

*Adjournment Debate*

riding of Calgary West to be a special adviser in the minister's office. Part of the discontent with that decision, which perhaps is not normal that civil servants should be so affected by such an appointment, was caused by the special adviser himself who, on April 7 in an interview conducted by a representative of the *Calgary Herald*, indicated that he was going to work in the minister's office in Winnipeg effective May 1 at a salary which was "the same as the salary he was receiving in his previous job". In that previous job this special adviser was the president of a small junior college in Calgary. The salary that was paid to him in that position was \$50,000 a year.

I rose in the House to point out to the minister that there were morale problems in his department because the top civil servant in each of the four western provinces, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia, is classified as an SX-2. The salary range for these experienced people with heavy responsibilities for budget and other staff, begins just a little over \$38,000. In this case the minister had appointed somebody without that background, without that experience and without those kinds of responsibilities to provide advice at a salary of some \$50,000.

That situation is causing serious morale problems in the west. Those morale problems show themselves at the riding level in decreased service to people. If people do not work for an organization or for a minister in whom they can believe, or who treats his whole department fairly, then their morale goes down and their willingness to serve the Canadian public is adversely affected.

I think it might be in the minister's best interests, or the parliamentary secretary's best interests this evening, that if the minister was correct when he said in the House the other day that the \$50,000 salary was not correct, it would be useful to morale in western Canada, if the parliamentary secretary could tell us exactly what that salary is.

All that the minister told us was that the salary was not \$50,000. It could be \$50,000 and one cent. It could be more than \$50,000, it could be less. But I think it would be in the interests of this nation and a service to the people in western Canada if the minister or the parliamentary secretary could be forthcoming and tell us.

A little more than a week later I rose in this House as a consequence of the minister's statement to this House on Monday, and as a consequence of the press reports which followed. We heard a great deal of impressive rhetoric about the minister's concern for jobs for women. In news reports on Tuesday, the day after the minister's announcement, the minister was quoted in the press as saying that the program he announced in this House on Monday would create 81,000 jobs total. In that same press report his officials are reported as saying that the announcements made in the House on the same afternoon would create 31,000 jobs total.

The minister handed us background papers on that same day. If one was to total up all the subparts, they indicate that 192,000 jobs were created. I would hope that the parliamentary secretary could take this occasion this evening to tell us whether there were 31,000 jobs created, 81,000 jobs created,

or 192,000 jobs created. However, the really important part of that question is the fact that in the minister's background paper he estimates that of the jobs created, and it does not matter whether we are talking about the 31,000, 81,000 or 192,000, 12,200 of those will be filled by women. That is a number that almost boggles my mind, if I may use that expression. Whether it is 31,000, 81,000 or 192,000, 12,200 jobs is considerably less than half.

● (2215)

The minister has repeatedly stated that he cares about women and the employment opportunities available to them. Possibly the parliamentary secretary can tell us whether the minister will consider that whole job-creation package with a view to putting in some rules, regulations and procedures that will guarantee that at least half of the created jobs go to women. I wonder if the parliamentary secretary can give us an answer to that.

**Mr. Dennis Dawson (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Employment and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, I will gladly give an answer to the second part of the question, but I remind the hon. member of the motion before us. Your Honour read it at five o'clock:

It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows:—

Employment—Training Programs for Women.

I do not know about the morale of employees in western Canada. I do not know about the problem the hon. member raised concerning the salary of the personnel concerned. What I had was a question concerned the training of women. That I will deal with.

I have to tell the hon. member that if he wants us to co-operate with him as far as Standing Order 40 is concerned, he will have to co-operate with us. He wants us to carry out research in order to answer his questions. He knows that we only have three minutes in which to give an answer.

The hon. member talked about questions raised in three different question periods. They had nothing to do with the Standing Order 40 debate this evening. If the hon. member wants us to co-operate, we will be glad to do that. As I said, we have three minutes to answer. Therefore, we will need to have the same co-operation from him.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, if we add to the existing employment and training programs those announced on June 2, we note that more than 183,000 women will receive training or find employment this year.

However, more than figures are involved, interesting though they might be. The announcement of June 2 emphasized the proposed reorientation of the program, which will not only provide opportunities for women, but will also offer them other benefits.

For the first time in their history, Canadian women will be offered assistance in the form of on-the-job training in types of