990. How does the solo parent benefit compare with those in other countries? The New Zealand solo parent benefit,

after the so-called benefit cuts, was just on 40 percent of the average wage in society. Compare that with Australia where the same benefit available was at 30 percent of the average wage, or the United Kingdom where it is 15 percent! We have a very generous welfare system and it is the largest part of the Government's Budget every year in this House because \$11 billion out of \$30 billion goes in social welfare payments.

Then we hear comments about cuts in health and education. This Government is spending more in health, education, and housing than any previous Government has spent in this country. I am not necessarily proud of that but I say the facts need to be brought before the people. For example, education funding has gone up by 25 percent in the last 5 years and health funding likewise with a similar increase. Housing funding has also gone up quite markedly. And in the welfare area we have continued to adjust benefits to those who receive them. [Interruption] This Government can be very proud---

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am sorry to interrupt the honourable member. I say to the member on my left, who has already spoken and who has consistently interjected, that she should remain quiet now until lunchtime.

Hon. JOHN LUXTON: As I said, this Government can be very proud of the role it has played in actually giving choice to women in our society. I must say that the women members of Parliament in this House, particularly on the Government side, have made a tremendous contribution to those changes that have given choices to women.

Dianne Yates: Name some.

Hon. JOHN LUXTON: We have heard of some of the issues that have been raised again by the Opposition. It says the telephone system for Plunket is no longer available in some area. What it ignores is the fact---

Dianne Yates: No, we didn't.

Hon. JOHN LUXTON: Somebody said that funding has been cut to Plunket. Now, my understanding is that Plunket's funding has gone up every year that we have been the Government and currently we fund about \$20 million of Plunket's expenditure. When we look at the amount of voluntary contributions to Plunket we find that it is minimal compared with the Government's contribution.

Larry Sutherland: I raise a point of order, Mr Speaker. I seek clarification of the caution you gave to the previous speaker, Jill Pettis, when she was speaking and somewhat generalising at times about the issues as they affect women---and there are many. On that occasion you drew to her attention the fact that there were some confinements in this debate and that those confinements related to the wording of the motion as it directly relates to the National Council of Women in New Zealand. So far I have heard no mention of that in the Minister's speech and perhaps you might like to rule on that.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: With respect, that is slightly overstating it. In the first portion of his speech the Minister was totally relevant to the motion. It is true that he is starting to drift off. When he was talking about the Plunket Society he was in direct rebuttal to earlier comments, but the Minister will come back to the motion.

Hon. JOHN LUXTON: Might I also note that these are the types of issues on which submissions have been received by the Government from the National Council of Women. We respect those submissions. Part of the problem is that from one perspective Labour says only half the story, and that is often what invites a submission to this House. At the same time there is another side to the story

that says: "Currently the Plunket Society movement in this country receives approximately \$20 million." Not only that, the work that was solely the domain of the Plunket Society previously now has several other organisations actually providing the services also supported with Government funding through the health system or through other agencies of Government.

We now have far more services in the area than perhaps the Plunket Society was ever able to provide when it was predominantly a charity-funded organisation. I agree with that. I think that that is very important. The National Council of Women can be very proud of the results that have come as a result of its submissions.

I am talking of the impact of Government in the area of women's lives. Just last year the Domestic Violence Act was passed as a result of a Government initiative. We have seen quite marked changes in our society in how we police that. The police now take a much more direct role in preventing violence in the home---far more than ever happened under a Labour Government. This is partly as a result of submissions from the National Council of Women and partly from proactive work by this Government. In a whole lot of other areas this Government can again be very proud of the work that it has done. I might also add that today more women are in the paid workforce than ever before. That is partly because of technological change, and partly because of choice.

Eric Roy: I raise a point of order, Mr Speaker. You have cautioned the member sitting opposite to withhold her interjections. She is interjecting from a seat that is not her own.

Jill Pettis: Was the member a big tittle tattle at school?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member will resume her seat because the point of order concerned the member and she cannot walk out talking whilst I am on my feet.

Jill Pettis: To square one.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will give the member a warning. She is getting very close to getting into quite severe trouble. I did say to the member that she---and I used the word "should"---should remain quiet. [Interruption] I give the member the last warning. If she speaks again whilst I am on my feet she will be leaving the Chamber. I gave the member a warning that she should remain quiet. I should have been more firm and said "she will". I did not, but said "should". She will remain quiet while she is in the Chamber until lunchtime.

JUDY KEALL (Horowhenua): I am speaking in support of the motion to congratulate the National Council of Women on achieving 100 years of contribution to the life of our country. I note the point in the Minister's motion that a donation of \$300,000 has been made to this worthy organisation. But I also add, and endorse the comments of the Opposition spokesperson on women's affairs, Dianne Yates, that it does not seem such a significant contribution when we realise that year by year the National Council of Women has to survive on \$30,000 per annum assistance when it does so much work making submissions on legislation that goes through our Chamber. By comparison, the Minister in her vote had \$200,000 set aside for speeches. When we asked how many speeches she had given in that particular year, it was only six.

