

if its existence is accepted, which can constitute grounds for debate.

Our precedents clearly indicate that the imminent, potential collapse or failure of a bank—and in this case it would be the second—and its repercussions for the banking industry as a whole has and does constitute, in my view, a genuine emergency as envisioned by the Standing Order. The Chair must then consider whether an early opportunity of debating the matter is likely to be available. As Hon. Members well know, there is a Government notice of motion on the Notice Paper but, as yet, the Chair has no clear indication of when that motion is likely to come up for debate. However, I am advised that conversations continue as to whether there will be a debate.

While I find that the emergency questions have been met, today I am not satisfied, as yet, that there is a sufficiently urgent need to change today's Order Paper to have that matter debated today.

* * *

[Translation]

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURN

Mr. Paul Dick (Parliamentary Secretary to President of Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, if starred question No. 331 could be made an order for return, that return would be tabled immediately.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House that question No. 331 be deemed to have been made an order for return?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

[Text]

ESCAPES FROM MINIMUM SECURITY INSTITUTIONS

Question No. 331—**Mr. Nunziata:**

What are the names of the inmates who have escaped from minimum security institutions including all those who failed to return on passes during the last 12 months and, in each case (a) from which institution and on what date did the inmate escape (b) how long had the inmate been in the institution (c) where applicable, from which medium security institution was the inmate transferred?

Return tabled.

[Translation]

Mr. Dick: I ask Mr. Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Family Allowances Act GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

FAMILY ALLOWANCES ACT, 1973

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed from Thursday, September 19, consideration of the motion of Mr. Epp (Provencher) that Bill C-70, an Act to amend the Family Allowances Act, 1973, be read a second time and referred to a legislative committee; and the amendment of Mr. Frith (p. 6625).

Mr. Speaker: I see the Hon. Member for Egmont (Mr. Henderson) seeking the floor. I had understood that the Hon. Member for Beaches (Mr. Young) had the floor the last time the matter was before the House.

Some Hon. Members: He is not here.

Mr. Speaker: In those circumstances, I recognize the Hon. Member for Egmont on debate.

Mr. George Henderson (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, it is rather ironic that we are speaking to Bill C-70 today. In effect its only motive is to cut the payments to mothers on behalf of their children.

In the last day or so we have seen a Government and a Minister who have seen fit to allow a product to go on the market, in this case tuna, which could be injurious to the health of small children. Instead of talking today about cutting family allowances, we in this Chamber should be talking about the whole issue of tainted tuna. Therefore I move:

That this House do now adjourn.

● (1230)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The House has heard the terms of the motion.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion, please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed to the motion, please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.
And more than five Members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Call in the Members.
And the division bells having rung:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Towers): Order, please.