

*Supply*

predominantly in the service industries, banking, insurance, communications, government, office workers, tellers, telephone operators and so on, will be lost. The Government knows this from its own reports, such as "In The Chips" which was presented to it last year, and "Employment Impacts of the New Technologies". There are similar reports from Great Britain, the United States, Japan and France. So there is adequate documentation on what will happen to women in the short run.

From its own research and from industry, the Government also knows that microtechnology may eventually lead to more jobs being created than are lost in the long run, but the question is whether those jobs will go to women. There is no indication at the moment that they will. In fact, there is every indication that these new, more exciting, better paid jobs will not go to women. That is the major problem that women are facing. No one is insisting that women get a fair share of these new jobs that will be created.

The federal Government has been called upon repeatedly to offer leadership on the microchip issue, to set priorities with regard to industry and unions and our educational institutions. These are things that the Government has been urged to do, yet research shows that women, who are the majority of displaced workers already, are going to be shut out of these new opportunities. We see that time and again, Mr. Speaker. We see it with regard to the present role of the federal Government.

I raised that question in the House not long ago with the Minister responsible for the Status of Women. I pointed out that Government training places are being cut back this year and the numbers of women who are being included in training places is a minimum of the over-all opportunities. Of those training places which remain, just 27 per cent of the industrial training places—the areas of future employment—have been allocated to women and only 6.4 per cent of the enrollees in non-traditional segments of that program are women.

● (1125)

Now, in her cavalier reply to these questions, the Minister went so far as to imply that women made redundant by high technology are already untrainable because they do not have the proper maths and sciences. She seemed to imply that it was no problem of ours. We in the Progressive Conservative Party are not prepared to write off up to a million women who could become unemployed over the next few years.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Miss MacDonald:** This is one area that I feel has to be dealt with very substantially and immediately by the Government. It should establish a task force to help the transition through this period of high technological revolution.

There are other critical areas which my colleagues will be addressing today. The Hon. Member for Okanagan North (Mr. Dantzer) will be dealing primarily with the issue of pensions, a program that we know is the great social issue of the 1980s. That has been delayed and delayed even though it was mentioned three years ago by the Government as being of

immediate concern. Now we have another study to take us forward into more delay and procrastination.

The Hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona (Mr. Kilgour) will be dealing with another area which has escaped the attention of the federal Government, and that is controlling sexual stereotyping. There is no action by the Government on the very serious issue of pornography on Pay TV. The Hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona will be dealing with that issue, but I want to mention that in the area for which the Government itself is responsible, and that is the question of affirmative action, nothing affirmative is being done and there is no action. From 1975 to 1980 the number of women in the lowest category of jobs in the federal Government increased. It went up from 79 per cent to 81 per cent. The bulk of the women in the Federal Public Service are still being ghettoized in low-paying, dead-end jobs, many of which may soon become redundant. The minimum number of increases at the upper level does not begin to offset that. I am talking about 52 female executives against 1,250 male executives, or 699 women at the senior level compared with 12,500 men.

There are a number of issues which have to be dealt with. I know that I cannot deal with them all in 20 minutes, but I want to say that one of the most critical issues which should be dealt with on this particular day has been the comments over the last couple of months of the Minister responsible for the status of women when she hurt women, angered women and made them bitter all across the country, because she denied them the feeling of worth and dignity that they should have because of their contributions to society.

It is because of these matters that we on this side feel there should be a standing committee of the House of Commons on issues relating to women. If we can have standing committees for farmers and bankers, surely we can have a standing committee for 52 per cent of the population.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. The rules of the House permit a ten-minute period of questions and answers. Are any Hon. Members rising to put questions to the Hon. Member?

**Mr. Ethier:** Mr. Speaker, I listened quite attentively to the Hon. Member for Kingston and the Islands (Miss MacDonald). I wondered at times if the Hon. Member was aware of the funding the Government has committed through the Department of National Health and Welfare for the pension conference, especially as it relates to women. Is the Hon. Member aware of the funding the Government has provided for daycare centres across Canada, or is the Hon. Member aware of the Government's commitment to shelters for battered women? Can the Hon. Member tell me how many Provinces have established Ministries responsible for the status of women across this country and how many have departments?

● (1130)

While the Hon. Member is on her feet, can she tell us whether it is true that during the short-lived Clark Government that administration was committed to cutting 60,000 jobs