The previous speaker made great play of the fact that more women are in the workforce. This is something about which the National Council of Women has had a lot to say. Yes, there are more women in the workforce. Right from the very establishment of the National Council of Women, it has worked for equal pay---not just equal pay between men and women, but equal pay for work of equal value. The council's remit goes right back to 1896. The council continued through the years with remit after remit.

Let me just read the House a couple of them: "That the National Council Women of New Zealand urge the Government to set up a commission to investigate the question of equal pay for equivalent work for men and women." That was in 1945. Another remit in 1960 urges the Prime Minister to implement the Government's declared policy of equal pay for equal work in terms of the findings of the implementation committee set up.

But do we have this? We almost got it. We got the piece of legislation put in place by a Labour Government supported by the National Council of Women. We got it in place in 1990. Groups were just getting ready to make a case under this legislation to get equal pay for work of equal value. We had an election and the first action of the National Government was to repeal Labour's employment equity legislation. The very first action taken on any legislation was to repeal that excellent Act. The problem is that we have huge groups of women in employment where the pay is lower. We have nurses, secretaries, shop assistants, and other big employment groups who are not getting equal pay for work of equal value. This is a big issue that the National Council of Women has made submission after submission on.

I want to congratulate the National Council of Women on the way it makes submissions to so many select committees---not just to select committees but also to the various bodies that take submissions--for example, the Public Health Commission or the Human Rights Commission. The National Council of Women makes submissions to the ministries as they are drafting legislation. Every month we get a stack of papers from the National Council of Women with examples of the submissions that have been made. Being on the Social Services Committee, I really value the contribution that the National Council of Women make. A lot of the submissions made by the National Council of Women are not taken up by this Government.

Debate interrupted. Sitting suspended from 1 p.m. to 2 p.m.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE---WEEKLY STATEMENT

Rt Hon. DON MCKINNON (Leader of the House): Obviously, Government Bills set down on the Order Paper and the consideration of the select committee report on the Tax Reduction and Social Policy Bill will, I believe, take up a fair amount of House time. On Wednesday the Dog Control Bill should just about take us through to the agreed rising time, somewhere before 6 o'clock. This is to enable the appropriate events to take place---Thursday being Anzac Day. As I conveyed to the Business Committee yesterday, we have the proposed dates for the balance of the sitting for the year.

Rt Hon. JONATHAN HUNT (Senior Opposition Whip): Firstly, I wish the Leader of the House and Minister of Foreign Affairs and Trade all the best on his trip overseas. I know it is an important one, and I hope he has a valuable and rewarding time. Secondly, I would like to say to him that I am glad the days for the rest of the session have been put down by way of notice of motion indicating they go right through to the end of October---which is, of course, no surprise to those of us who know something about Parliament. The third thing I would ask the Minister is whether in addition to the tax Bill there is any other Bill that has to be passed during this---

Rt Hon. Don McKinnon: The Dog Control Bill.

Rt Hon. JONATHAN HUNT: We will get through that. Is there any Bill---other than those two Bills---that has to be passed in the 4-week session that ends early in May?

Rt Hon. DON MCKINNON (Leader of the House): I take the view that the tax Bill is the principal one to be concluded. I say that with reference to the Dog Control Bill. I am not aware of any other Bill. If there is another I will raise it with the members concerned. I raise another matter with colleagues.

Parliament that the statement was totally false. I now have proof that the said statement made to this House by the member of Parliament for Pencarrow was, indeed, totally false.

In this Parliament yesterday the member of Parliament for Pencarrow said I had called the eminent President for South Africa, Mr Mandela, "a fat, balding, Maori" on my radio programme last Sunday morning. At the time yesterday I challenge the member of Parliament for Pencarrow to produce a transcript that showed I had made such a statement. I said to the House that the statement was false. Late yesterday the member for Pencarrow indeed produced a transcript of my radio programme--- known as the "People's Parliament"---for the Evening Post newspaper. There was no such reference to Mr Mandela as either fat or balding.

I respect the eminent President for South Africa, and I would not say those things. I told Parliament that I did not. The member for Pencarrow did not accept my word until the Evening Post brought him to account on it. It was a malicious accusation, and the member of Parliament for Pencarrow should now apologise---not to me, but to this Parliament---for this malicious accusation.

TREVOR MALLARD (Pencarrow): It became clear to me late yesterday that the information that I had that suggested that the Minister had said that President Mandela was "a fat, balding, Maori" was in fact incorrect. The information that the Minister had twice indicated that a photograph of President Mandela was a photograph of a Maori resembling President Mandela was in fact correct. I took some advice as to whether it was appropriate to apologise at that stage. The advice I got was that bringing it up again might in fact further embarrass our relations with South Africa, so I did not. But I do apologise to the Minister for the partial inaccuracy.

