



House of Commons
CANADA

Standing Committee on Human Resources, Social Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities

HUMA • NUMBER 075 • 1st SESSION • 39th PARLIAMENT

EVIDENCE

Thursday, May 17, 2007

—
Chair

Mr. Dean Allison

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

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

Standing Committee on Human Resources, Social Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities

Thursday, May 17, 2007

• (0905)

[English]

The Chair (Mr. Dean Allison (Niagara West—Glanbrook, CPC)): Order, please.

Pursuant to the order of reference of Wednesday, November 22, 2006, we are studying Bill C-303, An Act to establish criteria and conditions in respect of funding for early learning and child care programs in order to ensure the quality, accessibility, universality and accountability of those programs, and to appoint a council to advise the Minister of Human Resources and Skills Development on matters relating to early learning and child care. We'll continue to go clause-by-clause and look at where we are.

I wouldn't say we made a whole lot of progress in our first meeting. I'm hopeful that, now that everyone's got all their remarks they would like to have on the record, we can move a little faster today.

As the committee knows, if we get it done this morning, we won't have to have our meeting this afternoon; however, there is a possibility we may end up going this afternoon if we're not able to move forward this morning.

Once again, I will encourage the members to make their points and keep them short, and then we can move on from where we left off. We're still working on clause 2.

(On clause 2—*Definitions*)

The Chair: I believe amendments one and two have passed. We're now on Liberal amendment L-3.

Mr. Silva, perhaps you'd like to talk to L-3.

Ms. Olivia Chow (Trinity—Spadina, NDP): I have a point of order.

The Chair: Yes, Ms. Chow.

Ms. Olivia Chow: Mr. Chair, because I know at least two new members have joined us, can you do a quick recap of what we have passed in the other meeting, the first clause, so everybody's up to speed and other folks know what's in front of us?

Thank you very much.

The Chair: Sure.

Liberal amendment L-1 was amended to include band governments:

“aboriginal peoples' organization” means an organization of first nation band governments, Inuit, or Métis people

and then Liberal amendment L-2, which was “province, territory, institution, first nation band government”—

A voice: That was withdrawn.

The Chair: That was withdrawn, so “province, territory, institution, aboriginal peoples' organization or corporate”. So once again, it was just to include the band governments.

Mrs. Lynne Yelich (Blackstrap, CPC): Just for those who are new to the committee, we had the author of the bill before us. She said she had consulted widely with stakeholders. Pretty soon we found out that the aboriginal people, the people who were going to be particularly targeted with this bill, because we wanted to make sure that early learning child care was offered to them—it was never part of the bill. I found it a little difficult to understand why it wouldn't have been in the beginning, because we're supposed to have consulted widely. We're finding out the provinces don't agree.

Right now, we have more amendments than clauses to the bill. We know it's a badly flawed bill, and it's just unbelievable what we're voting for.

The Chair: I think those points were made in the last meeting.

Mrs. Lynne Yelich: But it's just to get them up to speed. The NDP claimed their stakeholders were widely consulted—

The Chair: I think the new members were checking the blues before they got here.

Ms. Chow, were those all the points you wanted to make?

Ms. Olivia Chow: I also thought that to make it easier and faster for today, we should say there are three sets of amendments. The first set is by Ms. Dhalla. Every one of them has to do with the aboriginal people and first nations. The second one is mine, which deals with home care, to make sure home care is allowed. And then the third one is a name change on the bill by, I think, Mr. Lake.

So those are the three chunks of amendments. I thought since we have new people—it looks like a large group of them, but it's really not a whole lot.

The Chair: Sure. A lot of them are similar in nature, just referring to the fact that we want to include aboriginals.

I am hopeful that, since we understand that, as we move forward, we can.... As you know, we need unanimous consent to be able to chunk all of them together, but certainly after explaining that to the new members here, I hope we can move through them quickly, because any points made previously, one can assume, could be applied to all the previous ones.

Ms. Olivia Chow: Exactly. I've bunched the amendments that I submitted at the last meeting. Some of them are just little amendments to the aboriginal part. We'll go through those clause-by-clause.

Thanks very much for allowing me the time.

The Chair: Perfect.

We are now going to move, then—

Mrs. Lynne Yelich: We didn't get those until yesterday. For a serious and well-thought-out bill, I think we should have had them a little sooner.

The Chair: I know Ms. Chow was working through the whole week trying to get them just right, so that's why it took her so long to get them to us.

Mrs. Lynne Yelich: She was at the party last night.

The Chair: All right. So let's move right to amendment L-3.

Ms. Dhalla, welcome. If you'd like to read your amendment and talk briefly about it, we'll then have some discussion and move on that.

I'll also mention that this particular amendment has been ruled out of order by the clerk.

I'll just leave it at that, but you could just talk to it, Ms. Dhalla.

• (0910)

Ms. Ruby Dhalla (Brampton—Springdale, Lib.): The amendment is as follows: that Bill C-303, in clause 2, be amended by replacing line 14 on page 2 with the following:

child care program of a province, territory or aboriginal peoples' organization by

As discussed at the previous meetings, I think it is important that all legislation going through this committee and the House be reflective of our country and incorporate and include the aboriginal people. The amendments that have been forwarded were done so in consultation with aboriginal organizations from across the country; hence, despite the ruling of the clerk, I would request support for this particular motion.

There are a number of additional amendments following, which are very similar in nature, so I'm going to keep my remarks short, in the hope we can actually get through this before 12 o'clock today and finish this up.

The Chair: I was even thinking that before 11 would be nice.

Mr. Mike Lake (Edmonton—Mill Woods—Beaumont, CPC): On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, you've ruled that each one is out of order. But we—or they—only really overruled you on the first one, right?

The Chair: On the first three.

Mr. Mike Lake: On the first three.

So do we have to have a vote in each case, or not?

The Chair: Just until we get to the next batch. On this one, given that the first three have been ruled out of order and I've been overruled, we'll wait till we get to the new one, which is substantially different.

Mrs. Lynne Yelich: Can you just rule them—

Mr. Mike Lake: So you're deemed to have been overruled on every one of them, then?

The Chair: Just on the ones relating to the aboriginals, the first three.

Mr. Mike Lake: Okay.

The Chair: All right. There are no other amendments to that, so if there's no more discussion, I will call the question on amendment L-3.

(Amendment agreed to)

The Chair: Now we'll need to vote on clause 2 as amended.

