



HOUSE OF COMMONS  
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES  
CANADA

44th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

---

# Standing Committee on Finance

EVIDENCE

**NUMBER 142**

Tuesday, May 7, 2024

---

Chair: Mr. Peter Fonseca





## Standing Committee on Finance

Tuesday, May 7, 2024

• (1105)

[English]

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

Welcome to meeting 142 of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Finance.

Pursuant to Standing Order 108(2), the committee is meeting to discuss Bill C-69, an act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on April 16, 2024.

Today's meeting is taking place in a hybrid format, pursuant to Standing Order 15.1.

Before we begin, I remind all members and other meeting participants in the room of the following important preventive measures.

To prevent disruptive and potentially harmful audio feedback incidents that can cause injuries, all in-person participants are reminded to keep their earpieces away from all microphones at all times.

As indicated in the communiqué from the Speaker to all members on Monday, April 29, the following measures have been taken to help prevent audio feedback incidents.

All earpieces have been replaced by a model that greatly reduces the probability of audio feedback. The new earpieces are black in colour, whereas the former earpieces were grey. Please use only the approved black earpieces. By default, all unused earpieces will be unplugged at the start of a meeting. When you are not using your earpiece, please place it face down in the middle of the sticker for this purpose, which you will find on the table as indicated.

Please consult the cards on the table for guidelines to prevent audio feedback incidents. The room layout has been adjusted to increase the distance between microphones to reduce the chance of feedback from an ambient earpiece. These measures are in place so that we can conduct our business without interruption and protect the health and safety of all participants, including the interpreters.

Thank you all for your co-operation.

I will make few comments for the benefit of the members and witnesses.

Please wait until I recognize you by name before speaking. For members in the room, please raise your hand. For members on Zoom, if you wish to speak please use the “raise hand” function.

The clerk and I will manage the speaking order as best we can, and we appreciate your understanding in this regard.

I will remind everyone that all comments should be addressed through the chair.

With us today are officials from the Department of Finance as well as officials from the CRA.

We have a number of officials who will be providing opening remarks. We start with Lindsay Gwyer, who will be providing an opening statement, and then we'll move through a number of other officials. Then, when we get to members' questions, members will all have an opportunity to ask questions to whomever they like, and if someone is in the background, they'll make their way to the table.

Also, we have our clerk, Alexandre Roger, and Ariane Calvert is also joining Alexandre as we go through Bill C-69 here at the committee, so we have the resources and all the help we require.

With that, I will ask Ms. Gwyer to start our opening statements.

**Ms. Lindsay Gwyer (Director General, Legislation, Tax Legislation Division, Tax Policy Branch, Department of Finance):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I'm Lindsay Gwyer, director general, legislation, at the Department of Finance. I'll be speaking about part 1 of the bill.

Part 1 contains the income tax measures. There are 15 measures in part 1 of the bill, in addition to a number of technical amendments. Given the number of measures, I won't discuss them all. I'll just touch on some of the key measures. They're all summarized on the second page of the bill.

First, part 1 includes a measure to restrict deductions in respect of short-term rentals that are not compliant with applicable laws in the province or municipality in which the short-term rental is located. Part 1 also includes changes to the home buyers' plan, increasing the withdrawal limit from \$35,000 to \$60,000 and deferring by three years the start of the period during which individuals must repay their home buyers' plan withdrawals.

It also includes changes to certain existing tax credits. In particular, it doubles the volunteer firefighter and search and rescue tax credits, enhances the Canadian journalism labour tax credit and extends the mineral exploration tax credit by one year.

[Translation]

Part 1 would also implement the new Canada carbon rebate for small businesses. This measure would return a portion of federal fuel charge proceeds via a refundable tax credit directly to qualifying Canadian-controlled private corporations that have employees in provinces where the fuel charge applies.

Part 1 would also implement two new refundable investment tax credits. First, it would implement the clean hydrogen investment tax credit. The credit rate for hydrogen production would range from 15% to 40% of eligible project costs, with the cleanest hydrogen receiving the highest level of support. Ammonia production equipment that meets certain conditions would receive a 15% credit. To obtain these rates, projects would need to meet the labour requirements in Bill C-59. The clean hydrogen credit would be available for equipment that is acquired after March 28, 2023, and would no longer be available after 2034.

The second investment tax credit is for clean technology manufacturing. It is a 30% credit that would be available for property that is acquired on or after January 1, 2024, and would no longer be available after 2034.

[English]

Part 1 would also implement significant changes to the existing alternative minimum tax. Key changes would include an increase in the rate from 15% to 20.5%, an increase in the exemption amount, a requirement to fully include most capital gains in income, and restrictions on the available tax credits and deductions.

Finally, contingent on Bill C-59 receiving royal assent, part 1 would implement a \$10-million capital gains exemption available for qualifying shares of employee ownership trusts.

Those are some of the measures in part 1.

My colleagues and I would be happy to explain those or any other measures in part 1 in more detail.

• (1110)

**Mr. Peter Repetto (Senior Director, International Tax, Department of Finance):** Hello. I'm Peter Repetto, a senior director in the tax legislation division at the Department of Finance Canada, and I will be speaking about part 2 of the bill.

Part 2 is a proposed new act that would implement the global minimum tax, known as "pillar two", in Canada.

By way of background, Canada is one of 139 members of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development's G20 inclusive framework on base erosion and profit shifting that joined a two-pillar plan for international tax reform in 2021. Pillar two of that plan is a framework for a global minimum tax regime.

The pillar two rules are designed to ensure that the profits of large multinational businesses, which are those with annual revenues of at least 750 million euros, are subject to an effective tax rate of at least 15% in each jurisdiction in which they operate. This is intended to reduce the incentive for multinational businesses to shift their profits into low-tax jurisdictions and to set a floor on tax competition among countries.

The government originally announced its intention to implement pillar two in budget 2022, and then, in budget 2023, set out the proposed implementation time frame, starting in 2024.

As noted, the new global minimum tax act in part 2 of the bill would implement pillar two in Canada. More specifically, it contains legislation that would implement the primary pillar two rule, known as the income inclusion rule, or IIR, with effect for 2024. Generally, under that rule, Canada would impose a top-up tax on a Canadian-headquartered multinational enterprise when its profits in a foreign country have an effective tax rate below the 15% minimum rate. This tax would bring the effective tax rate on those profits up to the 15% rate.

The legislation would also implement a domestic minimum top-up tax in Canada. It would impose a top-up tax on a multinational enterprise when its Canadian profits have an effective tax rate below 15%, and this would also be effective in 2024.

Thank you.

[Translation]

**Mr. Gervais Coulombe (Acting Director General, Sales Tax Division, Department of Finance):** Good afternoon, my name is Gervais Coulombe and I am acting director general of the Sales Tax Division at the Department of Finance.

Part 3 of Bill C-69 contains various budget measures amending the Excise Tax Act, the Excise Act, the Excise Act, 2001, the Underused Housing Tax Act, part 1 of the Greenhouse Gas Pollution Pricing Act and other related texts.

The first measure under Division 1 would end the temporary GST/HST relief of certain face masks or respirators and certain face shields, which had been introduced in 2020 to support public health during the COVID-19 pandemic.

[English]

Division 2 of part 3 would implement, among other things, excise duty rate adjustments for tobacco, vaping and alcohol products. Specifically, it would implement the budget 2024 proposal to increase the tobacco excise duty rate by \$4 per carton of 200 cigarettes, effective April 17, 2024. It would also implement the budget 2024 proposal to increase vaping product excise duty rates by 12%.

Finally, as announced on March 9, 2024, it would extend by two years the 2% cap on the inflation adjustment on beer, spirits and wine excise duties, and would also reduce by half, for two years, the excise duty rate for the first 15,000 hectolitres of beer brewed in Canada.

*[Translation]*

Division 3 of part 3 implements changes to the Underused Housing Tax, in response to suggestions from Canadians. The changes would facilitate compliance while ensuring that the tax continues to apply as intended. Among other things, the amendments would eliminate filing requirements for certain owners, reduce minimum penalties for failing to file a return and introduce a new exemption for residential properties held as a place of residence or lodging for employees.

Division 4 of part 3 implements a measure that would broaden the provisions allowing the disclosure of confidential information in respect of a provincial Crown or its agent that is non-compliant or has stated that it will not comply with the federal fuel charge under part 1 of the Greenhouse Gas Pollution Pricing Act.

Mr. Chair, this completes our opening remarks for parts 1, 2 and 3 of Bill C-69.

• (1115)

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

*[English]*

Thank you, Mr. Repetto and Ms. Gwyer, for your opening statements.

Now we're going to head to the members' questions. In the first round, each party will have up to six minutes to ask questions.

We are starting with MP Chambers for the first six minutes.

**Mr. Adam Chambers (Simcoe North, CPC):** Thanks very much, Mr. Chair.

It's good to see everybody again.

I'll start with a couple of general questions, and then we'll get to some specifics.

Does anyone know how many full-time equivalents are going to be added, based on the measures in these parts?

I don't think there's anyone here from the economic and fiscal branch, is there?

**Ms. Lindsay Gwyer:** Yes, that's right. We're just from the tax policy branch, so I don't think we have those numbers handy. We could get them for you.

**Mr. Adam Chambers:** That's fair. That's fine.

Since you are here, on the home buyers' plan, I was curious....

This was very helpful, by the way, for the questions and answers. Thank you to whoever put that together. It's very helpful.

Thirteen thousand households are expected to benefit from the proposed increase over the next five years. I'm curious—this is in part 1(m)—about what we know about the 13,000 households. Can you give me an idea, either in 30 seconds or in a written follow-up later, of who these 13,000 households are and, for example, their average income and how many assets they have in their RRSP account?

**Mr. Pierre Leblanc (Director General, Personal Income Tax Division, Tax Policy Branch, Department of Finance):** It's tough

to describe exactly what this group will look like, because we have a sense now of who, let's say, in 2021 or 2022, has taken the maximum amount out of the home buyers' plan—the current limit of \$35,000—but we can expect that group to change pretty significantly over the next couple of years. That's because of the introduction of the tax-free first home savings account.

In other words, given that the account started last year and so far has been quite a popular measure for prospective first-time home buyers, basically the number of people who would otherwise be constrained by the \$35,000 limit will go down.

Our best estimate is 13,000. Exactly how the composition of that group changes once you bring in the first home savings account is a complicating factor. We can see what we can provide, but I just provide that note of caution.

**Mr. Adam Chambers:** Thank you very much. That would be very helpful. I'm very interested in the expectations on the average median income of these individuals, and also we want to make sure who's getting these tax preferences, I think, as I'm sure my NDP colleague is always interested to see who is benefiting from changes to the tax code.

I think there are some officials from CRA here. I'm very interested in the measure with respect to a grace period for child care benefits for six months after an unfortunate death of a child. There is a fairly specific number of \$15 million for the costing of this measure. I'm curious about how that number was arrived at.

Is the finance department relying on CRA data in order to provide a costing estimate of \$15 million?

**The Chair:** Go ahead, Mr. Bowen.

**Mr. Christopher Bowen (Director General, Benefit Programs Directorate, Assessment, Benefit and Service Branch, Canada Revenue Agency):** Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you to the member for the question.

I will actually turn to Department of Finance colleagues to provide some clarity on where the \$15 million has come from, so maybe I will cede it back to Pierre.

• (1120)

**Mr. Adam Chambers:** Specifically, I want to know whether you received data from the CRA in order to come up with the \$15-million estimate.

**Mr. Pierre Leblanc:** The answer is yes. We receive, as part of our ongoing responsibility of advising on policy on the Canada child benefit, detailed administrative data on who receives the Canada child benefit. One of the pieces of information we receive as part of that is the number of eligible children who have died during the year. That's where we get the number of about 1,500 children per year. It's basically by using an average Canada child benefit amount that we arrive at the \$15 million over the five-year period.

**Mr. Adam Chambers:** Thank you very much for that.

For the carbon rebate for businesses, how many people are going to be hired in CRA to carry out this work?

I think I'll have a little bit of...

**The Chair:** I'll build in time for the transitions that are happening, for sure.

**Mr. Adam Chambers:** I appreciate that, Mr. Chair. Thanks for your indulgence.

**Mr. Adnan Khan (Director General, Business Returns Directorate; Assessment, Benefit and Service Branch, Canada Revenue Agency):** The funding required for the implementation and administration of the Canada carbon rebate will be part of a Treasury Board proposal that we'll be making in the coming month. Following the approval of the Treasury Board submission, current year funding will be sought through the upcoming supplementary estimates (B) and (C), so it's still too early, Mr. Chair, to estimate exactly how many full-time equivalents or resources we'll require to administer the Canada carbon rebate.

