

Family Allowances Act, 1973

[Translation]

Mr. Gagliano: Mr. Speaker, I was just speaking about the problem that cashing the family allowance cheques could create, especially for the small corner stores. Months often go by before someone realizes that a child has disappeared or has died.

Under the legislation, if the Minister decides after a certain time, such as one year, to issue a certificate declaring the child dead, stop the cheques and ask for repayment, when the store owner tries to get his money back from his customer, he will be told: "Well no, my child is not considered dead because no court in this land has declared him dead." You can imagine the fight there would be before the courts. The parents of this child would have to hire lawyers and spend more money. Not only will their child have disappeared, but they will also face additional expenses and other very unpleasant problems.

Mr. Speaker, this is why I support the motion of my colleague which adds a new element to the legislation, namely a waiting period of at least five years during which time the search can continue and all these aspects can be considered.

Mr. Speaker, we are trying to debate this issue in this House and to try to find a perfect solution, but the Hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Wise) has just imposed closure.

Mr. Speaker, I object to this procedure which is unfair and undemocratic. For my part, Mr. Speaker, I move:

That the debate be now adjourned.

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

[Translation]

Mr. Gagliano: Mr. Speaker, I have just moved immediate adjournment of the debate to protest against the proposal of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Wise).

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Could I have the motion, please, and I need a seconder for it? Is it the Hon. Member for Ottawa-Vanier (Mr. Gauthier)?

Mr. Gauthier: Sure.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): It has been moved by the Hon. Member for Saint-Léonard-Anjou, seconded by the Hon. Member for Ottawa—Vanier, that this House do now adjourn—

Mr. Gauthier: No. That the debate—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): That the debate do now adjourn.

Mr. Gauthier: That the debate be now adjourned.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The next time, would you please write it out fully so that I know exactly what it is. Is the House ready for the question?

Mr. Epp (Provencher): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. There seems to be some question in the your mind as to exactly which word is being used. Could we have a clear example of what in fact has been submitted?

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Hon. Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Epp) knows that the Speaker in the chair is one of the most competent men who could possibly be in the chair. He has heard the words of the Member being shouted to the Speaker. Clearly everyone in the House has heard it. The motion is that the debate be now adjourned. The Minister of Health is not helping his cause by engaging in these kinds of delaying tactics.

Mr. Gauthier: I wrote it down.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): May I read it again, please? It is moved by Mr. Gagliano, seconded by Mr. Gauthier, that the debate be adjourned. Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those in favour of the motion please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those against please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Call in the Members.

● (1750)

And the division bells having rung:

Mr. Speaker: It being six o'clock p.m., the motion before the House has lapsed in terms of Standing Order 9(1), and the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at eleven o'clock a.m. pursuant to Standing Order 3(1).

The House adjourned at 6.01 p.m.