Ms. Ruby Dhalla: Mr. Chair, can we have recorded votes, please?

(Clause 2 as amended agreed to: yeas 6; nays 4)

(On clause 3—*Purpose*)

The Chair: We've got amendment L-4.

Once again, I would point out that for the same reasons as I mentioned for clause 2, I had ruled this out of order, and so we won't go back into all the minutia we dealt with before.

Ms. Dhalla has amendment L-4 before us. Ms. Dhalla, if you'd like to quickly ready your motion, then we will have some discussion and get to a vote.

Ms. Ruby Dhalla: I move to amend clause 3 in Bill C-303 by replacing line 25 on page 2 with the following:

program of a province, territory or aboriginal peoples' organization.

The Chair: Do we have any discussion on that at all?

Hearing none, I will ask the question on L-4.

(Amendment agreed to)

• (0915)

The Chair: Shall clause 3 carry as amended?

Ms. Ruby Dhalla: A recorded vote, please.

The Chair: Okay.

(Clause 3 as amended agreed to: yeas 6; nays 4)

(On clause 4—*Exemption*)

The Chair: There are no amendments before us.

Mr. Chong.

Hon. Michael Chong (Wellington—Halton Hills, CPC): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I want to voice my opposition to this particular clause as well. There are a lot of intellectual inconsistencies here.

For members of the Bloc, they don't believe the federal government should utilize the spending power to effect priorities in provincial areas of jurisdiction, but that's exactly what this bill does. Even including clause 4, they seem to believe it's acceptable for intrusion into provincial jurisdiction utilizing the spending power for nine provinces, if not ten, but somehow they're supporting this bill. I think that's inconsistent.

The second problem with this clause is that it makes the members of Parliament from Quebec essentially voiceless when it comes to a say in how things are being run in this country. It effectively exempts members from that province in the federal Parliament from effecting the supposed priorities in this bill in their very own province.

For members from the rest of the country, I don't know how you could argue that this constitutes a national program when the eight million or nine million Canadians resident in the province of Quebec are not being treated the same as Canadians living in other provinces. I don't see how Liberal MPs can support something like this, which treats Canadians from one part of the country differently from Canadians living in other parts of the country. That's intellectually inconsistent.

I think this clause should be opposed. I think it's a fundamental flaw in this bill.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Chong.

Mr. Lessard, did you want to say something, or were you just wanting people to turn off their BlackBerrys?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yves Lessard (Chambly—Borduas, BQ): I believe the message regarding people's BlackBerrys has come through loud and clear. That's good.

Mr. Chairman, I think it makes a lot of sense to give Quebec the chance of opting out of the program. Quebec has been running its own program for the past 10 years, without any financial assistance whatsoever from the federal government.

The program that the federal government is preparing to introduce—provided of course the Conservative government consents to it, which we surely hope it does—will force Quebec to pick up some of the costs.

I would remind our colleague Mr. Chong that the federal government does not contribute one red cent to Quebec's program and that 25% of the costs of the proposed program which we are supporting will be paid by Quebec, even though it will be of no benefit to Quebec. Therefore, it makes a lot of sense that we be allowed to have our say in this matter.

I think he should be delighted, as should the rest of Canada, that Quebec is willing to contribute to this program in order to improve the daycare and early childhood education system in Canada. I think this magnanimous gesture on our part deserves to be recognized.

I think the NDP party deserves credit for tabling this bill, as does the Liberal Party for supporting it. I'm most distressed by the Conservatives who are arguing against the proposed legislation.

[*English*]

The Chair: Thank you, and we want to thank Quebec for their generosity on this one.

Mr. Lake, do you have some comments?

Mr. Mike Lake: I want to speak to the same inconsistency as my colleague spoke against. As was raised before about a previous bill on EI, the Bloc previously voted in the House against a motion by a Liberal member, Andy Scott, having to do with autism. It was something he had put a lot of work into, and it was designed specifically to obtain support from all provinces.

Their only reason for voting against it was that it involved a national strategy and included the words “national strategy”. This motion would have helped families of kids with autism across the country—well, it will, because the other three parties actually voted for it.

I am flabbergasted by the level of inconsistency in their positions, based on what I've seen in this committee. I find it amazing how selective they are in their principles. Their entire reason for being seems to be thrown out the window when it comes to their stand on this bill. It's something I don't understand.

When we're dealing with this type of legislation, it seems to be a core principle that all provinces will be treated the same in this, and that provincial jurisdictions will be respected.

I find it amazing that they would stand against a motion having to do with families dealing with autism, simply because it had the word “national” in it, and then come in here and support this bill.

• (0920)

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Lake.

Ms. Yelich.

Mrs. Lynne Yelich: If I recall, Ms. Savoie said this bill wouldn't cost any more money, therefore Quebec wouldn't have any extra funding with which to be so generous.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

We have clause 4 before us. There are no amendments.

Ms. Olivia Chow: I would like a recorded vote, please.

(Clause 4 agreed to: yeas 6; nays 4)

The Chair: As I mentioned before, I was challenged on a number of amendments that had gone beyond the scope. But I want to get it on the record today, because we are in a new day, that we now have before us amendments L-5, L-6, NDP-0.1, L-7, NDP-0.2, L-8, L-9, L-10, and NDP-2, which I am going to rule out of order.

The question is whether you'd like to handle them all right now, in terms of challenging the chair. I would prefer to be rejected once instead of a dozen times, because I don't know if my fragile ego can handle being rejected about a dozen times today. But I would like to get it on the record today, if that is the case.

Mr. Silva.

Mr. Mario Silva (Davenport, Lib.): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I would of course challenge the chair. Then I was hoping we could also vote for them as a package.

The Chair: You'll need unanimous consent for that, but let's deal with one thing at a time here.

Go ahead, Ms. Chow.

Ms. Olivia Chow: I heard the clerk say last time that the aboriginal amendments were out of order. May I hear the rationale for the home child care amendment being out of order?

Ms. Ruby Dhalla: Could you give them once again?

The Chair: I'll give you the Liberal ones first: Liberal 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10; and then NDP amendments 0.1, 0.2, and 2. Once again, all these amendments are ruled out because they go beyond the scope of the bill.

• (0925)

Ms. Ruby Dhalla: Thank you. We'll do a package.

The Chair: Thank you. I appreciate that. I feel much better about that.

I will mention that the home child care amendment was within the scope so that was not ruled out of order.

I will rule all these motions out of order. Is the ruling of the chair sustained?

