

Private Members' Business

It works something like this. Before the election the Reform Party was in favour of ameliorating the infrastructure and of the federal government supporting it. After the election Reformers started criticizing this. You might ask what is wrong with that, after all, they are Reformers and it should be expected that they will contradict themselves every now and then. That might be true, but there is a certain limit beyond which it becomes odd, even for Reformers.

We have the spectacle of the hon. member for Simcoe Centre. That is a spectacle if I ever saw one. He wrote a letter regarding an infrastructure program in his riding. I want all my colleagues to know it was a coincidence that it was in his riding. The letter, which was to the President of the Treasury Board, stated: "I am writing to further offer my strong support for the project because of the significant job creation this project will provide. One of the main objectives of the infrastructure program is to promote public and private sector partnerships that will not only improve the local and regional economic climate, but also will help Canada as a whole to attract corporations by providing prime business opportunity" and so on.

That was the hon. member for Simcoe Centre, who was at that time writing in praise of an infrastructure program that just happened to be located in his riding. After that was over the same member—

Mr. Harris: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. We are supposed to be discussing the amendment that was put forward by the hon. member for Laurentides. What the hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell is talking about now has no relevance to the amendment. Mr. Speaker, that he speak to the amendment.

• (1745)

The Deputy Speaker: The member is referring to the standing order regarding relevance. I am sure the hon. member will make his remarks relevant, if that was not the case, very soon.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, the motion is with regard to supporting infrastructure programs. The amendment refers only to how one should fund these infrastructure programs. Of course the member for Simcoe Centre was writing in support of funding an infrastructure program which is exactly what the amendment is about.

Let us get back to the member for Simcoe Centre because I like him a lot. The member for Simcoe Centre in commenting to a reporter said "of other infrastructure programs". By coincidence, these other projects were not in his riding, but here is

what he said about them. Remember, let us not be cynical. These other projects to which I am going to refer were in someone else's riding. He said about those: "It is not infrastructure; it is a make work project. They talk about the short term jobs this is creating but those jobs can be anywhere from one day to one month". He was explaining how these things were wrong, among them renovating the coliseum in Edmonton and building facilities and arenas elsewhere.

All those other arenas were wrong but the arena in Barrie was right. It just happens to be in the riding of the member for Simcoe Centre. It was worthy of support and all the praise I brought to the attention of the House a moment ago. It constituted all those virtuous things I described to the House, such as promoting public and private sector partnerships, and so on.

How could that be? How could it be that infrastructure projects are worthy when they are in the hon. member's riding but virtually identical projects in someone else's riding are not worthy of similar praise? I am sure there is a reasonable explanation for this and we will hear it soon.

Let us talk about the infrastructure works program. The city of Calgary has put out a publication on the Canada—Alberta infrastructure works program. It is called "Calgary at Work". Calgary of course is where the ridings of the leader of the Reform Party and other Reform members are located. I wonder if they will pay attention to this because we might ask them questions later. The publication "Calgary at Work" lauds all the virtues of the infrastructure program and all the things that have been done in Calgary. Here are some of the things—

Mr. Johnston: A point of order, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you could confirm quorum.

The Deputy Speaker: There is not a quorum.

Call in the members.

And the bells having rung:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 29(4), I would ask those members present to approach the table and have their names recorded in the journal.

[*Translation*]

Pursuant to Standing Order 29(3), as we do not have a quorum, the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m.

(There being only 13 members present, including the Deputy Speaker, the names were written down, and the House adjourned at 6.03 p.m.)