



CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 141 • NUMBER 175 • 1st SESSION • 39th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Wednesday, June 20, 2007

—

Speaker: The Honourable Peter Milliken

CONTENTS

(Table of Contents appears at back of this issue.)

CORRIGENDUM

In the June 19, 2007 issue of *Hansard*, on page 10834 in the right-hand column, immediately before the 1550 time bullet, the following text should appear:

The Speaker: On behalf of all hon. members, I want to express our thanks to the hon. member for Toronto Centre for his service in the House. It has been a pleasure for me as Speaker to work with him as a minister and leader of the opposition.

I appreciated his remarks about respectfulness in question period and in dealings between members. I hope all hon. members will bear those comments in mind overnight so that tomorrow's question period will be the very model of civility which we can all look forward to.

I thank the hon. member for Toronto Centre for his friendship over the years and wish him and his wife Cathy the very best on his retirement.

Also available on the Parliament of Canada Web Site at the following address:

<http://www.parl.gc.ca>

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, June 20, 2007

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

• (1405)

[*English*]

The Speaker: It being Wednesday, we will now have the singing of the national anthem, led by the hon. member for Yukon.

[*Members sang the national anthem*]

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*Translation*]

DAIRY FARMERS OF CANADA

Mr. Jacques Gourde (Lotbinière—Chutes-de-la-Chaudière, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that the Dairy Producers of Canada welcome the amendments to the compositional standards for cheese proposed by Canada's new government.

Most countries that are known for their excellent cheeses have very strict standards. The Conservative government has taken the initiative to ensure that cheese standards uphold consumer confidence and protect Canada's reputation as a producer of quality cheese.

This support provides yet more proof that the Liberals were unwilling to do anything and the Bloc unable. For the past 16 months, our government has been taking real action and keeping its promises in this file as in others.

In closing, I would invite all of my colleagues to sample Le Lotbinière cheese, which is one of our high-quality cheeses available in supermarkets all over Quebec. Le Lotbinière is made by the Bergeron master cheesemakers, whose contribution to the economy of Saint-Antoine-de-Tilly has been invaluable. It is perfect with fruit at a picnic, and it works well for fondue and raclette.

* * *

[*English*]

RELAY FOR LIFE

Mr. Anthony Rota (Nipissing—Timiskaming, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize those who helped organize as

well as those who participated in the annual Relay for Life which took place in North Bay, Ontario this past weekend.

This fundraising event, which involved over 225 cancer survivors, also served as a memorial to friends and family members who succumbed to the disease.

The theme of this year's event was "Cancer Never Sleeps". Those who took part in the overnight relay will not rest until a cure for cancer has been found. Every step taken during the relay takes us one step closer to that goal.

The Relay for Life takes place in communities across Canada and is a celebration of life, a way of remembering loved ones and a tribute to the family members and care workers who help cancer patients through a trying time. On behalf of all survivors, I thank them. We would not have made it without them.

* * *

[*Translation*]

PETITE-RIVIÈRE-SAINT-FRANÇOIS MASSIF

Mr. Michel Guimond (Montmorency—Charlevoix—Haute-Côte-Nord, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Charlevoix region is waiting for close to \$30 million over five years that was promised by Ottawa to help complete a major project: the development of the Massif de la Petite-Rivière-Saint-François by developer Daniel Gauthier. This project has yet to be launched because the Charlevoix region is still waiting for the millions promised.

The project involves upgrading the railway between the Gare du Palais station and Pointe-au-Pic, and includes a 150-room hotel, a multifunctional conference facility and a public market for locally grown products. We cannot allow this project, which has support from the community, to wither away, just because the federal government did not want to sign an agreement in time. Without a signed agreement, the developer cannot start work, since it would no longer be eligible for available grants.

This major project, which would create 600 permanent jobs is crucial to the region's economic development. I am calling on the Minister of the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec to keep his word. Why is the Conservative government so quick to find money for military equipment and not to help a project that will create jobs and put Charlevoix on the map?

Statements by Members

[English]

ABORIGINAL WOMEN

Ms. Jean Crowder (Nanaimo—Cowichan, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Sharon McIvor has won her case in the B.C. Supreme Court, arguing that it was wrong for the federal government to arbitrarily say that women could not pass Indian status on to their children. This is a long overdue decision to reverse decades of discrimination against first nations women.

Along with difficulties accessing programs available to status Indians, the effects of Bill C-31 were felt throughout the community, where children faced acceptance or rejection based on their different status.

The government knows it will lose this case if it goes forward. Its own internal documents show that. However, the minister has told the media that this judgment may not be enough and he is contemplating spending more taxpayer dollars to fight this decision at a higher court, this from the minister who insists the Conservatives are working to bring human rights to first nations.

Human rights are inalienable and Sharon McIvor has proven through her long battle that those rights should be recognized.

The minister should accept this ruling and start making the necessary changes in his department to deal with the influx of people applying for status.

* * *

● (1410)

STEM CELL RESEARCH

Mr. James Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni, CPC): Mr. Speaker, much has been said in the House about stem cell research and the tremendous possibilities for regenerative medicine. Spinal cord injuries, tissue replacement and even sports injury repair are hot topics of discussion.

Whether it is baby Cole in Cape Breton who is undergoing a transplant, or toddler Joseph Kim in Coquitlam, B.C. whose blood may save his five year old brother, stem cells and transplants have been in the news.

Recently, a plentiful, non-ethically charged and underutilized source of valuable tissue has been coming to the forefront. Umbilical cord blood is a rich source of blood tissue and stem cells that until recently has been largely discarded.

Increasingly, blood and bone marrow specialists have been calling for a national cord blood bank. Dr. Armand Keating, Director of Cell Therapy at Princess Margaret Hospital in Toronto, and Dr. Stephen Couban of the Bone Marrow Transplant Group are two prominent advocates.

Motion No. 287 gives this Parliament an opportunity to support this life-saving initiative. Let us move quickly to make a national cord blood bank a reality and help Canada develop the rich potential of regenerative medicine.

JOHN TURNBULL

Mr. Michael Savage (Dartmouth—Cole Harbour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Father's Day was different for the family of John Turnbull this year. Mr. Turnbull, who was born in 1919, died earlier this year and was interred on Saturday.

As his son Greg said, he was a member of the "greatest generation", one that survived the depression, fought in the war and then raised families and built our Canada with great sacrifice and no complaints.

During World War II, he joined the West Nova Scotia Regiment and was stricken with rheumatic fever, which affected him for the rest of his days. In 1945 he married Gladys, his amazing wife of 61 years.

John was an outstanding sportsman, expert shot, woodsman and fisherman. He was a hard worker and the chief of the volunteer fire department in Mount Uniacke.

When he moved his family to Dartmouth, he became a cub leader and coached baseball. His wife has been one of the most dedicated volunteers in Nova Scotia for many years. They contributed to building a better community. He was a strong, dedicated and caring man.

We join Gladys, Janice, Meredith, Greg, my best man, Larry and his grandchildren in mourning the loss of John Turnbull, a charter member of Canada's greatest generation.

* * *

TAX FREEDOM DAY

Mr. Mike Lake (Edmonton—Mill Woods—Beaumont, CPC): Mr. Speaker, today is Tax Freedom Day, the day when the average Canadian family has earned enough money to pay all of the taxes levied on it by the three levels of government.

This year, Tax Freedom Day is arriving four days earlier than in 2005 and 2006 thanks to our government delivering on our promise to reduce the GST by 1%.

While the Liberals made promises they did not deliver on, we took action to reduce the tax burden for hard-working Canadians.

In addition to lowering the GST, we introduced a host of other measures to reduce taxes for students, seniors, low income Canadians and families.

Worth particular mention is the introduction of pension income splitting for seniors and the new \$2,000 child tax credit that will provide up to \$310 per child in tax relief to three million Canadian families.

The bottom line is this: since taking office we have paid down the debt by \$22.4 billion and at the same time provided \$37.8 billion in tax relief for families and individuals.

When it comes to tax relief, Canadians finally have a leader and a government that knows how to get the job done.

Statements by Members

[Translation]

CLAUDE POUDRIER

Ms. Paule Brunelle (Trois-Rivières, BQ): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Bloc Québécois, I am pleased to congratulate a citizen of Trois-Rivières on an outstanding youth education project.

Claude Poudrier is the founder of a training project in environmental and citizenship education called “Action-Research for Community Problem Solving”, which is currently being implemented in 15 school boards across Quebec.

As a teacher, Mr. Poudrier actively promotes a problem-solving approach that encourages thousands of Quebec students to target problems within their environment, analyze them and find possible solutions that involve taking concrete steps to improve their environment.

This teacher/researcher has a degree in psychoeducation and teaches at the Saint-Gabriel-Archange elementary school in Cap-de-la-Madeleine. He deserves great admiration for his invaluable contribution to the well-being of our youth and, therefore, our future generations.

* * *

[English]

JUSTICE LEGISLATION

Mr. Rick Norlock (Northumberland—Quinte West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as we approach summer and look at our accomplishments it is clear that this government is getting the job done on criminal justice.

We set out with an ambitious plan to clean up the disastrous Liberal soft on crime agenda that allowed violent criminals back into the community, handcuffed prosecutors, marginalized victims and allowed organized crime to prosper.

We are delivering on our commitment to make our streets safer by getting tough on violent, repeat offenders and cracking down on organized crime and gangs.

Over the past 18 months we introduced 13 bills and only have two yet to be passed by this House.

We have passed laws that deny house arrest to serious violent offenders, make street racing a crime and expanded the use of DNA evidence for tracking criminals.

We are waiting on the Senate to pass five important bills that include mandatory penalties and a reverse onus on bail for gun crimes and raising the age of protection to 16.

This government is getting the job done and, as the justice minister says, we are just getting started.

* * *

●(1415)

[Translation]

JEAN CADIEUX

Mr. Brian Murphy (Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this week, the Université de Moncton honoured the

memory of Jean Cadieux, an extraordinary Acadian nation builder, by renaming the faculty of administration building after him.

Mr. Cadieux played a pivotal role in creating the Université de Moncton. He was a champion of bilingualism and contributed to advancing Acadian society.

He was dean of the school of commerce in 1963 and then president of the Université de Moncton for five years. He also helped establish the first French school of common law in the world.

Although Jean Cadieux passed away in February 2006, his work, his dedication and his involvement will live on in Acadia forever. Therefore, together with the Université de Moncton, which has renamed the faculty of administration building after him, I acknowledge Mr. Cadieux's contribution.

* * *

[English]

THE BUDGET

Mr. Rick Dykstra (St. Catharines, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as we prepare for the summer adjournment of Parliament, MPs who will return to their ridings across the country should be listening to their constituents' concerns and advice.

However, Liberal and NDP MPs will have some explaining to do this summer.

Their constituents will be puzzled as to why their MP voted against a budget that provided: a new working income tax benefit for the working poor; a new \$2,000 child tax credit for every child under the age of 19; new funding from the federal government to the provinces and territories to develop environmental measures to reduce pollution and greenhouse gas emissions; a commitment to reduce patient wait times in every province and territory; a commitment to Canadian women that this government will combat cervical cancer; and finally, after 40 years and two generations, income splitting for seniors.

As Ricky said to Lucy and I say to the Liberal and NDP members in this House, “You have some 'splainin' to do!”

* * *

KELLY MORRISSEAU

Mr. Paul Dewar (Ottawa Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Kelly Morrisseau was 27 years old and seven months pregnant when she was stabbed and left to die near an Ottawa area park. This tragic death is yet another example of the violence and death faced by aboriginal women in Canada.

Tomorrow is National Aboriginal Day and we are reminded that not only have we failed Kelly, but we have failed a generation of young aboriginal people.

Statements by Members

Since the federal government instituted a 2% funding cap in 1996, the number of aboriginal youths in higher education has fallen by 9%. The government must rescind this cap.

We must show that as parliamentarians our response is not more hollow words and more hollow promises. Let us start today by first helping to give hope and opportunity to the three children Kelly Morrisseau left behind. I invite all members to join me and the NDP caucus in making a donation to the Kelly Morrisseau fund.

Together, let us start investing in a better future for all aboriginal children.

* * *

NATIONAL ABORIGINAL DAY

Ms. Tina Keeper (Churchill, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise in the House today to recognize National Aboriginal Day, which is held on June 21 of each year and which we have celebrated every year since 1996, when former Governor General Roméo LeBlanc formally announced that the federal government would designate this date to honour and celebrate Canada's first nations, the Métis nation and the Inuit.

I am proud to represent a riding comprised of the Cree, Oji-Cree, Dene, Ojibway and Métis nations. Aboriginal people in the Churchill riding represent 65% of the population. They have traditionally been homemakers, fishermen, hunters and trappers, which today they continue, and they also have moved into a wide range of careers, everything from miners to professors.

Some of the people in my riding who have made a difference in this country are former Churchill MP Elijah Harper, National Chief Phil Fontaine, Chief Ovide Mercredi, a former national chief, educators Edwin Jebb and Doris Young, and councillor Bobby Smith.

I also would like to acknowledge the recipients of awards recognizing three special aboriginal women: Bernadette Beardy, Ruth Norton and Betsy Buck.

On this day, we celebrate their accomplishments and our communities and cultures.

* * *

[*Translation*]

HATE PROPAGANDA AGAINST WOMEN

Ms. Nicole Demers (Laval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, on April 22, a motion put forward by the hon. member for Etobicoke Centre to add the word "woman" to the Criminal Code with respect to hate propaganda was adopted by everyone except the Conservative Party.

The government and its Minister of Canadian Heritage and Status of Women do not seem to be too concerned about the prevalence of hate propaganda, yet it can be found in ads, in songs, on television, everywhere.

It is high time to give the justice system tools to eradicate this scourge. That does not mean encroaching on freedom of expression, but when freedom of expression is used to perpetrate gratuitous violence against women, it has to be censured.

The Conservative government has to implement this April 22 motion. It is a matter of political integrity and, above all, dignity and respect for women.

* * *

● (1420)

[*English*]

WORLD REFUGEE DAY

Hon. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today marks World Refugee Day, a celebration of the contributions refugees have made and a plea to halt the conflicts, famines and persecutions that produce them.

Unfortunately, there are some 40 million refugees worldwide, a number that is increasing precipitously as conflicts in the Sudan, the Palestinian territories, Iraq and other areas intensify.

At a time when action from the international community is critical, the minority Conservative government is slowly dismantling Canada's refugee system and has ignored playing an active role as a peacemaker.

By failing to fill the growing number of vacancies on the Immigration and Refugee Board, the government has created a mounting backlog of refugee cases that are lingering in limbo. Why the delay? Seemingly because the government wants to insert politics in a non-partisan process.

I urge the government in the spirit of World Refugee Day to do what is right, fill the vacancies, clear the backlog, stop putting partisan politics before those struggling to find a safe place to live, and bring Canada back to being an international peacekeeper.

* * *

GOVERNMENT POLICIES

Mr. Joe Preston (Elgin—Middlesex—London, CPC): Mr. Speaker, last year Canadians voted for leadership.

Through strong leadership, the Conservative government has delivered on its five priorities and more.

The Federal Accountability Act is leadership. Legislation to get tough on crime is leadership. Patient wait time guarantees is leadership. Supporting our farmers is leadership.

Tax reform for seniors is leadership. A renewable energy initiative is leadership. Tax relief for working Canadians is leadership. Campaign finance reform is leadership.

Cutting the immigration landing fee is leadership. Creating a national infrastructure plan is leadership. Creating Canada's first ever climate change plan is leadership.

This government continues to deliver on its commitments. Canadians voted for better government and Conservatives have delivered.

This government has shown leadership for families, for business and for all Canadians.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Now I encourage all hon. members to show a little leadership and be quiet for question period.

ORAL QUESTIONS

[*Translation*]

AFGHANISTAN

Hon. Stéphane Dion (Leader of the Opposition, Lib.): Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

[*English*]

The Speaker: Order. We are into question period now. Perhaps a little order would be appropriate.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition has the floor.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Stéphane Dion: Mr. Speaker, today we mourn the deaths of three Canadian soldiers who served with courage and honour in Afghanistan. That is the ultimate sacrifice citizens can make for their country.

[*English*]

On behalf of all of the Liberal caucus and indeed all Canadians, I want to extend my sincere condolences to the families of these three fallen heroes, to their friends and to their comrades.

We will remember them. We will honour them. We thank them.

I would like to give the Prime Minister an opportunity to pay his respects.

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his kind words.

This is of course a terrible tragedy, as it always is when Canada loses brave men and women who are willing to put on the uniform to defend not only our own rights and freedoms but those of people around the world.

We obviously will remember these three fallen members of the armed forces in our thoughts and prayers. Our condolences and heartfelt sympathies go out to their families, friends and colleagues.

* * *

• (1425)

EQUALIZATION FORMULA

Hon. Stéphane Dion (Leader of the Opposition, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when the finance minister tabled his budget, he said that it would be the end of the era of federal-provincial bickering, but since then things are so bad that now we have premiers accusing the Prime Minister of acting with “dishonour”.

I ask the Prime Minister, what would it be like if we were in an era of bickering?

Oral Questions

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have to point out that the budget was well received by most provincial and territorial governments. At the same time, the budget increased transfer payments to every provincial and territorial government this year and into the future. We have tried to base those decisions on a set of principles that everyone can understand.

We have respected special deals, side deals, that we signed before the budget. The value of those deals remains identical to the value there was before the budget was tabled. We have provided new enriched programs to others. We will not provide new side deals—

The Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. Stéphane Dion (Leader of the Opposition, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, about the claim the Prime Minister just made that he respected Atlantic accord, the Hon. John Crosbie said, “The public isn't that stupid”.

It is time for the truth. Will the Prime Minister admit that he should stop insulting the intelligence of Canadians and instead say that he broke his promise?

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): I disagree, Mr. Speaker. Here are the facts. The transfers under the Atlantic accord to Newfoundland this year are exactly the same as they were before the budget and, under the new equalization formula, Newfoundland will be able to gain when that accord runs out, as it surely will under its current terms, in 2012.

I say again that every province can have the arrangements they signed before, but the new arrangement has to be available to all. There will be no new special deals only for some provinces and not for others.

* * *

AFGHANISTAN

Mr. Michael Ignatieff (Etobicoke—Lakeshore, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, all Canadians and all members of this House mourn the death of our soldiers in Afghanistan today.

The government does need to be accountable with Canadians about this mission. It is incumbent upon the government to tell Canadians how long this combat mission will last.

The Prime Minister has described his own end date of February 2009 as arbitrary. Will he now clearly say to the House how long this combat mission will last? Canadians deserve to know. Is it not time for the truth?

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I think the government has been extremely clear on this point. Three of the four parties of this House have agreed with this military mission to February 2009. The government has been clear.

If there is to be any military activity after that date, that would have to be approved by Parliament. This is, frankly, something the previous government did not do, but we will do that in the future. We have been very clear on that. I have communicated that to foreign leaders at the appropriate opportunities.

Oral Questions

[Translation]

Mr. Michael Ignatieff (Etobicoke—Lakeshore, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with the imminent departure of the Royal 22nd Regiment, the moment of truth for the mission has arrived. Canadians are entitled to hear the truth from this Prime Minister and they deserve straight answers.

Does the Prime Minister plan to extend the combat mission beyond February 2009 or will he commit to respecting the date he set that was passed by this House?

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the government has made it clear that the mission will end in February 2009. A new mission after that date would have to be approved by this Parliament. I must remind members of the Liberal Party that their leader said that he saw a possible role for Canada in training Afghan forces and protecting reconstruction activities even after this date.

* * *

• (1430)

EQUALIZATION FORMULA

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the members of the Bloc and myself, I would like to offer our condolences to the families of the soldiers who were so tragically lost in Afghanistan. I would also like to offer my condolences to their comrades in arms.

With respect to the fiscal imbalance, everyone in Quebec agrees that the formula should not be based on specific agreements that confer certain advantages on one province or another. There are rumours that the government is negotiating a new formula with Nova Scotia.

Does the Prime Minister agree that the only fair equalization formula is one that includes all 10 provinces and 100% of natural resource revenues?

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the fairest formula is the one that this Parliament and this government adopted, the one that the Bloc Québécois voted for. It is based on the recommendations that resulted from an independent inquiry by Mr. O'Brien, recommendations that were modified to honour this government's commitments, and I think that it is the fairest solution.

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, all parties in Quebec's National Assembly agree that the solution to the fiscal imbalance must not be based on a temporary financial agreement but on a permanent formula. The only way to fix this is to transfer tax fields.

The Prime Minister promised to fix the fiscal imbalance once and for all. When will he acknowledge Quebec's demands and transfer tax fields?

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): Mr. Speaker, fiscal balance was restored by a Conservative government. This country must have a government that respects provincial areas of jurisdiction.

I would like to quote the member for Roberval—Lac-Saint-Jean, who said: "Now that the fiscal imbalance has been corrected, the

provincial government will be able to announce subsidies or tax cuts."

Mr. Paul Crête (Montmagny—L'Islet—Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister promised Quebec that he would limit federal spending power in Quebec's and the provinces' areas of responsibility. Then the Prime Minister watered down his promise by limiting it to cost shared programs.

The Prime Minister promised to limit federal spending power, period. Will he take action and present concrete proposals in this regard?

[English]

Hon. Rona Ambrose (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we have had negotiations and talks with the Quebec government and other provincial governments on the federal spending power. To this date we have not received a proposal from any provincial government.

[Translation]

Mr. Paul Crête (Montmagny—L'Islet—Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, BQ): Mr. Speaker, contrary to what the government has said, minister Benoît Pelletier maintains that he does not have the necessary tools to set appropriate limits on federal spending power. The latest budget deals with cost shared programs, but that is not what we are talking about. Truly limiting spending power means two things: unconditional withdrawal from all areas of jurisdiction that belong to Quebec and the provinces and full compensation. Will the government do this?

[English]

Hon. Rona Ambrose (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, CPC): As I said, Mr. Speaker, there is wording in our budget related to cost sharing programs and to limiting the federal spending power. It is the intention of our government, as we have with the settlement of the fiscal imbalance, to limit our spending in areas of provincial jurisdiction where it touches on obviously provincial programs.

Again, we are open to proposals. We have not yet seen a proposal from the Quebec government or any other province at this point.

* * *

HEALTH

Hon. Jack Layton (Toronto—Danforth, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and I in the NDP caucus extend our condolences to the families of our fallen soldiers.

[Translation]

Our condolences also to the comrades of our soldiers.

*Oral Questions**[English]*

Across the country there are Canadians now who are having to choose between buying groceries or getting the medications their doctor says that they need. Some provinces like Saskatchewan and Quebec are taking some leadership here, but the result is we are getting a patchwork quilt because there is no leadership from the federal government when it comes to prescription drug costs.

Whether or not people get the drugs they need does not depend on their illness. It depends on how much money they have, where they live, or whether they have the right disease to match up with the right province. When are we going to see some leadership on the health care issue by the government?

Hon. Tony Clement (Minister of Health and Minister for the Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member no doubt is aware, we are in discussions with the provinces and territories on this very issue to see how the federal sphere of competency can be helpful in what is a provincial sphere of jurisdiction.

However, the hon. member asks about leadership. It is this government that has ensured that there has been extra spending on health care in this budget and in last year's budget to the tune of \$1.1 billion last year and \$1.2 billion this year. That is real leadership.

• (1435)

Hon. Jack Layton (Toronto—Danforth, NDP): Mr. Speaker, discussions do not treat diseases and the fact is that the government has not moved at all on the whole concept of a national approach to pharmaceuticals as requested by the provinces.

I have been discussing this matter with the premiers and I can tell members that they can feel the foot on the brake. The result is that every day families spent \$4 billion on prescription drugs last year, provincial governments \$7 billion, and companies \$10 billion. Meanwhile, 3.5 million Canadians have no coverage at all.

The fact is that we need universal prescription drug coverage now. Why will the government not get moving on it?

Hon. Tony Clement (Minister of Health and Minister for the Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member knows very well this would be an intrusion into the provincial area of jurisdiction, so one has to deal with the provinces and territories on this issue.

In the meantime, we have acted. The federal government's responsibilities in terms of the Canada Health Act and in terms of funding of Canadian health care are in fact ensured.

We have launched a national cancer strategy. Why is the hon. member not supporting our government when it comes to a national cancer strategy? That is what Canadians should be asking.

* * *

STATUS OF WOMEN

Hon. Maria Minna (Beaches—East York, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yet another broken promise by the Conservative government. During the election the Prime Minister wrote to women's groups and guaranteed that if elected, it would "take concrete and immediate

measures...to ensure that Canada fully upholds its commitments to women".

However, now the government says one thing while it does exactly the opposite. Canadians deserve answers. It is time for the truth. Why has equality been removed from the mandate of Status of Women Canada? Equality, Mr. Speaker.

Mrs. Lynne Yelich (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Human Resources and Social Development, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I do not have to tell that member that she belongs to the Status of Women. She should understand that this government works on a principle of equality and that is how we run our mandate.

* * *

*[Translation]***OFFICIAL LANGUAGES**

Ms. Raymonde Folco (Laval—Les Îles, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, since coming into power, the Conservatives continue to attack official language minorities. The elimination of the court challenges program is the most striking example of that. Canadians deserve to get real answers from this government.

Will the minister responsible for official languages promise, once and for all, to reinstate funding for the court challenges program for minorities?

Hon. Josée Verner (Minister of International Cooperation and Minister for la Francophonie and Official Languages, CPC): Mr. Speaker, our government is firmly committed to promoting linguistic duality. The latest budget earmarks \$30 million over two years to help minority communities in our country. The government will continue to do its job in this area.

* * *

*[English]***CHILD CARE**

Ms. Yasmin Ratansi (Don Valley East, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Conservative government has yet to deliver on its promise to create 125,000 new child care spaces. This betrayal is happening while Canada lags way behind other OECD countries on investments in early learning and child care.

Canadians want to be leaders not laggards. Canadians deserve answers and it is time for the Conservative government to tell the truth.

When is the government going to deliver the child care spaces it promised Canadian parents?

Oral Questions

Hon. Monte Solberg (Minister of Human Resources and Social Development, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that Sheila Copps not long ago pointed out that the previous government did not create a single child care space with its plan.

I point to the commitments in provincial budgets this spring where provinces say they are going to use that money that we are providing them to create spaces. But more than that, upon coming to office this government provided families with \$2.4 billion a year through the universal child care benefit, which is helping families who want choice, something the leader of the Liberal Party said he would take away. I do not understand it.

* * *

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Hon. Anita Neville (Winnipeg South Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, a report from the minister's own expert panel on drinking water for first nations said the government's plan "may even put drinking water safety at risk by diverting badly needed resources into regulatory frameworks and compliance costs". The truth is that the minister has only half a plan. Canadians deserve answers and it is time for the Conservative government to tell the truth.

When will the minister put money where his mouth is? When will he tell the truth?

• (1440)

Hon. Jim Prentice (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we are supporting the delivery of drinking water to first nations communities, but let us talk about human rights because for 21 years first nations women on reserve in this country have not had access to matrimonial property rights. For 30 years first nations women on reserve in this country have not had access to Canada's human rights legislation. The member, together with the Liberal Party, is supporting that sad state of affairs by blocking Bill C-44.

Yesterday in committee she said, "It doesn't matter whether first nations women's rights are postponed for six months, eight months or a year. It makes no difference to them".

* * *

[Translation]

SECURITIES INDUSTRY

Mr. Thierry St-Cyr (Jeanne-Le Ber, BQ): Mr. Speaker, after meeting with his Quebec and provincial counterparts to discuss the creation of a Canada-wide securities commission, the Minister of Finance indicated that he plans to form an independent expert panel to advise on possible securities regulation. The Quebec finance minister, however, specified that the passport system would remain her priority. In fact, no one but Ontario wants any other arrangement.