We'll have a recorded vote.

(Ruling of the chair overturned: nays 6; yeas 4)

The Chair: Let's move on then.

Yes, Mr. Lessard.

[Translation]

Mr. Yves Lessard: Mr. Chairman, I heard Mr. Silva say that he wanted to vote with the Bloc and I'm delighted.

[English]

The Chair: I'm pretty sure it's a block of motions.

[Translation]

Mr. Yves Lessard: All kidding aside, when we voted to overturn your decision, it affected all of amendments.

[English]

The Chair: Yes, just the block of amendments that have been proposed, that's correct.

We're on clause 5, and once again we have Liberal amendment L-5. Who's going to move that?

Ms. Olivia Chow: Mr. Chair, may I test the floor to see whether my friends would agree to vote en bloc? I know it has to be unanimous. Yes, we can do it as a block?

Some hon. members: Yes.

The Chair: Okay. So what I have is a—

Mrs. Lynne Yelich: It's not because we think that's the intelligent thing to do, but the bill is so lacking academia that it doesn't matter.

The Chair: Ms. Yelich, you made that point yesterday and again this morning. So thank you very much.

Here's how we will handle this then. The first thing we'll do is we'll vote on the block of amendments that has just been proposed and then we can go back to the clauses as amended.

Mr. Mike Lake: Can I clarify one question, based on what Ms. Chow had said? That block that we just talked about and just voted to overrule you on, were they all the ones dealing with aboriginal peoples?

The Chair: Yes.

Mr. Mike Lake: So there were no other ones in there. I just want to clarify that.

The Chair: No, just the ones that were ruled out of order.

Let's deal with the amendments first then.

All those in favour of the amendments that I just talked about: amendments 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10, which are Liberal amendments—

Ms. Ruby Dhalla: A recorded vote, please.

The Chair: And NDP amendments 0.1, 0.2 and 2.

So we have the motion on the floor. Ms. Dhalla has asked for a recorded vote.

(Amendments agreed to: yeas 6; nays 1)

The Chair: The amendments are carried.

Here's what we'll do now. We'll just go by each clause now.

(Clause 5 as amended agreed to)

(On clause 6—*Early learning and child care services*)

• (0930)

The Chair: Under clause 6 we've got an amendment by the NDP. It's NDP-1, and I believe it's the one with home child care.

Would you like to read your motion?

Ms. Olivia Chow: The amendment is that Bill C-303, in clause 6, be amended (a) by replacing line 37 on page 4 with the following:

agency, organization or govern-

(b) by replacing line 2 on page 5 with the following:

agency, organization or govern-

(c) by adding after line 10 on page 5 the following:

(c) provided by an individual authorized under provincial or territorial law to provide such services.

This allows the province the flexibility to have the licensed home care that is now present in almost all the provinces and territories. It provides very valuable services. It's regulated home care. They provide the flexibility that is needed, and this accomplishes that goal.

The Chair: Is there any more discussion on the amendment proposed by the NDP? Seeing there is none, I'll call the vote.

(Amendment agreed to)

(Clauses 6 to 8 inclusive as amended agreed to)

(Clause 9 agreed to)

(On clause 10—*Advisory council*)

The Chair: We did not approve amendment L-11, but we should have included that.

I've just been informed that the challenge we have is between amendments L-11 and NDP-3. There are some conflicting lines. Could you two could talk to each other and determine the wording you want to have?

Go ahead, Ms. Chow.

● (0935)

Ms. Olivia Chow: Can you give the amendment numbers again?

The Chair: They are L-11 and NDP-3, which are at pages 12 and 12.1 in your packages.

Ms. Olivia Chow: I will withdraw mine.

The Chair: Thank you.

Ms. Dhalla, would you like to move L-11?

Ms. Ruby Dhalla: Yes, it would be my pleasure.

(Amendment agreed to [See *Minutes of Proceedings*])

(Clause 10 as amended agreed to)

The Chair: Shall the short title carry, as drawn up in clause 1 of the original bill?

Mr. Lessard.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yves Lessard: I have a question before we vote. It concerns the original title of the bill, as tabled. Mr. Lake moved an amendment and he didn't withdraw it.

[*English*]

Ms. Olivia Chow: Yes, it's motion 13.

The Chair: This clause is on the short title. Mr. Lake's was definitely on the long title.

The short title is the Early Learning and Child Care Act.

Ms. Ruby Dhalla: Can we have a recorded vote on that, please?

(Clause 1 agreed to: yeas 6; nays 3)

The Chair: Shall the preamble carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chair: Next is what we've all been waiting for—the actual title.

We have a proposed amendment. I'm going to rule this title out of order as being somewhat frivolous, although very clever.

Mr. Savage.

Mr. Michael Savage (Dartmouth—Cole Harbour, Lib.): I am prepared to vote with Mr. Lake in support of this amendment if he'll accept a friendly subamendment to the amendment.

The Chair: I thought we were going to get out of here early today.

Mr. Michael Savage: I'm proposing he might want to change it to “a mechanism to withhold transfers to the provinces if they do not do what the dirty, rotten, mean-spirited Conservative federal government tells them, except for Quebec”.

● (0940)

The Chair: Am I ever glad we ruled that one out of order.

Mrs. Lynne Yelich: That makes the case of how ridiculous this bill was.

The Chair: Anyway, we're going to rule the original amendment out. I'm going to look at the original title, and my question is, shall the title carry as it was...?

Mr. Lake.

Mr. Mike Lake: I do want to speak to the title. Obviously it's important for a title to describe what a bill actually does, so that is why I moved my amendment. I thought it would be accurate to—As you know, I would have worded the amendment to read: “A mechanism to withhold transfers to the provinces if they do not do what the federal government tells them (except for Quebec) act.” And I think that pretty much describes what this bill does.

I know there are people on the other side who have visions of a \$20 billion institutional nine-to-five day care program that would come out of this, but this bill doesn't actually do that. All it does is provide a mechanism to withhold funding from the provinces and now, with amendments, to also withhold funding from aboriginal groups. That was the idea behind changing the title. I think it's important to be very clear to Canadians what we're legislating for here.

The Chair: Mr. Brown.

Mr. Patrick Brown (Barrie, CPC): I was disappointed that Mr. Lake's amendment was ruled out of order. I thought he was very insightful in coming up with a very well-worded description of the bill—and hearing if there was any interest around the table. I know a lot of us have heard different intentions of why the bill is here. I think everyone comes from different perspectives on child care.

