



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

44th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

Standing Committee on Finance

EVIDENCE

NUMBER 094

Monday, May 29, 2023

Chair: Mr. Peter Fonseca



Standing Committee on Finance

Monday, May 29, 2023

• (1605)

[English]

The Chair (Mr. Peter Fonseca (Mississauga East—Cooksville, Lib.)): I call this meeting to order.

Welcome to meeting number 94 of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Finance. Pursuant to the order of reference of Tuesday, May 2, 2023, and the motion adopted on May 16, 2023, the committee is meeting to discuss Bill C-47, an act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on March 28, 2023.

Today's meeting is taking place in a hybrid format, pursuant to the House order of June 23, 2022. Members are attending in person in the room and remotely using the Zoom application.

I'd like to make a few comments for the benefit of the witnesses and members.

Please wait until I recognize you by name before speaking. For those participating by video conference, click on the microphone icon to activate your mike. Please mute yourself when you are not speaking. For interpretation, for those on Zoom, you have the choice at the bottom of your screen of English or French. For those in the room, you can use the earpiece and select the desired channel.

Just as a reminder, all comments should be addressed through the chair. For members in the room, if you wish to speak, please raise your hand. For members on Zoom, please use the "raise hand" function. The clerk and I will manage the speaking order as best we can. We appreciate your patience and understanding in this regard.

Members, I'd like to bring your attention to paragraph (b)(iii) of the motion adopted on May 16:

(iii) if the Committee has not completed the clause-by-clause consideration of the Bill by 4:30 PM on Monday, May 29th, 2023, all remaining amendments submitted to the Committee shall be deemed moved, the Chair shall put the question, forthwith and successively, without further debate on all remaining clauses and proposed amendments, as well as each and every question necessary to dispose of clause-by-clause consideration of the Bill, as well as questions necessary to report the Bill to the House and to order the Chair to report the Bill to the House as soon as possible.

I'd like to welcome our witnesses. They are all virtual. With us today, for the first hour, is a multitude of senior officials from various departments to answer any questions from the members.

Where we last left off.... Actually, I see that MP Blaikie's hand is up and MP Dzerowicz's hand is up.

I don't know if anybody else's hand is up.

No. There is nobody on the screen.

I will go to MP Blaikie just before we get started here on an annotated agenda.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie (Elmwood—Transcona, NDP): Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

I believe the slate is clear, as it were, of motions. I'd like to start by moving and then motivating a motion.

The motion reads as follows:

That notwithstanding the May 16th motion passed by the Committee, if the Committee has not completed the clause-by-clause consideration of the Bill C-47 by 4:30 PM on Monday May 29th, 2023, (i) all remaining amendments submitted to the Committee as of Friday, May 26, 2023 shall be deemed moved, (ii) the Chair shall put the question, forthwith and successively, without further debate on all remaining clauses and proposed amendments, except that not more than 20 minutes shall be allotted for debate on each proposed amendment, to be divided to a maximum of five minutes per recognized party, unless unanimous consent is granted to extend debate on a specific amendment, (iii) no subamendments or motions may be moved during debate, (iv) at the expiry of the time provided for debate on a specific amendment, the Chair shall put every question to dispose of the amendment, forthwith and successively without further debate, (v) the Chair shall be empowered to group clauses for which no amendment has been proposed, subject to the unanimous consent of the committee, (vi) once all questions necessary to dispose of all remaining clauses and proposed amendments have been decided, the Chair shall put, forthwith and successively, every question necessary to dispose of clause-by-clause of the bill, as well as questions necessary to report the Bill to the House and to order the Chair to report the Bill to the House as soon as possible.

This motion is really just meant to address the problem that I highlighted last day. Due to the choices of folks around the table, we've now exhausted most of the time we have to debate proposed amendments to the bill. How that works is that, until we get to the clause, the amendments that have been proposed so far aren't moved. At 4:30 they're all deemed moved. Then you could talk about them, except that the motion, which was agreed to by everyone around this table, including the Conservatives, by unanimous consent, prohibits debate.

We end up in an awkward position where prior to 4:30 we can't talk about the amendments. After 4:30 we have to vote on them. I think that means we end up not being accountable for the decisions we're making around the table.

I would say, because I notice we have some substitutions here today, that unfortunately we've come to a place where there's just no trust around the committee table. On trying to extend this process, I think many of us feel that any goodwill we might show in order to extend the process for appropriate reasons won't be honoured, and that it will be abused in order to do more of what we have seen around the table so far. It makes it really difficult in that kind of context, where you just don't have a lot of trust around the table, where the goalposts have often shifted and where you thought you had an understanding about how to proceed and then the time isn't used for the purposes we thought we had agreed to.

As I've said earlier too, I don't think it's just one side that's been difficult in this whole process. I think the minister ought to have told the committee if she was going to come for more than an hour, whether that was an hour and 20 minutes, an hour and 40 minutes or the two hours that I would have liked for us to express as a committee that we wanted her here for, but we never did get to a vote on the invitation for the two hours. There has been a lot of dysfunction.

I think the minister should show more respect to the committee than to refuse to come for a reasonable amount of time. I think she clearly had time in her schedule to stay longer. I think she should have indicated that to the committee beforehand. I think that's a very easy, respectful thing to do. That means that people can prepare for a longer appearance. It's nice of her to stay longer, but in a properly functioning professional work environment, people would have a heads-up. It's not like she can claim she didn't know that this was a matter of contention.

That doesn't mean I endorse the way everyone around this table handled it. I think they actually wasted all the time we had to hear from witnesses, then agreed to a really quick turnaround on clause-by-clause, and then kind of went back on that and decided to complain that, even though the text of the motion they agreed to was honoured, it wasn't good enough for them.

● (1610)

You know, I can hear them wanting to have heard more witnesses. There was some time for that early last week. Instead of raising it on the Sunday or the Monday, they chose to raise it on the Wednesday. They chose to raise it publicly before they raised it anywhere else.

We can all point fingers at each other around here. This has not been a good process. I think it's pretty pathetic, frankly. I hope nobody here is feeling good about what we've been doing over the last four or five weeks for any reason. I don't think there's anything we can point to in order to say to Canadians that we've done our job the way it should have been done. Some of us may be able to say we were prepared to do our job. I certainly undertook to do all the things one has to do to prepare for these meetings. Then I wasn't given the opportunity to do the work required.

This motion is just to allow five minutes to each party on each amendment that has already been proposed, to put some reasons on the record for why we're either supporting that amendment or not supporting that amendment. If folks here want to spend the next hour debating it and not have a vote, then what we'll end up doing is just going and voting on everything successively. It's just that

Canadians won't get to know the reasons why we're voting. There will be nothing to hold us to account on that. I don't think that's value added to the process, regardless of the reasons somebody might feel it hasn't been a good process to date or of where they lay the blame. The one thing we can do now in the situation we find ourselves, where nobody really trusts anybody around the table, is to at least do the minimum to make sure that Canadians have an opportunity to hear why certain parliamentarians on this committee are voting one way on amendments or why they're voting the other way.

As I said, we can talk it out, but that's not going to do much except ensure that we have less accountability around this table. We don't all have to agree on it. All we have to do is let it come to a vote. Then the majority of the committee can decide if this is the way they want to proceed or not.

I've said my piece on that, Mr. Chair. I hope this is something that, at a minimum, we can agree to in order to meet our responsibilities to Canadians and to make ourselves accountable for the decisions we're going to make around the table. We don't have the power to compel a minister to appear, but we're here. We do have the power to allow ourselves to put comments on the record and then be held to account for those. I hope that at least we will hold ourselves to that standard of accountability. That remains to be seen.

Thank you, Mr. Chair. I look forward to hearing debate on this motion.

The Chair: Thank you, MP Blaikie. The clerk has received your motion and has distributed it to members.

In terms of what you said about timing, MP Blaikie, we have 16 minutes before we go to clause-by-clause with no debate on anything after that.

I have a speakers list on your motion. I have MP Dzerowicz, MP Baker, MP Beech, MP Chambers, MP Lawrence and MP Morantz, in that order.

MP Dzerowicz.

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

I want to thank Mr. Blaikie for putting forward this proposed motion. I do support it. I hope everyone around the table will support it as well.

I want to say that I'm also very sad that we are where we're at right now. I agree with something Mr. Blaikie said in our last session—that what is happening right here at committee is a disservice to Canadians. I think it truly makes a mockery of the committee and the important work that we have been elected to do. I think that moving forward we need to do much better.

I will also say that I very much honour the comments. I would like to ask for unanimous consent on Mr. Blaikie's motion.

Can we ask for that, Mr. Chair, and see whether or not we have that? Maybe a miracle has happened and everyone has seen the light and we're able to have unanimous consent and approval for Mr. Blaikie's motion.

• (1615)

The Chair: Thank you.

I see MP Ste-Marie with a thumbs-up—

Mr. Philip Lawrence (Northumberland—Peterborough South, CPC): No.

The Chair: I hear a no.

Ms. Julie Dzerowicz: I wanted to make sure of that, just in case something happened.

Anyway, thank you, Mr. Chair. I will say to you that I also want to acknowledge and honour the comments that Mr. Beech and you made at our last committee meeting. I think you both did an outstanding job of explaining how we got to where we are.

I also would like to say—just because I know the people in my riding and I have to be accountable to them—that there has been in no way any desire not to be accountable for this very important budget 2023 and the budget implementation act. I think there are a number of issues, concerns and questions that we could have had an opportunity to raise last week. Unfortunately, there was a filibuster that was led by our Conservative colleagues.

I will also say to you that I'm very glad our Deputy Prime Minister has come to committee. It's important for us to reiterate that our Deputy Prime Minister has been to this committee four times. There's no minister who ever comes every time they are invited to committees in general. I do want to say that our Deputy Prime Minister has, indeed, been here before this committee on a number of different bills. Before this bill, the budget implementation act, she actually came for almost two hours. It was just over an hour and 40 minutes.

Mr. Chair, I know that there are a number of other people who want to speak. I'll say to you just in ending that I think it's very important for us to move forward with this budget implementation act. I think there are a number of targeted inflation relief measures for Canadians who need it the most. We do know that there are a lot of Canadians who are having a hard time making ends meet. There are a number of measures in the budget implementation act that will be very supportive to them. I think it's important for us to move forward with haste on this bill.

I think there are stronger public health care dollars, including millions of dollars for dental care. We currently have a dental care benefit, but the passage of budget 2023 will allow us to actually transition that dental care benefit into a dental care plan.

There are also significant investments to build Canada's clean economy, which will not only continue to create really great middle-class jobs but also ensure a prosperous economy moving forward. I'll tell you, in my riding there's a very strong belief that we need to move as quickly as possible to decarbonize and get to net zero by 2050. I know that this part of the budget is particularly important for those people in my riding.

Mr. Chair, I think that my colleague Mr. Blaikie is very right. I think we need to do much better. I think we have to come together after this budget implementation act to say how we can rebuild trust amongst ourselves and find a way to move forward on the impor-

tant work that we've been elected to do on this very important committee.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, MP Dzerowicz.

It's now over to MP Baker.

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

I want to start by thanking Mr. Blaikie for moving the motion that he moved. I think what he has tried to do is give members a chance to explain their decisions as they vote through the budget bill. I think that's really important. Our role here in Parliament, as members of committee or in the House of Commons, is not just to vote on stuff. It's to make sure that we're listening to Canadians, hearing their points of view and then sharing with them why we've made the decisions we've made in voting or why we're advocating for what we're advocating for.

Unfortunately the Conservatives didn't give unanimous consent to Mr. Blaikie's motion. I think if we could pass Mr. Blaikie's motion, it would allow us to convey to our constituents why it is we're voting the way we are. I think that's a really important mechanism. I'm disappointed. I'm not looking to place blame, but I do think...

Let's be frank. The Conservatives just spent 27 hours or so filibustering this committee, which prevented us from hearing from witnesses. It prevented us from working on the bill to make it better. It prevented us from working on a bill that has tremendous implications for a lot of Canadians, especially on issues of affordability.

The fact that those 27 hours were spent filibustering by the Conservatives, who now won't give us five minutes per MP to speak to the amendments that are before us because they've declined Mr. Blaikie's motion, is really disappointing and goes counter to the spirit of how this place is supposed to work.

It's not just that it's not in Mr. Blaikie's interest or that it's not in our interest. It's not in the interest of any of the members here at this table not to be able to at least communicate for a few minutes about why we're voting the way we're voting or why certain amendments have been brought forward, or under what circumstances we would support certain amendments that have been brought forward. I'm disappointed in that.

More broadly, I would like to say that, as a member of this finance committee, this is the piece of legislation that I look forward to working on the most. I would argue that it's the most impactful part of what we do as a finance committee.

When I think about the challenges that all of our constituents are facing—especially when it comes to affordability, when it comes to challenges like growing our economy, when it comes to challenges like providing the most vulnerable with the support that they need—I think it's important that we take the opportunity and take the time we can to make this budget bill as strong as possible. Because of what has happened over the past number of weeks and the filibuster, we're not going to be able to do that. All we're going to be able to do is vote on the amendments as they are before us, and I think that's really unfortunate.

The intent of the budget bill is to supplement the budget that was introduced by the finance minister at the end of March. When I think about what the budget was designed to do, it was designed to, first of all, help people with the cost of living. As inflation has hit Canadians hard, as they struggle to pay their bills, the budget was meant to help address some of those challenges.

An example of that is the grocery rebate to help folks with the rising cost of food. Whether it's cracking down on junk fees, credit card interchange fees or predatory lending, whether it's the tax-free first home savings account, which would allow homebuyers to save \$40,000 tax free, or whether it's freezing the excise tax for a year on beer, wine and alcohol at 2%, these are some of the measures, in addition to many others that have been taken in the past several years, to help folks with the cost of living.

The budget had significant investments in health care, with conditions attached, which is really important because we need to make sure that not only are we getting value for taxpayer dollars as they get provided to provinces, in this case for health care, but that they actually deliver results for patients. We know there's a lot of improvement but also a lot more results that Canadians expect from their health care systems, and that's why we've not only provided a record amount of money but also attached conditions to that funding.

There's \$13 billion for the new Canadian dental plan, which will provide dental coverage to families earning less than \$90,000. I think that's transformational.

• (1620)

Then there are investments to build a clean economy and a number of other things to make sure that our economy grows so that the pie grows for everyone, and so that the quality of life in this country is growing and people's prosperity is growing.

All this is to say that I think there's a lot in this budget implementation act, an awful lot, designed to make Canadians' lives better. I look forward to voting on these amendments. It really would have been nice to be able to debate them, hear from more Canadians and communicate why we're voting the way we are.

I thank you, Mr. Chair, for the time.

The Chair: Thank you, MP Baker.

I have PS Beech and then MP Chambers, MP Lawrence and MP Morantz, although we have only five or six minutes left.

• (1625)

Mr. Terry Beech (Burnaby North—Seymour, Lib.): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I think I'd like to take this opportunity, first of all, to thank Daniel for his attempts, since the last time we met and over the weekend, to find consensus on this important mechanism so that individual members of Parliament can talk about the amendments.

I, too, find it unfortunate that we're in the current position. I want to make sure that there is some time for the Conservatives to say something before the 4:30 deadline. I think that's the least that we can do given that we only have five minutes left, so I'll keep this relatively short.

I did want to say that I've been in this role for about a year and a half, give or take, worked with three or four finance critics and a large number of Conservatives on the finance committee, and I think I've been a reliable and predictable, if not friendly, partner in working through these differences of opinion.

I understand that, in some cases, external factors such as leaders' offices or other factors can weigh into how we actually get things done here. I think we all see where this is going, and it's unfortunate that it's going there, but I do want to say to my partners that this will be over in a relatively short period and we still have some good work that we can do. I hope that all members around this table will come together after our voting today and try to return to this table in good faith so that we can schedule some good work, both for the rest of the year and proceeding into next fall. Perhaps we can all work together to avoid this particular situation.

I will once again ask if there's unanimous consent to pass Daniel's motion, and if there's not, I will yield the floor.

The Chair: Thank you, PS Beech.

Do we have unanimous consent on this?

Mr. Philip Lawrence: No.

The Chair: I heard a no.

I do still have a few minutes left for MP Chambers, MP Lawrence and MP Morantz.

Mr. Adam Chambers (Simcoe North, CPC): Mr. Chair, what I would provide unanimous consent for is to deem all amendments moved and then allow each party to put on the record for 15 minutes their reasons for how they're voting.

The Chair: Thank you, MP Chambers.

Now we're moving to MP Lawrence and then MP Morantz.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Did Mr. Chambers not move a motion for unanimous consent?

The Chair: Yes, we're on Daniel's motion.

An hon. member: Could you repeat that one more time?

Mr. Adam Chambers: Yes. It's that we deem all amendments moved, and that each party will have 15 minutes to put forth one person to put forth the party's recommendations on how they're voting.

Ms. Julie Dzerowicz: Then, do we vote after that?

Mr. Adam Chambers: Then we start the clock at 4:30.

Ms. Julie Dzerowicz: Can we suspend for two minutes, Mr. Chair?

The Chair: We have two minutes, and then we're done. That's it.

Ms. Julie Dzerowicz: We want to just consider it. Is that okay?

The Chair: Okay. We'll suspend for a minute.

• (1625) _____ (Pause) _____

• (1630)

The Chair: Okay. That was a good minute.

We're back. I do see a hand up.

MP Dzerowicz.

• (1635)

Ms. Julie Dzerowicz: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I want to thank Mr. Chambers for putting something forward that I think we are open to. Just because we want to make sure what the intention is, I'm going to sort of propose—

The Chair: We do need unanimous consent to continue any of this conversation, or else we're going right to clause-by-clause. If we have unanimous consent.... I see thumbs up here. I see MP Ste-Marie with a thumbs-up. Thank you very much, on screen. Everybody else?

Ms. Julie Dzerowicz: I'm not sure.

The Chair: Okay, yes, it's time limited.

Ms. Julie Dzerowicz: No.

An hon. member: Just five minutes, whatever you want.

The Chair: Look, we are going to go to our motion. We're going to clause-by-clause in five minutes. That will be at 4:40 on my watch.

Ms. Julie Dzerowicz: Where are we right now?

I was actually going to read out a statement that we are very comfortable with. It is that the amendments be deemed moved and that the committee provide 15 minutes for a representative of each recognized party to provide their views on Bill C-47, as well as the amendments to the bill. During this time, no other motions can be moved, nor can questions be put to the representative of each party, and the chair and clerk be empowered to enforce the 15-minute speaking slot.

The Chair: Thank you, MP Dzerowicz.

MP Chambers, I see a thumbs-up. Are you going to speak to this? No.

Do we have unanimous consent for what has just been put on the table?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chair: Thank you very much for that. We do have unanimous consent.

Have you received it clerk? Okay. Could we get that so that everybody's clear?

MP Dzerowicz, if you could just repeat it. You don't have to send it in writing. Don't worry. Just repeat it.

Ms. Julie Dzerowicz: I will.

It is that the amendments be deemed moved and that the committee provide 15 minutes for a representative of each recognized party to provide their views on Bill C-47, as well as the amendments to the bill. During this time, no other motions can be moved, nor can questions be put to the representative of each party, and the chair and clerk be empowered to enforce the 15-minute speaking slot.

The Chair: Just to clarify, MP Dzerowicz, are you asking for these 15 minutes right at the start, right now?

Mr. Adam Chambers: Right now.

The Chair: Okay. It's right at the start. We're clear now.

With unanimous consent to do this, for the 15 minutes, we are going to go in the order that we always go when we do our rounds of questions. We're going to start with the Conservatives. Then we'll go to the Liberals, then the Bloc and then the NDP, if everybody is okay with that. That is how we're going to start.

Do the Conservatives have somebody up and ready to go?

MP Lawrence for 15 minutes, please.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

I won't dive too deep into this, but I share everyone's sense of disappointment that the mistrust has reached these levels.

I'll jump into the amendments because time is short.

The first I'd like to talk about is with respect to.... Of course, this is a huge document. It's \$490 billion, and we have 15 minutes, but I'm going to talk about a couple of areas that I believe deserve some attention and that I'm familiar with as well, which are around tax policy.

There are a couple of principles of fundamental tax fairness that this budget implementation act violates. I'll start with the Excise Tax Act. I think it is a good step by the government to limit the amount of increase, but the principle behind it is so very troubling and undemocratic. It runs anti the very basics of tax policy and democracy, I might add.

What happens with the excise tax is that it increases every year. That is a tax increase on Canadians who engage in drinking beer, which many Canadians like to do, and there's no ability—no accountability—for Parliament to say yes or no with respect to it. It has sort of slipped underneath the veil of darkness because there hasn't been high inflation in recent years. However, thanks to this government's high-deficit, high-spending agenda, we saw inflation increase dramatically, which then led to—because this is tied to inflation—a dramatic increase in the excise tax.

We actually saw inflation go up again in the latest report. What happens is that, without the consent of Parliament—which is, of course, the people's representative—the government is appropriating funds for individuals performing the terrible act of going to their local grocery store, LCBO or SAQ and buying a case of beer or a bottle of wine.

In that scenario, perhaps it's only a couple of dollars on that beer or that wine, but it's the principle behind it that is so very troubling—that we would engage in taxation without representation, because that's what that is. It's giving a large tax increase, a large amount of revenue, to the government simply because of inflation. In fact, it's rewarding the government for its own poor economic record, because the higher inflation goes, the more revenue the government will receive. We saw revenues overflow, and even with that large amount, we still get large deficits and large debts.

I'll move from there to another troubling principle. Once again, it's the principle that matters, not so much the subject. This is the section within the BIA that calls for the application of retroactive taxation, and not just by a year or two years or five years or 10 years. It goes back 30 years. For those of you for whom it is unfamiliar, it is of course with respect to the banks and the application of GST and HST on certain monies that they make with respect to the charges of credit cards. The actual subject of the matter is not particularly important relative to the overall concept or the principle of it.

What happens is that, when we pass laws, those laws, by principle, are the rule of law. It doesn't matter what Philip put on the record or what Sophie put on the record beforehand. It doesn't even matter what we thought the bill was going to be. It's actually what the legislation is. It is then the courts who get to decide how the law is interpreted. It's a very basic tenet of law, and it's a very basic tenet of democracy that the rule of law is what we put in writing.

● (1640)

It's what separates democracies from authoritarian states, because in authoritarian states, the leader can go and say, "Do you know what? Just kidding, actually, we meant the law to mean this." In Canada and other advanced democracies, when you write something, when that becomes law, at that point, the legislators then pass that law on to the judiciary for their interpretation, so whatever happens happens. If a legislator wants to change the law because they're unhappy with a decision, they can do that, but it's nearly always done prospectively.

When I asked Ms. Gwyer of the Department of Finance to name a single case where retroactive taxation had been put in place, she could not name one. Thirty years—that's what separates an authoritarian regime in its application of the law from an advanced democracy, where once that law is made there is certainty so that those individuals will go out and plan their lives based on the rules that exist at the time. Certainly, there could be different interpretations of the rules, and that's for the judiciary to decide, but lawmakers in general won't go back to change the rules of the game halfway through the game. This is a very basic fundamental principle, not just of tax law but of law in general.

This change proposed by the budget implementation act sets a dangerous precedent. It says that, regardless of the rules and despite the law in force for decades at the time, the government can, at its own behest or otherwise, go back and actually change the rules of the game more than halfway through the game—in fact, decades through the game. People plan their lives on this certainty in law.

The challenging part is that Canada is, of course, amongst the lowest, and predicted to be the worst, with respect to capital invest-

ment. We, in many ways, are an economy unfortunately in decline, and that's due in part at least to the lack of economic and capital investment. Our manufacturing inventory is not being updated at the rate we need. We are not seeing the capital investment that is required to keep a modern economy moving. Right now, change is exponential with artificial intelligence and other technologies that are coming online, so our country needs capital investment more than ever. Because we're not replacing our capital stock, that doesn't just hurt us for today. Some of these pieces of equipment will be online for 10, 15 or 20 years, so as we fall further and further behind, it gets to be almost a generational problem of capital investment. Some of this money will come domestically, and that's terrific. Some of this will come from investors from abroad, who would hopefully see a Canadian market that would be an excellent choice to invest in.

Unfortunately, when a government creates uncertainty, as they will with this budget by setting a precedent that, even for laws that are decades old, they can go back and change the game and they can go back and change the rules, this will no doubt have.... In fact, in talking to stakeholders from far and wide, many discussed the fact that it's this uncertainty that would be a concern to investors in their business.

You can imagine making a substantial investment—maybe of millions, maybe of tens of millions, maybe even billions of dollars—and you're counting on a certain law being in place. If they want to change the law going forward, fine, give those actors notice and they can go ahead and make their changes prospectively. However, going back retroactively might mean that you have an inability to make decisions because you were counting on the rules of the game staying the same—and if not, with notice for future changes.

● (1645)

This will have a chilling effect on individuals and companies from around the world and their willingness to invest in Canada at a time when Canada needs that investment most.

We're struggling with respect to innovation. We have an innovation gap with respect to most of our advanced economic peers, and the root cause is capital investment.

We also have a productivity gap. Despite having the best workers in the world—we have incredible talent here in Canada—we are amongst the lowest with respect to productivity. We're well behind the United States of America, Switzerland, Ireland and many other developed economies. This is extremely challenging.

To introduce uncertainty into our economy is baffling, quite frankly. That this would be the time, for relatively small gain in tax dollars, to put in additional uncertainty when we need capital investment to bridge that innovation and productivity gap is baffling.

All of this has resulted in our having the lowest economic growth per capita, 0.8% over the last 10 years. What that translates into is not just a statistic; that has affected Canadians' lives, because now we have double or even triple the food bank usage.