Can the Minister of Finance explain what he is doing in this area of jurisdiction that is none of his business, unless he hopes to give his friends on Bay Street another handout?

[English]

Ms. Diane Ablonczy (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as the member mentioned

yesterday, there was a good exchange of views on this issue of securities regulation with provincial counterparts. It was a good meeting. The discussion centred around the need for better access to capital by Canadian companies, a more competitive cost of capital, increased investment choices for Canadians and, of course, this would create more jobs for Canadians.

We are within the federal jurisdiction and we will be preparing a paper on this issue, and I hope the hon. member will read it.

[Translation]

Mr. Thierry St-Cyr (Jeanne-Le Ber, BQ): Mr. Speaker, does the minister realize that, by failing to respect the will of Quebec, he is violating the civil code of Quebec and ignoring the national character of Quebec? In actual fact, the openness that his government is so proud of is reserved only for Ontario, to the detriment of Quebec and the other provinces.

[English]

Ms. Diane Ablonczy (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the member knows that is nonsense. I know he likes to fan these flames, but that is completely and utterly untrue.

The fact of the matter is that all provinces are involved in these discussions. They are important discussions for Canada. They are discussions which the International Monetary Fund urged Canada to undertake and to get into, and we are doing that in an appropriate, responsible and collegial way.

* * *

[Translation]

AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

Mr. André Bellavance (Richmond—Arthabaska, BQ): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the dairy, poultry and egg sectors sounded the alarm on the federal government's inaction at the current round of WTO negotiations. Quebec's agriculture minister and the president of the UPA said the following in a press conference: "The Government of Canada is responsible for the WTO negotiations and their subsequent results. Those results will be deemed positive if, and only if, producers under supply management come out as winners in this negotiation".

Does the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food intend to carry out this mandate?

Hon. Christian Paradis (Secretary of State (Agriculture), CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to remind the hon. member that for the past 14 months, unprecedented measures have been taken in defence of supply management. As a result, it is obvious that the Government of Canada will continue to support and defend supply management. Those were our instructions. The motion put forward in this House specifies that we must defend supply management and not touch the tariffs and quotas. That is what we will do.

Oral Questions

Mr. André Bellavance (Richmond—Arthabaska, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food said that he is currently not negotiating at the WTO. To say they are defending supply management is nothing but fine words if there is nothing concrete to back them up. All the countries at the WTO are currently positioning themselves and presenting their points of view, expect for Canada, according to the federal minister himself.

Will he stop shamelessly shifting the blame for his inaction to the GO5 coalition and start fulfilling his responsibilities by emphasizing the vulnerability of the sectors under supply management?

Hon. Christian Paradis (Secretary of State (Agriculture), CPC): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member can say what he wants, but one thing is certain: the coalition's instructions were to defend supply management and not to touch tariffs and quotas.

The minister has said so time and time again in this House. This has been repeated over and over again. Again, what language should I say this in? This government will defend supply management.

* * *

•(1445)

[English]

INCOME TRUSTS

Hon. Garth Turner (Halton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, taxpayers showed up in Waterloo, Ontario last Monday, as they did in Burlington last week, and as they will in Whitby next week and in scores of other cities.

Income trust investors are asking for one thing above all, proof that the government was justified in decimating their savings with a new tax and a broken promise.

Canadians deserve answers, not blacked out pages, not moody arrogance from the Minister of Finance. It is time he told us the truth, so let us have it.

Hon. Peter Van Loan (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC): Mr. Speaker, that is a question from the member who used to campaign in favour of income splitting and then voted against it when it came to the budget.

Yesterday we heard a call from the Liberal Party to hold byelections quickly. I know that the member said that he thought anyone who crosses the floor should go back to the people for ratification. The opportunity is coming. The time is coming. The member should get in line. We will give him what he wants and help him keep his promise.

* * *

[Translation]

THE ENVIRONMENT

Hon. Geoff Regan (Halifax West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, all credible scientists, economists and environmentalists unanimously agree: This government's climate change plan will see greenhouse gas emissions increase over the next 50 years. Canadians deserve some answers. It is time for this government to tell the truth.

When will the Prime Minister admit that his ecofraud has not fooled anyone? When will he adopt the clean air act?

[English]

Hon. John Baird (Minister of the Environment, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I think it is very interesting to note that the Liberals are doing everything they possibly can rather than talk about their record. Why do they not quote Professor Mark Jaccard?

Professor Mark Jaccard last year wrote a report on the Liberals' record on climate change. The report was entitled, "Burning Our Money to Warm the Planet: Canada's Ineffective Efforts to Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions". It said that the leader of the Liberal Party's promise would lead to an increase of 50% in harmful greenhouse gas emissions.

We will cut greenhouse gas emissions by an absolute 20%. That is our commitment. That is our promise.

* * *

MINISTERIAL EXPENSES

Mr. Mark Holland (Ajax—Pickering, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, hearing the Secretary of State for Multiculturalism and Canadian Identity boast of taking more than 100 trips to perform outreach, it is logical to wonder how much it all cost.

Despite Treasury Board guidelines that require such expenses to be posted, not a single disclosure has been made since April 2006. There is not one trip reported. For the Minister of Canadian Heritage there are no disclosures at all.

The government has again broken its promise on transparency again. In fact, if that promise was in NASCAR, it would have flown off the road and erupted in flames at every race it ever entered.

When will the government tell the truth and disclose these expenses?

Hon. Peter Van Loan (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we are proud of our track record of cabinet ministers' expense spending, because it is a fraction of what the Liberal ministers spent. We care about the taxpayers' dollars.

While the Senate is over there refusing to do its job on all our bills, it is worth noting that the Senate government leader under the Liberals spent almost 4,000 times in expenses in their last year what our Senate leader spent.

As for NASCAR, we are proud to be sponsoring a car at NASCAR, not like the Liberal member for Bourassa who said that he finds NASCAR bizarre. We find it exciting and so do a lot of other Canadians.

*Oral Questions***HEALTH**

Hon. Hedy Fry (Vancouver Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, during the last election the Conservatives promised to implement a wait times guarantee for all Canadians. Eighteen months later, Canadians are still waiting and their health care is being put at risk.

Stop the smoke and mirrors. Canadians deserve answers and it is time for the government to tell the truth.

When will the Conservatives establish a wait times guarantee, which they specifically promised well over a year ago?

• (1450)

Hon. Tony Clement (Minister of Health and Minister for the Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario, CPC): Mr. Speaker, perhaps the hon. member missed the press conference, but indeed, the Prime Minister and I were able to announce that we have in each and every province and territory a patient wait times guarantee, at least one in many of the provinces and moving ahead with more.

We have kept that promise. We are moving to reduce wait times. We are moving to increase accessibility in our health care system.

After 13 years in which the wait times in this country doubled, we are moving to act.

* * *

DEMOCRATIC REFORM

Mr. Laurie Hawn (Edmonton Centre, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this spring the House of Commons has been very busy. There were 29 bills sent to the Senate, including all of the government's priority bills such as the budget, and bills to make our streets and communities safer.

However, the Liberal dominated Senate continues to obstruct and delay bills like Bill C-10, which institutes mandatory sentences for gun crimes.

I heard the Liberal dominated Senate is now refusing to do its job on democratic reform and refuses to vote on a bill that will democratize the Senate by limiting senators' terms to eight years instead of 45.

Could the Prime Minister please tell me if the Liberal dominated Senate is really refusing to do its job?

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have to point out that in rejecting terms of less than 45 years, the Liberal Senate has not merely defied the government, it has defied its own leader here in the House. It has defied its former leader in the Senate and of course defied public opinion and all common sense.

Liberal senators will not stop Senate reform. They will only ensure that they are not part of the reform that is coming, because reform is inevitable, because the public will not stomach any longer an institution that functions like that.

CONSUMER AFFAIRS

Ms. Penny Priddy (Surrey North, NDP): Mr. Speaker, there has been tainted carrot juice, spinach laced with e-coli, dog food that leads to severe health issues and death. Now we find that ordinary Canadians have been exposed to counterfeit toothpaste and other personal hygiene items. Canadians are quickly losing confidence in imported foods and personal items.

With bad trade deals and understaffed inspectors, the government does not seem to grasp the severity of the issue. Releasing warnings to the media is not enough.

Why has the minister not taken the Consumer Products Association's advice and made importers responsible for the contents of their goods?

Hon. Tony Clement (Minister of Health and Minister for the Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this is indeed a serious situation. The hon. member is talking about the possibility of tainted toothpaste which has been available in the marketplace.

I can tell the hon. member that in fact we do have inspectors and investigators who are on the scene and who are busy analyzing the products to see whether there is any kind of health hazard. That is what we do. We are responding to this situation. Indeed, we do have staff who are involved in the counterfeit situation as well. They monitor to ensure that we have a response if counterfeit products do appear on our shelves.

The best advice I can give until that investigation is complete is buyer beware.

Ms. Penny Priddy (Surrey North, NDP): Mr. Speaker, that is not good enough. The health of our children is being put at risk.

Why is it only the responsibility of those who sell the tainted goods and not also the responsibility of those who import the tainted goods?

If the minister believes the current regulations are adequate, would he be confident eating an entire meal or using personal products that are not regulated?

How many more tainted products do Canadians need to be exposed to before the minister makes real change?

Hon. Tony Clement (Minister of Health and Minister for the Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is absolutely incorrect. In this case the importer has in fact acted to remove the products from the shelves. That is what a responsible importer would do.

The hon. member should be aware that we do have an enforcement mechanism. We do have a monitoring system. Can it catch everything? Obviously not, because that is why we are faced with this situation. We are going to continue to monitor and continue to enforce.

The fact of the matter is if there is a problem in our food supply, we will do everything that we can do and that a government should do, but also, people should take care. The fact of the matter is we get what we pay for. In this particular case, what has happened is not acceptable.

*Oral Questions***SOFTWOOD LUMBER**

Mr. Blair Wilson (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government brags about its softwood lumber sellout, but only seven months into the deal the U.S. has started attacking our programs, increasing the 10.8% duty to a 15% tax. Now we learn it is getting set to impose a new 50% penalty tax, while at the same time starting new lawsuits against us using our very own money which the Conservatives surrendered in the first place.

Canadians deserve answers. It is time to tell the truth. When will the government stop caving in to the White House and the U.S. lumber lobby?

• (1455)

Hon. David Emerson (Minister of International Trade and Minister for the Pacific Gateway and the Vancouver-Whistler Olympics, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I think the truth of the matter is it is time the hon. member, members opposite, members of the NDP and the others who oppose the softwood lumber agreement faced up to the fact that without the softwood lumber agreement, we would be facing new chapter 19 lawsuits, new actions. We would be facing duties of 30% or 40%. And we would not have put over \$5 billion back into the pockets of Canadians.

* * *

AUTOMOBILE INDUSTRY

Hon. Navdeep Bains (Mississauga—Brampton South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our auto industry is very concerned that the Conservative government is currently negotiating a free trade agreement with South Korea. Based on the government's track record on the softwood sellout, the industry has every right to be concerned. There are numerous reports which indicate that thousands of auto sector jobs will be lost.

Canadians deserve answers, and it is time the government told the truth.

Will the government ensure that any agreement with South Korea will not sell out our auto industry?

Hon. David Emerson (Minister of International Trade and Minister for the Pacific Gateway and the Vancouver-Whistler Olympics, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it amazes me. I guess when the Liberals lose some critical members from the other side, they start to take their economic lessons from the NDP. Even the language is NDP language.

We will not enter into free trade agreements that are not in the best interests of all Canadians and all affected industries.

* * *

GOVERNMENT POLICIES

Hon. Ken Dryden (York Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians deserve answers, but the government has never felt the need to give them, not to ordinary people through the media or question period; not to members of Parliament in committees, the unbelievable dirty tricks manual; not to groups that have made the environment, literacy, women, you name it, Mr. Speaker, their life's work. We can ask them. They cannot even get a meeting.

Canada works because with more potential differences than any other country, we talk, we listen, we do not purposely strategically divide. The current Prime Minister is different. He is the great divider.

When will the Prime Minister begin offering Canadians real answers?

Hon. Peter Van Loan (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC): Mr. Speaker, our Canada is the Canada that my grandmother, a refugee from communism, told me about when she said it was a country of freedom, hope and opportunity. She told me one did not have to be from the elite. It did not matter if one's father was a professor, a politician, a businessman or a diplomat. It did not matter. One could succeed simply by working hard and doing one's best.

That is the Canada that Conservatives believe in. That is the kind of Canada that this government is trying to build.

Hon. Ken Dryden (York Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when one does not give answers for a while, people might still assume one has them, then months pass and they wonder.

It has been the last few weeks, having governed to campaign, suddenly with no campaign, the Conservative government has shown clearly that it has no purpose, no direction, no idea of what to do. In 17 months it has gone from decisive to decisively wrong to decisively decisive. There is nothing else there. The government became so old, so fast.

When will the Prime Minister understand what the public already knows? For the Conservative government the problem is not just not giving answers, it is not having them.

The Speaker: Order, please. The hon. government House leader.

Hon. Peter Van Loan (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canadians can see today a choice, a choice between the pessimism of people who are desperate to hang onto power, who wish they were in the government on this side, which is delivering results.

We are not just delivering answers, we are delivering the things we committed to Canadians, such as lower taxes. We are delivering balanced budgets. We are correcting a fiscal imbalance. We are delivering legislation that is making our streets and communities safer by getting tough on crime. We are delivering democratic reform legislation. We are trying to get our Senate cleaned up. We are trying to make our country a better place.

Who is in the way every step of the way? One group of people, the Liberal Party.

Oral Questions

●(1500)

[Translation]

EXPENSES OF THE FORMER LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR OF QUEBEC

Mr. Jean-Yves Laforest (Saint-Maurice—Champlain, BQ): Mr. Speaker, this week at the Standing Committee on Public Accounts, the federalist parties demonstrated their deep attachment to the monarchy by refusing to ask Quebec's former lieutenant governor to appear and testify about her excesses and expenses. A Conservative and an NDP member even want to hear from legal and constitutional experts before making the simple decision to ask her to appear.

Lise Thibault is no longer the lieutenant governor and as she has returned to private life, what would be the reason for not wanting her to testify about how she spent taxpayers' money?

Hon. Lawrence Cannon (Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities, CPC): Mr. Speaker, let us be clear. The government acted decisively. First and foremost, this government asked the Auditor General to investigate, and she did. This government asked the RCMP to investigate, and it is doing so at present. This government recognizes and respects the authority and the independence of parliamentary committees to invite whomever they wish to appear. That is the government's position.

Mrs. Vivian Barbot (Papineau, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the federalist parties are placing their affection for the monarchy ahead of the interests of taxpayers.

Does the federal government intend to follow Quebec's lead and henceforth require future lieutenant governors and the Governor General to appear before the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage to justify their expenses? Expert legal opinions are not needed for that.

Hon. Lawrence Cannon (Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the honourable member seems to be forgetting something. This government, when it took power, tabled a bill on accountability, which is now law. That is our trademark.

We do not tolerate secrecy. We do not tolerate corruption. We are transparent, we are accountable and we are serious about protecting the rights of Canadian taxpayers. That is our trademark.

* * *

SUPPLY MANAGEMENT

Mr. Bernard Patry (Pierrefonds—Dollard, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, supply management is currently being viciously attacked at the WTO negotiations. Quebec's agriculture minister and the UPA have joined forces to implore the federal government to defend Quebec producers at the WTO. It is time for this government to tell the truth.

Is it true that our negotiators received strict orders from this government not to interfere in the process, meaning that they have an empty chair strategy? Will the government officially and firmly commit to supply-managed producers that they will not experience any tariff decreases in the short, medium and long terms?

Hon. Christian Paradis (Secretary of State (Agriculture), CPC): Mr. Speaker, the instructions are clear. Our government will

defend supply management. No, we will not touch quotas. No, we will not touch tariffs. This is what Canada's negotiator will say loud and clear—defending supply management as is.

* * *

[English]

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. Dave Batters (Palliser, CPC): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the United Nations Human Rights Council concluded its fifth regular session in Geneva.

Canada has always held that the council needs to live up to expectations to promote and protect human rights around the world through an objective and impartial body. So far, the council is failing to live up to these expectations, but our Conservative government has maintained a principled position.

The main emphasis of the fifth session was institution building, yet Canada did not agree with the final consensus document. Could the Minister of Foreign Affairs say why Canada did not agree with the conclusions reached by the human rights council?

Hon. Peter MacKay (Minister of Foreign Affairs and Minister of the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canada was in fact disappointed with the human rights council, created to promote and protect human rights, which failed to respect its founding principles in the text that was adopted this week.

We cannot, for expedience, accept a permanent agenda item on the Palestinian territories, singling out one situation while at the same time eliminating a special human rights scrutiny of countries of concern, such as Cuba and Belarus. It is a contradiction.

If the human rights council is to be successful and avoid being discredited like its predecessor, the founding principles must be respected and upheld.

Canada, for its part, will continue to work for an effective and credible human rights body that is consistent in its principles and its actions.

* * *

●(1505)

VETERANS AFFAIRS

Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Eastern Shore, NDP): Mr. Speaker, by the end of the day, Canada will lose 120 World War II and Korean veterans and/or their spouses due to the aging process.

A widow from Cape Breton came to the House to make the Prime Minister keep his promise to extend the VIP immediately, but he told her it would be in the next budget. If that is to be true, and no one trusts the Prime Minister any more, that means 69,000 veterans and their spouses will die before they see the extension of this program.

Why did the Prime Minister break his trust with the widow of a veteran and is this the Canada that the House leader so envisions?

*Oral Questions***HEALTH**

Hon. Greg Thompson (Minister of Veterans Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we are committed to enhancing that program. The member knows this. In fact, if he were being intellectually honest, he would tell the House that we brought 12,000 people, veterans and spouses, into that program in the last year alone.

When we do it, we want to do it in a way that is consistent with the department and consistent with the good delivery to veterans and widows. We are committed to doing it, and we will get it done.

* * *

FISHERIES AND OCEANS

Ms. Catherine Bell (Vancouver Island North, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my constituents are very concerned about the appalling lack of conservation for wild salmon and halibut. Numbers are down and fishermen cannot get their quota, yet DFO insists on extending their openings. The wild salmon policy is clear: conservation first.

Is the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans trying to eliminate the fishing on the west coast or will he commit to increasing funding and staffing for conservation measures to maintain sustainable fish stocks for west coast sport, commercial and native fishermen?

Hon. Loyola Hearn (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, CPC): Mr. Speaker, let me assure the hon. member that this government has put more money into conserving fish on the west coast than any government before it. We have more boarding enforcement officers than ever before.

If the member wants to see what we will really do for the west coast, I suggest to her that she stay tuned.

* * *

CANADA SUMMER JOBS

Mr. Michael Savage (Dartmouth—Cole Harbour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let us review the summer jobs fiasco. Let me give the minister a few highlights.

He cancelled a program that worked; brought in one that does not with less money and a new criteria; organizations and students were thrown into disarray; scrambling ensued; and departmental officials admitted in committee that the program was botched. Now the minister refuses to come clean with details about funding.

I want to wish the minister a happy summer, a good guy, but we need to ensure that next year summer will be good for everyone else involved in this program.

When will the government start telling truth about the Canada summer jobs fiasco of 2007?

Hon. Monte Solberg (Minister of Human Resources and Social Development, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the truth is students are getting the best jobs they have ever had under the new program. That is the truth.

For my friend, though, I do not care how many times he asks me, he is not young enough to qualify for a Canada summer job. He needs to get that into his head, but failing that, I hope he and his family have a terrific summer.

Mr. Pierre Lemieux (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, CPC): Mr. Speaker, heart and other related diseases affect thousands of Canadians every year. Earlier today the Minister of Health announced the government's response to the report by the trans fat task force.

Could the Minister of Health informed the members of the House what our government is doing to help Canadians make healthier food choices?

Hon. Tony Clement (Minister of Health and Minister for the Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario, CPC): Mr. Speaker, today I announced that we are accepting the recommendations of the task force to limit trans fats in our food supply at 2% for vegetable oils and 5% through the rest of the food supply.

We have given industry two years to use market forces, which they are doing. We have cut the trans fat supply in half over the last two years in our food supply because of the results of consumers and industries.

I hope that will make a difference. I think it will make a difference for our health, and I hope it will make a difference for some members of the House as well, because they need the help too.

* * *

[*Translation*]

PRESENCE IN GALLERY

The Speaker: We have several aboriginal veterans with us today.

[*English*]

I would like to draw to the attention of hon. members the presence in the gallery of members of the National Aboriginal Veterans Association, who are here in Ottawa to celebrate National Aboriginal Day tomorrow, June 21.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

● (1510)

The Speaker: The hon. member for Willowdale is rising on a question of privilege.

* * *

[*Translation*]

RESIGNATION OF MEMBER

Hon. Jim Peterson (Willowdale, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to address you and my colleagues. It is with great emotion that I announce today that after July 12, I will no longer be the federal member for Willowdale.

*Oral Questions**[English]*

While this is a very difficult decision for me, we all know a law was passed that would see an election in the fall of 2009. As my good friend and colleague, the hon. member for Toronto Centre, said yesterday, I feel this is the best option we have for renewal and for the voices of tomorrow to be heard in this august chamber.

For the right hon. Prime Minister, while I respectfully understand the calling of a byelection is his sole prerogative, I can assure him that the people of Willowdale will stand behind him if he chooses to do so.

[Translation]

It was a great privilege and a great honour for me to have served in the national capital under this Prime Minister and to have represented the people of Willowdale.

[English]

There have been many highlights. I am proud that in 1982, as parliamentary secretary to the minister of justice, the Right Hon. Jean Chrétien, I was able to help pass Criminal Code changes that created the offence of sexual assault and ensured that a woman's previous relationships could no longer be put on trial.

As chair of the finance committee in 1993, the very first duty assigned to me by the prime minister was to find a way to honour our election commitment to replace the GST. We looked at over 20 alternatives and we found one. The conclusion was that we would harmonize the federal sales tax with the provinces. We would have tax included pricing and, most important, we would change the name to the national value added tax.

I can say that former Prime Minister Chrétien was not very happy but former Prime Minister Mulroney was.

The finance minister at the time, the member for LaSalle—Émard, instituted pre budget consultations by the finance committee which continue to this day and have been adopted by other legislatures in Canada and abroad. Our reports were long and scholarly and, as I was so often assured, they were, perhaps sometimes, read by someone in finance.

Secretary of state for financial institutions was an active stint. It included foreign bank branching, a five year review of the Bank Act which resulted in the longest bill to ever hit Parliament, the deneutralization of our insurance companies, FINTRAC to counter money laundering, major reforms to the office of the ombudsman and four major financial institution mergers without a public furor.

I want to say that our financial institutions in Canada are among our leading corporations and many are global champions. I believe mergers will help our banks remain competitive and that these mergers can be engineered without major job losses or branch closings, as evidenced by the TD Canada Trust merger. We should not fear bank mergers.

As minister of international trade, I received incredible support from the prime minister at the time, the member for LaSalle—Émard, to develop and implement a commercial strategy, not just for the U.S., EU and others, but especially for the Brazils, Russias, Indias and Chinas. We see the strategy being continued today but I

believe there is urgency in bringing greater resources and efforts to bear.

I visited China three times and India twice, as well as Russia and Brazil. The prime minister at the time, the member for LaSalle—Émard, was a huge help with these BRICK countries. We visited them and opened doors for Canadians that only a prime minister can open.

India is especially dear to me. Last Saturday night in Toronto, I met with Kamal Nath, India's industry minister. He is a great leader, politician, statesman and friend. Later on in the evening, Heather and I attended the Indo-Canada Chamber of Commerce dinner where he was a keynote speaker, along with someone else from this House. It was a splendid event.

I remember not only fruitful bilateral dealings with Minister Nath, but our work at the WTO. I especially recall going three days without sleep as we worked in the green room in Geneva at the end of July. It was hot and there was no air conditioning. We opened the windows but there were no screens. Millions of mosquitoes joined us inside but, nevertheless, we achieved a framework agreement for Doha.

Today, success in this realm seems illusive. However, I leave this House believing that a successful outcome of the Doha round is critical. It must be about development and, most important, only the WTO can rein in the obscene agricultural subsidies that we find in the U.S. and in the EU. Bilateral and regional deals will not do it.

● (1515)

Life in the public eye has had some precious moments. A few days after the same sex vote in this House, I was scheduled to attend the laying of a cornerstone at a convent, something I faced with great trepidation. The Mother Superior met me at the gate and said, "Jim, thank you for what you did". I asked her what she was talking about. She replied, "Your vote for same sex marriage". I told her that she had to be kidding. She said, "No, Jim, Jesus would want us to be inclusive".

I am very proud of the parishioners of Newtonbrook United Church who have donated a huge, expensive property at Young and Cummer, raised the money and built 52 affordable housing units. This is a shining example of what more of us might do to help others.

I recall the time I worked long and hard to get a young man with severe disabilities into a proper facility that could cope with his needs. During the next election, I called at the family's door and asked if I could put up a sign. He replied, "No, I am not Liberal". As members in this House know, one's best efforts are not always met with a reward but that is not the reason that we make those efforts.

*Routine Proceedings***ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS***[Translation]*

There are so many to whom I am grateful. I want to thank the involved, caring and committed people of Willowdale who made my public years possible. To the officers and employees of this House, I thank them for being unfailingly helpful. To the many public servants at finance, trade and elsewhere, I thank them. They are among the hardest working and ablest people I know. To our extended family of outstanding staffers over the years, to whom I owe so much—would it be in order to recognize them in the gallery?

The Speaker: No.

Hon. Jim Peterson: No. They are right up there.

My staffers are among Heather's and my closest friends today. My mom and dad are both 94 and they have given me more than any son could hope for. They are to this day an incredible inspiration. I could not have chosen better parents or better Liberals. To my brothers, David and Tim, who have always been there for me, I look forward to seeing more of them and their exceptional families. I could not have chosen better brothers.

My most important thanks goes to Heather, who, if members looked in the gallery she would be there but I cannot recognize her. I met Heather the first week of grade nine and eight years later I finally got her to marry me. That was 44 years ago. Heather has shared this journey with me 24/7 and I thank her. I thank her for her unconditional support that has made all of this worthwhile. I thank her for her wisdom and advice which have proven invaluable. I thank her for her love that has made tough times easier, good times better and, at election time, she got far more signs up in Willowdale than anyone else.

Lastly, I want to thank my colleagues throughout the years from all parties in this House, including you, Mr. Speaker. We may at times have differed over policies but we never differed over the need to serve our constituents with dedication and commitment, to work to make a difference in the lives of people and to build a better Canada and a better world.

In closing, I would like to say that over the course of my life I have visited and worked in many countries but it has always been such a great joy to come home to Canada. We Canadians are among the most fortunate of all people on earth.

I leave my colleagues today fully confident that they and those who follow will ensure that Canada is always the envy of the world.

• (1520)

[Translation]

Thank you for everything you have done for Canada. Thank you for everything you have done for me.

The Speaker: I thank the hon. member for Willowdale for his announcement.

ETHICS COMMISSIONER

The Speaker: Pursuant to section 72.13(1)(b) of the Parliament of Canada Act, it is my duty to present to the House the annual report of the Ethics Commissioner on activities in relation to public office holders for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2007.

