



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

45th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

Standing Committee on Finance

EVIDENCE

NUMBER 009

Monday, October 27, 2025

Chair: Karina Gould



Standing Committee on Finance

Monday, October 27, 2025

• (1100)
[English]

The Chair (Hon. Karina Gould (Burlington, Lib.)): Good morning, everyone.

I call this meeting to order.

Welcome to meeting number nine of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Finance.

I would like to welcome back our witnesses. We have most of the same witnesses from the CRA, the Department of Finance and the Privy Council Office as we had last week, so thank you for being with us again.

Pursuant to the order of reference of Thursday, June 12, 2025, and the motion adopted on September 22, 2025, the committee shall resume consideration of Bill C-4, an act respecting certain affordability measures for Canadians and another measure.

We were debating NDP-2.

Mr. Kelly, I'll start with you.

Pat Kelly (Calgary Crowfoot, CPC): With the meeting having been adjourned, I don't think anything had been moved.

I move:

That, with respect to the committee's clause-by-clause consideration of Bill C-4:

(a) debate on each remaining clause, including any amendments or subamendments thereto, be limited to no more than five minutes per recognized party, after which the chair shall forthwith put every question necessary to dispose of the clause and any amendments or subamendments related thereto;

(b) no more than one subamendment shall be moved to any amendment, and once the chair has put the question on that subamendment, no further subamendments shall be received;

(c) once the time provided for debate on a clause has expired, any amendments, for which notice has been given but were not yet moved, shall be deemed to have been moved and the chair shall put every question necessary to dispose of the clause without further debate or amendment;

(d) the committee not adjourn until it has disposed of Bill C-4;

(e) should the clause-by-clause consideration not be completed within the time normally scheduled for the meeting, the committee seek the necessary resources to continue beyond its usual meeting hours until Bill C-4 is disposed of; and

(f) upon completion of clause-by-clause consideration of Bill C-4, the committee's next meeting be held in its usual meeting hours for its study on tax havens.

I believe an embargoed copy of the motion was given to the clerk, so the clerk can distribute this to everyone. Is that correct?

The Clerk of the Committee (Danielle Widmer): Yes.

Pat Kelly: Thank you, Clerk.

The motion should be in the inboxes of members in both official languages.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Kelly.

Members have not received it yet, so they're just working on this. While that is done—

• (1105)

Pat Kelly: I still have the floor, though, so I would like to speak to the motion, if it is now moved.

The Chair: Okay. Please carry on.

Pat Kelly: This bill does contain affordability measures that are important to Canadians and that Conservatives support, so we would like to get this bill passed. We would like to go further with this bill. That is why we proposed reasonable amendments that would have made this bill go much further towards its stated objectives and provide more meaningful tax relief to Canadians and more meaningful affordability measures for new housing.

We saw from the previous meeting that members of the governing party do not appear ready to adopt these amendments. Nevertheless, we would like to see this bill progress. There is agreement from Conservatives to withdraw our amendments in order to make it easier for the passage of this bill, so that this committee can get on to other important business.

There will be other amendments. I'm not precluding—and there's nothing in this motion that would preclude—the other parties from moving their amendments. If they have amendments to move then we can debate them and move on.

This is a path forward, Chair, since at the last meeting the Liberals were filibustering their own bill, I guess out of fear of allowing any amendments to come to a vote. This is a path forward so that we don't have a repeat of that, where the Liberals would just filibuster their own bill.

Note though that this isn't going to adjourn. There is no consent from our side to adjourn this meeting if you have a speaker on the speakers list. What happened at the conclusion of the previous meeting was totally unacceptable, where the chair actually interrupted Mr. Turnbull in the middle of him asking the officials a question to gavel out the meeting. It was also while I was on the speakers list.

We can manage the timing of these meetings. It could well be that Mr. Turnbull was ready to end in order to facilitate a timely scheduled end of the meeting. It's quite likely that I was also prepared not to cause the meeting to go longer just to get my turn on the speaking order. To be clear, meetings can't be adjourned while a member is in the middle of speaking. If this motion is adopted then it couldn't be more clear.