Those were a couple of the amendments that Conservatives put forward. We look forward to having a robust discussion with respect to the amendments from the other sides.

Once again, I will conclude by saying that I share everyone's disappointment at this table. Certainly I think there's a lot of blame to go around, and that disappointment in the way this committee has evolved should be shared by everyone.

What I won't do is in any way apologize for being the opposition. That's our role. As I said earlier, we don't work for the Liberal Party of Canada. I work for the people of Northumberland—Peterborough South. This government's economic record after eight years is atrocious. We have high deficits, high debt, high inflation and high interest rates. We have the worst growth since the 1930s. Our job is not to cheer the Liberal Party on as it drives our economy into the ditch. It's our job to yell, "Stop!", and that's what we're going to do.

I will never apologize for speaking out for the people of Northumberland—Peterborough South and saying, quite frankly, the truth. I'm going to speak truth to power, Mr. Chair, because that's my job. I make no apologies for that whatsoever. The economy is in a challenging situation. I talk to so many constituents. Even the food bank chair in your own riding said that the situation on the ground is terrifying.

If, after eight years of economic failures, Conservatives are not sitting there cheering on, helping you press the accelerator to drive our economy off the cliff... I don't understand that, and I make no apologies for telling you to stop. Stop trying to ruin our economy through the unbelievable deficits, debts and challenges that you're putting on Canadians.

We live in the greatest country in the world. We have the greatest people. The only thing stopping us from realizing our potential is the Liberal Party and this government.

• (1650)

The Chair: Thank you, MP Lawrence.

Now we'll go to the Liberals and PS Beech, for 15 minutes, please.

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

While I don't agree with all the points that were just stated, it was refreshing to actually hear some of MP Lawrence's reflections on the bill that we are debating. It is disappointing to me that this is the only opportunity we're all going to have to engage on this. I hope that going forward we're going to find ways to engage in more constructive ways, so that some of Mr. Lawrence's good ideas can find their way into future legislation.

We don't expect a cheerleader in the opposition. We merely expect a reasonable working relationship. Unfortunately we haven't had that for the last little while, but I am an eternal optimist. Mr. Lawrence and I have had many good conversations about many important issues, and I think some of our best work is potentially ahead of us. I'll continue to be optimistic about that.

I'm not optimized, necessarily, towards this 15-minute summary, because that wasn't initially the plan, and we're optimized towards individual clause-by-clause, but I will do my best to provide some coverage on the 686 clauses that we are set to vote on, and then maybe give some concluding thoughts if there is still time.

As members know, we've already carried clauses 2 to 6. With regard to clauses 7 to 70, we are in favour. On clause 71, we are opposed. On clauses 72 to 112, we are in favour.

The first government amendment is on clause 113. This is a coordinating amendment. All members around this table, and in the chamber, for that matter—I'm going to try to continue to focus on the positive—agreed that it would be a good idea to get Canadians the grocery benefit in advance and to get provinces and territories \$2 billion in health transfers in advance. This amendment simply takes this out of this BIA, since we have already delivered those funds through another legislative mechanism.

We continue with clauses 114 to 117, of which we are in favour. That brings us to clause 118, which is the Bloc Québécois's first amendment. The first and second both have to do with GST and how it applies to crypto mining. In general, we believe that crypto miners should be paying GST. Where it gets complicated, of course, is when we're talking about the data providers that are providing the technical hardware and usage—the computing power—for that mining. We don't think they should be held to that unless they're actually mining themselves. I've sent some notes to my friend Gabriel regarding the reasons we're opposed to his amendments, but I also believe, through discussions with him, that we're trying to accomplish the same thing. I think we're going to end up in a good place.

That would take us through to clauses 119 to 123, which we are in favour of. That brings us to amendment CPC-1 and a number of amendments that have to do with the excise tax. We consulted with industry professionals from across the country. We heard that this has been a very challenging year, as it has been for many different industries across the country, but it has been for this one in particular. We listened to that feedback, which is why we're very proud to support a 2% reduction in the increase to the excise tax this year. We have also examined the methodology by which the Conservatives are proposing to go forward with this, and there are some unintended consequences, including refunding some of our largest brewers and resetting rates to what they were several years ago when we talk about being retroactive. That's something this would actually do, so we are opposed.

There are a number of amendments that speak to that. I think I will move from there to amendment BQ-5. That would mean we support clauses 127 to 136. Amendment BQ-5 is on clause 137. This has to do specifically with the Bank Act. We believe the authority sought under this amendment already exists, therefore we are opposing it. It's not because we necessarily disagree with it, but rather because we want to keep legislation clean.

That would bring us to clauses 138 through 209, which we are in favour of.

• (1655)

The next amendment is CPC-13, which is adjusting for the Criminal Code. I think this language, if I remember correctly, might have reflected a vote that we had in a private member's bill a while back that we all voted against—except the Conservatives. The reason we're opposing this, the actual reason, is that we believe this also is duplicative legislation. CPC-14 we oppose.

Clauses 211 to 241 we support.

The second government coordinating amendment in the last of our amendments is clause 242. I've already stated the reasons for that. That would bring us to a number of clauses that we oppose but I'm not going to comment on, just for the sake of time.

I would go all the way down to clauses 243 to 246 in the middle of the CPC clauses we do support. There are no amendments attached to them.

If we zoom down to CPC-18, this has to do with equalization and reporting. It is our position that any changes to equalization or the reporting of equalization need to be done in conjunction and consultation with the premiers in the provinces and territories. We would not support any measures without that consultation and their full support.

That would then take us to—pardon me, this is a bit of a distance from where I want to speak to you—another set of Conservative amendments that we will be opposing, until we get to clause 251 through to—and this is a big chunk—clause 444.

I'm seven minutes in, and it looks like we might actually make it.

Where does that bring us down to? Yes, there are still the CPC amendments that have to do with interswitching. I believe we're split on those.

We then carry down from clause 447 to clause 454, which we are in favour of.

Then there are a number of NDP amendments around air passenger protection regulations. It's unfortunate, because there are a number of things that are in here that we think are reasonable. There are a number of things in here, though, that we can't support, and we were actually planning to work through this as part of the clause-by-clause process and perhaps see some things get passed. Without the ability to have some sort of constructive debate, though, we're not going to be able to do that. Hopefully, we'll be able to continue to work with the NDP to figure out how to improve legislation going forward.

We support clauses 456 to 458, clause 460 and clauses 462 to 464, which do not have amendments, as well as clauses 466 to 470, and then clause 472 through to clause 632.

That would bring us to Bloc-6, I believe, which has to do with the reporting via the chairperson versus the board. Substantially, reporting ends up entirely at the board, so we find this to be somewhat duplicative as well, and we will be opposing it.

This would take us then to Bloc-7, which is about the standards for attending the EI tribunal either in person and the options thereof.... Now, I think this is another situation in which we're in agree-

ment with the Bloc, but that we don't necessarily think the language of the clause being proposed is accomplishing what we want. Our general principle, given the consultations that we had over the summer, is that proponents—workers—should have the flexibility to appear as they need to, and that a virtual option should always be available. I believe that's also the Bloc's point of view, but we're not necessarily sure that the particular writing of this clause actually accomplishes that. I think we're going to end up in a good place anyway.

Then we would support clauses 635 through 662. This would bring us to CPC-22, which is a cost analysis for changes to the EI programming.

• (1700)

The only thing I would say about this is that it was never meant to be a cost-saving measure. It was supposed to ensure that we had better representation and better results for workers. We think this amendment is speaking against workers.

That would bring us to clauses 664 through 681, which we support. We support schedule 1 and schedule 2; we support the short title and the title itself, and, of course, we support the bill itself.

With that, Mr. Chair, seeing that I have a little less than four minutes left, I will use the remainder of my time to address some things that our government has done, both through this bill and through previous legislation, which I think are important for Canadians.

Obviously the budget itself is focused on a few major things. One was an unprecedented investment in health care. Two billion dollars of that has already gone through, but there is significantly more provided by the actions that our government has taken. There is a massive investment in the next stage of investing in the clean jobs of tomorrow and ensuring that we meet our climate change targets while creating good, high-paying, quality, sustainable jobs in every region of our country. The third thing, of course, that we focused on, while dealing with inflation, was making life more affordable.

I want to detail some of the measures we have taken to make life more affordable, but first I want to provide a bit of economic context.

First, despite what my friend MP Lawrence has stated, we fully understand that there are difficult times in Canada. There are definitely difficult global times that we as a government have been dealing with. We just came out of a global pandemic. There is a war in Europe, which has had a significant impact on food prices and energy prices and a massive effect on countries around the world. Despite that, we have been able to keep inflation lower than many of our peers have, including the United States and our peer countries in Europe. We've had the fastest-growing economy in the G7 while having the lowest deficit and the lowest net debt-to-GDP ratio while we have created almost one million jobs since the pandemic.

We recognize that things are tough. We need to invest in making life more affordable and in making new opportunities. This budget does that.

It's not just the grocery rebate. It's dental care, letting children get their teeth fixed. Up to nine million Canadians are going to have the benefit of the dental care program. It's eliminating interest on loans for students while increasing grants by 40 per cent. It's lowering fees and taxes for small businesses, including \$1 billion in saving on credit cards alone over the next five years. It's making sure that we improve the Canada workers benefit, which will provide up to \$2,400 in support for our workers for up to 4.2 million families. It's decreasing the cost of child care so that families have the option to rejoin the workforce when they feel it's the right time, and then further lowering that to \$10 per day by 2025. It's indexing all of the support programs we have invested in over the years, including the Canada child benefit, the GST credit and the Canada pension plan, OAS and GIS to inflation. That does lag a bit now, but those increases are coming to match inflation and make sure people have the resources they need. It's the climate action incentive, which, in jurisdictions where it applies, is making life more affordable for eight out of 10 Canadian families. All of these combined, including our anti-poverty strategy, have lifted 2.7 million Canadians out of poverty.

Conservatives like to accuse Liberals of saying it has never been so good. We are never the ones who say that. We understand that these are challenging times, but we will continue to take an evidence-based approach to make sure we are setting up Canada and Canadians for success. That is exactly what this budget does.

I want to thank the officials who are in the room for the very hard work they have done to put forward such a great budget. It's unfortunate that we weren't able to hear more from them, but hope springs eternal, and maybe next year we will.

With that, Mr. Chair, I am happy to cede the floor.

• (1705)

The Chair: Thank you, PS Beech.

Officials are not in the room, but we do thank them. There are many of them, and they are here virtually, to help if needed.

We are now moving to the Bloc and to MP Ste-Marie for 15 minutes.

Go ahead, please, if you are ready.

[Translation]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie (Joliette, BQ): Good afternoon, everyone.

I'm speaking to you through a House-approved standing microphone. Let me know if there are any sound problems. I also have my micro-headset for backup.

I'll try to be brief in presenting my amendments.

As Mr. Beech mentioned, amendment BQ-1 concerns the taxation of businesses that own large servers, with major processing capacity and very high-speed fibre service, which are located in Quebec and Canada and that hire out their services. When those ser-

vices are hired by a foreign business capable of carrying on mining, the concern for the industry in Quebec and Canada is that they may no longer have access to the same benefits as businesses in other sectors. Consequently, amendment BQ-1 would specify and ensure that, if a business leases its computers for activities, it will be treated in the same way as other businesses.

This is important because this rapidly developing sector will help all kinds of research sectors. We've even heard talk about artificial intelligence. I want to thank Mr. Beech for all the follow-up he has done with me on this issue. According to him, and according to the government's action line, these businesses are targeted by this division. However, that's not the industry's opinion. So I encourage you to support amendment BQ-1, which would clarify matters and ensure that our industry remains competitive.

I won't present amendment BQ-2. I had concerns about the admissibility of amendment BQ-1. I know that our chair, Mr. Fonseca, is very strict about the admissibility of amendments. However, Mr. Méla reassures me, and it's quite possible that Mr. Fonseca will allow amendment BQ-1. Consequently, amendment BQ-2 won't be presented. In any case, it wouldn't completely achieve its objective. It would've had to be amended, which is no longer possible.

That brings me to amendments BQ-3 and BQ-4, which concern the excise tax on fruit-based alcohol products.

This takes us back to the debate on last year's budget implementation bill. The government said that it would henceforth be taxing all kinds of wines because Australia had sued Canada before the World Trade Organization, the WTO, and had won its case. We said that Australia's suit concerned only wine made from grapes. In Quebec, wine is wine made from grapes. Cider and mead go by different names. We wanted to exclude all alcohol products made from small fruits, honey and maple syrup. However, the amendment was ruled inadmissible. We very soon managed to exclude cider and mead, but all other alcohol products, such as ciders made from pear, apple, apple combined with pear and other small fruits, weren't covered by the exclusion that we obtained last year, and the producers are subject to full compensation. This makes no sense. For a year now, I've been hounding and repeating to the minister, Ms. Freeland, that the industry wants her to correct this error. We hope that will be done.

We are introducing amendments BQ-3 and BQ-4 in order to clarify that alcohol products, wines made from other small fruits, cider made from pears, or anything else, such as a maple syrup product, aren't targeted by the WTO judgment, which solely concerned wine made from grapes. I sincerely hope that Mr. Beech and all my colleagues can remind Ms. Freeland and her team to resolve the matter. It's urgent. It's extremely important. These are small artisans. Whether or not this tax applies can make the difference between a viable business or a failing one. This is very important.

These amendments may well be ruled inadmissible. Once again, I hope the chair of our committee will be magnanimous. Otherwise, I urge Mr. Beech to speak to Ms. Freeland and her team to resolve this, please. I realize that billions of dollars aren't at stake here, but it would really make a difference for these businesses.

Those are the concerns that amendments BQ-3 and BQ-4 are intended to address.

• (1710)

Now I'll turn to amendment BQ-5.

When we heard from the representatives of Option consommateurs, they told us that a great innovation that appears in Bill C-47 would pose a problem. Currently, in a dispute between a client and the client's bank, the case may be reviewed before a commissioner, but the commissioner's decision is only a recommendation. Consequently, amendment BQ-5 supports what the Option consommateurs representatives told us, which was that the recommendation should be made binding. I obviously hope this amendment will be supported.

Amendments BQ-6 and BQ-7 concern employment insurance. We aren't seeking an in-depth reform, but what we're proposing isn't in Bill C-47. The people concerned by employment insurance generally welcome what's in the bill on this matter.

Amendments BQ-6 and BQ-7 propose minor amendments to improve this part. Suggestions have been made by Quebec's four main unions, the CSN, FTQ, CSQ and the CSD, the Centrale des syndicats démocratiques, which came to speak to us on behalf of the group. The amendments are minor but important.

The aim of amendment BQ-6 is to increase transparency. Its purpose is to ensure that the joint group operates properly. Currently under Bill C-47, management reports to the chairperson of the commission, who provides a summary to all members. We are requesting—this is the unions' proposal—that management be directly accountable to the commission as a whole. There would thus be more transparency and openness than there would be with an intermediary.

Mr. Beech said his party didn't think that was appropriate. However, the unions feel that management should be directly accountable to the commission as a whole and not through an intermediary.

We're saying that we want to go back to a regionalization of appeals. In the part amended by amendment BQ-7, if the parties say that an appeal may be heard virtually, we can do it. We're saying that not all the parties to the matter need to be consulted, just the person who brings the appeal. For example, a person filing an appeal in an unemployment case may want to be heard in person rather than have the case heard virtually.

Once again, according to Quebec's major unions, Bill C-47 is drafted in a vague manner. For example, a person residing in Sept-Îles who wants a case to be heard in person, whereas the other parties prefer that it be heard virtually, could be heard virtually. That wouldn't achieve the desired objective. This amendment would ensure that the person can be heard in person in his or her region.

I hope I have clearly presented the Bloc Québécois' various amendments.

Having said that, I want to draw your attention to certain points. First, I will support the NDP's amendments because I think they're very constructive. The same is true of those of the Conservatives, except those respecting equalization. This seems to be related to today's election in Alberta. Failing anything better, we want a good equalization system. However, it's being said that the equalization process would be delayed, except as regards stabilization payments, which is oil company equalization. We don't agree with that, but it's fine to change the name. We also support the Conservatives' amendments respecting the excise tax, among other things.

As regards the Liberal Party's two amendments, the idea here is, first, to take away the GST check, which is just grocery money, since that's already included in Bill C-46. However, we want to keep it since officials told us it wouldn't mean a second payment in any case. However, if that's true, I would nevertheless support it since I think the less well-off do need it.

The same is true for health. Ottawa is giving the provinces a sixth of the money they requested, but we'd have a chance to get \$2 billion more if the Liberal amendment were defeated. It wouldn't be automatic, but it would be a step in the right direction.

• (1715)

The Bloc Québécois believes that Ottawa should make its proper contribution to health. We will therefore vote against this Liberal Party amendment.

Otherwise, as regards division 9 on equalization, we recently received correspondence from certain officials who said that adopting this division would result in hundreds of millions of dollars in losses for Quebec, without it being consulted. The Bloc Québécois therefore opposes this division.

Mr. Blaikie invited the Comité des représentants des transporteurs ferroviaires. So there's a whole debate going on. Unfortunately, we couldn't get to the bottom of things in order to form an opinion. For the moment, however, the railway carriers have convinced me, and, like Mr. Blaikie, I'll vote against Bill C-47's divisions regarding this matter.

I have a final point to make. Under section 510.2 of Bill C-47, which runs to hundreds of pages and more than 600 clauses, "Charles the Third, by the Grace of God" would officially be made King of Canada.

It is a rule of Parliament that we may not be irreverential toward the Crown or the monarchy.

Thus, instead of preparing a short, clearly presented bill that would be debated in the House, we are concealing the fact that we are providing for a change of sovereigns in a budget implementation bill that will affect a range of statutes.

I think this is unacceptable. I therefore encourage members of this committee to reject this clause in order to force the government to present this matter in a regular bill so that it's done properly in an open and transparent manner.

On this subject, I would like to use my speaking time to ask the committee clerk, Mr. Roger, a question.

According to tradition, when a government appoints persons to unelected positions, opposition members may summon those persons to appear before a parliamentary committee to speak with them and get to know them and their duties.

Consequently, I would have liked to welcome King Charles III to the Standing Committee on Finance since, under Bill C-47, he would be named, and not elected, King of Canada. There is nothing more hereditary than that appointment.

As it is customary to be able to question appointees in committee, I asked, more than one month ago, that we invite King Charles III and his little prince to come and testify.

I would therefore ask Mr. Roger whether we have received any news from Buckingham Palace.

• (1720)

[*English*]

The Chair: Thank you, MP Ste-Marie.

I'll look to our excellent, wise clerk, Alexandre Roger.

Can you answer the question?

The Clerk of the Committee (Mr. Alexandre Roger): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I called the Governor General's office, and they told me to send an email to them, which I did. I got no response to that email. I also called Great Britain, because if you go on the website of the King, it says the only way to reach them is to call them directly from overseas.

[*Translation*]

That's what I did. I left a message, and no one called back.

Unless I appear in person at the residence of the Governor General of Canada, I don't have a lot more opportunities to communicate with those people, since we don't have a specific email address.

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: Mr. Chair, I want to thank our two excellent clerks for all the work they do and all the effort they have made to respond to my request. I am very grateful to them for that.

Perhaps we should have found an old parchment and sent it off by horse-drawn carriage or carrier pigeon. Who knows? This reminds us once again that we are elected and that we serve the people. We want to represent them, and that's our role.

However, as a result of a tradition that we have inherited, we find ourselves dealing with a representative of the Anglican Church who won't even answer the elected representatives of his people. Under Bill C-47, that representative would be made King of Canada. I think that raises some serious questions.

Once again, I invite the members of the committee to do as I do and vote against clause 510.2 of Bill C-47, under which Charles III would be made King of Canada, so that we can have another, proper bill.

With that, I hope that all will go well. I would have liked to be with you in person, but I unfortunately could not.

Thank you, everyone.

[*English*]

The Chair: *Merci*, MP Ste-Marie.

Thank you for that, Monsieur Roger. You left no stone unturned.

We are now going to the NDP and MP Blaikie for his 15 minutes.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: Mr. Ste-Marie, I heard the king was here yesterday, but, since we weren't here, the "little prince" said he might be back another day.

[*English*]

For those of you who don't know, there is a little French song about a *petit prince*, and they talk about coming to see somebody who is not there, and the little prince suggests coming back another day of the week.

I think it's enough to participate briefly in this exercise to know that this isn't a great legislative process. I'll say just that much and then try to make the best of the time that I have.

I'll speak first to the government amendments. I think they're sensible. I think they're meant to have the legislation reflect not only the intention of the government but also the agreement that the government reached with the provinces in respect of an increase to the Canada health transfer, and I think we would not be doing our job well if we were to consent to unilateral changes in funding, even if that's a funding increase. I think that when we're talking about the terms and conditions of the Canada health transfer, we need to have an agreement between the federal and the provincial governments in order to back that up.

I would say, and I have said before at this table, that it really was remiss of the government not to have included these coordinating amendments in the first place. I certainly hope that the finance department has learned a lesson and in future will ensure that, if it's offering cash in more than one bill for the same agreement with the provinces, it has coordinated the legislation sufficiently to not run the risk of doubling the cash amount or otherwise changing it.

In the same spirit, the amendments that have been presented by the Conservative Party in respect of the equalization formula are not something that I would be prepared to support. Again, if we're going to make changes, and as I understand this amendment—of course, we don't have time for discussion or for debate—it would give a province that had a referendum the unilateral right to try to trigger a renegotiation of the terms and conditions of equalization. That is something about which, I suspect, other provinces would have something to say, so I don't think it's becoming of the finance committee of the House of Commons to decide that it's appropriate, without any real discussion or consultation, to change the way in which provinces would go about initiating a conversation about the equalization formula. For parties that are serious about honouring the rights of provinces, I think that kind of discussion and agreement is required. Because there has been no such discussion and there has been no such agreement, I don't think it's appropriate for this committee to decide to make a change like that on a unilateral basis.

There are some amendments proposed for the Bank Act. I believe these amendments are amendments that we've seen already in this Parliament as a private member's bill. The New Democratic critic on that bill, Randall Garrison, did some good work, and we have had a debate already. New Democrats had a position on those amendments at that time in the House, and nothing has changed in that regard here at the finance committee.

I want to talk a bit about some of the excise tax amendments. Canadians who have been following this file will know that New Democrats have opposed the automatic escalator. We don't think it's a good idea, and a big part of that is the role of Parliament and the unpredictability of inflation rates, and I think we've seen that. We've also seen that as inflation goes up, it can have a real negative impact on the core business of certain companies that are subject to the excise tax. That's the position on the automatic escalator.

The thing is, these amendments, as a package, go a lot further than that. They actually return the excise tax to 2017 or 2018 levels from before the automatic escalator was put in place. We support not having an increase in the excise tax this year, but that's different from reducing the excise tax. We also haven't said that we're opposed to reasonable excise tax increases in the future. We just think they should be voted by Parliament. The package on the excise tax would substantially lower the excise tax. It's not just a matter of keeping it at zero. It would actually go back to, I think, 2017 levels, which would involve a substantial rebate, as I understand it, of the excise tax. We just had a lecture on making tax policy retroactively. I think this falls along the same lines.

• (1725)

Interestingly, this substantially changes the excise tax position of the government, whereas the other changes that were referred to earlier have to do with digital payment infrastructure. This is why I'm comfortable supporting this legislative change.

I don't think what's going on here is an egregious example of retroactive legislation. It seems to me, and we've heard this to some extent around the table, that the government has had a pretty consistent position over the last 20 or 30 years in respect of this tax. It has collected the tax. It's not a matter of going back and taking a

tax. The government implemented a tax, and it has been assessing and collecting that tax. It's a tax on big banks, which have made tons of money over just the last couple of years, let alone over the 20 to 30 years that this tax has been in place.

The amount of revenue generated by that tax is not an incredible amount. I've heard some people use that as an argument to say that it should be no problem for the government to give it back. However, when you compare it to the profits that the banks make, it's a good question as to why we think taxpayers would remit that money back to the biggest banks in Canada when the government has had a consistent position and has been collecting the tax.

I get that big banks want a rebate on the tax. However, when we heard from the person from their organization, I didn't hear a compelling reason for why we would rebate big banks and not continue doing business as it has been done for the last 20 or 30 years.

It's an odd thing. We have a claim that is retroactive, but in this case the retroactivity simply affirms the status quo, and up to some time within the last year, the courts have actually maintained the government's position. It was in an appeal court decision that this was reversed, and the government has acted relatively quickly to change the legislation to preserve the status quo and save taxpayers from having to refund big banks.

That's a case where I think what's going on is not anywhere near as nefarious as it has been made out to be. That's why I won't be supporting those amendments.

When it comes to the EI appeal board, we have a few amendments. What I want to say globally about the changes to the appeal board in the budget implementation act is that I think this is largely a change that's headed in the right direction. We heard that from a lot of different folks. Of course, we didn't get to hear it at this table, but we heard it elsewhere. I think that's a really positive thing. Some of the details that we might quibble about and that the amendments seek to change, overall, are not huge and don't substantially alter what's going on.

In respect to the Bloc amendment to slightly change the reporting relationship of the executive head of the EI appeal board, that's one I am inclined to support. That's something I too have heard from stakeholders. I think it provides a little more clarity.

In respect to the Bloc amendment around in-person appeals, I'm satisfied that the legislation goes at least as far as the amendment would. I worry that the language here might make things needlessly complicated. If there is an issue, I think it's in the vagueness of "except in the circumstances provided for", because those are circumstances provided for in regulations.

To the extent that I share Mr. Ste-Marie's concern that people should always be able to insist on an in-person hearing, I think it's the exception that is probably the biggest threat to that. I note that this is preserved by his amendment, so I don't intend to support that particular amendment.