[English]

Pursuant to section 72.13(1)(a) of the Parliament of Canada Act it is my duty to present to the House the annual report of the Ethics Commissioner on activities in relation to members of the House of Commons for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2007.

* * *

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mr. Tom Lukiwski (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8) I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to 22 petitions.

* * *

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

PUBLIC SAFETY AND NATIONAL SECURITY

Hon. Stockwell Day (Minister of Public Safety, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as Minister responsible for Public Safety, I am pleased to table the government's response, in both official languages, to the ninth report of the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security.

The government's response agrees with the recommendations of the standing committee to consider the advisability of new enabling legislation for the establishment of a missing persons index for Canada following the completion of the ongoing federal-provincial-territorial process, which is intended to address the legal, financial and privacy issues surrounding the implementation of such a system.

The government recognizes the important work that has been done to advance this issue by the hon. member for Burlington, by the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security and many other parliamentarians.

* * *

INTERPARLIAMENTARY DELEGATIONS

Mr. Leon Benoit (Vegreville—Wainwright, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have three reports to table today.

First, pursuant to Standing Order 34(1) I have the honour to present to the House, in both official languages, the report of the delegation of the Canadian NATO Parliamentary Association respecting its participation in the annual session of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly held in Quebec City, Canada, November 13-17, 2006.

Routine Proceedings

The second is respecting its participation in the parliamentary Transatlantic forum of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly held in Fort McNair, Washington, D.C., U.S.A. on December 11 and 12, 2006.

The third is regarding the participation in the joint meeting of the defence and security, economics and security and the political committees held in Brussels, Belgium, February 18-20, 2007 and the annual economics and security committee consultation with the OECD of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly held in Paris, France on February 21 and 22, 2007.

● (1525)

Mr. Rob Merrifield (Yellowhead, CPC): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 34(1) I have the honour to present to the House, in both official languages, the report of the Canadian delegation of the Canada-U.S. Inter-Parliamentary Group respecting its participation at the co-chair's meeting in Washington, D.C., United States of America, on April 16, 2007.

Hon. Roy Cullen (Etobicoke North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present two reports.

The first is pursuant to Standing Order 34(1) and it is the report, in both official languages, of the delegation of the OSCE Canada-Europe Parliamentary Association respecting its participation in the winter meeting of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly held in Vienna, Austria, February 22 and 23, 2007.

The second report is pursuant to Standing Order 34(1). I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the report of the delegation of the OSCE Canada-Europe Parliamentary Association respecting its participation in the fall meeting of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly held in St. Julians, Malta, November 17-19, 2006.

* * *

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE**ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT**

Mr. Colin Mayes (Okanagan—Shuswap, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the ninth report of the Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development regarding debates on the repeal of section 67 of the Canadian Human Rights Act.

CANADIAN HERITAGE

Mr. Gary Schellenberger (Perth—Wellington, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 21st report of the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage related to the nomination of Mr. Tom Perlmutter to the position of Government Film Commissioner of the National Film Board of Canada.

INDUSTRY, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Mr. James Rajotte (Edmonton—Leduc, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the eighth report of the Standing Committee on Industry, Science and Technology in relation to a study on counterfeiting and piracy of intellectual property. Pursuant to Standing Order 109 the committee requests that the government table a comprehensive response to the report.

JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Art Hanger (Calgary Northeast, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 17th report of the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights.

In accordance with the order of reference of Tuesday, February 6, 2007, the committee has considered Bill C-32, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (impaired driving) and to make consequential amendments to other Acts, and as agreed on Tuesday, June 19, 2007, to report it with amendments.

I would like to commend the members of the committee. We sat very late yesterday to conclude this particular debate on Bill C-32 and were successful in bringing it to the House today.

Ms. Alexa McDonough: Mr. Speaker, there have been consultations among the parties and I believe that if you were to seek it, you would find unanimous consent for the following motion. I move that the House congratulates the Pugwash conferences on science and world affairs, on the occasion of their 50th anniversary, for their significant contribution to nuclear disarmament.

The Speaker: Does the hon. member for Halifax have the unanimous consent of the House to propose the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The 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.

* * *

● (1530)

PETITIONS**PASSPORTS**

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased today to rise to present two petitions signed by hundreds of people in northern Ontario concerning the need and desire in our region to actually have adequate passport services.

As we know, we have had major passport issues with backlogs right across the country, but in northeastern Ontario we are challenged because we have no walk-in passport facilities anywhere. We have people who have to often travel 12 hours by bus to get walk-in passport service.

The petitioners call upon the federal government to work to develop a walk-in passport service for northeastern Ontario, like other regions in the country are able to have, so that people in our part of this country, and it would service also possibly people from northwestern Quebec, can get walk-in passport services on a need basis.

I am very pleased to bring forward those two petitions today.

NATURAL HEALTH PRODUCTS

Mr. James Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have two petitions on two different subjects. I have a group of petitions on Bill C-404. There are about 500 signatures coming from Kelowna and Surrey in British Columbia and as far away as Quebec.

The petitioners call on Parliament to take note that the weight of modern scientific evidence confirms the mitigation and prevention of many diseases and disorders through the judicious use of natural health products. They note that Canadians support the use of natural health products to promote wellness and health.

They call on Parliament to provide Canadians with greater access to natural health products by removing the GST from natural health products and implementing Bill C-404, An Act to amend the Excise Tax Act (natural health products).

AGE OF CONSENT

Mr. James Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the second petition is signed by some 400 petitioners from British Columbia, many from my riding.

The petitioners call on the government to take note of the age of consent and protection for our children from sexual predators. They call on the government to make this a priority and to raise the age of consent to 16 to protect vulnerable 14 and 15 year olds.

The bill, I believe, is at the Senate. The petitioners are hoping the bill will be enacted.

[Translation]

INCOME TRUSTS

Mr. Massimo Pacetti (Saint-Léonard—Saint-Michel, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of David Marshall of Cornwall, Ontario, I would like to present a petition on the government's broken promise regarding income trusts.

Mr. Marshall remembers that the Prime Minister was bragging about his so-called commitment to accountability when he stated that there is no greater fraud than a promise not kept.

The petitioners remind the Prime Minister that he promised never to tax income trusts, but that he shamelessly broke his promise by imposing a punitive tax of 31.5%, which wiped out \$25 billion that more than two million Canadians, mainly seniors, worked so hard to save for their retirement.

Therefore, the petitioners are calling on the government to do three things: first, to admit that the decision to tax income trusts was based on a flawed methodology and incorrect assumptions; second, to apologize to those who were unfairly harmed by this broken promise; and third, to repeal the punitive 31.5% tax on income trusts.

[English]

THE ENVIRONMENT

Ms. Jean Crowder (Nanaimo—Cowichan, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present a petition on behalf of citizens from across British Columbia.

The petitioners have viewed Al Gore's presentation *An Inconvenient Truth* and they believe that it summarizes the life-threatening global danger from atmospheric pollution as also reported by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and scientists of many nationalities.

The petitioners are requesting that the Government of Canada legislate programs consistent with meteorological reality and act immediately to reduce the climate change crisis by diminishing fossil

Routine Proceedings

fuel dependency, while sponsoring initiatives and incentives to promote less harmful technology.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING

Mrs. Joy Smith (Kildonan—St. Paul, CPC): Mr. Speaker, today I am presenting a petition from hundreds of constituents across Canada. The petitioners call upon the government to continue its good work in combating the horrendous crime of human trafficking.

[Translation]

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. Jean-Claude D'Amours (Madawaska—Restigouche, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to present a petition from several hundred people in my riding. It concerns, among other things, eliminating the waiting period for employment insurance.

For months, if not years, we have been talking about eliminating the waiting period. Despite my attempt last week to obtain the unanimous consent of the House, my private member's bill was not adopted.

The petitioners criticize the Conservative government for not wanting to go ahead with eliminating the waiting period. As soon as the Conservatives had the chance, they voted against eliminating the waiting period. The petitioners are also calling on the Conservative government to make sure people have the choice of applying for employment insurance on paper or on the Internet. The petitioners are asking the government to eliminate the waiting period for employment insurance once and for all and to respect those who need it the most: the people who work every day and have no choice but to apply for employment insurance because they do seasonal work.

• (1535)

[English]

ASBESTOS

Mr. Pat Martin (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a petition from hundreds of Canadians from all over British Columbia who call upon Canada to recognize that asbestos is the greatest industrial killer the world has ever known. Yet, Canada continues to be one of the largest producers and exporters of asbestos in the world.

Canada allows asbestos to be used in construction materials, textile products and even children's toys. Canada spends millions of dollars subsidizing this industry and blocking international efforts to curb its use.

Therefore, these petitioners call upon Parliament to ban asbestos in all its forms, to introduce a just transition program for asbestos workers, end all government subsidies of asbestos in both Canada and abroad, and stop blocking international health and safety conventions designed to protect workers from this terrible product, such as the Rotterdam convention.

Routine Proceedings

IMMIGRATION

Mr. Leon Benoit (Vegreville—Wainwright, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to present a petition on behalf of constituents from the county of Two Hills, the town of Two Hills, Willingdon, Mynam and Derwent. The petitioners call upon the government to expedite the immigration process for all qualified physicians seeking to practice in rural Canada.

INCOME TRUSTS

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present this income trust broken promise petition on behalf of Mr. George Chin of Calgary, Alberta, who remembers that the Prime Minister was boasting about his apparent commitment to accountability when he said there was no greater fraud than a promise not kept.

The petitioners remind the Prime Minister that he promised never to tax income trusts, but that he recklessly broke that promise by imposing a 31.5% punitive tax which permanently wiped out over \$25 billion of hard-earned retirement savings of over two million Canadians, particularly seniors.

The petitioners, therefore, call upon the Conservative minority government to, first, admit that the decision to tax income trusts was based on flawed methodology and incorrect assumptions; second, apologize to those who were unfairly harmed by this broken promise; and finally, repeal the punitive 31.5% tax on income trusts.

NATURAL HEALTH PRODUCTS

Ms. Peggy Nash (Parkdale—High Park, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to present three petitions from my constituents. The first is signed by 92 people.

The petitioners call upon Parliament to provide Canadians with greater access to natural health products by removing the goods and services tax on them and by enacting Bill C-404.

• (1540)

FEDERAL MINIMUM WAGE

Ms. Peggy Nash (Parkdale—High Park, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the second petition is signed by 41 constituents in support of my private member's bill, Bill C-375, to re-establish a federal minimum wage and set it at \$10 an hour.

There are more than two million Canadians who make less than \$10 an hour, and we know the impact of poverty on health, social development and our economy as a whole. We know that a federal minimum wage can lift minimum wages across the country, and that since the federal minimum wage was abolished by the Liberals provincial wages have been stagnant.

This petition is urging the re-establishment of a federal minimum wage and setting it at \$10 an hour.

IMMIGRATION

Ms. Peggy Nash (Parkdale—High Park, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the third petition is in support of my private member's bill, Bill C-394, called the once in a lifetime bill.

My bill recognizes that family sponsorship is a key component of a fair immigration policy. The current family class rules are too restrictive and they mean that close family relatives in many cases

are not eligible for sponsorship. I have had a huge response to this private member's bill.

The petitioners are urging that we act to redefine family class under the immigration and refugee act by passing Bill C-394.

[*Translation*]

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. Yvon Godin (Acadie—Bathurst, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have here a petition signed by 100 people in New Brunswick. The petition states that the employment insurance program was set up to help workers who lost their jobs and their salary temporarily or permanently. In today's economy, a loss of even one day's pay is a hardship for too many people.

The two-week waiting period is unfair to workers who are already suffering the loss of their jobs. This petition calls on the government to reject the mandatory waiting period and to allow workers to apply for benefits as of the first day.

It also calls on the government to reinstate the appropriate number of staff at the regional offices of Service Canada in order to give applicants the choice of applying on paper or on line, and to provide them with help from a well-informed staff member.

* * *

[*English*]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Tom Lukiwski (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Question No. 211 will be answered today.

[*Text*]

Question No. 211—**Mr. Wayne Marston:**

What projects, grants, contributions and any other funding support has Human Resources and Social Development Canada funded for the riding of Hamilton-East—Stoney Creek since February 7, 2006?

Hon. Monte Solberg (Minister of Human Resources and Social Development, CPC): Mr. Speaker, government information on funds, grants, loans and loan guarantees issued by departments and agencies is based on parliamentary authorities for departmental or agency programs and activities. This information is listed by department and government organization in the public accounts and disclosed on the websites of government organizations. However, government organizations do not compile or analyze expenditure information by electoral district. Consequently, at present, it would not be possible to provide the information in the form requested.

Routine Proceedings

Over the course of the 39th Parliament, a number of government organizations have undertaken efforts to identify federal expenditures by postal codes which could then be summarized by electoral districts using a tool developed by Statistics Canada. While there is some promise in this approach, there remains a significant potential for error since over 5,000 postal codes straddle two or more electoral districts. Moreover, the government would have significant concerns about the quality of the financial data derived by this approach because there is no way to track the geographic area in which federal funding is actually spent. For example, federal funding could be provided to the head office of a firm situated in one electoral district, while the funding was actually spent by a subsidiary located in another electoral district. This may also be the case for payments to individuals, organizations or foundations. For these reasons, and the fact that fewer than half of government organizations have acquired the Statistics Canada tool, it is not possible to produce an accurate and comprehensive answer to this question at the present time.

That said, Statistics Canada has initiated a process to enhance the accuracy of the tool that provides the link between postal codes and electoral districts. The process will allow departments to better approximate by electoral district data gathered on a postal code basis. The improved tool should be available in the fall of 2007. In the interim, the Privy Council Office will also launch an interdepartmental process to determine whether this tool can be extended to all government organizations as well as the means to ensure that it is used in a consistent manner across the whole of government.

* * *

[English]

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

Mr. Tom Lukiwski (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC): Mr. Speaker, if Questions Nos. 184 and 208 could be made orders for returns, these returns would be tabled immediately.

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[Text]

Question No. 184—**Mr. John Cummins:**

With regard to the waters of the Tsawwassen Territory, both in the Strait of Georgia, the Fraser River and elsewhere, as set out in the Tsawwassen Final Agreement and Side-Agreements: (a) what was the nature of the vessel traffic in the Tsawwassen Territory in 2006 both on the Fraser River and the Strait of Georgia; (b) how will vessel traffic in the waters of the Tsawwassen Territory be impacted by the Final Agreement and what studies have been undertaken on the impacts of the Final Agreement on vessel traffic; (c) in addition to the Strait of Georgia and the Fraser River, what are the additional bodies of water within the Territory; (d) what species of fish or shell fish were caught by recreational and commercial fishermen within the Tsawwassen Territory in the years 1986 to 2006; (e) what was the number or quantity and the landed value of fish and shellfish caught under commercial license by species in each year during the period 1986 to 2006; (f) how many commercial fishermen were licensed to fish for any area within the Tsawwassen Territory in each year during the period; (g) how many recreational fishermen were licensed to fish in the area within the Tsawwassen Territory in each year during the period; (h) how many commercial fishing licenses by species were held by fishermen for any part of the area within the Tsawwassen Territory in each year during the period; (i) how many hours of fishing time were authorized for the Tsawwassen Indian Band to undertake food, social and ceremonial fisheries by species for each year during the period; (j)

how many pounds of fish were landed by the Tsawwassen Indian Band for food, social and ceremonial fisheries for each year during the period; (k) how many sockeye salmon could have been caught under the Tsawwassen Fishing Right Allocation for each year if it had been in place during the period, and what was the total catch of Fraser sockeye for each year during the period; (l) how many members of the Tsawwassen Indian Band as registered under the Indian Act were resident on the Tsawwassen Indian Reserve for each year during the period; (m) what studies have been undertaken to identify the impacts of the creation of the Tsawwassen Fishing Right on other recreational and commercial fishermen who have traditionally fished in what is now the Tsawwassen Territory, in particular the displacement of traditional recreational and commercial fishermen; (n) if the 0.78% of the Canadian commercial total allowable catch for Fraser sockeye that is being transferred to the Tsawwassen Band had been fished by the Tsawwassen Band what would the total catch be in pounds for each year during the period; (o) what measures have been put in place to guarantee that those recreational and commercial fishermen who have traditionally fished in the area that now constitutes the Tsawwassen Territory will be able to continue to fish in the public recreational and commercial fisheries unimpeded; (p) what would have been (i) the value, in number of fish, of the 0.78% allocation of the Canadian Commercial Total Allowable Catch to the Tsawwassen Band for Fraser sockeye for each year during the period as provided under the Final Agreement and accompanying side-agreements, (ii) the total Canadian commercial catch of Fraser sockeye for each year, (iii) the average allocation to the Tsawwassen Band for the period based on the 0.78% allocation; (q) what would have been the value, in quantity and dollars, of the 3.27% allocation of terminal commercial catch of Fraser River chum salmon to the Tsawwassen Band for each year during the period; (r) what would have been the value of the 0.78% allocation to the Tsawwassen Band of the Canadian commercial total allowable catch of Fraser River pink salmon for each year during the period; (s) what would have been the value of the five commercial crab licenses to be issued to the Tsawwassen Band under the Harvest side agreement for each year during the period; (t) what is the size limit going to be for crab taken under the Final Agreement and Side-Agreements for food, social, ceremonial and commercial purposes; (u) what is the quantity and value of the crab taken by the band for food, social and ceremonial fisheries for each year of the period; (v) what was the quantity and value of each species caught during food, social and ceremonial openings or under such licenses and exported to the United States or any other country for each year during the period; and (w) does the Final Agreement and Side Agreements provide for self catch monitoring and reporting by the Tsawwassen Band and, if so, how does that differ from the reporting and catch monitoring planned for those public recreational and commercial fisheries that will still be able to operate within the Tsawwassen Territory following the implementation of the Final Agreement?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 208—**Mr. Nathan Cullen:**

With respect to the Pine Beetle infestation in British Columbia and Alberta: (a) what is the most up-to-date assessment of the economic impact of the infestation, including, but not limited to, lost lumber, hectares, employment, and longer term regional development; (b) how many communities and families are affected by the infestation, according to province; (c) within affected areas, which communities are considered to be the least and worst hit, according to province; (d) what financial resources are estimated to be needed to adequately respond to the crisis, on an annual basis; (e) how much money has the government committed to the problem over the last five years, on an annual basis; (f) what were the dates upon which these funding announcements were made; (g) of these funds, what amount has actually been disbursed, on an annual basis; (h) from which departmental budget were these funds disbursed, or to have been disbursed from; (i) which communities in British Columbia and Alberta, on an annual basis, received federal money to tackle the infestation, and in each case, name the recipient agencies and projects that received funding; and (j) which branches, of which departments, are tasked with developing and implementing a strategy to tackle the infestation?

(Return tabled)

Government Orders

[English]

Mr. Tom Lukiwski: Mr. Speaker, I ask that all remaining questions be allowed to stand?

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. Tom Lukiwski (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would ask you to call Motions Nos. P-23, P-24 and P-27

Motion P-23

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the October 21, 2004, email addressed to Adam LaRusic, Senior Environmental Assessment Engineer, Pollution Prevention and Assessment Division, Environment Canada (Vancouver) from Lisa Walls, Acting Manager of Pollution Prevention and Assessment Division, Environment Canada (Vancouver) noting the Department of Fisheries advised the Vancouver Port Authority that the Terminal 2 project could be removed from the Deltaport Third Berth Project environmental assessment scoping document without the need to have public consultations.

Motion P-24

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the October 21, 2004, memorandum addressed to Lisa Walls, Acting Manager of Pollution Prevention and Assessment Division, Environment Canada (Vancouver) from Adam LaRusic, Senior Environmental Assessment Engineer, Pollution Prevention and Assessment Division, Environment Canada (Vancouver), stating that the Terminal 2 project should be included in the cumulative effects assessment portion of the Deltaport Third Berth Project environmental assessment.

Motion P-27

That an Order of this House do issue for a copy of Canada's Sixth and Seventh Periodic Report to the United Nations Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women.

Mr. Tom Lukiwski: Mr. Speaker, Notices of Motion for the Production of Papers Nos. P-23 and P-24, in the name of the hon. member for Delta—Richmond East, and P-27, in the name of the hon. member for London—Fanshawe, are acceptable to the government and will be tabled immediately.

(Motion agreed to)

Mr. Tom Lukiwski: Mr. Speaker, I ask that all remaining notices of motions for the production of papers be allowed to stand.

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

PUGWASH CONFERENCES

Ms. Alexa McDonough (Halifax, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. There have been further consultations among the parties and I believe you would find unanimous consent for the following motion. I move:

That the House congratulate the Pugwash Conferences on Science and World Affairs on the occasion of their 50th anniversary for their significant contribution to nuclear disarmament.

The Speaker: Does the hon. member for Halifax have the unanimous consent of the House to propose this motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The 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.

(Motion agreed to)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

AERONAUTICS ACT

The House resumed from June 19 consideration of Bill C-6, An Act to amend the Aeronautics Act and to make consequential amendments to other Acts, as reported (with amendment) from the committee, and of the motions in Group No.1.

Mr. Brian Masse (Windsor West, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise this afternoon to speak to Bill C-6. This is very much a consequential act, which would make a significant change in the airline industry.

Today we are debating a series of amendments to Bill C-6 that were introduced to make it a better bill, but the government has decided to take out some of those amendments, water down the bill and water down safety requirements for the airline industry in this country, in particular for Air Canada as well as WestJet, which quite frankly did a good job of lobbying to get less accountability to the public into the system.

It is important in the debate to talk about the overall situation in manufacturing and also connect that to why Canadians and Canadian consumers deserve greater accountability. It is perplexing why the government wants to continually take those types of amendments out of legislation.

Most recently it did this with regard to the rail transportation amendments, and once again it has taken out provisions for accountability for the airline industry in regard to providing full information in terms of disclosure about the ticket, the price, the charge, the fees and all those different and often hidden charges that are in the system. The government took those out of the previous bill, which is puzzling.

In the previous bill, the government also took out the opportunity for neighbourhoods to have mediation when there is a dispute with rail properties and their usage. I do not understand why the government would want to take away these civil liberties that consumers really deserve and should have our open market society.

These provisions, which were introduced by the NDP, are important. My colleague, the member for Burnaby—New Westminster, deserves a lot of credit for working hard on the bill. He was able to work with other opposition parties to change the bill significantly in favour of the public, but we now are seeing the erosion of those changes, and in particular a safety management system that really will give the industry carte blanche in terms of its operation and the actual application of reporting safety hazards and problems in the airline industry.

Government Orders

Even when there are violations, and I will get into some of the particulars later, the industry actually gets a get out of jail free card. It can make self-correcting measures. At the same time, this will do nothing to punish a race to the bottom, which can happen in this industry.

We have been fortunate. The airline industry rebounded somewhat in this country after 9/11. We have had significant problems and challenges. Extra fees were added for security as well as other types of operations. There have been increased costs for fuel and other types of factors that have really challenged the industry.

The industry has done a good job of working its way back, but at the same time it does not take away from the fact that we do not want to have less accountability, fewer restrictions, and less opportunity for the public to get information about safety issues.

Today, the parliamentary secretary, who was actually the chair of the industry committee, tabled a report from our counterfeiting study that our industry committee just concluded. Part of the testimony we heard was that counterfeit parts are being used by current airlines and other industries. We heard that not only in terms of aerospace, but also, for example, in regard to circuit breakers that were knock-offs and ripoffs and were being used in hospitals, which can affect Canadian patients. If we have less reliable and unaccountable products as part of the system of managing our hospitals, what takes place when there is a problem? There is no accountability.

We heard evidence in the industry committee that we are getting knock-off parts that are being used in the aeronautics industry. Why would we allow this to continue? The recommendation of our committee is to clamp down on some of the counterfeiting that is out there and to make people more accountable, not only those who are procuring the counterfeit products but also those who are the distributors of those products and, lastly, the companies and the countries that are allowing this to be perpetrated.

• (1545)

At the same time, by removing accountability, we are now going to be introducing a system that will allow a company not to have to report to the department to the fullest extent possible when we have airline industry problems. That is an issue. As a young father, I have brought my daughter here to the House of Commons for this last week. We flew here. One thinks about the safety issue. I do not like to fly as it is. I have never enjoyed that part of this job, but at the same time, one gets over it.

However, what one does hope is that we have the highest degree of safety standards. I have confidence in the airline providers that we have had, but at the same time we know that at times there have been providers that have actually taken out safety requirements or have had improper practices that have put people at risk, not only in this country but around the world.

We have had that happen in this country, too, and Jetsgo, for example, is an oft-cited case in which thousands of passengers got on planes that had problems. The reporting and the accountability were not up to snuff in terms of how I would feel about it.

When we get on a plane we want to feel that there will be the best practices possible. Those best practices come from healthy competition but also from the accountability of the consumer being

able to make the right choice about how they want to spend their money and also knowing the value of that related to the product they have. Some of it is safety driven. Having that opportunity to select safety as a priority for one's purchasing is something that consumers across the country deserve, not only in aerospace but also in automobiles and other types of manufactured devices.

We can see that things do get through the system. Again, on counterfeiting, right now we see a toothpaste that was in Canadian stores. It was poison, quite frankly. Also, my son was one of those persons who had a Thomas the tank engine train that was painted with lead-based paint from a company in China that was importing it into Canada.

We can see that not only are we getting some of these products into the country—and our laws at the border to regulate and inspect them are deficient—but they are getting into our system. This has penetrated into our aerospace system, as was shown by the evidence presented at the industry, science and technology study on counterfeiting. Why, then, would we change Bill C-6 to take out provisions that would provide for less accountability when we need it most right now?

That is important. Once again, consumers should have the opportunity to evaluate and equate the safety of airlines when they are making a purchase. It should be just like they do it for comfort. I do not believe the bill does us a service in that regard. I am very troubled by the fact that we would do it when we have a situation emerging in Canada that has been identified as a priority.

It is important to note that on the counterfeiting study we have all party unanimous consent on a series of recommendations. That is important, because we know that there is a public priority for those recommendations. That is why I am troubled that the government wants to move away from that accountability.

As for the corporate responsibility, when we look at the history of it in this country, it has had some unique things that are quite puzzling. It was only a few years back that we were able to wrestle down the Liberal government to get it to change the tax deductibility of corporate fines and penalties.

Let us imagine that. If a company polluted or was caught in some type of business practice, went through the court system, was fined, penalized—the whole judicial review—it then wrote off up to 50% of the fine as a business related expense. If in their corporate plans companies used pollution discharge that is illegal or used products or services that were counterfeit or certainly not at the industry standard where they were supposed to be, they would actually be allowed to write off 50% of that.

I will conclude with this. There are other important issues in the bill. They involve everything, even whistleblower protection, which is being usurped; it is conditional in the bill, which makes no sense at all. We fought across the country to get whistleblower protection here in Ottawa and there are still some problems with it, so taking that away from another important bill makes no sense whatsoever.

To conclude, let me say that this is a plea to the government. We do not want to have our transportation systems, which business travel and passenger travel depend on so much, put under a cloud that could create further problems for our productivity.

Government Orders

•(1550)

That is important to note because if there is a significant safety problem as a result of this bill and accountability is brought to bear on those who brought it here, other people will pay, people other than the injured and the people who rely upon the practice or the business itself. Other people will lose out as well. That is why we need to change this bill and make it better, like the way it was.

Mr. Peter Julian (Burnaby—New Westminster, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that we are not going to see any Conservative MPs getting up to speak to this issue. They themselves are embarrassed about how reprehensible, how reckless and how irresponsible this bill and the Conservative amendment are, so they just do not speak.

