

Family Allowances

nothing new to the adherents of his particular philosophy. To the hon. gentleman who has just preceded me I might say that I thank him for his little lecture on parliamentary behaviour. However, I think it would be a wise suggestion if he would be kind enough to take the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath) within the sphere of his influence. I am sure there is much he could teach him.

In considering this resolution I should also like to point out something else to the hon. member who preceded me. If my earphones were tuned in properly, as they usually are, I believe he suggested that in the amendment there should have been included some reference to the cost or to the payments themselves. My understanding is that this procedure is not permissible at this time and that we can only ask the house to consider the advisability of these amendments.

I may say that the financial burden placed upon families, particularly at this time and particularly in the constituency which I represent, would be alleviated if students over the age of 16 years and up to the age of 21 years were to benefit from the Family Allowances Act. There are a great many examples of large families where a number of members of the family, perhaps two or three, are pursuing higher education. I feel that in a general sense it would be in line with the philosophy of government in this country if we were to broaden the scope of this legislation.

I do not wish to take up too much of the time of the house at this moment. I merely wish to limit my remarks to expressing my support of this motion. I may say that an unusual occasion is presented for this House of Commons when we see a ray of light coming from the marriage that conveniently keeps this house in session. We should not, however, as a result of this circumstance, be carried away with greater hope for increased enlightenment on some of the more important problems of this country. I would remind you, Mr. Speaker, that in the kingdom of the blind the one-eyed man is king.

Mr. McGrath: May I ask the hon. gentleman a question?

Mr. Cashin: I am always glad to hear from the hon. member for St. John's East.

Mr. McGrath: Would the hon. member have broadened the scope of the bill to include students at law such as the hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate?

(Translation):

Mr. Robert Beaulé (Quebec East): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member for St. Mary (Mr. Valade), who said that the motion was not clear, I must say that, in my opinion,

[Mr. Cashin.]

it is very clear and simple. I cannot see why he who said that a child can study 15 or 20 years in Europe, would not support it, for it has to do with family allowances, not with old age pensions. The motion is not about old age pensions but about family allowances.

(Text):

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, I wish to advise the house that I am in agreement with both the amendment and the main motion. The motion as originally placed before the house was commendable in that it pointed out one other area in which family allowances could be expanded. I have felt that there are several situations in which family allowances are properly payable even after the child has reached the age at which the allowances are normally discontinued. The amendment broadened the scope of the original motion to a point that I would still agree is commendable.

I know, and I suppose all hon. members know, that there are cases of children whose father has died or who is not supporting the family, and in the province of Ontario such a child is supported by assistance under the mothers' allowance regulations. In most provinces these allowances are discontinued when the child reaches a certain age and, to add insult to injury, family allowances are also discontinued at about the same time. This creates a great hardship for the widowed mother in many of these cases where the provincial mothers' allowance and the federal family allowance are both discontinued at approximately the same time. The children still have to be sent to school either within the community or somewhere else.

I believe that an expansion of the provisions of the act to cover these situations would be met with general approval.

With respect to the original motion, when a parent goes to another country to carry on his education that parent generally is classified in that country as a non-resident. Under these circumstances he is not entitled to the privileges of a resident of that country and therefore does not qualify—

(Translation):

Mr. Lamy: Mr. Speaker, is the hon. member killing the motion?

(Text):

Mr. Aiken: I would ask the hon. member to repeat his question.

(Translation):

Mr. Lamy: Mr. Speaker, I asked the hon. member if he was killing the motion. It is now four minutes to six.

(Text):

Mr. Aiken: I will be talking until six o'clock, although I had not intended to. Other