**Mr. Adam Chambers:** I mean, \$180 million is a fairly significant one-time number.

This is the sixth budget bill in this Parliament, and every time we get a budget bill, the question is always asked, "Well, how many people we are going to hire?"

When we do the projections, we have operating and program costs. I provided the clerk with a notice of motion. I don't intend to move it now because I'm in the spirit of collaboration, and it's not fair to my NDP colleague.

However, the deputy minister of finance and the Treasury Board deputy minister need to show up to this committee to talk about the people plan, because 25% of the government's savings targets are based on shrinking the public service, and yet every single year, when the departmental spending plans come out, they and show that, "Oops, we didn't shrink it. We grew it." It's unclear to me who's actually looking at the people plan in government, so that's a motion that's put on notice, Mr. Chair.

I yield the floor back, but I look forward to collaborating with my colleagues on that issue.

**The Chair:** Thank you, MP Chambers. I do understand from the clerk that members should have received it in their inboxes, so we will look for that.

Now we will go to MP Weiler for the next six minutes.

**Mr. Patrick Weiler (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country, Lib.):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thank you to all our witnesses for being here today to answer questions on Bill C-69.

I will start in part 1 with some of the measures that Ms. Gwyer mentioned in her introduction.

I hope that Ms. Gwyer or other officials can explain to the committee how the new investment tax credits, particularly on hydrogen and clean-tech manufacturing, will interact with the other investment tax credits that are being implemented through the fall economic statement.

**Mr. Maximilian Baylor (Director General, Business Income Tax Division, Department of Finance):** I'll take that one.

Basically, as you indicated, this bill implements two new investment tax credits, the clean hydrogen investment tax credit and the clean technology manufacturing tax credit. Those are part of a suite of six investment tax credits that the government has announced. Those six investment tax credits represent the cornerstone of the government's plan for a clean economy. It has two core objectives.

One is the environmental objective, of course. The second one is very much a competitiveness objective and a response to what we saw in the U.S. with the Inflation Reduction Act. In that regard, these two represent the next two credits in the government plan. That's sort of the big picture.

If you're asking the technical question as to whether they interact and can be claimed together, the answer is that in general, no. You can't stack them. They're complements. Obviously, if a project has two separate pieces of equipment, one can take one credit if it's eligible, and the other can take the other. That's certainly a possibility, but one doesn't stack on top of the other. They complement each other. They cover a range of clean technologies that the government is seeking to encourage to implement its plan.

● (1125)

**Mr. Patrick Weiler:** Thank you.

Like Mr. Chambers, I do appreciate some of the information that was sent in advance about these different measures.

One of them, I think, is very important in looking at the integrity of these investment tax credits. It mentions the clean hydrogen tax credits, which will be done through carbon capture from natural gas, which would be turned into a form of clean hydrogen.

It mentions that the Environment and Climate Change Canada fuel life cycle assessment model is going to be used to assess the life cycle carbon intensity of a hydrogen project, based on its design.

The history in Canada, and also around the world, has shown that carbon capture has vastly underperformed expectations, with some facilities only capturing half of what was expected.

I was hoping that you could explain to this committee how the investment tax credits related to carbon capture—both this one and the one we discussed with the fall economic statement—will ensure integrity for carbon capture in practice, rather than just in theory, before it's built, given that it's an investment tax credit and is provided up front.

**Mr. Maximilian Baylor:** In terms of the clean hydrogen investment tax credit, I think you'll notice that the credit is based on the carbon intensity of the hydrogen produced. Essentially, that looks at the amount of emissions from the beginning of the process, or what is called "cradle to gate". It's essentially the point where the hydrogen leaves the factory. It's the amount of emissions through that entire production process that establishes the credit rate. Of course, the cleaner the hydrogen—i.e., the lower the emissions—the higher the credit rate will be.

To your question, in order to reach a level of carbon intensity that allows you to access the credit or to access it at a higher rate, the carbon capture technology has to be effective. It has to be capturing a very high proportion of the carbon and storing it through approved storage mechanisms.

Essentially, that is what allows you to ensure that the carbon capture technology is working properly. It's stored either underground or in concrete, as in the case for the CCUS tax credit. If that's not effective, then you essentially won't achieve the level of carbon capture intensity that is needed to access the credit.

I think that answers the question.

Was there another part?

**Mr. Patrick Weiler:** Just to follow up on that quickly, what happens if it doesn't perform as well as it's expected to? Is there any way of recapturing this tax credit?

**Mr. Maximilian Baylor:** When you go through the initial project, you have to submit your project plans based on the initial plans for the credit.

I'm just looking for the technical term here, but I'm not....

The project plans are submitted. You go through an Environment and Climate Change Canada fuel life cycle assessment. That allows you to establish the credit rate. That's verified by the government. On that basis, the credit is granted.

Then, after that, there's a five-year period when the carbon emissions are measured and then benchmarked against the actual emissions. If there's a deviation of more than 0.5, then there's effectively a recapture. That basically ensures that the actual performance matches the expected performance. If there are flaws, ultimately, in the actual performance, then there would be a recapture.

• (1130)

**The Chair:** Thank you, MP Weiler. That's your time.

**Mr. Patrick Weiler:** Thank you very much.

**The Chair:** Now we'll go to MP Ste-Marie, please.

[*Translation*]

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

I'd like to welcome all the witnesses and thank the senior officials once again for being here. I also want to join Mr. Chambers and Mr. Weiler in thanking them for the incredible quality of the document introducing Bill C-69, which also includes a questions and answers section. That's very helpful, and we thank them for that.

My first questions will focus on part 2 of Bill C-69. I am very pleased to finally see a budget implementation bill include the measures it contains. They will bring about significant economic changes by starting to address tax fairness and equity. I commend the government for putting that forward.

However, I'm disappointed to see that part 1(b), which deals with international shipping, seeks to exempt Canadian international shipping companies from this global minimum tax of 15%. I can come back to this question a little later, probably with the officials, to discuss this provision, which I will call "the Paul Martin and family clause".

Let's go back to part 2, which is 300 pages long with amendments to the Income Tax Act and other acts. I'm not sure I understand all the intricacies that well.

Corporate income tax doesn't just go to the federal government because part of it goes to the provinces. Alberta and Quebec deal with corporate taxes themselves. However, in part 2, there do not seem to be any provisions for sharing the revenue resulting from this new tax between the federal government and the provinces, or even any mechanisms that would allow Quebec and Ottawa to coordinate their measures to achieve the 15% rate. Is my reading correct?

[*English*]

**Mr. Peter Repetto:** Thank you, Chair, and thank you to the member for those questions.

The member is correct in stating that the legislation for the new global minimum tax act in part 2 of the bill does not contain a mechanism for sharing the revenues from the pillar two global minimum tax between the federal government and provincial governments.

The government indicated in budget 2023 that it intended to share with the provinces some portion of the revenues from the pillar two international tax plan that has been led by the OECD's G20 inclusive framework and is being implemented in Canada.

We don't have any further information at this point in time as to sharing, but we anticipate that the government will be engaging with the provinces in due course on the question of the sharing of revenues from, again, the pillar two international tax reform, which consists of pillar one and the pillar two global minimum tax that is in part 2.

To be clear, pillar one is not in part 2 of this bill.

The other point that I would make in response to the member's question is that the pillar two global minimum tax does take into consideration taxes paid at both the federal and provincial levels by the large multinational enterprises that are within the scope of pillar two in determining the effective tax rate of the multinational in Canada for purposes of applying the global minimum tax.

• (1135)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie:** Thank you very much. The answer is very complete and very clear.

The government has therefore committed to holding discussions with the provinces with a view to transferring at some point some of the revenue generated by this new tax on multinationals. However, there is no mechanism to do so in Bill C-69.

If I understand correctly, Mr. Repetto expects the government to take steps with the provinces to reach an agreement. As long as it does not propose an allocation mechanism, Bill C-69, as it currently stands, will see all the revenue generated by this new tax wind up in federal coffers, and the provinces will not receive any of this revenue, apart from the revenue they already receive. Is that correct?

[English]

**The Chair:** Go ahead, Mr. Repetto.

**Mr. Peter Repetto:** Thank you, Chair.

I'd like to begin by clarifying my previous response, because I want to make sure that there is no misunderstanding.

In budget 2023, the government indicated that it intended to share a portion of the revenues from the two-pillar international tax reform, which consists, again, of not only the pillar two global minimum tax that is in part 2 of this bill, but also pillar one. I just want to clarify that the government didn't indicate in budget 2023 a specific intention to share a portion of the pillar 2 global minimum tax revenues. It was a portion of the two pillars combined. I just want to clarify that.

In response to the member's last question, I can confirm that, once again, part 2 of the bill does not contain a mechanism for sharing the revenues from pillar two with the provinces.

Thank you.

[Translation]

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

**Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie:** Thank you very much.

[English]

**The Chair:** Now we'll go to MP Davies, please.

**Mr. Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thank you to the witnesses for being here.

I'd like to start with division 3 of part 4, which authorizes the making of payments to the provinces respecting "a national program for providing food in schools". Is there someone here who can answer that?

**Ms. Lindsay Gwyer:** We're here on parts 1 to 3.

**Mr. Don Davies:** All of you here are just...?

**Ms. Lindsay Gwyer:** I think there will be other people here at a later time on part 4.

**Mr. Don Davies:** Okay. Thank you. I'll leave it at that.

I'll turn, then, to the global minimum tax. Can you confirm how much additional revenue the global minimum tax is expected to generate in Canada?

**Mr. David Messier (Director, International Taxation Section, Business Income Tax Division, Department of Finance):** Yes.

Budget 2024 presented updated estimates of the projected revenue that we expect will be raised from pillar two. Over the three-year period from 2026-27 to 2028-29, we estimate that the government will raise around \$6.6 billion in revenues from pillar two.

**Mr. Don Davies:** Thank you.

It's my understanding that U.S. Treasury Secretary Janet Yellen has announced that she is working to carve out an allowance for the U.S. research and development tax credit. Is Canada seeking any similar exemption, to your knowledge?

• (1140)

**Mr. David Messier:** To my knowledge, our legislation follows the legislation that has been developed at the OECD. We're participating in these discussions, but no agreement has been reached so far, so it's not part of the law.

**Mr. Don Davies:** Thank you.

Clause 16 in part 1 includes provisions to deny income tax deductions "for expenses incurred with respect to non-compliant short-term rentals". I think you touched on that.

Do you have any estimate of the value of income tax deductions that are expected to be denied to non-compliant short-term rentals?

**Ms. Lindsay Gwyer:** We don't have that information at this time. The rules are designed to try to motivate people who are operating non-compliant short-term rentals—that's short-term rentals that are not compliant with the local laws in their province or municipality—to return those housing units to the long-term supply. It's not.... It's difficult at this point to say whether people will continue to operate those non-compliant short-term rentals—

**Mr. Don Davies:** It's a compliance-generating measure, not a revenue....

**Ms. Lindsay Gwyer:** Yes, that's right. It's not.... There's no specific revenue estimate.

**Mr. Don Davies:** Does the department have any estimate about the value of the tax credits for those that are non-compliant now?

**Ms. Lindsay Gwyer:** It's not a tax credit per se. It's just that right now, if they're operating a business, they would be entitled to just the regular deductions that anyone who's operating a business or earning income from property is entitled to—

**Mr. Don Davies:** I'll rephrase it. Do you have any value of the deductions that are being inappropriately claimed?

**Ms. Lindsay Gwyer:** We don't have that information now.

Again, it's really hard to estimate the number of short-term rentals that are non-compliant, because it is based on municipal and provincial laws and it's also an area where many provinces and municipalities are currently in the process of putting in place those restrictions on short-term rentals. At this point, we don't have a lot of information to be able to estimate those amounts.

**Mr. Don Davies:** Okay. Thank you.

In terms of the volunteer firefighters and search and rescue volunteer tax credits, do you have an estimate of the total value of these tax credits and approximately how many Canadians might qualify for them in a given year?

**Mr. Pierre Leblanc:** We estimate that this measure would generate \$105 million in extra tax relief over the 2023-24 to 2028-29 period, or about \$20 million a year. Currently, about 44,000 individuals claim the volunteer firefighters' tax credit and another 6,000 claim the search and rescue volunteers' tax credit. There might be some increase from that, but that gives you a sense of the current claimants of these credits.