In terms of the amendment that would create some reporting on cost, I'm not usually opposed to such things, but I don't really see the purpose here. I think this is a real change in the way that the appeal board is going to work. It's not a change that's being made for the sake of cost-effectiveness. It's a change that's being made in order to, hopefully, be able to hear more appeals more quickly and to have fairer outcomes for people who have been hearing those cases.

I think that trying to artificially maintain an idea of what the operating cost structure would be for something that's changed substantially over the years is not—

• (1730)

The Chair: MP Blaikie, there are bells. We need UC to continue. There are bells in the House right now. Do we have—

Mr. Philip Lawrence: No.

The Chair: There's a no.

We are at 9:55 on your time, MP Blaikie.

We're suspended.

• (1730)

(Pause)

• (1825)

The Chair: Okay, everybody, we're back.

MP Blaikie had the floor.

MP Blaikie, you had just over five minutes left for your remarks.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. I appreciate that.

I was just in the process of going over the proposed amendments. I want to briefly address the amendment on applying GST, or not apply it, to crypto currency mining.

It was an interesting discussion we had in respect to the witness testimony we heard. I am satisfied that the department understands the problems that have been raised and that the intention is to try to create a fair tax policy in this regard while being sensitive to the concerns that have been raised.

It sounds to me as though the dispute is over whether or not the legislation is clear enough. It seems to me as though it's worth giving this particular legislation a shot. I wasn't convinced by the arguments around the table that the legislation is obviously not clear enough, and it does seem to me that the department has a relatively clear intention in terms of how it believes the legislation should be implemented. I think that this is the kind of thing that can be evaluated over time. I'd be open to perhaps revisiting this question in the future, but for the moment I'm satisfied with the legislation in its present form.

I also want to talk briefly about the interswitching proposal. As I understand it, no amendments were proposed on that, but we have had a good discussion here.

I represent Transcona. There are a lot of folks who work for the railway. I think there are some real concerns, which I am not as prepared to dismiss as the agricultural lobby on the Hill is, about employment in Canada and business essentially being handed off to American railways. The interswitching proposal is one that I find hard to support. I will be requesting a recorded vote on clause 443, which is the first of the interswitching clauses.

If that clause passes anyway, then for the sake of efficiency, I won't request a recorded vote on the subsequent clauses. If you could take note of that, Mr. Chair, and consider me to have already requested that vote, that would be great. If we are doing it late in the night, I might miss the opportunity. I would hate to think so. I will do my best to be vigilant. That's why I want to lay that marker down now and inform you, Mr. Chair, that this is my intention. Any kind reminders, in the event that I do miss it, are certainly welcome.

Finally, I want to go through some of the amendments on the air passenger bill of rights.

Actually, I think a substantial amount of the package is dedicated to this. I would be remiss if I didn't commend my colleague Taylor Bachrach for all the work he's done on the air passenger rights question generally as well as in preparing these amendments. I regret that Mr. Bachrach isn't here to present them himself. He wanted to be. He made efforts to be here on Thursday. Members of the committee will know that he was here. Had we not been subjected to a filibuster, we very likely would have considered those amendments in the time that he made available to be here. It has been a very unpredictable process around this table, including the eleventh-hour agreement to have any time at all to discuss amendments. Unfortunately, we weren't prepared to have Mr. Bachrach here to do that.

Any errors or omissions in the presentation of the amendments are my own. They are not his. I apologize in advance if I've not quite captured the intention or the spirit of those amendments.

The amendment he has proposed to clause 445 would put some language back in to protect the right of the complainant to make their own complaints in addition to any proactive requirements for action by the agency. There's some concern here that it is left to the agency's discretion to be the one to move forward on a complaint. We believe an individual complainant should have the opportunity to move forward on something even if the agency does not wish to. We want to make sure the customer is in the driver's seat when it comes to shepherding their complaints forward.

We have some concern about there being a secrecy provision with respect to complaints being adjudicated. We think that's appropriate in the case of mediation, but if something moves to adjudication, open court principles should apply. There should be a body of precedent that's built and that's public. That's not something the current legislation allows for.

• (1830)

I see that I'm getting a little bit of a nod that my time is over, and while there's more to say and there are more amendments, I am grateful to have had at least this much opportunity. I hope that next time we'll have a better process that allows for full and proper debate of these amendments, instead of this kind of rush job that we've all just been subject to.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, MP Blaikie.

Thank you to all members. Thank you for those clear, concise remarks on many of the amendments, whether your party's amendments or those of other parties, and on where you stand on those amendments.

Now, members, as you know, pursuant to the motion adopted by committee, there will be no more debate. There will be no debate now as we move forward.

The Chair: We are at clause 7.

• (1835)

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Mr. Chair—

The Chair: No debate—

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I'm asking for a point of order. I'm still allowed that. That's still a parliamentary procedure.

The Chair: We have a point of order.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Could you please read the section into the record? That's not debate.

The Chair: We're going to suspend for a second.

• (1835)

(Pause)

• (1835)

The Chair: We're back.

The request is something that is not done. I spoke with the legislative clerk and clerks. I believe that it's been done once in 20 years. We will not be doing that, MP Lawrence. We'll be moving forward. We are at—

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Mr. Chair, on a point of order—

The Chair: We are at clause 7.

Clause 7—

Mr. Philip Lawrence: On a point of order, Mr. Chair—

The Chair: We have a point of order.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: —I wish to challenge the chair's ruling.

The Chair: There's a challenge.

An hon. member: Can we have a recorded vote, please?

The Chair: Okay.

Go ahead, Clerk.

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

The Chair: It has been sustained.

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): On a point of order, Chair—

The Chair: We have a point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: —can I just understand, because I was sent some documents regarding the motion that we're working on here—

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, we're not going to have debate. There's no debate here.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I know. It's a point of order, Chair.

The Chair: There is no debate. What is the point of order?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: It's a point of order.

The Chair: Yes...?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I want to clarify the motion we're operating under. The motion that I have—

The Chair: I'll give you the motion, MP Genuis. It says that pursuant to the motion adopted to the committee, there is no debate. That is the motion.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Yes. The motion I have says that. It says in point iii:

if the Committee has not completed...clause-by-clause consideration of the Bill by 4:30...on Monday May 29th, 2023, all remaining amendments submitted to the Committee shall be deemed moved, the Chair shall put the question, forthwith and successively, without further debate—

Am I correct?

—on all remaining clauses and proposed amendments, as well as each and every question necessary to dispose of clause-by-clause consideration of the Bill, as well as all questions necessary to report the Bill to the House and to order the Chair to report the Bill to the House as soon as possible;

That's not the whole motion. That's the section you're talking about. It makes no reference to not reading questions. The committee has just determined you shouldn't read questions—

Ms. Julie Dzerowicz: That's debate—

The Chair: MP Genuis, I've given my ruling—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I'm just wondering—

The Chair: I've given my ruling.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: —what the section is, Chair.

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, you do not have the floor.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I have a point of order. I don't have the floor; that's correct—

The Chair: MP Genuis, I've given my ruling—

• (1840)

Mr. Garnett Genuis: A point of order is not “having the floor”. It's a matter of order.

The Chair: MP Genuis, I've given my ruling. It has been sustained. We are moving on.

Members, we are at clause 7.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Chair, my question is, which motion are we operating under? I'd just like to know—

The Chair: We are at clause 7.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: —if I have the correct motion, Chair. That's my point of order.

The Chair: Yes. Okay.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Is the section I read out from the correct motion?

The Chair: MP Genuis, we are at clause 7. That's where we are right now.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Yes.

On a point of order, Chair, I'm just trying to understand which motion we're operating under, because the section of the motion I read out makes no reference to your reading or not reading the question. You've determined that you're not to read the question, which is very odd to me, but I just want to make sure I'm using the correct motion.

Ms. Julie Dzerowicz: That's debate, Mr. Chair—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Could you send me the motion we're operating under then, Chair? I'm trying to understand where this is in the motion.

The Chair: MP Genuis, this is debate. You are getting into something that we were not discussing.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: No, it's a matter of order, Chair.

The Chair: MP Genuis, we are now at clause 7.

Okay, it's clause 7.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Shame on you for not reading—

The Chair: Clerk...?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: —the questions we're voting on.

The Chair: We're on clause 7.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: There's nothing on that in the motion that was adopted.

Ms. Julie Dzerowicz: It's clause 7, on division.

The Chair: Is that on division?

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Could we have a recorded vote, please?

The Chair: We will have a recorded vote.

(Clause 7 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: We're on clause 8.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Chair, I'd like to move to delete the clause. It's not debate; it's an amendment.

Ms. Julie Dzerowicz: It's debate.

The Chair: You can't debate.

On clause 8, Clerk, call the vote, please.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: On a point of order, Chair, it's a deletion amendment.

The Chair: There is no debate. We're at clause 8.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: It's not debate; it's an amendment.

The Chair: Clause 8—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: On a point of order, Chair, amendments are in order.

Mr. Terry Beech: No. No amendments are in order. You might have missed that part of the meeting.

Ms. Julie Dzerowicz: There are no amendments. There's nothing other than the vote.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: There's nothing in the motion that was adopted that says you can't move deletion amendments.

The Chair: We'll hear from the legislative clerk, please.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you.

Mr. Philippe Méla (Legislative Clerk): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

It's not in order to move an amendment. To delete a clause, you have to vote against the clause.

The Chair: Okay. You've heard, MP Genuis. You can't do it. We're on clause 8.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Okay. I'm sorry, but I'm challenging the chair on that. That's not my understanding, with all due respect.

The Chair: Okay. There is a challenge, Clerk.

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: That's carried. We're on clause 9.

A voice: Sir, we didn't vote on the clause.

The Chair: I apologize. Let's go back. It was sustained.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Can I point out that we should vote on it—

The Chair: No, you can't point anything out.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: —or is that debate?

The Chair: MP Genuis, you can't—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I'm asking for a recorded division. Is that debate?

The Chair: You can. You can ask for recorded division.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: That's great.

Ms. Julie Dzerowicz: It's on division.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Do we want a recorded division?

That's just so I understand the distinctions you're making, Chair.

The Chair: We're on clause 8.

(Clause 8 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

(Clause 9 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: We're at clause 10.

A voice: On division.

• (1845)

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Could we have a recorded vote?

The Chair: MP Gazan, you can't be recognized at this time. We need an official substitution.

Ms. Leah Gazan (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): That should have come in to the clerk.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I move that we suspend while Ms. Gazan gets officially recognized.

The Chair: We're just seeing if the clerk has received it, because it looks like it has been sent. I don't know if there's...

The Clerk: I should give out the numbers, because I didn't get it yet. I should give the numbers, and she would be on the next vote.

The Chair: Okay.

Mr. Clerk, can you just let us know how the vote went?

(Clause 10 agreed to: yeas 6; nays 4)

The Chair: We're going to suspend for a couple of minutes.

• (1845) _____ (Pause) _____

• (1850)

The Chair: Okay, we're back, everybody. I think we have cleared up the substitution.

We're at clause 11.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I'd like a recorded division, Mr. Chair.

(Clause 11 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I have a brief point of order.

Would it be too much to ask for the sections to be read?

The Chair: Yes, it would. We are not doing that, MP Lawrence.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Oh, come on, Mr. Chair. Wow.

The Chair: We're on clause 12.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I'm challenging the chair on reading the sections. Come on. Just read the sections. Give us a little bit.

The Chair: MP Genuis, you haven't been on this committee. Maybe you don't understand how things work—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: No, Mr. Chair, I understand how things are suppose to work at committees, so—

The Chair: If you're challenging the chair—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: —if this is Peter Fonsecaland with a whole bunch of different rules, that's fine—

The Chair: There's no debating, MP Genuis—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: —but I know the standing orders very, very well.

The Chair: We'll go to the clerk. There's a challenge.

The Clerk: There's a challenge to the chair to read the sections.

The Chair: It's that we're not reading the sections.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: We can challenge the chair. You don't get to unilaterally decide the challenges of the proceedings.

The Chair: We'll suspend.

• (1850) _____ (Pause) _____

• (1850)

The Chair: We're back.

MP Genuis, you can't even be recognized, because it was under debate.

We'll just go back to clause 12, everybody.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I challenged the chair, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: You were debating within your point of order and you were debating a motion.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I wasn't debating a motion. He said that you should read the sections. You said that you wouldn't read the sections, and I challenged the chair.

The Chair: We will suspend.

• (1850) _____ (Pause) _____

• (1850)

The Chair: MP Genuis, you cannot move a motion on a point of order. That's what you did—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I'm not moving a motion. I'm challenging the chair.

The Chair: You did move a motion on that point of order about reading sections into the record.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I didn't move a motion at all. Mr. Lawrence asked you to read the sections as part of the vote, which is standing procedure.

The Chair: It was on a point of order, MP Genuis, yes.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: As a matter of order, he believes, as do I, that you should read the sections, and then I challenged the chair.

The Chair: It all commenced on a point of order. That cannot be done.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: You cannot move a substantive motion on a point of order, but you can raise a matter of order on a point of order. That's what a point of order is for.

The Chair: Clerk, can you just let the member know?

The Clerk: If something needs to be done in committee, it has to be done by a motion. Asking to do something would be done through a motion, and one cannot move a motion on a point of order.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: With respect, because it was my point of order, it was not a motion; it was an interpretation—

• (1855)

The Chair: It was a point of order.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Yes, it was a point of order that I had a different interpretation. There was no motion. It was an interpretation.

The chair believes it's too much work for him to say 1.16, and I believe it's appropriate that he should say that so that we can make sure that—

The Chair: That's debate—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Just on the point of order, Chair, it is not correct to say that you need a motion to ask someone to follow the rules. You need a motion to do something that is different from the existing rules. If I'm asking the chair to sing a song before each clause, that would require a motion, but asking the chair to read the numbers of the item being voted on is simply asking the chair to follow standing procedure. If the chair is deviating from that or has a different understanding of what standing procedure is, the chair can make a ruling that's different from that. Then it's up to the committee to ultimately decide, if there's a challenge to the chair, whether the chair's interpretation of the rules is correct.

It was not done on a motion. There was no motion that was read or that was moved. A point was made about what the rules should be. That's what a point of order is for.

The Chair: The legislative clerk has looked in the book, and he will tell us what it says. MP Genuis, you can understand what it says in the book so that it will be clear for you.

Mr. Philippe Méla: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

This is on page 766 of the book:

Each clause of the bill is a distinct question requiring separate consideration. The committee Chair calls each clause successively by number and, after discussion, puts the question on the clause if no amendment is proposed.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: If I can just respond and ask a follow-up question to the clerk, what that says is that the chair should ask “Shall clause 7 carry?” or “Shall clause 8 carry?”, which the chair has not been doing. Actually, that's explicitly what you read, is it not? The chair has not been doing that.

The Chair: MP Genuis, what you're concerned about, then, is that you would like me to ask “Shall clause 12 carry?”. Is that correct?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: The appropriate procedure is to identify the clause we're on and to ask “Shall the clause carry?”, and then we would proceed to consider the clause. My colleague was asking that you read the section numbers as well, and I do think the book will confirm that regardless of the chair's interpretation, the committee does have the right to challenge the chair's interpretation. The committee can then make its own determinations, and it can defer to your advice or to anyone else's advice.

I think there are two issues: One, the chair should actually read the question being asked; two, I agree with my colleague that the sections should be read. If the sections are not going to be read,

then I would challenge the chair, we can have quick vote on that challenge, and the committee can come to a conclusion.

Respectfully, I think we're spending more time discussing whether or not the challenge should be considered than it would take to actually consider the challenge, but it's up to you, Chair, how you want to use that time. I think it's an important principle that the chair cannot decide to reject a challenge. The purpose of a challenge to the chair is to give the committee recourse if members believe the chair is not correct.

The Chair: We're going to suspend.

• (1855)

(Pause)

• (1900)

The Chair: All right. Based on what I heard from the legislative clerk, what was read from the book and what I heard from MP Genuis, we're going to go into.... Is this what you're looking for? Shall clause 12 carry?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: That is my understanding of what's in the book. Are you using that as an example, or are you actually asking the question?

The Chair: I'm asking the question. Is this what you were looking for?

Shall clause 12 carry?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: That is the correct formula for posing the question to the committee, and then we proceed to do it on division or have a recorded vote or something else.

Mr. Tom Kmiec (Calgary Shepard, CPC): I'd like a recorded vote.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: In this case, we'll have a recorded vote.

The Chair: It will be a recorded vote.

Mr. Tom Kmiec: Mr. Chair, am I subbed in now? I don't want what happened to the New Democratic member to happen now.

The Chair: You are subbed in. It's good to see you, Mr. Kmiec.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: You didn't say that to me, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: You were already here.

An hon. member: Mr. Chair—

The Chair: We're in a vote right now.

Shall clause 12 carry?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: It's a recorded vote.

The Chair: We're in a recorded vote.

Clerk, please go ahead.

(Clause 12 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

Shall clause 13 carry?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I'd like a recorded vote.

The Chair: On clause 13, we'll have a recorded vote.

(Clause 13 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

On clause 14—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I want a recorded vote.

The Chair: Shall clause 14 carry?

(Clause 14 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

Shall clause 15 carry?

• (1905)

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I'd like a recorded vote.

The Chair: Go ahead, Clerk.

(Clause 15 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

Shall clause 16 carry?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: On a point of order, Chair, could I get unanimous consent to change my just-cast vote? Because these sections are not being read, it creates some challenges. This is...

The Chair: There's no point of order until the results are announced.

Could we have the results, please?

(Clause 16 agreed to: yeas 9; nays 2)

The Chair: It was carried.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Again, on a point of order, Chair, is there unanimous consent to allow members to change their vote? Again, since the amendments are not being read, which is very unusual, I think it would be a reasonable courtesy. I support this section; I just was looking at wrong page.

The Chair: We heard no.

Shall clause 17 carry?

Mr. Kelly McCauley (Edmonton West, CPC): I'm sorry, but on the same point of order, I would appreciate....

Mrs. Sophie Chatel (Pontiac, Lib.): No.

The Chair: There's a no, so we are moving....

Members, shall clause 17 carry?

Clerk, go ahead, please.

An hon. member: Could we have a recorded division?

Mr. Kelly McCauley: Okay, if that's the game you're going to play, then we will do the same. You guys always freak out....

(Clause 17 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: Shall clause 18 carry?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Could we have a recorded vote?

The Chair: Clerk, go ahead, please.

(Clause 18 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

Mr. Garnett Genuis: On a point of order, Mr. Chair, with great respect, I think there's a colleague online who's not using the appropriate headset—who evidently is not wearing a headset.

The Chair: Everybody has been tested.

Who was that? Are you pointing out members? No. I'll look to the clerk.

Clerk, there was—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I don't want to embarrass the member.

The Chair: —a point of order about the headset.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: I think Mr. Genuis is talking about me. Since he wasn't here during the sound checks, he doesn't know what he's talking about.

I did the tests. Thank you

[*English*]

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Isn't there a requirement to have a House of Commons-issued headset regardless of the sound test?

The Chair: It is an approved headset, MP Genuis.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Okay.

The Chair: Okay? It's been tested. It's an approved—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: That's not the rule.

The Chair: It is approved. It is an approved headset.

For all members' sake, actually, if you are here virtually, you are allowed to vote, so if anything does happen with your headset or your mike or you're not able to speak, you could do a thumbs-up or a thumbs-down.

(Clauses 19 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: Shall clause 20 carry?

• (1910)

Mr. Marty Morantz (Charleswood—St. James—Assiniboia—Headingley, CPC): Could we have a recorded vote?

(Clauses 20 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

(Clauses 21 to 30 inclusive agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

• (1915)

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

I know some government members may want to communicate their lack of enthusiasm for the budget, but is there a proper...? I wonder whether the clerk can clarify what the appropriate format—

Ms. Julie Dzerowicz: That's not a point of order.

The Chair: Shall clause 31 carry?

• (1920)

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Chair, it was a point of order. With a bit of rhetorical flourish, it was a point of order.

A voice: It's not a point of order.

The Chair: It's not a point of order.

A voice: It's not a point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I'm wondering whether the clerk can clarify what the appropriate direction is for a yea or nay. Is an "okay" sufficient for a yea?

That's my question.

The Chair: We saw a positive gesture, be it a thumbs-up or somebody saying "yea" or "yes." There are many different ways of communicating whether it is a yea or a nay.

In my opinion, it was communicated by P.S. Beech as a yea, so we are moving on.

(Clauses 31 to 45 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

• (1930)

Mr. Garnett Genuis: On a point of order, Chair, you've been a little harder on members on this side than on those on the other side when it comes to smuggling editorial comments into votes—

Ms. Ariane Gagné-Frégeau (Legislative Clerk): That's not a point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: —or other comments. When a member is voting—

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: That's not a point of order; it's a debate.

[*English*]

Mr. Garnett Genuis: It is a point of order. Let me finish.

Ms. Julie Dzerowicz: [*Inaudible—Editor*] too long.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Oh, is there a time limit on points of order, Ms. Dzerowicz?

When a member is voting, they're generally not supposed to editorialize about their reasons for or against in the process of taking the vote. If that's allowed, then I would do it as well—

Ms. Julie Dzerowicz: I have a point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: —but there were members who were doing it repeatedly in the last couple of rounds.

The Chair: MP Genuis, we—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: This is a matter of order.

The Chair: MP Genuis, I'm listening to you. I've heard what you've had to say.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you. Excellent.

The Chair: I'll say this to the members: Just give a positive sign. Say "yes" or "yea", or give a thumbs-up or a thumbs-down. That is how members should vote. We will get through this, and we'll move forward.

Point taken, MP Genuis.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you.

I'm sorry, Mr. Chair. I just have one other thing. I would like to move, since you've given me the floor—

The Chair: There is no moving. No, MP Genuis. No, no, there is no debate.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: You gave me the floor.

The Chair: No, there isn't, MP Genuis.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: You gave me the floor.

The Chair: MP Genuis, there is no debate.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I have a motion on notice under Mr. Hallan's name.

The Chair: There is no debate.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: But you provided me the floor, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: There is no debate.

A voice: On division.

The Chair: You can't do it on a point of order anyway.

MP Genuis, please.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: No, I had a point of order, and then you gave me the floor after that.

The Chair: A little order, MP Genuis. I know you're new to this committee. I know you're subbing here. I know you want to make a show for the members.

• (1935)

Mr. Garnett Genuis: The finance committee does not have standing orders separate from other committees.

The Chair: MP Genuis, you cannot move a motion on a point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I'm well aware of that. I didn't move a motion on a point of order.

The Chair: MP Genuis, we are moving on.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I sought the floor afterwards. I raised a point of order. You affirmed my point of order, and then I sought the floor after that. I didn't say point of order—the record will show.

The Chair: MP Genuis, listen. We're moving on.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Chair, I sought the floor. Mr. Chair, I have the floor.

(Clauses 46 to 48 inclusive agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: Shall clause 49 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tom Kmiec: I request a recorded vote.

[*English*]

Ms. Leah Gazan: Mr. Chair, my touchpad is sticking a little bit. Is it possible for me to vote with a thumbs-up just so that I don't hold the committee back? I just feel like I'm wasting people's time.

The Chair: MP Gazan, you can vote with a thumbs-up, or thumbs-down. Yes.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: You can't do a point of order in the middle of a vote.

The Chair: It was not a point of order. It was a clarification about how to vote...if she was able to vote—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: She already voted.

Ms. Julie Dzerowicz: This is debate, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Yes.

(Clause 49 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: Shall clause 50 carry?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: It might be news to you, but the rules are the rules.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tom Kmiec: I request a recorded vote.

[*English*]

The Chair: We'll do recorded votes.

(Clauses 50 to 59 inclusive agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

• (1945)

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Chair, on a point of order, when a member votes by thumb, is that recorded in the same way as it would be for other votes?

The Chair: It is recorded, yes.

Shall clause 60 carry?

Ms. Julie Dzerowicz: On division.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tom Kmiec: I request a recorded vote.

(Clause 60 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

[*English*]

The Chair: Shall clause 61 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tom Kmiec: I request a recorded vote.

(Clause 61 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

[*English*]

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I have a point of order, Chair. Imagine how quickly this would go if we had had the 10 hours of testimony that you promised [*Inaudible—Editor*] agreed to.

Ms. Julie Dzerowicz: This is debate.

The Chair: Shall clause 62 carry?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: It was in the original motion—

Mr. Marty Morantz: I'd like a recorded vote.

The Chair: On division.

Mr. Marty Morantz: Mr. Chair, I just asked for a recorded vote.

(Clause 62 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

(Clauses 63 to 70 inclusive agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

(On clause 71)

• (1950)

The Chair: Members, we're at clause 71, and amendment CPC-0.1.

The chair's ruling on this is that Bill C-47 amends several acts, including the Income Tax Act, to add a mechanism of transmission of information between officials for the purpose of the administration enforcement of the Canadian dental plan. The amendment seeks to add a mechanism of transmission of any confidential information related to an individual between that individual and an official at his or her request by which the official could not withhold any confidential information related to the person.

As *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, Third Edition, states on page 770, "An amendment to a bill that was referred to a committee after second reading is out of order if it is beyond the scope and principle of the bill."

In the opinion of the Chair, this addition is a new concept that is beyond the scope of the bill as adopted by the House at second reading; therefore, I rule the amendment inadmissible.

• (1955)

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Chair, I would like to respectfully challenge—

Ms. Julie Dzerowicz: Debate....

Mr. Garnett Genuis: It's not debate.

Mr. Kelly McCauley: Mr. Chair, could I have a moment, please?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Learn the rules, Ms. Dzerowicz.

