



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

44th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

Standing Committee on Finance

EVIDENCE

NUMBER 023

Monday, February 28, 2022

Chair: Mr. Peter Fonseca



Standing Committee on Finance

Monday, February 28, 2022

• (1005)

[English]

The Chair (Mr. Peter Fonseca (Mississauga East—Cooksville, Lib.)): I call this meeting to order. Welcome to meeting number 23 of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Finance. Pursuant to the House of Commons order of reference adopted on Thursday, February 10, 2022, the committee is meeting on Bill C-8, an act to implement certain provisions of the economic and fiscal update tabled in Parliament on December 14, 2021 and other measures.

Today's meeting is taking place in a hybrid format pursuant to the House order of November 25, 2021. Members are attending in person in the room and remotely using the Zoom application. The proceedings will be made available via the House of Commons website. So you are aware, the webcast will always show the person speaking rather than the entirety of the committee. Today's meeting is also taking place in the webinar format. Webinars are for public committee meetings and are available only to members, their staff, and witnesses. Members enter immediately as active participants. All functionalities for active participants remain the same. Staff will be non-active participants and can therefore only view the meeting in gallery view.

I would like to take this opportunity to remind all participants to this meeting that taking screenshots or photos of your screen is not permitted. Given the ongoing pandemic situation and in light of the recommendations from health authorities as well as the directive of the Board of Internal Economy on October 19, 2021, to remain healthy and safe, all those attending the meeting in person are to maintain two-metre physical distancing and must wear a non-medical mask when circulating in the room. As well, it is highly recommended that the mask be worn at all times, including when you are seated. You must maintain proper hand hygiene by using the hand sanitizer provided at the room entrance.

As the chair, I will be enforcing these measures for the duration of the meeting, and I thank members in advance for their co-operation.

To ensure an orderly meeting, I would like to outline a few rules to follow. Members and witnesses, you may speak in the official language of your choice. Interpretation services are available for this meeting. You have the choice, at the bottom of your screen, of floor, English or French. If interpretation is lost, please inform me immediately, and we will ensure that interpretation is properly restored before resuming the proceedings. The “raise hand” feature at the bottom of the screen can be used at any time if you wish to

speak or alert the chair. For members participating in person, proceed as you usually would when the whole committee is meeting in person in the committee room. Keep in mind the Board of Internal Economy guidelines for mask use and health protocols. Before speaking, please wait until I recognize you by name. If you are on the video conference, please click on the microphone icon to unmute yourself. For those of you in the room, your microphone will be controlled as normal by the proceedings and verification officer. When speaking, please speak slowly and clearly. When you are not speaking, your mike should be on mute. I remind everyone that all comments by members and witnesses should be addressed through the chair.

We have so many witnesses, officials and members with us here to assist with this meeting that I'll just name off the departments. We have officials from the Department of Employment and Social Development Canada, the Department of Finance, the Department of Health and the Public Health Agency of Canada.

Thank you, officials, for joining us and being here to assist with questions and any concerns during our clause-by-clause study of the bill. We also have Jacques Maziane and Émilie Thivierge, legislative clerks, who will be here to assist.

With that, members, pursuant to Standing Order 75(1), consideration of clause 1 (short title) is postponed.

The chair calls clause 2. Is there any discussion?

Shall clause 2 carry?

(Clause 2 agreed to on division)

• (1010)

The Chair: Shall clause 3 carry?

(Clause 3 agreed to on division)

The Chair: Members, shall clause 4 carry?

(Clause 4 agreed to on division)

The Chair: Shall clause 5 carry?

(Clause 5 agreed to on division)

The Chair: Shall clause 6 carry?

(Clause 6 agreed to on division)

The Chair: Shall clause 7 carry?

(Clause 7 agreed to on division)

The Chair: Shall clause 8 carry?

(Clause 8 agreed to on division)

The Chair: Shall clause 9 carry?

(Clause 9 agreed to on division)

(On clause 10)

The Chair: On clause 10, there is an amendment from the Bloc. MP Ste-Marie, you have your hand up.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie (Joliette, BQ): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The purpose of the amendment is to add the following clarification to the 1% tax on vacant housing:

(3.1) The tax under subsection (3) may only be applied in a province with the agreement of that province.

Constitutional expert Patrick Taillon came to remind us that there were two possible scenarios.

First, there's reasonable doubt that the courts will see the tax as a regulation. If we look at the records of the debates, we can see that the government is proposing this tax to change behaviour. If the courts view this tax as a regulation, they may very well strike down this section, since regulations fall under provincial jurisdiction.

If this tax weren't seen as a regulation, then it would constitute a problematic practice under co-operative federalism. The constitutional expert made this point. If we think of it as a tax, even though Ottawa has the power to impose a property tax, it's the last tax field not handled by Ottawa. This tax field is basically handled by the municipalities and school boards, which fall under provincial jurisdiction. As the Parliamentary Budget Officer reminded us, according to the studies conducted, which are updated each year, the funding issue lies with the provinces rather than with Ottawa. This may compound the issue.

Another issue is interference with existing or future taxes. For example, the City of Vancouver and the Government of British Columbia have this type of tax.

Since cities fall under provincial jurisdiction, the amendment simply suggests that the agreement of the province be obtained before proceeding. This will save us a great deal of trouble.

[*English*]

The Chair: Thank you, MP Ste-Marie.

Now I will give my ruling.

In the opinion of the chair, submitting the application of the tax to the approval of a province is a new concept that is beyond the scope of the bill and also contrary to the principles of the bill as agreed to at second reading. Therefore, I rule the amendment inadmissible.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: I disagree with you, Mr. Chair. With all due respect, I take issue with your decision.

[*English*]

The Chair: Committee members, as you know, the decision of the chair is not debatable, so I look to the clerk for the vote.

• (1015)

The Clerk of the Committee (Mr. Alexandre Roger): Shall the decision of the chair be sustained?

(Ruling of the chair sustained)

The Chair: Members, shall clause 10 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: Mr. Chair, since the Bloc Québécois amendment was ruled inadmissible, I'll request a recorded division for clauses 10 to 40.

I want to apologize to my colleagues.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Ste-Marie.

[*English*]

Shall clause 10 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: Mr. Chair, as I just said, I would like to request a recorded division for each clause up to clause 40.

[*English*]

The Chair: A request has been made for a recorded division.