**Mr. Don Davies:** Thank you.

Turning to the refundable income tax credit to qualifying businesses for certain “clean hydrogen projects” and clean-tech manufacturing, I know that in December of last year the Department of Finance released draft legislation for the clean hydrogen investment tax credit and the tech manufacturing tax credit.

What changes, if any, were made to the draft legislation based on consultations with stakeholders? Was there anything significant?

**Mr. Maximilian Baylor:** Maybe I will start with the clean technology manufacturing investment tax credit and then I will let my colleague take clean hydrogen. There was a fair bit for clean hydrogen.

On clean technology manufacturing, there weren't many changes. I think one of the key things that came out of the consultations and what we heard was about polycrystalline silicon and the difficulties and the lack of clarity there. Changes in that regard to allow polycrystalline silicon, mostly relating to copper, were announced in budget 2024, but those measures aren't part of this bill.

I will let my colleague answer on clean hydrogen, because there were a fair number of changes and he's more familiar with them.

**Mr. Don Davies:** Do I get credit for all the steps I'm generating?

**The Chair:** It's not 10,000 yet, but we're working on that.

• (1145)

**Mr. Tyler Minty (Director, Industrial Decarbonisation Taxation, Department of Finance):** Thank you for the question.

I'm Tyler Minty, director of the business income tax division.

With regard to the high-level design of the investment tax credit, the ITC, there were no changes to the initial design details that were provided in budget 2023 and then followed up in the fall economic statement of 2023.

There were a number of technical adjustments that really don't relate to the high-level design of the tax credit, as well as additional details in terms of administration, the compliance period and that type of thing.

**Mr. Don Davies:** Obviously these tax credits are intended to help Canada meet our overall strategy for reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

Is there any estimate of what impact these measures may have over time in that regard?

**Mr. Maximilian Baylor:** I can take that one.

As you indicated, that is clearly the intent of these tax credits.

In the government's approach for estimating emissions, as you're probably aware, every year they put out the emissions projection for the economy. It takes into account the suite of measures that the government has put forward to achieve its objectives, and those projections look at those suites of measures.

These investment tax credits are part of those suites and are therefore entrenched in those projections.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Thank you, MP Davies.

Members and witnesses, we're moving into our second round. Times are a little different in this round.

MP Lawrence, go ahead for the next five minutes, please.

**Mr. Philip Lawrence (Northumberland—Peterborough South, CPC):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

We have heard from the senior deputy governor of the Bank of Canada, Carolyn Rogers. We have heard from Bill Morneau, John Manly, the C.D. Howe Institute, the Fraser Institute and Dr. Ian Lee, among many others, about Canada's productivity crisis.

I would like to go over these three sections. Maybe you could quickly point out to me which sections will improve our GDP and by how much you expect GDP per capita to improve.

We will start with section 1. Could someone tell me which sections will improve our productivity?

**Mr. Maximilian Baylor:** I will start with a broad response.

The investment tax credits are meant to address investment and competitiveness and to basically enhance the competitiveness of the economy.

**Mr. Philip Lawrence:** Thank you for that.

Could you table with the committee any analysis that your department has performed demonstrating that these ITCs will improve productivity?

**Mr. Maximilian Baylor:** We don't have specific numbers. I can see what we can....

**Mr. Philip Lawrence:** We will move on.

Thank you, sir.

**Mr. Maximilian Baylor:** I'm sorry.

**Mr. Philip Lawrence:** With respect to part 2, how much will the implementation of part 2 improve Canada's productivity?

**Ms. Lindsay Gwyer:** We don't have specific numbers on part 2. It's a measure, as Peter explained, that's something being done on a global basis along with our peers. It's really about ensuring the competitiveness of Canada's tax system in terms of Canadian companies and ensuring that Canada can collect its appropriate share of tax in that context.

**Mr. Philip Lawrence:** I understand. Its goal is not to increase productivity.

**Ms. Lindsay Gwyer:** I think that's a fair statement.

**Mr. Philip Lawrence:** Thank you.

In part 3, what provisions will improve our productivity, and by how much?

[Translation]

**Mr. Gervais Coulombe:** Thank you for the question.

Part 3 essentially contains measures to generate additional tax revenue. For example, measures on tobacco and vaping products will raise up to \$1.6 billion. To my knowledge, there are no measures specifically aimed at increasing productivity.

**Mr. Philip Lawrence:** Okay.

[English]

I think it's fair to say that this is not the intent. That's fine.

I want to move on from there to talk a little bit about part 2, about the global minimum tax. I know that Mr. Davies asked this, but I didn't quite catch it. What was the total revenue to be gained from part 2?

• (1150)

**Mr. David Messier:** The total revenue was \$6.6 billion over a three-year period.

**Mr. Philip Lawrence:** *Merci.*

Perhaps I can follow up on that as well. First, just so I understand, what's the estimated number of Canadian companies that will be caught by this who are sheltering profits in jurisdictions that have less than a 15% tax rate? How many Canadian companies do you expect to be caught by this provision?

**Mr. David Messier:** The global minimum tax has actually two components. One would target low tax revenues that are reported outside of Canada and another would apply to low tax revenue earned in Canada. It would apply as well to Canadian companies, Canadian multinational companies. As foreign companies that have operations in Canada, this component would apply to the foreign —

**Mr. Philip Lawrence:** Thank you for that clarification.

How many Canadian companies will be caught by that and how many other multinationals operating in Canada will be caught by the provision? If you don't have the number, you can table it with the committee as well.

**Mr. David Messier:** We don't have the precise number, because the number of companies that would be caught by the rule would depend on the particular situation of every corporation. The rules apply to groups that have more than—

**Mr. Philip Lawrence:** I apologize. My time is running out. I can see that the chair is getting ready.

Could you give us your estimates of the Canadian companies that will be caught by that? You can table it with the committee. That's fine.

There's another part that I want to ask about really quickly. We're talking about capturing tax evasion here. That is a laudable effort, but could the CRA please answer how many dollars have been collected from the Panama papers and how many convictions there have been?

**Mr. David Messier:** If I can just answer your previous question, we estimate that there are around 200 Canadian multinationals that are above the 750-million euro threshold for being in scope of the global minimum tax.

[Translation]

**Ms. Priceela Pursun (Director General, International and Large Business Directorate, Compliance Programs Branch, Canada Revenue Agency):** Thank you for the question. I'm Priceela Pursun, director general of the International and Large Business Directorate at the Canada Revenue Agency. I'm sorry, but the person responsible for the matter you are interested in is absent today.

[English]

**Mr. Philip Lawrence:** Would you mind tabling that with the committee and sending us a note on that?

**Ms. Priceela Pursun:** Certainly.

**Mr. Philip Lawrence:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you, MP Lawrence. That's the time.

We will now go to PS Turnbull.

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull (Whitby, Lib.):** Thanks, Chair.

Thanks to all the witnesses for being here today.

I have a motion to move from the floor. I'm sorry for the slight interruption, but I'm hoping that we can deal with it very swiftly and get back to the testimony that is so important to the pre-study that we're doing.

I'll read it into the record:

As it relates to the committee's future business, it be agreed that:

- i. the committee dedicate its meeting on Thursday, May 9th, 2024, to hearing from the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, and officials, on the subject matter study of Bill C-69;
- ii. the committee dedicate its regular meetings on May 9th, 21st and 23rd, 2024, to consideration of the subject matter study of Bill C-69, barring referral of the bill to committee; and that all evidence gathered as part of the pre-study be considered as evidence in the committee's full study of the bill, once referred to committee;
- iii. any amendments to the bill be submitted no later than 5:00 PM EST on Thursday, May 23rd, 2024;

iv. clause-by-clause consideration of the bill start no later than 12:00 PM EST on May 27th, 2024, and that the chair be empowered to set up extended hours and request additional House resources on that day; if the committee has not completed clause-by-clause consideration of the bill by 11:00 AM on May 28th, 2024, 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 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;

v. following the completion of the study of Bill C-69, the committee dedicate no less than two meetings on its study on the financialization of housing, followed by no less than two meetings to consider the draft report on the current state of play on green finance, green investment, transition finance and transparency, standards and taxonomy;

vi. the committee dedicate its regular meetings on the week of June 17th, 2024, on the committee's study on inflation in the current Canadian economy.

I will speak to that. I've sent it to the clerk, Chair, in both official languages.

We tried to schedule the rest of our meetings in the agenda pre-committee meeting. I note that the chair hasn't been able to report anything back, so we did not achieve consensus. Really, we're hoping to take a very collaborative approach and work with all parties. Unfortunately, we've seen that the Conservatives are not willing to collaborate. Yesterday, we saw the Conservatives in the House move an amendment to delay the second reading of the budget implementation act. I'm bringing this motion forward today because the budget implementation act needs to be the top priority, and I believe that Canadians are truly counting on us.

I believe very strongly that this budget includes many measures that Canadians really need right now. The national school food program is just one of many that I know Mr. Davies and I and many others have worked on for quite a number of years. We're finally seeing the commitment to a billion dollars over five years. Feeding an additional 400,000 kids per year is truly gratifying to see in this year's BIA. We need to get that accomplished. Canadian families certainly are relying on us.

The Conservatives stand up every day in the House and cite increasing food bank lineups. I think it's pretty inconsistent with the position that they seem to be purporting to hold, which is that somehow they care about families who are suffering from food insecurity but are then not supporting a budget that's attempting to feed 400,000 more kids in Canada.

● (1155)

We know that the investment tax credits in this budget, as we've already heard this morning—the clean tech manufacturing ITC and the clean hydrogen ITC—are things that industry is asking for. They have been asking for us to fast-track these ITCs. They need predictable timelines for their implementation. Many of the large projects to decarbonize our economy are relying on those ITCs to move forward.

On research funding, I was in my riding and met with researchers at the Ontario Tech University, which is my local university. The researchers were ecstatic about the \$3.5 billion for science and research that is in this budget, the tri-council funding, the research infrastructure, and the additional dollars for grads, post-grads and fellows.

Those are things that Canadian researchers are counting on. They'll prevent brain drain in our economy. These things have been cited for quite some time. Many Conservative members have actually advocated to address brain drain in this country. I hope that we're aligned on wanting to get those budget measures through the committee and back to the House as soon as possible.

With respect to housing, I talked to a senior from my riding yesterday who's concerned about rental construction and our need for more affordable rental housing. There is a significant amount of financing for more rental construction in this budget. There are also infrastructure dollars to help municipalities and provinces that are struggling to fund some of the infrastructure for new housing development.

The budget includes the Canada carbon rebate for small businesses. I will note that the Canadian Federation of Independent Business was very vocal about this and the Conservatives were very vocal about it, yet they're going to stand against a budget that will get those returns back to small businesses across the country. I note that the number is 600,000.

There is a major investment in artificial intelligence of \$2.4 billion in this budget. It proposes to increase productivity across Canada, and it will have a significant impact in future years.

I will also just note quickly that the employee ownership trust is another measure that's in here. The incentives are included in this year's BIA. They're essential for ensuring that there's an uptake of that option, that succession model that will allow owners to sell to their employees. It is an exceptional measure for the redistribution of wealth in a way that also protects Canadian businesses.

Last, I also will just say that between our last meeting and this meeting, I ensured that I kept my word to the committee. I have secured the Deputy Prime Minister to come to the committee on Thursday for an hour of testimony. I truly hope that we can dispense with this motion quickly so that we don't jeopardize that appearance and can hear the important testimony from our Minister of Finance, who's ultimately accountable for this budget.

Thank you, Mr. Chair, for indulging me. I look forward to dispensing with this motion quickly.

● (1200)

**The Chair:** Thank you, PS Turnbull.

I do have a speaking list. I have MP Lawrence, MP Dzerowicz, MP Ste-Marie and MP Chambers.

**Mr. Philip Lawrence:** Thank you.

I'm disappointed that this heavy-handed motion has been brought forward by the Liberals.

I think in the most recent fall economic statement, while certainly pointing out the flaws, Conservatives were co-operative. In this budget, we moved right through it. I'm sure that if Canadians saw the first couple of rounds of questions, they would have seen very thoughtful questions that were there to help Canadians.

I believe that in most cases, it's best that cooler heads prevail. What I would suggest, with unanimous consent of the committee, is that we adjourn this debate until the end of the meeting so that we can hear from these very hard-working, brilliant and professional members of our civil service.

