

*Family Allowances Act, 1973*

mothers. I am delighted to tell him that all Indian mothers, I am informed by the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss Bégin), are recipients of the full Child Tax Credit of \$343. So the poor of the country, the poor mothers, are indeed being protected by the Child Tax Credit. Let us put that on the record.

**Mr. Malone:** Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Minister of State for Mines (Mrs. Erola) for putting on the record the fact that Indian mothers are able to get a tax credit. I accept that. As a matter of fact, I never even said anything other than that. She says I did, but she will notice tomorrow in *Hansard* that what I said was that Indian families are not counted amongst the unemployed.

**Miss Bégin:** You will change the "blues".

**Mr. Malone:** I am sorry, the sound waves did not get across to the other side, but I stand by my position. Indians are not counted amongst the unemployed in this country, and that is what I was talking about at the time.

With respect to the \$240 tax credit, I accepted that there will be an increase over last year. However, because of the capping of the Family Allowance this year there will be a permanent loss of \$30 for each family thereafter. It is a permanent loss and it will hit the poor families harder than it does the rich. The Minister can come forward with her tax credit, but that will not solve the ongoing problem. That is not the way to put into place national policy.

**Miss Bégin:** Madam Speaker, I should not even react to the scare tactics used by the Official Opposition—

**Mr. Manly:** A point of order, Mr. Speaker. Is it not customary to rotate amongst different Parties during the exchange following a Member's speech?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin):** You are absolutely right. We will do that eventually. The Hon. Minister for National Health and Welfare (Miss Bégin).

**Miss Bégin:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Hon. Member if he is not aware that his last explanation is totally false. He explained to the people of Canada who are watching television right now that there will be a loss forever in the base of child benefits received by mothers in need. That is not the case. Is the Member aware that the Child Tax Credit will be a full \$50 more, on top of indexation, which will replace all possible loss this year and next year? I repeat, all possible loss. I will send him a copy of the detailed figures I gave in committee because he may not be aware of the damage he is trying to create amongst mothers with false information.

Is he aware of how many mothers get the Child Tax Credit, partially or fully? I would like to know what number he thinks it is.

**Mr. Malone:** Mr. Speaker, the Minister is at odds with the Canadian Council on Social Development who support the

position I have expressed here today. Not only has she a debate with me, she has one with that organization also.

I want to say to her that whenever you restrict the increase in Family Allowance with the intention to start full indexing later, you will be indexing from a lower base. The calculations I have, on the basis of the legislation before us, show there will be a \$30 reduction for every child. I concede there is a one-year supplement, but that does not make up for the fact that the base will be lower thereafter in perpetuity, unless the Government makes some other legislative changes. I stand by that statement, and I guess there is nothing else I can say about it other than that that is a fact.

**Mr. Anguish:** Mr. Speaker, as I understand what has been said here, the recipients of Family Allowances are not really losing anything because they are getting it back in the Child Tax Credit. Is this Liberal Government telling us that it has put us through all kinds of debate in the House of Commons over the six and five program when it really does not change anything? Has this been done for cosmetic, political posturing in the country when there is really no loss to the recipients and no gain to the Government of Canada? What is the whole point of the six and five program?

**Mr. Kristiansen:** And they talk about wasting time.

**Mr. Malone:** Mr. Speaker, I have no quarrel with that submission. I am sure there is some accuracy in it.

**Mrs. Mitchell:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the Hon. Member for Crowfoot (Mr. Malone) on his speech. I was watching him on the monitor and I thought for a while I was watching Dallas. That was very impressive. However, I know that in addition to being a fine orator, he also was very serious about what he was saying. Indeed, we agreed with many but not, of course, all the points he raised.

He talked about Government expenditures and I would like to ask him whether he would be willing to reduce the Government allocations for defence in order to raise Family Allowances for Canada's children?

**Mr. Malone:** Mr. Speaker, I am quite willing to find ways of raising funds out of the wasteful expenditures the Government is making at the present time, so that women and children in this country do not have to suffer. However, at a time when this country would lose a war with Cuba because we do not have Armed Forces to match those of Cuba, I would be somewhat reluctant to tone down our defences, especially since there is, on both sides of the House, some feeling that there is a need to beef up Canada's defences.

**Miss Bégin:** Mr. Speaker, we just saw the usual fight between the NDP and the Conservatives. When it suits them, they gang up one way, then gang up the other way, and go to bed together.

Of course the Hon. Member for Crowfoot has not read the report of the Canadian Council on Social Development, nor is he aware of the amount of poverty, as he showed clearly in his