We're going to pass Bill C-4 and move on to other committee business, if it is the will of this committee to pass this motion, which provides this committee with a path forward.

I think in future, too, the chair has the ability to meet with vice-chairs and others to negotiate or speak a little more informally about our work plan so that we don't have parties filibustering their own bills.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Kelly.

Mr. Turnbull.

Ryan Turnbull (Whitby, Lib.): Can we have a suspension to discuss this?

Pat Kelly: We agree.

Ryan Turnbull: We'll come right back.

Thanks.

The Chair: We will suspend the meeting briefly.

Thank you.

• (1105) _____ (Pause) _____

• (1115)

The Chair: Members, we're returning.

Is there any further comment or debate on this?

Mr. Kelly.

Pat Kelly: Yes. I'm going to ask the committee for unanimous consent to delete the word "recognized" so, it's "five minutes per party". Otherwise, the NDP would not be permitted to move and speak to the motion.

I ask for unanimous consent to delete the word "recognized".

The Chair: Do we have unanimous consent to delete the word "recognized"?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Amendment agreed to)

Pat Kelly: I have nothing further to add to the debate on the motion.

The Chair: Can I put the question on the motion?

We have Mr. Turnbull.

Ryan Turnbull: Can I clarify that the Conservatives have retracted their amendments to the whole package?

Pat Kelly: This is a tricky thing. It goes together, but yes, we will withdraw our amendments upon passage of this motion.

The Chair: Thank you.

Normally, once we get to them, you will withdraw them as we get there.

Pat Kelly: That's correct. You'll have to trust me on that, but yes, that's what we'll do. It's on the record.

The Chair: Is there any further debate on this?

Seeing none, do we have UC? Can we have a show of hands for moving this?

Seeing everyone is in favour, we will move forward with this.

(Motion as amended agreed to)

The Chair: We'll go back to NDP-2.

Mr. Turnbull.

• (1120)

Ryan Turnbull: I have a very quick point.

It's unclear to me whether the report produced will be able to meet the timelines that are useful. Although I do appreciate NDP-2, I think it will have to rely on historical data, and I don't think it will be that useful, because it will be based on 2025 or previous tax years. That's the reason we'll be voting against it.

Otherwise, I think it's a relatively reasonable and helpful amendment. I just don't think we can support it, because I don't think it can meet reasonable timelines for this particular measure.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Turnbull.

Would anyone else like to speak to NDP-2?

We're voting on NDP-2.

(Amendment agreed to: yeas 5; nays 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

(On clause 3)

The Chair: We'll move to amendment BQ-1.

Monsieur Garon, did you want to introduce it?

[*Translation*]

Jean-Denis Garon (Mirabel, BQ): Thank you, Madam Chair—
[*English*]

The Chair: I'm sorry. We're going to CPC-2.

You said you were withdrawing that, so we skipped it, but go ahead.

Pat Kelly: Yes, I think I have to do that clearly for the analysts and the record.

We withdraw the amendment.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Kelly.

CPC-2 is withdrawn. My apologies for that. I was just trusting you.

We'll go to Monsieur Garon for BQ-1.

[*Translation*]

Jean-Denis Garon: Thank you, Madam Chair.

When the government announced a goods and services tax rebate for the purchase of a new home upon signing the contract, it obviously intended to incentivize people to buy a newly built home rather than an existing home on the market. We wanted to create demand for new housing, and we know that first-time buyers don't necessarily prefer newly built homes.

On March 20, 2025, when we weren't in an election campaign, the Prime Minister announced the measure in a press release. We have since heard from representatives of the Association des professionnels de la construction et de l'habitation du Québec, or APCHQ, and the Residential Construction Council of Ontario. They clearly told us that a number of people, having believed the Prime Minister, had signed a contract to buy a new home only to realize, when the notice of ways and means was tabled and, subsequently, when the bill was introduced, that what had led them to make the purchase wasn't there.

The purpose of amendment BQ-1 is therefore to recognize the situation these individuals are in. All we're proposing is to change the date on which people who signed a contract will be able to get a refund. I assume the government has some apprehensions since, even if the amendment is in order, there are some costs associated with it. However, the amendment would add only two weeks to a program that will last several years. The government's credibility with respect to its announcements is also at stake. In my opinion, this is entirely in line with the bill, and I invite my colleagues to support the amendment.

