

The Budget—Mrs. Erola

that any who are veterans could apply for the war veterans' allowance if they served overseas. In the case of a married couple at the present time, \$922.30 is sent to them instead of \$900.28, which gives them an increase of \$22.02 if they are on war veterans' allowance. The increase in the GIS will leap over that \$22 on July 1.

Can the Minister assure us that the war veterans' allowance is going to be increased by at least that amount and preferably by enough to keep them ahead of the sum of the OAS and the GIS?

Could she tell us also when the reforms about the continuing payments on remarriage are going to apply to those people directly controlled by the Government, the civil service, armed forces and MPs.

Mrs. Erola: Mr. Speaker, unfortunately I am in no position to give detailed answers on all of these matters, particularly on war veterans' allowance, but I will look into that and try to provide the Hon. Member with the details of the timing.

In the areas of pensions and credit splitting, as I said earlier, we hope that with the concurrence of the provinces, which could come as early as 1985, we can move forward on pension splitting and survivors' benefits. I will look into the matter and provide the Hon. Member with details of the dates they will be brought into effect.

Ms. Mitchell: Mr. Speaker, the few things that are being done for older women are very few and seem to be geared mostly toward middle-class women. Does the Minister feel that the Budget is adequate for women who are not yet senior citizens? There was nothing in it about job creation for women at the very time they are being phased out and displaced by high technology. There is no affirmative action at all. For instance, the youth projects that are proposed, minimum though they are, and the previous job-creation program, NEED, the Special Recovery Projects and probably the Liberal slush fund projects as well, were predominantly for areas that provide jobs for men, not for women. Women have not had equal access to the inadequate job-creation programs.

The Budget is also very unfair to women in the Public Service who are notoriously underpaid. The Minister talked about equal pay for equal value and the need for legislation in this area. I should like to know what she is doing about that.

Compensation comparisons with the private sector will mean that women in the Public Service, when the six and five program is removed, will still be capped. Their wage differential is something like \$7,000 less than men. There are no training programs targeted especially for women's needs. If the Minister is going to talk about the existing training programs, she had better talk to some women because they do not have equal access to those. They do not have daycare and other supports that are needed to get into them.

I should like to ask the Minister why she did not talk about jobs for women. In my opinion there is nothing in the Budget about job creation for women.

Mrs. Erola: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member has just made a hodge-podge of statements that bear no relevance to the subject matter I was discussing. I suggest to her that she is totally ignorant of government programs if she is saying that affirmative action does not exist in government. I do not know where the Hon. Member has been because affirmative action programs are in place in the federal civil service. I suggest to her that equal pay for work of equal value legislation is in place at the federal level. If she were to take her duties seriously, she would be working with women of this country to see that that kind of legislation were in effect throughout the country.

With regard to job creation, if the Hon. Member looked at our NEED projects—and I would be happy to provide her with some statistics that I do not have on hand at the moment—she would see that in Section 38 we tried very hard to see that women get their share.

If she looks at the youth training programs she will see that the record is very high. The Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mr. Roberts) is with us this morning and I think he will confirm that youth job-creation projects have a very high rate of participation of females. This is especially good and I am particularly pleased about it.

Of course, it is not good enough. I agree with the Hon. Member that work must be done and we must continue to push to see that women get their fair share. But to suggest that the problem has not been addressed by the Government is utter nonsense.

In this Budget we are addressing the needs of the poorest women in the country. The GIS is the cornerstone. It is absolutely necessary that they get \$50 increase. I am surprised that the Hon. Member would criticize a measure that does so much to improve the position of the poorest women in our society.

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister is also in connection with the GIS. I appreciate the fact that people are going to receive \$50 more because it is a lot of money to some. They will be able to do a lot of things they could not do before—perhaps even buy enough to eat when otherwise they could not.

One aspect of this bothers me somewhat. Some women and men who have worked in industry have received injuries—sometimes they lose a finger, a foot, or an eye—and receive what is known in compensation terms as PPD or permanent partial disability. This can amount to \$2 or \$3, or quite a sum of money up to \$200 or more, say, if the back is broken or both eyes were lost. This bothers me. For many years the PPD was considered as compensation for the loss of part of their body in an industrial accident. They left part of their body there so they get a PPD. Now it will be considered in the total sum of money, which means some of these people will get less GIS than they are getting now. The \$50 will bring them over the total and this may bring some very sad results.