MOTION---NATIONAL COUNCIL OF WOMEN OF NEW ZEALAND: CENTENARY

Debate resumed.

JUDY KEALL (Horowhenua): Before lunch we spent a good hour debating this motion, which congratulates the National Council of Women on its 100th anniversary. It is very pleasing to see members of the National Council of Women in the gallery today for the continuation of the debate on this motion. We are all very pleased to be able to acknowledge the 100 years and the fact that the council has been given a donation by the Government.

Having said that, I just want to go back over a few important points that were made in the debate this morning. The debate did turn into a bit of a debate about how much had been done for women over this 100 years, and to what extent each political party had been involved in that. There was even a debate as to whether we were talking about women's issues or issues generally.

I would just like to make clear that the National Council of Women has always made submissions on a wide variety of topics, and in fact its first president, Kate Sheppard, said it all when she said in 1897: "It is quite possible that it may be said that as our council is composed entirely of women we should confine ourselves to subjects which affect women only. With this I have no sympathy. We are human beings as well as women and our humanity must take precedence over our womanhood. We are New Zealanders and therefore citizens, and whatever affects the well-being of the commonwealth is our concern." That has always been the way the National Council of Women has done things, and it has made submissions on a wide variety of Bills.

It has made hundreds of submissions to select committees and to Government bodies, and in my time in Parliament I have been very impressed by the range of submissions the council has made, and by the range of women it represents. Currently 46 different organisations are represented, ranging

from the most conservative religious groups to quite radical women's groups, and they manage to come together on some very important issues.

One of the issues we discussed this morning was the issue of fairness for women in employment. That is a topic the National Council of Women have made hundreds of submissions on, particularly on equal pay and equal pay for work of equal value. Those were quoted in some detail this morning. It was noted, sadly, that even though the Labour Government in 1990 brought in an Employment Equity Act, that was the very first piece of legislation that was tackled when this Government came to power, and that Act was repealed. Despite the fact that many more women are in the workforce now, they are not as well off as men in the workforce, and the fact is that in employment women are receiving a lower wage on average than men.

I was very pleased to be present in Levin at the celebration of the 100th anniversary with my local branch last Saturday, and I want to pay tribute to Gwen Segal-O'Regan and her team for the work they have done locally.

The other issue I want to address is that time is marching on. Times are changing and it is really important for younger women to come into this organisation. I guess that is one of the challenges I would like to raise to the National Council of Women today, seeing as some of its members are here with us---that they will look for ways, and I hope we can help them, to encourage younger women in. It may be that the organisation actually needs more funding. It was noted this morning that this organisation, despite its heavy workload, has to exist on only \$30,000 per annum on a regular basis. But it may be that it actually needs more assistance in the work it does in promoting interests for women and for all New Zealanders. The council plays a very important role. It may be that we have got to look at new ways of bringing these issues before Parliament and Government bodies.

In summarising, I just want to say that despite all the progress made by this organisation in making submissions, we still have a long way to go. The Labour Party has 13 women members of Parliament. We are doing our bit in Parliament. The National Government has only 4 out of 41. I notice that half of the Alliance members are women, which is very good. We are still waiting for New Zealand First to come up with some candidates, and the United New Zealand Party has two.

So on this day of celebrating the 100th anniversary of the National Council of Women, I would like to pay tribute to the work it has done and wish the organisation all the best for the next 100 years in making submissions.

Hon. KATHERINE O'REGAN (Associate Minister of Women's Affairs): I am delighted to be able to stand and speak to this Government motion today, which congratulates the National Council of Women of New Zealand on celebrating the centenary of its inaugural meeting on 13 April 1896 in Christchurch. Unfortunately I have not been able to be in the House this morning to hear them, but I am sure many of the speakers before me would have said that this was possibly a very unusual event in that we in this Parliament have taken time to speak to a motion of this type. I am even more delighted, of course, that it is about women, because I think it is a very important issue and at times we are unfortunately overlooked.

The National Council of Women grew out of the suffrage movements of some years before, and, 3 years ago, along with the suffrage celebrations, we also celebrated the Women's Christian Temperance Union's centenary. It was out of that time and out of that desire for greater political control and for independent control of women's lives as individuals that the National Council of Women began. The name of its most famous member would be Kate Sheppard, but other very important women became involved in that very first council. Some of them have gone down in history

as fine women to copy, in the sense that they achieved many things that were so difficult to achieve during that time.

The National Council of Women had as its kaupapa, its agenda if you like, issues that today are still with us. In those early times some of the issues that the women faced were actually quite well before their time, and, I am sure, drew the wrath of many a male politician, and, if not, then certainly of the church at that time. Issues that are of more recent time---although not so recent, probably within 30 or 40 years---such as equal pay, and, certainly in the 1950s, nuclear-free policies, matrimonial property and divorce laws, and the place of women and children in society, have been a part of their plans, their discussions, and their movements to impress upon Government the need for change and the need for it to be done reasonably quickly.

