

We need more counselling facilities for victims of abuse, but I want to congratulate organizations such as Women's Post-Treatment Centre of Winnipeg and Plurielles for providing this kind of support.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, you and I both know that women earn much less than men. This is totally unacceptable. They are often denied opportunities because they are women. They occupy many low paying jobs with no benefits, no future.

[Translation]

Mr. Speaker, we need a new initiative as well as a change of attitude. We must really make a commitment to helping women in our society.

[English]

Mr. Greg Thompson (Carleton—Charlotte): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to take part in this very important debate today. The motion before us is a non-votable motion, but I think it is worth mentioning here so the people back home know exactly what we are debating. The motion reads:

That this House condemn the government for its failure to protect and promote the fundamental rights of Canadian women, especially as reflected in the 1992 budget.

That gives us a pretty broad area in which to talk about this government's position with regard to women and our responsibilities as a government.

Where I want to pick that up is in a publication that is going out in my own riding in the next couple of days. I call this publication *A Citizen's Guide to the Federal Budget*. We introduced a budget in this House a month or so ago. I have taken the budget and broken it down into what I call *A Citizen's Guide to the Budget* so that people back home will have a sense of what this government is doing for people, particularly families and women.

That document will be arriving in households shortly, probably within the next couple of days. I have used a couple of examples. I think it is important to mention that because these examples were drawn from what might be a reflection of my riding, typical families in my riding or any member's riding, for that matter.

I wanted to indicate clearly in this publication that what the government was doing in regard to the child tax benefit was a net gain for 99 per cent of the families out there, particularly in my riding. The income of a family would have to exceed \$70,000 before this program of

ours became a negative, before it put it in a negative position with regard to support for the family.

My argument is that very few people in my riding make \$70,000 a year. The ones who do and to whom I have spoken have no problem with the new system we have brought in: a child tax benefit which will be less cumbersome for government to control and administer. At the end of the day families in my riding and ridings all across this country will be better off.

I want to point out one example that think is an important one. Today we have heard members from both sides of this House talk about single mothers and the difficulties they have raising families today as a single parent but more particularly as a single mother. In the pamphlet I am sending to my constituents I compare the benefits of Patricia, a fictional person, who is a single working mother with two children and an income of approximately \$19,000 a year.

The bottom line as I step through the numbers is a net gain of \$615 for that family of three: a mother and two children.

• (1610)

I think the important thing to remember is that these new benefits are non-taxable. When the tax implications of the old system versus the new one are considered, there is no comparison. Therefore that \$615 gain could be substantially higher at the end of the tax year.

Again taking a look at the traditional family, the mother and father both working and two children, the combined income is approximately \$40,000 per year. At the end of the year after everything is considered, the new system versus the old complex system, as I call it, their net gain would be \$163. It is important that the Canadian people understand that.

I do not think the figures as presented in this House always reflect the realities of the budget. The reality of this budget is that we recognized the importance of families and working mothers and have responded to it very favourably.

The other thing I might mention that is important for Canadian people to understand is that for the first time we will be taxing family situations the same. In other words, there will not be an imbalance in the way that we tax a traditional married couple in relation to a common law couple.