Ms. Julie Dzerowicz: It's debate.

The Chair: There's no debate.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: You're right; there's no debate.

The Chair: Stop the crosstalk, members. Please, everybody, there's no debate.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: That's correct.

The Chair: That is the chair's ruling.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: The chair's ruling is now being challenged.

The Chair: It's inadmissible.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: The chair's rule is now being challenged.

The Chair: It is inadmissible.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: That's what I was exactly about to say when I was rudely interrupted by Ms. Dzerowicz.

Ms. Ariane Gagné-Frégeau: The vote is, shall the decision be sustained?

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

Mr. Tom Kmiec: Mr. Chair, that was on page 770, right?

The Chair: We just voted on my ruling on CPC-0.1. It was sustained.

Mr. Tom Kmiec: The page number in the book, Chair, is all I want.

The Chair: It is page 770.

It was sustained, so we are moving on, members.

(Clause 71 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: Members, I am going to try this. I'm not sure how much success it will have, but there are no amendments between clauses 72 and 112. We would need unanimous consent to group those.

A voice: No.

• (2000)

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Chair, could we have some discussion about that first?

The Chair: There is no discussion.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Could we suspend to discuss our parties'—

The Chair: The discussion is....

Listen. I heard a no.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I think we might be open to it if we suspended and talked about it for a bit.

The Chair: Shall clause 72 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tom Kmiec: I request a recorded vote.

[*English*]

The Chair: Let's then have a recorded division.

(Clause 72 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: Shall clause 73 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tom Kmiec: I request a recorded vote.

(Clause 73 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

[*English*]

The Chair: Shall clause 74 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tom Kmiec: I request a recorded vote.

(Clause 74 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

[*English*]

The Chair: Shall clause 75 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tom Kmiec: I request a recorded vote.

(Clause 75 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

[*English*]

The Chair: Shall clause 76 carry?

Mr. Marty Morantz: On division...I mean, I'd like a recorded vote. I'd better stop asking.

I'd like a recorded vote, please.

The Chair: Are you sure, Marty?

An hon. member: Defeated on division...?

Mr. Marty Morantz: I'd like a recorded vote.

The Chair: Okay.

(Clause 76 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: Members, we need the microphones to be on mute because we're getting some cracking sounds coming through. They should be on mute when you are not speaking.

Shall clause 77 carry?

• (2005)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tom Kmiec: I request a recorded vote.

(Clause 77 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

[*English*]

Le président: Okay.

(Clause 77 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: Shall clause 78 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tom Kmiec: I request a recorded vote.

(Clause 78 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

[*English*]

The Chair: Shall clause 79 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tom Kmiec: I request a recorded vote.

(Clause 79 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

[*English*]

The Chair: Shall clause 80 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tom Kmiec: I request a recorded vote.

(Clause 80 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

[*English*]

The Chair: Shall clause 81 carry?

Mr. Tom Kmiec: I'd like a recorded division.

(Clause 81 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: Shall clause 82 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tom Kmiec: I request a recorded vote.

(Clause 82 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

• (2010)

[*English*]

The Chair: Shall clause 83 carry?

Mr. Marty Morantz: I'd like a recorded division, Mr. Chair.

(Clause 83 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: Shall clause 84 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tom Kmiec: I request a recorded vote.

(Clause 84 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

[*English*]

The Chair: Shall clause 85 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tom Kmiec: I request a recorded vote.

(Clause 85 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

[*English*]

The Chair: Shall clause 86 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tom Kmiec: I request a recorded vote.

(Clause 86 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

[*English*]

The Chair: Shall clause 87 carry?

(Clause 87 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: Shall clause 88 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tom Kmiec: I request a recorded vote.

(Clause 88 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

[*English*]

The Chair: Shall clause 89 carry?

• (2015)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tom Kmiec: I request a recorded vote.

(Clause 89 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

[*English*]

The Chair: Shall clause 90 carry?

(Clauses 90 and 91 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: Shall clause 92 carry?

The Chair: Shall clause 92 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tom Kmiec: I request a recorded vote.

(Clause 92 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

[*English*]

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Chair, could we request a recorded vote on that, please?

The Chair: We'll have a recorded vote.

(Clauses 93 and 94 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: Shall clause 95 carry?

• (2020)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tom Kmiec: I request a recorded vote.

(Clause 95 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

[*English*]

The Chair: Shall clause 96 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tom Kmiec: I request a recorded vote.

(Clause 96 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

[*English*]

The Chair: Shall clause 97 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tom Kmiec: I request a recorded vote.

(Clause 97 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

[*English*]

The Chair: Shall clause 98 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tom Kmiec: I request a recorded vote.

(Clause 98 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

[*English*]

The Chair: Shall clause 99 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tom Kmiec: I request a recorded vote.

(Clause 99 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

[*English*]

The Chair: Shall clause 100 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tom Kmiec: Negatived on division.

[*English*]

The Chair: It's on division? Okay. It's passed on division.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tom Kmiec: I have a point of order

That's not what I said. I said, "Negatived on division."

[*English*]

The Chair: Okay. I got a different interpretation.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Chair: MP Kmiec, is it on division?

• (2025)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tom Kmiec: There are two possible expressions: "Carried on division" or "Negatived on division", which means that the clause is negatived.

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: Yes, but the question was:

[English]

“Shall we carry clause...”, and then you have to add—

[Translation]

Mr. Tom Kmiec: That's correct, but if we say, “Negatived on division”, that means it doesn't carry.

[English]

The Chair: No.

MP Kmiec, are you accepting on division?

[Translation]

Mr. Tom Kmiec: No. What I said was, “Negatived on division.”

[English]

The Chair: You cannot do that.

[Translation]

Mr. Tom Kmiec: That's done in other committees. Another House committee did it today.

[English]

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: The question is different. It's “shall it be carried?”, with a question mark. Then it's “with *dissidence*”.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: The answer to the question is, “No, it shall not carry: It shall be rejected on division.”

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: Then you've changed the chair's question.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: No, you're not changing the question. You're answering the question. “On division” means you're agreeing to proceed on the basis of a—

An hon. member: This is a waste of time.

The Chair: Yes.

Clerk, record the vote.

(Clause 100 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: This is a good time, members, to suspend for about 15 minutes.

Thanks.

• (2025)

(Pause)

• (2045)

The Chair: We're back. Everybody got a good stretch and some air.

Members, shall clause 101 carry?

Mr. Tom Kmiec: I'd like a recorded vote.

(Clause 101 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: Shall clause 102 carry?

• (2050)

[Translation]

Mr. Tom Kmiec: I request a recorded vote, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

[English]

The Chair: MP Ste-Marie, you have a point of order.

[Translation]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: Would you please confirm for me that clause 100 was carried before the break.

[English]

Mr. Garnett Genuis: On a point of order, we didn't hear the point of order, because there was no translation.

The Chair: MP Ste-Marie, we did not get the translation.

I did hear about the headset. MP Ste-Marie's headset was approved and is approved by the House, but we do need the translation.

MP Ste-Marie, can we try again and see if we can get translation?

[Translation]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: Can you confirm for me that the interpretation is working?

[English]

The Chair: Interpretation is now working, MP Ste-Marie.

[Translation]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: All right.

I wanted to make sure that clause 100 had carried before the break.

[English]

The Chair: It had, MP Ste-Marie.

[Translation]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: All right. Thank you.

[English]

The Chair: We did clause 100 just before the break. We've now finished clause 101. That was carried.

Shall clause 102 carry?

[Translation]

Mr. Tom Kmiec: I request a recorded vote, Mr. Chair.

[English]

The Chair: We'll have a recorded vote.

(Clause 102 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

Mr. Kelly McCauley: Mr. Chair...?

The Chair: Shall clause 103 carry?

Mr. Kelly McCauley: Mr. Chair...?

The Chair: Shall clause...?

No debate.

Mr. Kelly McCauley: Mr. Chair...?

The Chair: No debate.

Shall clause 103 carry?

Mr. Kelly McCauley: Mr. Chair, I just want—

An hon. member: Recorded division.

(Clauses 103 to 109 inclusive agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

• (2100)

Mr. Garnett Genuis: On a point of order, Mr. Chair, I think Mr. MacDonald might appreciate knowing that he left his microphone on.

The Chair: MP MacDonald, and actually everybody, when you're not—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: If I were in that situation....

The Chair: —speaking, if you could just keep the mikes off, that would be great. Thank you.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: It's great how much cross-party collaboration is happening here. We're helping each other out.

(Clauses 110 to 112 inclusive agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

(On clause 113)

The Chair: On clause 113, shall amendment G-1 carry?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Chair, let's have a recorded vote on that particular amendment.

The Chair: We'll have a recorded vote.

(Amendment agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

Mr. Philip Lawrence: On a quick point of clarification, is there a difference between a recorded division and a recorded vote?

The Chair: No.

(Clause 113 as amended agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: We're on part 2, dealing with GST and HST measures.

Shall clause 114 carry?

• (2105)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I request a recorded vote.

[*English*]

The Chair: We'll do recorded votes.

(Clauses 114 to 116 inclusive agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: Shall clause 117 carry?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Chair, let's have a recorded vote on that one.

The Chair: We'll have a recorded vote.

An hon. member: Could I have clarification of what we're voting on?

The Chair: It's clause 117.

An hon. member: [*Inaudible—Editor*] because of the crosstalk from the Conservatives, I couldn't hear.

Thank you.

(Clause 117 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: Just for all the MPs, yes, the chatter does affect the interpreters, especially when your mike is on, as it was just on for MP Genuis for a little bit—not when you were voting, but even before that.

Try to keep your mikes off. If the red light is on, your mike is on. It's live. You have to turn your mike off unless you're voting. That will really help the interpreters.

• (2110)

Mr. Kelly McCauley: Mr. Chair...?

The Chair: Yes.

Mr. Kelly McCauley: To Ms. Belmore, just quickly, who I had the joy of serving with on OGGO, I want to thank you for filling in. You class up the place by bringing some OGGO in. Can you put your microphone a tiny bit closer?

The Chair: Okay. Great.

Hopefully that helps.

Mr. Kelly McCauley: It's fantastic to see you some more here today.

The Chair: Thank you. All right.

We thank our hard-working clerks.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I have just a quick point.

The Chair: Is it on the mikes?

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Yes. It's sort of on this issue.

Sometimes, and I don't know who—

The Chair: It's run by the technicians in the back.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Sometimes they turn it on and sometimes I have to turn it on.

The Chair: I know. It happens to me, too, MP Lawrence.

We're going try our best.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: If we could just decide on a particular way of doing business, I'm good either way.

The Chair: I know the technicians are trying to manage it.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: They're doing a great job.

The Chair: They do their best to see who is going to be speaking, but if you do see that your mike is on.... Because there is some chatter in the room and it does affect the interpreters' ability to do their jobs and also the clerks and everybody else, just for clarity.

We're going to try to do the best we can to help out and to make things work as smoothly as possible.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Perfect. I will not challenge the chair, given his reasonable ruling here.

The Chair: Thank you, MP Lawrence.

We're on clause 118.

Shall Bloc-1 carry?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I have a point of order.

Chair, I submitted a subamendment in writing in advance. I understand that it can't be read, but I assume it can be voted on.

The Chair: MP Genuis, that's not a point of order.

Right now, shall Bloc-1 carry, members?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Chair, it's a point of order. I submitted a subamendment to Bloc-1. I submitted it in writing to the clerk in advance of this meeting. The motion as adopted by the committee does not exclude the possibility of subamendments.

The Chair: I'm suspending.

• (2110) _____ (Pause) _____

• (2110)

The Chair: We're back.

I know that MP Genuis was not here for, and did not hear, the motion brought forward. It's pursuant to the motion adopted by the vote. There is no debate, MP Genuis.

Shall Bloc-1 carry?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Chair, it's not a matter of debate. It's a subamendment.

The Chair: No, MP Genuis.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I don't want to debate it. I don't want speak about it. I don't want to read it.

The Chair: That is not allowed.

We are—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: On a point of order, Chair, there is nothing in the motion....

Chair, this is an important matter of procedure because if you don't allow members the opportunity to move subamendments, then amendments will be moved at report stage in the House.

The Chair: MP Genuis, we're going to suspend.

• (2113) _____ (Pause) _____

• (2114)

The Chair: We're back.

My ruling is no subamendments. That's where we are.

MP Genuis, that is my ruling.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: On a point of order, Chair, could you explain your ruling? There is nothing in the motion that refers to subamendments.

The Chair: As the motion says—

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: Can I speak on his point of order?

The Chair: MP Blaikie.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: My understanding of what is going on is that the motion says there's no debate, which means that no member can get the floor except by a point of order.

You can't move a subamendment off a point of order, which means you can't move the subamendment because there's no debate allowed and no having the floor except on a point of order. The job of the chair now is to put every question forthwith and successively without debate.

You can't get the floor, so you can't move a subamendment.

The Chair: That is correct, MP Blaikie.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Could I speak to the same point of order?

Thank you, Chair.

The amendments are deemed moved because they were provided in advance. I provided subamendments in advance, which were based on the amendments that were provided. By the same principle....

If we don't allow subamendments to be moved, then the chair is opening a situation where members have not been able to make changes in committee, which means that all of those various changes could be moved and would require separate votes in the House if members aren't able to make these changes.

The other thing is just in an appeal to the way committee should function—

• (2115)

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: We're well past that, Mr. Genuis. Don't even start. We're well past—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: To say it's impossible to move a subamendment to an amendment even if the subamendment were submitted in advance is just an absurd way to legislate. It means that you can't do any kind of refining even if someone saw the amendment in advance and submitted a subamendment, which is what I did. I have only one subamendment to this amendment.

The Chair: MP Genuis, listen, right now—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: There's nothing in the motion that says you can't subamend. You're just kind of making things up that aren't in the motion, Chair.

The Chair: MP Genuis, pursuant to the motion adopted by the vote, there is no debate. You're debating right now. We are going to move—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: It's a point of order, Chair—

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: On this same point of order, my question is one of clarification. If a member has duly submitted an amendment or subamendment in advance, is that something that any member of Parliament—not any member of this committee because Mr. Genuis is not a standing member of the committee—has a right to do?

If so, was it received before we started this process? If so, it seems to me that it's in order and we should just have a vote on it and put an end to this.

If it's not in order to have been received, then that's a separate question.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I have one subamendment on this—

The Chair: We're going to suspend.

• (2115) _____ (Pause) _____

• (2115)

The Chair: We're back.

I've made my ruling. The only way to change that would be to challenge my ruling.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Okay, Mr. Chair. My view is that subamendments should be allowed. I'll challenge the ruling that they're not, provided they were given in writing in advance.

The Chair: They are not, because, as MP Blaikie said, even within a point of order, you cannot bring forward an amendment or a subamendment. That is not allowed.

It is also captured within the motion, is that right, Madam Clerk?

It is not allowed.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Chair, I believe it is allowed. I provided it in writing in advance and the motion doesn't reference subamendments—

The Chair: I've spoken to the legislative clerk and the clerk.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: —but I've also challenged the chair, so if you'd like to discuss it further, I'm happy to discuss it further.

The Chair: There is no discussion.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I said I'd challenge it, then you had further comment.

I'm happy to discuss it, but I think the challenge is on the floor. Let's vote on it.

The Chair: Okay, there's a challenge of the chair. Let's take the vote.

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 7; nays 4)

• (2120)

The Chair: We are moving on. We are at clause—

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Mr. Chair, I have a point of order.

The Chair: There's a point of order.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Could we have unanimous consent to discuss moving subamendments?

The Chair: It's a no.

Shall BQ-1 carry?

Mr. Kelly McCauley: Mr. Chair, I'm sorry. Could you repeat that?

The Chair: On clause 118, shall BQ-1 carry?

Mr. Philip Lawrence: We'll have a recorded division on that.

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

The Chair: BQ-2 can only be moved if BQ-1 was defeated, as they address the same issue. Therefore, we can go on to BQ-2. We are at—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Chair, I have another subamendment I would like to move on this one.

The Chair: We are at —

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Chair, I'd like to move a subamendment on this one.

The Chair: We are at, right now....

Members, shall BQ-2 carry?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Go ahead on a point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I submitted a subamendment in writing—

The Chair: We have ruled—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: —in advance, and—

The Chair: We have ruled—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: —I would like to be able to—

The Chair: There has been a ruling, MP Genuis.

We are at—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: This is a different amendment. I think members were looking for further context. I provided that in writing, in advance, to the clerk. It can be distributed. I understand it hasn't been circulated, but it can be circulated, or simply read—

The Chair: MP Genuis, it's outside the motion. There is no debate.

We are moving on, members.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Members are allowed to move subamendments, and it's not in there. Are you—?

The Chair: MP Genuis, it's out of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I'm going to challenge you on this, then, because it's a separate amendment. I think I should be able to move my subamendment. It's crazy that you're prohibiting the use of subamendments. It's unprecedented.

The Chair: There was a ruling. It was sustained. We are moving forward.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Chair, it's a new section. I challenge the Chair.

The Chair: Shall Bloc-2 carry?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I challenge the ruling you just made.

The Chair: The ruling has been sustained. You cannot do that, MP Genuis.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: It's a separate amendment, and I'm challenging the Chair.

The Chair: MP Genuis—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: You can't decide as the chair that it can't be challenged.

The Chair: MP Genuis, there has been a ruling.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Yes, and I challenge the ruling.

The Chair: It's been sustained.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I've challenged the ruling. I would like to be able move it on this clause.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: To be clear here, on a point of order.... I guess it's a point of clarification—

The Chair: It is outside the motion.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I understand that. I just want to understand what you were saying.

Are you saying that you just ruled on this point of order that Mr. Genuis has come up with and talked about, or are you saying there's a precedent set and that now no more challenges to the Chair will be permitted?

• (2125)

The Chair: What I am saying, MP Lawrence, is that I have already ruled on whatever MP Genuis was bringing forward with regard to the subamendments. You should know, MP Lawrence, because through unanimous consent, the motion that has brought us to where we are right now says “no debate”.

Within that motion, Clerk, could you read how it addresses the issue when it comes to amendments, which it would also capture, which could not even have subamendments within them.

Go ahead, Clerk, please.

Ms. Miriam Burke (Legislative Clerk): The motion says under (a)(i) that “amendments be submitted to the clerk of the committee in both official languages no later than noon on Friday, May 19, 2023”.

The Chair: Go ahead, MP Blaikie.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: I'm looking for a point of clarification from Mr. Genuis now. Earlier, he said he had just one subamendment that he had submitted in writing. Now we're hearing that he had two subamendments.

I'm wondering if there are any other subamendments that we don't know about that will arise on future clauses, or is this the final subamendment that he apparently sent in before the date? I don't call that into question, but I haven't seen it. It wasn't circulated. That's not on him, although it was presumably after the deadline that was set out in a motion that was passed by unanimous consent.

I'm just looking for some clarification.

The Chair: MP Blaikie, I can't speak to that. What I can say is that what MP Genuis is requesting is out of order. It has been already been ruled on.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Can I provide the clarification he's asking for?

The Chair: MP Genuis, you cannot do what you are asking for.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Could I provide the clarification on the rules?

Mr. Blaikie, I'm sorry if I wasn't clear. I had one amendment to that clause. This will be the only amendment that I move on the Bloc amendment. I have a couple of others on other amendments, but they are fairly simple, straightforward changes that are sincere in their impact. They were provided in writing in advance to the clerk.

The Chair: MP Genuis, I'm going to interject and I'll tell you why—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Obviously, they were after the deadline, because you can't propose subamendments when you haven't seen the amendments yet. You can only propose subamendments after the deadline, because once the package is distributed—

The Chair: With respect, MP Genuis—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I'm just trying to answer the question, Chair. You're cutting me off and not others.

The Chair: MP Genuis, when I ruled, I ruled on all subamendments. It was on all. It's done. It's finished.

MP Genuis, I know you like to listen to yourself, but MP Genuis—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Chair, just on basic decorum, you're the Chair—

The Chair: Yes, I am.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: —and you have the right to make your rulings, and I have the right to challenge them.

The Chair: Yes.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: You might not like me, or you might not like...or you have all kinds of dispersions to cast on my motivations, but I'm trying to challenge a decision you've made.

The Chair: MP Genuis, the challenge was sustained.

Mrs. Sophie Chatel (Pontiac, Lib.): I'd like a recorded vote, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Go ahead, MP Blaikie.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: On this point of order, I'm trying to figure out...and I think I'm right in thinking that had we actually done the work on clause-by-clause for the 10 hours that we met last week while Conservatives filibustered this committee, there would have been every opportunity to present subamendments when we considered the amendments during the 10 hours of meetings that we held for that very purpose. The fact that we're here now and there's no debate allowed was already established by a motion that passed by unanimous consent.

If people were serious about their subamendments, I submit to you, Mr. Chair, that they would have talked to their party and would have engaged in the study of clause-by-clause in good faith while there was the full opportunity to move subamendments, instead of putting them on notice after the 10 hours that we spent studying clause-by-clause last week.

At a certain point give me a break. Just give me a break.

The Chair: Listen, I concur with that, and—

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: That's 10 hours, Mr. Chair—10 hours.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Chair, on that point of order—

The Chair: I've ruled, MP Genuis.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: —you allowed Mr. Blaikie to make comments. I have a right to respond.

The Chair: Look, shall BQ-2 carry?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Chair, on a point of order, you're saying “no debate”, then you're letting some members speak and not others.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: There's a point of order, Mr. Chair. You have to recognize it.

The Chair: Shall BQ-2 carry?

Mr. Philip Lawrence: This is a violation of my privilege. It's a point of order. You have to recognize it.

The Chair: Go ahead on the point of order, MP Lawrence.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: You have to recognize a point of order. You have a responsibility.

• (2130)

The Chair: I am recognizing you, MP Lawrence.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Mr. Chair, it is not your responsibility or your job to admonish my colleague by saying he wants to hear himself talk. Mr. Blaikie gets the right to talk. Why don't we?

The Chair: MP Lawrence, what is your point of order?

I'll explain. I shouldn't have to explain it to you, though. I'll tell you why. MP Lawrence, as you were part.... I know MP Genuis wasn't there, but you were part of the discussion on the motion that brought us to where we are now. It said “at 4:30”.

Can the clerk look at the motion? I'm sorry.

Read where there is no debate, if you can.

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: Can we have a recorded vote, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: MP Lawrence, I know you're well aware of this, but I'll let the clerk read it into the record one more time, so we can move forward.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

[*English*]

The Chair: Okay, MP Ste-Marie. It's a point of order.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: As you said earlier, it's bad for the health and safety of the interpreters when everybody talks at the same time—

[*English*]

Mr. Kelly McCauley: Mr. Chair, I'm not getting translation. Can we wait a second and restart, please?

The Chair: Yes, MP Ste-Marie, I agree.

Everybody—

Mr. Kelly McCauley: Mr. Chair, I have a point of order.

The Chair: I am listening. We have a point of order from MP Ste-Marie.

Mr. Kelly McCauley: Mr. Chair, I cannot hear translation. I've stated this three times. You're so busy playing your games that it seems as if you're ignoring me.

The Chair: MP McCauley—

Mr. Kelly McCauley: I'm not getting translation and I've asked politely whether the member could restart.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: I'll start over, Mr. Chair.

[*English*]

The Chair: Yes, MP Ste-Marie, let's just—

Mr. Kelly McCauley: Can we check the translation, please?

The Chair: We will check for translation first.

Is translation working?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: Mr. Chair, as you said, it undermines the health and safety of the interpreters when the mikes are switched on and everybody talks at the same time.

This is an extremely important issue, and I'm asking my colleagues to try not to talk at the same time because that makes the interpreters' work impossible, and it can undermine harm their health and safety.

[*English*]

The Chair: Thank you, MP Ste-Marie. I agree wholeheartedly.

The health and safety of our interpreters, staff and everybody here supporting this committee is paramount to all of us. I would ask that members only speak with no crosstalk when their mike is on and they have the floor.

I was speaking to MP Lawrence's point of order.

Again, as the motion says, there is no debate. We had a ruling on amendments and subamendments. That is not possible. My ruling has been sustained and we are now at BQ-2.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: There's a point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: May I speak?

The Chair: Go ahead on the point of order, MP Genuis.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

It's striking to me that you've recognized some points of order from members and not others. You've thrown things around about who's a regular member of the committee, whose motivations are what and so forth. Members have a right to substitute. I think you should observe the same practices in your treatment of all members. If the NDP member is allowed to finish his thoughts and explain his reasoning for coming to this conclusion—as he should be able to do—the same principle should apply to Conservatives. Your interpretation of “no debate” seems to be “no debate for people I have some unexplained personal animus against.”

Now, my—

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: On this point of order, Mr. Chair—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I'll finish my point of order, then you'll have your point of order, I suppose.

Mr. Chair, your second ruling seems to be that the chair cannot be challenged on a later matter if the chair has been sustained on a previous matter. That is a ruling you made—a conclusion you came to. I disagree with that conclusion.

I wish to challenge that conclusion. Will you allow that challenge to occur?

The Chair: MP Genuis, to clarify, the ruling was on all amendments, which captured all subamendments, so that was—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I don't think it was, and I'm challenging that.

The Chair: I will just look to the legislative clerk.

Could you just give us some insight into that, please, Mr. Méla?

Mr. Philippe Méla: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

When the chair ruled on the possibility of subamendments, the answer was no from the chair. The chair's ruling was appealed, and it was sustained, so that ruling applies to all subamendment comments.

• (2135)

The Chair: Okay. It is to all subamendments. Thank you.

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: On a point of order—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: That was not my understanding of it, which is what I wish to challenge.

The Chair: Thank you to our legislative clerk.

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: I have a point of order.