One thing I've raised a lot at the table is the fact that I was concerned that Dalton McGuinty really took it to the children of Ontario when this government gave him \$97.5 million in the most recent federal budget for child care and he decided to only spend \$25 million on it.

Part of my concern with this bill was that it simply gave another government the same tool to do what Dalton McGuinty did, and said, “I want to abandon the children, I want to abandon child care.”

I'm not sure, Ms. Chow, or anyone else, if there is a way to incorporate that in the title. I realize you come to this from a different perspective, but maybe part of the title should include the provincial Liberal tax on child care, because I think that's why Ms. Savoie originally came to this position.

I'm not sure what the wording would be—certainly not as eloquent as Mr. Lake's title—but whether it's worded to prevent Liberal assaults on child care—I'm still against this bill, because I worry that on a federal level they'd use this as a tool to gut child care. But realizing where you're coming from, it might be a nice gesture to include in the title “preventing Liberal premiers from attacking child care from the very generous contributions given by the Conservative government to child care”.

The Chair: I do believe I did rule this out of order, but I realize we wanted to get on record all the things that went into thinking up what this title was all about.

So let's move forward with the vote on this. Shall the title carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

• (0945)

The Chair: All right. So the title will carry. Now we have a couple of questions.

Shall the bill as amended carry?

An hon. member: A recorded vote.

The Chair: Yes, a recorded vote.

(Bill C-303 as amended agreed to: yeas 6; nays 4)

The Chair: The next question is, shall the chair report the bill as amended to the House?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chair: All right. The chair shall report the bill as amended to the House.

I believe the last question for today...this could be a miracle. Shall the committee order a reprint of the bill as amended for the use of the House at report stage?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chair: Mr. Lessard.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yves Lessard: Mr. Chairman, if we've dispensed completely with Bill C-303, I'd like to come back to a topic we discussed at the last meeting, namely the Summer Career Placements Program. If we're done studying this bill, then I'd like to move a motion, as I announced at our last meeting.

[*English*]

The Chair: We would need notice for that. The orders of the day were to talk about this bill. Since there's no motion before us right now, we're going to end the meeting, and we'll come back to these things if it's brought up or put on the agenda for future meetings.

It would have been nice if we had known. We could have moved through quickly and we could have started working on Bill C-284.

Mr. Savage, on a point of order.

Mr. Michael Savage: At the last meeting I proposed an amendment to Mr. Lessard's amendment, and I agreed to withdraw it with the consent of the committee that I could bring it back on Thursday. I'd like to bring that back.

First of all, if I could, I'd like to commend you for the way you've handled this bill and the way you've kept us on track and done a very good job, Mr. Chair. Thank you for that.

But I wonder, can I present this motion now for consideration and quick adoption?

The Chair: I would suggest once again, because we're not on that committee business, that you would need unanimous consent to put

the motion. If not, it has to be tabled within 48 hours. If you'd like to table it now, by all means, we can have a look at it on Tuesday, when we return.

Mr. Michael Savage: Next Tuesday?

The Chair: We could start the meeting. If I'm not there, you guys can start without me. It will have to be a week Tuesday.

Mr. Michael Savage: It was my understanding that the committee agreed that this could come back on Thursday, in consideration of pulling the amendment.

The Chair: Sure. Once again, we would need to see that amendment, so—

Mr. Michael Savage: Can I get unanimous consent based on the goodwill and the honesty of all members in remembering that commitment?

The Chair: Sure. We can ask the question.

Is there unanimous consent for this motion?

Mr. Mike Lake: Let's ask for two minutes to concur here with my colleagues. Is that fair enough?

A voice: Thirty seconds.

Mr. Mike Lake: Thirty seconds, maybe.

Ms. Olivia Chow: Mr. Chair, while they're conferring, I want to express my appreciation for your handling of this bill, and I thank you for the fact that we were able to deal with all the amendments within 40 minutes. Thank you for that.

The Chair: I want to thank the members for limiting their pontification on all the additional points. You guys have made this thing go quickly.

Mr. Lake.

Mr. Mike Lake: I think you'll find that we'll give consent, because we did agree to that last time.

The Chair: Yes, Mr. Chong.

Hon. Michael Chong: Mr. Chair, we will provide our consent on this side to discussing the amendment that Mr. Savage has put forward if the members from the Bloc and the New Democratic Party do the same, and then we can discuss it.

The Chair: Here I was thinking I was going to get to have breakfast before 10 o'clock. That may not be the case.

I will then, with that, thank the departmental officials. You don't need to sit around for this potentially painful process over the next two hours. We can see if we can talk it out until noon, use up all our time.

Thank you very much for being here again, and for the legislative clerk as well. Although it's not the weekend yet, I wish you guys a good weekend.

Mr. Lessard.

[Translation]

Mr. Yves Lessard: Mr. Chairman, I too would like to take this opportunity on behalf of the Bloc Québécois to thank you and congratulate you on the way you've chaired these proceedings. We have no qualms about entrusting you with the responsibility of presenting this to the House.

[English]

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Lessard. I appreciate that.

[Translation]

Mr. Yves Lessard: Before the amendment is tabled, I'll like someone to read it to us.

[English]

The Chair: Most definitely. What we're going to do is ask for Mr. Savage to hand out the motion right now to everybody.

Mr. Michael Savage: Mr. Chair, I don't have it in both official languages. Do I need unanimous consent?

• (0950)

The Chair: You would need that as well, from Mr. Lessard.

Mr. Michael Savage: Would I have unanimous consent to consider this in the one language?

[Translation]

Mr. Yves Lessard: I need to know what's being proposed. I have no idea.

[English]

The Chair: Here's what I'm hearing. We don't need unanimous consent to talk about the motion because you can read it in and it will be interpreted. However, you would need unanimous consent to hand out the motion.

So why don't you read the motion? That's the way we can handle it. The interpreters can then translate that in French for the Bloc.

Mr. Michael Savage: Thank you, Chair.

The motion is:

That the Department of Human Resources and Social Development provide the committee with: the list of non-profit organizations and private companies that applied for funding and were denied funding under the Canada Summer Jobs program, and that information be provided on a riding-by-riding basis, and that the department provide the amount of funding distributed by Canada Summer Jobs program on a riding-by-riding basis for 2007.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

I'm just wondering if there is going to be much debate on this. I know we talked about it at the previous meeting, so I would encourage members to keep the debate short. If they have some points to make, by all means we'd be happy to hear them on the record, but could we keep the responses quick. I know we've discussed this.