We are into the third day of debate at report stage and we do not see Conservatives defending their position. They cannot because it is an indefensible position to put ordinary Canadian families in the kind of peril the Conservatives seem to want to put them in. What we saw with the railway system, the Conservatives now want to do with the airlines.

I was interested in the comments that were made in committee by Kirsten Brazier, the president of Dax Air. She was actually brought to the committee by the member for Kenora. She said the following:

When we started our company, we both agreed we would do our best to abide by the standards and operate safely and responsibly. We knew we were going to have a tough time because of the state of the industry we are in, where cutting corners is common practice. We are all faced with rising costs and a declining market, so to compete, many operators continue to overload their airplanes, cut rates and push weather, basically getting more done for less... We find ourselves in the position that many others have come to: either cut corners to survive and compete or go out of business. While we expected a few challenges in establishing our company and operating principles, we also expected that our doing-it-right approach would be supported by Transport Canada. We have found that this is not the case.

When company spokespeople are coming forward and saying they are being forced to cut corners on safety, why would the Conservatives put forward an irresponsible bill when we know that this is essentially the problem?

We are putting Canadians' lives in danger. Instead of trying to rectify the problems, the near misses and the many near accidents that we are facing, instead of coping very responsibly with those, the Conservatives are doing exactly the opposite and giving the most irresponsible companies a get out of jail free card.

Why does the member for Windsor West think that the Conservatives are taking this clearly irresponsible action?

•(1555)

Mr. Brian Masse: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the efforts of the member for Burnaby—New Westminster in his work on this bill.

Quite frankly, I am troubled by the fact that the Conservatives want to let corporate criminals get away. If the bill passes, there will be an adjustment process, a fixing of the problem that allows them to not receive any type of penalty for the injurious effects that have cost passenger safety, and potentially lives. That is unacceptable.

Canadians expect to get good products and good services that are safe and fair for their hard-earned money. We heard this before when we got rid of the tax deductibility that the Liberals allowed for the environment and fines. Good companies were coming to me and

saying that some companies had business plans to rip off the system, either by environmental degradation or with some types of business management systems that were counter to the actual competition, such as subsidizing through illegal practices. Some companies would use that as a subsidy to take out the good people in the system.

That is what is unacceptable about this. If there needs to be a fix in the system, it is to bring greater accountability, which is what we want. What they are doing is unacceptable.

Mr. Peter Julian: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Justice Virgil Moshansky said:

This is an ominous sign for the future of air safety in Canada, particularly if Bill C-6 is allowed to proceed...

When people like the hon. Justice Moshansky are raising serious concerns, why are the Conservatives doing this? Why are they being so irresponsible?

Mr. Brian Masse: Mr. Speaker, their ideology has taken over. Their ideology is to get government and regulations and any type of accountability that protects consumers out of the way. That is why we have not seen the review of the Competition Act which was supposed to happen. That is why we see CN and the rail system get a similar pass. And the Conservatives are giving that to the airline executives and management which really should be held accountable if they have practices that hurt customers and the general public.

Ms. Peggy Nash (Parkdale—High Park, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to speak to this bill. I want to begin with a brief citation from an article that appeared in the *Toronto Star* about a year ago:

Jetsgo, which offered tickets as low as \$1, had repeated mechanical breakdowns, shoddy maintenance practices, inexperienced pilots and midair mishaps.

Transport Canada, which is mandated to keep Canada's skies safe, knew of the problems, but for 2 1/2 years dismissed the troubles as the growing pains of a start-up operator.

Only after a near-crash in Calgary in January 2005 did it take tough action, but even after a special inspection the next month revealed serious trouble, the regulator continued to publicly tout the airline as "safe."

I raise this because the bill we are dealing with today, Bill C-6, is about health and safety. It is about the health and safety of the public in the airline sector. It is about the safety of people who work in this sector. Bill C-6 would not address the situation the article describes with Jetsgo, which subsequently did go bankrupt, but it would make this situation worse.

We have seen, certainly for more than the last two decades, a period of deregulation and privatization, increasing transfer over to the private sector of oversight and enforcement of various rules. I do remember the pre-deregulation period in the transportation sector. The public was assured and the airline industry was assured that there would be no compromise on safety, that public safety was paramount and that even though companies were to be privatized and there was to be deregulation in terms of fares and routes, there would not be deregulation of the public good when it came to safety, that that would never happen.

Government Orders

Today we have Bill C-6 which would do just that. I want to review what it is that Bill C-6 will do. It will enshrine what is called safety management systems and it will enshrine them so that the companies themselves in effect will be supervising their own safety compliance. It transfers increasing responsibility over to the industry itself to set and enforce its own standards. It is designed not to enhance the public safety or security in the airline industry. What it will do is help Transport Canada deal with limited declining resources and projected declining numbers of airline safety inspectors due to retirements.

Certainly the Canadian public wants to be assured that their safety is paramount and is not compromised in dealing with administrative concerns about lack of resources or demographic changes among the inspectors because of retirements. Canadians have a great deal to be concerned about with this legislation. Self-enforcement when it comes to public safety in the airline sector is simply unacceptable.

It began in the U.S., but it has expanded to Canada and to many other countries. We have seen with deregulation absolutely cutthroat competition in the airline sector. I have worked in this sector. I have seen the changes that have taken place over the last several years.

The kind of service that has been offered to the travelling public has changed dramatically. Certainly no one would want to see their safety treated as the change in meal service has been treated on the airlines. No one wants to go from a full breakfast on Air Canada to peanuts and have their safety treated in a similar fashion. However, we are finding this incredible cutthroat competition in the airline sector.

• (1600)

When it comes to food, bringing one's own lunch, breakfast or dinner is not a big deal and people are doing it. However, when it comes to public safety and security, we do not want public safety and security to be subject to cutthroat competition.

Competition has been exacerbated by high fuel prices which have squeezed the airline industry even further. With the high prices of fuel combined with cutthroat competition, airlines are being driven into the ground. The industry has been littered with bankrupt airlines going back a number of years.

There is one area in which we do not want airlines to compete. In that incredibly fierce competitive environment, the one area we want completely protected from cutthroat competition surely is public safety.

We know there have been a number of close calls over the years, but generally, I think the travelling public feels fairly confident in the airlines when it comes to public safety. This goes back to the reassurance that Canadians had prior to airline deregulation and privatization that whatever happened, public safety would be paramount.

The issue we are raising around Bill C-6 is the concern that public safety will no longer be paramount. That bedrock confidence Canadians have in the safety and security of their airlines can no longer be resting on absolutely firm ground as it has been in the past.

I do want to commend my colleague from Burnaby—New Westminster for the tremendous work he has done in the transport

committee in trying to amend what is a very bad bill. He has been successful in making a number of positive changes that have tightened this bill to some degree, but not to the point where the public can have assurance that their safety is going to be completely uncompromised. For that reason, I am rising to oppose this bill. I think it is not in the best interests of Canadians.

We are a vast country that was built on effective transportation. Certainly the railway from sea to sea and airlines in the 20th and 21st centuries have allowed Canadians to stay connected with one another. For our country more than any other country in the world to compromise public safety with a bill like this by transferring responsibility for safety enforcement to the very companies that are in this cutthroat competition in a deregulated environment, I believe is wrong.

• (1605)

Mr. Peter Julian (Burnaby—New Westminster, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the work the member for Parkdale—High Park has done on infrastructure, pressing for urban transit and a new deal for cities, as well as the work she has been doing on behalf of her constituents and for consumers. This is very much a consumer issue. Essentially, we have the Conservatives pushing forward with this bad bill, unparalleled bad choice of policy.

There was a report in the *Hamilton Spectator* this morning by Fred Vallance-Jones, who is one of the foremost journalists in the country looking into air safety issues. Part of the article quotes Richard Balnis, who is a senior research officer with the Canadian Union of Public Employees. He says:

This is an incredible deal that has been struck with the airlines that Transport Canada is saying, "We cannot oversee you anymore, so we're going to trust you to do it yourself, and the quid pro quo is we are not going to enforce against you, but more importantly, we're going to put a secrecy cone over the both of us".

This article goes on to reiterate the investigation of air safety by the *Hamilton Spectator*, the *Toronto Star* and *The Record* of the Waterloo region. It says:

—gave publicity to the government's plans for SMS, many groups appeared before the Commons transport committee to warn Canada could be heading for an aviation catastrophe. The newspapers' investigation found more than 80,000 passengers were put at risk over a five-year period from 2001 to 2005 when planes came dangerously close to each other in Canadian skies. It also found rising numbers of mechanical defects and lax safety regulations.

We have the appalling record that Transport Canada has, only through luck, avoided a catastrophe certainly in the last few years. Essentially we have this excellent investigation done by *The Toronto Star*, the *Hamilton Spectator* and the *Kitchener Waterloo The Record*. We have a case by case examination of the number of passengers that came close to tragedy.

Why would the Conservatives proceed with a plan like this when they know that Canadian families are absolutely opposed to putting their loved ones in danger and when all the evidence shows that we have less and less security in our air space, less and less enforcement of safety regulations and fewer and fewer flight inspectors? We have 100 vacant positions the Conservatives refuse to fill.

Government Orders

In all that dynamic, why would the Conservatives push forward with what is exactly contrary to the public interest and to what Canadians want and need?

• (1610)

Ms. Peggy Nash: Mr. Speaker, why would the government not act in the public good? The public expects not only effective regulation, but oversight and enforcement of those regulations.

I also argue that the government has generally abandoned the public good when it comes to infrastructure investment. I know in my own neighbourhood of Parkdale—High Park, due to lacking a very small amount of money, public swimming pools are closing and the community is being abandoned in its struggle to maintain this infrastructure that is good for the community and for children and prevents disease and crime.

Why would the government not invest in this kind of infrastructure? Why will the government not act in the public good to have effective oversight of our transportation sector, which is exactly what Canadians expect from our federal government?

Mr. Peter Julian: Mr. Speaker, I hope the Conservatives, at some point, will actually defend this deplorable, reckless and irresponsible approach of gutting aviation safety. I hoped one would stand up. Hopefully, they are not all sheep.

I would like to quote a poll of federal aviation inspectors. They have found that nearly three-quarters of inspectors believe a major airline accident is looming because of increasingly lax safety oversight.

When three-quarters of the federal aviation inspectors are saying a major airline accident is looming, does the member not believe that the government should be heeding those who understand best what is important to maintain the safety in Canada's airlines?

Ms. Peggy Nash: Mr. Speaker, clearly what we have here is a case of ideology trumping not only common sense, but trumping the public good. It is hard to believe that any hon. member in the House could defend the bill that the government has put forward. It is not surprising that the Conservatives are not rising to their feet to defend this legislation.

Clearly, it is not in the public good. I appreciate my hon. colleague, the member for Burnaby—New Westminster and all the fine work that he has done to bring the weaknesses of this bill into the public domain.

Mr. Nathan Cullen (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is with great anticipation that I rise to speak to Bill C-6. This is an opportunity for members of Parliament to deal with an issue that many of our constituents do not have the time or the ability to delve into this type of legislation, but yet it impacts their lives in a serious way.

The region I represent in northwestern British Columbia is often described as remote. It is certainly spread out. When I return to my constituency, I use any one of a number of seven different airports to access the communities and villages that I serve and represent. Air safety is one of the most important issues for the constituents who I represent.

It goes without saying that the work of the member for Burnaby—New Westminster is laudable and commendable due to his unending energy in trying to squeeze out of the government and the other opposition parties better legislation. We all know that at the end of the day, regardless of partisan interests, we only want to promote legislation that most protects the health and safety of Canadians. Members of Parliament only want legislation that properly balances the powers that be within the country and those interests of the voters who we represent.

Bill C-6, An Act to amend the Aeronautics Act and to make consequential amendments to other Acts, is a broad, sweeping bill. It is a bill that has had some long history of debate. It has been pushed by various governments, previous Conservative and Liberal governments, and now the current Conservative government. Each time the bill is presented, the part which is most desperately flawed pertains to the interests of average Canadians.

Representatives from the industry are always front and centre and are always well represented and well rehearsed in the things that they want primarily around the issue of self-regulation and them being able to monitor themselves and their safety record. Whereas, the bill does not balance properly on the side of constituents, flyers, people who rely upon air travel and depend upon it.

Often the captain will come on the intercom and comment that the most dangerous thing we will do that day is drive to and from the airport and that the flying is incredibly safe. This is an unbelievably important part of the airline industry.

Anyone who knows the history of the airline industry in North America, the first and most important thing it had to address and deal with was the concept that this was a dangerous activity. For many people initially, the idea of getting into a plane was considered very dangerous and it was. There were very few regulations and safety requirements, much like it was getting into an automobile when they were first invented, but there was an evolution. We saw an evolution in regulations, unfortunately often driven by accidents.

When an air accident would occur, the transportation and safety review board, or whatever incarnation there was at the time, would come on to the scene, review what had happened and then make recommendations to the government, which it could enshrine either in legislation or regulations, but something that would then protect the public. This would then give greater assurance to future travellers that they and their families would be safe.

There has been a natural tension and while potentially healthy, it also has the potential for great harm. That tension is between the air carriers, the companies involved, particularly the two major national ones, and their interests. Generally speaking, if we speak of fiduciary responsibilities, it is the maximization of profit for their shareholders. That is what their board and corporate governance structure is meant to do. It is meant to allow the greatest benefit derived for all those who have invested in their companies. This is matched off against the need for proper regulations and safety requirements. Lo and behold, sometimes safety actually costs money and time.

To ensure that something is safe and it is something we can all live by, it has to be done right. It has to be fixed right. It has to be of the highest quality and standards.

Government Orders

Many members of Parliament, as this session ends, will be considering their travel plans. Many of us have to board an airplane. In all the confusion in trying to get onboard that airplane, one thing we do not often think about. We assume our travel experience, while it will be potentially long and annoying, because we are on these things all the time, will be safe. That is something that goes without saying because there have been relatively few accidents in the Canadian airline industry.

The tension that exists and that is not properly balanced within Bill C-6 is between the role of government and the role of the private sector. Government has no right and no business telling the airline industry how to run a maximizing profit industry. That is the responsibility of the airline executives, management and consulting crews.

•(1615)

The government's responsibility is to balance those interests with the interests and safety of Canadians. Canadians trust our ability and our tenacity to ensure we never pass laws that would put them in any jeopardy.

Lo and behold, this bill moves toward a self-monitoring, a self-regulating and a self-inspecting regime. This would allow the industry to make up rules and decide what level of risk and safety would be permissible. The industry's sole and primary interest is not only making a profit. The industry's interests are mixed. Ours is to allow a healthy industry to exist while at the same time balance the public benefit.

There are two analogies that I would like to mention to members and they work best for my region in northern British Columbia. One is in the forestry sector and the other is in the train sector.

Many of the rail systems in Canada, particularly in British Columbia, for convenience sake or just by fate of history often run beside many of our major waterways. Over the last number of years, we have seen an increasing rate of serious train accidents, which have caused us grave concern. Many of these trains pass right through our towns and our communities, sometimes within 100 feet of people's homes. The buffer between having a safe and reliable train system and having one that causes great harm is not great. There is not a lot of space.

As the industry has moved toward self-regulation, self-monitoring, deciding within its own confines what is safe and not safe, exactly what the airline industry is asking for, the accident rate goes up.

I speak with rail workers every day when I am in my constituency of Skeena—Bulkley Valley. They privately talk to me about what is going on within their industry. They tell me that the drive toward the bottom line has become intense. The basic safety mechanisms that have been developed over time, often based upon accidents, have not been made out of thin air. Inspectors go on site after a major accident and they design a safety protocol after they realize what went wrong. That is meant to happen. That is the reason we go about these things.

When an industry is moved toward deregulation and self-monitoring, all those regulations come into question. All those safety mechanisms potentially go off the books. If an industry feels it

is cutting too much into its bottom line, it can decide that a particular safety clause designed back in 1985 no longer pertains and it costs \$1 million a year, and it will let that clause slide.

With no transparency at all existing within the bill for the airline industry, Canadians will not know what safety regulations have been taken out. In the future imagined by this bill, there will be no way of knowing whether all the safety procedures were taken or not. It was not up to any regulator to decide; it was up to the industry to decide. While we all hope that safety is important to the industry, with this conflict of interest built within the bill, it is not a risk that we can take.

The other sector that is important in our region is the forestry sector. Whenever there was a fatality within the forestry sector, inspectors would go to the accident site to find out what went wrong. They decided that certain safety measures had to be put in place to prevent the future loss of life. It was shown that rules and protocols were necessary.

When we moved to a deregulated forestry sector, when we moved to a place where health and safety requirements were placed in the hands of the company with a profit motive, there was a huge spike in the number of forestry fatalities in British Columbia. There were 50 last year. Those 50 lives could have been saved.

•(1620)

What we need to do at this moment is to reconsider the bill from top to bottom, move the amendments that the NDP has called for and then build something that we can all be proud of. It should not be to the rush of some limit of time but something that we know will keep Canadians safe.

•(1625)

Mr. Peter Julian (Burnaby—New Westminster, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am sad to see that the Conservatives are refusing to stand and defend their position on this bill. We are supposed to have a democratic debate in the House of Commons. The Conservatives have put something together that, at the very least, one can say is dangerously reckless and yet they are refusing to defend their actions. They are absolutely refusing to stand and say why they want to be dangerously reckless. It may be to increase CEO's bonuses, who knows, but they could at least give some reason for their recklessness, their irresponsibility and their complete disregard for the families of ordinary Canadians who will be getting on flights soon of airlines that will no longer be regulated or, if they are regulated and there are internal problems, we will never know about them.

I want to come back to the presentation by the member from Skeena—Bulkley Valley who is certainly one of the most active MPs in the House. He works extremely diligently on behalf of his constituency here in Ottawa and then he goes back to Skeena—Bulkley Valley and flies regularly throughout that vast riding, about a quarter of British Columbia. The member for Skeena—Bulkley Valley is extremely diligent about getting out to his riding so he flies a great deal, not just to Ottawa but around his riding on the weekends when he goes back to it.

We have a comment from Ken Rubin, who is a public interest researcher, who said the following before the transport committee:

Government Orders

[The] Transport Minister...cannot claim that he and his officials, as they said in front of the committee, are simply adding, via an industry-government confidential non-punitive SMS reporting system, just another protective layer to improve air safety and are implementing a system far removed from airline self-regulation. Rather, they are attempting to circumvent public scrutiny and abdicating their public regulatory—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Andrew Scheer): I have to cut the member off so I can allow the hon. member for Skeena—Bulkley Valley to respond to the question.

Mr. Nathan Cullen: Mr. Speaker, one of the concepts that was brought forward, and this I believe happened at committee in testimony, was the balance between what the industry was calling for, which was some sort of notion of streamlining and some cost effectiveness measures. To most Canadians, if we were able to propose to them, if this bill were to pass, that there would be some marginal savings on an airline tickets, most Canadians would say that should be considered but the cost of that small savings would be in some order of safety, some magnitude of Canadians' safety in getting on the airplane.

What is safety worth to people? What is safety worth to parliamentarians when we are deciding what bills should go forward and what bills should not and which concepts should go forward and which ones should not? Clearly, it is very difficult.

We had people from the health department in front of us at the environment committee some time ago and I did not know this but the government uses a formula to decide the value of a Canadian life. Apparently, in Health Canada anyway, it is \$5 million. That is what the life of a Canadian is worth when the government is trying to estimate how many lives are lost or saved. This was in the area of pollution prevention.

It would be fascinating if some of the Conservatives would stand and defend their position.

We have a government advocating for some measure which, I suspect, is an ideology toward a deregulated form of business where there is little or no oversight for regulations and restrictions are made up by the industry themselves, some laissez-faire free hand, the invisible hand of the marketplace stepping into an issue like health and safety, to passenger safety.

This seems so ridiculous, particularly when it is presented in the light of the day. My colleague from Burnaby—New Westminster has been working diligently to ascertain the qualities of any of the motions that are being considered within the bill, to improve them and to try to work with other members of Parliament on the committee, within government and within the opposition parties and has found few partnerships that were willing.

The member from Eglinton—Lawrence, I believe, has some further and future ambitions and can only see in his starry eyes the executives within the biggest corporations that run our airline industry but cannot see for a moment that the trade-off between the security of individual people, who I suppose he represents, cannot be seen for this other ambition.

Clearly, we need to rebalance the scales and design a bill that we can all be proud of, not one that plays to some selected audiences.

●(1630)

Mr. Bill Siksay (Burnaby—Douglas, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak to Bill C-6, An Act to amend the Aeronautics Act and to make consequential amendments to other Acts.

We are at report stage in this debate, which is a very crucial phase of the debate where we are considering the amendments that were made at the transport committee to this important bill.

I want to begin by thanking my colleague, the member for Burnaby—New Westminster, for his work on this important legislation. He has toiled long and hard to ensure that the House pays due attention to the safety concerns of Canadians when we are travelling by air. He has worked to see improvements made to the proposed legislation.

We still believe it is a very flawed bill but the work of the member for Burnaby—New Westminster has certainly ensured that it is a better bill than it was and the amendments that he has brought forward are very important toward that.

It remains a deeply problematic bill, however, because all of the amendments that were necessary did not get passed.

We debated that process in the House yesterday and we are debating it again today. It is, as I said, a very crucial piece of legislation. I believe all Canadians want to know that they are safe when they are travelling by air. They want to know that the airline industry is safe for the people who work in it. They want to be sure that someone is paying attention to the safety of our air transportation system.

I am not convinced that Bill C-6 would act in the interest of Canadians when it comes to ensuring our safety as we travel by air or as we transport goods by air.

The proposed legislation would enshrine safety management systems to allow the industry to decide the level of risk that it is willing to accept in its operations, rather than abide by a level of safety established by a minister acting in the public interest. It would allow government to transfer increasing responsibility to the industry itself to set and enforce its own safety standards. It is designed in part to help Transport Canada deal with declining resources and high projected levels of inspector retirements.

That is of great concern to me and to members of the New Democratic Party. The basic premise of the bill to allow the transfer of responsibility from government to the corporate sector for something as important as ensuring safety just is not an acceptable way to go.

Government Orders

As someone from British Columbia, I have watched the increasing number of railway accidents in recent years that have caused deaths and environmental problems in British Columbia and across the country due to safety concerns. We have also heard concerns from some of the workers whose colleagues have been killed in these accidents and from workers who have made that a key component of their bargaining in recent collective agreement negotiations with the major rail companies in Canada. They have tried to highlight their concerns for ongoing safety because we know that the railway industry has a similar system to what is being proposed in Bill C-6 for the airline industry. We have seen the failures of that by the large number of railway accidents in recent years.

As someone from British Columbia, I am also concerned about the major derailments on the former BC Rail line which have caused many deaths. There have been many fairly dramatic accidents. One accident in particular was the Cheakamus Canyon derailment which caused the death of that river and will require probably decades of remediation work to bring the river back to even some semblance of what it once was. The derailment caused the dumping of hazardous materials into the river which killed a huge number of fish and other creatures that live in that river system.

It is a very important concern to me, to the people in my riding and to the people of British Columbia when we see a safety record in the railway industry that causes those kinds of concerns and has led to those kinds of accidents and has not improved the safety record of railways. It has done nothing to improve it, to make it better, to prevent accidents, to prevent the deaths of workers and to prevent environmental problems that result from those accidents.

● (1635)

I think we want to be absolutely certain that any legislation that goes forward from this place does not contribute to a similar circumstance in yet another transportation industry. Our concern is that Bill C-6, which deals with the aeronautics industry, would lead to similar circumstances in the management of safety concerns and the attention to safety details.

It is always a concern to us when we turn safety monitoring, safety enforcement and enforcement measures over to the corporate sector to follow because we know that in the corporate sector the bottom line is the financial ledger. It often does not pay the attention needed to safety because of its concerns about profits. I suppose that is a reasonable circumstance if one were in the corporate sector, but I do not think it is a reasonable assumption or a reasonable premise for Canadians who use the airline industry.

I remember where this was first driven home for me years ago. It was at the Miners Museum in Cape Breton. I do not know if the museum is still there because it has been some decades since I was there. However, off the main lobby of that terrific museum on Cape Breton Island was what looked like a side chapel and there was a glass case that had a number of objects in it. One of the two key components in that display was the company ledger showing the profits that the company was making. The other component was a list of the workers who had died in that particular mine because the museum was built on the site of a former coal mine on Cape Breton Island. There was no explanation as to why the company ledger was sitting there beside the list of workers who had died but it made a

very powerful statement and a very deliberate statement about how those two things were not combined naturally to pay attention to the safety of the people who worked there and to ensure their safety and well-being as they worked there.

For me, that was a very dramatic example of the kinds of concerns that arise when we allow the corporate sector a free rein over issues like worker safety and the safety of the travelling public, which is why I am very skeptical about the direction of Bill C-6 and what it hopes to accomplish as a piece of legislation in this House.

Safety should never be subject to the rise and fall of a company's profit margin. I think that is particularly true in the airline industry where we know that often airline companies have had a difficult go of it in Canada, where we have seen airlines come and go in recent years because of the difficulties of making a reasonable profit, of making a go of it as a business in that industry. That kind of circumstance, I think, is ripe for the kinds of concerns to arise over cutting corners when it comes to dealing with questions of safety.

I know there are many concerns that we have in this corner about Bill C-6 but we do not think the amendments at report stage go nearly far enough to addressing all of them.

Our three major concerns are around the safety management systems. As I have already noted, the airline industry would be permitted to increasingly define the safety level of its operations. I think all of us would see some flaw in allowing that to happen. We are concerned that there would be no spokesperson for the travelling public to ensure that there is another standard applied to those operations.

We also know that heightened secrecy would be allowed because of this legislation. It would restrict access to information on the safety performances of airlines. Certainly, in a situation where we are turning that over to airlines, that is of great concern. Any more secrecy is not appropriate.

We also know that the whistleblower protection included in this legislation for employees would not be strong enough to allow an employee who sees a serious concern about safety to make that public and seek a resolution to that where it has not been given appropriate attention by the company, and that is not acceptable either.

We also see that there is a lack of accountability overall for airlines in this because it would give them, I think, far too many chances to voluntarily correct problems, that it would set deadlines in a timely fashion rather than on an immediate or urgent or—

● (1640)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Andrew Scheer): Order. Before moving on to questions and comments, it is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 38, to inform the House that the question to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment is as follows: the hon. member for Bramalea—Gore—Malton, Citizenship and Immigration.

Questions and comments, the hon. member for Vancouver Island North.

Government Orders

Ms. Catherine Bell (Vancouver Island North, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my hon. colleague from Burnaby—New Westminster for his hard work on this file and for keeping it alive, and also my colleague from Burnaby—Douglas for his remarks that he just made.

However, I also want to touch on some things that my other colleague from Skeena—Bulkley Valley mentioned. He talked about the north coast and the air taxi industry where loggers, miners and fishermen have to use air taxis to get back and forth to work. That is something that is very common in the riding of Vancouver Island North.

Several years ago in 2005, a small airplane crashed into the ocean and all five of the loggers who were on their way to work lost their lives, but a very brave woman, one of the spouses of the men who were killed, has continued to raise awareness about air traffic safety and what is happening in this industry. She has tried to come to the committee and make a presentation, but has so far not been successful.

Therefore, on behalf of her, her name is Kirsten Stevens, I bring this issue up in the House to talk about air safety. What she said to me was that the concerns are very real. There is a general feeling in the industry that the air taxi sector suffers from a considerable lack of effective oversight and enforcement.

Many concerns which were addressed by Transport Canada in the safety of air taxi operations task force's final report of 1998, which related to the problem of occupational health and safety as well as oversight in this sector, have never been corrected.