(Clause 10 agreed to: yeas 6; nays 1)

The Chair: I have MP Ste-Marie and then MP Beech.

Please go ahead, MP Ste-Marie.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: We may be raising our hands for the same reason.

Mr. Chair, I believe that you would find unanimous consent to apply the vote on clause 10 to clauses 11 to 39.

[*English*]

The Chair: I hear a no.

Shall clause 11 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: Mr. Chair, I would like to request a recorded division, as I've said twice already.

[*English*]

The Chair: Okay.

(Clause 11 agreed to: yeas 6; nays 1)

The Chair: Shall clause 12 carry?

• (1020)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: I would like to request a recorded division.

[*English*]

The Chair: Please go ahead, Mr. Clerk.

(Clause 12 agreed to: yeas 6; nays 1)

The Chair: Shall clause 13 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: I would like to request a recorded division.

[*English*]

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Clerk, please.

(Clause 13 agreed to: yeas 6; nays 1)

Mr. Terry Beech (Burnaby North—Seymour, Lib.): I have a point of order.

The Chair: Mr. Beech has a point of order.

Mr. Terry Beech: This being virtual, with regard to Monsieur Ste-Marie's ask to apply, there was a "no", but I wasn't aware of who said "no". Could you just clarify that, please?

The Chair: It came from the Conservative side.

Mr. Terry Beech: Thank you.

The Chair: Shall clause 14 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: I would like to request a recorded division.

[*English*]

The Chair: Mr. Clerk, we will have a recorded vote, please.

(Clause 14 agreed to: yeas 6; nays 1)

The Chair: Shall clause 15 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: I would like to request a recorded division.

[*English*]

The Chair: Mr. Clerk, we will have a recorded vote, please.

(Clause 15 agreed to: yeas 6; nays 1)

The Chair: Shall clause 16 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: I would like to request a recorded division.

[*English*]

The Chair: Mr. Clerk, we'll have a recorded vote, please.

(Clause 16 agreed to: yeas 6; nays 1)

The Chair: Shall clause 17 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: I would like to request a recorded division.

[*English*]

The Chair: Mr. Clerk, we will have a recorded vote, please.

(Clause 17 agreed to: yeas 6; nays 1)

The Chair: Shall clause 18 carry?

• (1025)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: I would like to request a recorded division.

[*English*]

The Chair: Mr. Clerk, we will have a recorded vote, please.

(Clause 18 agreed to: yeas 6; nays 1)

The Chair: Shall clause 19 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: I would like to request a recorded division.

[*English*]

The Chair: Mr. Clerk, go ahead, please.

(Clause 19 agreed to: yeas 6; nays 1)

The Chair: Shall clause 20 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: I would like to request a recorded division.

[*English*]

The Chair: Please call the vote, Mr. Clerk.

(Clause 20 agreed to: yeas 6; nays 1)

The Chair: Shall clause 21 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: I would like to request a recorded division.

[*English*]

The Chair: Please call the vote, Mr. Clerk.

(Clause 21 agreed to: yeas 6; nays 1)

The Chair: Shall clause 22 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: I would like to request a recorded division.

[*English*]

The Chair: Please call the vote, Mr. Clerk.

(Clause 22 agreed to: yeas 6; nays 1)

The Chair: Shall clause 23 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: I would like to request a recorded division.

[*English*]

The Chair: Please call the vote, Mr. Clerk.

(Clause 23 agreed to: yeas 6; nays 5)

The Chair: Shall clause 24 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: I would like to request a recorded division.

[*English*]

The Chair: Please call the vote, Mr. Clerk.

(Clause 24 agreed to: yeas 6; nays 5)

The Chair: Shall clause 25 carry?

• (1030)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: I would like to request a recorded division.

[*English*]

The Chair: Please call the vote, Mr. Clerk.

(Clause 25 agreed to: yeas 6; nays 1)

The Chair: Shall clause 26 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: I would like to request a recorded division.

[*English*]

The Chair: Please call the vote, Mr. Clerk.

(Clause 26 agreed to: yeas 6; nays 1)

The Chair: Shall clause 27 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: I would like to request a recorded division.

[*English*]

The Chair: Please call the vote, Mr. Clerk.

(Clause 27 agreed to: yeas 6; nays 1)

The Chair: Shall clause 28 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: I would like to request a recorded division.

[*English*]

The Chair: Please call the vote, Mr. Clerk.

(Clause 28 agreed to: yeas 6; nays 1)

The Chair: Shall clause 29 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: I would like to request a recorded division.

[*English*]

The Chair: Please call the vote, Mr. Clerk.

(Clause 29 agreed to: yeas 6; nays 1)

The Chair: Shall clause 30 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: I would like to request a recorded division.

[*English*]

The Chair: Please call the vote, Mr. Clerk.

(Clause 30 agreed to: yeas 6; nays 1)

The Chair: Shall clause 31 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: I would like to request a recorded division.

[*English*]

The Chair: Please call the vote, Mr. Clerk.

(Clause 31 agreed to: yeas 6; nays 1)

• (1035)

The Chair: Shall clause 32 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: I would like to request a recorded division.

[*English*]

The Chair: Please call the vote, Mr. Clerk.

(Clause 32 agreed to: yeas 6; nays 1)

The Chair: Shall clause 33 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: I would like to request a recorded division.

[*English*]

The Chair: Please call the vote, Mr. Clerk.

(Clause 33 agreed to: yeas 6; nays 1)

The Chair: Shall clause 34 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: I would like to request a recorded division.

[*English*]

The Chair: Please call the vote, Mr. Clerk.

(Clause 34 agreed to: yeas 6; nays 1)

The Chair: Shall clause 35 carry?

[Translation]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: I would like to request a recorded division.

[English]

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Clerk.

(Clause 35 agreed to: yeas 6; nays 1)

The Chair: Shall clause 36 carry?

[Translation]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: I would like to request a recorded division.

[English]

The Chair: Mr. Clerk, go ahead.

(Clause 36 agreed to: yeas 6; nays 1)

The Chair: Shall clause 37 carry?

[Translation]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: I would like to request a recorded division.

[English]

The Chair: Proceed, Mr. Clerk.

(Clause 37 agreed to: yeas 6; nays 1)

The Chair: Shall clause 38 carry?

[Translation]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: I would like to request a recorded division.

[English]

The Chair: Proceed, Mr. Clerk.

(Clause 38 agreed to: yeas 6; nays 1)

The Chair: Shall clause 39 carry?