The Chair: MP Chatel has a point of order.

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: I have a quick point of order.

Look, your boss, okay, Pierre Poilievre, put us all in this to do that childish work. What I want is respect around this room—

An hon. member: That is not a point of order.

The Chair: No crosstalk—

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: Yes, it is a point of order, because we owe each other respect. We owe each other respect, and I don't want you to be yelling. At least try to get that. Have a little bit of fun, but not this type of discussion. I'm the only woman here and I want respect.

That is my right, and I want respect for the chair, so don't talk like this, like you do. That's not acceptable.

The Chair: MP Chatel's point of order is speaking to respect and decorum here at committee. That is something we would all want and we are asking for.

Again, on the ruling, you heard the ruling: It was a blanket ruling for all amendments and subamendments.

I have MP Lawrence on a point of order.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: On that point of order, with respect to that, no disrespect was intended, but I will say to everyone that it was disrespectful of the chair to say to one of the honourable members of this committee that the member liked to hear himself talk. That was an obvious insult and bullying and not appropriate, so I'll give the chair an opportunity to apologize to Mr. Genuis.

The Chair: I will take that back for any member. I should not have said that.

We will now move forward, members.

Shall Bloc-2 carry?

Mr. Tom Kmiec: I would ask for a recorded vote.

The Chair: Go ahead, Clerk.

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

(Clause 118 agreed to: yeas 10; nays 1)

The Chair: Members, there are no amendments to clauses 119 to 123, so—

• (2140)

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Could we have recorded divisions of each individual one, as it's written—as you have reminded me so many times?

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

(Clauses 119 to 123 inclusive agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: We're now on part 3, “Amendments to the Excise Act, the Excise Act, 2001 and the Air Travellers Security Charge Act” and “Division 1, Excise Act and Excise Act, 2001 (Alcohol Products)”.

On clause 124, shall CPC-1 carry?

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

(Clause 124 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: We're going to suspend for one minute.

• (2140) _____ (Pause) _____

• (2145)

The Chair: We're back.

I do have a note here. CPC-2 can only be moved if CPC-1 had been adopted since CPC-2 removes the reference to clause 170.2 after its deletion by CPC-1.

MP Lawrence.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I'd like to challenge your ruling.

The Chair: Okay. There's a challenge to the ruling, members.

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: Sustain.

The Chair: Members, just to refocus everybody, we are on CPC-2.

A note to the chair here from the legislative clerk says that CPC-2 can only be moved if CPC-1 had been adopted since CPC-2 removes the reference to clause 170.2 after its deletion by CPC-1. Because of that, it cannot be moved, but there's been a challenge to the chair, just so everybody is aware.

• (2150)

The Chair: We'll have a recorded vote.

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

The Chair: The ruling has been sustained.

Shall CPC-3 carry?

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

(On clause 125)

The Chair: Shall CPC-4 carry?

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

(Clause 125 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: We now go to new clause 125.1, which is BQ-3. I do have a chair's ruling here.

Bill C-47 amends several acts, including the Excise Act, 2001 to add inflationary adjustment clauses. The amendment seeks to add a new category of exempted product, bulk wines made in Canada from agricultural or plant product grown in Canada, to the exclusion of grapes.

As *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, Third Edition, states on page 770:

An amendment to a bill that was referred to a committee after second reading is out of order if it is beyond the scope and principle of the bill.

In the opinion of the chair, this addition is a new concept that is beyond the scope of the bill as adopted by the House at second reading. Therefore, I rule the amendment inadmissible.

• (2155)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: That looks like hard work.

[*English*]

The Chair: MP Ste-Marie, I know. It's tough.

We are now on BQ-4. I do have a chair's ruling on BQ-4.

Bill C-47 amends several acts, including the Excise Act, 2001 to add inflationary adjustment clauses. The amendment seeks to add a new category of exempted product, wines produced in Canada for personal use and by small producers made from agricultural or plant product grown in Canada, to the exclusion of grapes.

As *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, Third Edition, states on page 770:

An amendment to a bill that was referred to a committee after second reading is out of order if it is beyond the scope and principle of the bill.

In the opinion of the chair this addition is a new concept that is beyond the scope of the bill as adopted by the House at second reading and therefore I rule the amendment inadmissible.

(On clause 126)

The Chair: We are at now at clause 126.

Shall CPC-5 carry?

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Let's have a recorded division on that one.

The Chair: That's agreed: six yeas, five nays.

The Chair: Shall clause 126 carry?

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Let's have a recorded vote.

The Chair: A recorded vote, clerk.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: First, I have a point of clarification on the previous vote. Was it on clause 125 or was it on an amendment?

The Chair: That was on amendment CPC-5 to clause 126.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: Then I voted in error. The vote ought to be recorded as a no.

The Chair: We will need unanimous consent, members.

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chair: We'll change MP Blaikie's vote.

Ms. Julie Dzerowicz: Can we suspend? I think it's a good moment to suspend.

The Chair: I think so, too. I agree with Julie.

We will suspend for a minute.

• (2155) _____ (Pause) _____

• (2155)

The Chair: We are back.

We were at CPC-5, and there was unanimous consent for MP Blaikie to change his vote.

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

• (2200)

The Chair: Shall clause 126 carry?

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I'm sorry, Mr. Chair. I just have a quick....

CPC amendments 5 to 12 here on my sheet.... Don't we have to go through those or...?

The Chair: I have a number of rulings on those coming up, MP Lawrence.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Okay, so, you're going to do the rulings.

The Chair: Yes, we will go one by one because I'll just read out my rulings.

CPC-5 was defeated.

Shall clause 126 carry? That's where we are right now.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Is that with respect to clause 125 or clause 126?

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: I have a quick point of order.

I think CPC-6 also amends clause 126.

The Chair: I do have a ruling on CPC-6 when we get there.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: I think we have to get there before we vote on clause 126, unless it creates a new clause.

The Chair: We're going to suspend here for a minute.

The Chair: Okay, members, I'll just to clarify for everybody that CPC-5 amended clause 126. When we get to CPC-6, it will fall under new clause 126.1.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Members, you'll see at this hour that I do have to pull out the cheaters. I have the glasses at this hour. It's age, guys. You guys are all young 'uns.

Shall clause 126 carry?

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Can we have a recorded division on that one?

(Clause 126 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: Now we're at new clause 126.1.

This is CPC-6. I do have a ruling, members.

Bill C-47 amends several acts, including the Excise Act, 2001, to add inflationary adjustment clauses. The amendment seeks to establish new amounts of fines related to certain alcohol offences. As *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, Third Edition, states on page 770:

An amendment to a bill that was referred to a committee after second reading is out of order if it is beyond the scope and principle of the bill.

In the opinion of the chair, this addition is a new concept that is beyond the scope of the bill as adopted by the House at second reading. Therefore, I rule the amendment inadmissible.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Mr. Chair, at the risk of pushing the envelope with respect to the rules of the motion, would you be so kind as to indulge me? What, exactly, in this amendment is outside of scope?

The Chair: I can read the ruling again. That's what I have here.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I'm sorry. I didn't quite follow it.

The Chair: I'll read the ruling one more time for members.

The ruling is that Bill C-47 amends several acts, including the Excise Act, 2001, to add inflationary adjustment clauses. The amendment seeks to establish new amounts of fines related to certain alcohol offences. As *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, Third Edition, states on page 770:

An amendment to a bill that was referred to committee *after* second reading is out of order if it is beyond the scope and principle of the bill.

In the opinion of the chair, this addition is a new concept—

• (2205)

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I've got it.

The Chair: Okay, are you good?

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I'm going to challenge it, but yes, I get it, thank you.

The Chair: There's a challenge of the chair, Clerk.

The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Aimée Belmore): The question is, shall the decision of the chair be sustained?

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

The Chair: Now we are on CPC-7. There is a chair's ruling on this one, on CPC-7.

The chair's ruling is that Bill C-47 amends several acts, including the Excise Act, 2001, to add inflationary adjustment clauses. The amendment seeks to establish new amounts of fines related to certain more serious alcohol offences.

As *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, Third Edition, states on page 770, "An amendment to a bill that was referred to committee after second reading is out of order if it is beyond the scope and principle of the bill."

In the opinion of the chair, this addition is a new concept that is beyond the scope of the bill as adopted by the House at second reading; therefore, I rule the amendment inadmissible.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Go ahead.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I'd like to challenge the chair.

The Chair: There's a challenge of the chair.

Go ahead, Clerk.

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

The Chair: It's been sustained.

Members, now we are at amendment CPC-8.

I do have a ruling. The ruling is that Bill C-47 amends several acts, including the Excise Act, 2001 to add inflationary adjustment clauses. The amendment seeks to establish a new amount of fine related to the supply of bulk wine offences.

As *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, Third Edition, states on page 770:

An amendment to a bill that was referred to committee after second reading is out of order if it is beyond the scope and principle of the bill.

In the opinion of the chair, this addition is a new concept that is beyond the scope of the bill as adopted by the House at second reading; therefore, I rule the amendment inadmissible.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I will challenge the Chair.

The Chair: Go ahead, Clerk.

• (2210)

The Clerk: Shall the decision of the chair be sustained?

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

The Chair: We are now, members, at amendment CPC-9.

I do have a chair's ruling.

MP Lawrence, I have a ruling here I have to read. Bill C-47 amends several acts, including the Excise Act, 2001, to add inflationary adjustment clauses. The amendment seeks to establish new amounts of fines for alcohol offences in relation to sections 73, 74 and 90 of the act.

As *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, Third Edition, states on page 770:

An amendment to a bill that was referred to committee after second reading is out of order if it is beyond the scope and principle of the bill.

In the opinion of the chair, this addition is a new concept that is beyond the scope of the bill as adopted by the House at second reading; therefore, I rule the amendment inadmissible.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Can I ask for a quick clarification? Is it the calculation in the new bill that's the problem?

The Chair: We can't get into that.

Ms. Julie Dzerowicz: That's debate, Chair.

The Chair: We are now—

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I will challenge the Chair.

The Chair: There's a challenge. Shall the decision of the chair be sustained?

Clerk, we will have a vote.

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

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I have a quick point of order, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Mr. Lawrence, go ahead..

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I don't mean this in any disrespectful way. I think I work quite well with Mr. MacDonald, but I have noticed several times that he hasn't said "yes". He just used his thumbs-up, which I guess we do on an acceptance basis. I was just wondering if there was a technical problem.

The Chair: You can use your thumbs-up or thumbs-down, if you want, for voting. That's all we're doing here; we're voting.

If that is what MP MacDonald would like to do, that's what he can do. Other members can do that also if you want to use your thumbs-up or thumbs-down.

Ms. Julie Dzerowicz: But you can only use thumbs-up. That's it.

The Chair: That was sustained.

We are at CPC-10. There is a ruling here from the chair.

Bill C-47 amends several acts, including the Excise Act, 2001 to add inflationary adjustment clauses. The amendment seeks to establish new amounts of fines for alcohol offences in relation to section 76, 89 and 91 of the act.

As *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, Third Edition, states on page 770:

An amendment to a bill that was referred to a committee after second reading is out of order if it is beyond the scope and principle of the bill.

In the opinion of the chair, this addition is a new concept that is beyond the scope of the bill as adopted by the House at second reading. Therefore, I rule the amendment inadmissible.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Mr. Chair, if we were in a hockey game, and if 10 penalties were called on one side and zero on the other, I might call into question the unbiased nature of the referee.

I'll leave that alone and just say we need a challenge, Chair.

Mr. Yvan Baker: I call into question the people being penalized.

The Chair: There is a challenge. Shall the decision of the chair be sustained?

Clerk, we will have a vote.

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

The Chair: Shall CPC-11 carry?

Mr. Philip Lawrence: We want a recorded vote on division, please.

The Chair: We will have a recorded vote.

(Amendment negatived: nays 6; yeas 5)

The Chair: Shall CPC-12 carry?

• (2215)

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I just want to confirm that it's in good order and within scope? Perfect.

We would like a recorded vote on division, please.

The Chair: We will have a recorded vote.

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

(Clause 127 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: Now we're at part 4, "Various Measures", and division 1, the "Bank Act".

Members, I'm going to try this again as we're getting a little more into the evening. There are no amendments to clauses 128 to 136. If we had unanimous consent, then we'd be able to group those together.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I don't think so, Mr. Chair. I appreciate your efforts, though.

(Clauses 128 to 136 inclusive agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

• (2225)

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Can we confirm that we can get resources till 2 a.m.? Is that possible?

The Chair: We're going until we finish.

(On clause 137)

The Chair: We are now at clause 137, and amendment BQ-5.

(Amendment negatived: nays 10; yeas 1 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I have a point of order.

The Chair: It was defeated, but we have a point of order.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I apologize to the interpreters for the crosstalk.

I just had a brief exchange with the clerk. Is it possible to defeat something on division? My understanding is no, but we've done this in the past and I just wanted to make that clear, so that we could speed things up and defeat some things on division, if that's possible.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: I can speak to that point of order.

The Chair: I'll let the clerk speak to that first, MP Blaikie.

Ms. Miriam Burke: No.

The Chair: Okay. That's a no.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: Mr. Chair, I'd still like to speak to the point of order.

The Chair: Okay, MP Blaikie.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: I accept that the answer to that, properly speaking, is no, but we have on other bills established that as a

precedent at this table. It seems to me that if the committee were to consent to defeating clauses on division, it's something we could do. We've done it in the past. We did it, I think, on Bill C-19. I want to say it was that one.

The Chair: I'll look to the clerk.

As long as the committee provides consent for that...

Yes, MP Morantz.

Mr. Marty Morantz: I think that the issue has to do with question, because the question is, "Shall this clause carry?", and then it's on division. If the question was, "Shall this clause be defeated?", then it would be defeated on division. That's my understanding of the logic or rationale.

The Chair: The clerk has nothing for me. We'll stick with "it's a no" right now.

We are at clause 137.

We'll keep that in our back pocket.

Shall clause 137 carry?

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: I have a point of order.

The Chair: On a point of order, I see MP Chatel.

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: May we combine...? There are no amendments that I'm aware of between clause 138—

The Chair: No. We are not there yet.

We have to conclude clause 137. You can then do your point of order.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I'd like a recorded division, or we could try defeating it on division, if you wish.

(Clause 137 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

• (2230)

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: Thank you.

On that, I have a point of order.

The Chair: On the point of order, I have MP Chatel.

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: I feel like we're all at school, having a time out. I don't know why.

If we can expedite this, the best way forward would be to combine clauses 138 all the way to 209. Combine them and vote, because there are no amendments.

The Chair: No. We would have to go to clause 147. Is that...?

We can...? Okay.

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: By combining them—

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I appreciate it. If I were a member of the government, perhaps I would want to expedite this process as well. As I'm in His Majesty's loyal opposition, it's my job to perform my duties with all due diligence and due dispatch.

I wish to vote on every one, as is my right. I might add, as the chair and Mr. Beech said repeatedly, that we have to follow the letter of the law.

The Chair: We did not have unanimous consent for that.

Go ahead, MP Blaikie.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: I'm wondering if there's a plan to suspend at some point for five minutes.

The Chair: Yes. Are members looking for a...?

We'll suspend.

• (2230) _____ (Pause) _____

• (2240)

The Chair: I call the meeting back to order.

Okay, everybody. We're back.

I see MP Hallan has joined us. I hope everybody got a little something to eat and stretched their legs.

I think what was asked—and I'll ask again, because MP Hallan wasn't in the room at that time—was, for clauses 138 to 210, could we get unanimous consent? Are members in agreement?

Mr. Philip Lawrence: What do we think? No.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

(Clauses 138 to 140 inclusive agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

• (2245)

The Chair: If we were able to group clauses 141 to 147, because some of the members have talked to me from all sides and said smaller groupings may work.... I'm just looking for unanimous consent.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I have to say no.

The Chair: Okay. You may come around to it down the line.

On a point of order, I see MP Lawrence.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I would like to test something here.

I know you ruled earlier—and, of course, you can shoot me down if you wish, Mr. Chair—but is it possible to read the section as we go?

The Chair: That is not possible, MP Lawrence.

We are now moving on.

(Clauses 141 to 147 inclusive agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

• (2250)

The Chair: On division 2, “Private Sector Pension Plans”, I do have a note. It says there are no amendments from clauses 148 to 180.

We would need unanimous consent to group those.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: No, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Okay. We will do recorded votes, but I will keep trying as we go along.

(Clauses 148 to 180 inclusive agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

• (2315)

The Chair: We're at division 3, “Measures Related to Money Laundering and to Digital Assets and Other Measures”.

For members' sake, there are no amendments to clauses 181 to 210. I'm looking to see if we would have UC to group those.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Mr. Chair, I'm sorry. I thought there were amendments CPC-13 and CPC-14.

The Chair: Those are after clause 210. For clauses 181 to 210 we're clear. There are no amendments.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: No, we won't go with unanimous consent. We want to vote on each one of the provisions here.

The Chair: Okay.

Mr. Yvan Baker: I would like recorded votes.

(Clauses 181 and 182 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: Shall clause 183 carry?

• (2320)

Mr. Philip Lawrence: On a point of order, I thought I would just test this again with you. I was wondering if I could get you to see, given the importance of terrorist financing and money laundering and the issues we're having throughout the country—

The Chair: There's no debate. I'm sorry. We're moving on.

(Clauses 183 to 192 inclusive agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

• (2325)

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

How long do we have resources for? Can we go through the night?

The Chair: Yes, I think we're going to go until we can get this thing done.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Terrific. Good.

(Clauses 193 to 196 inclusive agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

• (2330)

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Mr. Chair, I have a point of order.

The Chair: Go ahead on your point of order.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: We've voted on a number of sections. I was wondering whether it would be possible to get a tally of how many have been voted in and how many have been struck down at this point.

The Chair: That's debate.

An hon. member: Yes, it's not a point of order.

The Chair: We're not going into that, so we're at clause 197.

Mr. Yvan Baker: I'd like recorded votes.

(Clauses 197 to 205 inclusive agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

• (2340)

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Mr. Chair, I have a point of order.

Just in case you suspend at midnight, as I suspect you will, I may not get a chance.... Regardless of how we got here, we are—

The Chair: That's debate.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Hang on, guys. I just want to say thank you to the clerks and interpreters who are doing a fabulous job.

The Chair: Thank you to our great clerks.

(Clauses 206 to 210 inclusive agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: We're on new clause 210.1. Shall CPC-13 carry?

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

The Chair: Members, we're at CPC-14, which adds an “s” to the word “offence”. It could only be moved if CPC-13 were adopted; otherwise, there would only be one offence listed under a plural heading.

CPC-13 was not adopted, so we move on.

• (2345)

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Mr. Chair, I'll challenge your ruling.

• (2350)

The Chair: There's a challenge.

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

The Chair: Now, members, we are at clause 211. I'll test the waters again. There are no amendments between clauses 211 and 228, so would members like to provide unanimous consent to group those?

Some hon. members: No.

The Chair: Okay.

Shall clause 211 carry?

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Perhaps on a point of order, I'll test the water again, Mr. Chair, to see if there's unanimous consent to read—

The Chair: No, MP Lawrence. That's debate.

Shall clause 211 carry?

Mr. Yvan Baker: I'd like recorded votes, please.

(Clauses 211 to 217 inclusive agreed to: yeas 7, nays 4)

• (2355)

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

We are quickly approaching when the meeting was scheduled until, which was 11:59.

Ms. Julie Dzerowicz: That's not a point of order.

The Chair: That's not a point of order. It is not.

We have resources. We're going to continue.

(Clauses 218 to 222 inclusive agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

• (2400)

The Chair: Mr. Lawrence, do you have a point of order?

Mr. Philip Lawrence: On a point of order, this meeting was scheduled to 11:59 p.m. As per the—

The Chair: I think we're still pretty good right now. We're good, so—

Mr. Philip Lawrence: No, no. I think I'm allowed a point of order. This is my privilege. Thank you, sir.

The Chair: Go ahead on your point of order.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: And please don't talk over.... It hurts the interpreters.

I believe the whips had negotiated to 11:59 p.m. Those are the resources. Our House of Commons staff do a fabulous job. I don't believe pushing them beyond this point would be helpful for their health and for their health and safety.

Mr. Chair, you made that a clear priority of yours in previous discussions, but if your agenda is more important than health and safety, I guess that's what it is.

The Chair: No, MP Lawrence, I want the health and safety of everybody in this room—and with you, too, I see you're having a little difficulty right now.

What we're going to do is to suspend until tomorrow morning.

[*The meeting was suspended at 00:02 a.m., Tuesday, May 30*]

[*The meeting resumed at 9:04 a.m., Tuesday, May 30*]

• (3300)

The Chair: We are back, everyone. I call this meeting to order.

We're resuming meeting number 94.

Pursuant to the order of reference of Tuesday, May 2, 2023, and the motion adopted on May 16, 2023, the committee is meeting to discuss Bill C-47, an act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on March 28, 2023.

Today's meeting is taking place in a hybrid format, pursuant to the House order of June 23, 2022. Members are attending in person in the room and remotely using the Zoom application.

As per the annotated agenda, members, we're resuming with clause-by-clause consideration.

Let's get to it.

Shall clause 223 carry?

• (3305)

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I'd like a recorded division.

Thank you.

(Clauses 223 to 225 inclusive agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair. We were all up relatively late last night, and it's early morning. I'm wondering if we could have a recap of the first 222 sections, whether they passed or—

Ms. Julie Dzerowicz: It's not a point of order.

The Chair: It's not a point of order.

Shall clause 226 carry?

Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan (Calgary Forest Lawn, CPC): I would like a recorded vote.

(Clauses 226 to 228 inclusive agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: Next, we have division 4, "Preferential Tariff Programs for Developing Countries".

Members, from clauses 229 to 234 there are no amendments. I'm just looking to see if we have unanimous consent.

• (3310)

Mr. Philip Lawrence: No, but I would test to see if we can read the sections into the record.

The Chair: That will not be happening.

Shall clause 229 carry?

Mr. Yvan Baker: I request a recorded vote.

(Clauses 229 to 234 inclusive agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: We're on division 5, "Removal of Most-Favoured-Nation Tariff Treatment for Belarus and Russia".

(Clauses 235 and 236 agreed to: yeas 11; nays 0)

The Chair: We're on on division 6, "Non-application of Sections 27 and 27.1 of the Bank of Canada Act".

(Clause 237 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: We're on division 7, "Canada Innovation Corporation Act".

(Clause 238 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: Shall clause 239 carry?

• (3315)

Mr. Yvan Baker: I'd like a recorded vote.

(Clauses 239 to 241 inclusive agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

• (3320)

The Chair: We're on division 8, Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements Act (Canada Health Transfer)".

Shall clause 242 carry?

Mr. Yvan Baker: I'd like a recorded vote.

(Clause 242 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: The Chair: We're on Division 9, "Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements Act (Equalization and Territorial Financing Renewal and Other Amendments)". This is new clause 242.1

Shall amendment G-2 carry?

The Chair: We'll have a recorded vote.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: It would be helpful to hear the amendment read out, but I know we are not allowed to read out the sections we are going to vote on. This is division 8 with respect to clause 242 and the government's second amendment. It has already passed—

The Chair: MP Lawrence, there is no discussion. It's yea or nay. It's your turn to vote.

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

The Chair: Next, we have CPC-15, and I do have a chair's ruling.

Bill C-47 amends several acts, including the Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements Act. The amendment seeks to make an amendment to the title of this act. As *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, Third Edition, states on page 775:

Titles, whether it be the long, short or alternative title, may be amended only if the bill has been so altered as to necessitate such an amendment.

In the opinion of the Chair, no amendment has been made to the bill that would necessitate a change to the title of the act. Therefore, I rule the amendment inadmissible.

Mr. Yvan Baker: I'd like a recorded vote.

• (3325)

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Mr. Chair, I have a point of order.

If there are amendments...?

The Chair: There's no debate.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I'm not debating, Mr. Chair. I'm asking for clarification, and a bit of courtesy.

The Chair: It's inadmissible.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: You made a ruling. It's completely reasonable for me to ask for an interpretation.

The Chair: That's debate, and we are not debating.

You can challenge the chair, but it's not debatable, MP Lawrence. It's inadmissible.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I challenge the chair, then.

The Chair: Clerk, call the vote.

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

The Chair: Shall clause 243 carry?

Mr. Yvan Baker: I would like a recorded vote.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

I see on my sheet CPC-15 to 21. They're for clause 244.

Are they for upcoming sections? I'm sorry. I must have misread that.

The Chair: That is coming later, MP Lawrence.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I would like a recorded division.

The Chair: We'll have a recorded vote.

(Clause 243 agreed to: yeas 6; nays 5)

The Chair: Shall clause 244 carry?

• (3330)

Mr. Yvan Baker: I'd like a recorded vote.

The Chair: We'll have a recorded vote.

(Clause 244 agreed to: yeas 6; nays 5)

The Chair: On new clause 244.1, CPC-16, I do have a ruling.

Bill C-47 amends several acts, including the Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements Act. The amendment seeks to establish a new mechanism to reassess the method of calculation of the fiscal equalization payments following a provincial referendum on the matter. This is a new concept that was not envisioned in the bill when it was adopted by the House at second reading.

As *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, third edition, states on page 770, "An amendment to a bill that was referred to committee after second reading is out of order if it is beyond the scope and principle of the bill."

Therefore, and for the above-stated reason, I rule the amendment inadmissible.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Yes, go ahead on a point of order.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I wish to seek clarity on this, but before that I have a point of order.

There's nowhere in the motion, if you'd like to read it, that says that discussion of a chair's ruling is prohibited.

The Chair: The motion says that there is no debate.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: This is discussion of a chair's ruling.