**The Chair:** I heard a no.

I do see hands up.

MP Dzerowicz, is your hand still up? You don't know. I saw you say no.

It's MP Ste-Marie, then.

[*Translation*]

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

I'm really disappointed with this motion. I find that it's disrupting the work that the Standing Committee on Finance must do on Bill C-69. As Mr. Turnbull said, the Subcommittee on Agenda and Procedure has not been able to come to an agreement. Basically, I think we could try to work on a motion that would focus solely on Bill C-69. As for what happens next, there would be other discussions.

The number of hours proposed for the study of Bill C-69 is really insufficient. In fact, if I understand correctly, we're going to have very little time today to ask the senior officials questions on parts 1 to 3 of the bill. Personally, I still have a lot of questions to ask. In my opinion, even if we didn't debate this motion, we could run out of time, which means that we would not have the answers to all our questions.

Only one hour to study part 4 is clearly not enough. We need to take the time to do things right. I would remind my colleagues that part 4 implements an open banking system. This is something new, and we need to take the time to reflect on it. In addition, what the government is proposing goes against the wishes of the Canadian Bankers Association and a number of financial institutions, if I'm not mistaken.

This bill is not aligned with the laws of the various provinces. To my knowledge, no consultations have taken place between the government or the departments and their counterparts in Quebec and the provinces. If they did happen, it was very recently. We have a lot of questions about that. In addition, a number of things need to be improved. Several details seem technical, but they will have major repercussions.

I'll give you an example. There's a bank that doesn't call itself a bank in Alberta, and it's owned by the provincial government, the Alberta government. If that institution wanted to be part of open banking, it would have to come under federal jurisdiction, at least for the part about open banking. We have to wonder why anyone would want to duplicate legal services and legal advice. That's a major concern.

It's the same thing with credit unions. If memory serves, in British Columbia, lawmakers didn't allow credit unions to come under federal jurisdiction. What about that part? Are we creating a two-tiered open banking system, that is to say for banks under federal jurisdiction and for other institutions under provincial jurisdiction? We have a lot of concerns about that. So I'm going to have a lot of questions for the officials on this. In addition, the committee is going to have to call many witnesses.

The committee must proceed with the study of a mammoth 660-page bill that affects a number of acts, makes a lot of amendments and contains a number of elements to be covered. Are we saying that we're going to finish studying the bill this week, hear from witnesses for two two-hour periods and move to clause-by-clause consideration immediately afterwards? In my opinion, that's woefully inadequate.

During the pandemic, the government urged us to pass bills. We did it on the fly, but there were a lot of mistakes. A number of things had to be corrected because the committee didn't have the time it needed to do its work properly.

This bill is 660 pages of jargon that's incomprehensible to the average person. It will take time for all stakeholders in society to read it, to reflect on it and to see whether it meets their expectations or causes problems. Therefore, we have to give all stakeholders a little time so that they can get an idea of the bill and contact us individually to share their concerns with us.

There's not enough time allotted, obviously. Let's take the example of Bill C-59, Fall Economic Statement Implementation Act, 2023, which wasn't as significant. We spent 20 hours hearing from witnesses. Four hours are being proposed now for Bill C-69. The officials will have been here for an hour, maybe a little longer, if we can get through this. A single hour to study part 4 is clearly not enough.

• (1205)

I also want to remind you that, recently, the Minister of Finance has spent only one hour at committee when she comes. However, Mr. Morneau very often stayed two hours to answer our questions. There are so many things to deal with in this bill. One hour is not enough time to ask questions.

In my opinion, it will take much longer than what's being proposed to properly study Bill C-69, improve it and ensure that everything is in order. We had 20 hours to question witnesses on Bill C-59, but only four hours have been proposed for Bill C-69. That's unacceptable.

The minister should come for two hours, as Mr. Morneau did most of the time, if I'm not mistaken. We would also have to extend the deadline in order to do our work properly, which would mean holding meetings during constituency week, I believe. No one wants to do that, but if the government is in such a hurry, we will have to do it. We will also need to have additional meetings at least a week later to make sure that all stakeholders in the economy have had time to take note of the 660 highly complex pages of the bill, that everything is in order and that there's no distortion. Then, of course, we will have to withdraw what comes after the study of Bill C-69 if we pass this motion.

So I have a lot of reservations about this motion. In my opinion, it's completely unacceptable in its current form and I won't be able to support it. In fact, I find it very cavalier to propose such a motion, which I would describe as a gag order, to take up the debate without warning while the senior officials are here to answer our questions. We have to react to it immediately, as we were unable to read it in advance.

Those are my initial comments. I'm sure I will have more.

• (1210)

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

[*English*]

I have MPs Chambers, Dzerowicz, Morantz, Lawrence and Davies.

**Mr. Adam Chambers:** Thanks very much, Mr. Chair.

I appreciate the spirit of collaboration the parliamentary secretary showed by showing up to committee and not sharing his motion in advance with the members. That's very, very collaborative.

Obviously, we're not going to agree to the motion as it's drafted in its current form. We've been doing this every single year. Wisdom has been chasing this government for a very long time; it just hasn't caught up with it yet. We do this every single year. We're in the same position. If you want MP Rick Perkins to come in to talk about elvers for another 40 hours, he's on deck. That's no problem. We can make that happen.

However, in the interest of trying to get something done, why don't we park the clause-by-clause date? You can bring it back later. If you want to bring it back on Thursday, that's fine. If you strike that from the motion right now, we can continue with our meeting and we can revisit that on Thursday. We can revisit it when we get back. That would be acceptable, at least to me; I won't speak on behalf of my colleagues.

I will just mention getting lectured about people visiting food banks. Stats Canada is going to release their household income survey in probably a week, and I'm not really sure you're going to want to be patting yourselves on the back for the work the government's done, because the survey is going to show that tens of thousands of people are falling below the poverty line. I don't really think lecturing people on food bank lines is a winning strategy for you.

Of course, we also know that one of the requests we've had at this committee is to have Governor Carney show up. He was at a

Senate committee last week, so apparently it's okay for him to appear at the Senate committee. If we were to arrange for Governor Carney to come here, I think we would be able to move this motion forward. If that's acceptable to the government, they'll let us know.

In the interest of time and with the nice officials we have here, if we struck the clause-by-clause end date, we could move on. I'm not really sure that's going to be possible, so we'll get Rick Perkins all dialed up and ready to come in to talk about elvers.

Thanks, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Thank you, MP Chambers.

I have MPs Dzerowicz, Morantz, Lawrence and Davies.

**Ms. Julie Dzerowicz (Davenport, Lib.):** Mr. Chair, if you could put me at the end of the list, I would like to hear from my other colleagues first.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Okay. Thank you, MP Dzerowicz.

I have MP Morantz next, and then MPs Lawrence, Davies and Dzerowicz.

**Mr. Marty Morantz (Charleswood—St. James—Assiniboia—Headingley, CPC):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Well, I have to say that it's very disappointing to have this motion thrust upon us in the middle of our consideration of Bill C-69. It's an attempt to program the rest of our meetings before the summer break, literally to the end of June, basically.

Really, what I'm concerned about is that we have I don't know how many officials here. For the people watching, Mr. Chair, do you know how many officials are here from the finance department?

Can I ask you, Ms. Gwyer, how many of your officials are here in the room?

**Ms. Lindsay Gwyer:** I think there are about eight or so.

**Mr. Marty Morantz:** How many?

**Ms. Lindsay Gwyer:** I think there are maybe eight or 10 or so from the finance department.

**Mr. Marty Morantz:** There are eight or 10 finance officials here to answer questions on a bill.

Again, for all the many people who are watching this meeting right now, I think it's important for them to understand that this bill is another omnibus budget bill from this government. It's 659 pages long. It has 468 clauses. This committee meets roughly only twice a week for two hours, so we need every possible moment to examine this document and/or ask the questions that people expect us to ask. We have all these excellent officials here today who have the answers to our questions, and now we've been stopped from asking them, over a self-centred, overbearing, centrally planned Liberal motion that basically tries to neuter our ability to ask questions about this massive document.

It's very, very disappointing, Mr. Chair, and I certainly echo the comments of all of my colleagues.

I think one of the things that the Liberal members.... Maybe because Mr. Turnbull is new to this committee, he's forgotten that more people voted for Conservatives in both the 2019 and the 2021 elections than for Liberals and that in fact they're not a majority government. They're a minority government, and they can't just dictate to the committee what it is we're going to study and when we're going to study it. That has to be worked out.

If there is some reason that they can't modify this motion to come to an acceptable arrangement, I think that's on them. They need to work in the spirit of collaboration and reach across the aisle, as Conservatives do every day, but they're just not willing to. They have deluded themselves into thinking that they're still a majority government, but they're not, and of course they won't be government much longer—everyone knows that—so they're bringing in these heavy-handed motions to try to map out the agenda for their government in their dying days to try to basically get through as much harmful legislation for Canadians as they possibly can.

I have a lot of questions. I have questions about the small business rebate. I have questions about the journalism tax rebate, the short-term rental adjustments, the underused housing tax and the alternative minimum tax. However, I'm being basically prevented from asking my questions of officials because of this heavy-handed motion.

Those are basically my comments, Mr. Chair. I think that Canadians watching will be as appalled as I am at the heavy-handed tactics of the Liberal members on this committee and will understand that they are not provided with the benefits of having their elected officials ask questions of finance officials about this 659-page omnibus budget.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

• (1215)

**The Chair:** Thank you, MP Morantz.

I have MP Lawrence and then MP Davies and MP Dzerowicz.

**Mr. Philip Lawrence:** I have a quick technical question for the clerk.

If I make a motion to adjourn, I still get the floor even if I'm unsuccessful. I get to continue. Is that correct?

**The Chair:** On a motion to adjourn, there is no debate. It will go directly to a vote.

**Mr. Philip Lawrence:** No, I mean after the vote: Do I get the floor back? I'm sorry if I didn't clarify.

**The Chair:** If it were defeated, yes, you would get the floor back, because you have the floor.

**Mr. Philip Lawrence:** Thank you.

I move to adjourn the debate and I ask for a recorded vote, please.

**The Chair:** We'll have a recorded vote.

(Motion negated: nays 6; yeas 5)

**Mr. Philip Lawrence:** I'll carry on—

**Mr. Adam Chambers:** I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** We have a point of order.

**Mr. Adam Chambers:** There's a lot of intellectual capacity in this room right now. I recommend that we allow our witnesses the opportunity to leave if they choose.

**The Chair:** I think we're going to keep the officials here.

Go ahead.

**Mr. Philip Lawrence:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I am really disappointed that the Liberals did not choose to circulate the motion beforehand. In having discussions and negotiations before with Mr. Terry Beech and Ms. Bendayan—as well as Mr. Baker, I might add—I've never had that happen, not once in about two years on this committee now.

In fact, once the chair and I got in a bit of a tiff and he said to me, "You have my phone number. Give me a call." Maybe Mr. Turnbull simply didn't have our phone numbers, but I think that's probably not correct.

He did not even give us a chance to circulate that motion, and now we're wasting time. We've proven through that vote on the adjournment that neither the NDP nor the Liberals are serious about doing the people's business. Instead, they want to bicker about the schedule on the time of our civil servants.

As Mr. Chambers said, there is a lot of intellectual capacity over there, and I would like to see their time spent in a more value way than in hearing the machinations, discussions and arguments of parliamentarians over relatively trivial matters such as scheduling.

The reality is that the Conservatives have been constructive, if not co-operative. On the fall economic statement, I don't remember a budget bill passing as quickly as that one did. I can't remember one in recent history, even going back to majority governments. Even though Conservatives did not agree, we certainly did our democratic duty by pointing out the weaknesses, and we were constructive if not co-operative, as I said.

This motion is definitely striking a different tone, and of course it will have consequences. There is just no way that.... It has certainly the trust I had in building trust with the members on the other side.

Just to put some context to the issue of where we are and why the Conservatives are extremely skeptical about the impact of this budget, it's because the Liberal government didn't just get elected today. The Liberals aren't in opposition. They've been in government for the last nine years, and we've seen an economic lost decade. That means zero economic growth per capita. That is a scary place to be.

That means our standard of living has not increased in 10 years. Sure, they'll point to the pandemic and other issues as to why this should have happened, but this isn't the case in many of our direct comparables. For example, in the United States, the GDP per capita has gone up 50%, while ours has gone up a paltry 4%, so we're in the midst of a lost decade here.