The organisation represents 250,000 women---that is in round figures---through 46 organisations, totally diverse, right across the country. It always amazes me that they have survived over this 100 years, because of the huge diversity that lies in them. For a start, National Party women are there along with Labour Party women. As the member who spoke before me said, there were conservative organisations and very liberal organisations. I think it shows the common sense of women to have been able to sit together around their council table for all these years to attempt to bring what they believed was a reasonable view from those women with such diverse views.

I think it is important to realise that women do not speak with one voice. It is wrong of anyone to presume or assume that they do, because they do not. Men do not all speak with one voice, neither do we. For that reason the National Council of Women has been able to distil, if one likes, the views of varying groups of women, and to be able to come up with proposals, certainly with ideas, to Government on many occasions when the Government has sought input from them not only at the beginning, in the establishment of policy decisions, but also at legislation time.

At the weekend, many of us---certainly I would hope all the women in this House---celebrated with the local branches the 100 years.

Trevor Mallard: And the men.

Hon. KATHERINE O'REGAN: I hope that some of the men also attended the celebrations. I attended in Hamilton, where we heard a history of the development of Hamilton and the development of women within that structure as well as looking at the history of that body. In many instances some branches have waned and then waxed strongly in different times when there were supportive women who had the time and the energy to become involved with the National Council of Women.

I think it is interesting for members to listen to the submissions from members of the council, many of whom are based here in Wellington, the people who come to the select committee. Probably the two that might be the best known, with due respect to those who are coming along and who have been there---I have to say I have not sat before select committees for some time---would be Lady Jocelyn Keith and Dame Stella Casey. Those two faces have been coming to this Parliament for many years, along with other well-known faces, and presidents of the National Council of Women---of which there are too many for me to recognise. To Janet Hesketh and her council today I say happy birthday. Those women bring with them, I think at times, some common sense to issues that are very important.

I did hear Mr Luxton's address on the radio in my office, before lunch, and I think he may have been taking to task the, shall I say, occasional submission that perhaps gave only one perspective. Of course it will give only one perspective. It is a woman's perspective gleaned from the membership of the National Council of Women, so that would be expected. I suppose as politicians we would also expect

its members to take into consideration other views and other ideas that are around. However, when they bring their views to the table it is those that we listen to.

During the preparation of the report to the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women, in New York, we relied a great deal on the non-governmental organisations to guide us with information to establish a report to give to the committee. I had the proud privilege of presenting New Zealand's second report to the committee. We were asked many questions. They were very impressed that we had consulted through the Ministry of Women's Affairs, and that we had consulted non-governmental organisations. Many of the countries involved in the United Nations, I believe, pay lip service to that information-gleaning. I am proud to say that we received a great deal of credit in New Zealand for consulting the National Council of Women, which, of course, represents so many New Zealand women's organisations.

It is thanks to the National Council of Women that the candle has been kept burning for women in this country. They are not only good at producing ideas and policies, but they are wonderful role models for younger women in this country. When I see the women who have passed through the portals of the National Council of Women's offices here, and I look to those presidents of the past and others, I think to myself that I am proud to have known them. I think they are worthy of the praise that they receive for their examples of community work, because it starts at that base before they even get to the high levels of office based here in Wellington. Many of them begin at grass-roots level with grass-roots organisations, and they carry that right through their time in the National Council of Women. So they give to all of us, to all women, very good role models and examples of how we can convey our views and our thoughts through to Governments of the day.

I would like to convey to the National Council of Women my personal happy birthday wishes, and I hope it will have another 100 years of very good success. Kia ora tatou.

JUDITH TIZARD (Panmure): This motion is our opportunity in this House to congratulate the National Council of Women of New Zealand on celebrating the centennial of its inaugural meeting on 13 April 1896 in Christchurch. It is an opportunity for people in this House to pay their respects, and to offer their love and gratitude to all the women who over the last 100 years have worked in and through the National Council of Women to make New Zealand a better place in which to live. For indeed the National Council of Women has not just worked for women, it has worked for all New Zealanders, but for women and children especially.

The aims that were set then are very similar to the aims New Zealand women have today, which is encouraging, because it shows that the foresight of our foremothers has guided us well. But it is also depressing because in many cases we have not achieved that which those good women hoped we would. The National Council of Women at its first meeting set its objective as being to unite all organised societies of women for mutual counsel and co-operation and the attainment of justice and freedom for women, and for all it makes for the good of the community, and to encourage the formation of societies of women engaged in trades, professions, and social and political work in connection with which no organised union existed.

The council was basically set up as a trade union for women, and it has carried out its job very well in some aspects. But while I always look to the National Council of Women's submission first on any Bill, I am often disappointed because I find that the number and the range of women who have the opportunity to express their view has, on some occasions, been rather narrow. The fact is that many women in this country use all their time to raise their families and to earn a living to keep a roof over their children's heads, and to feed, to educate, and to look after them. Many, many women in this

country do not have time to belong to organisations of the sort that feed into the National Council of Women, and it is for them that I hope that we all remember that the council, while doing an excellent job, is able to represent only a group of New Zealanders.