[English]

Ryan Turnbull: I have a point of order, Chair.

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Turnbull.

Ryan Turnbull: Chair, I would like to raise a point of order respecting the admissibility of BQ-1, concerning part 2 of Bill C-4, the proposed making life more affordable for Canadians act. Part 2 proposes to amend the Excise Tax Act and other related regulations to implement a temporary GST new housing rebate for first-time homebuyers. This measure was accompanied by a royal recommendation to authorize the GST rebate, for first-time homebuyers in respect of the purchase of a new house. The royal recommendation authorizes the CRA to draw from the consolidated revenue fund to pay to buyers who meet the terms, conditions and qualifications under part 2 of Bill C-4, once that bill receives royal assent, an amount equal to the GST that the buyer paid to the builder of the house.

Let me explain how this scheme operates. First-time homebuyers who qualify under part 2 of Bill C-4, who purchase a new house from a builder, pay that builder the price of the house as well as the GST related to that purchase. In respect of BQ-1, the key condition that governs the rebate is that the buyer must have entered into and signed a purchase agreement on or after May 27, 2025. Provided that condition, and the other qualifying conditions in part 2 of Bill C-4 are met, and the bill receives royal assent, the qualifying buyer could file a claim with the CRA for the GST rebate portion of the purchase. CRA would process the claim and, provided that the conditions are met under part 2 of Bill C-4, CRA would be authorized, by the royal recommendation, to draw funds from the consolidated

revenue fund to issue a rebate payment for the GST portion to the buyer.

BQ-1 proposes to move the start date of the scheme as set out in part 2 of Bill C-4 from May 27, 2025, to March 20, 2025. This would allow first-time homebuyers who purchased a new house on or after March 20, 2025, to claim the GST rebate. This would represent an expansion of the scope of the rebate in a manner that is inconsistent with the terms and conditions of the rebate contained in the bill at first reading, is not authorized by the bill and exceeds the maximal charge authorized by the royal recommendation. This amendment requires a new royal recommendation, which could be provided only at the report stage by a minister of the Crown with the accompanying amendment.

This is not a novel matter for the House to consider in respect of a GST rebate for the purchase of housing. In the previous Parliament, on February 1, 2024, the Speaker ruled on the need for a royal recommendation for Bill C-356, respecting a GST rebate on housing, standing in the name of the former member for Carleton. The Speaker stated:

In raising his point of order, the parliamentary secretary argued that the bill would infringe on the Crown's financial prerogative by repurposing \$100 million from the housing accelerator fund and by implementing a 100% GST rebate on new residential rental property for which the average rent payable is below the market rate. Page 838 of *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, third edition, states:

A royal recommendation not only fixes the allowable charge, but also its objects, purposes, conditions and qualifications. For this reason, a royal recommendation is required not only in the case where money is being appropriated, but also in the case where the authorization to spend for a specific purpose is significantly altered. Without a royal recommendation, a bill that either increases the amount of an appropriation or extends its objects, purposes, conditions and qualifications is inadmissible on the grounds that it infringes on the Crown's financial initiative.

Following a careful review of Bill C-356, the Chair is preoccupied with some elements that would cause a withdrawal from the public treasury for new and distinct purposes.

The bill seeks, among other considerations, to authorize a minister to disburse up to \$100 million to municipalities that surpass identified housing targets. This amount would be withdrawn directly from the consolidated revenue fund, although the bill requires a minister to table a plan to reallocate funds from the housing accelerator fund program to offset that amount. Moreover, the bill also proposes certain circumstances for which a 100% GST rebate on new residential rental property may be paid out.

● (1125)

The aforementioned elements would cause new and distinct charges against the consolidated revenue fund, thus constituting an infringement on the financial initiative of the Crown.

Accordingly, Bill C-356 must be accompanied by a royal recommendation, and without one, the Chair will not put the question at the third reading stage of the bill in its present form.

