

much better than I could have done myself. For this reason I wish to quote his words:

I think that before we get too smug about women in the work force, we should realize it is a sad commentary that at least one million women in the Canadian work force are in it not because they want to buy a second automobile or a coloured television set but because their income means the difference between poverty and survival. When, in such instances, a woman is deprived of her income as a result of maternity, this creates a terrible hardship. I am hopeful that drawing unemployment insurance, after a two weeks waiting period, for at least 15 weeks will help the working mother.

I wish to echo the sentiments of the minister in this regard. Yesterday it was stated that it was a poor idea to provide maternity benefits in this legislation because maternity is not a predictable interruption of income. I would indicate that the reasoning behind the introduction of this benefit is precisely the reasoning behind the introduction of sickness benefits. Sickness is not a predictable interruption of earnings either. One cannot predict when sickness will hit a worker either male or female. If any member in this House believes that maternity is a predictable occurrence or a predictable hazard, I believe he should take another good look around him in this twentieth century. A realistic look at the birth statistics in this country today would lead anyone to conclude that maternity is not a predictable hazard any more than sickness is a predictable hazard. This is precisely the reason I and others wish to see birth control and contraceptive information publicized in this country.

Maternity is a hazard of the most unpredictable kind, probably even more so than sickness if such is possible. The number of women who can be affected is very great. Of all female employees covered under the Public Service Employment Act, 57.4 per cent, nearly 60 per cent, have children and 46.3 per cent, nearly 50 per cent, of these women are the sole support of their children. In spite of these facts, women are treated as though they are temporary accidents in the labour force and as though if they are made sufficiently uncomfortable they might go away. This provision in the unemployment insurance legislation is a recognition by the minister that women are in the labour force to stay, that women have every right to have time off in order to give birth to their children in safety and comfort and have them looked after so that they may become the future citizens on which the whole community will depend. I wish to congratulate the minister, not only for his good political wisdom and sense but for his humanitarianism and far-sightedness in this regard.

Now, I should like to deal with a point which has been touched on in a slightly different way by the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants (Mr. McCleave). I refer to the inclusion of different types of workers under the unemployment insurance legislation, and more particularly teachers. We in this party have long held that all working people ought to be covered by unemployment insurance. I am very glad the minister is insisting that fishermen be covered under this legislation until some other coverage is provided for them. I should like to see seasonal workers treated in the same way. Until other provisions can be made available to them, I believe they

Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971

should be given some coverage under this legislation. I hope the minister will not rest content until seasonal workers are given some other kind of coverage to protect them against the hazards of unemployment. Certainly, when there is a policy which involves the buying up of boats and depriving the smaller fishermen of their employment we must have some kind of umbrella under which they can be looked after until such time as they can be reabsorbed into other employment.

I believe, however, that other groups should be included in this scheme as well. In addition to teachers, it should include doctors, lawyers, engineers and other people including the self-employed. These people should also come under unemployment insurance. I am glad we have changed our attitude in respect of teachers. I believe teachers, doctors, lawyers and other people have previously been left out because of a basic hangover from the old days when professional people were considered to be a class above and apart from people in working class groups. Today, these people are beginning to be regarded as forming sections of the people who work in the community. I should like to see a revision of the Unemployment Insurance Act which would include doctors, engineers, lawyers and other people who are in a more secure position perhaps than others. I remember the occasion years and years ago when Sir Winston Churchill introduced the social security scheme in Britain which was based on the Beveridge Report. At that time Winston Churchill used this phrase. He said: "This legislation aims to bring the magic of averages to the rescue of millions". It is bringing the magic of averages to the rescue of millions which makes any of these social insurance schemes work. If we bring in just the bad risks, it will cost these bad risks more and the coverage will be less good. We have to bring in the good risks in order to cover the poorer risks—the less secure people—to the fullest possible extent and to give them the best possible coverage.

• (3:30 p.m.)

A few years ago, before the conversion of the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants (Mr. McCleave), some of us felt that, precisely because teachers and other groups were in a more secure position, they should be included in this legislation. I have made this argument to the teachers before now. For years as a property owner in Vancouver, which I am not now, I paid school taxes on my property, even though I had no children. Why was that? The fact that I had no children did not mean I had no responsibility for children. The community's children were my children and it was in my interest, not only from the standpoint of being my brother's and sister's keeper but from the standpoint of self interest, to pay my share of school taxes. Educated children mean educated citizens. Educated citizens are good citizens, not only physically but emotionally and in every other way. In the same way, because teachers were in a more secure position I think they should have been included years ago in the legislation so as to lend their greater strength and greater security to the scheme.