[Translation]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: I would like to request a recorded division.

[English]

The Chair: Mr. Clerk, go ahead.

(Clause 39 agreed to: yeas 6; nays 1)

The Chair: Shall clause 40 carry?

• (1040)

[Translation]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: I would like to request a recorded division.

[English]

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Clerk.

(Clause 40 agreed to: yeas 6; nays 1)

The Chair: Members, we've come to clause 40.1. There's an amendment from the Conservatives.

I'm looking to MP Chambers.

Mr. Adam Chambers (Simcoe North, CPC): Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

Hopefully, we'll just get some pause for the committee to consider. This is an amendment to basically take a pause on purchases by foreign buyers in the Canadian marketplace for a two-year period, recognizing that it is not permanent. It's mostly so that we can all take a step back and try to take a little bit of the wind out of the sails of this breakneck speed that we're seeing in the property market.

It is, in our view, a reasonable amendment to put forward at this time and gives us a bit of additional time for data and opportunities to see what's happening in the housing market. Last year, as an example, we saw a 25% increase. We don't think this will be a silver bullet, but it will help to take some of the upward pressure out of the property market.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Thank you, MP Chambers.

Just for members and for the record, this is part 2 of Bill C-8, which enacts the underused housing tax act: "This Act implements an annual tax of 1% on the value of vacant or underused residential property directly or indirectly owned by non-resident non-Canadians."

Amendment CPC-1 seeks to prohibit purchases of residential properties by an individual who is neither a citizen nor a permanent resident who does not reside in Canada.

As the *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, third edition, states on page 770, I will now give my ruling. It is the opinion of the chair that creating a prohibition to purchase a residential property is a new concept that is beyond the scope of the bill. Therefore, I rule the amendment inadmissible.

Hon. Ed Fast (Abbotsford, CPC): I would like to challenge the ruling of the chair.

The Chair: As the Honourable Ed Fast would know, this is not debatable. I would ask the clerk to please poll the members on whether or not the decision of the chair shall be sustained.

(Ruling of the chair overturned: nays 6; yeas 5)

The Chair: The ruling is overturned.

Members, do you want to speak to this?

[Translation]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: Mr. Chair, I have my hand up.

[English]

The Chair: Go ahead, MP Ste-Marie.

[Translation]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: I want to comment on the amendment moved by Mr. Chambers.

First, I want to commend my colleague for his dedication, his intelligence and all his work on the committee. It's truly a pleasure to work with him.

I like the idea. However, I want to raise two issues that may lead me to vote against the amendment. I would like us to discuss these issues before we vote.

First, when this tax was discussed, some colleagues in the Conservative Party expressed the following concern. What would happen if our American neighbours, our neighbours to the south, implemented the same type of legislation? There was some reluctance in this area. If the United States were to adopt reciprocal legislation or legislation with a mirror effect, it would mean that, for two years, snowbirds wouldn't be able to buy a home in the United States. Since we're talking about a significant number of people, I'm already anticipating many calls and visits to my constituency office. Many people would be unhappy. This is one reason why I would vote against the amendment.

Second, I agree with the general idea, but what about the exceptions? For example, if a Canadian homeowner wants to sell their home to their children who aren't Canadian citizens or permanent residents and who don't live in Canada, the transaction can't take place for two years. How do we address this issue?

These factors raise enough doubts for me to reject the amendment, even though the overall spirit of the amendment is appealing.

• (1045)

[English]

The Chair: Thank you, MP Ste-Marie.

I have MP Beech and then MP Baker.

Mr. Terry Beech: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thanks to my colleagues for bringing in this amendment. In principle, the general scope of the amendment is very similar to something we had campaigned on in the last election on the Liberal side of the platform. In principle, the notional idea of the amendment is pretty good. There are definitely concerns around whether or not this reflects the full scope of the challenges we might have in enforcing these measures and making sure these measures are effective.

This certainly makes me believe that it would be better to have this in a separate piece of legislation than tacking it on to Bill C-8. There are several examples of this. One example that I can think of, off the top of head, is that this amendment would apply to individuals but not necessarily to entities that individuals could control. I'm sure there are others as well. I would certainly want to give more time to it and probably give more thought to a more complete and holistic approach to implementing this and making sure that it was effective.

In general, it is trying to accomplish something that I think we want to look at too.

The Chair: Thank you, MP Beech.

Please go ahead, MP Baker.

Mr. Yvan Baker (Etobicoke Centre, Lib.): Thanks very much, Chair.

We have spoken about it and looked at this issue to a great extent in our committee. We've heard from a number of economists and

experts as we've looked at inflation and specifically the rise in the price of housing. I think what we've heard from folks is that largely this is a sort of supply-side problem, but there is definitely this aspect of non-resident non-Canadians, non-permanent residents, etc., buying property largely as an investment. I think my colleagues from all sides have heard me speak to this issue in the committee as part of the discussions. I'm very much in favour of something like this in principle.

Usually, when we craft legislation around things like this, we want to make sure that every scenario is thought through.

[Translation]

Mr. Ste-Marie raised some issues. I'm not saying that I agree with all of them, but I do agree that we need to think about them.

[English]

I think it's important that we also consider what regulations need to be in place to enforce this. Are there some sorts of exceptions? It's something that needs to be thought through carefully. I just want to make sure we are careful about how we proceed on this.

In principle, I'm supportive of the concept, of course. I just think the right of a Canadian to get access to a home certainly should come ahead of the right of someone who is not living in Canada, and not contributing, to invest in our housing market.

The Chair: Thank you, MP Baker.

Go ahead, MP Fast.

Hon. Ed Fast: Mr. Chair, I'm pleased to hear that there is at least some support in principle here around the table for our amendment. I note that at least two parties ran on this and included it in their platforms. Clearly, there is some merit to this, because two parties have reviewed this closely. In fact, our amendment directly tracks what we included in our platform.

Second, to Mr. Ste-Marie's point, I would note that this applies only to residential property as defined in the underused housing tax act, so this is very narrowly construed. This is not in any way focused on snowbirds. Snowbirds are coming up here for vacation properties. If in fact snowbirds are buying residential property and depriving Canadians of the right to purchase or live in their own home, that is a problem anyway, but the word "snowbird" implies vacation properties. Those are not captured by this legislation.

