

ing economic insecurity and family stress, Canadians live under the fear of a nuclear holocaust and the anxiety that their government is doing very little to prevent this.

Will the new government policies as outlined in the Speech from the Throne improve the health, economic, and social well-being of Canadians, particularly Canadian women? As my party's critic for health and welfare and the status of women I wish to highlight our concerns in these three areas.

First, I want to thank the residents of Vancouver East for their very strong support during the last election. I must say I am very pleased to represent them in the House of Commons. I regret to say that the Speech from the Throne unfortunately does not show many benefits for the people of Vancouver East. People in my riding need jobs desperately and a more secure future for their children. This they have not been promised in the Throne Speech.

The unemployed are told to wait by the Conservatives until the private sector develops confidence, and then by some sort of magic new jobs are going to appear. Unemployment insurance meanwhile is going to be tightened and social housing units will be cut back. Grants from the Secretary of State (Mr. McLean) are going to be cut and universal social programs are threatened. In addition to this students who cannot afford the increased fees of colleges and post-secondary education and who have no job prospects should know that this new government has cut \$5 million from student loans. It has also terminated Canada Summer Works.

I am particularly saddened, coming from Vancouver East which has a very large number of immigrants settling in the neighbourhoods, that we will now welcome new Canadians with increased fees for Canadian citizenship, for immigration processing and even to obtain visas and passports.

I want now to concentrate on government proposals as they affect women and also as they affect the area of health and welfare.

First, let me deal with women. Despite the platitudes that I note in a press release put out by the Secretary of State, who, Mr. Speaker, you will recall was belatedly given the responsibility for the status of women, the new government shows a remarkable lack of awareness of the major concerns affecting women in Canada. Let me quote from the Economic Council of Canada's study entitled, "The Occupational Diversification of Women in the Labour Market":

—only 23 per cent of "traditional male occupations" are held by women, in spite of the fact that they make up 42 per cent of the labour force, and only 8.4 per cent of women in the labour force earned over \$20,000, compared to 36.5 per cent of men in 1980.

The study notes that until governments take some concrete steps to improve the position of women, "There persists an under-utilization of talent and resources that, while it affects women the most, penalizes Canadian society as a whole."

The Throne Speech mentioned no economic development targeted to women. We are very concerned about that. There was no mention of job creation programs, training programs, or even affirmative action within the existence of Canada

The Address—Ms. Mitchell

Works projects, something which has been lacking until now. Despite election promises, there was no commitment to mandatory affirmative action and no plans to enforce the current law to which surely we should be adhering for equal pay for work of equal value.

I might mention also a matter about which I was concerned in the last House, namely, the condition in which many part-time workers, most of whom are women, find themselves and the need for prorated benefits for part-time workers. There was nothing mentioned about that.

Women are demanding substantive changes that will improve their lot. I do not think when the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) mentions that he is going to appoint more women to high places that he really understands what we mean by affirmative action and by equal pay for work of equal value. We will look forward indeed to the recommendations of Judge Abella, which I believe will be coming forward tomorrow.

We are very concerned that \$9.8 million will be chopped from the grants of the Secretary of State. This is the main source of funding for women's groups, for women's centres, for immigrant and native women as well as for many other very important programs. We will be questioning the Minister to find out just what impact this cut will have on women's programs.

We will support the Government's decision to extend the spouses allowance to widows and widowers between the ages of 60 and 65. I am glad the Hon. Stanley Knowles is with us in the House to hear this because it was he who for years pushed not only for increases for widows and widowers but for all people in the age group 60 to 65 who are unemployed. He was particularly concerned that these benefits not be based on marital status which is, in effect, discriminatory.

I want to mention the question of day-care also. The Prime Minister has called for a Parliamentary task force on day-care. I cannot understand why it is necessary to delay action in the whole field of daycare, action that is desperately needed for children of working parents. There has been a very active task force on daycare which has been working over the last few months which I understand will be making recommendations in the very near future. There are also excellent reports from the Canada Day-care Advocacy Association, which association consists of experts in this field. What all these groups want and I am sure what all parents want is action so they will have decent affordable day-care available to them in their communities. Too many children are being cared for in very risky situations.

I urge the Minister to consider the model day-care bill which was prepared and sent to him last week by the provincial Minister of Community Services for Manitoba. I believe that that Minister sent copies to all her provincial counterparts. I hope this bill will be studied very seriously.

We believe the federal government should take an active role immediately in providing direct funding for day-care centres as was proposed by the advocacy group. We think this should be direct funding, very similar to the way funding is