This is the situation which this committee now has before it, Chair. BQ-1 would alter the terms, conditions and qualifications of the royal recommendation that is attached to part 2 of Bill C-4, specifically including individuals who entered into and signed a purchase agreement with the builder from March 20, 2025, to May 26, 2025, who would not otherwise be eligible for the GST rebate under the parameters of part 2 of Bill C-4.

This expands the eligibility requirements and thus infringes upon the Crown's financial prerogative. This amendment is inadmissible to be moved in committee because it requires a royal recommendation. I therefore submit to the chair that BQ-1 is not admissible on the aforementioned grounds.

Thank you, Chair, and thank you to the members for their patience and for indulging me.

• (1130)

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Turnbull.

I'm going to consult with the legislative clerk.

To the officials, could you clarify how the GST rebate would work in terms of the impact on the consolidated revenue fund and whether this is considered to be a payment or a tax credit? Could you explain that, please, for this amendment?

[*Translation*]

Gervais Coulombe (Director General, Legislation, Sales Tax Division, Department of Finance): Thank you, Madam Chair.

The goods and services tax, or GST, rebate for the purchase of a first home provided in Bill C-4 operates as a payment from the consolidated revenue fund. Legislatively, it is not forgone tax revenue that would otherwise be payable. Therefore, any increase in the number of applicants eligible for repayment as of the new date proposed by the amendment would result in additional payments from the consolidated revenue fund. Furthermore, the Canada Revenue Agency has consistently maintained that no rebates could be processed before Bill C-4 receives royal assent, as these are payments to be made from the consolidated revenue fund.

The Chair: Thank you. I'd like to get a better understanding, because I'm not a tax policy expert. Is this the same thing Mr. Poilievre proposed in Bill C-356, or is it something else?

Gervais Coulombe: It's the same concept. Bill C-356 proposed a new rebate on new housing. Here, we're in exactly the same legislative environment, and the same provisions of the Excise Tax Act are involved. If you look at the exact wording of the proposed amendments to Bill C-4, it's really about a payment and not a tax reduction. That was the ruling made in February 2024 based on case law as to whether or not amendments on GST rebates were admissible.

The Chair: I have another question for food for thought. Will what is being proposed change the royal recommendation that accompanied Bill C-4?

Gervais Coulombe: Our experts at the Department of Finance have estimated the additional costs associated with this measure. As I said, more homes would potentially become eligible and the increase would be in the order of \$50 million over the five years of the tax planning period. That is certainly an order of magnitude exceeding the royal recommendation that accompanied the introduction of Bill C-4 in June.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Coulombe.

I'm going to take a moment to confer with the clerk.

Mr. Garon, do you want to speak to Mr. Turnbull's point of order?

• (1135)

Jean-Denis Garon: Madam Chair, I beg to differ.

The parliamentary secretary referred to Bill C-356, a private member's bill that requires a royal recommendation from the outset, and it was never granted. That is completely different from what is before us today. Bill C-4 is already covered by a notice of ways and means. I understand the officials' opinion, which is clearly at odds with that of the legislative clerks who studied the proposal in advance. Obviously, the officials are here to advise you, Madam Chair, but in my opinion, independent opinion should prevail.

It's not a question here of whether or not it involves an expense, but whether it involves an expense within the meaning of parliamentary jurisprudence. Every tax cut or tax exemption, on the fund or on the form, has an effect on the public treasury. In this case, it's clear that the rebate associated with these new homes is directly related to the amount of GST paid. It's a rebate on a tax that was paid, and consumers feel they're owed that. We're of the opinion that, within the meaning of existing parliamentary jurisprudence, this amendment doesn't require a royal recommendation and that the comparison with Bill C-356, a private member's bill that was never supported by a notice of ways and means adopted by the House, isn't admissible in the case before us.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Garon.

[*English*]

We have reflected on this, and thank you to the officials for sharing. I appreciate both Mr. Turnbull's and Mr. Garon's interventions.

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 that will affect government revenues and expenditures. It was clear that this is both a payment and would exceed the royal recommendation which accompanies Bill C-4. Therefore, I rule the amendment inadmissible.

Mr. Garon.