The Chair: There is no debate. It has been ruled inadmissible. So we are—

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I will challenge the chair.

The Chair: Okay, we have a challenge.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Just to be clear, the challenge is on whether we are allowed to debate a chair's ruling.

The Chair: That is not debatable.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: That is challengeable. You've made a decision.

The Chair: Are you challenging my ruling, MP Lawrence?

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I am challenging your ruling that I'm not allowed to debate your ruling.

The Chair: Your understanding is incorrect, MP Lawrence. You can only challenge the chair's ruling.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: The chair is ruling that I can't challenge the chair.

The Chair: You can only challenge the chair's ruling. I've conferred with the legislative clerk.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: This is very Liberal. You cannot challenge—

The Chair: There's a vote.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: So the chair has argued that I can't challenge—

The Chair: There's no debate, MP Lawrence.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: It seems about par for the course.

I will challenge your ruling, then.

The Chair: Mr. Clerk, go ahead.

The Clerk: This is a vote on the challenge of the chair's ruling.

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

(Clauses 245 and 246 agreed to: yeas 6; nays 5)

• (3335)

The Chair: This is CPC-17, clause 247. I have a ruling.

Bill C-47 amends several acts, including the Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements Act. The amendment seeks to remove subsections 6(8) to 6(10) of the act from the calculation of the fiscal stabilization payment that may be paid to a province for a fiscal year, which could result in an increase of payment out of the consolidated revenue fund.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Mr. Chair, I have a point of order.

The Chair: We have a point of order.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Could you please slow down for the sake of the interpreters, as well as for my sake? You're speed-reading through that.

The Chair: Okay. I hope everybody has the bill in front of them, but I will slow down.

As *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, third edition, states on page 772:

Since an amendment may not infringe upon the financial initiative of the Crown, it is inadmissible if it imposes a charge on the public treasury, or if it extends the objects or purposes or relaxes the conditions and qualifications specified in the royal recommendation.

In the opinion of the chair, the amendment proposes a new scheme, which could impose additional charges on the public treasury. Therefore, I rule the amendment inadmissible.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Would the chair permit a challenge to the chair in this scenario? Is this one that you'll accept?

The Chair: It is the member's prerogative to challenge my ruling.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: This is one challenge to the chair that the chair will accept, so I will challenge the chair.

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

(Clauses 247 and 248 agreed to: yeas 6; nays 5)

● (3340)

The Chair: On new clause 248.1, shall CPC-18 carry?

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

The Chair: On CPC-19, I do have a ruling.

Bill C-47 amends several acts, including the Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements Act. The amendment seeks to make an amendment to the title of this act, referenced in numerous other acts.

As *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, third edition, states on page 775, "Titles, whether it be the long, short or alternative title, may be amended only if the bill has been so altered as to necessitate such an amendment."

In the opinion of the chair, no amendment has been made to the bill that would necessitate a change to the title of the act. Therefore, I rule the amendment inadmissible.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Mr. Chair, with great respect, could we please challenge your ruling?

The Chair: There's a challenge, Mr. Clerk.

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

The Chair: We're going to suspend for 30 seconds.

● (3340)

(Pause)

● (3340)

● (3345)

The Chair: We're back.

Members, at clause 249, you'll see next that there's amendment CPC-20. CPC-20 can be moved only if amendment CPC-16, on page 26 of the package, has been adopted, since the amendment refers to new clauses 244.1 and 244.2, which would have been created by amendment CPC-16.

Since that did not happen, we are now moving to—

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I'd like to challenge the chair.

The Chair: There's a challenge to that.

I'll explain it one more time, if you would like.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Sure.

The Chair: Amendment CPC-20 can be moved only if amendment CPC-16, which is on page 26 of the package, has been adopted. That was not the case. Since the amendment refers to proposed clauses 244.1 and 244.2, which would have been created by amendment CPC-16, we will not be voting on amendment CPC-20. We will jump over that.

There's been a challenge.

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 7; nays 4)

(Clause 249 agreed to: yeas 6; nays 5)

The Chair: We're on clause 250.

Shall CPC-21 carry?

(Amendment negated: nays 7; yeas 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

(Clauses 250 and 251 agreed to: yeas 6; nays 5)

● (3350)

The Chair: We're on division 10, "Economic Sanctions".

Shall clause 252 carry?

(Clause 252 agreed to: yeas 11; nays 0)

The Chair: Members, I'll just test the waters.

For clauses 253 to 264, there are no amendments. Would members like to try for unanimous consent to group those?

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I believe it is important to vote, and I also believe there's no debate, Mr. Chair, so I'm not sure you're in order.

The Chair: It's not a debate. I'm asking the members if that's something they—

Mr. Philip Lawrence: You have a very wide definition of debate.

The Chair: Okay, MP Lawrence.

We will move forward.

(Clauses 253 to 264 inclusive agreed to: yeas 11; nays 0)

● (3400)

The Chair: We are now on division 11, entitled "Privileges and Immunities (North Atlantic Treaty Organisation) Act".

(Clause 265 to 269 inclusive agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

● (3405)

The Chair: We are now on division 12, "Service Fees Act".

- (Clauses 270 to 279 inclusive agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)
- (3410)

The Chair: We're now on division 13, "Canada Pension Plan".

Shall clause 280 carry?

(Clause 280 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: We're on division 14, "Department of Employment and Social Development Act".

Shall clause 281 carry?

(Clause 281 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: We're on division 15, "Canada Labour Code".

(Clauses 282 and 283 agreed to: yeas 11; nays 0)
 - (3415)

The Chair: We're on division 16, "Immigration and Refugee Protection Act (Claims for Refugee Protection)".

(Clauses 284 and 285 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: We're on division 17, "Immigration and Refugee Protection Act (Sponsorship Applications)".

Shall clause 286 carry?

(Clause 286 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: We're on division 18, "College of Immigration and Citizenship Consultants Act".

(Clauses 287 to 291 inclusive agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)
 - (3420)

Mr. Philip Lawrence: On a point of order, Mr. Chair, are we going to have a bio break any time in the next while? What's your scheduling there, Mr. Chair?

The Chair: We'll finish off a number of clauses, and then we'll have a bio break. Is that okay? We will get to that.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: There's no problem, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Okay.

(Clauses 292 to 298 inclusive agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)
 - (3425)

The Chair: Shall clause 299 carry?

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Mr. Chair, I have a point of order.

Are we supposed to vote the whole time as it's going by, or are we supposed to wait our turn to vote?

The Chair: That is not a point of order.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: It's a point of order; it's how it works.

Can I just say "yea" all the time—

The Chair: Shall clause 299 carry?

Mr. Philip Lawrence: —or am I supposed to vote when I'm supposed to?

Mr. Yvan Baker: I would like a recorded vote.

- Ms. Julie Dzerowicz:** We could adopt them in bunches if you want.
- The Chair:** We'll have a recorded vote.
- (Clause 299 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)
- The Chair:** We're on division 19, "Citizenship Act".
- Shall clause 300 carry?
- (Clauses 300 to 306 inclusive agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)
- (3430)

The Chair: We're on division 20, "Yukon Act".

Shall clause 307 carry?

(Clause 307 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: We're on division 21, "Oceans Protection Plan".

Shall clause 308 carry?

(Clauses 308 and 309 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)
 - (3435)

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Mr. Chair, on a point of order, we're now at 10:30. I wonder if the chair would be gracious enough to grant us a suspension—

The Chair: We will, soon, MP Lawrence. We usually go for about two hours in our regular meetings, so we'll keep on going.

Shall clause 310 carry?

(Clauses 310 to 341 inclusive agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)
 - (3500)

The Chair: Shall clause 342 carry?

Hon. Ed Fast (Abbotsford, CPC): Mr. Chair, on a point of order, I'm sure this has already been raised, but I notice that Mr. Beech has his thumb up in the air. It's like it's pasted to the screen.

The Chair: No. He's moving. It's good.

Shall clause—

Hon. Ed Fast: I just want to know if there was a formal ruling on whether a voice vote permits an extended thumb to be an equivalent?

The Chair: You can have your thumb up. If your thumb is up, it is a yea.

Hon. Ed Fast: Really?

The Chair: Yes.

Shall clause 342 carry?

(Clause 342 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: We have a really hard-working team here, and we usually go well past two hours, but I know Mr. Lawrence has asked me a number of times for a bio break, so we are going to take a five-minute bio break.

• (3500) _____ (Pause) _____

• (3510)

The Chair: We are back.

Members, we are at clause 343.

Shall clause 343 carry?

Mr. Yvan Baker: I would like a recorded vote.

(Clauses 343 to 347 inclusive agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

• (3515)

The Chair: Shall clause 348 carry?

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair. The clerk is doing an excellent job, but could he speak up just a wee bit? I had the same problem as Ms. Dzerowicz. It would be greatly appreciated.

The Chair: Maybe he can put the mike just a little closer.

(Clauses 348 to 350 inclusive agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

• (3520)

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: I have a point of order before we go to the next clause. I was just wondering if, at some point later in the day, you might have the clerk calculate what the cost per hour of the meeting is: the extra meals, the House staff and the officials who were on the line for 10 hours. I'd just like to get a sense of the overall costs of the legislative process.

The Chair: There are costs. We know that. It's not a point of order.

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: On that point of order, I did the math, and we are approaching \$200,000—

The Chair: Okay, MP Chatel—

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: —and it's close to \$3,000 per hour.

An hon. member: Wow.

The Chair: Thanks, MP Chatel and MP Blaikie.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Marty Morantz: On that point of order, Mr. Chair—

The Chair: Members, it was not a point of order.

An hon. member: It was a point of order.

An hon. member: [*Inaudible—Editor*] allowed to speak.

The Chair: I know. I said it was not a point of order.

Some hon. members: [*Inaudible—Editor*]

The Chair: Members, members, members, members. I see that food has arrived, so you can always go get your food, but we're on clause 351.

Shall clause 351 carry?

(Clauses 351 and 352 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

• (3525)

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Mr. Chair, I have a point of order.

I find it interesting to hear the Liberals talk about fiscal restraint and responsibility. Giving—

The Chair: Just like the other, it is not a point of order.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I would just ask for equal time.

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: You're wasting taxpayers' money.

The Chair: We'll continue to move forward, members.

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: You are wasting taxpayers' money.

The Chair: Members, MP Chatel, for everybody's sake here—

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: I'm sorry, Mr. Chair. I care when they're wasting taxpayers' money.

Hon. Ed Fast: What's your budget deficit?

The Chair: MP Fast....

MP Chatel, please.

As you know, the motion—there's no debate, there's no talk, etc. This is not a point of order.

Shall clause 353 carry?

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

I just ask for equal time. I would say, briefly—

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: You're wasting taxpayers' money.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: —every moment we stop this government spending trillions of dollars, we are saving—

The Chair: Please, members.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Mr. Chair, she's talking over me. It's hurting the interpreters.

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: Yes, because it's not a point of order.

The Chair: MP Chatel, please.

Thank you.

I will now call clauses 353 through to 369.

Mr. Yvan Baker: I would like recorded votes.

(Clauses 353 to 369 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

• (3540)

The Chair: Shall clause 370 carry?

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: We have Mr. Lawrence on a point of order.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: How is the thumbs-down or thumbs-up recorded in the committee Hansard on our vote? Is it just put down as a “no” or a “yes” vote?

The Chair: The thumb gesture is allowed. A thumbs-up is a yeas and a thumbs-down is a nays.

Shall clause 370 carry?

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Could we have a recorded division?

(Clause 370 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: I will now call clauses 371 to 400.

Mr. Yvan Baker: I would like recorded votes.

(Clauses 371 to 400 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

• (3600)

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Mr. Chair, I have a point of order.

Could we have a bio break now as we're two hours in?

The Chair: No, we can wait. We had a bio break just a little bit ago.

I will now call clauses 401 to 412.

• (3610)

Mr. Yvan Baker: I'd like recorded votes.

(Clauses 401 to 412 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Mr. Chair, I have a point of order.

I just received a good faith message from Mr. Beech with respect to some upcoming provisions.

I would like the opportunity to talk to him before we get to clause 443.

The Chair: There is no debate.

Shall clauses 413 and 414 carry?

Mr. Yvan Baker: I'd like recorded votes.

(Clauses 413 and 414 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

• (3615)

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Mr. Chair, on a point of order, perhaps you could refer to your clerk. Is there a time allotment for how long it takes to vote?

The Chair: We will suspend for a bit.

• (3615)

(Pause)

• (3615)

The Chair: We are back.

Shall clause 415 carry?

Mr. Yvan Baker: I'd like a recorded vote.

(Clause 415 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: Shall clause 416 carry?

Mr. Philip Lawrence: On a point of order, is there any precedent for a chair ever refusing a member to vote because they took too much time, ever in the history of the House of Commons?

An hon. member: That's debate, a waste of time.

The Chair: That is not a question. It is at the discretion of the chair. What we are moving to—

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Mr. Chair, on a point of order, my privilege has been violated.

The Chair: It is at the discretion of the chair.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I asked a question with respect to that. Can the chair just pick zero seconds if he wants?

The Chair: I don't know if we have any information on that.

No, there is no information we have for you, MP Lawrence.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Just to be clear, there is absolutely zero precedent of a chair ever refusing a member, no matter how much time they took to vote.

The Chair: MP Lawrence, you're debating this.

Shall clause 416 carry?

Mr. Yvan Baker: I'd like a recorded vote.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Mr. Chair, this is a valid point of order. My privilege is being violated.

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: The library is just one floor away. You can go and check the precedent.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: My privilege is being violated. I was sent here by the people of Northumberland—Peterborough South. I work for them, not for the Liberal Party.

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: That's debate. We're having a recorded vote.

The Chair: MP Lawrence, the timing—

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I asked you a question, Mr. Chair. I know that you decide when the chair can be challenged.

The Chair: Yes. MP Lawrence, what I will say is that I allow ample time for you to vote. I've allowed ample time throughout all of these proceedings. Do you believe you have ample time to vote?

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I believe you've been reasonable in that respect.

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I just want clarity. That's all I'm asking for.

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: We live in a rules-based system. I just want to know what the rules are.

The Chair: It's at the discretion—

Mr. Philip Lawrence: We don't live in North Korea.

The Chair: Yes. It's at the discretion—

• (3620)

Mr. Philip Lawrence: You don't get to decide.

The Chair: MP Lawrence, we're not getting into debate. It is at the discretion of the chair. I've allowed for ample time. I'm glad you recognized that.

Shall clause 416 carry?

Mr. Yvan Baker: I'd like a recorded vote.

(Clause 416 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: I will now call clauses 417 to 435.

Mr. Yvan Baker: I'd like recorded votes.

(Clauses 417 to 435 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

• (3635)

The Chair: Now we're at division 22, Canada Transportation Act.

I would like to see if members are interested in grouping clauses 436 to 451 before we get to our first amendment. We would need unanimous consent to group clauses 436 to 451.

Some hon. members: No.

The Chair: Okay.

Shall clause 436 carry?

Mr. Yvan Baker: I'd like a recorded vote.

(Clause 436 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 1)

The Chair: Shall clause 437 carry?

Mr. Yvan Baker: I'd like a recorded vote.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I'd like a recorded division.

(Clause 437 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 1)

The Chair: Shall clause 438 carry?

Mr. Yvan Baker: I'd like a recorded vote.

(Clause 438 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 1)

The Chair: Shall clause 439 carry?

Mr. Yvan Baker: I'd like a recorded vote.

(Clause 439 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: Shall clause 440 carry?

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I'd like a recorded vote.

(Clause 440 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: Shall clause 441 carry?

• (3640)

Mr. Yvan Baker: I'd like a recorded vote.

(Clause 441 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: Shall clause 442 carry?

Mr. Yvan Baker: I'd like a recorded vote.

(Clause 442 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: Shall clause 443 carry?

Mr. Yvan Baker: I'd like a recorded vote.

(Clause 443 agreed to: yeas 9; nays 2)

The Chair: Shall clause 444 carry?

An hon. member: I'd like a recorded vote.

(Clause 444 agreed to: yeas 8; nays 2)

The Chair: Shall clause 445 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: I request a recorded vote.

(Clause 445 agreed to: yeas 6; nays 5)

[*English*]

The Chair: Shall clause 446 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: I request a recorded vote.

(Clause 446 agreed to: yeas 9; nays 2)

[*English*]

The Chair: Shall clause 447 carry?

• (3645)

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: I request a recorded vote.

(Clause 447 agreed to: yeas 9; nays 2)

[*English*]

The Chair: Shall clause 448 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: I request a recorded vote.

(Clause 448 agreed to: yeas 9; nays 2)

[*English*]

The Chair: Shall clause 449 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: I request a recorded vote.

(Clause 449 agreed to: yeas 9; nays 2)

[*English*]

The Chair: Shall clause 450 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: I request a recorded vote.

(Clause 450 agreed to: yeas 11; nays 0)

[*English*]

The Chair: Shall clause 451 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: I request a recorded vote.

(Clause 451 agreed to: yeas 11; nays 0)

[*English*]

The Chair: We're on division 23, Air Travel Complaints.

Shall clause 452 carry?

[Translation]

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: I request a recorded vote.

(Clause 452 agreed to: yeas 8; nays 3)

[English]

The Chair: Shall clause 453 carry?

• (3650)

[Translation]

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: I request a recorded vote.

(Clause 453 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

[English]

The Chair: Shall clause 454 carry?

[Translation]

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: I request a recorded vote.

(Clause 454 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

(Clause 455)

[English]

The Chair: Shall NDP-1 under clause 455 carry?

[Translation]

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: I request a recorded vote.

[English]

The Chair: We'll have a recorded vote.

(Amendment negatived: nays 9; yeas 2 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: Shall clause 455 carry?

[Translation]

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: I request a recorded vote.

[English]

The Chair: We'll have a recorded vote.

(Clause 455 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: Shall clause 456 carry?

[Translation]

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: I request a recorded vote.

[English]

The Chair: We'll have a recorded vote.

(Clause 456 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: Shall clause 457 carry?

[Translation]

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: I request a recorded vote.

[English]

The Chair: We'll have a recorded vote.

(Clause 457 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: Shall clause 458 carry?

• (3655)

[Translation]

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: I request a recorded vote.

(Clause 458 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

(Clause 459)

[English]

The Chair: On clause 459, shall NDP-2 carry?

[Translation]

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: I request a recorded vote.

(Amendment negatived: nays 8; yeas 3 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

[English]

The Chair: Shall NDP-3 carry?

[Translation]

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: I request a recorded vote.

(Amendment negatived: nays 9; yeas 2 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

[English]

The Chair: Shall NDP-4 carry?

[Translation]

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: I request a recorded vote.

(Amendment negatived: nays 8; yeas 3 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

[English]

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: Mr. Chair, on a point of order, there are about eight or nine NDP amendments to this same clause. Having defeated several of them now, I think if any of them were to pass, we might risk creating some bad law. I do think that even though they might not be, strictly speaking, consequential, they are meant to work together.

I would ask for unanimous consent of the committee to withdraw the balance of the amendments for this particular clause so that we don't accidentally create an incoherent or otherwise bad law.

The Chair: We're looking for unanimous consent—

Mr. Yvan Baker: Can we suspend for a minute, Chair?

The Chair: Let's suspend for a minute.

• (3655)

(Pause)

• (3710)

The Chair: We are back.

We last heard from MP Blaikie.

MP Blaikie, could you speak to what you were asking for?

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: My request has caused more confusion and consternation than I anticipated and did not serve the intent and purpose of saving time. I'll withdraw my request for unanimous consent. We can proceed with the voting.

Thank you.

I believe we were at NDP-5.

The Chair: We are at NDP-5.

Shall NDP-5 carry on division?

Mr. Philip Lawrence: No, on a recorded vote, Chair.

(Amendment negatived: nays 9; yeas 2 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: Shall NDP-6 carry?

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Mr. Chair, on a point of order, I just wondered, on Daniel's UC request, if we have consent to remove those, so that we don't get bad law, I think it made eminent sense.

An hon. member: No.

The Chair: Shall NDP-6 carry?

Mr. Terry Beech: I'd ask for a recorded vote.

(Amendment agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: Shall NDP-7 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: I request a recorded vote.

(Amendment negatived: nays 9; yeas 2 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

[*English*]

The Chair: Shall NDP-8 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: I request a recorded vote.

(Amendment negatived: nays 9; yeas 2 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

[*English*]

The Chair: Shall NDP-9 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: I request a recorded vote.

(Amendment negatived: nays 9; yeas 2 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

[*English*]

The Chair: Shall NDP-10 carry?

• (3715)

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: I request a recorded vote.

(Amendment negatived: nays 9; yeas 2 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

[*English*]

The Chair: Shall clause 459 as amended carry?

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: I request a recorded vote.

[*English*]

The Chair: We'll have a recorded vote.

(Clause 459 as amended agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

(Clause 460 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: On clause 461, shall amendment NDP-11 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: I request a recorded vote.

[*English*]

The Chair: We'll have a recorded vote.

(Amendment negatived: nays 9; yeas 2 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: Shall clause 461 carry?

(Clause 461 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

(Clause 462 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

(Clause 463 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

(Clause 464 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

• (3720)

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

I understand that we are to be going through question period. Is that correct?

The Chair: That is correct. We are continuing.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I would like to raise an objection to that on the point of order.

It's a violation of my privilege and all the members' privilege. Question period is incredibly important and part of our job. Even more so, there was an opposition motion brought forward by the New Democratic Party raising the issue of foreign interference. This is a serious issue—

The Chair: That's debate.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: This is a point of order, Mr. Chair. I have privilege—

The Chair: MP Lawrence, that's debate. You're debating.

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: On this point of order, Mr. Chair—

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I could understand why the Liberals wouldn't want to be in the House when foreign interference—

The Chair: Members, we're on clause 465.

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

To expedite the process, my suggestion is, later on, to combine clause 472 to—

The Chair: That is not a point of order, MP Chatel. Those are not points of order.

Shall NDP-12 carry?

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Mr. Chair, are you ruling against...?

It's my point of order. It's my privilege.

The Chair: Shall NDP-12 carry?

Mr. Philip Lawrence: It's my point of order, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: What is your point of order, MP Lawrence?

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Are you ruling against my point of order that we should suspend for question period?

The Chair: That is not a point of order.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: It certainly is a point of order. It's with respect to our schedule. You were saying that we can go through question period.

The Chair: We're going to suspend for a moment.

First, the member and any member is welcome to attend question period. They're welcome to go.

I understand that the whips came to this agreement that this is how we would proceed. We are proceeding right through question period, but the member is welcome to go and attend question period.

• (3725)

Mr. Philip Lawrence: As a point of clarity on two of those issues, they are disingenuous.

One is the whips did not agree on that. It was a majority of seats, so both the Conservative and I understand—Gabriel, you can correct me if I'm wrong—the Bloc Québécois did not—

Mr. Terry Beech: That's how democracy works.

It's debate, not a point of order. Call the question.

The Chair: There's no crosstalk, PS Beech.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Yes, I could attend, but we require voting. If I'm not here voting, that would impact our ability to function as a committee and our committee wouldn't have a quorum.

The Chair: We're getting into debate, MP Lawrence.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I guess that's a reflection of our chair.

The Chair: MP Lobb, is that a point of order you had?

Mr. Ben Lobb (Huron—Bruce, CPC): No. I have a question.

The Chair: No. There are no questions.

Mr. Ben Lobb: Well, I think so, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: There are no questions, so we are moving forward.

Mr. Ben Lobb: Then I have a point of order. Are you ready?

The Chair: Yes.

Mr. Ben Lobb: My point of order is this: I would like clarity now because you said that the whips agreed that the committee will sit through question period. That's what you stated. If the committee is the master of its own domain and independent of the whip's office, what the whips agree to is completely irrelevant to what occurs in this committee.

I would like the clerks to find the parliamentary precedent where it states that somehow the whip's office controls when a committee sits beyond—

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: Chair, this is debate.

Mr. Ben Lobb: —its scheduled time—

The Chair: This is debate.

Mr. Ben Lobb: I don't care if you give me the answer now or five years from now, but I'd like that answer on when the whip's office decides when committees sit and don't sit beyond the previously approved—

The Chair: MP Lobb, that is debate.

Mr. Ben Lobb: How is this debate?

The Chair: That is debate. No crosstalk, please, MP Chatel and MP Lobb.

Mr. Ben Lobb: I think the rest of Canada would like—

The Chair: We have heard from you. Thank you very much, I appreciate that.

Mr. Ben Lobb: I'm glad I made my contribution to the finance committee.

The Chair: Again, members, on clause 465, shall NDP-12 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: I request a recorded vote.

[*English*]

The Chair: You'd like a recorded vote.

We want your vote MP Lawrence.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: At this point, Mr. Chair, you might as well take my vote away. You've taken everything else—our ability to challenge you, your schedule. You can set the meetings for whenever you want, whatever the challenge you want. You do whatever you want, so no.

The Chair: We'll move on.

(Amendment negatived: nays 8; yeas 2 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: Shall NDP-13 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: I request a recorded vote.

(Amendment negatived: nays 9; yeas 2 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

[*English*]

The Chair: Shall clause 465 carry?

• (3730)

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: I request a recorded vote.

(Clause 465 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

[English]

The Chair: Shall clause 466 carry?

[Translation]

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: I request a recorded vote.

(Clause 466 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

[English]

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Mr. Chair, I have a point of order.

The Chair: A point of order.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I would like to move at this point to suspend for question period.

The Chair: You can't do that, as you know, as per the motion.

Shall clause—

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Point of order.

The Chair: That is not a point of order.

Shall clause 467 carry?

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I have another point of order.