This sector suffers from a high accident rate. I find that appalling. My question for my hon. colleague from Burnaby—Douglas is this. When we see the amendments and this act which is asking for more oversight by the industry, and in this case the industry is not living up to the commitments now, what happens when they are in full control of it? Would he not think that we need more oversight and not less?

Mr. Bill Siksay: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Vancouver Island North for her question and for representing Ms. Stevens and her family so well on this particular issue. They have gone through what no family should have to go through, losing a loved one in an airplane accident, and they know the difficulty of that.

They know the problems associated with that and to their credit, they have worked to ensure that the same thing does not happen to other families and other workers who depend on airplanes to get to and from work, to do their work, or who work on those planes themselves.

It is very commendable and admirable that despite their loss and their grief at the loss of their own family member, they take up the cause and seek a solution to this.

The member is absolutely right that we do not need fewer regulations, laxer regulations or looser regulations. We need to make sure that we have tough regulations and enforced regulations, and the inspectors to do the enforcement. Otherwise, we are letting people down. We are letting people down like Ms. Stevens and her

family, and we are letting workers down who make their living on airlines or providing these kinds of services.

We cannot afford to do that and if government is not about ensuring some modicum of standards for Canadians and serving the Canadian public by ensuring that our safety is a priority, then what should government be about? It just seems so logical that this is a job for the Canadian government, to ensure that safety is a priority for the airline industry.

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to my colleague and I was moved by the whole discussion on what we have seen in terms of railway safety and the abysmal record that has developed in Canada over the last number of years with railway accidents.

We are surprised, given the incredible number of accidents, that we have not seen a greater level of tragedy, yet this seems to be a model that is being promoted for airlines, where there should be a zero level allowed for accidents because of what obviously would be entailed.

I would like to ask the hon. member this question. How does he compare the situation that we have seen with rail transportation oversight with airline oversight?

• (1645)

Mr. Bill Siksay: Mr. Speaker, as I said in my speech, the example of the railway industry is the wrong example. We have seen far too many accidents and lives lost in recent years because of rail accidents. My concern is that the safety standards that we need are not in place, are not in force, and we do not want to see that happen in the airline industry.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yvon Godin (Acadie—Bathurst, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the NDP member for Burnaby—New Westminster for all the work he did on Bill C-6, which is an important bill.

Bill C-6 has been around before. In the case of railways, the bill was amended to make companies responsible for ensuring railway safety and to remove this responsibility from the government's mandate.

Not long ago, the news reports and newspapers were saying that the railway linking Moncton to Campbellton was so damaged that a VIA Rail train was an hour late by the time it got to Bathurst. Imagine a whole hour late. Also, what would happen if a freight train carrying dangerous goods derailed, or if the goods spilled into the rivers? The government is no longer there to keep an eye on things. They leave it to the companies and big corporations.

As for the air industry, we should remember the difficulties Air Canada experienced. It was on the verge of bankruptcy. It practically declared bankruptcy. Without blaming Air Canada, we have the right to wonder whether corners will be cut. What does the government have to say about that? It could not care less. This is also what happened with the Coast Guard, which suffered cutbacks. There are no more fish in the sea, so there is no need for anyone to monitor the sea or the ocean. I do not think anyone can get hurt or lose their life because of that, but the air industry is another story.

Government Orders

The government just wants to turn around and say that in this case it is not responsible, the airline company is. It is up to the company to say when something is wrong. If it does not say anything, it is responsible. All it has to do is say something, write it in its logbook, and that is that.

I would like to go back to the railway between Moncton and Bathurst. I am thinking of all of the derailments that have happened across the country: in the west, in Ontario and in Quebec. The government is not fulfilling its responsibility. It has passed everything on to the companies. As everyone knows, these big companies were good friends with the Conservative and the Liberal governments, so the government wants to lighten their load and, at the same time, abdicate its responsibility so that it does not have to spend a lot of money.

Furthermore, Bill C-6 does not protect whistleblowers. For example, when I was working in the mines back in 1978, we made sure that a worker could refuse a job if he thought that it would endanger his health or safety. Workers also had the right to tell their co-workers that the work posed a health or safety threat. Bill C-6 offers no protection for whistleblowers. There is nothing to protect whistleblowers who might want to say that they think the plane that passengers are about to board is not safe, that something could happen to put people in danger. There is nothing to protect those people.

How can the Conservative government, along with the Liberals and the Bloc Québécois, support a bill like Bill C-6? All three parties support this bill. With respect to the—

An hon. member: The Canadian Union of Public Employees.

Mr. Yvon Godin: The Canadian Union of Public Employees is against the bill.

•(1650)

One of these days, we will all be sitting at home and there will be an accident. We will then read in the papers that the airline did not fulfill its responsibilities in terms of safety. However, since it filled out the aircraft journey log, it will be protected. The government will not be able to hold the company responsible. We will not be able to hold it responsible, and families will have problems and will be left to deal with the tragedy.

This bill is important and should have been adopted a long time ago. This bill also aims to raise the awareness of the Conservative government, the Liberals and the Bloc Québécois. How can they accept the fact that the government is abdicating responsibility for corporations that should be under its supervision?

Take Air Canada for example. This example may seem rather banal, but in a country like ours, which is supposedly bilingual—French and English—on-board instructions were not even provided in French on Air Canada planes. Flight attendants did not give instructions in French. We had to fight for our official language rights. At long last, a manual now exists, and the flight crew is responsible for providing passengers with emergency landing instructions in both official languages.

This is an important bill, and it is unfortunate that it has come along at the last minute and without warning, and that it does not

appear very important. Yet, workplace health and public safety are of prime importance. Once an accident happens, it is too late. The public should know what the government hopes to achieve with Bill C-6. It hopes to shift its governmental responsibilities for public safety and health onto the airlines. This is completely unacceptable and even worse than the Coast Guard situation.

If we put fewer Coast Guard members out there, people could be in danger. There are not enough people to help us in these situations. I remember the same thing happened in New Brunswick in the mining industry over 15 years ago. At the time, the government was responsible for the health and safety of below-ground workers. It was called the Mining Act. The inspector was responsible for various things. Then the government turned the tables and made the company responsible. They could have at least left the inspectors in place or added more inspectors so that work sites could be inspected. That is when they started reducing the number of inspectors.

That is really where it all began: the government started reducing the number of inspectors working in the airline industry, and that is sad. I do not want to see the day when, at home or elsewhere, we hear about an accident in which people lost their lives, or about a plane that crashed in a city or in the country, killing innocent bystanders.

I do not want to see that day because it will be Parliament's fault for passing the Conservative bill as it is currently worded because the Liberals and the Bloc Québécois voted in favour of it. They have not done their duty. The union of public employees was clear about not being in favour of this bill. We are therefore not the only ones.

•(1655)

[English]

Hon. Peter Van Loan (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. There have been discussions among the various parties and I think you will find unanimous consent to the following motion. I move:

That, notwithstanding any Standing Order or usual practice of the House, Bill C-6 report stage Motion No. 2 shall be withdrawn.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Royal Galipeau): Does the hon. government House leader have the unanimous consent of the House to move the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Royal Galipeau): The House has heard the terms of the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

(Motion No. 2 withdrawn)

[Translation]

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

Some hon. members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Royal Galipeau): The question is on Motion No. 4. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Government Orders

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Royal Galipeau): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And five or more members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Royal Galipeau): The recorded division on Motion No. 4 stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 9.

[*English*]

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Royal Galipeau): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And five or more members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Royal Galipeau): The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 10.

[*Translation*]

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Royal Galipeau): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And five or more members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Royal Galipeau): The recorded division on Motion No. 10 stands deferred.
[*English*]

The next question is on Motion No. 11. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Royal Galipeau): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And five or more members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Royal Galipeau): The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

● (1700)

The next question is on Motion No. 12. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Royal Galipeau): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Royal Galipeau): In my opinion, the nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Royal Galipeau): The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded divisions at the report stage of the bill. Call in the members.

Before the taking of the vote:

* * *

● (1740)

PEACE TOWER CARILLON

The Speaker: Order, please. Before I put the question to the House, I have a brief announcement that I forgot to make earlier.

This year marks an important anniversary in the story of Canada's Parliament Buildings. On July 1, 1927, the year of Canada's Diamond Jubilee, the carillon of the Peace Tower was inaugurated. Eighty years ago, the late Viscount Willingdon, former Governor General, presided over the ceremony, which, in the words of Prime Minister William Lyon Mackenzie King would make the carillon a part of our national life.

[*Translation*]

Fifty-three bells, weighing from 10 pounds to 22,000 pounds, were installed in the Peace Tower by the authority of Parliament, and the first notes played were those of our national anthem.

[*English*]

Today, thanks to the talents of our current Dominion Carillonneur, Gordon Slater, Canadians and foreign visitors alike can delight in the melodious and majestic sounds emanating from the carillon of Parliament's Peace Tower, a memorial to peace born of victory.

* * *

AERONAUTICS ACT

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-6, An Act to amend the Aeronautics Act and to make consequential amendments to other Acts, as reported (with amendment) from the committee, and of the motions in Group No. 1.

The Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 4. If Motion No. 4 is agreed to, the vote will also apply to Motion No. 14. A negative vote on Motion No. 4 requires the question to be put on Motions Nos. 5, 7 and 8.

• (1750)

[*Translation*]

(The House divided on the motion, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 210*)

YEAS

Members

Angus	Atamanenko
Bell (Vancouver Island North)	Bevington
Charlton	Christopherson
Crowder	Cullen (Skeena—Bulkley Valley)
Davies	Dewar
Godin	Julian
Layton	Marston
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	Masse
Mathysen	McDonough
Nash	Priddy
Savoie	Siksay
Stoffer	Wasylcia-Leis— 24

NAYS

Members

Abbott	Albrecht
Alghabra	Allen
Ambrose	Anders
Anderson	André
Bachand	Bagnell
Bains	Baird
Barbot	Batters
Bélangier	Bell (North Vancouver)
Bellavance	Benoit
Bezan	Bigras
Blackburn	Blaney

Government Orders

Bonsant	Boshcoff
Bouchard	Boucher
Bourgeois	Breitkreuz
Brison	Brown (Leeds—Grenville)
Bruinooogé	Brunelle
Calkins	Cannan (Kelowna—Lake Country)
Cannis	Cardin
Carrie	Carrier
Casson	Chan
Chong	Clement
Coderre	Comuzzi
Cullen (Etobicoke North)	Cuzner
D'Amours	Davidson
Day	Del Mastro
Demers	Deschamps
Devolin	Dhaliwal
Dion	Dosanjh
Dryden	Dykstra
Easter	Emerson
Epp	Faille
Fast	Fitzpatrick
Flaherty	Fletcher
Folco	Freeman
Fry	Gagnon
Galipeau	Gallant
Godfrey	Goldring
Goodale	Goodyear
Gourde	Gravel
Grewal	Guamieri
Hanger	Harper
Harvey	Hawn
Hearn	Hiebert
Hill	Hinton
Holland	Hubbard
Jaffer	Jean
Jennings	Kadis
Karetak-Lindell	Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)
Keper	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Khan	Komarnicki
Kotto	Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)
Laforest	Laframboise
Lake	Lauzon
Lavallée	LeBlanc
Lee	Lemieux
Lessard	Lévesque
Lukiwski	Lunn
Lunney	Lussier
MacKay (Central Nova)	MacKenzie
Malhi	Maloney
Manning	Marleau
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Mayes
McCallum	McGuinty
McGuire	McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)
McTeague	Ménard (Hochelaga)
Ménard (Marc-Aurèle-Fortin)	Menzies
Merrifield	Miller
Mills	Minna
Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)	
Moore (Fundy Royal)	
Murphy (Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe)	Murphy (Charlottetown)
Nadeau	Nicholson
Norlock	O'Connor
Obhrai	Ouellet
Owen	Pacetti
Pallister	Paquette
Paradis	Pearson
Perron	Peterson
Petit	Picard
Plamondon	Poilievre
Prentice	Preston
Proulx	Rajotte
Ratansi	Redman
Regan	Reid
Richardson	Robillard
Rota	Roy
Russell	Savage
Scarpaleggia	Scheer
Schellenberger	Sgro
Shipley	Silva
Simms	Skelton
Smith	Solberg
Sorenson	St-Cyr
St. Amand	St. Denis
Stanton	Steckle

Government Orders

Storseth	Strahl
Sweet	Szabo
Temelkovski	Thibault (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les
Basques)	
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)	Tilson
Toews	Tonks
Trost	Turner
Tweed	Van Kesteren
Van Loan	Vellacott
Verner	Vincent
Wallace	Warawa
Warkentin	Watson
Wilfert	Williams
Wilson	Wrzesnewskyj
Yelich	Zed— 216

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 4 lost.*[English]*

The next question is on Motion No. 5. If Motion No. 5 is agreed to, the vote will also apply to Motion No. 14.

Hon. Jay Hill: Mr. Speaker, I think if you were to seek it, you would find unanimous consent to apply the results of the vote just taken to Motion No. 5 currently before the House, in the name of the hon. member for Burnaby—New Westminster, and also all the other motions in his name, namely Motions Nos. 9, 10, 11, 12, 14 and 15.

The Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to proceed in this fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(The House divided on Motion No. 5, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 211)

YEAS

Members

Angus	Atamanenko
Bell (Vancouver Island North)	Bevington
Charlton	Christopherson
Crowder	Cullen (Skeena—Bulkley Valley)
Davies	Dewar
Godin	Julian
Layton	Marston
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	Masse
Mathysen	McDonough
Nash	Priddy
Savoie	Siksay
Stoffer	Wasylcia-Leis— 24

NAYS

Members

Abbott	Albrecht
Alghabra	Allen
Ambrose	Anders
Anderson	André
Bachand	Bagnell
Bains	Baird
Barbot	Batters
Bélangier	Bell (North Vancouver)
Bellavance	Benoit
Bezan	Bigras
Blackburn	Blaney
Bonsant	Boshcoff
Bouchard	Boucher
Bourgeois	Breitkreuz
Brisson	Brown (Leeds—Grenville)
Brunoogoe	Brunelle
Calkins	Cannan (Kelowna—Lake Country)
Cannis	Cardin

Carrie	Carrier
Casson	Chan
Chong	Clement
Coderre	Comuzzi
Cullen (Etobicoke North)	Cuzner
D'Amours	Davidson
Day	Del Mastro
Demers	Deschamps
Devolin	Dhaliwal
Dion	Dosanjh
Dryden	Dykstra
Easter	Emerson
Epp	Faille
Fast	Fitzpatrick
Flaherty	Fletcher
Folco	Freeman
Fry	Gagnon
Galipeau	Gallant
Godfrey	Goldring
Goodale	Goodyear
Gourde	Gravel
Grewal	Guarnieri
Hanger	Harper
Harvey	Hawn
Hearn	Hiebert
Hill	Hinton
Holland	Hubbard
Jaffer	Jean
Jemings	Kadis
Karetak-Lindell	Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)
Keeper	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Khan	Komarnicki
Kotto	Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)
Laforest	Laframboise
Lake	Lauzon
Lavallée	LeBlanc
Lee	Lemieux
Lessard	Lévesque
Lukiwski	Lunn
Lunney	Lussier
MacKay (Central Nova)	MacKenzie
Malhi	Maloney
Manning	Marleau
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Mayes
McCallum	McGuinty
McGuire	McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)
McTeague	Ménard (Hochelaga)
Ménard (Marc-Aurèle-Fortin)	Menzies
Merrifield	Miller
Mills	Minna
Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)	
Moore (Fundy Royal)	
Murphy (Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe)	Murphy (Charlottetown)
Nadeau	Nicholson
Norlock	O'Connor
Obhrai	Ouellet
Owen	Pacetti
Pallister	Paquette
Paradis	Pearson
Perron	Peterson
Petit	Picard
Plamondon	Poillievre
Prentice	Preston
Proulx	Rajotte
Ratansi	Redman
Regan	Reid
Richardson	Robillard
Rota	Roy
Russell	Savage
Scarpaleggia	Scheer
Schellenberger	Sgro
Shiple	Silva
Simms	Skelton
Smith	Solberg
Sorenson	St-Cyr
St. Amand	St. Denis
Stanton	Steckle
Storseth	Strahl
Sweet	Szabo
Temelkovski	Thibault (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les
Basques)	
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)	Tilson
Toews	Tonks
Trost	Turner

Tweed
Van Loan
Verner
Wallace
Warkentin
Wilfert
Wilson
Yelich

Van Kesteren
Vellacott
Vincent
Warawa
Watson
Williams
Wrzesnewskyj
Zed- — 216

PAIRED

Nil

(The House divided on Motion No. 9, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 214)

YEAS

Members

Angus
Bell (Vancouver Island North)
Charlton
Crowder
Davies
Godin
Layton
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Mathysen
Nash
Savoie
Stoffer

Atamanenko
Bevington
Christopherson
Cullen (Skeena—Bulkley Valley)
Dewar
Julian
Marston
Masse
McDonough
Priddy
Siksay
Wasylcia-Leis- — 24

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Alghabra
Ambrose
Anderson
Bachand
Bains
Barbot
Bélangier
Bellavance
Bezan
Blackburn
Bonsant
Bouchard
Bourgeois
Brisson
Bruinoog
Calkins
Cannis
Carrie
Casson
Chong
Coderre
Cullen (Etobicoke North)
D'Amours
Day
Demers
Devolin
Dion
Dryden
Easter
Epp
Fast
Flaherty
Folco
Fry
Galipeau
Godfrey
Goodale
Gourde
Grewal
Hanger
Harvey
Hearn
Hill
Holland

Albrecht
Allen
Anders
André
Bagnell
Baird
Batters
Bell (North Vancouver)
Benoit
Bigras
Blaney
Boshcoff
Boucher
Breitkreuz
Brown (Leeds—Grenville)
Brunelle
Cannan (Kelowna—Lake Country)
Cardin
Carrier
Chan
Clement
Comuzzi
Cuzner
Davidson
Del Mastro
Deschamps
Dhaliwal
Dosanjh
Dykstra
Emerson
Faille
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Freeman
Gagnon
Gallant
Goldring
Goodyear
Gravel
Guarnieri
Harper
Hawn
Hiebert
Hinton
Hubbard

Government Orders

Jaffer
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Keeper
Khan
Kotto
Laforest
Lake
Lavallée
Lee
Lessard
Lukiwski
Lunney
MacKay (Central Nova)
Malhi
Manning
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McCallum
McGuire
McTeague
Ménard (Marc-Aurèle-Fortin)
Merrifield
Mills
Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)
Moore (Fundy Royal)
Murphy (Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe)
Nadeau
Norlock
Obhrai
Owen
Pallister
Paradis
Perron
Petit
Plamondon
Prentice
Proulx
Ratansi
Regan
Richardson
Rota
Russell
Scarpaleggia
Schellenberger
Shipley
Simms
Smith
Sorenson
St. Amand
Stanton
Storseth
Sweet
Temelkovski
Basques)
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Toews
Trost
Tweed
Van Loan
Verner
Wallace
Warkentin
Wilfert
Wilson
Yelich

Jean
Kadis
Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Komarnicki
Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)
Laframboise
Lauzon
LeBlanc
Lemieux
Lévesque
Lunn
Lussier
MacKenzie
Maloney
Marleau
Mayes
McGuinity
McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)
Ménard (Hochelaga)
Menzies
Miller
Minn
Murphy (Charlottetown)
Nicholson
O'Connor
Ouellet
Pacetti
Paquette
Pearson
Peterson
Picard
Poilievre
Preston
Rajotte
Redman
Reid
Robillard
Roy
Savage
Scheer
Sgro
Silva
Skelton
Solberg
St-Cyr
St. Denis
Steckle
Strahl
Szabo
Thibault (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les

PAIRED

Nil

(The House divided on Motion No. 10, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 215)

YEAS

Members

Angus
Bell (Vancouver Island North)
Charlton
Crowder
Davies

Atamanenko
Bevington
Christopherson
Cullen (Skeena—Bulkley Valley)
Dewar

Government Orders

Godin
Layton
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Mathysen
Nash
Savoie
Stoffer

Julian
Marston
Masse
McDonough
Priddy
Siksaya
Wasylycia-Leis— 24

Norlock
Obhrai
Owen
Pallister
Paradis
Perron
Petit
Plamondon
Prentice
Proulx
Ratansi
Regan
Richardson
Rota
Russell
Scarpaleggia
Schellenberger
Shiple
Simms
Smith
Sorenson
St. Amand
Stanton
Storseth
Sweet
Temelkovski
Basques)
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Toews
Trost
Tweed
Van Loan
Verner
Wallace
Warkentin
Wilfert
Wilson
Yelich

O'Connor
Ouellet
Paçetti
Paquette
Pearson
Peterson
Picard
Poilievre
Preston
Rajotte
Redman
Reid
Robillard
Roy
Savage
Scheer
Sgro
Silva
Skelton
Solberg
St-Cyr
St. Denis
Steckle
Strahl
Szabo
Thibault (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Alghabra
Ambrose
Anderson
Bachand
Bains
Barbot
Bélanger
Bellavance
Bezan
Blackburn
Bonsant
Bouchard
Bourgeois
Brison
Brunoogoe
Calkins
Cannis
Carrie
Casson
Chong
Coderre
Cullen (Etobicoke North)
D'Amours
Day
Demers
Devolin
Dion
Dryden
Easter
Epp
Fast
Flaherty
Folco
Fry
Galipeau
Godfrey
Goodale
Gourde
Grewal
Hanger
Harvey
Hearn
Hill
Holland
Jaffer
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Keeper
Khan
Kotto
Laforest
Lake
Lavallée
Lee
Lessard
Lukiwski
Lunney
MacKay (Central Nova)
Malhi
Manning
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McCallum
McGuire
McTeague
Ménard (Marc-Aurèle-Fortin)
Merrifield
Mills
Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)
Moore (Fundy Royal)
Murphy (Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe)
Nadeau

Albrecht
Allen
Anders
André
Bagnell
Baird
Batters
Bell (North Vancouver)
Benoit
Bigras
Blaney
Boshcoff
Boucher
Breitkreuz
Brown (Leeds—Grenville)
Brunelle
Cannan (Kelowna—Lake Country)
Cardin
Carrier
Chan
Clement
Comuzzi
Cuzner
Davidson
Del Mastro
Deschamps
Dhaliwal
Dosanjh
Dykstra
Emerson
Faille
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Freeman
Gagnon
Gallant
Goldring
Goodyear
Gravel
Guarnieri
Harper
Hawn
Hiebert
Hinton
Hubbard
Jean
Kadis
Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Komarnicki
Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)
Laframboise
Lauzon
LeBlanc
Lemieux
Lévesque
Lunn
Lussier
MacKenzie
Maloney
Marleau
Mayes
McGuinty
McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)
Ménard (Hochelaga)
Menzies
Miller
Minna
Murphy (Charlottetown)
Nicholson

PAIRED

Nil

(The House divided on Motion No. 11, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 216)

YEAS

Members

Angus
Bell (Vancouver Island North)
Charlton
Crowder
Davies
Godin
Layton
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Mathysen
Nash
Savoie
Stoffer

Atamanenko
Bevington
Christopherson
Cullen (Skeena—Bulkley Valley)
Dewar
Julian
Marston
Masse
McDonough
Priddy
Siksaya
Wasylycia-Leis— 24

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Alghabra
Ambrose
Anderson
Bachand
Bains
Barbot
Bélanger
Bellavance
Bezan
Blackburn
Bonsant
Bouchard
Bourgeois
Brison

Albrecht
Allen
Anders
André
Bagnell
Baird
Batters
Bell (North Vancouver)
Benoit
Bigras
Blaney
Boshcoff
Boucher
Breitkreuz
Brown (Leeds—Grenville)

Government Orders

Bruinooge
Calkins
Cannis
Carrie
Casson
Chong
Coderre
Cullen (Etobicoke North)
D'Amours
Day
Demers
Devolin
Dion
Dryden
Easter
Epp
Fast
Flaherty
Folco
Fry
Galipeau
Godfrey
Goodale
Gourde
Grewal
Hanger
Harvey
Hearn
Hill
Holland
Jaffer
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Keeper
Khan
Kotto
Laforest
Lake
Lavallée
Lee
Lessard
Lukiwski
Lunney
MacKay (Central Nova)
Malhi
Manning
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McCallum
McGuire
McTeague
Ménard (Marc-Aurèle-Fortin)
Merrifield
Mills
Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)
Moore (Fundy Royal)
Murphy (Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe)
Nadeau
Norlock
Obhrai
Owen
Pallister
Paradis
Perron
Petit
Plamondon
Prentice
Proulx
Ratansi
Regan
Richardson
Rota
Russell
Scarpaleggia
Schellenberger
Shipley
Simms
Smith
Sorenson
St. Amand
Stanton
Storseth
Sweet
Temelkovski
Basques)

Brunelle
Cannan (Kelowna—Lake Country)
Cardin
Carrier
Chan
Clement
Comuzzi
Cuzner
Davidson
Del Mastro
Deschamps
Dhaliwal
Dosanjh
Dykstra
Emerson
Faille
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Freeman
Gagnon
Gallant
Goldring
Goodyear
Gravel
Guarnieri
Harper
Hawn
Hiebert
Hinton
Hubbard
Jean
Kadis
Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Komarnicki
Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)
Laframboise
Lauzon
LeBlanc
Lemieux
Lévesque
Lunn
Lussier
MacKenzie
Maloney
Marleau
Mayes
McGuinty
McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)
Ménard (Hochelaga)
Menzies
Miller
Minna
Murphy (Charlottetown)
Nicholson
O'Connor
Ouellet
Pacetti
Paquette
Pearson
Peterson
Picard
Poilievre
Preston
Rajotte
Redman
Reid
Robillard
Roy
Savage
Scheer
Sgro
Silva
Skelton
Solberg
St-Cyr
St. Denis
Steckle
Strahl
Szabo
Thibault (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les

Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Toews
Trost
Tweed
Van Loan
Verner
Wallace
Warkentin
Wilfert
Wilson
Yelich

Tilson
Tonks
Turner
Van Kesteren
Vellacott
Vincent
Warawa
Watson
Williams
Wrzesnewskyj
Zed— 216

PAIRED

Nil

(The House divided on Motion No. 12, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 217)

YEAS

Members

Angus
Bell (Vancouver Island North)
Charlton
Crowder
Davies
Godin
Layton
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Mathysen
Nash
Savoie
Stoffer

Atamanenko
Bevington
Christopherson
Cullen (Skeena—Bulkley Valley)
Dewar
Julian
Marston
Masse
McDonough
Priddy
Siksay
Wasylycia-Leis— 24

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Alghabra
Ambrose
Anderson
Bachand
Bains
Barbot
Bélanger
Bellavance
Bezan
Blackburn
Bonsant
Bouchard
Bourgeois
Brisson
Bruinooge
Calkins
Cannis
Carrie
Casson
Chong
Coderre
Cullen (Etobicoke North)
D'Amours
Day
Demers
Devolin
Dion
Dryden
Easter
Epp
Fast
Flaherty
Folco
Fry
Galipeau
Godfrey
Goodale
Gourde
Grewal
Hanger
Harvey

Albrecht
Allen
Anders
André
Bagnell
Baird
Batters
Bell (North Vancouver)
Benoit
Bigras
Blaney
Boshcoff
Boucher
Breitkreuz
Brown (Leeds—Grenville)
Brunelle
Cannan (Kelowna—Lake Country)
Cardin
Carrier
Chan
Clement
Comuzzi
Cuzner
Davidson
Del Mastro
Deschamps
Dhaliwal
Dosanjh
Dykstra
Emerson
Faille
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Freeman
Gagnon
Gallant
Goldring
Goodyear
Gravel
Guarnieri
Harper
Hawn