[*Translation*]

Jean-Denis Garon: Madam Chair, I would like to challenge your ruling and put it to a vote.

The Chair: Shall the decision of the chair be sustained?

[*English*]

(Ruling of the chair overturned: nays 5; yeas 4)

The Chair: Is there debate on the proposed amendment?

Seeing none we'll go straight to a vote.

(Amendment agreed to: yeas 5; nays 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

(Clause 3 as amended agreed to: yeas 5; nays 4)

(On clause 4)

• (1140)

The Chair: We have amendment CPC-3.

Mr. Hallan.

Jasraj Hallan (Calgary East, CPC): We will withdraw the amendment.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Hallan.

Amendment CPC-3 on clause 4 is withdrawn.

Next is NDP-3.

Ms. Kwan, would you like to introduce it?

Jenny Kwan (Vancouver East, NDP): Madam Chair, NDP-3 essentially proposes that the first-time homebuyers' GST exemption be applied based on the closing date of a home purchase rather than when the date the purchase agreement is signed.

[*Translation*]

Jean-Denis Garon: I have a point of order, Madam Chair.

I'm sorry, Ms. Kwan.

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Garon.

Jean-Denis Garon: As I understand it, since BQ-1 was adopted, NDP-3 becomes moot given the dates it mentions. Is that correct?

The Chair: I would ask for a second.

After checking, BQ-1 concerns another provision of the bill, so there is no conflict with NDP-3.

[*English*]

Ms. Kwan, you may continue.

Jenny Kwan: Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

The issue that has been brought to my attention by some Canadians is that more and more Canadians are concerned about affordability. This would apply to those who are entering the housing market for the first time and are relying on the exemption to make home ownership more affordable. For the vast majority of the transactions in Canada, the goods and services tax, the GST, is applied at the point when a good or service is actually purchased or delivered. In the real estate sense, that moment occurs on the closing date when the legal title transfers to the buyer and when payment is complete. GST is assessed and then paid at that time, the closing date.

For preconstruction or delayed closings, buyers often sign agreements months or years before taking ownership, but the GST is not applied until the closing date. This highlights why it is only logical and consistent to apply any GST exemptions at that point as well.

Basing the exemption on the purchase agreement date creates, I believe, several unfair outcomes. It will penalize first-time homebuyers for circumstances beyond their control, such as construction delays or market conditions. It contradicts the general tax principle that GST applies at the time of final sale, and it introduces confusion and inequity into a policy designed to provide relief. By tying the exemption to the closing date, the government would align with how GST is typically administered, increase policy transparency and ensure that first-time homebuyers who are taking legal ownership after the exemption policy is in effect receive the support that they were promised.

This is simply a change that would make a meaningful difference to many Canadians who are trying to secure their first home in a very challenging housing market.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Kwan.

For the same reasons that I deemed amendment BQ-1 inadmissible, I believe this amendment requires a royal recommendation, so I will also be deeming this inadmissible.

We will move on to amendment BQ-2.

Mr. Garon, would you like to introduce this?

• (1145)

[*Translation*]

Jean-Denis Garon: The rationale for amendment BQ-2 is identical to that of amendment BQ-1. I moved amendment BQ-2 because different types of properties are covered by different sections of the bill. Therefore, consider everything I said before, including admissibility, as repeated.

[*English*]

The Chair: The chair's ruling stands. I still believe this is inadmissible.

[*Translation*]

Jean-Denis Garon: I'd like to appeal your ruling.

[*English*]

The Chair: Okay, we will have a vote.

Shall the ruling of the chair be sustained?

(Ruling of the chair overturned: nays 5; yeas 4)

The Chair: Is there debate on amendment BQ-2?

Seeing none, we'll put the question.

(Amendment agreed to: yeas 5; nays 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

(Clause 4 as amended agreed to on division)

(On clause 5)

The Chair: We will move to amendment CPC-4.

Mr. Hallan.

Jasraj Hallan: We'll withdraw the amendment.

The Chair: Amendment CPC-4 is withdrawn.

We are now on amendment NDP-4.

Ms. Kwan.