The Chair: On another point of order.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: My point of order is that we have confirmed with the whip that, contrary to what you said, Mr. Chair, they did not agree to that. I'll give you the opportunity to retract it as an honourable member that our whip agreed to it, because they did not.

The Chair: I didn't say it was your whip. I said it was my understanding that whips—

Mr. Philip Lawrence: The whips, so that's inclusive.

The Chair: Yes, whips.

All I'll say, MP Lawrence, is that you're welcome to find a sub to do that if you want to attend question period, or you could just attend question period, but members, we're moving on.

Shall clause 467 carry?

[Translation]

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: I request a recorded vote.

[English]

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I have a point of order.

The Chair: We will have a recorded vote.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: On a point of order, Mr. Chair, you have to....

I'm sorry. I know you don't like following the rules, but you have to recognize my point of order.

The Chair: On a point of order.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Thank you.

Question period is a sacrosanct part of our democracy. We know that this government has tried to ride over democracy—

The Chair: MP Lawrence, that is debate.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: We have seen this record over—

The Chair: That's debate.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: —and over again.

The Chair: That's debate.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I know you'd like for us to just go away and be lap dogs to the Liberal Party, but that's not our role.

The Chair: That is debate.

MP Lawrence, I'd ask for some decorum, some respect.

We are moving to—

Mr. Ben Lobb: I have a point of order.

The Chair: On a point of order, MP Lobb.

Mr. Ben Lobb: Chair Fonseca, would a motion to suspend supersede the agreement with the whips?

The Chair: That is not a point of order.

Shall—

Mr. Ben Lobb: It's a legitimate question on the function—

The Chair: That is not a point of order.

Members, we're moving forward.

Shall clause—

Mr. Ben Lobb: How can you not answer that question?

The Chair: —467 carry?

[Translation]

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: I request a recorded vote.

(Clause 467 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

[English]

The Chair: Shall clause 468—

• (3735)

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: On a point of order, MP Blaikie.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: There are a couple of things that I think are worth saying in response to some of the previous points of order.

The first has to do with the conversations among the whips. There are times when various parties are on the wrong end of a decision taken at the whips' table. They do make a lot of decisions about which committees meet when, which committees are cancelled and which other committees go longer. I don't think it's helpful when one party doesn't like the outcome at the table, where they are sometimes on the winning side, for them to reflect on decisions that are taken at that table.

The reason I'm willing to sit through question period is that I would like to get through this process. If we can group clauses in order to make up for the time we won't spend voting while we're in question period, then I'm happy to break for question period, but I'm not prepared to lose the time in a process that, frankly, has been very frustrating, and I'll leave it at that.

We've been doing about 50 votes an hour. If we want to group 50 clauses now and go until two o'clock, I'd be prepared to do that.

For me, it's about the time, so if we're not going to be able to group clauses, as is often done in clause-by-clause, then we're going to sit at this table. I'm happy to make that a decision of the committee. If folks object to the whips doing that, I'm happy to vote to stay through question period. I'm happy to do that at this table. I recognize that we can't because it's out of order. That's a little problem for the chair to solve, but we could do it by UC.

In any event, this is a problem with a solution. We can be reasonable and talk about it, but that has not been a feature of this process for weeks now, so I don't have a lot of confidence in that.

Mr. Marty Morantz: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: I have a point of order on the point of order, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: MP Chatel, is your point of order on MP Blaikie's point of order?

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: Yes. I would be happy to group clauses 171 to—

The Chair: That's not a point of order.

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: But to the solution, Mr. Chair...

The Chair: Yes, it's to the solution.

Okay.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: I recognize that it's frustrating, and you're not wrong.

Mr. Marty Morantz: Does Mr. Blaikie have the floor? I have a point of order.

Mr. Chair, it's important for you to treat all members equally. When we raise points of order, we seem to get cut off very quickly. Mr. Blaikie raised something that wasn't a point of order, and you let him talk for several minutes. You have to treat everyone the same. You gave him the floor for quite some time on something that wasn't a point of order, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: I agree, MP Morantz, but—

Mr. Heath MacDonald (Malpeque, Lib.): I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: —on a point of order that's also not a point of order.

Mr. Heath MacDonald: Can we suspend for two minutes?

The Chair: I will give members an opportunity to digest everything that has just been said on these many points of order for a couple of minutes and see if members can come to some kind of agreement.

We'll suspend.

• (3735) _____ (Pause) _____

• (3740)

The Chair: We are back.

We'll try a little grouping here, members, if you are interested.

Do we have unanimous consent to group clauses 468 to 470?

An hon. member: No.

The Chair: Okay.

Shall clause 468 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: I request a recorded vote.

(Clause 468 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

[*English*]

The Chair: Shall clause 469 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: I request a recorded vote.

(Clause 469 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

[*English*]

The Chair: Shall clause 470 carry?

• (3745)

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: I request a recorded vote.

(Clause 470 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

(Clause 471)

[*English*]

The Chair: On clause 471, shall NDP-14 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: I request a recorded vote.

(Amendment agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

[*English*]

The Chair: Shall clause 471 as amended carry?

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: I request a recorded vote.

(Amended clause 471 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

[*English*]

The Chair: Shall clause 472 carry?

• (3750)

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: I request a recorded vote.

(Clause 472 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

[*English*]

The Chair: Shall clause 473 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: I request a recorded vote, Mr. Chair.

(Clause 473 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

[*English*]

The Chair: Shall clause 474 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: I request a recorded vote.

(Clause 474 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

[*English*]

The Chair: Shall clause 475 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: I request a recorded vote.

(Clause 475 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

[*English*]

The Chair: Shall clause 476 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: I request a recorded vote.

(Clause 476 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

[*English*]

The Chair: Shall clause 477 carry?

An hon. member: I'd like a recorded division.

(Clause 477 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: Shall clause 478 carry?

• (3755)

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: I request a recorded vote.

(Clauses 478 to 488 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

• (3805)

[*English*]

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I have a point of order, Chair.

The Chair: Has Mr. Genuis been subbed in?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I think I can raise a point of order if I weren't, but as it happens I am.

The Chair: Has he been subbed in? Okay.

Mr. Genuis on a point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: It is a long-established convention in this place that members are able to attend question period, that committees adjourn from 2:00 until 3:00. I believe it's in the rules that—

The Chair: That is debate—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: It's not debate.

The Chair: You should confirm with your whip, MP Genuis.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: It's a matter of order. The committee should be adjourned. It should be suspended.

The Chair: We are moving on now.

Shall clause 489 carry?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Chair, I have raised a point of order.

The Chair: I have already said it's debate.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: It's not a matter of debate. It's a matter of order.

The Chair: That is debate, MP Genuis.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Chair, it's not debate. You can't just say that matters of order are matters of debate when you don't like the fact that they're being raised or you don't like the person raising them. The fact is, it is a matter of order. It is a well-established practice of this House that committees do not sit from 2:00 to 3:00, which is during question period.

The Chair: That is debate, MP Genuis.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: It's not debate. If you'll let me finish, Chair.

The Chair: MP Genuis, that is debate.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: It's not a matter of debate. It's a matter of order.

The Chair: It's not a point of order, MP Genuis. I request that you go speak to your whip. We are moving forward.

Shall clause 489 carry?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: It is a matter of order. It is not a matter of debate. I move to suspend.

The Chair: That is debate.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I move to suspend, Chair.

The Chair: That is debate.

Shall clause 489 carry?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: It's a matter of order, Chair.

I move to suspend.

The Chair: That is not within the motion.

Shall clause 489 carry?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: It's not in the motion to suspend? Did you suspend last night?

The Chair: Clerk, call the vote.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Did you suspend last night, Chair?

The Chair: Call the vote, Clerk.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I'm requesting the committee suspend.

The Chair: Shall clause 489 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: I request a recorded vote.

[*English*]

The Chair: MP Genuis, that is debate.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: It is a point of order. It is not a matter of debate. I'm asking the committee suspend for question period so members can do their jobs and attend question period.

The Chair: Call the question, Mr. Clerk.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Chair, it's a point of order. I'm asking the committee suspend so that members may attend question period. It's unfair to the members here, some of whom may have questions to ask, some of whom may be responsible for answering questions on the government side.

I'm asking that we suspend. It is a point of order and points of order should be heard.

The Chair: MP Genuis, you can vote now.

• (3810)

Mr. Garnett Genuis: It's a point of order. I was in the middle of speaking on the point of order when you began the vote.

There's a point of order on the floor.

The Chair: We are in the midst of a vote—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: The committee is supposed to be suspended.

The Chair: I'm going—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Chair, this vote never started.

The Chair: We're going to the next member.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Chair, check the Hansard. This isn't going to be valid.

The Chair: Mr. Genuis—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: This isn't going to be recognized as valid by the House, Chair. Question period is going to start in five minutes. Members have questions—

The Chair: Stop talking.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: It's a point of order, Chair.

The Chair: I ruled on your point of order—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: No, you didn't. You said it was debate when it wasn't debate.

The Chair: Yes, I did, MP Genuis.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: It's not a matter of debate. It's a matter of order.

The Chair: It's not a point of order. We were in the midst of a vote—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I'm asking for a suspension.

The Chair: —member.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: You started the vote in the middle of a point of order, Chair.

The Chair: MP Lawrence, what's your vote?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Chair, you started the vote in the middle of a point of order. I have a right to raise points of order, and you're showing flagrant disregard for the privileges of members.

The Chair: Clerk, move to the next.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: It's a point of order. You're supposed to suspend during question period. It's a well-established practice of committees that during question period, committees should be suspended.

The Chair: MP Morantz, your vote.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: This committee should be suspended.

Mr. Marty Morantz: I think we're in the middle of a point of order, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: No, okay. Next member.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: It's a point of order.

The Chair: MP Ste-Marie, your vote.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Chair, this doesn't make any sense. There's a point of order. Question period is going on. Question period is about to start.

The Chair: MP Blaikie.

An hon. member: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Members may not be aware, it's 2:10. Question period is about to start and members have a right to be—

The Chair: MP Blaikie, your vote.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: —at question period. If members can't hear, that is question period going on. Statements by members. Mr. May.

The Chair: That is dangerous for the interpreters, MP Genuis.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Chair, it is dangerous for our institution.

The Chair: The health and safety of the people—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: The health and safety of our institution is under threat, Chair.

The Chair: Order. Decorum. Respect.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: You are showing flagrant disregard for our institution. This should be suspended.

The Chair: MP Genuis, turn that off.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: This should be suspended, Chair. I want you to understand that this is going on and you're calling a vote in the middle of a point of order.

The Chair: I had ruled on your point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: No, you said it was debate. You didn't even rule on it. You said it was debate.

The Chair: We are going to MP Blaikie on—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I had barely started and you said it was debate.

The Chair: Vote, MP Blaikie, please.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Question period is going on, Chair.

An hon. member: Mr. Chair, I have a point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: This is question period. Mr. May is raising—

An hon. member: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Clause 489 is carried.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Chair, members—

The Chair: We are going to suspend for a minute.

MP Genuis, if you'd like, you can challenge my ruling. That's what you can do.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Chair, I'd like to raise a point of order. You implied that there was an agreement among whips regarding proceedings—

The Chair: No.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: —during question period.

The Chair: You can challenge my ruling. You're debating again.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: It's not a debate—

The Chair: You can challenge my ruling—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: —it's a matter of order.

The Chair: You can challenge my ruling, MP Genuis.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Chair, when you raise a point of order, part of the process of raising a point of order is informing—

The Chair: MP Genuis, that's debate.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: —the committee about the matter of order that is at stake.

The Chair: That's debate.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: You don't understand at a basic level, Chair, the distinction between debate and matters of order.

The Chair: MP Genuis—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Matters of order deal with the rules—

The Chair: MP Genuis, you can challenge—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Matters of debate are matters of—

The Chair: You can challenge the chair, MP Genuis.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Chair, I want to raise my point of order and then you can rule on it. There will then potentially be a challenge.

This is a question of the privileges of members.

The Chair: MP Genuis, I've already ruled.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: You haven't even heard what I've had to say, Chair. You haven't let me finish a sentence, Chair.

The Chair: I've already ruled that we are [*Inaudible—Editor*].

Mr. Garnett Genuis: No. You haven't let me finish a sentence—

The Chair: Is this a point of order, MP Blaikie?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I'm trying to raise a point of order, and you've said it's debate.

The Chair: Is it on the same point of order?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Suspend for question period, Chair.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: It's on the same point of order, Mr. Chair.

It seems to me, and folks can correct me if I'm wrong, that what we have is a dispute arising from a question of whether the whips are in power to decide these things. As a matter of fact, I think they are and have done things like this before. However, the other side of that is whether it's the will of the committee to sit through question period or not.

I would be happy to provide unanimous consent for a vote on whether we suspend or not. I will be voting to carry on through question period. We tried to have an agreement to lump some clauses together to represent the time lost for question period. That failed. I am in support of sitting through question period. I'm happy to vote on whether to suspend or not. I will vote against suspending.

If that helps clear this up so that we can end this disorder and return to the business at hand, I'm happy to do that. Let's find a path forward. I'm not interested in sitting through this for the next hour or so.

• (3815)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: I request a recorded vote, Mr. Chair.

[*English*]

The Chair: There's a point of order from MP Ste-Marie.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: Mr. Chair, in my understanding of the standing orders, the committee must obtain the unanimous consent of its members in order to continue its meeting during question period.

I'd like to get some clarification from the clerk on that.

[English]

The Chair: Wait one moment, MP Ste-Marie. We did not have translation.

Can we test translation? Does everybody have translation?

[Translation]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: I'll keep talking so we're sure everyone has access to the interpretation.

[English]

The Chair: We're going to allow MP Lawrence to switch his mike.

Wait one moment, MP Ste-Marie. MP Lawrence is switching his microphone.

Can you speak, MP Ste-Marie, *en français*?

[Translation]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: Mr. Chair, in my understanding of the standing orders, the committee must obtain the unanimous consent of its members in order to continue its meeting during question period.

I'd like the clerk to confirm my interpretation of the standing orders.

[English]

Mr. Marty Morantz: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Wait one moment, MP Ste-Marie.

We're going to suspend for a second.

MP Ste-Marie, you're correct. It's when the bells are ringing. When the bells are ringing, we would need UC.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I can't hear. It's a point of privilege. Give me something here.

Mr. Marty Morantz: I have a point of order before you suspend.

The Chair: We're going to suspend to fix the technical difficulty that we have.

• (3815) _____ (Pause) _____

• (3820)

The Chair: We're back.

I understand the technical issues have been dealt with.

I am going to ask MP Ste-Marie...because MP Lawrence was having some challenges with his mike and the interpretation. On that note, on the interpretation, and on the members in here, for MP Genuis to turn on his phone and put on some kind of recording and then start blasting the interpreters and...the health and safety of the staff and members here in this room, that is completely unacceptable.

MP Genuis, your mike will be turned off. You cannot do this. You are hurting people. You should know better. After all the years here you should know better than to do what you did. I would hope

that everybody in the room would feel the same way and that you don't do that again.

MP Genuis, please...decorum and respect. Please abide by the rules.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I hope I'll have the opportunity to respond to that on a point of order, Chair, but I welcome Mr. Ste-Marie to go next—

The Chair: No, we're going to MP Ste-Marie's point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I will have a point of order later.

The Chair: I'm asking MP Genuis again.... You're one who always comes up with crosstalk—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I will have a point of order later, as is my right, Chair. The rules protect the privilege of all members.

I know Mr. Ste-Marie had one first, and he's welcome to go ahead.

The Chair: MP Genuis, what I'm asking for is decorum and respect for your colleagues from all parties.

We are going to MP Ste-Marie.

Can you repeat that so that MP Lawrence and others, if their interpretation was not working, know what your point of order was?

[Translation]

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

My point of order concerned my understanding of the standing orders. From what I had understood, the committee had to have unanimous consent of the members to continue during question period. What I understood from the clerk, through you, Mr. Chair, is that that's valid only for votes.

So since we'll be having two votes immediately after question period, without bells for 30 minutes, what is the chair going to do?

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

[English]

The Chair: Thank you for that, MP Ste-Marie.

I'm going to allow the clerk to read into the record what the rule is when it comes to votes, which is what you're asking.

Mr. Jean-François Lafleur (Legislative Clerk):

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

According to Standing Order 115(5) unanimous consent is needed to continue with the votes.

The Chair: With the votes, yes, but not to continue right now through question period.

That's where we are, members.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Chair, I have a point of order I'd like to raise.

The Chair: Okay, you have a point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you, Mr. Chair, for allowing me to raise a point of order.

My request to you has been simply that you follow the rules.

I would emphasize that decorum flows from rules. What decorum means is adherence to the rules of committee. If a chair is showing flagrant disregard for rules or favouritism among members allowing some members to raise points of order but not others, or cutting people off when they're raising matters of order, that is a violation of the rules, that is a violation of decorum, and that speaks to something fundamental about the health of our institutions.

That's the first matter of order I wanted to raise.

The second, Chair, is that there is an important difference between debate and matters of order. Matters of debate are on a substantive subject matter other than the rules. If I were to start speaking to the budget, to the financial measures in it, to comments about tax and so forth, that would obviously be debate. To raise concerns about the rules is a matter of the rules—

The Chair: MP Genuis, what is your point of order? Get back to your point of order.

• (3825)

Mr. Garnett Genuis: As you're demonstrating, Chair, members have a right to raise points of order and shouldn't be interrupted when they're on matters of order, and that's what I'm trying to do, to raise a few points. You called it debate about 10 seconds into it.

That's the second point of order.

The third and fundamental point on which we started this conversation is the fact that question period is going on. It is a long-established convention of committees that they suspend or adjourn during question period so that members can fulfill their responsibilities as members of Parliament, which is to be engaged in question period, to ask or answer questions and to hear matters of the day.

I would ask that the committee suspend.

The Chair: MP Genuis, I've ruled on that. You can challenge the chair—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Finally, you have said that there is an agreement of whips on this. There is not an agreement of whips.

The Conservative Party, our whip, does not believe that committees should sit during question period without agreement, and there is no agreement. For you to tell the committee or imply to me that I should talk to my whip or... Fundamentally, committees are masters of their own domain, but in this particular case, there was no agreement of whips. You have misled the committee about what the position of our whip is, or the whips are.

On these points, I think the committee should suspend.

I would like to move that the committee suspend.

The Chair: MP Genuis, you cannot do that.

What we are going to do now is allow for members to see if there is UC to vote on a suspension.

Members, do we have UC to vote on a suspension?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I don't think you need UC to vote on a suspension, Chair.

The Chair: Do we have UC to vote on a suspension?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I would say, Chair, even if a majority of this committee thinks we should sit through question period, just like if a majority of the committee thinks we should sit through the vote, the rules exist to protect minorities of members as well.

The Chair: That is not a point of order.

We will continue.

Shall clause 490 carry?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Chair, I think there is unanimous consent to hold that vote.

I don't oppose holding that vote on the suspension.

The Chair: Is there unanimous consent to hold that vote?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chair: Okay.

The question is this: Shall we suspend?

(Motion negatived: nays 6; yeas 5)

The Chair: It was defeated. We will move forward.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I have a point of order, Chair.

If five out of 11 members of this committee think we should suspend—

The Chair: That was the vote. You believe in democracy, MP Genuis. That's democracy.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I believe in minority rights as well, Chair.

The Chair: Shall clause 490 carry?

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Mr. Chair, I have a point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Chair, we have doctrines of privilege to protect minorities.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: We have MP Lawrence on a point of order.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Did that previous vote go through, or are we starting all over again? Did we vote on clause 489 when Conservatives didn't get a vote?

The Chair: We voted on clause 489, yes.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: We didn't get a vote for that.

If you look at the Hansard there, even if you overruled Mr. Genuis, I clearly said "point of order", which means that vote never happened.

The Chair: I did not hear your point of order.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I said it clearly—

The Chair: I did not hear it.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Check the Hansard.

It doesn't matter. Your job, as I say to my children, was to listen, and you didn't listen.

The Chair: Okay, that is debate.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I raised it. It's a point of order.

It is the very essence. There's nothing more critical than a point of order, Mr. Chair. If you refuse to acknowledge it, then why are we even here? Why are we even here? The Liberal Party should just get to do whatever they want.

The Chair: Okay, MP Lawrence—

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I raised a point of order before you went to the vote.

The Chair: I did not hear your point of order.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I said it. Check the Hansard. Talk to the clerks.

The Chair: I did not hear your point of order.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: You have to recognize it. It's the most sacred, sacrosanct....

When we're on that side and you're on this side, if we don't recognize a point of order, holy mackerel, we hear it from the Liberals and the NDP. How many times do we hear the NDP talking about time allocation, and here we are—we don't even get the right to vote. What have we come to?

I raised a point of order, and I said it clearly into the microphone. It's your job to recognize it.

• (3830)

The Chair: MP Lawrence, we were into a vote.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Is there a process to remove the chair?

The Chair: We were into a vote, so—

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Mr. Clerk, is there a process to remove the chair? He won't recognize a point of order. He won't even let us vote.

The Chair: I recognize your point of order. Do you have a point of order right now? What is the point of order?

Mr. Philip Lawrence: The point of order before the last vote.... That vote didn't happen.

The Chair: We were already into a vote—

Mr. Philip Lawrence: You overruled Mr. Genuis—fine, fair, I accept that. I said “point of order” clearly.

The Chair: We were into a vote.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: No, we weren't. I said it before the vote. Check the Hansard.

The Chair: Okay, we are now, let's see, moving forward to—

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Mr. Chair, I have a point of order.

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

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I wish to challenge your ruling that I didn't say “point of order”.

The Chair: Okay, there's a challenge.

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

The Chair: Shall clause 490 carry?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Chair, I would like to raise a question of privilege, which members are actually required to do at the earliest reasonable opportunity.

The Chair: We're going to suspend.

• (3830)

(Pause)

• (3835)

The Chair: We are back.

MP Genuis, you have a question of privilege. What is your question of privilege?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you, Chair.

Really, the most foundational right of members in this place is the right to vote. There are extensive protections that are established in terms of the right of members to vote. I did want to be able to raise this quickly, given that I think a violation of privilege has taken place, even though I don't have all the precedents in front of me around this.

I do recall a number of rulings, though. One was by the previous speaker, when a number of members were not able to vote simply because they were not able to get to the vote in time because the buses weren't running. At the time, the Speaker of House, Speaker Regan, granted a prima facie case of privilege. Members were prevented from doing their job simply because the buses were not getting there in time.

That is one example I can recall. I think there would be many examples where various Speakers and committee chairs have recognized the centrality of members' right to vote and that right being unfettered.

I would also add, in terms of understanding the right to vote as it exists in our parliamentary tradition, that the right to vote is an individual right. It's not dependent on membership in parties. It's not dependent on what one's own party may or may not be doing. If a member of the same party is engaging in activity that is disruptive to another member's ability to vote.... I don't think that's what was happening in this case, but even if that was your view of it, the fact is that the right of a member to vote is individual.

The committees exercise delegated authority from the House, which means that the rights that exist for members in the House ought also to be protected by members in committee. In this case, the role of committee members voting in committee should, I think, not be seen as materially different. I mean, it's different in certain respects, but not substantively in terms of the privileges of members. The ability of members to vote in the context of committee should be afforded the same fundamental protections as the right of members to vote in the context of voting in the House. That's the right to have unrestricted and unfettered access to the place where the vote is taking place. It's the right to exercise their vote without being blocked in any way from doing so. These are all foundational to the rights of members of Parliament.

They're foundational because this is what makes us members of Parliament. There are many activities that we engage in that other people can engage in or that are potentially optional for us, but the most core thing our constituents send us here to do is to vote on their behalf—that is, to be their voice through the voting process and cast their ballot for them in the House and in committee, on their behalf.

We had a situation take place at the finance committee earlier this day where members were trying to raise points of order. There were clearly disputes among members, as well as between members and the chair, about the appropriate process for raising those points of order. There were various members saying “point of order” at the same time. There were, simultaneously, some audio and translation issues. The point is that points of order were being raised at the time members were speaking. Other members who did not have the floor were sharing thoughts off-mike back and forth with members. There was considerable noise in the room.

In the midst of that environment, members were trying to raise points of order and had concerns about whether the committee should be suspended or not because question period was, at the time, about to begin. The chair first told one member who was raising a point of order that the member could not raise the point or order. He said that it was a matter of debate, and then he said that we were proceeding to a vote.

• (3840)

That member continued to try to raise the point of order; meanwhile, multiple other members were, at the same time, raising points of order. In spite of the general level of noise and discussion in the room, and despite the fact that members were raising points of order about what was taking place, the chair made the decision to proceed with the vote.

This was an environment in which I could not hear what was being voted on, even the initial question that led to that. Members didn't have an opportunity to indicate how they thought the vote should proceed. The chair called the vote after members had already begun to raise points of order and when there were multiple members who were trying to raise points of order at the same time.

The chair then proceeded with the vote. I'm not sure what the status of interpretation was at the time, but I suspect that members were not able to hear the votes that were going on because some members were, I think, still of the view that we were not into consideration of a vote, that we were into consideration of points of order.

Members then went through and were instructed to vote. I believe maybe some members voted, but a number of members did not vote during the vote that was taking place, so they may not have been aware of what was being voted on. Other members were in the middle of speaking, trying to raise points of order and other members in the....

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: I think debate on the matter of privilege has collapsed, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: No, I'm still speaking, but the chair is not in the chair, and I'm trying to make arguments to the chair.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: If you're speaking, you have to be audible, or it doesn't count.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: The irony is that I'm raising a question of privilege. I'm trying to make arguments to the chair about my privilege. Maybe there's a vice-chair. Is the vice-chair available to assume the chair?

Thank you, Mr. Chair, for returning to the committee.