I have a few people on my list right now: Mr. Lessard, Mr. Lake, Ms. Chow, Mr. Silva, Ms. Dhalla, Ms. Yelich, and Mr. Chong. So much for having a quick and speedy exit.

All right, we're going to start with Mr. Lessard.

[Translation]

Mr. Yves Lessard: I'm just trying to understand, Mr. Chairman. What does this add to the motion, or change? We adopted two Bloc motions at last Tuesday's meeting. Unless I'm missing something here, it doesn't change anything.

[English]

The Chair: Sure.

[Translation]

Mr. Yves Lessard: If the motion is deemed to be in order, then I will move a sub-amendment.

[English]

The Chair: Sure.

The original motion brought up the fact that they wanted a list of people who had actually qualified. With this motion, Mr. Savage wants to try to get a list of people who applied but did not get the funding. So that is the primary difference. Mr. Savage is hopeful to get a list of people who applied for funding but were denied, as opposed to the original motion. That is the primary difference here.

I'll move to Mr. Lake.

I have Mr. Lake, Ms. Chow, Mr. Silva, Ms. Dhalla, and Ms. Yelich.

Mr. Mario Silva: You can take me off the list.

The Chair: Okay.

Mr. Lake.

Mr. Mike Lake: I have a couple of things. I'm not sure if I heard this, but do we have anything in there about being subject to the Privacy Act? Maybe that should be in there.

Secondly, my understanding is that this information is not available riding by riding, but only by province and nationally. So in terms of the actual list that we could have access to, and that would be tabled—

The Chair: I just want to mention here that the department cannot go against the law, whatever it is. You have mentioned this, so it's on the record. But I would just suggest that if the department cannot provide the list because of privacy legislation, that would be the case. I'll just mention that.

But go ahead, Mr. Lake, if you want to finish up.

Mr. Mike Lake: The other thing is that this is a challenge because we don't have it in writing and we don't have it in both official languages, and I can't look at it. It was only said once, and it's a long motion.

First of all, is it a motion or are we making an amendment to the motion?

The Chair: It's a brand new motion.

Mr. Mike Lake: A brand new motion.

The Chair: Once again, it's the list of non-profit organizations and private companies that applied for funding and were denied funding by the Canada summer jobs program, and that information be provided on a riding-by-riding basis, and that the department provide the amount of funding distributed by the Canada summer jobs program on a riding-by-riding basis.

Once again, perhaps I could summarize the three things: it's a list of people who applied and were denied; that the department provide it riding by riding; and that the department show the funds distributed riding by riding. Those are essentially the three things that have been requested.

• (0955)

Mr. Mike Lake: So the differences between this and Mr. Lessard's motion from the last time is that it's the people who didn't get funding.

The Chair: That's the first difference.

Mr. Mike Lake: That's the first difference. And it's only for 2007 as opposed to 2006?

The Chair: That's correct.

Mr. Mike Lake: And what other differences are there?

The Chair: He wanted it riding by riding, as well as riding by riding for those who actually got it.

Mr. Mike Lake: But having it riding by riding was in Mr. Lessard's motion in the first place, so the only difference is that he's asking for people who didn't get it, and he's not asking for 2006.

The Chair: That is correct.

Mr. Mike Lake: Okay.

I think it would be important that we include "subject to the Privacy Act"; that we recognize it might not be riding by riding, in terms of the way the information is distributed by the department; and certainly, in the interest of consistency, that we get it for 2006 as well, so that we're consistent with Mr. Lessard's motion in the first place.

The Chair: If you are moving an amendment, I'd ask you just to think for a second about what that will say. I have a list of people. If you have an amendment, talk to Mr. Savage.

I now have Ms. Chow, Ms. Dhalla, Ms. Yelich, Mr. Lessard, and Mr. Savage again, followed by Mr. Brown.

Ms. Chow.

Ms. Olivia Chow: Mr. Chair, maybe you can help answer some questions.

So the list that would be provided would be from 2006 and also 2007, the ones that were approved and the ones that were denied, and riding by riding, if possible; and if not, then by region. Am I correct in those assumptions?

The Chair: Yes, that is my understanding—with the motion. That would be—

Ms. Olivia Chow: Okay, and of course, making sure that we're not breaking any privacy rule, because I remember seeing it.

Mr. Chair, I don't know whether this would be out of order or not. Aside from getting the list—which makes sense, because certainly

it's public anyway for a member of Parliament to receive it, and I don't see there is any reason for it not to be—I'm just wondering whether Mr. Savage would consider another aspect.

Since it's the first time that a grid system is being used—which I think is a good way to determine, by points and by merits, and all that; it's a good idea—has the department explored establishing an appeal process? I have seen that there are occasional mistakes, not because of the fault of anyone, but sometimes there is miscommunication.

I don't know whether an appeal process is possible. It may not connect with getting the information out, which I support anyway. I see that we don't really have department staff here, but if we're discussing this issue, could we think about having an appeal process, which really would help the situation right now?

The Chair: Okay, thanks. And once again, that's probably not within the scope of this motion. Maybe it's something that should be considered for down the road.

I have Ms. Dhalla, who just got up to leave. I'll give you a chance to get back to your seat, if you like, or I can switch you with Ms. Yelich. Why don't we do that? We'll come back to you in a second.

Ms. Yelich.

Mrs. Lynne Yelich: The student summer jobs program has changed significantly, so it is no longer done riding by riding. It has priority groups. The remote areas have been taken into consideration. So I don't think it's even possible to provide that.

If they're going to do comparative data and that's what they want, then we'll have to go back years and see who has been denied and who has received funds, because we'll find that there are not always consistencies there either. These are new groups that have apparently gotten some of the funding, that are very pleased. The criteria have changed, so I don't think it's going to be quite that simple. It's a new program. We're not calling in the old program.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Yelich.

I will just continue to move Ms. Dhalla down the list here.

Mr. Lessard.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yves Lessard: Mr. Chairman, we're prepared to support this motion. I do indeed believe that it complements the motion we tabled at the last meeting.

It was somewhat amusing, and at the same time, rather disconcerting to see the minister demonstrate the exact opposite of what he said here yesterday in committee. At that time, he maintained that there were no lists containing data for each individual riding.

