

Family Allowances

ment and government and the related policies of the Department of Labour—\$21,024. Plettenberg, Elizabeth—examine and appraise the industrial relations system of West Germany and the role of trade unions and the views of the participants and leaders at the union-government-sponsored labour studies centres—\$3,000. Quantetics Corp.—study to provide Department of Labour with cost estimates for setting up various systems for information exchange in a collective bargaining information centre—\$4,219. Pothschild, Robert—analyses existing adult educational facilities available in the community colleges and similar institutions—\$878. Scott and Hart Associates Inc.—consulting on labour productivity in the automotive industry—\$975. Simmons, Prof. Gordon—advisory services related to protection of employees against wrongful dismissal and the arbitration of dismissal grievances—\$1,104. Smith, A. & Associates Ltd.—provide advisory and consultative services to the Department of Labour with respect to the development of a framework for the implementation of expanded advisory services as part of the department's post-control program—\$34,951. Willard, Joseph—provide advice in connection with policy related to the development of controls and post-controls related to inflation—\$7,241. Willard Consultant & Research Services Ltd.—provide advice with policy related to the development of controls and post-controls related to inflation—\$1,200. (b) Supply and Services Canada (Audit services bureau)—provide audit services relating to provincial safety inspection agreements and services provided by Workmen's Compensation Boards—\$36,667. Capelle, Ronald G. Dr.—provision of advisory services related to organization development of the department—\$937. Clarke, Richard—assist the Department of Labour in the preparation of labour standards documentation—\$3,560. Weiler, Richard & Associates Ltd.—provide advisory and consultative services to the Department of Labour in the development of works councils (safety and health committees) and assessment of the progress of the department's reorganization and program implementation—\$7,437.

2. see 1 (a) and (b) above.

Mr. Speaker: Question No. 43 has been answered. Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

INCOME TAX ACT

AMENDMENT TO PROVIDE FOR CHILD TAX CREDIT

The House resumed from Thursday, November 2, consideration in committee of Bill C-10, to amend the Income Tax Act to provide for a child tax credit and to amend the Family Allowances Act—Mr. Chrétien—Mr. Laniel in the chair.

[Mr. Ouellet.]

The Chairman: Clause 1 is under consideration.

• (1522)

On clause 1—

Mr. Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): Mr. Chairman, the point I want to make comes under clause 1 because the bill does not especially deal with the particular subject. Some members of the House may remember that over the last four years I have pointed out that the family allowances bill of 1973, which the minister made very clear was a universal bill, was not in practice universal. I think the regulations will show that any person within the age set down in the act gets the family allowance, with one exception. That exception is if that person or child is an orphan.

Since 1974 I have been asking the minister's predecessor about this, and he was shocked that this provision would be in existence. The promise was made to bring in amendments to make sure that orphans would be protected by the universality clause of this bill. What the regulations actually say is that if any child has parents with any income whatsoever—and every child has parents—regardless of the income of the parents that child gets the family allowance. To put it into simple terms, a person could be a millionaire and have children within the age limit who would still be entitled to the family allowance.

However, when they brought down the regulations, with no approval of parliament whatsoever, the regulations said this does not apply to an orphan if that orphan has an estate which yields more than \$1,660 a year. My point is that when these people drafted these regulations, approved by a committee of the cabinet, and which have been in effect for the past five years, they discriminated against a person who is a child, whether that child was two years of age or 16 years of age, merely because he is an orphan.

In my file I have a whole series of questions that I have asked every three or four months about this matter. I have a copy of a report on the Family Allowances Act which states flatly that the allowance is not paid for a child who has a taxable income. I am simply asking whether, after this bill is passed, the same discrimination will apply. The answer, as I read the bill, is that it will, because the eligibility sections of this bill are the same eligibility sections as those which are found in the Family Allowances Act.

My question to the minister is very simple. Would she consider an amendment to this bill to make it absolutely clear that no power is given to anyone to bring in regulations that destroy the principle of universality? I contend that if a child is an orphan and has lost both parents, whether he is under the care of uncles, aunts, grandparents or social agencies, that child by law of parliament has a right to family allowances. Under this bill, if it is passed, such a child should also have the right to the refund. I think that is a very clear question. It is a moral and a political question. If the minister wants, I can give the answer the minister gave as to why it is not being done.