

Supply

have us do, we have opted to ease the conditions faced by children living in poverty.

Given that there are no magical sources of new money to address these problems, what can be done? First of all, it is important to streamline expenditures and the administration of expenditures so that money reaches those who need it most.

The objective of the child benefit is to create the best possible program for families with children. To do this, the new benefit puts resources where they are needed. The new child benefit puts resources where they are needed. The new child benefit provides more generous benefits, an additional \$2 billion over the next five years to low and middle income families. The new child benefit is fairer. It is based on family circumstances, it rewards work and it supports low and modest income families.

The new child benefit is simpler than the patchwork of measures it replaces. Currently 600,000 family allowance cheques are sent each month to high income families and the money is then recovered.

• (1220)

The new system will calculate automatically and deliver a single monthly cheque to over three million families. Thus the new child benefit becomes a major step in improving benefits for families with children. Under the new system, a low income family with one child can receive as much as \$1,520 per year, an increase of almost 50 per cent.

Child benefits will be increased by \$2.1 billion over the next five years. However, money alone is not enough. We will be consulting with provincial colleagues and key groups on a related package of initiatives directed more specifically toward helping young children at risk.

Mr. Rey Pagtakhan (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to rise and speak on this motion introduced by my colleague for Halifax which reads:

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

I ask, Mr. Speaker, why? The answer is best summarized by the statement issued by the president of the National Action Committee on the Status of Women, Miss Judy Rebick when she stated: "This is not a direct hit like the last time", that is referring to the 1991

budget, "but it is a much more profound attack on women—it is more global".

Why is that? Immediately I will set out before the House the reasons and outline them. First, the Tories have abandoned their promise to introduce a national child care program. Second, the government has eliminated the Court Challenges Program which was introduced in 1985 and has provided funds for women, minorities and disadvantaged groups to mount court challenges under the Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

The Charter of Rights and Freedoms would be a hollow document if the rights contained in it were not exercised. The Court Challenges Program ensures that those rights are exercised. Witness the recent example of a ruling by the Supreme Court of Canada on the constitutionality of the federal obscenity law through the help of the Court Challenges Program. The decision rendered is crucial to our understanding and recognizing the harmful effects of pornography on women and children.

The third reason why this budget reflects poorly on women is that this budget attacks the spouse's allowance. The majority of low income seniors that would benefit from this allowance, those between the ages of 60 and 64, are women. Fourth, this budget has attacked the Pay Research Bureau, and thereby indirectly attacks the pay equity principle. Last, this budget has cut back on social housing on which many single mothers rely for shelter.

In February 1991 I was part of the Liberal task force on the recession of the economy when it met in Winnipeg. A hotel in the southeast end was the venue on a bitterly cold day in the depths of winter. At that time we thought the recession, like all prairie winters, was showing the worst of itself. Well, we were wrong. There was still much more to come. We learned how much lack of money and human tragedy have in common. On that day in the hotel room the testimony I heard shocked and saddened me, especially the words of the women.

Three witnesses particularly stand out in my mind. They were representatives of the Native Women's Coalition who told us simply with a stark forcefulness about the hell in which many natives live. We were told that on most reserves women have no shelter from abuse in their homes. Because of this it is not uncommon for teenagers to get pregnant in order to qualify for enough social assistance to move away from their families and into the cities to their own apartments.