Government Orders

Hearn	Hiebert
Hill	Hinton
Holland	Hubbard
Jaffer	Jean
Jennings	Kadis
Karetak-Lindell	Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)
Keeper	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Khan	Komarnicki
Kotto	Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)
Laforest	Laframboise
Lake	Lauzon
Lavallée	LeBlanc
Lee	Lemieux
Lessard	Lévesque
Lukiwski	Lunn
Lunney	Lussier
MacKay (Central Nova)	MacKenzie
Malhi	Maloney
Manning	Marleau
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Mayes
McCallum	McGuinty
McGuire	McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)
McTeague	Ménard (Hochelaga)
Ménard (Marc-Aurèle-Fortin)	Menzies
Merrifield	Miller
Mills	Minna
Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)	
Moore (Fundy Royal)	
Murphy (Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe)	Murphy (Charlottetown)
Nadeau	Nicholson
Norlock	O'Connor
Obhrai	Ouellet
Owen	Pacetti
Pallister	Paquette
Paradis	Pearson
Perron	Peterson
Petit	Picard
Plamondon	Poilievre
Prentice	Preston
Proulx	Rajotte
Ratansi	Redman
Regan	Reid
Richardson	Robillard
Rota	Roy
Russell	Savage
Scarpaleggia	Scheer
Schellenberger	Sgro
Shipley	Silva
Simms	Skelton
Smith	Solberg
Sorenson	St-Cyr
St. Amand	St. Denis
Stanton	Steckle
Storseth	Strahl
Sweet	Szabo
Temelkovski	Thibault (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les
Basques)	
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)	Tilson
Toews	Tonks
Trost	Turner
Tweed	Van Kesteren
Van Loan	Vellacott
Verner	Vincent
Wallace	Warawa
Warkentin	Watson
Wilfert	Williams
Wilson	Wrzesnewskyj
Yelich	Zed— 216

PAIRED

Nil

(The House divided on Motion No. 14, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 212)

YEAS

Members

Angus
Bell (Vancouver Island North)

Atamanenko
Bevington

Charlton
Crowder
Davies
Godin
Layton
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Mathysen
Nash
Savoie
Stoffer

Abbott
Alghabra
Ambrose
Anderson
Bachand
Bains
Barbot
Bélanger
Bellavance
Bezan
Blackburn
Bonsant
Bouchard
Bourgeois
Brisson
Bruinooge
Calkins
Cannis
Carrie
Casson
Chong
Coderre
Cullen (Etobicoke North)
D'Amours
Day
Demers
Devolin
Dion
Dryden
Easter
Epp
Fast
Flaherty
Folco
Fry
Galipeau
Godfrey
Goodale
Gourde
Grewal
Hanger
Harvey
Hearn
Hill
Holland
Jaffer
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Keeper
Khan
Kotto
Laforest
Lake
Lavallée
Lee
Lessard
Lukiwski
Lunney
MacKay (Central Nova)
Malhi
Manning
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McCallum
McGuire
McTeague
Ménard (Marc-Aurèle-Fortin)
Merrifield
Mills

Christopherson
Cullen (Skeena—Bulkley Valley)
Dewar
Julian
Marston
Masse
McDonough
Priddy
Siksay
Wasylcyia-Leis— 24

NAYS

Members

Albrecht
Allen
Anders
André
Bagnell
Baird
Batters
Bell (North Vancouver)
Benoit
Bigras
Blaney
Boshcoff
Boucher
Breitkreuz
Brown (Leeds—Grenville)
Brunelle
Cannan (Kelowna—Lake Country)
Cardin
Carrier
Chan
Clement
Comuzzi
Cuzner
Davidson
Del Mastro
Deschamps
Dhaliwal
Dosanjh
Dykstra
Emerson
Faille
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Freeman
Gagnon
Gallant
Goldring
Goodyear
Gravel
Guamieri
Harper
Hawn
Hiebert
Hinton
Hubbard
Jean
Kadis
Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Komarnicki
Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)
Laframboise
Lauzon
LeBlanc
Lemieux
Lévesque
Lunn
Lussier
MacKenzie
Maloney
Marleau
Mayes
McGuinty
McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)
Ménard (Hochelaga)
Menzies
Miller
Minna

Government Orders

Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)	
Moore (Fundy Royal)	
Murphy (Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe)	Murphy (Charlottetown)
Nadeau	Nicholson
Norlock	O'Connor
Obhrai	Ouellet
Owen	Pacetti
Pallister	Paquette
Paradis	Pearson
Perron	Peterson
Petit	Picard
Plamondon	Poilievre
Prentice	Preston
Proulx	Rajotte
Ratansi	Redman
Regan	Reid
Richardson	Robillard
Rota	Roy
Russell	Savage
Scarpaleggia	Scheer
Schellenberger	Sgro
Shipley	Silva
Simms	Skelton
Smith	Solberg
Sorenson	St-Cyr
St. Amand	St. Denis
Stanton	Steckle
Storseth	Strahl
Sweet	Szabo
Temelkovski	Thibault (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les
Basques)	
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)	Tilson
Toews	Tonks
Trost	Turner
Tweed	Van Kesteren
Van Loan	Vellacott
Verner	Vincent
Wallace	Warawa
Warkentin	Watson
Wilfert	Williams
Wilson	Wrzesnewskyj
Yelich	Zed— 216

PAIRED

Nil

(The House divided on Motion No. 15, which was negatived on the following division:)

*(Division No. 213)***YEAS**

Members

Angus	Atamanenko
Bell (Vancouver Island North)	Bevington
Charlton	Christopherson
Crowder	Cullen (Skeena—Bulkley Valley)
Davies	Dewar
Godin	Julian
Layton	Marston
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	Masse
Mathysen	McDonough
Nash	Priddy
Savoie	Siksay
Stoffer	Wasylcia-Leis— 24

NAYS

Members

Abbott	Albrecht
Alghabra	Allen
Ambrose	Anders
Anderson	André
Bachand	Bagnell
Bains	Baird
Barbot	Batters
Bélangier	Bell (North Vancouver)
Bellavance	Benoit
Bezan	Bigras
Blackburn	Blaney

Bonsant	Boshcoff
Bouchard	Boucher
Bourgeois	Breitkreuz
Brison	Brown (Leeds—Grenville)
Bruinooog	Brunelle
Calkins	Cannan (Kelowna—Lake Country)
Cannis	Cardin
Carrie	Carrier
Casson	Chan
Chong	Clement
Coderre	Comuzzi
Cullen (Etobicoke North)	Cuzner
D'Amours	Davidson
Day	Del Mastro
Demers	Deschamps
Devolin	Dhaliwal
Dion	Dosanjh
Dryden	Dykstra
Easter	Emerson
Epp	Faillie
Fast	Fitzpatrick
Flaherty	Fletcher
Folco	Freeman
Fry	Gagnon
Galipeau	Gallant
Godfrey	Goldring
Goodale	Goodyear
Gourde	Gravel
Grewal	Guamieri
Hanger	Harper
Harvey	Hawn
Hearn	Hiebert
Hill	Hinton
Holland	Hubbard
Jaffer	Jean
Jennings	Kadis
Karetak-Lindell	Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)
Keeper	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Khan	Komamicki
Kotto	Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)
Laforest	Laframboise
Lake	Lauzon
Lavallée	LeBlanc
Lee	Lemieux
Lessard	Lévesque
Lukiwski	Lunn
Lunney	Lussier
MacKay (Central Nova)	MacKenzie
Malhi	Maloney
Manning	Marleau
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Mayes
McCallum	McGuinty
McGuire	McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)
McTeague	Ménard (Hochelaga)
Ménard (Marc-Aurèle-Fortin)	Menzies
Merrifield	Miller
Mills	Minna
Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)	
Moore (Fundy Royal)	
Murphy (Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe)	Murphy (Charlottetown)
Nadeau	Nicholson
Norlock	O'Connor
Obhrai	Ouellet
Owen	Pacetti
Pallister	Paquette
Paradis	Pearson
Perron	Peterson
Petit	Picard
Plamondon	Poilievre
Prentice	Preston
Proulx	Rajotte
Ratansi	Redman
Regan	Reid
Richardson	Robillard
Rota	Roy
Russell	Savage
Scarpaleggia	Scheer
Schellenberger	Sgro
Shipley	Silva
Simms	Skelton
Smith	Solberg
Sorenson	St-Cyr
St. Amand	St. Denis
Stanton	Steckle

Government Orders

Storseth	Strahl
Sweet	Szabo
Temelkovski	Thibault (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les
Basques)	
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)	Tilson
Toews	Tonks
Trost	Turner
Tweed	Van Kesteren
Van Loan	Vellacott
Verner	Vincent
Wallace	Warawa
Warkentin	Watson
Wilfert	Williams
Wilson	Wrzesneskyj
Yelich	Zed— 216

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare Motions Nos. 5, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14 and 15 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 6.

Hon. Jay Hill: Mr. Speaker, I think if you were to seek it, you might find unanimous consent that the House would pass, unanimously, Motions Nos. 6, 7, 8 and 16.

The Speaker: Is it agreed that each of these motions will carry unanimously?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Speaker: I declare Motions Nos. 6, 7, 8 and 16 carried. (Motions Nos. 6, 7, 8 and 16 agreed to)

Hon. Peter Van Loan (for the Minister of Transport) moved that the bill be concurred in at the report stage with further amendments.

The Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (1800)

[*Translation*]

(The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(*Division No. 218*)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Albrecht
Alghabra	Allen
Ambrose	Anders
Anderson	André
Bachand	Bagnell
Bains	Baird
Barbot	Batters
Bélanger	Bell (North Vancouver)
Bellavance	Benoit
Bezan	Bigras
Blackburn	Blaney
Bonsant	Boshcoff
Bouchard	Boucher

Bourgeois	Breitkreuz
Brisson	Brown (Leeds—Grenville)
Bruinoogoe	Brunelle
Calkins	Cannan (Kelowna—Lake Country)
Cannis	Cardin
Carrie	Carrier
Casson	Chan
Chong	Clement
Coderre	Comuzzi
Cullen (Etobicoke North)	Cuzner
D'Amours	Davidson
Day	Del Mastro
Demers	Deschamps
Devolin	Dhaliwal
Dion	Dosanjh
Dryden	Dykstra
Easter	Emerson
Epp	Faillie
Fast	Fitzpatrick
Flaherty	Fletcher
Folco	Freeman
Fry	Gagnon
Galipeau	Gallant
Godfrey	Goldring
Goodale	Goodyear
Gourde	Gravel
Grewal	Guarnieri
Hanger	Harper
Harvey	Hawn
Hearn	Hiebert
Hill	Hinton
Holland	Hubbard
Jaffer	Jean
Jennings	Kadis
Karetak-Lindell	Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)
Keeper	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Khan	Komarnicki
Kotto	Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)
Laforest	Laframboise
Lake	Lauzon
Lavallée	LeBlanc
Lee	Lemieux
Lessard	Lévesque
Lukiwski	Lunn
Lunney	Lussier
MacKay (Central Nova)	MacKenzie
Malhi	Maloney
Manning	Marleau
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Mayes
McCallum	McGuinity
McGuire	McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)
McTeague	Ménard (Hochelaga)
Ménard (Marc-Aurèle-Fortin)	Menzies
Merrifield	Miller
Mills	Minna
Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)	
Moore (Fundy Royal)	
Murphy (Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe)	Murphy (Charlottetown)
Nadeau	Nicholson
Norlock	O'Connor
Obhrai	Ouellet
Owen	Pacetti
Pallister	Paquette
Paradis	Pearson
Perron	Peterson
Petit	Picard
Plamondon	Poilievre
Prentice	Preston
Proulx	Rajotte
Ratansi	Redman
Regan	Reid
Richardson	Robillard
Rota	Roy
Russell	Savage
Scarpaleggia	Scheer
Schellenberger	Sgro
Shiple	Silva
Simms	Skelton
Smith	Solberg
Sorenson	St-Cyr
St. Amand	St. Denis
Stanton	Steckle
Storseth	Strahl
Sweet	Szabo

Private Members' Business

Temelkovski
Basques
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Toews
Trost
Tweed
Van Loan
Verner
Wallace
Warkentin
Wilfert
Wilson
Yelich

Thibault (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les
Tilson
Tonks
Turner
Van Kesteren
Vellacott
Vincent
Warawa
Watson
Williams
Wrzesnewskyj
Zed— 216

NAYS

Members

Angus
Bell (Vancouver Island North)
Charlton
Crowder
Davies
Godin
Layton
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Mathysen
Nash
Savoie
Stoffer

Atamanenko
Bevington
Christopherson
Cullen (Skeena—Bulkley Valley)
Dewar
Julian
Marston
Masse
McDonough
Priddy
Siksay
Wasylcia-Leis— 24

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*English*]

WATER RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

The House resumed from June 15 consideration of the motion and of the amendment.

The Speaker: The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the amendment to Motion No. 249 under private members' business in the name of the hon. member for Brant.

• (1810)

[*Translation*]

(The House divided on the amendment, which was negatived on following divisions:)

(*Division No. 219*)

YEAS

Members

Alghabra
Atamanenko
Bains
Bell (Vancouver Island North)
Bevington
Brison
Chan
Christopherson
Crowder
Cullen (Etobicoke North)
D'Amours
Dewar
Dosanjh
Easter
Fry
Godin

Angus
Bagnell
Bélangier
Bell (North Vancouver)
Boshcoff
Cannis
Charlton
Comuzzi
Cullen (Skeena—Bulkley Valley)
Cuzner
Davies
Dhaliwal
Dryden
Folco
Godfrey
Holland

Hubbard
Julian
Karetak-Lindell
Layton
Lee
Maloney
Marston
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Mathysen
McDonough
McGuire
McTeague
Murphy (Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe)
Nash
Pacetti
Peterson
Ratansi
Regan
Russell
Savoie
Siksay
Simms
St. Denis
Stoffer
Temelkovski
Turner
Wilfert
Wrzesnewskyj

Jennings
Kadis
Keeper
LeBlanc
Malhi
Marleau
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Masse
McCallum
McGuinty
McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)
Minna
Murphy (Charlottetown)
Owen
Pearson
Priddy
Redman
Rota
Savage
Scarpaleggia
Silva
St. Amand
Steckle
Szabo
Tonks
Wasylcia-Leis
Wilson
Zed— 88

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Allen
Anders
André
Baird
Batters
Benoit
Bigras
Blaney
Bouchard
Bourgeois
Brown (Leeds—Grenville)
Brunelle
Cardin
Carrier
Chong
Davidson
Del Mastro
Deschamps
Dykstra
Epp
Fast
Flaherty
Freeman
Galipeau
Goldring
Gourde
Grewal
Harper
Hawn
Hiebert
Hinton
Jean
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Komarnicki
Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)
Laframboise
Lauzon
Lemieux
Lévesque
Lunn
Lussier
MacKenzie
Mayes
Ménard (Marc-Aurèle-Fortin)
Merrifield
Mills
Moore (Fundy Royal)
Nicholson
O'Connor
Ouellet

Albrecht
Ambrose
Anderson
Bachand
Barbot
Bellavance
Bezan
Blackburn
Bonsant
Boucher
Breitkreuz
Bruinooge
Cannan (Kelowna—Lake Country)
Carrie
Casson
Clement
Day
Demers
Devolin
Emerson
Faille
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Gagnon
Gallant
Goodyear
Gravel
Hanger
Harvey
Hearn
Hill
Jaffer
Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)
Khan
Kotto
Laforest
Lake
Lavallée
Lessard
Lukiwski
Lunney
MacKay (Central Nova)
Manning
Ménard (Hochelaga)
Menzies
Miller
Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)
Nadeau
Norlock
Obhrai
Pallister

Business of the House

Paquette	Paradis
Perron	Petit
Picard	Plamondon
Poilievre	Prentice
Preston	Rajotte
Reid	Richardson
Roy	Scheer
Schellenberger	Shikey
Skelton	Smith
Solberg	Sorenson
St-Cyr	Stanton
Storseth	Strahl
Sweet	Thibault (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les
Basques)	
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)	Tilson
Toews	Trost
Tweed	Van Kesteren
Van Loan	Vellacott
Verner	Vincent
Wallace	Warawa
Warkentin	Watson
Williams	Yelich— 144

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the amendment lost.

[*English*]

The next vote is on the main motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

(Motion agreed to)

[*Translation*]

Ms. Pauline Picard (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. With respect to the motion that you declared unanimously adopted by the House, I would like to point out for the record that we voted against this motion. It must therefore be deemed concurred in on division.

The Speaker: No problem.

Is there agreement to have this motion adopted on division?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

PROCEEDINGS OF THE HOUSE

Hon. Peter Van Loan (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. There seems to be some enthusiasm for some of the motions that I would like to put to the House right now. I will start with the first one. I move:

That, notwithstanding any Standing or Special Orders or usual practices of the House; Private Members' Business shall be cancelled and Government Orders shall continue during the time normally provided for Private Members' Business; after no more than one speaker per party has spoken to the second reading stage of C-64, the House shall adjourn for the day; provided that during debate on C-64, the Chair shall not receive any quorum calls, dilatory motions or requests for unanimous consent.

[*Translation*]

The Speaker: Does the hon. government House leader have the unanimous consent of the House to move the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The 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.

(Motion agreed to)

[*English*]

STANDING COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Hon. Peter Van Loan (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have another very interesting motion. I move:

That, at any time the House stands adjourned during June and July, 2007, the Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Development has ready a report, when that report is deposited with the Clerk, it shall be deemed to have been duly presented to the House.

[*Translation*]

The Speaker: Does the hon. government House leader have the unanimous consent of the House to move the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The 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.

(Motion agreed to)

[*English*]

STANDING COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

Hon. Peter Van Loan (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this is a motion that many members of Parliament have been lobbying me on and I know it is of great interest to many. I move:

That, at any time the House stands adjourned during June and July 2007, the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food has ready a report, when that report is deposited with the Clerk, it shall be deemed to have been duly presented to the House.

The Speaker: Does the hon. government House leader have the unanimous consent of the House to propose the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

The 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.

(Motion agreed to)

[*English*]

SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE

Hon. Peter Van Loan (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have another motion but I will read this one a little more slowly. I move:

Government Orders

That, notwithstanding any Standing or Special Orders or usual practices of the House, when the House adjourns on Wednesday, June 20, 2007, it shall stand adjourned until Monday, September 17, 2007, provided that, for the purposes of Standing Order 28, it shall be deemed to have sat on Thursday, June 21, and Friday, June 22, 2007; and, for the period of this adjournment only, in relation to Bill C-52, An Act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on March 19, 2007, Standing Order 28(3) shall read:

“Whenever the House stands adjourned, and at the request of the Government that the public interest requires that the House should meet at an earlier time, the Speaker shall give notice that the House shall meet for the sole purpose of considering Bill C-52, and thereupon the House shall meet to transact this said business. In the event of the Speaker being unable to act owing to illness or other cause, the Deputy Speaker, the Deputy Chair of Committees or the Assistant Deputy Chair of Committees shall act in the Speaker’s stead for all the purposes of this section”, Standing Order 28(4) shall be amended by replacing the word “may” with the word “shall” and Standing Order 32(1.1) shall be amended by deleting “to be given royal assent”.

• (1815)

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Wascana, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in order to have complete clarity with respect to the motion that the government House leader has just put forward in the House, I wonder if the government House leader could indicate to us the availability of precedents with respect to the constraint upon your discretion, which is involved in the reference in the motion to Standing Order 28(4).

That necessarily imposes a restraint on your discretion, Mr. Speaker, and substitutes instead the discretion of the government. I would be interested to know, since that is a serious matter in our Standing Orders, if the government House leader can inform the House, after consultation with the Table, which I am sure he has had, whether there are in fact the appropriate precedents for this type of provision to be included in an adjournment motion.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we have the clear assurance, because the wording of this motion is somewhat complex, that the special provisions being referred to here apply only in relation to this adjournment and only in relation to matters pertaining to Bill C-52.

Hon. Peter Van Loan: Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to assist the Liberal House leader.

In terms of the precedent, the whole nature of this motion is, of course, an amendment to Standing Order 28. The same constraints that are being applied to the Speaker’s discretion with regard to a recall of Parliament, in that it provides for it, are the same type of directions that are being provided in terms of the royal assent ceremony, which is the second aspect of this motion.

The intent of the motion and as it is drafted it would only create a right of recall for the government in relation to Bill C-52, the budget implementation bill.

The Speaker: Does the hon. the government House leader have the unanimous consent of the House to propose the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

The 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.

(Motion agreed to)

Mr. Yvon Godin: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order to indicate to the House that the NDP once made a mistake in the House and members were unwilling to do anything about it.

I see that the Bloc Québécois fell asleep this evening and forgot to vote on Motion M-249. I want to say to the House that it was very kind of us to agree to adopt the motion on division.

The Speaker: The clarification is very much appreciated.

[*English*]

Since the motion has carried, I would like, on behalf of all hon. members, to bid farewell to the pages of the House of Commons for 2006-07. The summer recess is almost upon us and we may not have another chance to thank all of you properly but I think you would all agree that being part of the 39th Parliament has been an exciting experience for us all.

• (1820)

[*Translation*]

On behalf of all my hon. colleagues of this House, I would like to thank you and congratulate you on all your hard work over the past year. Your task was not always easy, but you all performed very professionally and we thank you for that.

[*English*]

Today I ask you to receive our collective thanks and best wishes for your future endeavours. Perhaps some day soon I will have the pleasure of seeing you sitting at these desks and perhaps it was your experience with us that gave you the desire to serve as a member of Parliament.

[*Translation*]

Thank you for your excellent work. Good luck to you all in the future.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

[*English*]

The Speaker: Since there will be a debate now on this bill, following the adjournment of the House I assure all hon. members that there will be the usual reception in Room 216.

[*Translation*]

Everyone is invited. I hope you can all join your colleagues for a drink.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

PILOTAGE ACT

Hon. Peter Van Loan (for the Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities) moved that Bill C-64, An Act to amend the Pilotage Act, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

Mr. Brian Jean (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to present the House with Bill C-64, An Act to amend the Pilotage Act.

Government Orders

The Pilotage Act creates four pilotage authorities, the Atlantic, Laurentian, Great Lakes and Pacific, all of which are crown corporations. Pilotage in this particular case refers to the marine pilots who assist vessels in navigating coastal and inland waters, a very important issue in Canada with trade.

The amendments proposed in this bill would bring about the necessary administrative changes to the legislation that governs marine pilotage in Canada and would also provide these four pilotage authorities with the required administrative tools to assist them to become and remain financially solvent, a requirement under the Pilotage Act.

This bill is a critical step toward ensuring that legislative objectives and obligations in the act do not establish processes that contradict an authority's responsibility to remain financially self-sufficient and that the relationship between the pilotage authorities and pilot corporations is established as a commercial one, a very important piece of legislation.

Before I move on though, I would like to have an opportunity to provide the House with some background on the Pilotage Act and the impetus for the amendments to this particular bill and why it is so important at this stage.

The act allows for the creation of pilot corporations to provide pilot services via a commercial contract with an authority. Once a pilot corporation is formed in a specific area, an authority has no choice but to contract with the corporation for services. We now know, in essence, this creates a monopoly, which is not conducive to good business practices and an ongoing competitive environment that helps consumers and Canadians.

The act actually outlines how contract disputes between a pilotage authority and a pilot corporation are resolved via mediation and, if necessary, arbitration, which is based on a final offer selection process. During this process, the arbitrator selects one of the two final offers presented in its entirety. This means that the arbitrator cannot adjust the offers or select parts of an offer presented. He or she must make a choice.

Therefore, during service contract arbitration between an authority and a pilot corporation, an arbitrator could make a decision based on one of the two final offers presented, which could cause that authority to publish an amended tariff regulation. It is very important. The increased tariff sought by the amendment would allow that authority to cover the increased cost of the service contract.

As permitted under the Pilotage Act, stakeholders can file an objection with the Canadian Transportation Agency on the basis that the tariff increase is actually harmful to the public interest. The agency, in turn, can disallow the tariff increase on the grounds of public interest, a decision that can cause an authority to assume an unsustainable debt load.

Unfortunately, this is not entirely a hypothetical situation. This string of events recently occurred with regard to the Laurentian Pilotage Authority, which prompted Transport Canada and this government to seek approval via an order in council to rescind a Canadian Transportation Agency decision, a very rare event indeed to say the least and one we would prefer not to have to repeat, but if

this section of the act is not amended it is very likely it will take some intervention on the part of the government each and every year.

This action, however, was a temporary measure and this government looks for long term solutions to the issues which came about as a result of the governance related elements of the act that contradict the legislative requirement of an authority to be financially self-sufficient. Although the impetus for the amendments itself is the Laurentian Pilotage Authority's experience, as I just described, and the amendments provide a long term solution which we are looking for with regard to their specific issues, these amendments would not affect the way in which the other authorities conduct their business.

The amendments would provide options for all authorities to implement and they would give them flexibility to conduct business in a financially sustainable manner. This is a good thing.

The amendments in the proposed bill would provide specific additional tools to assist authorities to remain financially self-sufficient. These crucial amendments impact the governance tools for these crown corporations. As such, Bill C-64 is considered a "machinery of government bill" that is absolutely essential to carry out government business as it relates to the safe and efficient marine pilotage services and are strictly administrative in nature.

• (1825)

Our Prime Minister approved stakeholder consultations and as all members of the House are aware, the government consults with stakeholders because it is the right thing to do.

On four particular amendments to the act, late in January 2007 was when most of the consultations took place. Stakeholder reaction to the proposed amendments was swift and varied.

Two of the four amendments did not receive stakeholder support and as such the proposed amendments have been adjusted to reflect concerns raised by stakeholders during the consultations. Yes, the government listens and acts.

Two of the proposals received varying degrees of support with some stakeholders actually agreeing with our proposals and others adamantly opposing them. The proposed legislation therefore forges a middle road between the two, a compromise situation in the best interests of all parties involved.

As previously mentioned, the bill contains proposed amendments to the Pilotage Act relating to governance issues for crown corporations that do not impact the level of safety or the environment. Those are two very important issues for the government.

In order to add greater certainty to the functioning of the act concerning governance, the amendments proposed have the following five objectives and I would like to go through them.

The first objective is to introduce a level of flexibility in the process of engagement of pilots and to redefine the relationship between an authority and a pilot corporation as a commercial relationship.

Government Orders

The second objective is to amend the service contract negotiation process to reflect the commercial relationship to make sure it remains viable, competitive and adds proper service.

The third objective is to explicitly state that pilot authorities must remain financially self-sufficient. This is very important.

The fourth objective is to provide flexibility to the role that the department provides when amendments are made to specific regulations.

Finally, the fifth objective is to provide greater latitude to the Canadian Transportation Agency when reviewing objections to new tariff regulations published by an authority.

These are all great amendments and we are hoping that all members of the House will be able to support them and we believe they will.

The proposed amendments in the bill add flexibility to the Pilotage Act that will allow an authority to actually hire employee pilots while simultaneously contracting with the pilot corporation. If it makes good business sense to do so, and it does, with this change authorities would be free to hire their own employee pilots to match their workload and have the option of actually entering into a service contract with a pilot corporation if needed. In this way they can control their overall cost of providing the service and subsequently have greater control over their finances.

If an authority chooses to contract with the pilot corporation for services, then the proposed amendments in the bill will provide an even playing field, especially during service contract negotiations. If an authority and a corporation cannot agree on the terms of a contract, then mediation and arbitration is still a legislated requirement.