Finally, I would just say that this tool is not in any way replacing the underused housing tax that the government has brought forward. This is simply adding another tool to the tool kit. It's enhancing the tools that the government has available to address what is arguably the most serious affordability crisis this government has on its hands.

• (1050)

The Chair: Thank you, MP Fast.

I have MP Dzerowicz and then MP Chatel.

Ms. Julie Dzerowicz (Davenport, Lib.): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I want to thank the honourable member for suggesting this amendment. I also very much support the concept behind this. I think my hesitation is just that whenever we make these types of amendments in clause-by-clause, there isn't a chance for careful consideration or to ask officials what might be some of the unintended consequences.

A couple come to mind. We do know that there are American families who own property on the Canadian side and who have done so for years and years and years. They might even have a 100-year home within the family. Because the vacation home has been there for such a long time, and because we have urbanized, it might start to fall within the narrow definition that Mr. Fast talked about. Let's say there's the death of the owner, and the family wants to transfer the home directly to a child. They have to technically do some sort of sale and purchase. That could be one of the technicalities.

Again, if you look at it from a concept perspective in terms of non-citizen foreign residents purchasing residential property, you absolutely want to do that, but I'm worried about some of the unintended consequences. I also share the concern of my Bloc Québécois colleague. You know, I'd be worried, if we put in this type of a rule, about whether the U.S. would do correspondingly the same type of a rule over on their side, and about whether or not this is the best way of going about protecting the residential properties we have.

I just think it requires further discussion. I'd want to know what the unintended consequences might be. I think we should be a little cautious about adopting this.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Thank you, MP Dzerowicz.

We're moving to MP Chatel.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Like my colleague Mr. Ste-Marie, I am concerned about the precedent this may create concerning our trade partners. These same provisions could apply to Canadians who decide to purchase property in France, in the United States or in England, for example.

I am not against provisions to have foreign buyers pay more if they want to speculate on residential property, as that is really what we are trying to curb. However, I don't think we should ban those purchases without even having fully considered the potential consequences. We don't know every scenario.

For instance, I am thinking of Americans or French people who would want to purchase property in Canada so that their children can come study here. Will those purchases be banned? Will those people have to wait to be residents and be on-site before being able

to purchase the residence? That would be a bit strange. It could cause pretty significant technical issues.

How will this be applied, taking into account our international agreements with partners? For example, would we be violating any international agreements by discriminating against people who are not Canadian residents?

Have consultations been held with our international partners? Should we expect reciprocal action? For instance, after seeing Canada discriminate against its people, could the United States decide to reciprocate and prevent Canadians from purchasing property in Florida to spend their retirement there or to visit?

There are many technical issues. I am rather in favour of measures to make speculation on residential property unprofitable, but we should be careful about implementing prohibitive measures. Even if it is for just two years, it can be harmful.

• (1055)

The Chair: Thank you, Mrs. Chatel.

[*English*]

Now we're moving to MP Albas.

Mr. Dan Albas (Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola, CPC): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Good morning, everyone.

I would like to point out a few things.

First of all, this is a pause, not a ban; this would be two years from when the act comes into force, which would allow for studies to be done. We do know, because the government has put forward measures on its own saying that it wants to tamp down demand, that this will be demand side as well, because there will not be people bidding.

The second thing I would say is that this applies equally and is responding to a case of market conditions here in Canada. For example, we're part of the CPTPP, and New Zealand has banned foreign ownership of real estate, based on their own domestic issues. It applies equally to everyone and there has not been a challenge under the CPTPP.

What I would simply suggest is that we can rest assured that other partners.... Again, if the Americans or the French wish to put in place their own restrictions based on their own market distortions or market dysfunction, that's fine. Let's just bear in mind that we've seen house prices go up by 97% since 2015; that was put out in a PBO report recently. I think we need to start looking into this. Parties have agreed in principle, so let's put this into place. Nothing in here stops someone from gifting their property or allowing use of a property that is currently owned by a resident. It's just that they would not be able to transact it for those two years.

Lastly, if there are clarifications or exemptions, this act comes into effect only when the government says it comes into effect, so why would we not then use that time? If there are exemptions that need to be made, the government can simply put that in place in a future bill. The government controls the timing on this.

We've all run campaigns on this very pledge. I believe that when we're given the opportunity to fulfill our election promises, we should take the opportunity. I can understand that there are some questions from some members, but again, the government has the ability to time this and to amend the act in an upcoming budget bill if there are any issues that may arise.

Let's just vote in favour of this. It's something that many parties have committed to and, again, this is to deal with the domestic case where it would apply equally to everyone. I don't think any of our trading partners would hold that against us. If they want to put in place their own policies, that's in their sovereign interest to do so.

Thank you.

• (1100)

The Chair: Thank you, MP Albas.

Go ahead, MP Blaikie.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: Thank you very much.

I wanted to provide a few thoughts for the record. This is something that I'm generally supportive of. We've heard some reasons why the ban may not be quite as complete as one might think on a first read, including the fact that it invokes the definition proposed in the underused housing tax act. Folks who have been following the meeting will know I've been supporting the elements of that tax on clause-by-clause. I've been doing that because it's a step in the right direction, even though I think that the tax is not, ultimately, going to be adequate to the task, partly because I think there are a lot of loopholes and some of those have to do with this very definition. This is another step in the right direction.

There's no one silver bullet that's going to cure the problems of the housing market, but there has been a lot of talk about the role of foreign buyers in the Canadian housing market. This would at least create a window to see a relatively light definition of what a "foreign purchase" would be, given that we're using the definition in the act. It would give us an opportunity to see if putting a hold on some of the activity has a meaningful effect on prices in the housing market. As it has been said in many ways by many folks on all sides of the aisle, this is something that there is support for in principle.

I have to say that one of my frustrations over the last six and a half years has been the slow pace at which the Liberal government undertakes to meet its own commitments. I am pretty committed to trying to push for swifter action on certain things. We need to move on some things to get information on what policies are going to work and what aren't.

I'm prepared to move ahead with this amendment today, because it's a push in the right direction that the government clearly needs in order to get moving on some of its own stated commitments. If folks on the government side think that it needs to be done in another way, I would urge them to look at this and other platform

commitments on housing, like banning blind bidding and other things, that they've talked about but they haven't moved on. If they think they know how to move on these things better.... As Mr. Albas just said, they control the timing on all of these things, so these are things for them to prepare and then to bring to Parliament in a more timely way. Where the government doesn't, it's appropriate for parliamentarians to push. This is an example of that kind of appropriate pushing, and it's why I'm happy to support this one.