The council should be a trade union for New Zealand women, a union for all those women who do not have a voice in other political organisations. In 1896 it expressed its concern about adequate education and issues relating to women's participation in jury service. Old-age pensions were another concern, as were effective policing, marital property rights, and political equality. In general, all those issues remain with us still.

We are still concerned about women's access to education; about women's access to justice--particularly to the courts; about women's access to a dignified old age, and to a decent income to provide a dignified old age; about women's safety both in the home and outside it; and about women's marital property rights and the rights of women in other relationships, which would probably have been rather frowned on 100 years ago, but the fact is that hundreds of thousands of New Zealand women in de facto relationships have little or no protection for their property rights and for the rights of their children. Certainly, political equity is still a major issue for New Zealand women.

I pay particular credit to the two organisations that were major forces in the foundation of the National Council of Women. Those, of course, were women involved in the suffrage movement and women involved in the Women's Christian Temperance Union. While those women had a very wise view of what was for the good of society--and indeed what is good for women is good for society and good for the community--women recognise the need for community support rather than individualistic support as this Government so often moves to. We saw from the actions of those women a recognition that only through political change would women achieve that access to equality and to opportunity for their children.

The National Council of Women has always been political, perhaps with a small "p", but I want to argue that perhaps the next 100 years should see more analysis of the role of the council in politics with a big "P". Just as trade unions have found that it is hopeless standing on the outside battering at the institutions that are in charge of the creation and maintenance of the legal and social infrastructure, I would argue that every generation of women must relearn that lesson, and unless we become political, unless we find opportunities to participate and to make decisions, then decisions that we do not like will be made for us.

While fewer than 20 percent of the members of this House now are women, opportunities for good laws that affect all New Zealanders, particularly women, will be lost again and again. It is time for New Zealand women to become political, and to put themselves forward for office, recognising that it is not until we have good child-care and good community support that women can participate fully in politics.

Many areas continue to concern any thinking New Zealander about the role of women in this country. The fact is that, overwhelmingly, those families in poverty, those families identified either on the Minister of Health's rather narrow grounds, or on the grounds identified at the conference last week, are headed by women. I want to know what this Government is going to do to make a difference for those women, to give them and their children the opportunities our foremothers called for 100 years ago. Political equality is all very well but if the roof over a family's head cannot be paid for, political equality is well down the list of priorities.

Adequate education and access to education continue to be vital for all women, and I would argue that there are real problems in New Zealand right now about women's access to education. It is time

this Government recognised that its Study Right programme is denying women access to tertiary education. Many women who have helped to pay for their partner's, and who want to pay for their children's, education, who decided that they would put off their tertiary education until the family finances were better, have found that they have been cut out by this Government's action. That is an example of the sort of policy that is made when women are not at a decision-making table. No woman would have allowed that to go through, and I am outraged that this Government put it through.

In issues relating to access to training, we see that women continue to be vastly underrepresented both in post-graduate training and in trade training. Women are not being told about the opportunities they can get in a number of other areas. They continue to earn less than their male colleagues, even when they have the same qualifications. I am appalled to hear the Minister of Women's Affairs tell the House that the reason for the gap between women's and men's pay is that women have children. I want to ask her whether she is prepared to accept 20 percent less than her male colleagues because she has children. That is the effect of her stupid comments.

Women in welfare suffer because they are not being heard. They are the ones who are bringing up the children. They are the ones who are seeing the cycle of dependency, the cycle of deprivation, and the cycle of poverty being repeated because they cannot house and educate their children properly. Women are overwhelmingly the victims of violence; men are overwhelmingly the perpetrators of violence. Women need to be safe in their homes; they need to be safe in the community.

I argue that the things our foremothers asked for 100 years ago are still exactly the same as those that women in New Zealand are asking for today. I ask members of this House to think seriously about putting their money where their mouths are. I cannot imagine a national council of New Zealand men being satisfied with \$30,000 a year, or, on the occasion of its centenary, with \$300,000. The National Council of Women is a vital organisation for the well-being of this Parliament and for the well-being of New Zealand women, their families, and their whole community. The organisation is one that has probably contributed more than any other one organisation to intelligent debate on issues of policies of Government and social action in this country in the last 100 years.

CHRIS FLETCHER (Eden): I rise today to wish the National Council of Women a happy birthday and to give it my heartfelt thanks for all the confidence it has given me as an individual member of Parliament. I know it has meant a great deal to the other women members of Parliament. This can be quite an isolating place at times, and knowing that the council is there, knowing that it is apolitical, and that it is there to give support to women, for women, is something that means a great deal to me. So I thank the council very much. I acknowledge the women who are sitting in the gallery and the work that they have done for us all today.

