

**Mrs. Maily:** Mr. Speaker, as a woman in this Government I feel personally offended by the remarks made by the Hon. Member for Vancouver East (Ms. Mitchell). We, the women in this Government, have worked very hard to represent our sisters across Canada. This Budget will be helpful to them. Her remarks were very offensive. It will be helpful because up until now women have had to live with temporary jobs created by emergency measures. Those jobs, if they were lucky, lasted about 20 weeks. They were then back on welfare. We want to stop this vicious circle. This is why this Budget has been shaped in this way. We want jobs to be created by the small business sector in our communities, the most vital job creation sector in our country.

In my riding of Gatineau, which is in the Outaouais, the small business sector is the most dynamic sector in that part of Quebec. Like the Hon. Member for Kamloops-Shuswap (Mr. Riis), this past weekend I was in my riding. I spoke to small business-people, many of whom are women who have managed to create small businesses in the area. They are very pleased with this Budget because at last they will be able to create permanent jobs. They were sick and tired of these temporary job-creation programs.

● (1540)

I would also like to remind the Hon. Member for Vancouver East of what the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) said in Question Period today, that 89,000 jobs were created in April, 60 per cent of which were for women. That is a fact as well. I would also like to remind her that the training allowance in the Budget of \$900 million for 1986-87, the same as it is in this year's Budget, will give better allowances for women who go on training. Up until now allowances were not sufficient for women because they have extra expenses that men who have women at home looking after the children do not have. That too will be an improvement of the women's lot.

I would also like to remind her that at the request of the labour sector, which she purports to represent, we will now allow a deduction for contribution to the—

[*Translation*]

—Solidarity Fund of Quebec.

[*English*]

That will go a long way toward restoring jobs for women who are being laid off in small industries and in the forestry sector in the Outaouais and Abitibi. That is a very positive thing for the women of Canada.

I would also like to remind the Hon. Member that there will be access for homemakers to the pension plan after discussions are terminated with the provinces. That is something that must happen before it can be put in the Budget. Quebec has signalled that it is interested in finding a formula so that women who stay at home because they want to bring up their families at home will be able to.

I hope that women will have the right to choose the way of life they want. They do not have to listen to the Hon. Member for Vancouver East, living only the way she thinks is the right

*The Budget—Ms. Mitchell*

way for women to live. That is the other thing that offends me. She talks about taking away the total deduction for couples when the woman stays at home. She is dictating to the women of Canada the lifestyle that they should lead, and I object to that. I think women will be equal the day they can decide how best they want to live without being punished for the choices they make.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** I regret to interrupt the Hon. Member for Gatineau (Mrs. Maily).

[*English*]

Would the Hon. Member for Vancouver East (Ms. Mitchell) care to make a few comments?

**Mrs. Maily:** Mr. Speaker, I—

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** No, I have given the floor to the Hon. Member for Vancouver East.

**Ms. Mitchell:** Mr. Speaker, first I would like to say to the Hon. Member opposite that I would hope that she would be an advocate for women, and I think from some of the things she was saying that she possibly is an advocate for women. I would hope that she would not be offended by some of us believing very strongly in and working very hard at being advocates as well, as that is our job.

I wish I could ask the Hon. Member some of the questions she asked me. Of course we do not want 20-week jobs. No one has ever suggested that we want 20-week jobs. I have certainly never said that. I want long-term jobs but I do not think that the only way to get long-term jobs is through some magic worked by the private sector and small businesses while small businesses themselves are saying that they simply do not have the kind of consumer demand to do so. I do not really see what she is getting at.

I think it will be great if many more jobs are created by small business. We would all like that. We need millions of jobs in this country. However, that will not happen overnight, as the Minister has said and I am taking into account the first-hand experience we have had in British Columbia. As well, I just returned from Britain. The job situation over there is so dreadful that Conservative Members are splitting from the Margaret Thatcher position. I really do not have any great confidence that this approach will work.

We are all for jobs and we are all for small business. I hope, though, that as an advocate for women and as an advocate for small business, the Hon. Member will be doing something very dramatic to persuade the Government to make it possible for women in business to have more access to credit. It is disgusting that nothing has been done about that.

The Hon. Member raised the matter of the training allowances. Women's organizations and others have been fighting for years to have more adequate provisions for women. I congratulate the Government for putting this in place. It is