During question period, the Liberals put forward a series of questions and all of the minister's answers came with examples gleaned from different ridings. For someone who claims that detailed lists do not exist, it's rather surprising to see how readily he came up with examples for the ridings of the Liberal members who were asking the questions.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, I'm convinced that such lists do exist. Secondly, I don't think we need to amend or adjust current procedure or set up an appeal board, when quick action on our part is required. I think we need to come back to the old formula whereby decisions are made in the ridings or in their immediate vicinity, as was the case in the past.

Regarding privacy, Mr. Chairman, the answer is obvious. You're quite right to state that the people responsible, including public servants, for supplying information to a riding are sufficiently responsible to know what kind of information they can and cannot pass along. There is very little in the way of information that cannot be disclosed to a committee, Mr. Chairman, even if that means convening in camera where necessary.

Riding lists along with the names of businesses and non-profit organizations have never been secret. Why then would that change under a Conservative government? There's nothing to hide, Mr. Chairman. We're talking about public funds allocated for a good cause, namely providing jobs to students.

With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to move a sub-amendment. I'd like to add the following words:

and that the lists be turned over to the committee no later than June 1st, 2007.

I would like the sub-amendment to apply as well to the two motions allowed by the committee on Tuesday.

• (1000)

[*English*]

The Chair: We have an amendment to the motion now to be added after "for the basis of 2007": "and that this list be provided by June 1, 2007". Is that correct? Is it the first or the thirtieth?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yves Lessard: June 1, 2007 falls on a Friday.

[*English*]

The Chair: Okay.

Now the date is switched over to the amendment on Mr. Savage's motion. I still have you on the list, sir.

Do we have some new comments about this? Mr. Lake.

Mr. Mike Lake: We definitely want to support the motion in principle here. There are some amendments that we want to make. It needs to be noted, though, that we have to give a reasonable amount of time to put the information together. We're talking about the biggest department in the government. I think that June 1 might be pushing the limits of a reasonable timeframe to put together the information that we're talking about and make sure that it's in a format we can use.

I know we're just talking about the amendment right now, so I won't get into the other things. But I think when we're talking about a timeline here, let's make sure we're being reasonable in terms of our expectations.

The Chair: Thank you. Once again, I appreciate that.

We're talking about the amendment now. I've got three people on the list for this. I've got two people on the list for the original motion: Ms. Dhalla, Mr. Savage, and Mr. Lessard.

Ms. Dhalla.

Ms. Ruby Dhalla: In regard to the amendment being put forward, I think Mr. Lessard is correct in proceeding in terms of wanting a timeline, a deadline, on it.

I appreciate Mr. Lake's comment that it is a large department, but with the era of technology we're in, I'm sure the department has all of this information on hand, as many organizations have been provided with funding and there are many others, probably a greater number, that haven't. I would appreciate getting it by June 1. That will give us a chance to take a look at it as a committee before the House ends for the summer session. I think that will give us an opportunity as a committee to discuss it a little bit further.

• (1005)

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Dhalla.

Mr. Savage, followed by Mr. Lessard.

Mr. Michael Savage: Clearly the minister has this information right now. Mr. Lessard is right. In answer to my question he rhymed off some groups in my riding that got money, he rhymed some off in Cape Breton. This information is easy to get. It's not hard; we have computers. He has the information.

We should say June 1. If there's a reason he can't make that, then he can come back. We're reasonable people. We'll listen to that. But we should put a timeframe on it because we're getting close to summer. This program started way too late this year. The government was way too late out of the blocks. A number of organizations didn't qualify because they couldn't get the paperwork done in time. It was absolutely haphazard and disgraceful how this has been handled by the government. It is shameful. It is shameful that kids with autism, kids with cancer, are not getting support this year.

We have to move on this, and we have to move on it damn fast.

The Chair: I would say that we're usually reasonable, or most of the time, anyway.

Mr. Lessard.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yves Lessard: Mr. Chairman, two days ago, I asked the minister to hand over the lists in question. He told us that this information could be found on the Internet. That's not the case. Those who heard him make that statement quickly logged on to the department's website, but despite what the minister had said, they couldn't find the information on the website either. They are being told that everything will be ready for posting on the website on May 30, 2007.

Mr. Chairman, if these lists are indeed to be published on the Internet on May 30, I think that we should be able to have them by June 1.

[*English*]

The Chair: Thank you.

If there's no further discussion, we're going to have a vote on the amendment on the motion of Mr. Savage. Once again, it's that the information be provided by June 1.

Mrs. Lynne Yelich: With the understanding that if it can't be provided we can come back and suggest another date.

The Chair: Sure.

Mrs. Lynne Yelich: It's not quite that easy. I believe this is a new program. It's not the old program that the opposition member is talking about; it's definitely a new program. The fact of the riding by riding...the reason is that you are finding places in cities and towns in your riding that have been denied. So there is a list that has already been processed, and I think you have to take that into consideration. The list is still being considered, and there are more people being acknowledged as to whether they have received funds or not.

So I think you have to give us a little time.

The Chair: We were so close to a vote.

Mr. Lessard, followed by Ms. Dhalla.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yves Lessard: Mr. Chairman, out of respect for the interpreters who provide us with excellent service, I must again speak up about BlackBerry. I can't understand why this issue keeps cropping up in committee. Just because there is no feedback, people think it's quite all right to use them. However, it creates a problem for the interpreters. Could we perhaps come to an agreement on this issue amongst ourselves? I'm not trying to lecture anyone. I'm talking about something very basic here.

Getting back to the content of the amendment, Mr. Chairman, there's an old saying that no one can be expected to do the impossible. Mr. Savage alluded to it as well. If the minister ever tells us that it's impossible, he will surely give us reasons. With all of the new technologies out there, this has to be possible, to my mind. If it's impossible, it must mean that we're poorly equipped, or that we didn't properly prepare ourselves this year.

[*English*]

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Lessard.

Ms. Dhalla, and then we'll call the vote.

Ms. Ruby Dhalla: I just actually have a point of clarification. The parliamentary secretary to the minister mentioned that they are still in the process of awarding additional funding?

Mrs. Lynne Yelich: I don't think the organizations have had notification yet. There are still notifications to be sent out. It is a new program and there is a lot of review. They're trying to meet criteria, some very important criteria. The program has changed.

But we'll go with what Mr. Savage has suggested. Just call the vote.

Mr. Michael Savage: The government website does say that all organizations will be notified by May 15 whether they were successful or not. So they should have that information.

