

workers are unable to find further work for the full amount of time—and unfortunately this is the case in so many instances today—they are entitled to the benefits to which they have contributed?

In addition, if we are looking at this from a humanitarian point of view, it would seem to me that persons who are unable to find full-time work and who can only work part time must have a much harder economic situation than those who have full-time work.

I would like to mention also that part-time workers in Canada today are more often than not women and young people, and are usually the last hired and the first fired. Many women who have not been in the work force and who perhaps have children at home are only able to get part-time work. They need employment in order to survive. I know of many women workers in my riding who are raising children on their own and have perhaps been on welfare for a number of years because they have had no other choice at a time when their children are young. Their first step back into the labour market is to find part-time work. They are lucky if they can find it. But if they do, surely they should have the right to unemployment insurance for that work? This is an extremely important point, and I hope hon. members who represent the other sex in this House will listen, because it is very difficult for many women who have not had much work history to gain confidence and skills, and find the opportunities to get back into the work force.

● (1620)

While on the question of part-time work, I want to stress that wages for part-time work should be union wages. There is no way that women and young people should be exploited, receiving less than union wages, simply because they are unable to find full-time work. In my riding, the following kinds of workers can only find work part of the year: construction workers, painters working outside, many of whom I know personally, sales persons, many of whom are women and young people, only able to get jobs on a part-time basis. Some young people are lucky enough, if you can call it lucky, to get a job at McDonald's, dishwashing or doing something like that for certain periods of time.

These people pay unemployment insurance. Why should they not be able to collect? There are also the farm workers, the many seasonal workers at this time of the year. Fisher people are hit very hard this year by the lack of hours and days for fishing and the drastic problem of the reduction in fishing stocks.

In times of high unemployment, and unfortunately it is increasing year after year rather than being reduced, part-time jobs take on a special significance. It is really the only thing that many people are able to get. Surely that is better than being on welfare, the payments that many people have no other choice but to receive. However, most people on social assistance, and I know many of them, would far rather be working. They would consider part-time jobs at a decent rate of pay if they were able to get unemployment insurance

Unemployment Insurance Act

benefits when those jobs were phased out. With regard to Bill C-3, I hope the minister will take another look at the whole question of coverage of part-time and seasonal workers and ensure that they have their just right to unemployment insurance benefits.

There is a second group I want to mention, and here again this often concerns women. I refer to spouses who work with their mates or partners, be they husbands or wives, who are not eligible for unemployment insurance. I wish to cite the example of five fisherwomen who had a very painful but interesting experience when challenging their right to be covered by unemployment insurance.

These five fisherwomen, with the support of their union in British Columbia, challenged in court in 1979 their right to be covered by unemployment insurance benefits. These are women who go out with their husbands in any kind of weather. They work very hard as equal partners on fish boats. They were denied the right to unemployment insurance, and challenged this in the courts.

It is interesting to note that these women won their case the first time round. They won their right to unemployment insurance in their own name as workers who worked very hard in the fish boat industry. What happened? The very organization that should have been trying to protect their rights and ensure that they received unemployment insurance benefits, moved to challenge this legal decision. The Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mr. Axworthy), interestingly enough, is also the minister responsible for the status of women. It was his department that challenged this legal question and brought it back into the courts, in effect saying that these women should not have the right to unemployment insurance.

We feel very strongly about fisherwomen and others who work together in businesses. We know that tax exemptions were brought in initially by the Conservatives, and more recently by the Liberals, to allow tax exemptions for those wives who work with their husbands. Why not have adequate coverage for unemployment insurance benefits for those spouses who work as equal partners in family businesses, including the fishing business? We should ensure that definitions under the act include such workers, so that they should not be excluded under the act for unemployment insurance benefits.

Finally, I wish to refer to the very scandalous revelation made in this House on June 18 and June 19, as reported in the Vancouver *Sun*. The revelation was made by a former Liberal manpower minister, the hon. member for Lincoln. According to those I have heard from in my constituency, this was a shocking and scandalous revelation. It is a reflection on the hon. member when he was minister. I wish to quote three or four paragraphs from the June 20 edition of the Vancouver *Sun*. The article is headed "Mackasey Reveals Old Jobless Plot In UIC". I quote:

Former Liberal manpower minister Bryce Mackasey revealed in the Commons Thursday that during the 1970s the government orchestrated a campaign to