It's a slightly different situation than in the case of Monsieur Ste-Marie's amendment, when I was happy to support his ability to motivate that amendment and to have a debate on it, although I had some concerns about the substance of that amendment and would not have been voting in favour of it today. I was happy to sustain the challenge.

I see Monsieur Ste-Marie. In this case, the shoe is on the other foot, but perhaps the debate around this amendment will have convinced him to support it after all.

The Chair: Thank you, MP Blaikie.

Go ahead, MP Ste-Marie.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

This debate has certainly been interesting. I gave two examples to illustrate why I may have reservations about the amendment. I really appreciate everyone who has contributed to this debate.

I understand that, if we were to adopt this kind of legislation, our partners and our neighbours would not immediately adopt reciprocal legislation. However, I feel that, by deciding to adopt this kind of a legislative measure, we must accept the possibility that our partners may pay us back in full.

Mr. Fast made it clear that this two-year period applied within the context defined by the legislation. So if our American neighbours were to adopt a similar piece of legislation, it would be a matter of four weeks for people who travel to warmer regions in winter. The arguments that have been put forward have convinced me as far as those people go. That was one of the concerns I expressed

However, I have still not been convinced on the issue of the parent-child connection, in a case where parents want to sell their residence to their children. Ms. Chatel actually brought up a good example of children who may want to study here. I don't think that problem has been resolved.

I would like to ask the legislative clerks what impact adopting such an amendment would have on international agreements. Unless I'm mistaken, Mrs. Chatel raised the possibility of this amendment contravening certain international agreements. I would like to ask the legislative clerks for their opinion on this.

I invite my colleagues to convince me on the issue of the parent-child connection when it comes to the sale of a residence.

• (1105)

[*English*]

The Chair: Thank you, MP Ste-Marie.

I did look over to the legislative clerks, and they feel that it may be best answered by some of the officials we have with us today.

Do any of the officials have some information that they can share?

Mr. Phil King (Director General, Sales Tax Division, Tax Policy Branch, Department of Finance): Mr. Chair, I can attempt to answer that question. I'm not sure if it will be a satisfying answer. We're here from the tax policy branch at the Department of Finance, and I think the issue at hand here is that it's not so much a tax as it is a total ban or prohibition. A tax is something used to raise revenues. You would use something else to effect that ban or prohibition.

So I don't think I could speak to it. I'm not qualified to speak to what the international implications of that would be.

That's all, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Thank you.

Would other officials like to add anything?

Mr. Pierre Mercille (Director General, Sales Tax Legislation, Sales Tax Division, Tax Policy Branch, Department of Finance): I won't talk about the international agreement—I work in legislation—but I want to point out that this amendment applies only to individuals. It doesn't apply to corporations.

I also want to point out that it's a prohibition, but usually a prohibition comes with a consequence. There's no consequence here. The effectiveness of the amendment as drafted is not clear.

Thank you.

[*Translation*]

The Chair: Thank you.

[*English*]

Any other officials...?

Seeing none, I still have a speaking order. I have MP Chatel and MP Fast.

Hon. Ed Fast: I'll wait.

The Chair: Okay.

Go ahead, MP Chatel.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I thank the officials for confirming that such a ban would not necessarily lead to results and that it could be circumvented in other ways.

On the other hand, we would send our trade partners a message that their citizens and residents are banned from purchasing residential homes. Once our trade partners decide to take reciprocal action, two things will happen. First, it is not certain this will be limited to two years. Second, it is not certain that it will be limited to underused housing. This could go much further.

I am very concerned about the message we will send them, especially if we have not considered all the aspects of international

agreements and non-discrimination agreements Canada has with the United States and with Europe.

[*English*]

The Chair: Thank you, MP Chatel.

Go ahead, MP Fast.

• (1110)

Hon. Ed Fast: Mr. Chair, I'm sensing that there is this general agreement that the idea of implementing a temporary prohibition is a good thing. My colleague Mr. Albas has noted that this is a two-year prohibition. Quite frankly, if one of our trade partners were to challenge, it would take well over two years to actually complete a challenge, and it's unlikely that a provision like this, which is intended to provide a temporary respite from foreign buyers, would actually be challenged.

I think I'm probably the only one around this table who has any trade experience. I'm not claiming to be an expert, but having an understanding of challenges at the World Trade Organization, I think I can safely say that the scope of this amendment is so narrow and so circumscribed that it would not generate any challenges. I think it would send just that clear message that we are placing Canadian buyers of residential real estate first. They come first. Anybody else who wants to join can come later, but right now we have to focus on Canadians themselves.

I would encourage you, colleagues, to support this. I note that this would go back at report stage. The government can actually take this from committee and review this with officials to make sure it passes muster and will do what it claims to do. If an amendment is required or if the government wants to take this out, it can do so at report stage with the Speaker's consent.

There is a mechanism for us to move this forward and then have the House address it. I would encourage you to allow that to happen.

The Chair: Thank you, MP Fast.

I have MP Chambers next.

Mr. Adam Chambers: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thank you for the discussion and for your willingness to debate this amendment. I appreciate it very much.

For my Bloc colleague Mr. Ste-Marie, I did hear one of the officials indicate that this did not apply to corporations. I suspect that in the example you provided, there may be some planning opportunities for individuals if they're looking to provide or transfer housing to their children. I would stress once again the importance of the facts that this measure is temporary, that it is time limited, that it does sunset and that two years is, in many cases, a fairly short time frame to give us a little bit more time.

With respect to some of the concerns about international trade, I certainly appreciate those concerns. I'm wondering why we're more worried about the international trade effects on a temporary measure as opposed to some of the concerns we had raised about a permanent tax with the original clause of the bill. Given that it is temporary and that we have not seen reciprocal arrangements from some of our other trading partners, including New Zealand as my colleague mentioned, I do think two years is a reasonable time, and it certainly is not permanent.

Thank you very much.

The Chair: Thank you, MP Chambers.

I see no further hands on the amendment. Shall amendment CPC-1 carry?

Mr. Dan Albas: Could we have a recorded vote?

(Amendment negatived: nays 6; yeas 5)

The Chair: Shall clause 41 carry?

(Clause 41 agreed to on division)

The Chair: Shall clause 42 carry?

(Clause 42 agreed to on division)

The Chair: Shall clause 43 carry?

