

the sly, without consulting women's groups, and in a crude fashion that the Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women would be shut down. She said, among other things, that the council had been set up by a movement that was in its infancy.

● (1110)

Should we conclude from those remarks that the women's movement has reached its full development? I do not think so. I think that progress has, indeed, been made, but the movement has not reached maturity.

I would like to get specific indications from my colleague. I too can wax poetic about the status of women. I too had to fight to make my way and be elected to this House, and it was not easy. Structures are frequently barriers that are not easily overcome. I agree with my colleague opposite about that, but I would like to have specific facts.

It is no secret that the Axworthy exercise was rather vague as far as the status of women is concerned. The same holds true in other sectors as well, like justice. I would like to hear what concrete action the government will take within a certain time frame and how much money it will spend. With the cuts recently announced, the CACSW will lose 30 per cent of its budget. Women's groups are being told that they are now on a solid footing. Such a statement is dangerous because it is not true. Some groups may be on a solid footing, but discrimination will occur.

How will the minister responsible for the status of women decide which group is to get grants? How will that decision be made? There is a vacuum here and we are left wondering whether there is a real will to help women. In 1995, more than ever before, women will need help because, when we go through a severe economic crisis, violence escalates and women are more than ever in need of help.

[English]

Ms. Blondin-Andrew: Mr. Speaker, I agree that they are confused. On the one hand in dealing with the opposition we find that every time we raise an issue, no matter what it is, women, employment or child care, we are told it is in the purview of provincial jurisdiction, that we have to confer with our provincial counterparts.

The hon. member is suggesting that I make suggestions about specific projects, specific initiatives even though she knows full well we have not had the opportunity to discuss such issues as child care with the provinces, which Quebec feels very strongly about.

There is not a vacuum. The government has undertaken a number of initiatives. Program review and evaluation is one of them. Under that guise we have also looked at women's programs. Change is not a bad thing. What is wrong with change in

Supply

the name of effectiveness and efficiency? That is what the country wants. Canadians are telling us it is not how much we have, it is what we do with it. They are also telling us change is not such a bad thing. To make change in the name of efficiency and effectiveness is a good thing for this country as a whole, not just women.

It is true we are consolidating the women's programs but it is all in the name of removing duplication, eliminating a number of unnecessary allocations. We need to do that to make it more cost effective and to deliver services to the individual rather than build administrative bureaucracies.

[Translation]

Mrs. Gagnon: Mr. Speaker, it is true that we are asking for money, we are asking for transfers to provinces so that Quebec can finally get the amount of money that it needs to create its own programs. That certainly does not mean that we want the federal government to create the programs. We should not play on words either.

I will quote my colleague, the secretary of state, who was saying just yesterday that she had two good news. These two good news are bad news for the provinces. First of all, there are no tax increases. What does that mean? It means that the provinces will have to increase taxes in order to fill that gap and to pay for programs which will be created in the different provinces.

Second, tax loopholes have been eliminated; the budget makes our tax system more equitable. Which tax loopholes? The ones for big business, for family trusts or the ones for the middle class and the poorest people? That is the question that I am asking my colleague.

1115

[English]

Ms. Blondin-Andrew: Mr. Speaker, there is no way I would expect this hon. member and the opposition to come forward and endorse and kiss the budget that we presented. I do not believe that.

However, she suggests that in the budget we put forward the provinces have no responsibility. I dare say not. The province she is from is preparing a budget that will have an impact. She is fearful that it will not all be good.

These are tough times and we have taken the directions we believe are necessary in order to get our house in order. We are doing what we feel we do best and we are leaving to others what we feel they can do better. That is the way in which we are conducting our business.

There are different levels of taxation. I cannot speak to all of them but clearly there is a responsibility. We have made our move and the next step is up to the provinces.