

*Business of the House*

family homes rather than to keep them together. If surviving children are required to move into a foster home, they could be moving into an institution, as we know that foster homes are often not confined to one particular family. Oftentimes you will find several families in them. That is one thing about which we must be very careful.

I do not think that we should move too quickly in this matter. I feel that we should certainly keep the family home together. However, I also realize that, in communities such as the one from which I come, the standard of living is probably among the highest in Canada. When one looks at \$75 a month for the foster mother and \$25 a month for the children, one just wonders how they could make ends meet in keeping a home together. That is another reason why I think this act should be given a great deal more study rather than trying to pass this bill as it is at this time.

There is also the question whether the home might have a mortgage on it which it would be impossible for the foster mother to pay off. These are all matters that should be taken into consideration before we proceed to amend the act. As set out in the bill, suggestions have been made already that perhaps the merchant seamen compensation board should take a good look at the matter before any changes are made. I agree with this, and I feel that if we went into the bill a little more thoroughly as we should we might find other provisions that should be changed slightly. While the bill has a great deal of merit and is one I could support in principle, nevertheless I think there are a lot more details that should be worked out before we give it final approval. Again I wish to compliment the hon. member for bringing this matter to our attention.

**Mr. W. H. Payne (Coast-Capilano):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words with respect to Bill No. C-39. I think it would be proper to say that those from the west coast of Canada must regard with a great deal of sympathy the purpose and intent of the mover of the bill, the hon. member for Burin-Burgeo. I am sure that the situation he finds on the Newfoundland coast is not entirely different from that on the Pacific coast.

There was one note thrown into the discussion today that gives me some concern. Basically we are dealing with the dependants of merchant seamen and not with fishermen. We are also dealing with people rather than legal terms and I think it is very important we should keep in mind that in the rehabilitation and settling of orphan children, whether they be on the seashore or inland, the prime environment which will best establish and

guarantee their future development as citizens who will be a credit to the nation and themselves is the family. The basis of the existing legislation ties this adjustment entirely to property and certainly not to the family unit. I endorse and approve the spirit of the amendment and I am certain those who inhabit the Pacific coastal region and who are familiar with the plight of orphans in some of our remote outposts will also concur in the intent of the amendment. However, I do feel, not being trained in any way as a solicitor, more than somewhat confused by the wording. I think it leaves the bill open to a great deal of misconstruing and errors of interpretation.

I am sure it would be the wish of those living in the coastal area in my part of the country that we should look not only at the suggestion brought forward in this amendment but should also give some thought generally to the Merchant Seamen Compensation Act. I refer more particularly to the merchant seamen compensation board which, as I am sure all hon. members know, is composed of three officers of the public service of Canada. In my view this whole matter should be reviewed and surely any review should contemplate the establishment of a board with appointees from other than the public service. I think there are great advantages to be gained by orphans and others who benefit under the act. I could continue at great length, Mr. Speaker, but I see it is six o'clock.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is it agreed that it is six o'clock? It is very close to it.

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Speaker:** As hon. members know, a message is expected from the other place. Perhaps by unanimous consent hon. members would agree to sit beyond the hour. Otherwise we might rise and return.

**BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE**

**Mr. Martin (Essex East):** Mr. Speaker, perhaps we might take advantage of this little lull in our proceedings to ascertain from the leader of the house what business it is proposed we shall deal with on Monday. Possibly when the leader is speaking he might indicate not only what we are going to do on Monday but what he envisages we might do all next week. I would even go further and suggest that he might tell us what we are going to do up until April 6, which may be a very decisive date.

**Mr. Churchill:** If things happen on April 6 such as are anticipated by the hon. member, the decisive date will be later.