I am particularly proud to see the National Council of Women standing up to all issues at select committees and proud of the contributions it makes on often quite complex issues. This morning I was not able to be part of the debate. I regret missing it, because I would have liked to hear what was being said. We were dealing with the Ozone Layer Protection Bill and getting to the consideration of some of those weighty issues. I kept referring back to the submission that had been made by the National Council of Women for some common sense and some guidance on how we should be proceeding. So I acknowledge that today.

Today in this world there is a general consensus of where we would all like to be heading. But the challenge is to chart the course, and in doing that I think putting women into positions of power is an integral part of developing that strategy. We are approaching a new century in a world that is

increasingly closely connected in terms of problems and solutions. To me it is critical that our elected representatives also reflect our population.

For me, women have an economic and a social intuition that I do not think men share quite so well. Our instinct, coupled with education, tells us what the priorities for the world should be in order to survive---what is important, and how far a dollar can be stretched when purchasing food, education, housing, and clothing for our families. We know this, because we know that the consequences of survival can be harsh. We carry the survival of the human species, and in many ways I think that motivates most women. Sadly, in the past, I think women have not been very tactical or cohesive in the way they have sought power to achieve these objectives. What is more, under the two-party system, which has been the Executive-dominated and heavily whipped system we have experienced under first past the post, the opportunities for women to work together across parties to advance issues have been severely restrained.

I would also like to argue, though, that we tend sometimes to allow women's politics to be dominated by socialist politics. The reality is that there is a range of views in the advocacy of issues for women and that we cannot allow for there to be a monopoly of one isolated, politically correct view for women. There is a range of views, and, in drawing from that, I think we get sensible policies.

I have been very privileged while I have been in this House to have had the opportunity to represent this Parliament at conferences for the Inter-Parliamentary Union. I also had the great privilege of attending the fourth women's conference in Beijing, at the United Nations conference last year. In all those forums in which I had the opportunity to discuss with other women parliamentarians what their frustrations were, we kept coming back time and time again to the limited numbers of women actually represented in the parliaments of the world today. Why is that so? Why is it, when we have no legal impediments, no legal barriers for women seeking representation, that we still do not see women in this place in the numbers that they ought to be?

Whilst we can take some confidence, perhaps, that we have moved forward---20 percent of those who sit in the House are women---I do not have the confidence that that will necessarily be so after the general election this year. It will be the luck of the draw whether it is 20 percent. I rather suspect it will be something more like 10 percent. I, for one, feel personally disappointed that we are not taking far more action across political parties to ensure that that is not so. It is the women in this House who very often have been prepared to bring advocacy to very difficult and complex areas, particularly when it comes to using those limited resources we have in the most effective manner and to facing up to some of the behavioural issues. I think we do need to see greater representation of women.

Despite the best efforts, and I applaud the advocacy that the National Council of Women has brought to this, we still have some degree of blindness by the political parties in the way that they are facing up to this, in the selection of candidates and in the way they will be able to use the opportunities that are available under MMP and the party lists that are available. I have discussed the concerns that I have on the ratio of men to women. That is not true just of the New Zealand Parliament. I think that women make up 10 percent of the Parliaments of the world.

When women are absent from the forums where policy decisions are being made---those decisions that affect our daily lives---we see poor policy being made. As I have already said, nothing in law prevents women's names from going forward. But we live in societies where attitudes have not changed sufficiently.

I would like to start to bring advocacy to some of the concepts that have been put forward by the Inter-Parliamentary Union, of parity and partnership. The first is the concept of parity that acknowledges that persons of either sex are different but that they are, none the less, equal--partnerships that show that men and women can develop and enhance a co-operative working relationship to tackle communities' problems effectively. Discouragement of the tendency to present activities as outside and inside the home is important. A woman's social, professional, political, or community involvement outside the home must not be portrayed as conflicting with domestic activities. When women's names are put up for selection, nobody should be asking who is looking after their children when they want to get into the workforce.

We need to change the images of men and of women. The messages that are transmitted daily through the media are not necessarily those that portray women as strong. I look with some regret to the opposite side of the House and the way that the media have done Helen Clark an enormous disservice at times. I know the disservice that has been done to my colleague Jenny Shipley. God forbid that we ever lose Jenny Shipley from Cabinet. She has done a wonderful job of bringing advocacy to issues. Look at the treatment that Ruth Richardson got in this House! I do not believe that the media have been entirely fair in the treatment of the women leaders that we have had.

Action needs to be taken at these different levels to eliminate any suggestion that one sex is superior to the other. I think it is important to promote the image of equality and complementarity between the sexes. It is important that differences be seen as advantages, not as limitations.

The participation in politics by women exercising roles responsibly in Government shows that, without abandoning our traditional roles, we can participate responsibly in political activity. We do not need to behave like men in order to have to do so. That means sometimes doing things a little differently.

