

*Family Allowances*

**Mr. Railton:** Mr. Chairman, I rise on the same point of order. I would like to correct the hon. member for Provencher, who intimated or made the accusation that because I was trying to keep him on the bill, which he wandered away from for a long time—

**Mr. McGrath:** Who woke you up Doc?

**Mr. Railton:** —I was not interested in Indian people. I happen to be very fond of the aboriginal people of Canada. I think they need our support until they make the transition to a more lucrative or prosperous way of life. However, this has nothing to do with the bill in question. This bill is clearly about family allowances and how they are going to be administered. Having made that correction, I hope future questions will be about the bill.

**The Chairman:** I must say that the point raised by the parliamentary secretary is accepted as a point of clarification. As to the point raised by the hon. member for Welland, I am sure hon. members will accept the doctor's faith and beliefs.

**Mr. Epp:** Mr. Chairman, I intend to continue my questioning despite the intensity of hon. members opposite, who obviously do not want to answer questions in this area.

**Mr. Boulanger:** You are wasting time and you know it.

**Mr. Epp:** As long as Your Honour will allow me to continue questioning, which obviously means your Honour feels my questions are related to the bill, I will not listen to the hon. member for Welland, whether he thinks my questions relate to the bill or not. As long as Your Honour thinks my questions relate to the bill, that is good enough for me.

**Mr. McGrath:** Doc is on the record. That is the important thing.

**Mr. Epp:** The question I am trying to raise with the minister is simply whether native people will receive the same benefits to which everybody else is entitled. That is one point. The second question relates to whether they will receive their benefits in a manner which will not violate agreements held or understood. Third, the minister has chosen not to answer the question about an assurance from the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development as to what his department will do when these tax credits go to the mothers of status Indian children.

I suppose we will have to wait and see whether we can ask that question of the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development directly, but I want the record to show clearly that the Minister of National Health and Welfare has either chosen not to answer that question or does not have an answer.

**Mr. Harquail:** She has answered it twice already.

**Mr. Epp:** I will simply leave it at that. I would like to get to another point. Speaking at second reading of this bill on October 31 the Minister of Finance mentioned that there would be a \$35 million saving in the next fiscal year over and

above the amount of money which would have had to be expended if the present family allowance plan had remained in place. I would like to ask the parliamentary secretary or the Minister of National Health and Welfare about the annual administrative cost of paying out 12 monthly cheques on each account. A family receives 12 family allowance cheques per year. What is the administrative cost per family at the present time under the present plan?

**Miss Bégin:** Mr. Chairman, I want to say very clearly to the hon. member, who acts like a Crown attorney, that I have not refused to answer. That is a pure fabrication in his mind.

I am suffering from a sore throat. That has been obvious to my colleagues for two weeks. I wish there was a rule providing that I should not have to repeat answers to the same questions. However, I will repeat once more. I have given this answer fully at least twice earlier tonight.

**Mr. Harquail:** This is the third time.

**Miss Bégin:** The hon. member for Provencher either does not listen or he is having fun instead of doing his work. The new child tax credit will not violate any agreement with Indians. Does the hon. member think we would present legislation to parliament which would violate agreements with Indians? That is a very strange question. I said quite clearly to the hon. member, who was killing time, that the treatment of the child tax credit for Indian children will be the same as for any other Canadian children. I want to repeat that. I hope the hon. member understands. I could put it in writing for him. In this regard I wrote to my colleague, the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, in a way similar to the way I wrote to my provincial counterparts. I have not received a written reply from my colleague. I hope that is clear to the hon. member now.

On the question of the administrative cost of sending out family allowance cheques, I will have to check the question to see how the hon. member wants it answered. If he wants to know the cost per family of sending out family allowance cheques, I know it is the lowest administrative cost of all programs but I will provide him with exact details.

● (2142)

**Mr. Rae:** I do not have many questions and those I have will not, I think, strike fear in the hearts of members on the other side or cause much surprise because they have been raised by my leader and by other hon. members here. However, for purposes of clarity, I should like to state, first of all, that while I agree with the minister that the discount rate is 15 per cent, when we talk about that rate on an annual basis it is 60 per cent. The government requires under Bill C-46—I would refer my friend to schedule 1 under the bill, and in particular to the last column to be filled out by the tax discounter—that the discount rate as an annual rate be 60 per cent. That is what I was saying in my comments earlier. I would be interested to hear the minister on this, but I want to make it perfectly clear for the record. I was accused by some hon. members of not knowing what I was talking about. There are many times when