However, with these amendments the arbitrator will have the ability to actually assess the offers presented in light of a summary corporate plan of the authority and the legislated requirement for an authority to be financially self-sufficient. These are options not previously afforded to the arbitrator which are very important. The goal is to ensure that the arbitrator has taken into consideration the financial needs of the authority when rendering a decision.

With the proposed amendments in the bill the financial needs of the authority will also be considered by the Canadian Transportation Agency when it renders a decision on objections to tariff regulations.

It is important that the two entities mandated to make decisions impacting the financial self-sufficiency of a crown corporation use the same criteria on which to base their decisions. Given that the 2000 Auditor General's report stated: "The corporate plan is the cornerstone of the control and accountability framework for crown corporations", this amendment itself is relevant and will increase the significance of the corporate plan during arbitration and during CTA deliberations. This is very important.

• (1830)

Bill C-64 has been drafted in response to a significant negative financial situation experienced by one pilotage authority. While providing a solution for the Laurentian Pilotage Authority, it would

also give the remaining authorities options that would safeguard them from experiencing the same situation in the future.

The government listens to stakeholders and then makes the best decision possible.

The department's legislative initiatives remain consistent with the overall federal transportation framework. It emphasizes a national vision of safety, efficiency and environmental responsibility. These are three very important aspects to this government, especially the national vision. For so many years without a national vision, it takes this Prime Minister, this minister and this government to move forward with that agenda.

The changes introduced in Bill C-64 have been requested by some marine stakeholders and are welcomed by the Department of Finance, the Auditor General's Office and the Canadian Transportation Agency.

I ask for the support of all members of this House as I introduce Bill C-64. It is my pleasure to do so now.

Mr. Peter Julian (Burnaby—New Westminster, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to the parliamentary secretary.

Given the fact that the government is rushing forward with this bill that was only actually brought forward for first reading 48 hours ago, and because of some of the real problems we have seen in the transportation policy brought forward, thank goodness we just stopped Bill C-6 in the nick of time. At least Conservative members will have a few months to go home and think about the actions that they may take on Bill C-6.

Coming back to Bill C-64, the parliamentary secretary talked about consultations. This is the same Conservative government that has refused to bring marine employees in through their unions into a national marine advisory council, despite the fact that we have had very clear guidance from the transport committee saying that this needs to be put in place.

Marine employees, those workers who work in marine industries, need to be at the table when there is discussion around national marine transportation policy. It is logical. It makes sense that we would actually consult the people who know the most about marine policy. It is certainly not the CEOs. It is the people who actually do the job. Those are the folks who need to be consulted.

I enjoyed his speech, as I always do, but when he talked about stakeholders, could he tell us, were employees consulted, were unions consulted, or were the stakeholders simply company CEOs?

• (1835)

Mr. Brian Jean: Mr. Speaker, this gives me a great opportunity to answer the member's question specifically and to talk a bit about moving forward as the member mentioned.

We do get the job done on this side of the House. The government is moving forward with a tough agenda. We are not going to move forward like the NDP did on Bill C-6, which was actually moving backwards. We want to get the job done.

Government Orders

We did listen to stakeholders and we will continue to do so, from coast to coast to coast. I want to let the member know that I personally met with the union members and the officials he is speaking of from the marine industry representing the employees. I met with them and listened to them some four or five months before this issue even hit the radar screen on the NDP. So, we are listening and we are getting the job done.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mario Laframboise (Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities said he listened to the speeches. In reality, perhaps he heard them, but I am not sure if he actually listened to them. This is what bothers me.

I hope the parliamentary secretary is aware of the fact that pilotage is one of the safest ways to guarantee that we always have competent people in our waters, people who are familiar with the waters. I am thinking specifically about the waters of the St. Lawrence River, from which many cities draw water for their waterworks. That is also how it works in Mississippi and near other major water sources around the world where pilotage authorities exist, and this is the best way to go about it. When a visiting ship enters the waters of the St. Lawrence, it is handed over to a specialized pilot for the duration of its time in the St. Lawrence as it makes its way towards the Great Lakes. Pilotage authorities take charge of the ship.

We want to make sure this procedure is maintained. I am concerned that the proposed amendments—which are purely financially driven, it would seem—might jeopardize the entire pilotage safety system. Contrary to what the parliamentary secretary might say, the stakeholders and pilots do not approve of the bill being presented here today, and I know that for a fact.

[*English*]

Mr. Brian Jean: Mr. Speaker, I can confirm for the member that I have enjoyed sitting on the committee with him and all the other members. It has been a lot of fun to argue many points. We have not agreed on every point. In fact, sometimes we would take a balance on one side or take a balance on the other side. That is the reality of life. Not everybody is going to be happy with everything.

However, we tried to find a balance so that stakeholders are happy, both a little bit, and in fact that Canadians, for the most part, are going to be extremely happy. We get 90% of our goods through some form of pilotage in this country, through some form of shipping back and forth through our major ports. We have to make sure that continues and we are going to make sure it continues. We did listen to stakeholders.

I am looking forward to further input when this reaches committee. I really believe that the member, and all members of that committee, will work hard to get that job done.

Mr. Borys Wrzesnewskyj (Etobicoke Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member for the NDP previously raised the issue of union members and whether they were consulted. The parliamentary secretary said that they were consulted. It appears they may have been consulted, but the government did not listen to the advice.

Let me read a quote from Paul Devries, from the British Columbia Coast Pilots Ltd, who wrote that “Stakeholders on the west coast

unanimously agreed the proposed [changes] are counterproductive”. Could the parliamentary secretary tell us whether or not the stakeholders agreed, especially the ones he referenced earlier?

Mr. Brian Jean: Mr. Speaker, maybe that member was not listening to my speech. I assure him that we did listen. We had some specific amendments. We changed some of them because we could not get consensus with the stakeholders.

I know that the member is greatly concerned with the 300 or so pilots that we have in this country and so is this government. We are very concerned. Because they have an indirect accounting for some 90% of the trade that comes into this country, it is a very important issue.

It is important that Canadians continue to receive products, that the pilots in this country are treated fairly, and that Canadians are happy with the outcome of that. It is important that our trade continues and our economy continues to grow, and that we continue to enjoy the quality of life that we have had for so many years. This government is going to continue to make sure that happens for the Canadian people.

• (1840)

Hon. Michael Chong (Wellington—Halton Hills, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleague from Fort McMurray—Athabasca for bringing forward this work as we wind down the work in this House before the summer recess.

I have some comments tangentially related to this debate on Bill C-64, An Act to amend the Pilotage Act. The member has brought forward an important piece of work.

What we do here as members of Parliament is very important. What we are doing here today as we wind down for the summer break reminds me of the work that another distinguished Canadian did some 50 years ago in this place, somebody who represented the Great Lakes port of Hamilton. I am sure that had she been here today she would have been very proud.

Tomorrow marks the 50th anniversary of the establishment of the Diefenbaker government and the day the first woman was appointed a federal cabinet minister, and that woman was the Right Hon. Ellen Louks Fairclough.

I had the honour of meeting Madam Fairclough just a few years ago. She lived out her days in Dundas, Ontario. This remarkable woman served as minister of citizenship and immigration, and was postmaster general. She passed away in 2004 at the old age of 99 years. She demonstrated an interest in a wide variety of subjects, sort of like the subjects we are debating today: housing, income tax, employment insurance and the status of women. She introduced bills for equal pay for equal work of equal value. She was a member of Parliament for Hamilton West over four elections and one byelection.

I believe she was a role model for all of us, including the member for Fort McMurray—Athabasca, who is conducting the work of this government even in the last day before the summer recess. I commend him for his work on this issue. I am sure had Madam Fairclough been here today, this remarkable woman would have been an avid participant in this debate and would have been very supportive of the work that we are undertaking.

Government Orders

Mr. Brian Jean: Mr. Speaker, I can confirm with the member for Wellington—Halton Hills that I am very aware of Madam Fairclough's background. I had an example like that in my own life.

My own mother was instrumental in me coming here and she was very similar to Madam Fairclough as far as having a successful career in her community. Like all good Canadians, she stuck up for Canada, stuck up for the rights of individuals, women, and those people who are less fortunate and less able to do the job that they need to do. She was very successful in that and I am very proud of her.

Mr. Peter Julian: Mr. Speaker, I would like to come back to the parliamentary secretary on the issue of the national marine advisory council and getting the employees who do the work to be part of the advisory process to the government. We have had a number of questions which have exposed in a very short order the fact that many of the people who work in the marine industry do not support this bill. That is a major concern. Will the parliamentary secretary confirm that marine employees were consulted? Can he list who was consulted?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Royal Galipeau): The hon. parliamentary secretary has 15 seconds to give us that list.

Mr. Brian Jean: Mr. Speaker, certainly I think that is very important, but I would invite the member to come to my office at any time that is convenient for him, as I would invite any member from any party. I have instructions to cooperate with them fully and to provide any information I possibly can. I would be more than happy to do so at any time that is convenient for him.

Mr. Borys Wrzesnewskyj (Etobicoke Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in the debate on Bill C-64, an act to amend the Pilotage Act, a bill that was introduced yesterday in a mad rush by the government to try to convince Canadians that it is doing more than just producing taxpayer subsidized attack ads on its opponents and, of course, taxpayer subsidized logos for millionaire NASCAR race teams. With the government having run on the mantra of doing things differently, I guess Canadians are getting to see what doing things differently means for the Conservatives' 18 month old, tired, and not so new government.

Having said that, I note that Canada is blessed by three strikingly beautiful coasts and the St. Lawrence Great Lakes Seaway. We are a country blessed with a multitude of waterway systems that have played a defining role in the historic and economic development of our country.

Pilotage authorities have played a key role in ensuring a strong and safe marine transportation system. The four regional pilotage authorities, Atlantic, Laurentian, Great Lakes and Pacific, have played an important part in ensuring safe marine navigation in Canada.

Because pilotage authorities were created under the Pilotage Act, and each directed by a full time chairperson, they are crown corporations. Today the dynamics of Transport Canada are such that marine transportation, particularly marine transportation on the St. Lawrence Great Lakes trade corridor, is fiercely competitive with other transportation modes.

As pointed out in the submission of the Hamilton Port Authority during consultations in early March of this year, this competition has

led to marine transportation losing a portion of its traditional cargo to rail and truck transportation. While this competition between transportation modes will like be a permanent feature, a doubling of trade in 10 years and a tripling in 15 years is likely to place significant pressures on the capacity of land-based modes, which most Canadians, particularly those in urban centres like the greater Toronto area, already recognize as a fact of life.

In this context, those involved in the transportation of cargo recognize that they have a choice of modes and will always seek the most effective mode for their particular needs. Those in the marine industry have done their best to respond to the challenges they face and have worked diligently to improve their overall competitiveness in today's climate.

For instance, the St. Lawrence Seaway Management Corporation, which is now managing the assets of the seaway, recently introduced an incentive tolls program in an effort to draw in new business. As well, Canada port authorities are more interdependent and responsive to the needs of their customers.

Additionally, stakeholders have worked diligently to better market the potential of marine transportation. Once again, in the case of the St. Lawrence Great Lakes Seaway system, it is estimated to operate only at 50% of its capacity. Many stakeholders have underscored that this underutilization is largely due to expenses.

Some marine stakeholders have stressed that they face significant hurdles in the form of regulatory challenges, which include but are not limited to a pilotage regime. By working together under the Hwy H₂O marketing campaign to jointly promote the system, those in the marine industry have succeeded for a time in stopping the decline in tonnage and transits by attracting new business and new services onto the waterway.

The concern is, however, that this effort will not be sustainable, especially if the greater efficiencies passed back to customers are negated by excessive pilotage tariff increases. International vessel operators, commodity traders and other potential customers regularly cite pilotage as a disincentive. This is not just about cost. It is also about the reliability of service and the inability to predict with the required degree of accuracy what the pilotage cost, the bottom line, is going to be when contemplating a pro forma voyage estimate.

This is particularly challenging for the operators of the smaller multi-purpose type of vessels that potentially represent the future for the St. Lawrence Seaway and Great Lakes trade corridor. In fact, this sector has shown the greatest growth over the last two years.

● (1845)

It should be remembered that the Pilotage Act dates back to 1972 and governs the operation, maintenance and administration in the interests of safety and efficient pilotage service within one of the four regions. In short, pilotage authorities are in the business of mitigating risks to navigation and ensuring the protection of our marine environment.

Government Orders

Pilotage authorities can set fair and reasonable user charges that allow the authorities to sustain themselves financially. This means that pilotage authorities hire pilots either as employees or pilot corporations, and the act outlines how they are to negotiate service contracts with pilot corporations. Pilotage authorities are given broad powers in a number of areas of acquisition, as well as regulatory responsibilities.

When the consultations on the amendments to the Pilotage Act were held in early 2007, a number of important concerns remained. These concerns were underscored by the Shipping Federation of Canada, which stated that the consultation that took place focused exclusively on “the financial self-sufficiency of the pilotage authorities, rather than addressing the more pressing question of whether the Pilotage Act’s overall objectives of providing a safe and sufficient pilotage service are actually being met”.

While Bill C-64 claims to give pilotage authorities flexibility in the matter of engaging pilots, its overall effect will be to permit authorities to no longer be restricted to locally trained and locally engaged pilots. Given the expertise and the knowledge base that locally trained and locally engaged pilots bring to the table, and given their role in ensuring a strong and safe marine transportation system, this aspect of the bill should give pause to all concerned.

Furthermore, not only are there issues of an acceptable level of navigation safety in the four regions, but the cost factors for shippers and insurers in the event of an accident have yet to be fully determined within the scope of this proposed legislation. It is not yet clear that pilotage technology has advanced to the extent that pilots on our nation’s water systems have become expendable. The relatively few number of marine occurrences in the past year could very well be seriously jeopardized by this hastily drafted legislation.

Moreover, it appears that through this legislation pilots will be restricted to their job functions as pilots only. They in fact will not be permitted to serve as directors of their association and still hold their licence. Those associations also will have to operate without government assistance, having to meet all of their operating costs through sources that presumably come from fees only. This will also constitute an additional disincentive to serve on professional boards for pilots, who then only hold their licence if they restrict their activities to pilotage specifically.

The proposed amendments to the Pilotage Act would also have the effect of transferring additional investigative authority to the Department of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities, giving it the freedom to operate without regard for transparency and openness. The Conservative government’s mantra of transparency and openness appears to have been thrown out the window in this legislation.

The Minister of Transport would no longer be compelled to investigate upon receipt of notice of objection. The decision to do so would be at the minister’s discretion. The minister may also appoint a person to investigate the proposed regulation. That investigation could be done internally and the investigator would then report back to the minister. However, the minister would not be bound to do anything other than receive a report.

The bottom line is that there is no accountability here. The Conservatives like to talk accountability, but as this legislation shows, talking and delivering are two very different things, and Canadians continue to be shortchanged by this secretive and controlling government.

I would like to once again quote from the stakeholders who unanimously disagreed with this legislation. They stated that it was their hope that the government will take into consideration the views of those intimately engaged in the marine industry before proceeding further.

Unless there is a further substantial review of these proposed changes to the Pilotage Act that can take into account the concerns of all stakeholders, and where safety concerns are not trumped by other concerns, we cannot support this bill as it currently stands.

● (1850)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mario Laframboise (Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise on Bill C-64, which was introduced by the government and seeks to amend the Pilotage Act. I am glad to be taking part in this debate because it is important to look at the whole pilotage situation and understand how, in 1972, we came to have a Pilotage Act whereby our territorial waters are protected by qualified pilots who take charge of ships entering our waters.

I was saying earlier to the parliamentary secretary that we have to be careful when we open up the Pilotage Act, because in solving monetary problems, we may be threatening the security that has been in place for decades to protect our waters. This is especially important because there is more and more traffic in our territorial waters.

When I think of Quebec, I think of the St. Lawrence River and the St. Lawrence Seaway that leads to the Great Lakes. This is important, because there are more ships and boats plying these waters, pleasure craft and other vessels. We decided finally to protect the security of marine transport by ensuring that the pilots who take charge of ships and large marine craft trading in our waters are fully qualified and know the St. Lawrence River and Seaway like the back of their hand. It is impossible to completely avoid marine catastrophes or accidents, but the pilots have to know what they are doing and not just use the equipment. For years, people have been trying to have us believe that there is sophisticated electronic equipment. But there is no substitute for human experience when it comes to protecting the safety of our waters in conditions such as high winds and groundwater movement.

Government Orders

This is imperative for the Bloc Québécois. No law can jeopardize that safety, having foreign ships piloted by our own marine pilots who know the St. Lawrence, the St. Lawrence Seaway and the Great Lakes. That is the objective we must never forget and never jeopardize. When I meet with marine pilots and marine pilots' associations and they tell me that this bill could jeopardize the entire pilotage system, then I have a problem with this. As I was saying, I have a problem with this because there is more and more marine traffic and the water quality of the St. Lawrence, the St. Lawrence Seaway and the Great Lakes is even more important because most of the cities and towns along the river and the seaway get their drinking water from this wonderful navigable waterway, the St. Lawrence, the St. Lawrence Seaway and the Great Lakes. We cannot take any chances.

I listened closely to what the parliamentary secretary was saying and I know that there is a money problem, among other things, within the pilotage authority, in the Laurentians. In the past few years, the Laurentian Pilotage Authority has had some financial problems that could have been resolved and may be resolved in the coming weeks. Obviously, I know that the boards of administration of these authorities have pilots on them and also employers, shipowners and stakeholders.

We have been talking about the Laurentian Pilotage Authority's deficit for years. I think there will end up being some agreement since the shipowners have realized that the contract that was negotiated a number of years ago may have benefited them. I should point out that there are four authorities across Canada. Everything is going well for the other three, but for the Laurentian Pilotage Authority, there may have been a negotiation that benefited the shipowners. In my opinion, that is where the government could have stepped in. Not with a bill to change everything that is happening in the other authorities, but to be able, through negotiations, to put pressure on the shipowners.

● (1855)

He should have pointed out that there was a deficit at the Laurentian Pilotage Authority. It has difficulty hiring pilots and covering expenses. Pilots put in hours but are not paid because of the lack of money.

Personally, I thought that the Conservative government would have pushed the issue. On the contrary, it has made an amendment to the legislation that runs the risk of jeopardizing all the other pilotage authorities.

Having been the Bloc Québécois transport critic from 2000 to 2004—and also since the 2006 election—, I know that shipowners are constantly trying to have the pilotage system abolished.

The government must keep in mind that it must protect, for reasons of marine safety, the quality of the waters of the St. Lawrence Seaway and the Great Lakes, and also the Pacific waters around Vancouver. Safeguarding water quality is just too important.

Cities located along these navigable waterways draw their water from them. We must ensure that we never jeopardize this pilotage system. The objective of shipowners is to succeed in abolishing the pilotage system by any means. They claim that with today's

electronic equipment there is no longer a need for these pilots. Thus they can save money.

At this time, we cannot abandon the pilotage system because of the extent of marine traffic, not only merchant ships and freighters but also pleasure craft.

Let us look at what is happening on large bodies of water flowing inland in other countries, such as the Mississippi in the United States and others in Europe. They all have pilotage systems. It remains the best way to ensure that people with a thorough knowledge of the waterway take charge of the vessels. They know the winds, the waters and the groundwater movement. They know that, with torrential rain, sand accumulates at certain spots in some parts of the St. Lawrence River and that it shifts after a few days. The pilots are familiar with the geomorphology.

To become a pilot and to be a member of a pilotage association, you must take courses and pass the exams. That has been the case since pilotage associations were established. They are our best safety measure, even though they do not come with a 100% guarantee.

It is true that there have been some accidents. We are not the only ones in the world to do this. Everyone with major waterways entering their land is protected by pilots. I will repeat this for the Quebecers and Canadians listening, these pilots take charge of foreign ships.

As soon as these ships enter the St. Lawrence River, the pilots take charge. Each pilotage authority leads them to a particular destination. For example, if they must get to the Great Lakes, the pilots take them to the Great Lakes; if they must get to Quebec City, the pilots take them to Quebec City. If they must get to Montreal, another pilotage authority sets out from the mouth of the St. Lawrence and goes to Quebec City. There is also one from Quebec to Montreal. Then, another one takes over from Montreal to the Great Lakes. They exist in western Canada as well, in the Pacific. This ensures better safety.

I hope the government has understood this. We need to try to fix an administrative or monetary problem that was perhaps created by the industry. I am not accusing anyone, but this was allowed to deteriorate. Maybe it suited the shipowners that the Laurentian Pilotage Authority was not working, since this proved that the whole system did not work. I have a hard time accepting that. I am not sure that the shipowners are thinking about the interests of the people in the area and people in general when the time comes to make business decisions. It is their personal interests at stake instead of public interest.

● (1900)

We must bear in mind that history tends to repeat itself. Some businesses, even some Canadian businesses, fly all sorts of flags, in order to pay less taxes. I hope Canadians understand that the only thing these shipowners are thinking about is their bottom line, and not public interests.

Government Orders

The Conservative government must therefore stop protecting the shipowners' lobby because these people are thinking only of their own interests. Since becoming the transport critic for the Bloc Québécois, I have noted that the stated aim of these shipowners has always been to do away entirely with the whole pilotage system. They see it as an additional expense. Clearly, when their ships enter the waters of the St. Lawrence, making their way towards the Great Lakes, these ships are taken under the responsibility of specialized pilotage authorities and they must pay the pilots' wages. That is how it works. Each pilotage authority has its own pricing agreements, whether it is by the tonne, by the hour, or whatever the case may be.

As for the Laurentian Pilotage Authority, over the past few years, contract negotiations have been concluded to the detriment of pilots and to the advantage of shipowners. A good balance has never been achieved. The shipowners were the winners and the Laurentian Pilotage Authority has slowly been losing money. No one has been willing to say that the fees should be adjusted to allow it to get by. Why? Simply because there are more ships, and there is more transport and traffic, so this requires more pilots. In the manner in which the contract was negotiated, every time a pilot piloted, the authority was losing money. This explains why the deficit is higher than expected, and the government knows this.

With this bill, we hope to correct an administrative mistake, an economic mistake, a financial mistake. We run the risk of jeopardizing the entire pilotage system, which is protected by legislation adopted in 1972 that has never been reopened since. Why? Because it is too important.

The problem is that every time we try to touch this legislation, the pilots feel that the shipowners are trying to do away with them. The fact is that for shipowners, pilots are an unnecessary expense. But for the people living along the St. Lawrence River, the St. Lawrence Seaway or the Great Lakes, pilots are the best way of protecting their drinking water and their safety. Pilots prevent environmental disasters such as spills of oil, hazardous goods or anything else that could pollute the waters. We need pilots who can take charge of all foreign ships entering our waters and guide them through our beautiful waterways. Pilots are our best guarantee of safety.

Nothing is ever guaranteed 100%, but these pilots are trained, have diplomas and certificates and are supervised by the pilotage authorities. They know their area's geomorphology. For example, at the mouth of the St. Lawrence River in Quebec City, there is a pilot who knows that area. Another pilot will take ships from Quebec City to Montreal, and another from Montreal to the Great Lakes. They know their area, and each one has a particular specialty. This safeguards the waters of the St. Lawrence River, the St. Lawrence Seaway and the Great Lakes and protects the quality of those waters so that they are not polluted by disasters or shipping accidents.

Hon. members have no doubt grasped that the Bloc Québécois will always be opposed to this bill, especially since the pilots' associations have told us that they are opposed to the bill.

The government must continue negotiating, and I hope that in the coming weeks an agreement will be reached and the government will make shipowners understand that the Laurentian Pilotage Authority situation must be resolved. Clearly, the problem is contractual and financial. The government has many other ways of exerting pressure

on shipowners with a view to striking a balance. I hope that an agreement will be reached in the coming days and weeks.

Once this is resolved, the bill that was introduced today will no longer be necessary. In fact, it goes without saying that no pilotage authority should ever have a deficit. That is all well and good. The problem is that we have to make sure that everyone at the table understands that. We do not need legislation for that. They just need to sit down and strike a balance. We need the necessary revenue in order to pay the marine pilots who will take charge of the ships and so forth. That can be done without amending the legislation. All we need is people who want to sit down at a table, negotiate, get along well, and a government that wants to put pressure on the shipowners.

• (1905)

We do not need a government that gives in to pressure from the shipowners to abolish the legislation in order to get what they have been wanting for decades, the abolition, for purely financial reasons, of the pilotage system that guarantees our safety.

The Bloc Québécois will vote against Bill C-64. The members from the Bloc will be in committee to put forward amendments or to remove from this legislation everything they do not agree with. Much of what is in this bill should be taken out. We will see what happens.

Nonetheless, one thing is certain: what I heard come out of the mouth of the parliamentary secretary is not reassuring. The parliamentary secretary said that he was listening to the stakeholders. He was not listening to the stakeholders; he heard the stakeholders. He did not listen to them because the pilots said that was not what they needed. They did not need an amendment to the legislation, they needed the government to put pressure on the shipowners to resolve the problem of the Laurentian Pilotage Authority. That is all they needed.

There is nothing that reassures us in this bill. For a number of years we have gone to great lengths to ensure that this system was the best, not for shipowners, not for pilots, but for the safety of the people living along the St. Lawrence Seaway and the Great Lakes. We must ensure their safety and the safety of those navigating the waters. Many pleasure craft navigate these waters. We must also ensure the quality of the water, since a number of towns get their water from the St. Lawrence River, the Seaway or the Great Lakes. We must ensure the water quality. We must go a little further and tell the shipowners to stop thinking about the bottom line and start thinking about the people living along these great waterways, so that they can have an adequate and acceptable quality of life.

Government Orders

When we look at things objectively, we can see that everyone's problems must be set aside to focus on the public interest. Public interest requires an authority, a pilotage act and healthy pilotage authorities. At all times, we must take charge of foreign ships, those entering our waters whose pilots do not have the proper accreditation. Pilots must also have completed the course, been accredited and have the necessary licences to navigate these ships in our waters.

As I have already explained, each entity has its own accreditation. For example, from the mouth of the St. Lawrence to Quebec City is one accreditation. From Quebec City to Montreal is another, and from Montreal to the Great Lakes yet another. There is also one for the Pacific, in Vancouver. This is the best way of going about it. Canada is not the only country with such a system. This system is used on the Mississippi, in the U.S., and in other European countries where there are major inland navigable waterways. They all have this protection. We must ensure that local pilots who are familiar with the waters take charge of foreign vessels. We must keep this system even if Canadian companies tell us that these are our own ships. Canadian companies often fly under the flag of a foreign country and want the least expensive pilot. They do not care if the pilot is from Liberia or another country.

This bill definitely does not protect our citizens. The Bloc Québécois will vote against this bill.

• (1910)

Mr. Peter Julian (Burnaby—New Westminster, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I very much enjoyed the presentation given by my hon. colleague from Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel on the subject of Bill C-64, An Act to amend the Pilotage Act.

He very clearly stated that lobbyists and business leaders prefer to disregard the importance of safety as ships navigate the waters of Quebec and British Columbia, where there are very competent, trained people who are very familiar with the waters. This is an important factor. This is an example of how this government gives in to pressure without considering the repercussions.

Here on this side of the House, we said the same thing about Bill C-6. In an effort to save money, air industry lobbyists applied a great deal of pressure to diminish airline safety. Fortunately, the NDP managed to prevent the passage of Bill C-6 here today. I hope the government will rethink its entire approach to this issue.