Jenny Kwan: Madam Chair, the same principle applies with NDP-4, NDP-5 and NDP-6, under different categories. I will make the same argument as I previously did about the GST exemption date.

I hope committee members will reconsider this, because a lot of the people who, for example, enter into pre-sales would not qualify for this at a time when affordability is absolutely critical. This is not just about facilitating a process; it's also about creating housing that's affordable so people can get into the market.

GST is often applied at the time of closing. Let's say I buy a cell-phone. At the time of purchase, when I go to pay the cashier, I pay the GST and then I take the phone home. That should apply for housing as well.

Regarding the notion that it will somehow be a cost to the treasury, it will be a minimal cost, if that. The concept of the application, whether it applies at the time of signing or at the time of purchase, is essentially the same.

In any case, if the Conservative, Bloc and Liberal members want to ensure affordability for homebuyers, applying the GST exemption at the time of closing will make a difference to the homebuyers.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Kwan.

For the reasons I outlined earlier, the chair continues to state that the amendment is inadmissible.

We are moving on to amendment BQ-3.

Mr. Garon, would you like to introduce BQ-3?

[*Translation*]

Jean-Denis Garon: Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

The rationale for amendment BQ-3 is identical to that of amendments BQ-2 and BQ-1, which you very much appreciated. Since different types of housing are covered by different provisions in the bill, a number of amendments need to be moved. Consider everything I said as repeated, including my response to Mr. Turnbull, and consider that I object to your ruling.

The Chair: Okay, thank you for letting me know. I'm going to continue to rule this amendment out of order.

Jean-Denis Garon: I'd like to appeal your ruling, Madam Chair.

• (1150)

The Chair: Okay. I'm going to call the question.

[*English*]

Shall the ruling of the chair be sustained?

(Ruling of the chair overturned: nays 5; yeas 4)

The Chair: Is there debate on amendment BQ-3?

No.

We'll do a recorded vote.

(Amendment agreed to: yeas 5; nays 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: Shall clause 5 carry?

Ryan Turnbull: On division.

The Chair: We'll do a recorded vote.

(Clause 5 as amended agreed to: yeas 9; nays 0)

(On clause 6)

The Chair: Mr. Hallan, would you like to introduce amendment CPC-5?

Jasraj Hallan: We'll withdraw it, Chair.

The Chair: CPC-5 is withdrawn.

Ms. Kwan, go ahead on NDP-5.

Jenny Kwan: Madam Chair, I'll have one more go at it.

Just so people know what the language says, in this particular clause, it applies to co-operatives, but the language for this, whether it's a co-op, a condo or a home, is the same.

We're talking about striking out the paragraph that says "the agreement of purchase and sale referred to in paragraph (2)(c) is entered into after May 26, 2025 and before 2031," and changing lines 4 and 5 on page 7 to "ownership of the share is transferred to the particular individual after May 26, 2025 and before 2031, and".

Again, it is about the closing date. The only difference about the closing date is to apply the GST exemption at the time of closing as opposed to at the time of the signing of the agreement. I'm asking for this particular amendment to apply to co-ops.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Kwan.

My consideration of this amendment as inadmissible stands and continues for the reasons I outlined previously.

Monsieur Garon, go ahead on BQ-4.

[*Translation*]

Jean-Denis Garon: Thank you, Madam Chair.

As you know, different types of housing are treated under different sections, but the argument remains the same. I therefore consider that I have repeated my previous remarks. I also reiterate my opposition to Mr. Turnbull. We will see what happens next.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Garon.

I consider this amendment out of order for the reasons I mentioned earlier. It requires a royal recommendation.

Jean-Denis Garon: With all due respect, Madam Chair, I'd like to challenge your ruling.

The Chair: Okay.

The vote will be on sustaining the chair's ruling.

[English]

(Ruling of the chair overturned: nays 4; yeas 5)

The Chair: Mr. Hallan.

Jasraj Hallan: Chair, I'm just wondering whether, for all the Bloc amendments, since we have the same outcome on each one, there's a buy-in from everyone that we could pass it on division. We have the same outcome on each one, so maybe it will help save some time, if that works for everyone.