The Chair: That was, as I said, a couple of days ago.

I will now call the vote on the amendment, the Bloc amendment, to make sure that this information is back in our hand by June 1.

Okay, we want a recorded vote.

(Amendment agreed to: yeas 10; nays 0)

•(1010)

The Chair: The amendment is carried, so my question is now on the main motion.

I had a couple of names on the list. I originally had Ms. Dhalla and Mr. Savage. Did you still want to talk to that? And then I'll add Ms. Chow.

Ms. Ruby Dhalla: I just think—

The Chair: Once again, if I could get people to turn their BlackBerrys to quiet, that would be great. I think the vibrations are showing up through the sound system.

We're going to move to Ms. Dhalla, Mr. Savage, and then Ms. Chow.

Ms. Ruby Dhalla: I think Mr. Savage's motion is extremely important. I know there are a number of students in my riding of Brampton—Springdale who were employed and working with NGOs and who are no longer able to receive funding to get gainful employment for their summer. This has had a severe impact on them, because they utilized this particular opportunity to have jobs over the summer period to pay for their tuition and to pay for their loans.

The Conservatives have said that this is a new program and that they didn't want to fund private companies. I don't think anyone around this table would be in disagreement with that, but I think the important work non-profit organizations are doing in advocating, whether for autism, for cancer, for people with disabilities, or the homeless—I think they are doing tremendous work.

Many organizations that used to receive a number of opportunities for hiring students and are no longer able to do so have been calling my office in the last two weeks, and in the last few days in particular. They are really reconsidering how they're going to move forward.

As Mr. Savage said, I think this is a state of crisis for many of these students. I would really be interested in seeing what programs and companies applied, and the list of the ones that were denied. I hope this would have the support of all members around this committee table.

The Chair: Okay.

I have Mr. Savage, Ms. Chow, Mr. Lake, and Ms. Yelich.

Mr. Michael Savage: Thank you, Chair.

In response to a couple of questions that have been raised, all MPs can get the information now concerning the Privacy Act. Here is the list from last year of those who applied, those who were successful, and those who weren't. It's not marked confidential. It's available to any MP, so it certainly should be available to a committee.

As to riding by riding, this is important for comparison purposes. We owe it to our constituents and to the organizations and students in our riding to know how they're doing so that we can advocate on their behalf. There are a lot of organizations for which, if the results come out provincially, who knows where the regional independent students association is or which branch of the Canadian Diabetes Society was excluded? We need to know it riding by riding.

On the local aspect, it's not important because members of Parliament should have control, because frankly, I don't think they should. But Service Canada, which used to administer this program regionally, are just pulling their hair out in parts of Nova Scotia, I can tell you, saying this is the stupidest thing we've ever done. We have criteria that are absolutely nuts. We have high unemployment areas like Cape Breton that have been cut by, as far as we can tell, 90% in jobs. So they're saying—it's Service Canada saying this—"I can't believe we're doing this."

So we need to know, from their point of view.

In Newfoundland, on the radio last night, there was a woman who was so excited that she got her summer grants. Then she heard from all the people who didn't, and she said, "I shouldn't have it." She's offered her positions to other organizations that have been cut off. We need to know riding by riding, not so that MPs can have influence, but so that the local organizations can compare with previous years.

I agree with Ms. Chow on the appeal process, but I think that's a separate issue. I'd be happy to accept Mr. Lake's amendment about adding 2006, if he wanted, as well.

The Chair: Thank you.

I have Ms. Chow, Mr. Lake, and Ms. Yelich.

Ms. Olivia Chow: Chair, I'm wondering whether—this is a fairly friendly amendment—we could add also, "the funding allocation of 2006 and 2007 to each region".

What I've noticed, Mr. Chair, is that there seem to be—On the ground, we notice that there are organizations being cut that have received funding for many years. There seem to be disputes. The minister is saying there are no funding cuts to non-profit organizations. That seems to be contrary to the experience people are having in different regions. So I think, just for it to be clear—

Then we would know whether Cape Breton in fact got the same kind of funding allocation as before. I don't know; I have no way of knowing. I know, in terms of the Greater Toronto Area, whether it may or may not be.

It doesn't have to be by riding, as long as it's by region, so at least there is some kind of comparison to see fundamentally whether it is because of the \$11 million that's been cut from the program, or because there's a design flaw, or because of the staff not having historical knowledge. I think it's probably because of a combination of all of those reasons that we are seeing some really unfortunate situations, where organizations that have done very good work in the past are not receiving funding to hire summer students.

I thought that might be a friendly amendment, so that there would be a very clear discussion when we have the entire package of information.

•(1015)

The Chair: I would need to see that amendment. If you have something ready, would you let us know what it is and where it would be added?

Ms. Olivia Chow: The exact wording is by including the words "funding allocation of 2006 and 2007 to each region".

The Chair: Where is that added? Is that added at the end of the original motion, or where do you want to add that in the motion?

Ms. Olivia Chow: I think it's the clause that said, "denied and approved", plus "the funding allocation".

The Chair: So it's "—were denied funding under the Canada Summer Jobs program and,". Is that it there?

Ms. Olivia Chow: I don't have the motion in front of me in writing, so I can't—

Perhaps you want to see whether it's a friendly amendment or not. If it isn't, then it wouldn't make any sense, but I thought that if we were to have a holistic discussion on this when we get the entire list, it would be useful to have.

The Chair: Okay. I will come right back to you.

Mr. Lake, you're next on the list, so go right ahead.

Mr. Mike Lake: Ms. Chow, I brought this idea up in the first place and I've written out where I think it would fit, so is there a way I can just throw this out? If we bring in the word "region" now, we've brought in a whole new term that we haven't used anywhere else in here.

I think it is actually pretty straightforward. I have a copy of the motion here. I'm going to just read it out and I'll say where I'm fitting things in.

What I'd like to add right at the very beginning is "Subject to privacy considerations" and then "that the Department of Human Resources and Social Development provide the committee with: the list of non-profit organizations and private companies that applied for funding and were denied funding under the Canada Summer Jobs program".

Then I'd like to insert, after "program", the words "for 2007 and the Summer Career Placement Program for 2006".

Then it continues: "and, that information be provided on a riding by riding basis, and that the department provide the amount of funding distributed by Canada Summer Jobs program", and I'd like to insert the same phrase: "for 2007 and the Summer Career Placement program for 2006". Then it continues with "on a riding by riding basis", and we would strike "for 2007" off the original motion.