We have record food bank usage and we have people who are struggling to get by. As I said, these Liberals didn't get elected last week; it's been nine years.

I beseech them to just go out and talk to their constituents. How many of them think they're better off than they were in 2015? I'll tell you that if I walk around my neighbourhood, there won't be many people who say, "Yes, I'm doing better than in 2015", and I'm not being partisan. This is just the reality of it.

Under Prime Minister Harper, we had balanced budgets, we had housing that cost literally half as much, we had rentals that were half as much, we had food prices that were under control and we had a much stronger economy. We actually had economic growth, whereas under this Liberal government, we've seen surging food bank usage.

As Mr. Chambers alluded to, we have more and more statistics coming in about the challenges Canadians have. We can certainly look at statistics, but I don't even need to look at the numbers that would, no doubt, validate the anecdotal evidence.

However, when I go out in the constituency and I talk to folks, I can't tell you how many heartbreaking stories—and I mean this in all seriousness—I have to hear about person after person who has simply more month than money, whether it be the single mom who has to use a food bank, even though she has a job—and I've had those conversations—or the young couple who got married and, with great excitement, bought a house, getting ready to start their family—but then their mortgage went from a little shy of \$3,000 a month to \$9,000 a month, and they had to sell their house and basically go to zero again on their finances for a house.

• (1220)

Canadians are struggling out there. You guys talk about how this budget is going to be this magic panacea, but you've done that for nine years now. I have heard how budget 2022 or budget 2021 or the budget in 2016, 2017 or 2018 was going to magically solve all of Canada's problems. Well, guess what? We're here now. Look outside. Times are tough.

Unemployment is creeping up steadily. It's up to 6.1% and climbing. Inflation still remains outside the Bank of Canada's set range. So we have high inflation. We have interest rates that have climbed to record high levels and remain high, and I can't believe we actually haven't had more coverage or more questions about how the Governor of the Bank of Canada—or its board, more correctly—was telling us that he hasn't decided whether interest rates will go up or down, but the Prime Minister is saying he guarantees that interest rates will come down.

That should not happen in a G7 country. You shouldn't have the leader of the executive telling the independent central bank what it's going to do. That just should not happen, and we still haven't

received, and I haven't received, an explanation. I've asked the government about this with respect to who is right—the Governor of the Bank of Canada or the Prime Minister—and I have still not received an accurate explanation.

I'm fresh off the prayer breakfast this morning. It was a great event, and I heard the Prime Minister's remarks and of course those of the leader of the opposition, as well as those of some other notable individuals. I'm actually taken by some of the humility the Prime Minister showed at the prayer breakfast and I wish some of his MPs would exemplify some of the words the Prime Minister brought to the prayer breakfast with respect to realizing that we need co-operation, that this is teamwork and that we are in troubled waters.

As the Prime Minister said at the prayer breakfast, we are in troubled waters. We are facing significant challenges, whether they be the affordability crisis or climate change, and they require teamwork, but in this instance we've been given an ultimatum motion. I don't know what else to call it. It's certainly heavy-handed, and as I said, I've been negotiating and working on negotiating for the better part of two years now through many different budget bills, and I've never seen this. I've never seen the government plop something on the desk and say, "Take it or leave it."

We're not asking for anything extraordinary here. We just want to talk to the officials who have come prepared. They always give excellent testimony and they always do their best, and it's very enlightening for me to have those discussions. That's all that Conservatives want to get accomplished. We'll work away at this. We still have many hours of testimony to hear. There's no need for this heavy-handed motion. We can work together, negotiate a solution and find a way so that Conservatives can be the voice of the voiceless, those single moms who are struggling to get by, those business owners who are seeing their lifetime of hard work evaporate in front of their faces and those homeowners who have seen their mortgage payments go up sometimes two or three times.

We need to get that out, and I don't apologize for that. We need to be the voice for those who are struggling, the most vulnerable in our society, but we can do it in a constructive way. This heavy-handed technique is just not helpful. It limits debate. It limits our ability to fight for those who aren't in Ottawa.

I was elected by the 100,000 folks from Northumberland—Peterborough South, soon to be Northumberland—Clarke, and I'm here to represent them. I said that Conservatives have been constructive throughout the fall economic statement, and we have been constructive here.

• (1225)

We were having a great discussion. I very much appreciate some of my colleagues' questions with respect to the global minimum tax. I think it's a rich area for discussion and debate. Quite frankly, it's a technical discussion that requires a lot of the expertise we have here today in order to inform Canadians, because most folks don't get up in the morning and think, "You know what? What I'm going to talk about today is a global minimum tax regime." However, it would certainly have an impact on our ability to fund social programs. It would also have an effect on our economy. Canadians need to be more aware of these issues. Who better to bring to that discussion than some of our terrific civil servants, who are able to carry that discussion?

Specifically, if this meeting hadn't been ambushed by the Liberals' heavy-handed motion and if we had been given the opportunity to ask more questions, I would have loved to talk a bit more about the Panama papers and the CRA's failure to fully investigate and convict some of Canada's most egregious tax evaders. In a lot of ways, journalists did a lot of the work of the Canada Revenue Agency. While this government seems intent on getting their pound of salt—and I might say quite successfully—from the middle class, the super-wealthy, under this Liberal government over the last nine years, have done quite well. They continue to do quite well, whether it be by moving dollars offshore or, as the Prime Minister has done, by putting their money in trust funds to avoid higher rates of taxation.

We could have had a very substantive discussion about the bill. Quite frankly, I really enjoy some of the technical discussions and getting into the weeds. I know other members do. It's getting underneath the hood, finding out what is wrong and coming up with specific technical answers with respect to some of these budgetary moments.

Another area I would have loved to talk about is the employee ownership trust tax exemption. I think the employee ownership trust is, at least in theory and the big picture, a very good idea. It's been implemented in a number of countries around the world, such as the United States and the United Kingdom, I believe, with pretty good results. The whole idea behind that is to encourage business owners and allow businesses to flourish by having their business go on to those who have sweated, toiled and built the business into what it is. It has generally, as an approach, had conservative, liberal and socialist support because it hits on many different elements. I can remember learning, back in my MBA, that the likelihood of a business making it from one generation to the next is actually very low. I think it's around 20%. To make it to a third generation is actually in the single digits. Allowing employees to have ownership is beneficial both to the business owner and to the employees as they go forward.

I would have loved a technical discussion about that. Unfortunately, the technical briefing—which I know our civil servants worked very hard on—came right on the heels of our doing clause-by-clause study for the fall economic statement, so I wasn't able to dig into the BIA much in the technical briefing. Therefore, I was very much looking forward to the testimony today and to digging into those commentaries so that I could do my job as a member of

the finance committee and a parliamentarian and fully understand these provisions and be able to explain them.

The other area I'm looking forward to talking about—and I don't believe it's in part 1, 2 or 3—is the Canadian entrepreneurs' incentive with the lifetime capital gains exemption.

• (1230)

What this adds is an additional portion of reducing it from an inclusion rate, or I guess a future inclusion rate—we'll see when the capital gains bill comes in. This contemplates that being in place, reducing it from 66% to 33%, but has a number of different criteria on that. I was curious as to how that would actually be technically input as well.

All this is to say, Mr. Chair, that I'm extremely disappointed in the parliamentary secretary. Maybe he's new to this, Chair, and just doesn't understand how this can work and that we can collaborate. I would put in front of him the references of Mr. Terry Beech and also maybe even the deputy leader and Minister of Finance, who, yesterday in question period, actually was quite kind and said that she respected me. She did, then, say something disrespectful about me, but she did say that she respected me. Maybe he could talk to his boss about what she thinks of me and what type of negotiating partner I could be. This motion didn't even give the Conservatives an option to negotiate.

I would be remiss, too, if I didn't talk a little bit about the NDP. I was very pleased and, I guess, maybe proud of the relationship I had with Mr. Blaikie, and hopefully he would say the same thing about me. Although we disagreed on about 97% of everything, especially when it came to economics, he was always conducting himself honourably. We certainly had some lengthy negotiations. Those didn't all come to fruition, but he was always up front with me. Certainly I felt as though he wanted to do things the right way.

I don't really know Mr. Davies. I know his reputation of being a solid parliamentarian. I'm a little surprised that Mr. Davies didn't come and talk to us about this motion before. Clearly the NDP and the Liberals have already talked about it. They are coalition partners. I did know Mr. Blaikie to actually be quite independent, and he would not fall hook, line and sinker for what the Liberals were feeding him. I'm a little challenged by the fact that Mr. Davies didn't come to us with a discussion before the fact so that we wouldn't have had to go from zero to 90.

Quite frankly, I guess I could comprehend the actions of both the NDP and the Liberals if the Conservatives were being obstructionist, and perhaps they felt in their own way that it was essential for them to move forward with this and that the Conservatives would obstruct.

The fall economic statement was both constructive.... We just have to look at the clause-by-clause study, where, at Mr. Davies' request, we actually started grouping the clauses and expediting them. We were under no obligation to do so. Actually, when you look back at the time on debate during clause-by-clause consideration, the Conservatives actually had the lowest amount of time of all the parties, with the exception of the Bloc Québécois. We were actually very expedient in making our comments and expressing our disappointment with the fall economic statement while, once again, being constructive.

The Conservatives are very concerned. We also heard from the Bloc Québécois that those parties not in a coalition government want the opportunity to explain to the Canadian people the challenges around this budget.

As I said, I sometimes feel that we are in an alternative universe, that the Liberals somehow believe this is the first day they have to govern, every day, like in *Groundhog Day*. This is going to be the day. This is going to be the budget bill. This is going to be the thing that changes.

Well, guys, we keep going further into debt. Our GDP doesn't keep growing. We don't keep hitting our climate change targets, except for, I know, during the pandemic when the economy was shut down, guys. If you want that, it's yours.

● (1235)

Whether it be climate change, whether it be food bank usage, whether it be the GDP or whether it be growth, we continue to go down. Things get worse and worse and worse and worse and worse. Then you come to us and say, "Why don't you help us make it worse faster, Mr. Lawrence? Why don't you do that?"

My apologies to the interpreters. I get a little excited.

Look at your record. Your record is abysmal. Philip Cross, noted statistician and former head of Statistics Canada, said that this is the worst economic record since the Great Depression. If you look at the GDP per capita, you see that we're actually in our seventh quarter of negative GDP per capita. There's a strong argument that we should measure recessions on total GDP. Our GDP is masked by our high population growth, so it looks higher than it actually is. If we look at the GDP per Canadian, the economic output per Canadian—the prosperity of each Canadian, in other terms—we see that we have had seven quarters of decline. We would be in one of the longest recessions since the Great Depression if we measured GDP per capita. While Canada is not in a recession, Canadians most certainly are.

You can probably excuse my frustration when I hear folks say, "This budget bill will be the one. This is the magic pill. This is the magic bean that will make everything all right." Well, I have now been elected for close to five years, as it were, and I've heard, through multiple budget cycles, that this piece of legislation is the one that will finally help Canadians. The reality is that when I go back to my constituents, they are consistently worse off because of this federal government.

The carbon tax is absolutely crushing Canadians. It increases the cost of home heating, fuel and food. Of course, we heard the dema-

gogery with respect to the carbon tax. The Liberals will say that Canadians get back more than they pay, but that's not true. The Liberals play a shell game with words.

With respect to the carbon tax, there are two different types of costs that Canadians focus on. One is the fiscal cost. That's the direct impact. That's what you pay for the carbon tax at the gas pumps, etc., and what you get back in terms of a rebate. The other part that the Liberals don't acknowledge is the economic impact. What does that mean? Well, a cascading effect happens when farmers and business owners pay carbon tax. When a farmer pays carbon tax, because they are price-takers and not price-givers, that cost will get passed on to the consumer. Literally everything in the grocery store, because it all had to be transported, has a hidden carbon tax in it. Therefore, when you add the fiscal and the economic impacts, more than six out of 10 Canadian households are actually losing money.

That's a shell game that Liberals will play. They'll just talk about the fiscal financial impact without talking about the economic impact. The truth is that you have both. All Canadians are facing both the fiscal financial impact and the economic impact. When those things are added up, in every province the average household is at a net loss position. That's the reality of the carbon tax and what Canadians are playing against.

It also gets to the fact that because of stretching the truth in arguments like that, we really need to dig into that and understand it. You can understand why Conservatives want to have discussions, and lengthy discussions, about the budget. It's important for us to understand it.