The previous speaker spoke of the importance of education and of a number of other issues, and I support her fully. But I think we live in a society today that is frightened to speak up in terms of advocacy for women. I think that far from discussion on women being politically correct, it has almost become politically incorrect to speak up in terms of the need for some form of advocacy. I say today that I am not prepared to accept that.

If we are to address the paucity of numbers of women, not just in this House but also of women at board level and at every level of leadership within the public and the private sectors of New Zealand, in order for women to progress we have to be very much more honest about the fact that there are barriers. There are the obvious barriers such as child-care and the additional responsibilities that women carry outside of the workplace--whether it be elder care or whatever else. But for whatever reason, women are not making that transition into senior levels of management. I would like to see a lot more responsible discussion on why that is the case.

As I said at the beginning of my speech, I suspect it has a lot to do with the attitudes of both men and women who question the ability of women to handle power and leadership, and with the attitudes that question women's rights to full participation in political life. It is something that as women we need to be working on together across parties to be able to progress. It saddens me that too often partisan politics prevent women in this House from working together.

MARK BURTON (Tongariro): I felt compelled to take a call in this debate, for a couple of reasons. In part, I did want to come to the House to add my congratulations to the National Council of Women on celebrating the centenary of its 13 April 1896 inaugural meeting. It is a much-needed, well-

supported, and well-respected organisation. I also add my satisfaction at, and congratulations on, its well-deserved, one-off \$300,000 grant, although I will return to that before I resume my seat.

On Tuesday evening of this week I had the pleasure of addressing the Tokoroa Business and Professional Women's Club. Due to one of the members of the National Council of Women moving to Auckland, the position representing Rotorua on the council has become vacant. There was cause at that forum for some discussion of the role of the council. It gave me some pleasure to be able to relay to my constituents in Tokoroa, the members of that club, my observations as a member of a select committee on the quality and high standard of both written submissions and presentations made by members of the National Council of Women---certainly, in terms of those committees that I have had the pleasure to serve on. So it is with some pleasure that I support this motion.

However, I also felt compelled to take a call in this debate because of the Minister in whose name the motion is lodged. It seems to me that there is a bitter irony in that particular Minister lodging such a motion. She is the very same Minister who, with indecent haste, presided over the demolition of Helen Clark's pay equity legislation, stripping away one of the most positive and progressive pieces of legislation that protected and promoted the interests of working women in New Zealand. What a sad irony that this motion should be in the name of the same Minister who was responsible for that cruel demolition of such progressive and positive legislation!

As we reflect on the miserable \$30,000 a year that the Government allows the National Council of Women in non-election years---and I emphasise ``non-election years"---I want to echo the comments made by my colleague Ruth Dyson in noting the outstanding contribution of the National Council of Women, as I said a moment ago, to the work of select committees, but also, and perhaps more appropriately, as Ruth said, to the work of this House in its entirety. We are the richer for it, and I am sure that is an issue on which all members would have no difficulty agreeing.

I want to pick up a couple of points made by the member who has just resumed her seat. She observed that women's politics is sometimes dominated by socialistic principles. I suggest that is probably an accurate observation. There is a good reason for that. My observation is that women's politics, certainly from where I sit in this House, is dominated by a concern about, and a commitment to, community values. There is a logical connection between those things.

Christine Fletcher also referred to the opportunities that exist ahead of us in terms of the new political environment that we are going into. Certainly I agree with her that there is a lack of predictability for all of us as to who will be here and where they will be sitting. But I point out that I am proud to be part of a party that, without quotas but by sheer weight of the merit of the candidates, has produced a party list of candidates 50 percent of which are women. They are distributed throughout that party list, on merit. That conclusion was arrived at by a process of deliberation. It gives me some pride to stand as a member of the New Zealand Labour Party as we go into the first MMP election.

I sincerely hope, despite my obvious bias in terms of the numbers of my own colleagues who are returned to this House, that the voters of New Zealand, towards the end of this year---if indeed the Government does last that long---are given the opportunity to choose from a raft of parties that also offer women of quality in that sort of number. As we all know, there are many women of ability and quality who are in fact available for selection by political parties and, ultimately, election to this House.

I want to touch on a couple of areas that relate to my responsibilities as a member of Parliament, and that also reflect some of the principal concerns that the National Council of Women has been involved in for many years. I have the privilege of serving as Labour's spokesperson on adult and

community education, and its associate spokesperson on labour relations, both areas---education and the workplace---in which the National Council of Women has had a major and profound interest and involvement over many years.

I want to reflect on one or two facts, some of which are not particularly happy, but they do reflect the state in which we find ourselves, and do point out and steer the way to yet another 100 years of challenge and important involvement for the National Council of Women. As my good friend and colleague Judith Tizard mentioned in her speech but a few minutes ago, perhaps they also point to a more directly politically involved role for the council.