(Clause 43 agreed to on division)

The Chair: Shall clause 44 carry?

(Clause 44 agreed to on division)

(On clause 45)

The Chair: On clause 45, we have amendment NDP-1.

MP Blaikie, would you like to move this amendment?

• (1115)

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: Thank you very much. I will so move, Mr. Chair.

The point of this amendment is that there are some large spending authorities in this bill. We have heard from the Parliamentary Budget Officer that the government has been late in tabling it to public accounts. I think it is reasonable for Canadians to expect some kind of regular reporting on how the money is being spent as it goes out the door rather than having to wait up to 18 months to see that recorded in the public accounts. So this is just a simple amendment to require the government to report quarterly on how that money is being spent over the course of the next year.

The Chair: I do see some hands up.

MP Beech.

Mr. Terry Beech: Speaking specifically to this amendment, I want to step back and take a second to thank MP Blaikie for his package of amendments. I thought they were quite good and I'm looking forward to discussing them all.

With regard to this, in general, we are entirely in favour of more transparency and openness in reporting. There are some operational

challenges that we're concerned about with regard to actually getting this data from the provinces and the strain it would put on their standard reporting systems. We do have a commitment to do this annually, but at this time, we have some challenges with the strain this would put on individual provinces and territories.

The Chair: Thank you, MP Beech.

I have MP Ste-Marie next.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

My comments will be along the same lines. According to the amendment, the provinces would report to the department, which would then report to us.

First, the provinces have been chronically underfunded in health. Second, in the Bloc Québécois' view, the provinces should not be reporting to the federal government on health expenditures. For those reasons, I will vote against the amendment.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Ste-Marie.

[*English*]

I see MP Blaikie's hand up.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

I don't think the idea here is for the provinces and territories to report to the federal government, but rather for the federal government to report to Parliament. Parliament gives the government permission to spend money on specific things. In that context, it is reasonable for the federal government to guarantee to the House that money authorized for specific purposes has been spent on what it was allocated for.

As Mr. Ste-Marie knows very well, the NDP and I support increasing transfers to the provinces, with no strings attached. However, in this case, money was proposed for specific purposes, which is one reason why the NDP and I are supportive. So I think it makes sense for a report to guarantee to us that the money has been used for what is prescribed in the legislation.

I am open to the idea of changing the wording a little bit, if that can help. We could rather say:

• (1120)

[*English*]

“a report setting out how the provinces and territories intend to spend the money”.

I recognize that there are reporting processes at the provincial level and that, until those are completed, it may be difficult for the federal government to report with authority on how the money was spent. Presumably, though, the federal government is going to have a conversation with the provinces before this money flows. Presumably, in that conversation, they're going to say that this money is for the specific purpose of either purchasing COVID tests or whatever the other purpose happens to be under this legislation for the spending authorities. The federal government is going to release those funds, satisfied that it has at least some basic understanding of how that money is going to be used for the purposes for which Parliament authorized it.

That's the tree I'm barking up. I'm happy to modify the language a bit, but it's unthinkable to me that the federal government would release money to the province that is approved for a very specific purpose without any conversation at all about what the province largely intends to do with it. It also flies in the face of some more informal reporting that the government has been doing on its own website about how this money has been flowing, so this is a way of formalizing it. That's something that I believe is important.

It's important for at least two reasons. One is that it recognizes the appropriate role of Parliament and the accountability of the government to Parliament with respect to spending. The second reason is that it also formalizes and adds that reporting to the official record. While it's all well and good for the government to offer additional reporting on its website—that has, from time to time, been invoked by government members for various things having to do with financial reporting over the years that I've been here—the fact of the matter is, what is voluntarily reported can be taken down, and we have seen this in certain cases. It can be taken down overnight.

We saw this on reporting about the wage subsidy, for instance. The government, at one time, provided the names of publicly traded entities that were receiving wage subsidy funds. There was quite a good report on that done by *The Globe and Mail*. Lo and behold, either in the middle of that investigative process or shortly after the publication of that article, all of that information came down from the Internet.

I really do believe in this reporting and, therefore, believe it shouldn't be voluntary. It's something the government should be required to do and it should be recorded in a place like the official record of the House of Commons so that they are not numbers and that it is not information that can simply disappear at the will of the government.

That's why it's important to record these things. I'm not saying this because I think that any member of this committee feels otherwise; I'm just explaining my own reasons why it's important.

To Monsieur Ste-Marie's point, I don't think this is the place to raise unconditional transfers to the provinces. I think that needs to happen, and I think it needs to happen at the appropriate tables. Here, we're talking about money that is spent for very specific purposes having to do with the pandemic. I think the federal government at the very least should be reporting back to the House of Commons on whether it thinks it has accomplished those objectives or not. That's what's at stake in this amendment.

The Chair: Thank you, MP Blaikie.

We have further debate. I see that MP Albas has his hand up.

Mr. Dan Albas: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I would like to thank Mr. Blaikie for his intervention. His arguments around accountability I think are very strong.

I just want to raise the point that we have been seeing bill after bill now in this Parliament where the government is bypassing the usual estimates process and instead is using legislation to make these payments. I don't think that's necessarily a good process. If the government is going to move outside of the typical supply process, where they are putting it in the main estimates or putting it into the supplementaries, we should be asking for more accountability from the government.

It does seem to me that either they didn't anticipate this spending—and that starts to raise questions about whether or not they have a firm plan in place as to where this will go—or they are doing this for political reasons.

I think Mr. Blaikie has raised a number of arguments, and I'm willing to support him on this.

The Chair: Thank you, MP Albas.

In scanning the room and looking at the screen, I don't see any hands up.

Shall NDP-1 carry?

An hon. member: Yes.

• (1125)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: I request a recorded division.

[*English*]

The Chair: We will have a recorded division, Mr. Clerk.

(Amendment negatived: nays 6; yeas 5 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: Shall clause 45 carry?

(Clause 45 agreed to on division)

(On clause 46)

The Chair: Clause 46 has NDP-2.

Mr. Blaikie, please go ahead on your amendment.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: Thank you very much.

I will move this amendment. I think you'll find that this amendment does not have a reference to the provinces, so perhaps it will be more palatable to certain members of the committee for whom that's a concern.

It simply asks that the federal government, for money that is specifically for the purpose of buying rapid tests, regularly report on the number of tests purchased and how they were distributed. We know that some of this money, in the way that its purpose is characterized under the legislation, will not simply be distributed to provinces and territories.