● (1240)

Ultimately, there's nothing magical about me, Jas, Adam or Marty, but we are the representatives. Our office is magical. All of our 338—soon to be 343—offices are magical, because they represent the voice and the will of the people. That's what separates Canada from many other places in the world that don't have rights or that don't have the ability to vote in or vote out their leaders.

When we look at that office, you can certainly feel free not to respect me or other Conservative members, but you should have respect for Parliament. Parliament is the very base of our democracy, and it's critical that we are given the time to understand legislation. This bill is over 600 pages, and it modifies or amends hundreds of other pages.

To fully understand this legislation will take hours and hours and hours of study. There is no doubt that there will be commentary from across the country from different organizations and various industries. I don't think that it's an exaggeration to say that every single Canadian will be affected by this budget in some way or other. Conservatives want to get this right.

Right now, we would like to be sitting here and talking to officials, as we were constructively doing before the parliamentary secretary brought forward a motion that he kept in secret, unwilling to share and discuss it with Conservative members—

• (1245)

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** I have a point of order.

**The Chair:** Go ahead, Mr. Turnbull, on a point of order.

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** I don't want to cut off the soliloquy there, because it was very good and very well spoken, even though I agree with almost nothing that the member said, but I didn't keep this motion in secret. It's exactly identical to what we've discussed.

**Mr. Adam Chambers:** On a point of order, Mr. Chair, what's the point of order?

**The Chair:** Your point of order, MP Turnbull, is what?

**Mr. Adam Chambers:** What rule in the book is he relying on for his point of order, Mr. Chair?

**The Chair:** MP Turnbull, what is the point of order?

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** The point of order is that the member is claiming something that is untrue.

**The Chair:** Okay, thank you, MP Turnbull.

We have—

**Mr. Don Davies:** I have a point of order that is a bit more appropriate.

**The Chair:** Go ahead on a point of order, MP Davies.

**Mr. Don Davies:** I appreciate my friend's eloquence and articulation, and I know there is a wide latitude of where we can go, but the motion under consideration is a programming motion to schedule the meetings on the budget. If he could try to keep his comments towards that, as opposed to a wide-ranging discussion of the carbon tax, which I think is beyond the scope of the motion under consideration, that would be helpful.

He has mentioned several times that he wants to be constructive, but there are others who want to speak on this as well. He's mentioned me in particular, and I'm wondering if we're going to get a chance to talk. I have not yet had a chance to speak at this meeting on this motion.

I'm wondering if his spirit of constructiveness would extend to allowing people to have a chance. I do have something to propose as well that might help.

**The Chair:** Thank you, MP Davies. You are next on the list.

MP Lawrence, please stick to the motion and to relevance, please.

**Mr. Philip Lawrence:** Yes, I will, 100%. Thank you very much.

I yield the time.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

We'll move on to MP Davies.

I then have MP Dzerowicz, MP Hallan and MP Morantz after that.

**Mr. Don Davies:** Thank you.

Thank you to my colleague for that. I appreciate it.

I want to get to something constructive, because that's where I think we need to be. However, I have a few comments to make just prior to that.

Just to set the record somewhat straight, I'll say that I'm new to this committee. I've been on the committee for only three weeks. One thing that I believe is important is that in a minority parliament, as has been pointed out, we try to seek a consensus on how we get business done. No party can dominate in a situation like this. Frankly, even in majority governments, I don't think a majority can ever be used in a tyrannical way, but there has to be attention paid to other parties so that other priorities can make it to the committee's business.

I think it's important to note that we did meet last week, and I was the person who proposed that we have a subcommittee on the agenda so that we could meet in camera. I'm not going to discuss anything that was said at that meeting, but the purpose of that meeting was to try to get an agreement on the scheduling for the next two months. Many of the issues that have been canvassed here today were precisely the subjects that we intended to talk about at that meeting. Therefore, it's not quite accurate to say that where we are at this moment is a surprise to anybody, because we specifically talked about each and every meeting between now and the end of June in our subcommittee meeting and tried to arrive at an acceptable agenda that met everybody's goals to some extent.

On the motion that's been put forward today, for the record, I saw this motion for the first time last night at quite a late time, but there's no real issue of any intent to offend any of my colleagues on this committee.

I do want to say that we're sitting seven of the last eight weeks. We have one break week in there. I do want to say that in terms of the break week.... By the way, if ever there was a less apt name for a week, it's "break week". As all of us know, the last thing we all do when we go back to our ridings is have any break at all. However, it is a critical time to meet constituents and to consult. I know we're all just as busy as always, if not more busy, when we go our constituencies.

I jealously and assiduously guard that break week. It's the only one we have, and I think it's really important for some work-life balance as well, but unfortunately, that week takes out time when we could schedule meetings.

I did some quick research, and I found that in 2023 we spent 15.5 hours of witness time on the budget. In 2022, we spent 18 hours of witness time on the budget. That's excluding clause-by-clause consideration. I didn't go back to what was done before then, but if those are representative samples, that gives me a bit of an idea.

I want to say that I empathize. I've been in opposition my entire time on the Hill. I'm sorry, but I'll say it every time I hear it: We're not in a coalition government. I wish we were, but we're not in a coalition government. We don't have any cabinet seats. We don't get to make decisions. We have the confidence and supply agreement. I know that's a nice slogan that gets thrown around, but I don't think it does our political atmosphere any good to use terms that don't accurately describe the real situation.

However, being in opposition, I empathize with my Conservative colleagues when we talk about fighting to make sure that we have enough time to properly debate bills. I want to preface my proposal by saying this: Often when a bill comes to committee—just your garden variety of bill—that we've not seen before or had any study on, it's fresh. We don't know much about it, and we really need to hear from a broad variety of stakeholders and probe new concepts in order to do our job properly at committee.

A budget, to me, is a bit of a different type of bill. First of all, you have pre-budget hearings. I haven't had the pleasure of sitting in on them, but I have commiserated with and watched many previous finance critics as they go through days and days of—and travel across the country for—pre-budget hearings to hear from stakeholders. I presume it happened with this budget too.

Then we have pre-budget major announcements. I remember a day when budgets were secret until they were announced in the House.

• (1250)

It started with the Conservatives, actually. It's been a slow erosion of that over the last, I'd say, 10 years. In this case here, we did see major announcements made about the budget for several weeks in advance. Then we saw the budget itself.

I think we all have to acknowledge that a 416-page document has been published that contains pretty much everything about the budget. We've had a chance to read that and to study it. We've had budget lock-ups. Then we had budget briefings. Then we had the ways and means motion that was tabled. I had briefings, as I'm sure we all did. We were offered those on the budget.

When this budget implementation act comes to this committee, it's a little disingenuous to suggest that this is brand new and that we have to probe in all sorts of interesting areas. We're well aware of what's in this budget. We're well aware of what we like and, more importantly, what we don't like. We're prepared, in a way that we're not for any other bill, to probe in those areas.

We don't need 65 meetings on this budget, given the preparatory work that goes into the preparation of this budget, in the way that we would on other things. When the issue is something like medical assistance in dying or something like that, it can take months and months to canvass, and it should.

I do note that with Bill C-59, which was my inauguration to this committee, we had 20 hours of hearings. I have to say, with that 20 hours, and I think I've said this before, that I noticed a lot of repetitive testimony. We were hearing from multiple witnesses who were saying the same thing over and over again. I think that easily could have been cut by 50% or maybe more. We still would have gotten the thrust of the testimony. There were amendments made, I think from all parties, that were well crafted and that made the bill better, so I think that was important to do.

I do have to correct a couple of things that my Conservative colleague said. I think he said that the Harper government balanced its budget. I happened to have been in the House from 2008 to 2015. I missed 2006, and the truth is that the Harper government had seven consecutive deficits in a row, and it only tabled what it claimed to

be a balanced budget in year eight, which was the election year. I think that turned out to be a deficit budget when the numbers rolled in anyway.

I just have to correct that for the record. I'm not taking a shot, but whether a budget was balanced or not is a matter of numbers and facts, and that's just a fact.

I also want to say that in terms of this budget, I don't share a lot of the perspectives, reasons and policies of my Conservative colleagues, but I do agree that the budget is very important. I think we come at it from different ends. I also very much share my colleague's eloquent description of the difficulty that many Canadians are facing right now. There's no question about that. I don't know if I'd say that Canada could be in a recession, but Canadians are. I'll have to ponder that one for a while. I don't think they can be. However, I can say that millions and millions of Canadians, particularly low-income and middle-income Canadians, are struggling. I'm not sure everybody is. I think there's a sector, maybe the top quartile of this population, that's probably doing very well, maybe better than normal. However, millions of Canadians are not.

Therefore, I've come to a conclusion that is the complete opposite of that of my Conservative colleague, and it is that I think those people need assistance as fast as possible. This budget has things like pharmacare. I am biased and I'm shaped by the eight years I spent as health critic. I heard too many stories of people suffering, living with diabetes, type 1 and type 2, through no choice of their own, who were out of pocket thousands of dollars every year, and they're also struggling with the high costs of food and rent, etc. They're the same kind of people who were accurately described by my colleague.

If this pharmacare legislation passes—this money that's in the bill and the legislation in the House, which, by the way, the Conservatives are holding up and are trying to block right now—and gets royal assent by the end of June, you could have the federal government negotiating with provinces as early as July and August, and that would result in free diabetes medication. I negotiated the formulary for 11 kinds of insulin, SDG inhibitors, life-saving medication for free, including the devices, needles, syringes, test strips, pumps and continuous glucose monitors.

• (1255)

I heard some stories of people who have children who are five years old, of parents who have to wake their child up every hour and a half at night. Imagine waking your child up at one in the morning, then at 2:30 in the morning, then at four in the morning and then going to work—never mind the trouble to the child—because you're not sure if their blood sugar levels are going to spike in the middle of the night.

This legislation would deliver them a continuous glucose monitor and an insulin pump so that the child can sleep through the night and those parents don't have to go to work the next day sleep deprived, never mind the out-of-pocket expenses. Do you know what parents do now if they're not covered for that? They'll buy that glucose monitor for their child. Who here wouldn't? Do you know what that costs them? It's thousands of dollars, so when we talk about giving Canadians economic relief right now, what about that?

That's in this budget. There is \$1.5 billion in this budget to fund those programs that we want the federal government to be negotiating—that I want them to be negotiating yesterday—and the Conservatives are blocking the legislation in the House for pharmacare and the bill that would finance it here.

There is a school nutrition program. We're talking about the high cost of food; well, my primary concern for children is that I don't want a single kid in this country in grade 3 sitting at a desk trying to learn math or trying to read when their stomach is hurting them, but in addition to that, given the health and learning issues with the children and the families struggling with high food costs, what could be better right now to relieve their budget than to know that when their child goes to school, their child is getting a hot, nutritious meal in the middle of the day, five times a week?

That's one meal taken off their budget and, if you have multiple children—if you have two or three children—that's 10 or 15 lunches that you don't have to pay for. For the families I represent in Vancouver Kingsway, which is a working-class neighbourhood, if you're struggling on a total median household income of \$64,000 a year, that one measure alone might be the difference, and the Conservatives are holding this up. They want to have debate on this.

Then, we have billions of dollars of affordable housing expenditure in here.

I've said this before: There are 10,000 issues in politics. We all know that. Some are foundational. Some are existential. Housing is one of them, because housing anchors you. It anchors you in your community. It anchors you in terms of your work life, your community, your neighbours and your children's school. It anchors you. Too many Canadians can't find a decent place to rent or buy for love or money, and this has been going on for decades.

I'm going to say this. This didn't start in 2015. I've been in Vancouver for 40 years. You couldn't buy an affordable house or rent an affordable house 20 years ago—or 15 years ago, for that matter. Holy mackerel—I'll show you housing prices from 2010 that not a single person in this room could afford on our incomes. It's \$4 million for a house on Vancouver's west side that people bought for \$60,000 30 years ago: That's the reality. This budget has money for that.

There are critical indigenous services investments. I want to talk just for a moment about the indigenous people in this country. If there's one group of people in this country that is suffering more than any other, it has to be Canada's first peoples, and this budget has billions of dollars that ought to be flowing.

I think we have to find a balance here. The balance has to be how we can preserve our role here to do a proper dive into this bill—given that we all know what's in it and we know where we want to

probe—and how to get this out. Budgets are different. No government, not a Conservative government that I've ever seen and not one that we'll see in the future, will want a budget held up for three months while it's debated. This budget was tabled earlier in April. We all know that this budget has been passed by the end of June.