I reflect on an example in recent days that came out of the latest employment statistics. We have a Minister who is proud of his very careful selection of bits of his statistical data base, but one bit that is less attractive is that 37 percent of young Maori women are unemployed. That is an indictment, as we stand here recognising the contribution of the National Council of Women, on us all, but in particular on a Government that talks and boasts about the decent society. It has not delivered for those young women. It is not acknowledging and accepting that failure, and therefore is not even attempting to deliver for them. That is not a description, in my view, of a decent society.

I also want to pick up on a comment that the Hon. Katherine O'Regan made in her address. She referred to questions asked at a New York conference on industrial relations that she attended last year. I am advised that far from there being some interest in our industrial relations, there was, on the part of women from many nations, a very high level of interest in and, indeed, concern about the conditions of employment for women in New Zealand under the regime of this National Government's Employment Contracts Act. Indeed, I understand that that Minister was given a thorough grilling by many of the delegates to that conference. I think her rendition of those proceedings was somewhat rose-tinted, and did not reflect the concern that our international neighbours feel---and, indeed, many members of this House feel---for working women in this country, who are under the heel of the Employment Contracts Act and the erosion of the working conditions of many women that it has translated into.

In the field of adult and community education, my colleague Dianne Yates and I recently addressed the national conference of the Association for Community and Continuing Education in Hamilton. We attended and addressed it, and eventually the Minister of Police, a former Associate Minister of Education, turned up---somewhat late---and gave a speech. He started by telling the audience that in the previous 25 minutes that he had spent getting to the venue he had learnt more about adult and community education than he had learnt in his 5 1/2 years as a Minister. He then set about proving that not only had he learnt nothing as a Minister but he had not learnt much in the previous 25 minutes.

The Minister told the audience how committed his Government was to this field of education. The very first questioner pointed out to that Minister that her organisation had lost all its funding as a consequence of a decision of his Government. It was also pointed out at that same gathering that the rural women's advisory group on education had been abolished by his colleague the then Minister of Education, Lockwood Smith, in yet another great gesture of support for, and acknowledgment of, the role of women.

It has not been a great 5 1/2 years for women in terms of policy initiatives---

Hon. John Luxton: Of course it has.

MARK BURTON: The Minister, who has now decided to listen and who ignored the references to his own performance in recent weeks in Hamilton---

Hon. John Luxton: What?

MARK BURTON: The Minister should read Hansard. I have to say, in closing, that I believe that the House owes a debt of gratitude to the National Council of Women, not only for its work for women but also for its work for this nation. We are the better for its contribution, and I look forward to the contribution that the council will continue to make to all of our work for all of our good.

Motion agreed to.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE---PROCEDURE

ROGER SOWRY (Senior Government Whip): I seek the leave of the House that, following consideration of the report on the Maori Purposes Bill, which is the next item on the Order Paper, we move to the Dog Control Bill, then back to item 6, then down the Order Paper as per normal.

Mr SPEAKER: Leave is sought for that purpose. Is there any objection? There appears to be none.

MAORI PURPOSES BILL

Consideration of Report of Maori Affairs Committee

Hon. JOHN LUXTON (Minister of Maori Affairs): I move, That the House take note of the report of the Maori Affairs Committee on the Maori Purposes Bill. The Bill was introduced and referred to the Maori Affairs Committee on 23 March 1995, and received 19 submissions.

The Bill aims to amend law relating to Maori, Maori land, and other Maori purposes. It removes, firstly, the power of the Chief Executive of Te Puni Kokiri to provide financial assistance to Maori enterprises. It also removes the power to appoint honorary community officers. It removes the power of the Maori Trustee to make certain grants, and amends Te Ture Whenua Maori Act in order to clarify the position of forestry rights under that Act. The Bill also makes certain amendments to the Maori Trust Boards Act to do away with certain restrictions to the power of those trust boards.

Firstly, section 86 of the Maori Affairs Restructuring Act authorised the Chief Executive to provide advances and assistance to Maori enterprises. In line with the mainstreaming policy of the Government, those grants now do not appear as part of the budgets of Te Puni Kokiri or the Ministry of Maori Development---there is no appropriation made within Te Puni Kokiri---but, rather, are made available to Maori through the business development boards. Hence section 86 is no longer relevant, and will be repealed by this Bill.

Secondly, in relation to the Maori Community Development Act, many years ago the Minister of Maori Affairs used to appoint honorary community officers. Te Puni Kokiri no longer receives any appropriations for the employment of such officers, because, again, they have been mainstreamed within the Department of Social Welfare. It is hardly appropriate to have legislation that allows the Minister of Maori Affairs to appoint people when he has no budget appropriation to carry out those appointments. There was some concern from those within Maoridom who felt that that provision should continue, although there has not been any funding for this area for quite a number of years now. Certainly a lot of very good work is done within the Maori community by other organised groups.

Amendments to the Maori Trustee Act remove the powers and obligations of the Maori Trustee to make grants from the common fund and the general purposes fund to the Maori Purposes Fund Board,