The three changes, then, are adding "Subject to privacy considerations" at the beginning and then basically adding the same phrase in two different places, that phrase being "for 2007 and the Summer Career Placement program for 2006".

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Lake.

Ms. Chow, is that okay? Do you like that, in light of what you're suggesting?

Ms. Olivia Chow: The wording should include "and approved", I assume. Oh, we already have "approved". Okay.

That doesn't give us the funding allocation. Did you say that you've asked for it already?

Mr. Mike Lake: We asked for it already.

The Chair: That is in "riding by riding".

Mr. Mike Lake: He says in the last part of his motion “that the department provide the amount of funding distributed”.

•(1020)

Ms. Olivia Chow: Thank you very much; got it. It's fine.

The Chair: That amendment is okay, so I'll start a new list on the amendment.

I've seen Mr. Lessard's and Mr. Silva's hands.

Go ahead, Mr. Lessard.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yves Lessard: Mr. Chairman, aside from the fact that the motion calls for a number of restrictions under the Privacy Act, I'm trying to understand what purpose it serves. Aside from this fact, Mr. Savage's motion which was adopted this morning, and my two motions agreed to on Tuesday pretty much cover everything. Are we adding something new? Why repeat all of this, when all we need to do is refer back to the Privacy Act?

I'd like to hear your opinion on the subject, Mr. Chairman. If we open this door because we're afraid public servants will disclose information that they are not entitled to disclose, then this consideration should factor into all of our motions because in every case, information is being processed.

I fail to understand why we're insisting on this so much. As you so aptly said earlier, we are all responsible for the documents we disclose. I don't see why we are rehashing this. We now have three similar motions when all we want is some assurance that public servants treat information confidentially. However, by law, they are required to do just that. Therefore, to my mind, this motion serves no purpose.

[*English*]

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Lessard. I will just indicate that, on this amendment, you are correct that the subject of privacy is already covered, but this will not affect your motion in any way. This is only the motion before us right now, which Mr. Savage is okay with. So your motion will still stand the way it is. It will be fine. As I said, it's already covered.

Mr. Silva.

Mr. Mario Silva: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I will ask that the motion that Mr. Lake has put forward on the subject of privacy considerations be set aside and then voted on separately, because I will not be supporting it. I would just advise Mr. Lake, and also members of this committee, that there are few powers that members of Parliament have, but one of them—and it has been proven both constitutionally and in the history of the British parliamentary system—is the ability of members of Parliament to in fact ask for papers and documents, whether confidential or not. That is a right and privilege that we have as members of Parliament. I don't want to limit that right in any way, shape, or form.

It's up to the department to give the arguments as to why we cannot see them, whether we need to see them in camera and not in a public forum, or whether it needs to be distributed or not, but that right of ours as parliamentarians is a historical and constitutional

right, and I will not be voting for anything that will limit my ability and my rights as a member of Parliament.

The Chair: Okay, if there are no further questions, I will call for the vote on the amendment to the motion.

Mr. Mike Lake: Are you calling the vote on his subamendment? He's basically making a subamendment to take that out, right?

The Chair: No, he's not. He said he's not going to vote for it.

Mr. Mike Lake: So right now we're voting on the whole thing.

The Chair: I'm calling the question on your amendment.

Mr. Mario Silva: His amendment?

The Chair: Yes.

Ms. Olivia Chow: Are you separating the amendment? There are two clauses. One is the 2006-07 one, which I totally support. The other one is under privacy—

The Chair: It's the same amendment.

Ms. Olivia Chow: But if I want to support the 2006-07?

The Chair: No, it's the amendment that he made, and we're voting on that right now.

(Amendment agreed to)

The Chair: So I will go back to the motion as amended. If there is no further discussion, I'll call the question on that.

(Motion as amended agreed to [See *Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: Congratulations, Mr. Savage.

Mr. Mario Silva: Chair, I'd like to abstain from that vote, because I don't want to support the amendment.

•(1025)

The Chair: Okay.

Mr. Lessard.

Mr. Mario Silva: It's confidential documents. It's a right of parliamentarians.

Mr. Mike Lake: Are we—

The Chair: Hold on. The motion has been carried.

Mr. Lessard, do you have a comment?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yves Lessard: Mr. Chairman, based on what I discover after consulting with some people, I may appeal this motion. As Mr. Silva so aptly put it, we appear to be agreeing, with this motion, to restrict the right of members to obtain documents or information by virtue of their status as members of Parliament. Therefore, I will reconsider this matter based on my findings.

[*English*]

The Chair: Thank you very much. I will just state once again that the wording, as has been explained by the clerk, is redundant. It covers what we already know.

Mr. Lake, did you have any further comments before I adjourn the meeting?

Mr. Mike Lake: No.

The Chair: Ms. Yelich, would you like to speak?

Mrs. Lynne Yelich: Yes, I would like to adjourn, but—

The Chair: We're in class now. I have to recognize you first.

Mrs. Lynne Yelich: —before we adjourn, I would like to have Mr. Savage say what Service Canada area is having such a problem that they are just tearing their hair out. Is it your home city?

Mr. Michael Savage: That would be one of them, but a number of MPs have indicated that they have good relations with—

Mrs. Lynne Yelich: Service Canada is upset and they're not very happy—

Mr. Michael Savage: Service Canada employees are indicating to members of Parliament that they don't like the new criteria.

Mrs. Lynne Yelich: But yours in particular?

Mr. Michael Savage: Well, I'm not going to talk to you about specifics. What do you want, names, addresses, phone numbers? Home addresses? Neighbours?

Mrs. Lynne Yelich: That's a pretty unfair comment. They should be able to come to us if they're having—

Mr. Michael Savage: If there's one thing we know about this government, they can take pretty strong reprisals against not only MPs but others. So I'm not going to mention any names—

Mrs. Lynne Yelich: That's not even what I'm getting at.

Mr. Michael Savage: —and that's an inappropriate question to ask.

Mrs. Lynne Yelich: It was an inappropriate remark.

The Chair: Okay, I have on the list here—

Once again, all business has been taken care of, so anything that—

Ms. Olivia Chow: I move an adjournment.

The Chair: Mr. Lessard, do you have a final comment? After Mr. Lessard's comment, I'm going to move to adjourn. Mr. Lessard, do you have any final comments?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yves Lessard: No, I'm fine.

[*English*]

The Chair: No? Okay.

The meeting is adjourned.

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.

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.