The Chair: Mr. Turnbull, you have the floor on the same point of order.

Ryan Turnbull: I don't particularly have a problem with that, as long as the chair's ruling that it's inadmissible is documented on each one. If you're overruling the chair, if that's how everyone is going to vote, then we could do the whole thing as a package and get it over with.

• (1155)

The Chair: Give me one second.

• (1155)

(Pause)

• (1155)

[Translation]

The Chair: I call the meeting back to order.

Mr. Garon, do you wish to speak?

Jean-Denis Garon: I move that amendments BQ-5, BQ-6 and BQ-7 be considered moved, debated and then ruled out of order by the chair, that this ruling by the chair be considered overturned by the committee and that the amendments be considered adopted on division.

[English]

The Chair: We could....

[Translation]

Jean-Denis Garon: I would add amendments BQ-8, BQ-9 and BQ-10, to save even more time.

[English]

The Chair: Okay, do we have agreement from committee members to move forward?

An hon. member: Agreed.

The Chair: We don't want to get too confused, but how about I propose that each time we get to a Bloc amendment, it is deemed inadmissible by the chair; the ruling of the chair is challenged and overturned, and then the amendment is passed on division? We will go through each time, just to make sure that we don't mess anything up, unless you don't want to challenge it.

[Translation]

Jean-Denis Garon: Your compromise proposal seems perfectly acceptable to me, given the time we have and the use of public funds.

The Chair: That's perfect.

[English]

We will consider that amendment BQ-4 was deemed inadmissible by the chair. The ruling was challenged; the committee overturned the chair's ruling, and the amendment passed on division.

(Amendment agreed to on division [See Minutes of Proceedings])

(Clause 6 as amended agreed to)

(On clause 7)

The Chair: We have amendment CPC-6.

Mr. Hallan.

Jasraj Hallan: We'll withdraw it, Chair.

The Chair: Amendment BQ-5 is deemed moved, ruled inadmissible by the chair, the ruling challenged and overturned, and the amendment passed on division.

(Amendment agreed to on division [See Minutes of Proceedings])

(Clause 7 as amended agreed to)

(On clause 8)

The Chair: Amendment BQ-6 is deemed moved, ruled inadmissible by the chair, the ruling challenged and overturned, and the amendment passed on division.

(Amendment agreed to on division [See Minutes of Proceedings])

(Clause 8 as amended agreed to)

(On clause 9)

The Chair: Amendment BQ-7 is deemed moved, ruled inadmissible by the chair, the ruling challenged and overturned, and the amendment passed on division.

(Amendment agreed to on division [See Minutes of Proceedings])

(Clause 9 as amended agreed to)

(On clause 10)

The Chair: Amendment BQ-7.1 is deemed moved, ruled inadmissible by the chair, the ruling challenged and overturned, and the amendment passed on division.

(Amendment agreed to on division [See Minutes of Proceedings])

The Chair: I'm sorry, Ms. Kwan, but NDP-6 cannot be moved because there is a line conflict with BQ-7.1. Amendment BQ-7.1 carried, so, unfortunately, you can't move that amendment.

The same is true for CPC-7. It also cannot be moved, so I will not give you the chance to withdraw it this time. My apologies.

Mr. Kelly has a point of order.

• (1200)

Pat Kelly: Just quickly on clause 10, I guess I would ask for consent to say that this one is adopted on division.

The Chair: Do we have consent to adopt clause 10 on division?

[*Translation*]

Jean-Denis Garon: I agree.

[*English*]

The Chair: He's asking for consent because it was deemed carried and he's asking for it to be carried on division.

We have consent.

(Clause 10 as amended agreed to on division)

(On clause 11)

The Chair: I will slow down. You guys wanted me to go faster and then....

Amendment BQ-8 is deemed moved, ruled inadmissible by the chair, the ruling challenged and overturned, and the amendment passed on division.

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

(Clause 11 as amended agreed to)

(On clause 12)

The Chair: We're on CPC-8.

Jasraj Hallan: We'll withdraw it.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Hallan.

Jasraj Hallan: Chair, we have no issue if you want to make the call for the CPC ones and just say "withdrawn".