There are areas where the federal government has some responsibility, within the context of the Canadian Armed Forces or the provision of health services on reserve. There are areas where the federal government will also be making some of these purchases directly. In those cases, as well as in the cases where it's transferring money to provinces and territories for a specific purpose, I think it's reasonable that the federal government would be reporting to the House of Commons on how that money is spent.

As a colleague of mine on the committee rightly pointed out, normally we would interrogate some of this expenditure through the normal estimates process, and instead we are authorizing it through legislation. We're doing that in a context where the Parliamentary Budget Officer has said that the government has been slow to publish its public accounts in the pandemic context. I think that if we're going to have a sense of whether this money is being spent properly in time to be able to raise questions about it and maybe have a positive impact, then there has to be some kind of reporting.

Again, this is why I think it makes sense for us to try to introduce some of that into the legislation that provides authority for the spending. That's why I've suggested this amendment.

The Chair: Thank you, MP Blaikie.

I see a couple of hands up. I have MP Beech and MP Ste-Marie.

Mr. Terry Beech: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

In general, I'm quite supportive of this amendment. I circulated, or attempted to circulate, what I hope is going to be a friendly amendment, and I'll speak to what that is.

As NDP-2 and NDP-3 are close, I think I referred to Bill C-10 in my subamendment, but I will read this in and hopefully it will be considered a friendly—

The Chair: I'm going to interject, MP Beech, just before you start.

I've spoken to the clerk. The French version is not exactly the same as the English version.

I'll look to the legislative clerk. Could you help with where the problem is before you read that in?

Mr. Jacques Maziade (Legislative Clerk): In what we received, the English version is not the same as the French version. As I understand it, the English version seeks to modify NDP-3—

Mr. Terry Beech: Yes. That's the part I'm speaking to. I want to do it to Bill C-8, so it's to NDP-2, actually. They're similar.

Mr. Jacques Maziade: It's just to NDP-2. That means that the English version is not the correct version.

Mr. Terry Beech: Yes. That's exactly it.

I can read this in, and I think you'll see that it will be easily fixed.

Can I proceed, Mr. Chair?

The Chair: MP Beech, we only have it circulated in French. To circulate the English version, we would need that change made.

Mr. Terry Beech: Yes. I'm going to have to read it in, and type and talk at the same time.

• (1130)

The Chair: That's right.

Go ahead, MP Beech.

Mr. Terry Beech: There are two amendments and I'm hoping that they're both going to be friendly.

The first would be, in the first sentence where it reads, "COVID-19 comes into force and every three months after that", I would add the words "should any payments be made under the act during that period". This allows there to be, effectively, a sunset clause so that there's no needless reporting if there are no payments made.

The second part is immediately following this, which reads, "the Minister of Health must prepare a report setting out". It's a small addition, which is, "the total amount of payments". The initial motion reads "a report setting out the payments made under the act", but this clarification would say, "the total amount of payments under the act". That amendment is for competitive reasons. As we acquire rapid tests, they will be acquired by different companies. Knowing the individual breakdowns of what tests would be acquired at what price will hurt us competitively while negotiating to acquire them. There are some companies that may not wish to participate if their per-unit cost is known.

I'm hoping that this stays in the same intent as the mover's motion, and I'm hoping it can be adopted as a friendly amendment.

The Chair: Thank you, MP Beech.

I am going to look to the legislative clerk for some clarification on what you just entered into the record as your amendment.

Mr. Jacques Maziade: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Beech, I want to make sure that I understand what you want to add to NDP-2. Do you have page 4 of the package of amendments? You said that you want to add some words after the words "COVID-19", but it is not in NDP-2.

If you refer to page 4 of the package, and if you could read—

Mr. Terry Beech: Maybe I could ask this. We are at an hour and a half of a three-hour meeting, so could I ask for the five-minute suspension that we normally have, to have a quick break? I'll draft it appropriately and we can get it circulated. I think that would make it much quicker, and everybody could have a quick wash-room break at the same time.

The Chair: That's a good idea.

We'll suspend for five minutes.

• (1130)

(Pause)

• (1140)

The Chair: I call the meeting back to order.

Welcome, members. I do want to let members know that I just heard from the interpreters. Could members could keep their phones or devices on “silent”, just because when they “ding”, when they go off, it does affect the interpreters in their work? I'd appreciate that. Thank you so much.

Mr. Beech, you now are going to be moving your subamendment.

Legislative Clerk, will that be the process?

Mr. Jacques Maziade: Yes, with the copy that we just circulated.

The Chair: The copy has been circulated to everyone. Hopefully, everybody has the same copy.

Go ahead, MP Beech.

• (1145)

Mr. Terry Beech: Thank you.

I'm sorry for the delay, but the nice part of this delay is that we were able to make my subamendment even more efficient through some chat with MP Blaikie that happened after we were suspended.

The amendment changes starting with, “the Minister of Health must prepare a report setting out the number of payments made under subsection (1)”. The addition there would be “number of” payments. Immediately following that “made under subsection (1)” is this addition: “should any payments be made under the Act during that period”. This speaks to the two comments that I made prior to the break regarding this amendment, and I'm hoping that these will be taken as friendly.

The Chair: MP Blaikie.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: Those changes are acceptable to me, so I'm prepared to accept them if there's no objection from any other committee member to changing the wording of the motion. I'm happy to accept those.

The Chair: I'm just looking to see if there's any more discussion.

I have MP Fast.

Hon. Ed Fast: I would just ask for clarification of Mr. Beech. He has included the words “the number of payments made”.

Mr. Beech, are you referring to the actual amount of payments? How would we actually know what the amount of the payments were if you're just referring to the number of payments made? You could say a payment was made to that province, that province, and that province, and the fourth one got, say, three payments, but we'll never know exactly how large those payments were, at least on a quarterly basis. Perhaps you have some clarification as to what was intended.

Mr. Terry Beech: “Number of and total” could correct that, I guess. The major concern we have is making sure that the individual.... There's no way for individuals to figure out which individual companies...what their per-unit basis is. As long as we're qualifying that, I think everything else is fair game. We could add “total amount” to that, and I think it would be fine. I hope that provides clarity for you, but the intention is what you stated, Mr. Fast.

Hon. Ed Fast: The way that would then read, it would say, “prepare a report setting out the number and amount of payments made under subsection (1)”. Am I correct?

