COMMONS DEBATES

are eating away at government revenues through welfare payments. Mr. Chairman, I say women live on welfare not by choice but by obligation and because of discrimination in the labour market.

I believe employment and manpower programs for the '80s must be studied in light of the economic growth that we will witness. Yes, Canada is a country with a great potential. We have tremendous possibilities in the field of energy, we have natural resources in large numbers and we have manpower, people who can join the labour market, who in fact are already in the labour force and who represent tremendous human capital. In fact, Mr. Chairman, in the last ten years, Canada has been one of the countries whose employment rate of growth has been considerable, one of the highest among the members of the OECD. Between 1970 and 1974, the annual rate of growth was 3.5 per cent, and according to forecasts, it will be 2 per cent from 1980 to 1984, and 1.7 per cent from 1985 to 1989. Despite those forecasts, Mr. Chairman, it must be recognized that there will be a shortage of workers in the labour market. On the other hand, I should like to give some figures to show the evolution of women's role in the labour force. In 1955, they represented only 19.4 per cent of the work force; by 1980, at this point in time, they represent 45.9 per cent of it and by 1985, forecasts have it that women will represent 51 per cent, almost the same percentage they represent in terms of population.

Mr. Chairman, I feel it is important to study employment and immigration from two angles: how we will make up for shortages in the 1980s, and how and toward what work women should orient their efforts in the labour force. On the one hand, immigration can be one source of workers; on the other, I feel that women working in larger numbers can fill the other 50,000 jobs the present work force would be unable to fill.

Those sectors now under development, that is high technology, those in which skilled workers can find employment, where salaries are higher, where jobs are more secure, are those which at the present time are probably the least accessible to women. Speaking of the major developments in Canada, let us mention the James Bay project where women worked almost exclusively in the traditional fields, where they held clerical jobs and were the object of, let us say, Mr. Chairman, a certain amount of sectorialization not to say discrimination.

• (1830)

Indeed, well paid positions at James Bay were seldom open to women yet in future development, in the development of gas and oil resources, in the development of the tar sands, projects as important as Cold Lake in Alberta will generate from 8,000 to 10,000 jobs. What kind of positions are these projects going to create? First, they will be specialized jobs such as welding, machinery and in these specialized jobs, Mr. Chairman, there will be very few women, unfortunately. Women could perform

Supply

welding tasks, but they do not get the necessary training to do that kind of work. We know there will be growth in these areas over the next ten years and it is in this area that female labour force training should take place.

In 1980 only 1 per cent of Canadian women were apprentices in the area of non-traditional jobs. In adult vocational training women made up 42 per cent of the enrolment yet only 862 women were directed towards non-traditional jobs compared to 35,000 men. Where is the deficiency, Mr. Chairman? I do not think there would be much difficulty for women to learn those trades of welders, drillers, programmers, key punch operators, all trades which provide stable employment and are jobs of the future. What programs does the minister propose to correct this situation? At present there is the on-the-job training program which, I think, could be greatly extended. It is a very progressive program, especially with respect to Quebec which has not yet taken full advantage of it. Quebec employers could indeed apply for the grant which pays up to 75 per cent of the salary, for up to 52 weeks, at a weekly rate of \$185. In fact, 3,500 Canadian women, Mr. Chairman, could benefit from this program.

What efforts will be made to attract female workers in these areas which provide interesting jobs and are a good source of manpower for employers? I think that this area, Mr. Chairman, calls for joint action. The federal government must make its concerns known to the business community, unions, teaching institutions, women's organizations, so that all those concerned can join in the effort to publicize these on-the-job training programs. In order to ensure that women make a smooth entry into the labour force, there are other measures I think, Mr. Chairman, which must be taken and one of those which will be crucial to our economy in the years ahead is the development of private daycares in industry with the help of government, or of public daycares set up in schools which would provide ideal settings for this and which, in any case, are emptying year after year.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak of another measure which is essential to Canadian working women. I am referring specifically to the last brief by the Canadian Chamber of Commerce which stated that we must do away with the maternity leave benefits provided by unemployment insurance. I am astounded that the chamber of commerce made no mention of the possibility, by the same token, of eliminating sick leave for workers. I think that unemployment insurance benefits now paid are the least that can be done to encourage maternity leave and that they should at least remain at the same level and preferably be increased. That is why I ask and suggest to the minister that he should consider with his colleagues the possibility of extending maternity leave into unpaid maternity leave of at least 12 months renewable for a second year. This type of maternity leave policy, which provides for job security for the mother or the father, would certainly be in line with a harmonious population increase