I have two questions for my hon. colleague. First of all, in both cases, that is, Bill C-6 and Bill C-64, did he notice the government's tendency to give in to pressure from lobbyists?

Second, does he agree with us that Bill C-6 and Bill C-64 should be withdrawn?

Mr. Mario Laframboise: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like my colleague for Burnaby—New Westminster, who does an excellent job for British Columbia and who is a strong champion of that province, to distinguish between Bill C-6 and Bill C-64, which is before us.

He knows very well that Bill C-6 was supported not only by the owners' lobby but also by the pilots and the flight attendants. They represent two completely different worlds. Bill C-6 implements the safety management system for airports and all things pertaining to

airplanes. Airlines need this dual safety net. My colleague has not yet come to an understanding of that fact. However, he will probably be able to understand that we have been able to protect the inspections. It is important to have a safety management system not only to ensure that companies implement an internal plan to improve safety based on voluntary reports, but also to ensure that an inspection system is in place. I am thoroughly convinced that we have protected this aspect.

The Bloc Québécois amendments, most of which he supported, were designed to put in place a proper inspection system, which the rail system does not have. Since we are looking at this issue this afternoon, the rail system has a safety management system, but there is no legislation providing for an inspection system. Therein lies the problem. There are only 25 railway inspectors for the whole country, whereas there are about 800 inspectors in the airline industry in Canada. We need to protect that, and I believe that is what we have done in Bill C-6.

However, he is quite right about Bill C-64. Attempts are being made to resolve this issue, but the ship owners' lobby is very strong. I was lobbied between 2000 and 2006. The ship owners' lobby is very strong on the issue of pilotage. This lobby believes that it can replace people with machines, but that is not how things work. It would be a good idea for us to sit down with the pilots so that they can explain that geomorphology is not something a machine can handle when there is wind or flooding in an area or when groundwater shifts sandbanks.

These people know how things work and where the water runs down off the mountains and where it flows into the St. Lawrence River, in the estuary or in the seaway. These people know their stuff, just as they must in British Columbia. They know how things work. Pilotage takes a human being, and a machine is no substitute. This is true elsewhere in the world, and I see no reason why things should be different here.

I agree with my friend about Bill C-64. The Bloc Québécois and the NDP will block the ship owners' lobby again. We will make sure the quality of our waters can never be threatened. When all is said and done, we are protecting neither the pilots nor the ship owners, but the people who live near our beautiful bodies of water and often get their drinking water from them. We need to avoid disasters and accidents wherever possible.

• (1915)

Mr. Peter Julian: Mr. Speaker, I know it is difficult given that there are so many people who want to ask questions. I would say to my colleague from Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel that the total number of air safety inspectors is decreasing. The Standing Committee on Transport, Infrastructure and Communities noted that the number of inspector positions went from 800 to fewer than 700. So we see, again, that the Conservative government is not ready to fill vacant positions. Bill C-6 has shown us that there is a gradual and consistent decrease in the number of inspectors. Even if the NDP and the Bloc Québécois made amendments, Bill C-6 is still seriously flawed.

Government Orders

Lobbyists did in fact apply pressure, but, apart from the pilots who talked about safety management systems, very few people addressed the practical outcome of this debate. My colleague is quite right about Bill C-64, because it was indeed pressure that ultimately led to the change and to the bill. I do not understand why he fails to see the similarities between Bill C-64 and Bill C-6. Although Bill C-6 was improved by the amendments of the Standing Committee on Transport, Infrastructure and Communities, it is still far from guaranteeing airline safety as much as we all would like. Similarly, Bill C-64 does not do enough to ensure safety in the marine transportation sector.

Does my hon. colleague from Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel not see the similarities between the two bills?

• (1920)

Mr. Mario Laframboise: Mr. Speaker, I have an opportunity to try and educate my colleague. The Bloc Québécois was the first party to vote against Bill C-6. Having heard from both union and management witnesses in committee, the Bloc Québécois is firmly convinced of the value of a safety management system based on voluntary reporting. In fact, Bill C-6 is designed to create an environment where all airline employees, including administrative staff, who are often part of management, can voluntarily report safety problems without danger of prosecution or reprisals. We are firmly convinced that this is the right course of action and that it protects the number of inspectors.

That is why the Bloc Québécois made sure the government understood that Transport Canada was headed toward a system where traditional inspection was being replaced, and that is why the Bloc supported the arguments made by the ICAO representatives who came to meet with us. My colleague was there. They told us that Canada was a world leader in safety, certainly because it had one of the world's most effective inspection programs. We must make sure this inspection system is maintained.

The problem I have—my colleague probably has the same problem—is with the number of inspectors. I was very disappointed that what the employee network was saying did not correspond to reality. Not as many inspectors left as my colleague claims. It is not true. I wish it were true; it is not that I would not have liked that. Nonetheless, it is not true that so many pilot inspector positions were lost. There are roughly 30 fewer positions than there were 10 or 15 years ago, which is not as bad as we first thought. When Justice Moshansky presented this to us, he said the number dropped from 1,400 to 800, and I thought that was incredible. I am disappointed that some people exaggerated.

I do not believe what my colleague is suggesting about there being fewer pilot inspectors. There are slightly fewer, but I think in light of what we made the government realize, it wants the same level of safety that we do. I therefore have the feeling that the pilot inspector positions—

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Andrew Scheer): Resuming debate, the hon. member for Burnaby—New Westminster.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Peter Julian (Burnaby—New Westminster, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise to speak to Bill C-64. I expect to speak

at length on this bill because there is a great deal to be said. However, I realize that, under the Standing Orders, I will only have 20 minutes.

First, I would like to explain the process that has led us, this Wednesday evening before the summer recess, to a discussion of this bill. Then, I will touch on our concerns, in this part of the House, with regard to this government's policies in the area of transportation. What it is doing is not in the interests of Canadians. I will come back to that. Finally, I will speak about the pilotage system and the impact of what the government is introducing today.

I will take my time in talking about these three aspects. I know that we will come back to this bill at second reading and that we will have an opportunity in the fall to discuss it in more detail.

[*English*]

I would like to start by speaking about the process around Bill C-64, which raises red flags right off the bat, particularly when we saw what happened with Bill C-6 which the NDP was basically able to stop the House from adopting today, thankfully. That bill would have pushed Canadian airlines right over the cliff in terms of safety and security for Canadians and their loved ones who are travelling on Canadian flights.

Thankfully, we in the NDP dug in our heels. We said it was inappropriate legislation and it should not pass. Now Canadians from coast to coast to coast will have the chance this summer to write to their members of Parliament and say it is unacceptable that the Conservative government diminishes flight safety.

It is unacceptable that the government created a get out of jail free card for company CEOs no matter what they do, as long as they record it in their internal systems. Transport Canada is handing over safety preoccupations to the companies themselves. Essentially that information cannot be used against the company CEOs to prosecute them, so they get a get out of jail free card.

The secrecy that we have talked about in terms of Bill C-6 is absolutely appalling, and I will come back to that in a moment. There is also the fact that there is no whistleblower protection.

Thankfully, tonight the NDP stopped the government and the Liberal Party in their tracks from taking the airline industry over a cliff.

Now we see the same sort of process developing for Bill C-64. This bill was brought forward for first reading yesterday. It was just thrown into the House rapidly and the government is insisting that it go to second reading today, very quickly.

Government Orders

What is it about the government orientation and initiative that it cannot intervene when it comes to the housing crisis, to support more access to post-secondary education, to deal with the health care crisis or to deal with the myriad difficulties that Canadians are living through? There have been a quarter of a million manufacturing jobs lost in the last few years. We have seen the softwood crisis ignite because of the softwood sellout. In each case the Conservative Party will not react.

The Conservatives act like deer caught in the headlights. They cannot do a thing to fix some of these crises that Canadians are experiencing but they find lobbyists who say we should amend the Pilotage Act and within 24 hours that legislation is pushed into the House, and the government wants to take it to second reading and pass it. The Conservatives cannot deal with any real problems. They avoid dealing with any of the real crises and problems that ordinary working families are experiencing but when a lobbyist pushes something, that bill comes right into the House. That is absolutely unacceptable.

The parliamentary secretary was talking a few minutes ago about consultations. He said he consulted stakeholders and despite the fact that colleagues from three corners of the House all asked him to reveal the names of anybody beyond company CEOs that he actually consulted, he did not come up with any names. We pressed him to reveal who these stakeholders were, these anonymous stakeholders who somehow believe this is great legislation. He was not able to reveal any of those names, which puts in doubt the entire background information that was provided in the news release that the minister pushed forward when he announced that he wanted to ram this bill through Parliament.

When the Conservatives talked about stakeholder consultation they mentioned a couple of towns. They met with somebody at some point I guess, yet they cannot reveal any of the actual employee groups, the people who do the work in marine transportation in Canada. It certainly raises red flags about what exactly the government is doing.

The Conservatives race to bring this bill to the House rather than address any of the real issues that Canadians are facing. They say that they have done some sort of consultation but they cannot reveal any names.

Then, to top it all off, we have seen how the Conservative government has derided and disrespected the marine employees themselves, the folks who do the work on shipping from coast to coast. The folks who actually do the work, the marine transport workers, the unions, the employee groups that are actually out there doing the work do not appear to have been consulted at all.

● (1925)

We have seen the government move in a direction where there is no more national marine advisory council. The national marine advisory council has been gutted. It used to exist to actually provide very important input from ordinary working men and women who work in the marine industry. They were cut right out and now this little elite group of CEOs was put together.

The transport committee sat on this issue and directed the government to bring all stakeholders together, to bring employee

groups in, unions representing ordinary men and women who work in the marine industry, so that there would be real consultations.

So far the government has absolutely refused to have anything other than an elite process with CEOs. That is unacceptable despite the fact the transport committee provided clear direction.

When the parliamentary secretary said the government has had these consultations or it has actually listened to people in the marine industry, I am exceedingly skeptical about what consultations actually took place.

I will come back to this in a moment because then we can talk about what the actual results are of Bill C-64, the bill that the government is trying to ram through in a couple of days apparently.

I raised the issue about the overall orientation of the government on transportation policy and I would like to give two examples of why I am concerned with Bill C-64.

There are two reasons why I have some real concerns about where the government is heading and where the transport minister is heading. First, we had an attempt by the government last year to actually reduce the number of flight attendants on Canadian flights.

Why is that important? Flight attendants play that key safety and security role, particularly when there is evacuation required of an aircraft. We had the Air France disaster a couple of years ago where flight attendants played an extremely key role in ensuring that there was no major loss of life in that accident. The flight attendants were there to evacuate passengers.

If we think about it, the plane crashes and it is on fire and 100 people have to get out. The flight attendants are needed to help those individuals, particularly seniors and people with disabilities, to ensure that everyone gets out alive. There are only seconds to do that.

Ensuring that there are an adequate number of flight attendants on Canadian flights is of utmost importance. Yet, the government moved last year in the month of June to actually diminish the number of flight attendants on Canadian flights. What is wrong with that picture? It would have meant more danger for Canadians travelling on Canadian flights.

The NDP rolled up its sleeves as it is want to do and pushed the government back. The Conservative members in the House know very well that we forced the minister to retreat from that really irresponsible position and he has subsequently said that he will not lower the flight attendant ratio. He will not provide an excuse for airline companies to put a smaller number of flight attendants on Canadian flights. That means that Canadians are more secure. That is one example.

Let me refer to the other example, which is Bill C-6, which the NDP stopped in its tracks today. As a matter of fact all members of Parliament from the NDP were speaking on that bill and we managed to stop the government's agenda, which was to try to push through Bill C-6.

Government Orders

What does Bill C-6 do? It simply contracts out safety from Transport Canada to other companies. Some companies will be responsible, there is no doubt. Some companies will be very responsible. We have seen with the railways that some companies handle the additional responsibility of safety and hold the issue of safety uppermost in their minds, but other companies do not.

We saw with the railway industry when that was done how the CEO of CN decided that cutting corners was quite okay. Corners were cut to increase profits.

What we have seen in British Columbia and in other communities across the country is a lot more environmental devastation and loss of life because the CEO of CN was not as concerned about safety as he was concerned about profits. We essentially saw a gutting of the safety culture within CN. That is not me speaking.

• (1930)

The actual audit done on CN showed there was a dysfunctional relationship between upper management and those who did the work in regard to safety. Many of the workers at CN felt they were getting excessive pressure to try to simply cut corners on safety.

The government is now doing the exact same thing with the airline industry. It is saying that it will contract that out and companies will have to take care of themselves. What is wrong with that? Witnesses at transport committee said very clearly that would lead to a race to the bottom. Even presidents of airline companies, like Kirsten Brazier, who came forward from Dax Air, said that if we put this system into place, it would be a race to the bottom and companies would try to cut corners in order to stay alive.

That is what the Conservative government is doing. It is giving away the transportation responsibility for safety to the airline companies. Even more, the government is saying that a company CEO who makes a huge error will be protected. This is a get out of jail free card. The CEO will not be prosecuted.

There is also an excessive, absolutely paranoiac level of secrecy and confidentiality. The safety information that used to be part of the public domain, safety information that Canadians should have access to know which airline to choose, will now be treated like confidential tax information and locked away for decades.

Imagine how Canadians would feel if they put their loved ones on a Canadian flight, that airplane crashed and they found out 20 years after the fact that Transport Canada was well aware of the safety violations, but chose to do nothing about it. Therefore—

• (1935)

Mr. Dave Batters: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I have listened with great interest to my friend opposite, as the last hours of this session of Parliament wind down. He was here earlier today and he spoke many times to Bill C-6, the Aeronautics Act, which involved airplanes, pilots of airplanes and those types of issues. Now we are debating Bill C-64, the Pilotage Act. We are not talking about pilotage of airplanes any more. We are talking about the pilotage of ships.

I wonder if the member could try to stick a bit closer to the topic, the Pilotage Act, and leave Bill C-6 alone for a bit. We debated that

bill at length earlier today. Could the member be a bit more relevant in his comments?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Andrew Scheer): I appreciate the reminder from the hon. member for Palliser. The hon. member for Burnaby—New Westminster knows that he has to stay as closely as possible to the pertinent details of the bill before the House, which is Bill C-64.

Mr. Peter Julian: Mr. Speaker, this is obviously a huge sore point with the Conservatives in the room and I can understand. They are very sensitive to Bill C-6 and the very reckless and irresponsible tack that they took on that bill. However, Canadians will be happy to learn that the NDP stopped them in their tracks today. The bill is not law and hopefully over the next few months Canadians will make their voices heard.

It is important, relevant and pertinent because if we have concerns about the overall policy orientation of the government, coming back to Bill C-64, it is extremely relevant when we see the kinds of problems and mistakes in policy that the Conservatives have already made. Thankfully, one Conservative has just acknowledged that they have made a lot of mistakes, which is good. The first step of the rehabilitation program for the Conservatives is when they admit the mistakes they are making. Hopefully later on they can move to reconciling and actually fixing some of the errors that they have made in this first year and a half in government.

Because the orientation of the government raises serious concerns, when we look at Bill C-64 it brings more red flags. We have seen what the Conservatives tried to do with flight attendants after a lobbyist talked to them. We have seen what they tried to do with Bill C-6 after a lobbyist talked to them. Now we have the same kinds of issues raised with the act to amend the Pilotage Act.

What do we have? We have well-trained pilots who navigate coastal waters, particularly around the St. Lawrence Seaway. However, in my case, coming from British Columbia, what we are talking about, in many parts of the Pacific coast, are dangerous waters that can be very treacherous and that need to be known well and the pilots who navigate off the British Columbia coast are people who have a vast degree of experience and ability. They have been well-trained and they understand the importance of understanding the coastal waters. That training is an important asset to ensure that there are no accidents.

As we have seen when we look at Bill C-6, if the government's intention is to cause more accidents, one has to wonder why. What is the counterbalance? The Conservatives say in their news release, the same one that talked about consultations, and we know how credible that was, that flexibility will be important for authorities.

Government Orders

Flexibility, meaning what? Does it mean that they can hire people who do not have that high level of qualification? We fear that is the intent and that it is all influenced by dollars. The government is running billions and billions of dollars of surplus and it has not chosen to deal with any of the crises that many Canadians are experiencing, like the homelessness crisis. Certainly the Liberals did not put in place a housing program but the Conservatives have not chosen to either. What they want to do is simply put together surpluses without addressing some real issues.

We save a few dollars on pilots but we would have people who may be less qualified on the dangerous waters of the Pacific coast. That would make no sense whatsoever and that concerns us. When we look at the news release that accompanied this bill which the Conservatives tried to bring through in a matter of hours, it seems that the principal intention of the bill is to provide flexibility.

If the flexibility means hiring people who might not have the same degree of qualifications, of course we are concerned. If what it means is that we are trying to save a bit of money but putting our ships in danger, we are also talking about the marine environment and individuals, we need to think twice.

That is essentially the problem with Bill C-64. We look at the process where the Conservatives simply dropped the bill in the House a few hours ago and now want to bring it to second reading right away. The process raises concerns about where the government

is going. We have its track record on trying to diminish the flight attendant ratio and in trying to push through Bill C-6, which, thank goodness, the NDP stopped because it clearly was not in the Canadian public interest. Now we see with this orientation a similar problem.

● (1940)

We then have the bill itself which seems to be a way of perhaps saving some money but it does not really address the issue of safety, which must be utmost in the government's mind.

For those reasons, we in this corner of the House have real difficulty with this bill. We have difficulty with the government's orientation and transportation policy generally, and we have difficulty because we are concerned that the government has not consulted the marine employees, the unions that are involved in marine transportation and are the experts in how transportation policy should be adopted. The government did not choose to consult with them. That is unfortunate and that is why we will be opposing this bill.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Andrew Scheer): It being 7:43 p.m., pursuant to order made earlier today the House stands adjourned until Monday, September 17, 2007 at 11 a.m. pursuant to Standing Orders 28 and 24.

(The House adjourned at 7:43 p.m.)

CONTENTS

Wednesday, June 20, 2007

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Dairy Farmers of Canada	
Mr. Gourde	10889
Relay for Life	
Mr. Rota	10889
Petite-Rivière-Saint-François Massif	
Mr. Guimond	10889
Aboriginal Women	
Ms. Crowder	10890
Stem Cell Research	
Mr. Lunney	10890
John Turnbull	
Mr. Savage	10890
Tax Freedom Day	
Mr. Lake	10890
Claude Poudrier	
Ms. Brunelle	10891
Justice Legislation	
Mr. Norlock	10891
Jean Cadieux	
Mr. Murphy (Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe)	10891
The Budget	
Mr. Dykstra	10891
Kelly Morrisseau	
Mr. Dewar	10891
National Aboriginal Day	
Ms. Keeper	10892
Hate Propaganda against Women	
Ms. Demers	10892
World Refugee Day	
Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	10892
Government Policies	
Mr. Preston	10892
ORAL QUESTIONS	
Afghanistan	
Mr. Dion	10893
Mr. Harper	10893
Equalization Formula	
Mr. Dion	10893
Mr. Harper	10893
Mr. Dion	10893
Mr. Harper	10893
Afghanistan	
Mr. Ignatieff	10893
Mr. Harper	10893
Mr. Ignatieff	10894
Mr. Harper	10894
Equalization Formula	
Mr. Duceppe	10894
Mr. Harper	10894
Mr. Duceppe	10894
Mr. Harper	10894
Mr. Crête	10894
Ms. Ambrose	10894
Mr. Crête	10894
Ms. Ambrose	10894
Health	
Mr. Layton	10894
Mr. Clement	10895
Mr. Layton	10895
Mr. Clement	10895
Status of Women	
Ms. Minna	10895
Mrs. Yelich	10895
Official Languages	
Ms. Folco	10895
Ms. Verner	10895
Child Care	
Ms. Ratansi	10895
Mr. Solberg	10896
Aboriginal Affairs	
Ms. Neville	10896
Mr. Prentice	10896
Securities Industry	
Mr. St-Cyr	10896
Ms. Ablonczy	10896
Mr. St-Cyr	10896
Ms. Ablonczy	10896
Agriculture and Agri-Food	
Mr. Bellavance	10896
Mr. Paradis	10896
Mr. Bellavance	10897
Mr. Paradis	10897
Income Trusts	
Mr. Turner	10897
Mr. Van Loan	10897
The Environment	
Mr. Regan	10897
Mr. Baird	10897
Ministerial Expenses	
Mr. Holland	10897
Mr. Van Loan	10897

Health

Ms. Fry	10898
Mr. Clement	10898

Democratic Reform

Mr. Hawn	10898
Mr. Harper	10898

Consumer Affairs

Ms. Priddy	10898
Mr. Clement	10898
Ms. Priddy	10898
Mr. Clement	10898

Softwood Lumber

Mr. Wilson	10899
Mr. Emerson	10899

Automobile Industry

Mr. Bains	10899
Mr. Emerson	10899

Government Policies

Mr. Dryden	10899
Mr. Van Loan	10899
Mr. Dryden	10899
Mr. Van Loan	10899

Expenses of the Former Lieutenant Governor of Quebec

Mr. Laforest	10900
Mr. Cannon	10900
Mrs. Barbot	10900
Mr. Cannon	10900

Supply Management

Mr. Patry	10900
Mr. Paradis	10900

Foreign Affairs

Mr. Batters	10900
Mr. MacKay	10900

Veterans Affairs

Mr. Stoffer	10900
Mr. Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)	10901

Fisheries and Oceans

Ms. Bell (Vancouver Island North)	10901
Mr. Hearn	10901

Canada Summer Jobs

Mr. Savage	10901
Mr. Solberg	10901

Health

Mr. Lemieux	10901
Mr. Clement	10901

Presence in Gallery

The Speaker	10901
-------------------	-------

Resignation of Member

Mr. Peterson	10901
--------------------	-------

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**Ethics Commissioner**

The Speaker	10903
-------------------	-------

Government Response to Petitions

Mr. Lukiwski	10903
--------------------	-------

Committees of the House**Public Safety and National Security**

Mr. Day	10903
---------------	-------

Interparliamentary Delegations

Mr. Benoit	10903
Mr. Merrifield	10904
Mr. Cullen (Etobicoke North)	10904

Committees of the House**Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development**

Mr. Mayes	10904
-----------------	-------

Canadian Heritage

Mr. Schellenberger	10904
--------------------------	-------

Industry, Science and Technology

Mr. Rajotte	10904
-------------------	-------

Justice and Human Rights

Mr. Hanger	10904
------------------	-------

Petitions**Passports**

Mr. Angus	10904
-----------------	-------

Natural Health Products

Mr. Lunney	10904
------------------	-------

Age of Consent

Mr. Lunney	10905
------------------	-------

Income Trusts

Mr. Pacetti	10905
-------------------	-------

The Environment

Ms. Crowder	10905
-------------------	-------

Human Trafficking

Mrs. Smith	10905
------------------	-------

Employment Insurance

Mr. D'Amours	10905
--------------------	-------

Asbestos

Mr. Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	10905
------------------------------------	-------

Immigration

Mr. Benoit	10906
------------------	-------

Income Trusts

Mr. Szabo	10906
-----------------	-------

Natural Health Products

Ms. Nash	10906
----------------	-------

Federal Minimum Wage

Ms. Nash	10906
----------------	-------

Immigration

Ms. Nash	10906
----------------	-------

Employment Insurance

Mr. Godin	10906
-----------------	-------

Questions on the Order Paper

Mr. Lukiwski	10906
--------------------	-------

Questions Passed as Orders for Returns

Mr. Lukiwski	10907
--------------------	-------

Motions for Papers

Mr. Lukiwski	10908
(Motion agreed to)	10908

Pugwash Conferences

Ms. McDonough	10908
Motion	10908
(Motion agreed to)	10908

GOVERNMENT ORDERS**Aeronautics Act**

Bill C-6. Report Stage	10908
Mr. Masse	10908
Mr. Julian	10910
Ms. Nash	10910
Mr. Julian	10911
Mr. Cullen (Skeena—Bulkley Valley)	10912
Mr. Julian	10913
Mr. Siksay	10914
Ms. Bell (Vancouver Island North)	10916
Mr. Angus	10916
Mr. Godin	10916
Mr. Van Loan	10917
Motion	10917
(Motion agreed to)	10917
(Motion No. 2 withdrawn)	10917
Division on Motion No. 4 deferred	10918
Division on motion No. 9 deferred	10918
Division on Motion No. 10 deferred	10918
Division on Motion No. 11 deferred	10918
Division on Motion No. 12 deferred	10918

Peace Tower Carillon

The Speaker	10918
-------------------	-------

Aeronautics Act

Bill C-6. Report Stage	10919
Motion No. 4 negated	10920
Motions Nos. 5, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14 and 15 negated	10926
(Motions Nos. 6, 7, 8 and 16 agreed to)	10926
Mr. Van Loan (for the Minister of Transport)	10926
Motion for concurrence	10926
Motion agreed to	10927

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS**Water Resources Management**

Motion	10927
Amendment negated	10928
(Motion agreed to)	10928
Ms. Picard	10928

Business of the House**Proceedings of the House**

Mr. Van Loan	10928
Motion	10928
(Motion agreed to)	10928

Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Development

Mr. Van Loan	10928
Motion	10928
(Motion agreed to)	10928

Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food

Mr. Van Loan	10928
Motion	10928
(Motion agreed to)	10928

Sittings of the House

Mr. Van Loan	10928
Motion	10929
Mr. Goodale	10929
(Motion agreed to)	10929

GOVERNMENT ORDERS**Pilotage Act**

Mr. Van Loan (for the Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities)	10929
Bill C-64. Second reading	10929
Mr. Jean	10929
Mr. Julian	10931
Mr. Laframboise	10932
Mr. Wrzesnewskyj	10932
Mr. Chong	10932
Mr. Wrzesnewskyj	10933
Mr. Laframboise	10934
Mr. Julian	10937
Mr. Julian	10938

MAIL  POSTE

Canada Post Corporation / Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

Lettermail

Poste-lettre

**1782711
Ottawa**

If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:

Publishing and Depository Services
Public Works and Government Services Canada
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S5

En cas de non-livraison,

retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à :
Les Éditions et Services de dépôt
Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada
Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S5

Published under the authority of the Speaker of the House of Commons

Publié en conformité de l'autorité du Président de la Chambre des communes

**Also available on the Parliament of Canada Web Site at the following address:
Aussi disponible sur le site Web du Parlement du Canada à l'adresse suivante :**
<http://www.parl.gc.ca>

The Speaker of the House hereby grants permission to reproduce this document, in whole or in part, for use in schools and for other purposes such as private study, research, criticism, review or newspaper summary. Any commercial or other use or reproduction of this publication requires the express prior written authorization of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

**Additional copies may be obtained from Publishing and Depository Services
Public Works and Government Services Canada
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S5
Telephone: (613) 941-5995 or 1-800-635-7943
Fax: (613) 954-5779 or 1-800-565-7757
publications@pwgsc.gc.ca
<http://publications.gc.ca>**

Le Président de la Chambre des communes accorde, par la présente, l'autorisation de reproduire la totalité ou une partie de ce document à des fins éducatives et à des fins d'étude privée, de recherche, de critique, de compte rendu ou en vue d'en préparer un résumé de journal. Toute reproduction de ce document à des fins commerciales ou autres nécessite l'obtention au préalable d'une autorisation écrite du Président.

**On peut obtenir des copies supplémentaires ou la version française de cette publication en écrivant à : Les Éditions et Services de dépôt
Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada
Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S5
Téléphone : (613) 941-5995 ou 1-800-635-7943
Télécopieur : (613) 954-5779 ou 1-800-565-7757
publications@tpsgc.gc.ca
<http://publications.gc.ca>**