Mr. Terry Beech: I just have one small correction. It would be “total amount”, because we wouldn't want it to be confused with individual amounts.

The Chair: I'll look to the legislative clerk.

Could you just explain for clarity?

Mr. Jacques Maziade: Just to clarify, is it “setting out the total amount of the number”?

Mr. Terry Beech: I think it would be “the number of and total amount of payments made under subsection (1)”.

Mr. Jacques Maziade: Let me read this back for the committee, please. We will say: “the Minister of Health must prepare a report setting out the number of and total amount of payments made under subsection (1)”.

The Chair: Is that all right with Mr. Blaikie? It's his amendment.

Mr. Terry Beech: It's a friendly subamendment.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: This may just be an aesthetic preference, but I wonder if we might say “prepare a report setting out the number of payments made and the total amount paid under subsection (1)”.

Mr. Terry Beech: That is also acceptable.

The Chair: We'll make sure we capture that.

• (1150)

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: The fact that it rhymes is a little bonus. I can't take credit for having planned that out.

I don't know if you can make it rhyme in the French, as well, for Monsieur Ste-Marie, but I'm sure we would all be impressed if that were possible.

The Chair: I'm looking around and I don't see any further discussion. Shall we call the vote here on this subamendment?

Mr. Dan Albas: Agreed.

(Subamendment agreed to)

The Chair: On the amendment, shall NDP-2 carry as amended?

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

The Chair: Shall clause 46 carry?

(Clause 46 as amended agreed to on division)

The Chair: Now we have a new clause, 46.1.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: Mr. Chair, in respect of this amendment NDP-3 and given our advice on the admissibility of the amendment and the discussion around NDP-1, I won't move this amendment.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you, MP Blaikie.

Shall clause 47 carry?

(Clause 47 agreed to on division)

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: Mr. Chair, may I say something?

The Chair: Go ahead, MP Blaikie.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: My understanding is that there aren't any other amendments foreseen. I wonder if we might have unanimous consent to carry the other clauses of the bill on division.

Hon. Ed Fast: No.

The Chair: There is no unanimous consent.

Shall clause 48 carry?

(Clause 48 agreed to on division)

The Chair: Shall the short title carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: On division.

[*English*]

The Chair: Shall the title carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: On division.

[*English*]

The Chair: Shall the bill as amended carry?

Mr. Dan Albas: I'd like a recorded vote.

The Chair: We'll have a recorded vote, Mr. Clerk.

The Clerk: The vote is on the bill as amended.

(Bill C-8 as amended agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: Shall the chair report the bill as amended to the House?

Hon. Ed Fast: Could we have a recorded vote?

(Reporting of bill to the House agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: Shall the committee order a reprint of the bill as amended for the use of the House at report stage?

• (1155)

Hon. Ed Fast: Could we have a recorded vote?

(Reprint of the bill agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: Thank you, Clerk.

Thank you, members.

This concludes our session. Thank you for all the discussion. That was great.

We'll bring the report to the House.

Members, shall we adjourn?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chair: We're adjourned.

Published under the authority of the Speaker of
the House of Commons

SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

The proceedings of the House of Commons and its committees are hereby made available to provide greater public access. The parliamentary privilege of the House of Commons to control the publication and broadcast of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its committees is nonetheless reserved. All copyrights therein are also reserved.

Reproduction of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its committees, in whole or in part and in any medium, is hereby permitted provided that the reproduction is accurate and is not presented as official. This permission does not extend to reproduction, distribution or use for commercial purpose of financial gain. Reproduction or use outside this permission or without authorization may be treated as copyright infringement in accordance with the Copyright Act. Authorization may be obtained on written application to the Office of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Reproduction in accordance with this permission does not constitute publication under the authority of the House of Commons. The absolute privilege that applies to the proceedings of the House of Commons does not extend to these permitted reproductions. Where a reproduction includes briefs to a committee of the House of Commons, authorization for reproduction may be required from the authors in accordance with the Copyright Act.

Nothing in this permission abrogates or derogates from the privileges, powers, immunities and rights of the House of Commons and its committees. For greater certainty, this permission does not affect the prohibition against impeaching or questioning the proceedings of the House of Commons in courts or otherwise. The House of Commons retains the right and privilege to find users in contempt of Parliament if a reproduction or use is not in accordance with this permission.

Also available on the House of Commons website at the following address: <https://www.ourcommons.ca>

Publié en conformité de l'autorité
du Président de la Chambre des communes

PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

Les délibérations de la Chambre des communes et de ses comités sont mises à la disposition du public pour mieux le renseigner. La Chambre conserve néanmoins son privilège parlementaire de contrôler la publication et la diffusion des délibérations et elle possède tous les droits d'auteur sur celles-ci.

Il est permis de reproduire les délibérations de la Chambre et de ses comités, en tout ou en partie, sur n'importe quel support, pourvu que la reproduction soit exacte et qu'elle ne soit pas présentée comme version officielle. Il n'est toutefois pas permis de reproduire, de distribuer ou d'utiliser les délibérations à des fins commerciales visant la réalisation d'un profit financier. Toute reproduction ou utilisation non permise ou non formellement autorisée peut être considérée comme une violation du droit d'auteur aux termes de la Loi sur le droit d'auteur. Une autorisation formelle peut être obtenue sur présentation d'une demande écrite au Bureau du Président de la Chambre des communes.

La reproduction conforme à la présente permission ne constitue pas une publication sous l'autorité de la Chambre. Le privilège absolu qui s'applique aux délibérations de la Chambre ne s'étend pas aux reproductions permises. Lorsqu'une reproduction comprend des mémoires présentés à un comité de la Chambre, il peut être nécessaire d'obtenir de leurs auteurs l'autorisation de les reproduire, conformément à la Loi sur le droit d'auteur.

La présente permission ne porte pas atteinte aux privilèges, pouvoirs, immunités et droits de la Chambre et de ses comités. Il est entendu que cette permission ne touche pas l'interdiction de contester ou de mettre en cause les délibérations de la Chambre devant les tribunaux ou autrement. La Chambre conserve le droit et le privilège de déclarer l'utilisateur coupable d'outrage au Parlement lorsque la reproduction ou l'utilisation n'est pas conforme à la présente permission.

Aussi disponible sur le site Web de la Chambre des communes à l'adresse suivante :
<https://www.noscommunes.ca>