The Chair: Is this for the entire bill?

Jasraj Hallan: There's only one more. Then if you want to pass the rest of them as a block, we're okay with that for whatever ones we have.

Ryan Turnbull: You still have a few left.

Jasraj Hallan: We'll just block them together.

The Chair: We're going to go one by one, just so we make sure we get everything. In the future, if you're going to withdraw amendments, maybe don't put them on in the first place. I'm just kidding.

Amendment BQ-9 is deemed moved, ruled inadmissible by the chair, the ruling challenged and overturned, and the amendment passed on division.

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

(Clause 12 as amended agreed to)

(On clause 13)

The Chair: Next is CPC-9.

Mr. Hallan.

Jasraj Hallan: We'll withdraw the amendment.

The Chair: Amendment BQ-10 is deemed moved, ruled inadmissible by the chair, the ruling challenged and overturned, and the amendment passed on division.

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

(Clause 13 as amended agreed to)

(On clause 14)

The Chair: Mr. Hallan, did you want to introduce CPC-10?

• (1205)

Jasraj Hallan: No, we'll withdraw it.

Chair, I don't know if there's unanimous consent for this. If you wanted to make 14 to 39 one block, we could pass it all together, as long as everyone is okay with that.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Hallan, for the suggestion.

The Chair: Is there unanimous consent from the committee to group clauses 14 to 39?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chair: Mr. Turnbull.

Ryan Turnbull: I think we have to deal with clause 14 separately because there was a proposed amendment. Then we can do clause 15.

The Chair: That was withdrawn. He just withdrew that, but thank you for paying attention.

Since we are grouping them, shall clauses 14 to 39 carry?

[*Translation*]

Jean-Denis Garon: I would call for a recorded vote, please.

The Chair: Okay. We can go to a vote.

[*English*]

(Clauses 14 to 39 agreed to: yeas 8; nays 1)

(On clause 40)

The Chair: Next is Mr. Hallan on CPC-11.

Jasraj Hallan: We'll withdraw the amendment, Chair.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Hallan.

(Clause 40 agreed to)

(On clause 41)

The Chair: Next is Mr. Hallan with CPC-12.

Jasraj Hallan: We'll withdraw the amendment, Chair.

(Clause 41 agreed to)

(On clause 42)

The Chair: Next is Mr. Hallan on amendment CPC-13.

Jasraj Hallan: We'll withdraw the amendment, Chair.

(Clause 42 agreed to)

The Chair: There are no amendments from clauses 43 to 49. Is there unanimous consent to group them for the vote?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Clauses 43 to 49 agreed to)

The Chair: We're making good time, guys.

Shall the short title carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

An hon. member: On division.

The Chair: Shall the title carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

An hon. member: On division.

The Chair: Shall the bill as amended carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Ryan Turnbull: You still have to report the bill to the House.

The Chair: I'm not there yet.

Ryan Turnbull: Oh, my apologies.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

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: Congratulations, everyone. You've passed this bill through committee.

Monsieur Garon, go ahead.

[*Translation*]

Jean-Denis Garon: Madam Chair, I just want to thank my colleagues across the way. We've shown that we're able to work quickly, despite our disagreements. In this context, I'd also like to thank the government officials for their immense patience and professionalism.

[*English*]

The Chair: Do I have leave to adjourn the committee?

Mr. Kelly, go ahead.

Pat Kelly: I'll join in thanking the officials for their patience and other members of the committee for their co-operation today.

Thank you.

• (1210)

The Chair: Yes, Mr. Turnbull.

Ryan Turnbull: I would like to do the same and reiterate our thanks to the officials. It's really great to work together. I'm looking forward to the same degree of collaboration when we get to the budget.

The Chair: Mr. Leitão, do you want to do the same?

[*Translation*]

Carlos Leitão (Marc-Aurèle-Fortin, Lib.): I would also like to take this opportunity to thank the officials and to thank you for listening to me the other day.

The Chair: That concludes our first bill. Thank you to all of the officials and members of the committee. I look forward to working together again on our future consideration of bills.

Have a good day, everyone.

[*English*]

I will adjourn the meeting.

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>