I'll now continue with my arguments about privilege—

The Chair: Thank you, MP Genuis. I did hear your point of privilege.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I'm not finished with my point of privilege, Chair.

I was outlining the series of events—

The Chair: The chair's heard enough of your point of privilege, so I have a good understanding—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: May I finish the set of facts, Chair?

There were a number of members in different situations. Mr. Morantz was asked for his vote. He said, “I think we're on points of order.” The matter was not clarified. The clerk simply bypassed him after he had raised the issue. I can say for myself that I was in the middle of raising a point of order. I think Mr. Lawrence has already said that he had a point of order that was happening at the same time, and Mr. Hallan as well. You had multiple members in different situations who were not able to vote, who were prevented in their right to vote, and this is a serious matter of privilege.

I would submit to you, again, in the interest of minority rights, the rights of members of Parliament to be heard and to vote on behalf of their constituents, that this is a serious matter of privilege, and I would ask that you take it under consideration and report back to the committee. There may be other members who wish to add to this question of privilege.

This is an important matter dealing with the right of members to vote, so I hope the committee will uphold the right of members to vote and identify an appropriate remedy, because we are not here to just express our own opinions. We're members of the “deliberate assembly of one nation”, as Burke said, and we have a responsibility not just to articulate what we think, but to be the reasoned voices of our constituents and to exercise our considered judgment and reflect their voices in the things we say and the arguments we make in our defence of the rules and procedures in this place in the way that we seek to uphold the integrity of this institution.

We may at times be called upon to forcefully defend the functioning and the integrity of this institution, but that all comes back to the right to express ourselves—yes, in speech; yes, through putting various proposals on the table; but, most fundamentally, members have the right to vote. This is well established in rules and precedent. Members need to be able to vote and to access places where voting takes place unfettered. I think the facts of the case we dealt with earlier today... I don't know if there were members of other parties who were affected—

• (3845)

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, I'm just going to interrupt you. I've heard a lot. I've heard enough, I believe, to—

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Mr. Chair, just so I don't—

The Chair: No, we are on this point of privilege.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: No, I'd like to add to that point of privilege.

The Chair: On the point of privilege, just let me speak to MP Genuis, and I hope this would help all members if we can find a way forward.

If we did have unanimous consent, we could go back and redo that vote. I'm going to look to all members to see...so that they would be able to vote again. That would be on clause 489. Do we have unanimous consent? MP Genuis feels that members did not have the opportunity to vote. Can we do that?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chair: Great.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: The issue is that there was still a violation of privilege.

The Chair: I'm glad that members are open to that. We're now going to go back.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I would like to discuss the question of privilege, as it was with respect to—

The Chair: Okay, but we cannot do a—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: The question of privilege is still on the floor, and the committee has also given unanimous consent to redo the vote. I think that's where we're at.

The Chair: Okay, we have unanimous consent to go back. Let's do that now.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I'd like to discuss the question of privilege.

The Chair: First, we'll go back so that members do have the opportunity to vote. So, we're going to go back—

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Mr. Chair, the question of privilege arose because you ignored me. You're in the process of ignoring me again. You can't ignore a question of privilege.

The Chair: Here's what I can say to members. In my recollection, what I can say is that, at that time, there was a point of order from MP Genuis. In my opinion, I had dealt with that point of order, and I had moved on to a vote. However, during that time, within this environment, there was a whole lot of disruption and noise going on. MP Genuis turned on his phone and started blasting sound through the mike, affecting interpreters and everybody here in this room. There was chatter. There was screaming coming from members. You can go back and look at the video if you want. That was all captured there within that disruption. Within that disruption, I did not hear a point of order from MP Lawrence. That's what I can tell you. I did not hear a point of order. I dealt with the point of order from MP Genuis, and I moved on to the vote.

What we're going to do now, and I'm so glad.... The members are in agreement, so we have unanimous consent to go back and vote.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Yes, we have unanimous consent, but I would still like to talk, just because it is a point of rule—you can check with the clerk—that a chair cannot remedy a point of privilege. Only the Speaker can.

So, we have brought this, and we are appreciative of the unanimous consent to go back and vote on clause 489. We say thank you to the chair for that.

• (3850)

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: As is my obligation, I would still like to put on the record, at the earliest instance, the facts of my question of privilege. This is right out of the rules. Not only am I allowed, but I'm actually obligated to put those on the record.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you, MP Lawrence.

In *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, third edition, 2017, I am just going to direct the members—and I am not going to read through all of this—to “Questions of Privilege in Committee” in chapter 20, on page 1060. It does spell out the rule, and everything is there for members.

That being said, now, members, if we could go to where we had unanimous consent—

Mr. Marty Morantz: Mr. Chair, I would like to speak on the matter of privilege. It's specifically to the section you were just citing.

If you read on, Mr. Chair, it says that the chair then has to determine “whether the question raised in fact relates to parliamentary privilege”, which you have not done. Then it says, “If the Chair determines that the question does relate to parliamentary privilege, the committee may then consider presenting a report on the question to the House.” Then it goes through what the report is supposed to contain.

So, a process has been started, which you have accepted. A matter of privilege is on the floor, and we need to follow the processes outlined in the very clause that you are citing.

The Chair: We're going to suspend for a second.

• (3850)

(Pause)

• (3850)

The Chair: We're back.

House of Commons Procedure and Practice, third edition, 2017, does say on page 154 that it allows the chair to rule. I did rule. My decision was challenged. It was sustained.

That speaks to MP Morantz.

Now I have MP Blaikie.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I have one—

The Chair: I have MP Blaikie on a point of order.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I've been ignored. I've been trying to talk for the last 10 minutes here, before Mr. Blaikie.

I want to raise my point of privilege. As per the rules, and I'll read you the rules here—

The Chair: MP Lawrence, this has to be on a different matter. It cannot be on the same matter.

We're with MP Lawrence.

MP Genuis, turn your mike off, please.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Thank you.

My point of privilege relates to the privilege that I had taken from me. I understand your set of facts; I want to put mine on the record.

In the way that I perceive things, you are correct. There was some disruption. We were heading towards a vote and Mr. Genuis raised a point of order—rightfully so—which you called debate, which it was not. It was a point of order.

You were in an obvious hurry and a rush to get to a vote. I think that's clear. I said at least once, or I think multiple times—the record would show—“point of order”. That point of order was not recognized. It is an obligation of the chair to recognize points of order as they come in, provided it is prior to the vote.

If you look at the Hansard or the video, whichever you wish, it's clear that I said it before the vote. Regardless of whether we do a redo on the vote, which we are appreciative of, it does not ameliorate the fact that my privilege was violated.

• (3855)

The Chair: Thank you.

Again, I will let you know that I did not hear you, MP Lawrence. There was a lot of disruption going on at the time.

I'm glad that members have agreed to find a way forward and to move back to address that vote.

Members, are we ready to go back to clause 489?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: On a point of order, Chair, Mr. Morantz made a point about the rules that has not been addressed. It was that when a question of privilege is raised, the chair must make a ruling on the question of privilege. You said a ruling was made and it was challenged. No, you did not make a ruling on the question of privilege that I raised and there was no challenge on that ruling, so I think there's some confusion.

The rule Mr. Morantz read says that when a matter of privilege is raised, the chair must make a ruling on that matter. It doesn't have to be right away, but the chair has to make a ruling on it. Then the committee can consider actions for going forward if the chair rules that it does, in fact, relate to a matter of privilege.

You said that it was addressed, but I don't think it was addressed. I think we're still awaiting your ruling.

The Chair: MP Genuis, I believe it was addressed. That's how we got to the UC to be able to go back to that vote.

Now we have MP Blaikie.

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

When we talk about the matter of privilege that was raised, my understanding is that the matter was raised that there was a vote going on while some members were trying to make a point of order,

so not all members were aware of the vote going on, and some didn't get to cast their vote.

To raise a question of privilege at the earliest opportunity is a good thing to do. Part of the reason why you're supposed to do that is that justice delayed is justice denied, and it gives an opportunity, in this case around the committee table, not just for the chair but for the committee to respond to what happened and to try to provide a remedy.

In this case, the committee has agreed by unanimous consent to redo the vote that first gave rise to the question of privilege. You may care to return later with a ruling, but the fact that the committee was willing to provide an immediate remedy, which was to return to the vote and do the vote again, I think would be relevant to whatever ruling you may make at a later time.

As far as I'm concerned, I'm satisfied that, first of all, there was an issue. I'm not saying who was to blame. There was a lot going on. I think it would be useful if members on all sides kept their mouths shut when their colleagues have the floor for a point of order, because sometimes we have Conservatives calling points of order during a point of order being made by one of their very own colleagues. They should give each other the respect of hearing each other out when the other has the floor.

In this case, I would say that the process is working. The question of privilege was raised at the earliest opportunity, and that created grounds for an immediate remedy. If we could proceed to take the vote on that clause again, I think we would have addressed the legitimate concern within the question of privilege, and then we should be able to carry on with the business of the committee.

The Chair: Thank you, MP Blaikie.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I want to speak on that point, Chair.

The Chair: On that point, yes, go ahead.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you, Chair.

The rules say some specific things, and we have to be guided by the rules. I'm a big stickler for that concept, because the rules protect our privileges. They protect our democratic institutions, and they prescribe the mix between majority and minority.

To what Mr. Blaikie said, the reality of the rules is that it is not for committees or chairs of committees to provide the remedy. If there was a matter of privilege that was violated, then the chair's responsibility would be to rule as to whether or not a privilege is engaged, whether or not it's a matter of privilege, which is a form of the prima facie privilege ruling that the Speaker makes. After that, the committee may consider a report to the House, which brings the matter of privilege to the attention of the House.

Now, the chair may rule that it is a matter of privilege, but the committee may decide not to report it to the House. The committee can consider other options at the time, but the chair has to make a ruling on privilege. It is not for the chair to provide the remedy. It is for the Speaker and it is for the House as a whole to provide that remedy.

I think it is reasonable that the committee is allowing this vote to take place again. I think that's probably something the committee would take into consideration in determining whether or not to report this matter to the House, but to say that the committee has come up with a remedy or that the chair has come up with a remedy is just not consistent with the rules in terms of the way these things are supposed to be adjudicated.

Second, I remain unclear about whether the chair has actually made a ruling. The chair has to say whether or not this is a matter that engages with the privileges of members. The chair said at certain points that he had made a ruling. Mr. Blaikie said that the chair may make a ruling later on. The chair must make a ruling, and he must be clear about what his ruling is. Then the committee will proceed on the basis of that ruling. It's a simple thing. There's no way to get around it; it is established in the rules.

We need to hear a ruling from the chair on the matter of privilege, and then the committee can decide whether to dispose of this matter by referring it to the House or by taking other actions. The committee has options available to it, one way or the other. The matter of privilege, however, requires a ruling, which the committee will then consider, and—

● (3900)

The Chair: Thank you—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Are you listening, Chair?

The Chair: I am listening, yes.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: All right. Thank you for your attention, Chair. I appreciate it very much.

The chair will make a ruling, I hope, and then the committee will decide how to deal with it.

Chair, I await your ruling.

If you think you have made it already.... I'm not the only one who thinks you haven't, because Mr. Blaikie referred to the possibility of a future ruling, so if you intended to make a ruling, I think that was missed by people from more than one party.

We await your ruling on the question of whether or not the privilege of members was involved. Again, members also have the right to add to that question of privilege once it's on the floor, as Mr. Blaikie did. Other members may wish to add their reflections on the issue of privilege prior to the ruling being made.

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: If I could just add a little clarity too, I actually perceived there being two violations of privilege. One, the Conservatives were not allowed to vote, and two, my point of order was ignored. If we could get rulings on both those, that would be helpful.

The Chair: Thank you, MP Genuis and MP Lawrence.

Again, back to the book, *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, third edition, 2017, at page 1060, says:

The Chair then determines whether the question raised in fact relates to parliamentary privilege. If the Chair determines that the question does relate to parliamentary privilege, the committee may then consider presenting a report on the question to the House. The report should:

clearly describe the situation;

summarize the facts;

provide the names of the people involved, if applicable;

state that there may be a breach of privilege; and

ask the House to take such measures as it deems appropriate.

That is for the committee to determine.

Okay, so now—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Chair, did you rule that it is a matter of privilege?

The Chair: It is a matter of privilege for members to be able to vote.

Now, during the time when you made a point of order, I dealt with your point of order, in my opinion. I dealt with your point of order, and from there we moved, as our motion says, straight back to clause-by-clause and to a vote. I did not hear MP Lawrence's point of order on top of whatever point of order you had going on. I don't even know if you can have a point of order on top of a point of order as that point of order is being said. There was, as we said, a lot of disruption here in the room. There was a lot of noise.

I am glad that members.... It is your privilege, as it is all members' privilege, of course, to be able to vote, and I believe, in my opinion again, that members had that opportunity to vote. I looked at each of the members as we went through the vote with the clerk. I think I named each member for that opportunity to vote. Some members may have decided otherwise.

That being said, I'm glad that members have come to a unanimous consent to go back and move to the vote in question, which was clause 489, and that we can go to that vote at this time.

Shall clause—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Chair, is your ruling that the question of privilege engages a matter of privilege?

Maybe the clerk can advise the committee, but there is a specific formulation. You've said many things, so are you ruling that, yes, this is a question that engages the privilege of members?

The Chair: I'm ruling that members have, of course, the privilege to vote, and I just took you through the steps in terms of what I saw, from my vantage point, taking place. You had a point of order. I ruled on that point of order. You got into debate. I moved back to where our motion says we have to go into clause-by-clause and go directly to a vote. I went into that vote. There was a lot of disruption going on at that time.

MP Lawrence says he came up with another point of order. I did not hear that, and we moved to a vote. Through that vote, members did vote, and it was a recorded vote. I believe—and we could look back at the record—that I called out members. I believe I called out your name, MP Genuis, MP Hallan—

An hon. member: Chair, can we suspend for a bathroom break, please?

The Chair: I do believe I called out each of the members' names, and at that point they still decided not to vote.

• (3905)

Mr. Philip Lawrence: You just need to rule, though.

The Chair: The meeting is suspended.

• (3905)

_____ (Pause) _____

• (3910)

The Chair: We're back, members.

My ruling is that it is not a breach of privilege.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I challenge the ruling, Chair.

• (3915)

The Chair: There's a challenge to the ruling. We'll have a vote.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: In light of the UC to revisit the vote, I'd sustain the chair's ruling.

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

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I have a point of order, Chair.

The Chair: On a point of order, go ahead.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I have two points of order. One is just to remind members that providing a rationale in the context of casting their votes is not allowed. Second, question period has now concluded and we have votes right after question period. Members need to get to vote, Chair.

The Chair: That is not a point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: It is a point of order. I'm suggesting we suspend so members can get to.... Bells are ringing and we have to suspend.

The Chair: Do we have unanimous consent to continue?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: No.

The Chair: Thanks.

We're suspended.

• (3915)

_____ (Pause) _____

• (4010)

The Chair: I call the meeting back to order.

When we left off, members, we had UC to go back to clause 489.

Members, we're going back to the vote on clause 489.

Shall clause 489 carry?

(Clause 489 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

(Clauses 490 to 504 inclusive agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

(Clauses 505 and 506 agreed to: yeas 11; nays 0)

(Clauses 507 to 510 inclusive agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

• (4035)

The Chair: Shall clause 511 carry?

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Mr. Chair, if we lumped clauses 511 to 516, would we be able to suspend for five minutes so Dr. Ellis could go to the washroom?

The Chair: Are you looking for unanimous consent to group clauses 511 to 516?

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Yes, I am, and to suspend for five minutes.

The Chair: We will take a few minutes for a bio break and there's going to be UC. Is that what I see, members?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: Can we have the vote first?

The Chair: Okay. There's unanimous consent to group clauses 511 to 516.

(Clauses 511 to 516 inclusive agreed to on division)

The Chair: Now we'll suspend.

• (1638)

_____ (Pause) _____

• (4045)

The Chair: Okay, members, we're back.

We'll continue with the votes.

(Clauses 517 to 558 inclusive agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

• (4120)

The Chair: Shall clause 559 carry?

Mr. Yvan Baker: On division.

• (4125)

Mr. Philip Lawrence: No, let's do a recorded vote, actually.

(Clauses 559 and 560 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Mr. Chair, I see that Mr. Beech is doing some exercises with his thumb. I'm wondering if we should suspend, or if he's okay to continue.

The Chair: It's his thumb stretches. I don't know; he might be cramping up.

Shall clause 561 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: I request a recorded vote.

[*English*]

Mr. Marty Morantz: Sir, what clause are we on? The sound in here is so terrible.

The Chair: We are on clause 561.

(Clauses 561 to 567 inclusive agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

• (4130)

The Chair: Shall clause 568 carry?

• (4135)

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: On division.

[*English*]

Mr. Stephen Ellis (Cumberland—Colchester, CPC): I request a recorded division, please, Chair.

The Chair: We'll have a recorded vote.

(Clauses 568 to 571 inclusive agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

(Clauses 573 to 578 inclusive agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

• (4145)

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Mr. Chair, I have a point of order.

The Chair: On a point of order, go ahead, Mr. Lawrence.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I'm wondering if the committee would agree to a UC to have the PBO appear before the end of session. In exchange, the Conservatives would agree to lump—

The Chair: No, we can't be doing that.

Ms. Julie Dzerowicz: On a point of order, I heard “lump”.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I can't think, for the life of me, of the appropriate verb. My apologies. The grouping, that's it. It's a big word. Sorry, it's been a long couple of days.

We would be grouping the clauses and, where possible, passing them on division if we can agree by unanimous consent to have the PBO here before the end of the year. I'm sure we'll hear from the PBO anyway.

The Chair: We're not mixing those things up, so we're not doing that.

However, we can group if you'd like to just group. Right now, MP Lawrence, we are at clause 579. Would you like to group all the way to 632, our next amendment? We can go from 579 to 632 if there's UC.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Could you just test to see whether we have UC for the PBO to come, and maybe then we can group these?

The Chair: I don't think it would be appropriate to—

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I do enjoy spending time with you, Mr. Chair, but—

The Chair: I don't think it would be appropriate to mix those things, but if you did want to group those clauses—

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I don't think there's anything in the rules that this would violate. Can I just test the UC, with your permission?

The Chair: We're not—

Mr. Philip Lawrence: It will take all of 20 seconds.

The Chair: No.

Would you like to just do a grouping?

Mr. Philip Lawrence: No, unfortunately.

Mr. Larry Maguire (Brandon—Souris, CPC): Mr. Chair, I have a point of order.

The Chair: Yes, MP Maguire, go ahead on a point of order.

Mr. Larry Maguire: Thanks.

I'm new to this committee, but I've had many occasions to deal with the PBO and—

The Chair: There was a “no”, MP Maguire, on that.

Mr. Larry Maguire: —I just wondered why he wouldn't be eligible to be here.

The Chair: It's not a point of order, but thank you.

Members, shall clause 579 carry?

(Clause 579 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

• (4150)

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I have a point of order.

I'm not quite the communicator that, say, our leader is or other individuals, so maybe I just wasn't clear. We would agree to grouping the clauses if the Liberals would agree to a UC to have the PBO here by the end of June.

The Chair: That's not a point of order.

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: Let's finish this.

The Chair: We're going on.

Shall clause 580 carry?

(Clause 580 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: MP Maguire, you had a point of order.

Mr. Larry Maguire: I was just wondering. You called the vote there and I wasn't sure whether it was to have the PBO here or not.

The Chair: No, that wasn't it.

Mr. Larry Maguire: I wasn't quite sure.

The Chair: Shall clause 581 carry?

(Clause 581 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: Members, we just reviewed the video where there was some confusion around clause 572. Clause 572 was missed, so we are putting the question now on clause 572.

Shall clause 572 carry?

• (4155)

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: I request a recorded vote.

(Clause 572 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

[*English*]

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Mr. Chair, I wasn't quite quick enough to intercede on a point of order prior to your calling the vote again. Would you be kind enough just to explain to us what happened?

I guess we just went from clause 571 to clause 573. Is that what happened?

The Chair: I'll explain what happened.

We were going through the sequence of votes and we did vote all those times. What happened, though—and I did confer and look at the sheets that the clerks had—when I came to clause 572, I said “571” again, so we said “571” twice—we thought it was clause 572.

We recorded it on the sheet as 572, but when we reviewed the record, it said 571 twice. We did clause 571 twice. Now we have gone back to take care of clause 572.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Well, on that note, I think there is a lot of scientific evidence of the impact of exhaustion on people, so I am wondering if we should suspend now and pick this up tomorrow morning.

The Chair: No, I think we're good.

I do like my coffee. That will help. I think I need to perk up on that.

On a point of order, go ahead, MP Maguire.

Mr. Larry Maguire: I was like my colleague, Mr. Lawrence. That's why I called a point of order before, but I guess I just missed it. The vote had already been called.

Were both votes on clause 571 the same? Are you able to just scrap one? How does that work?

The Chair: We did vote on clause 571 and it was carried.

Mr. Larry Maguire: My point is, we did it twice.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

I think my colleague's question is—and I think it's a fair one—since we voted twice on clause 571, how do we know which vote is going to be put on the record?

The Chair: The result was the same.

Now we're on clause 582.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Sorry, I have one last point of order. I apologize for it.

No disrespect to you, Mr. Chair, but you did make that error. Can we just have the clerks review it to make sure we haven't missed any other ones?

• (4200)

The Chair: No. The clerks are very diligent. They did review and that's why we came back to it.

Actually, the clerks caught it at the start. It's just that on the sheets, it seemed that everything was correct, so we went to review the video. That was the only one.

Now, shall clause 582 carry?

[Translation]

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: I request a recorded vote.

(Clause 582 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

[English]

The Chair: Shall clause 583 carry?

[Translation]

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: On division.

[English]

Mr. Philip Lawrence: If we had the PBO, we could certainly do it on division, but given that we don't, we're going to actually do a recorded vote there. Thank you.

(Clauses 583 to 587 inclusive agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

• (4205)

The Chair: Shall clause 588 carry?

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Mr. Chair, I have a point of order.

The Chair: The vote is on. We'll do it right after the vote.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Did we not just do clause 586?

The Chair: We just did clause 587.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Oh, my apologies.

(Clauses 588 to 590 inclusive agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: Shall clause 591 carry?

[Translation]

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: I request a recorded vote.

• (4210)

[English]

Mr. Philip Lawrence: This is another one where I guess there was an error in the French version. They're replacing the French version. It would be good to hear this in English, translated, but I know that isn't allowed, so I will vote no.

(Clauses 591 to 627 inclusive agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

• (4240)

The Chair: Shall clause 628 carry?

[Translation]

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: I request a recorded vote.

[English]

Mr. Heath MacDonald: Can we suspend for two minutes?

The Chair: Are people looking for a bio break here? Okay, we're doing a bio break.

• (4240)

_____ (Pause) _____

• (4250)

The Chair: We're back.

MP Lawrence, you want to propose something.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: We want to see whether we have UC to group clauses 628, 629 and 630 and pass them on division.

The Chair: Do we have unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chair: We'll pass those on division.

(Clauses 628 to 630 inclusive agreed to on division)

(Clauses 631 and 632 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: On clause 633, shall Bloc amendment 6 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: I request a recorded vote.

[*English*]

The Chair: It will be a recorded vote.

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

The Chair: Shall clause 633 as amended carry?

• (4255)

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: I request a recorded vote.

(Amended clause 633 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

[*English*]

The Chair: On clause 634, shall Bloc amendment 7 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: I request a recorded vote.

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

[*English*]

The Chair: Shall clause 634 as amended carry?

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: I request a recorded vote.

(Clause 634 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

[*English*]

The Chair: Shall clause 635 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: I request a recorded vote.

(Clause 635 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: I request a recorded vote.

Would it be possible to group clauses 635 to 662 together?

• (4300)

[*English*]

The Chair: Well, we just did clause 635.

Are you asking for a grouping of clauses 636 to 662?

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: Yes.

The Chair: Do we have unanimous consent for that?

Mr. Philip Lawrence: No, unless the other side is agreeable to seeing the Parliamentary Budget Officer...

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: We can discuss it after we're done with that.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: We're in a bit of a low-trust environment here, as we've seen before.

The Chair: That's a no, I guess, so we're going to clause 636.

(Clauses 636 to 662 inclusive agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

• (4320)

The Chair: Shall clause 663 carry?

Mr. Philip Lawrence: I'm sorry, Mr. Chair. Don't we have an amendment to clause 663?

The Chair: It's coming up after this. That's new clause 663.1.

Shall clause 663 carry?

(Clause 663 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: Now we are on new clause 663.1.

Shall amendment CPC-22 carry?

(Amendment negatived: nays 7; yeas 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

(Clauses 664 and 665 agreed to: nays 7; yeas 4)

• (4325)

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Mr. Chair, I have a point of order.

Could we group the remaining clauses, to clause 681, and pass them on division?

The Chair: We're looking to group clauses 666 to 681 on division. Is that correct?

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Yes.

The Chair: I'm looking for unanimous consent on that.

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Clauses 666 to 681 inclusive agreed to on division)

Mr. Terry Beech: This committee always agrees on everything.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Chair: Shall the short title carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: On division.

The Chair: Shall the schedule carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: On division.

The Chair: Shall the title carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: On division.

The Chair: Shall the bill as amended carry?

An hon. member: I would like a recorded vote.

The Chair: We'll have a recorded vote.

(Bill C-47 as amended agreed to: yeas 6; nays 5)

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

An hon. member: On division.

The Chair: 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: That is it, members.

The budget for this bill was distributed by the clerk. Are we okay to approve that budget?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chair: Shall we adjourn?

● (4330)

Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan: I'm not sure.

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>