Family Allowances Act, 1973

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

Mr. Kaplan: I moved a motion before you recognized him.

Ms. Copps: He moved a motion.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): Order, please. The Hon. Member for York East (Mr. Redway) rose on a point of order.

Mr. Kaplan: No, it was on debate.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): Please. He rose on a point of order and I attempted to interrupt the Hon. Member for York Centre so that the Hon. Member could rise to speak. I have no knowledge of what the point of order is. I can understand full well that the Hon. Member for York Centre, being in the middle of his speech, could not very well understand what was said by the Chair, as is usually the case, anyway. Having said that, I believe the Hon. Member for York East (Mr. Redway) has a point of order.

Ms. Copps: Point or order-

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): I will recognize the Hon. Member for York East—

Ms. Copps: Point of order—

Mr. Andre: You are not at Queen's Park now.

Mr. Deans: Let's hear what's happening.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): Order, please. I will hear the Hon. Member for York East on his point of order and we will take it from there.

Mr. Gauthier: No, absolutely not. Absolutely not.

Mr. Redway: Mr. Speaker-

Mr. Gauthier: We will follow one set of rules in this House—one set of rules for all of us.

Mr. Redway: Mr. Speaker-

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, there is one set of rules for all of us.

Mr. Redway: Mr. Speaker-

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, I will not sit down. This is a show of partisanship on your part.

Some Hon. Members: Sit down.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): Order.

Mr. Gauthier: I will not sit down. You guys can yap all you like over there and I will not sit down. I will give this guy a piece of my mind.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): Order.

We are particularly concerned about Clause 5 of the Bill because, as I said, it would tighten up the wording to make sure that the Minister could not use presumption of death certificates which would follow to collect over-payments from parents. In committee, we heard from parents connected with Childfind, an organization established in both eastern Canada and British Columbia, and I understand that it has developed a national network. This organization is very concerned because many parents with missing children feel that they have been left alone. They feel that once a child is missing, all supports are pulled out from under them. The police will usually help them to search for missing children for a certain number of weeks, but then they slow down and in fact to all intents and purposes stop looking for missing children.

We also heard how important it is that parents have money to continue to search for missing children. That is why we feel it is important that the family allowance be continued during the period a child is missing and until the child is proven dead. The parents have to pay for photographs and long-distance telegrams and telephone calls. There is much concern about this. We object to the clause as it stands and that is why we have presented the amendment in Motion No. 4.

Hon. Bob Kaplan (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, the Government has made many promises which it has broken. There is an illustration of one of these broken promises in the legislation which is now before the House at report stage. Not only has the Government broken specific promises about family allowances but it has shown its true colours. Its true constituency is not composed of average and poorer Canadians but of those Canadians who are better off. Parliament will see Bill after Bill delivering goods to that constituency.

We see another broken promise in the case of the sale of the de Havilland Corporation to Boeing Corporation of Seattle. The Government is free to break its promises. It is free to tell the Canadian people one thing and to do another. It has control over this Chamber and eventually it will get its way here. Under the Financial Administration Act, the sale of the de Havilland Corporation is entirely within the control of Cabinet, not the House of Commons, to settle. But we believe that it does not have the authority or the power to keep the Canadian people in the dark about the terms and conditions of the de Havilland deal.

• (1610)

Mr. Redway: Point of order—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): Order. The Hon. Member for—

Mr. Kaplan: —in view of its refusal to allow that, I move that this House do now adjourn.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): Order, please. I am sorry to interrupt the Hon. Member for York Centre (Mr. Kaplan) but the Hon. Member—

Mr. Gauthier: He's moved a motion.