

*National Training Act*

Last week a Statistics Canada report revealed that on average women earn about half the income that men earn. On average women earn about \$8,200 a year, while men on average earn about \$16,700 a year. That is the difference at the present time. Every piece of legislation that we deal with in the economic sense must be geared to overcoming that difference, to redressing that inequity. If this situation is to change, and change it must, then the bill we have before us must address itself particularly to the needs of women. It must address the problems that women face today in the labour force. It must also address the potential contribution that women can make to the economic development of Canada.

I would urge the minister to use this piece of legislation to take into consideration the very problems that are now confronting women as we go further into the decade of the 1980s, with the microchip revolution upon us. I would urge him also to make sure that the potential of women in the work place is realized by putting into place with his provincial counterparts public information programs which will encourage women to overcome the reluctance that they now evidence towards some of the changes that are taking place as a result of the new technology.

**Mr. Bill Vankoughnet (Hastings-Frontenac-Lennox and Addington):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to participate in the debate on this legislation concerning job training. I recognize this issue to be of national importance as well as of local concern to residents in my constituency of Hastings-Frontenac-Lennox and Addington.

When I read this Bill, C-115, I read it with the same degree of skepticism as Canadians view the actions of this government. We have the appointment of Jack Horner as chairman of the CNR and Arthur Erickson as the architect for the New Canadian embassy in Washington. As we all know, the list is continuous. That is why, when I examine Bill C-115, I pose the same question that many Canadians are asking about government: Just what is the intention of this bill?

I would like to suggest that it is fairly ludicrous to establish a national training program for jobs that do not exist. The minister has stated that "major shortages averaging 9,000 skilled workers each year are predicted over the next five years unless the pace of expansion increases dramatically." If this prediction is made in the same manner as that in which the finance minister predicted good things from his November 12 budget, or the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Lalonde) predicted good things from his National Energy Program, I cannot believe the figure quoted for skilled worker shortages.

● (1530)

I believe this is a Utopian bill. How does one determine shortages? Changes in the work place are occurring very rapidly today. By the time a response has been developed to suit the market by establishing a training program and then placing workers on the market, the situation will have changed and the market will have shifted to meet the new conditions. It

makes much more sense to have industry train its work force and retrain on the job in the ever-changing marketplace.

Another point which concerns me about this bill involves the idea of a national training program. Other than the logistical problems and the corresponding increase in the size of the bureaucracy, how does one determine a national skill? Obviously the manpower training requirements will differ from region to region. I can see an individual moving from Nova Scotia to Manitoba for a job or job training in that province. However, I do not believe many individuals will undertake job training in Nova Scotia and start looking for work in Manitoba. What should really be addressed is the problem of job creation in the private sector for the 1.2 million unemployed in this country.

We are going from crisis to crisis and treating symptoms rather than the disease, which is a lack of confidence for private enterprise to invest in Canada with Canadian money.

The changes we are witnessing in industry will continue for some time. This process of change is exposing new problems daily. Shutdowns create problems which will be more difficult to address if we do not meet the challenge.

In my riding the spectre of the shutdown of a uranium mine looms. What good is this bill to the some 400 mine employees in Bancroft or other Canadians finding themselves out of work because of a lack of sales, bankruptcy or receivership? This mine, which employs over 380 people, is situated in a community of less than 1,400. The impact of this shutdown will be horrendous. The suggestion of retraining these people is unrealistic. Most people choose to remain in their locations, even if transfer opportunities exist. People who live in the rural areas of my riding do so because of the lifestyle, which is something upon which we do not put a price tag. People want to stay there and live in those communities. Of the few who do move, frequently they return to their previous locations. The end result is individuals on unemployment insurance and, ultimately, social assistance. This bill is like talking about shutting the barn door after the horse has escaped.

Let me expand on the effect the closing of this mine will have on 380 workers in a rural community who will be put out of work. First, there is the loss to governments of taxes which are collected. That loss would be in excess of \$500,000 per year. Then there is money lost to local communities for supplies amounting to approximately \$2 million. Then with respect to supplies bought from other Canadian businesses the loss would be approximately \$10 million. The annual payroll is about \$12 million. We see a budget forecast of approximately \$24 million lost to the community and to Canada. Of approximately 400 employees, let us say 300 decide to relocate with their families. If the 300 workers who relocate request and obtain relocation assistance from the Canada Employment Centre and the amount requested is the maximum per family, that will cost the Canada Employment Centre something in the neighbourhood of \$1 million. That leaves approximately 100 employees who will be qualified to apply for unemployment insurance benefits. Unemployment insurance benefits for