

Certainly I would question it. As long as money is paid out with no strings attached the money will be used for the benefit of the parents rather than for the benefit of the children to whom the money is directed.

I hope that in replying to the hon. member's remarks the minister will give us some assurance, though I do not know how he can, that the principle we are now discussing is whether we should pay these benefits to parents for the benefit of their children, or whether the money is paid to the parents for the benefit of the parents and their children. I can envisage this money being used to pay the rent or for the parents' medical expenses, for example, in which case the children would derive no benefit at all. Or is the money to be directed toward the maintenance, care, training, education or advancement of the person in respect of whom it is paid?

As I say, I should like the minister to underscore the principle of the bill so that the country can be advised. If the money is to be used for the benefit of the children, the act should so state and strings should be attached. In only one case are strings attached, and that is when children are in the care and control of an institution. No strings are attached when they are in the care and control of their parents. Therefore I support the motion.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. The minister has already spoken. He can only speak now with the consent of the House.

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Munro:** Mr. Speaker, the general philosophy behind family allowances is that the payment is an incremental income for a family with children to assist them with the additional responsibilities they have compared with a single person or a childless couple. The money goes into the general family income pot, so to speak, to assist families with a dependency factor, as opposed to the expenses incurred by a childless couple or a single person.

We all know that wage scales are based on the value of a service rendered by a person to a particular firm. However, such wages do not take into account this dependency factor, and this is one of the rationales of family allowances. In cases where family allowance is paid to children in the care of an institution, I think there should be a term in the legislation, in the absence of the natural parents, to provide that the money is to be used for the care and maintenance of the children.

The hon. member is now suggesting that we should ensure that each payment sent to a mother is used for the care and maintenance of her children. Let one just consider the number of cheques being sent out each year. There are well in excess of two million families in receipt of family allowance each month. Some hon. members opposite have been talking about the administrative difficulties created by the bill. The moving of a motion such as this illustrates just how terribly concerned they are about administrative difficulties. I would ask them whether they would want to see the creation of an horrendous federal bureaucracy, established at considerable cost to the taxpayers of this country, in order to police the action they suggest.

**Mr. Baldwin:** That is not so.

#### *Family Income Security Plan*

**Mr. Munro:** I suggest it would be so. Or, may I ask, is this motion being put forward merely as a pious declaration of intent, with no consideration at all being given to its enforcement? I am in the hands of the hon. member, but in our previous discussion of family allowance we have never considered this kind of policing arrangement in regard to parents in receipt of family allowance. We were well aware that it was unenforceable and as of right they receive this money subject to the income test, so I would ask hon. members in terms of common sense to let the legislation go as it now stands and not include this type of requirement.

• (1200)

We are talking here in many cases of lower income families, and this money is for the general good of the family. It would be very difficult in any particular situation to say whether the parents had used the money for the care and maintenance of the child as opposed to providing better accommodation generally for the whole family. Could one not say that is indirectly a very tangible benefit to the child itself? You get into all of these problems of interpretation which would render such an addition invalid and unsuccessful. For those reasons I would ask hon. members to turn down this amendment.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** Is the hon. member rising for the purpose of asking a question?

**Mr. Baldwin:** I want to make a speech if the House will let me, Mr. Speaker.

**An hon. Member:** Agreed, on division.

**Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River):** Very briefly, Mr. Speaker, I think the minister misconceives the legal aspect. I am sure my hon. friend in whose name the motion stands is not suggesting that the government should engage or hire a large number of people to actively police every aspect of this. As I construe the motion, it constitutes a statutory responsibility of a contractual nature by which those people who are legally entitled to and do in fact receive these funds have a statutory duty upon them which can be properly accepted by them through this clause. Such a provision has been put in other statutes. It is in many provincial statutes, perhaps not in precisely the same form, but surely this is why we have statutes. In many instances it is necessary to spell out that there is a duty upon those receiving certain funds and that these are the conditions under which the funds are received. In the motion the conditions have been clearly and explicitly set forth. The money is to be applied toward the maintenance, care, training, education or advancement of the child.

If the government became aware that there was a breach obviously it might have some responsibility to do something about it, but as between the child who is the beneficiary and the person who receives the money there is a legal duty upon the parent or other person. That is the meaning of the motion.

**Mr. Munro:** Ask me a question so I can reply.

**Mr. Baldwin:** The minister wants to make another speech. I think we will wait until we get to third reading.