I will talk for just a moment about the business community in this country. Again, if I've heard one thing more consistently from the business community over my time in politics, it's this: they want certainty. They can deal with a wide variety of policies—from the left or the right—but what they do need is certainty. In a time of economic uncertainty—and we're all aware of the problems that our business community is facing with productivity, lack of investment in machinery and equipment, technology and research—we want to hasten the transition to a more sustainable economy. We know the tax credits....

● (1300)

I had the opportunity to ask some questions about the hydrogen and clean-technology tax credits. We heard in the fall economic statement testimony that businesses are waiting for this.

I do think the meetings that are proposed in this motion don't give quite enough time. I'm going to put in some form of amendment, but I thought I would just share this with my colleagues first.

My calculations of the witness time for this, as has been proposed, is, in theory, two hours today and two hours on Thursday. That's four hours. Then we had the 21st and the 23rd, and this motion proposes another four hours for those. That would make a total of eight hours. I don't think that's sufficient.

What I'm thinking is that we do our two hours today and we do our two hours on Thursday. On the 21st and 23rd, I think we should schedule six hours each for those meetings. That would bring us up to 16 hours—12 hours there, and the four we have this week.

I'll go back to what I said. We had 15.5 hours last year and 18 the year before that. That puts us in the normative range for budgets—right smack in there—and it still preserves our ability to have the clause-by-clause consideration starting the week of the 27th. We can get this bill out of this committee by the end of the month and into the Senate by the beginning of June.

I know that the Conservatives really want to call Mark Carney. I think they referred to him as “governor” Carney. I don't know if it's proper to call him “governor” Carney, as he's no longer the governor. He's a private citizen. If they want to call witnesses.... Once we get this set, we'll all be able to call witnesses that we want to come to testify on the budget. I fully invite my colleagues to call Mr. Carney as a witness if they wish to. That would get him earlier.

I know this programming motion would have.... I wanted to point out as well something that's not been pointed out: It gives every party something in June that they wanted. It has two meetings on the housing study, which I think my predecessor Daniel Blaikie had started; two hours on the green financing, which I think the Liberals like; and two hours on the inflation study, which I think the Conservatives want. I also thought there's a built-in time, then, for calling Mr. Carney as well on inflation, since I think it was his remarks on inflation that spurred their interest. There are a couple of different points there when they can call Mr. Carney if they want to.

I have said before that I know there's a concern if Mr. Carney doesn't come. Well, that happens in this place, and we know what the remedy for that is. We can get to that at the time. I don't know that Mr. Carney will come, but I think there's an opportunity to call him.

I think that pretty much covers what I wanted to say. I want to thank my colleague for ceding the floor and letting me have a chance to have my say.

I don't know if you want me to put it in the form of an amendment, but I'm happy to. For pro forma purposes, I will.

I'll move to amend the motion, if I could, to make the meetings on the 21st and 23rd six hours each. I think that's all the amendment that's necessary—just add the needed hours.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

• (1305)

**The Chair:** Thank you, MP Davies.

Are you proposing a friendly amendment?

**Mr. Don Davies:** It's as friendly as it gets.

**The Chair:** Okay. We would need to incorporate that if we have UC for that.

I see that we don't have UC at this time to do that.

Do you want to move it as an official amendment?

**Mr. Don Davies:** I do. I will move it as an official amendment.

**The Chair:** Okay, we have an official amendment.

I have now on our list MP Dzerowicz, then MP Hallan, then MP Morantz.

**Mr. Dan Albas (Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola, CPC):** I have a point of order.

**The Chair:** Go ahead, Mr. Albas.

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

I'm pleased to join everyone today, but usually after an amendment has been made, there's debate on the amendment.

**The Chair:** I'm making a list right now. I'm going to ask members if we are in agreement to allow the officials to get on with their day and to leave the meeting.

I see that we are.

Officials, you may leave. Thank you very much.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Mr. Chair, wouldn't you reset the speakers list because a motion has been made?

**The Chair:** We will suspend briefly.

• (1305)

(Pause)

• (1320)

**The Chair:** We're back.

We're going to the speakers list. I have a number of different lists here that have come up. I hope I have this list right.

I have MP Ste-Marie, MP Dzerowicz and then MP Albas.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

I did have a point of order that when an amendment is moved, usually a new speakers list is prepared. You have not ruled on that point of order.

**The Chair:** My understanding, looking at all committees, is that it is done in many different ways and it is at the discretion of the chair.

This is the list I am going with. I am going with MP Ste-Marie, MP Dzerowicz and then—

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Essentially what you're saying is that someone who put their hand up on a previous question now must answer Mr. Davies' amendment. Okay.

**The Chair:** What I am saying is that when we were in the midst of the discussion, I didn't see all of the hands that were up or weren't up, etc. I have conferred with the clerks. The list that I'm going with is who I see: MP Ste-Marie, MP Dzerowicz and MP Albas.

MP Ste-Marie, go ahead, please.

[*Translation*]

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

I had actually raised my hand to respond to the amendment moved by Mr. Davies, whom I thank for his effort to have the committee reach a consensus, or at least a compromise.

I think we could manage with the number of hours proposed. However, the problem remains on the issue of deadlines. For example, the third paragraph of the original motion reads as follows:

iii. that any amendments to the bill be submitted by no later than 5:00 PM ET on Thursday, May 23rd, 2024;

However, if there are six hours of testimony on Thursday, May 23, and we have to move the written amendments the same day, that would be a problem. We often want to draft our amendments working with the law clerks of the House, based on the testimony we have heard. The law clerks must study the amendments from a legal standpoint so that they are drafted in such a way as to achieve their objective and so that their form follows the rules. In addition, they must then be translated. So there is a problem with the proposed deadline.

I understand how important the parliamentary break week is, especially since community groups often hold activities in May and June, and we are often sitting in the House, which leaves us little time to go and listen to our constituents and answer their questions. If we don't want to sit that week, then I suggest that we extend all deadlines by at least a week. Otherwise, I don't see how we can do our job properly, study the bill properly, and have the time to hear from witnesses, draft amendments and vote on them.

• (1325)

[English]

**The Chair:** Thank you, MP Ste-Marie.

I'm going to MP Dzerowicz now.

**Ms. Julie Dzerowicz:** Thank you so much, Mr. Chair.

Just for the record, I want to say that I was on the previous list. Before Mr. Davies made his amendment, I was next on the list, but I then put my hand up again for this amendment, and I did come in after Monsieur Ste-Marie, so I was indeed second on the list.

I just want to say thank you so much. I always like hearing the wise wisdom of my colleague Monsieur Ste-Marie. I always like to hear his thoughts.

The first thing I'm going to say is that I very much agree with Mr. Davies' suggestion. I'm not sure how he did this. I think he was stealing all my notes, because just about all of his comments he was making were about everything I was going to mention, so we are very aligned.

I will say first that I appreciated Mr. Davies' looking at how many hours we used in considering the BIA last year as well as in 2022. Indeed, his proposal does keep us in line with that. I want to let Mr. Davies know that I'm very much in agreement with what he has proposed for the week of May 20.

I would say to you, regarding Monsieur Ste-Marie's comment, that there would then have to be a bit of an adjustment around possible amendments. I think that is something we have to think about as we move towards what the final schedule on this budget implementation act.

The second thing I will also indicate, and I'm glad Mr. Davies has brought this up, is that we do have only seven weeks left. We do have to pass the budget before the end of June, for all the outstanding reasons my colleagues Mr. Turnbull and Mr. Davies made in terms of the importance of various aspects of the bill. There are a number of things I could put on the table as well that are important to my riding, but I will leave it, as I pretty much agree 100% with both colleagues and their excellent lists.

I would also say that I would encourage us to try to reach some sort of consensus today. We do not want to lose the opportunity to hear from our Minister of Finance and our Deputy Prime Minister this Thursday. If I heard Mr. Turnbull correctly, she is available this Thursday. I tend to like to have our minister at the front end when we are considering the budget implementation act. It allows us the opportunity to ask some questions of her and get some of her thoughts before we continue asking more specific questions on each of the sections of the budget implementation act.

I agree with Mr. Davies. I think that Mr. Ste-Marie made some thoughtful comments about timelines for the amendments that I think we have to consider. I do know that we all appreciate that we have a timeline to getting this budget passed, and there are only so many weeks left. I would ask for all of my colleagues' consideration that we find a solution today to this, because we do want our Minister of Finance in on Thursday and we want to get going on this testimony. There are a lot of excellent sections to this budget implementation act. I know that I have a lot of questions that I really would like to delve into, so I hope we could reach some sort of agreement today.

Thanks so much, Mr. Chair.

• (1330)

**The Chair:** Thank you, MP Dzerowicz.

Now we'll go to MP Albas, please.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Thanks, Mr. Chair.

I'll be very brief here.

On this particular omnibus piece of legislation, I'm very surprised that the NDP members have said that they want to see this process go so quickly. There are 50-plus divisions in here. The ways and means motion typically allows for the CRA to start acting as if the legislation has passed, so if there are any changes to tax laws within the BIA, those would already be considered implemented by the CRA.

From my scanning of the BIA.... I always stand to be corrected because I believe MP Davies.... Congratulations to him on becoming their finance critic, but I think that when we talk about how this bill allows for the budget to go through, that's not quite right.

The supply process is typically what funds the initiatives of the government, and quite honestly, the government can give money to whichever province it wants. That's something that it already has a clear area on, and those decisions are usually addressed through the estimates process.

If you look in the BIA itself, Mr. Chair, there are areas about giving \$100-million authorities to those who regulate our banks. There are so many things—CMHC changes, changes to the Criminal Code, money laundering, etc. I really think this whole thing about how we have to get this all wrapped up by the end of June really denotes a sense that the government is dictating to Parliament, rather than the government coming before Parliament saying, "Here is what we would like to discuss."

I know there will be a lot of other commentary and a lot of other issues. I just want to flag those things. Ultimately, the government will have, through the CRA, its tax authority. Most of the money that the government plans on spending—because that's really what I believe this government cares about—is already handled through the supply process.

For members to be conflating the two does a disservice to not only this particular committee; it also creates a little bit more of a wrong idea about what the budget implementation act is there to do and what it's not there to do, Mr. Chair.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you, MP Albas.

Are there any other speakers on the amendment?

It goes to a vote.

Mr. Hallan, is this on the amendment?

**Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan (Calgary Forest Lawn, CPC):** I just want to make sure I'm first on the list after the amendment vote.

**The Chair:** Yes.

We'll go to a vote on the amendment.

(Amendment agreed to: yeas 11; nays 0 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

**The Chair:** We are back to the main motion as amended.

I do have a speakers list. I have MP Hallan, MP Morantz and then MP Lawrence.

Go ahead, MP Hallan.

• (1335)

**Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan:** Thank you, Chair.

I'd like to address some of the comments that were made today, in particular one by Mr. Turnbull.

Usually in the past we've had negotiations outside of committee if things don't get resolved. In this case, there was no discussion. We were not reached out to whatsoever. I'm surprised to know that Mr. Davies actually got this amendment before all of us, and he admitted that.

It does bring up the question about this carbon tax coalition. It makes it more and more clear—to us, at least—that there is a coalition, not just in this committee, but outside.

I would like to propose an amendment to the motion as amended. Before I do that, I would like to say, in the spirit of collaboration on Bill C-59, that Mr. Davies' request was to get this passed as soon as possible. I will remind him that I ended up pulling my two amendments at the end so we could group the rest of the clauses. We passed the bill right away in that collaboration, which is why we got to this point.

We did help to pass his amendment. That's good. We should have some more witnesses.

I'd like to make an amendment. There are a few of them. I'd like to speak to them after I've given them.

In item ii, after May 23, I'd like to add the dates May 28 and May 30, 2024.

In item iii, I'd like to remove the date and put May 30, 2024.

In item iv, I'd like to change the first date to June 3, 2024, and strike everything after “resources on that day”.

In item v, after where it says “Bill C-69”, I would like to add “four meetings on its study of proceeds of crime and money laundering”. Strike everything before that and replace it with that, so “following the completion of the study of Bill C-69” strike out ev-

erything and add in “four meetings on its study of proceeds of crime and money laundering”.

I think we've distributed that, or we're going to distribute it. I believe it's been sent to you.

**The Chair:** It can't be distributed because it's only in English. We do not have the translation.

**Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan:** I want to move it still. I'd like to speak to it, if that's okay, and in the meantime—

**The Chair:** You're speaking to your amendment.

**Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan:** Yes, it's to my amendment.

**The Chair:** You can continue to speak to it, but it can't be distributed to the members without it being in both official languages.

**Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan:** Okay.

The reason I'd like to add these two dates, colleagues, is that I think we would like to have more witnesses come here. As it has been noted many times before, this is a 660-page budget. It's quite extensive. I think there is a will—I hope there's a will—in this room to be able to have more witnesses.

I think my friend Gabriel expressed this as well. He suggested a postponement of one week. I think we could agree. In that spirit, I added the two dates of the 28th and the 30th. Subsequently, that's why I moved the other dates forward. It's to accommodate that. It's because I fully agree with Mr. Ste-Marie on having one more week of witnesses.

It would shift those dates for amendments one week forward. On May 30, we could make the amendments, and the start of clause-by-clause consideration would be no later than June 3 at 12 p.m. Typically, as we know, opposition parties don't always agree to an end date, but we could definitely agree to start it then and there.

The one that's really important, I think, is this item iv that we want to amend.

We and the chair all received a letter from Chrystia Freeland, the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, on October 6, 2023. It was her request. She needed assistance with the fourth five-year parliamentary review of the Proceeds of Crime (Money Laundering) and Terrorist Financing Act, so she requested this last year, in October. She also said that the last review was completed in November 2018.

At this point, this is a very important topic, and my colleague and friend Mr. Chambers also put a motion on notice with regard to this, because right now, just in the last few days.... It just goes to show how important this study is.

I'm going to read some headlines with regard to TD Bank: "TD probe tied to laundering drug money, says Wall Street Journal" and "TD Bank could face more severe penalties after drug money laundering allegations, says analyst. Bank could face worst-case scenario after report connects TD to illicit fentanyl profits". These fines could hit up to \$2 billion, says the article. Then "TD Bank hit with \$9.2M penalty after failing to report suspicious transactions".

This is all getting worse, and we know there's an opioid crisis, so it could possibly be tied in to that. We are also seeing things like extortion and car thefts, which could also be tied in to money laundering and the proceeds of crime that are taking place under this government. That's why I think it's more important than ever.

We never hear the Liberals or the NDP talking about how important this is, even though the finance minister has requested that this committee study it. My friend Adam Chambers talks about that all the time, and he's right. These headlines on TD are from just days ago. This is how serious this issue is.

If we're going to be planning, I think we need to add these into the amendment so that it gets passed. If we're all going to decide to keep, and we want to keep, this so-called "spirit of collaboration"—which I feel the Liberals and NDP have broken—I feel this could be a good compromise as well, because this is important for Canadians. The amount of extortion....

I actually visited the owner of a trucking company and I saw the video and heard the audio first-hand of someone who's trying to extort money out of him. They said, "We will shoot your house up next week." They didn't comply. These people live in fear. The family had to separate and live in separate hotel rooms so they couldn't be seen together. The next video he showed me was of a car pulling up and shooting at his house. After that meeting, we went outside into the parking lot and he showed us his two cars, which had been fitted with bulletproof windows. This is the state of Canada after nine years of Justin Trudeau, with the help of the NDP.

• (1340)

This is what's happening. Common-sense Conservatives put forward a private member's bill from Tim Uppal, our deputy leader, who had to put forward a bill because this current government is not serious about crime. This soft-on-crime policy is the reason that things have gotten so bad in this country. He put a bill forward on extortion. If this government's not going to act, then we might as well, even before Pierre Poilievre becomes prime minister.

It just goes to show how bad a state this country is in after nine years. Many people left where they came from to come here for a safer future for them and their kids. Many immigrants risked it all and left everything behind to come here. When they come here, they get hit with high taxes and crime like we have never seen before—drugs, chaos, crime all over the place—and get hit with double the rent. We're hearing about international students living under bridges in tents, and nurses and teachers living in their cars, because after nine years of this Liberal-NDP government, housing costs have doubled. Immigrants leave everything to come here. They risk it all. Then they ask themselves, "What the hell did we leave our country for in the first place? It's even worse here."

These are the kinds of comments we get when we talk to Canadians as we're travelling around the country. Every single place we go, we hear about these kinds of stories: "What did we do wrong? What did we do before? We were always heating our house. We were always filling up our gas. We would get groceries like anyone else. What is this carbon tax?" They had been doing things that they had always been doing; now they are being hit by a carbon tax that makes everything more expensive.

It just goes to show you that you can risk it all, leave it, and come here, but under this current government there's no way you can succeed. This budget does nothing to help those people either. It does absolutely nothing for them. In fact, it just raises their taxes, which this government is known to do no matter what.

That's why I think it's important that we have more witnesses. It's so that the government can clearly hear from people about their suffering. Obviously, they are not talking to their constituents. We might as well have more witnesses here so that they can hear from everyday Canadians about how bad their policies are and how negatively impactful they are to their lives.

I think it's very important that we follow up with what the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance has asked for as well, with the proceeds of crime and money laundering, and that we act on that right away so that more people don't have to face extortion. Under this current government, with the support of the NDP, they don't feel safe in this country anymore.

I gave one example of a family and a company that we visited. There are numerous others across the country that are facing the same thing. They are too scared to speak up, because they know that under this current government, nothing happens. You can literally commit a crime in the morning and, because of the failed policies under this government, the soft-on-crime policies, you can be off in the afternoon, commit another crime and be out again in the evening. There's no justice for people.

• (1345)

**The Chair:** MP Hallan, because some members have S. O. 31s, etc., we'll now suspend. We'll be back later in the afternoon.

• (1345)

(Pause)

• (1605)

**The Chair:** We're back.

MP Hallan last had the floor. Then I have MP Morantz and then MP Lawrence.

MP Hallan, you have the floor.

**Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan:** I see my friend Marty Morantz is next, so I will concede my time to him.

**The Chair:** Go ahead, MP Morantz.

**Mr. Marty Morantz:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Given the fact that we had to suspend to go up to question period, I thought it would be appropriate to take some time to recap where we're at, for those watching.

Essentially, what happened earlier today was that a Liberal member proposed a motion—a programming motion, as we call them—to basically set out for the committee what we're going to be meeting on through to just before the summer. It was unfortunate, because that member never spoke to Conservative members on the committee to say that they were going to do this.

What was really surprising—because they talk a lot about working together and keep asking why we can't just all get along—was that what they did was kind of sneaky, Mr. Chair. They actually gave a copy of the motion to the NDP member of this committee last night. I know that because he told us. He had a chance to read it.

Obviously the Liberals must have been working on it for a while. They said that they wanted to make sure they had the votes to carry it, but instead of coming to us to see if we might support something like that or at least talk about what we're going to do for the next couple of months, they just went to their coalition partner and said to vote for this. He was happy to oblige them.

Just to recap, so that people who are watching understand, I think it would be appropriate to go through that motion.

Mr. Hallan proposed some amendments, so I'm going to try to capture the motion with those amendments.

It starts off with the sentence, “As relates to the committee's future business, it be agreed that”. The future business that they're talking about is the meetings that are going to take place over the next five or six weeks through to the end of June, when the House will rise for the summer.

Then it says, “i. the committee dedicate its meeting on Thursday, May 9th”—which is in just a couple of days—“to hearing from the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, and officials, on the subject matter study of Bill C-69”.

That clause seems reasonable on the face of it, but what's really sad about it is that it talks about meeting with officials. What I think folks watching need to understand is that we had 10 finance committee officials in this room this morning, sitting right here. I know that I was burning the midnight oil preparing my questions. Apparently the Liberals and Mr. Davies were burning the midnight oil cooking up a programming motion plot that has thrust this committee into a filibuster. It's really too bad. It's really unfortunate.

In any event, we had them here and I had questions. I had questions about the short-term rentals, about the journalism tax credit and about the so-called independent advisory board, which is a board that is appointed by the partisan Liberal cabinet. How independent could it possibly be?

I had a question about that, but I didn't get to ask it. Do you know why? Because the Liberals proposed a unilateral programming motion without consulting us, so here we are.

I had questions about the small business carbon rebate. For example, why is it only given to CCPCs? For those watching, I know we throw around a lot of acronyms at this committee. That stands for “Canadian-controlled private corporation”. This completely ignores sole proprietors and partnerships, which are apparently left out. At least, that's the question I wanted to ask to clarify, but I never got the chance to ask it because the Liberals decided to blow up the committee today.

It's really just a very unfortunate set of circumstances, Mr. Chair.

I wanted to ask about the underused housing tax credit. It's been in place for three years. I was curious as to whether or not anyone had paid the \$10,000 fine that they're now backing off from. They're reducing it to \$2,000. Do those people get their money back? I was going to ask that.

I wanted to ask about the \$5,000 fine that individuals were getting for not meeting their filing requirements, which they're now backing off from as well. The underused housing tax is another file that has been messed up by the Liberals for sure.

I was going to ask a couple of other things. I was going to ask about the AMT—the alternative minimum tax—and about what they call “tax relief”. Only in Liberal land can a tax increase be tax relief, Mr. Chair. The excise tax went up by 2% and they cast it as tax relief. The mental gymnastics you have to go through to increase a tax and call it “tax relief” are amazing. It's quite astounding. I wanted to ask about that, but I didn't get the chance.

• (1610)

Here we are, then. It's “only” a 600-page bill, by the way, with 468 clauses. There is a lot of ground to cover. It's an omnibus bill, which is always problematic. There are things in there amending the Criminal Code. I don't know, but people might wonder why the Criminal Code is being amended at the finance committee. There are all kinds of things in there that really shouldn't be in a budget bill, but it's what the government does when they want to get everything, including the kitchen sink, through the House of Commons: They throw it into a budget bill.

That's how we wound up with the SNC-Lavalin scandal, by the way. People shouldn't forget. We need to remind them regularly. I know Mr. Erskine-Smith remembers very well that the clause to provide a deferred prosecution agreement was buried in a bill like this at the finance committee. What was it doing there? I don't know. The committee members probably didn't even know what it was doing there. Maybe someone asked a question about it. I wasn't elected then. No one thought there would be a clause put in a budget bill for the benefit of one single corporation. However, there was.

That's why it's important that we have the opportunity to ask questions about these bills. That's a question I asked last year and that I'd like to ask again. Is there a clause among these 468 clauses in this 659-page bill for the specific benefit of one company or one person? Again, I didn't get the chance to ask that question this morning.

That's part i of the motion. There is a lot to unpack there, but I'm going to move on to part ii.

Part ii says:

the committee dedicate its regular meetings on May 9th, 21st, and 23rd, [and with Mr. Hallan's amendment] 28th and 30th, 2024, to consideration of the subject matter study of Bill C-69, barring referral of the bill to committee; and that all evidence gathered as part of the pre-study be considered as evidence in the committee's full study of the bill, once referred to committee.

Then there's part iii. It says:

that any amendments to the bill be submitted no later than 5:00 PM EST on Thursday, May 30th, 2024

Part iv says:

clause-by-clause consideration of the bill start no later than 12:00 PM EST on June 3rd, 2024, and that the chair be empowered to set up extended hours and request additional House resources on that day

Mr. Hallan asked that the rest of part iv be struck. What he is asking to be struck—because it's important that folks watching know what we're voting on—are the following words:

if the committee has not completed clause-by-clause consideration of the bill by 11:00 AM on May 28th, 2024, 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 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

If this motion as amended were to pass, those words would be struck.

Then there's part v. It says:

following the completion of the study of Bill C-69, the committee dedicate two meetings on its study on the financialization of housing, followed by no less than two meetings to consider the draft report on the current state of play on green finance, green investment, transition finance and transparency, standards and taxonomy

Those words would be struck under Mr. Hallan's amendment.

Then part vi says:

the committee dedicate its regular meetings on the week of June 17th, 2024, on the committee's study on inflation in the current Canadian economy.

The provision I want to circle back to is part ii.

• (1615)

There's been a lot of discussion about whether we could have Mark Carney appear at this committee.

I just note that I'm assuming that Mr. Davies will support this idea, because just last week he said, "I look forward to Mr. Carney's coming to this committee at the appropriate time in the appropriate study, which can happen in the next two months." He is on side with the idea of Mr. Carney's coming to this committee.

Why are Conservatives asking for this? Well, Mr. Carney has been on the lecture circuit. He's been making speeches. He's been making speeches on government policy, and he's been critical of government policy in some aspects and supportive in others. He supports the inflationary deficit spending of this government, a government that doubled the national debt in eight years, which is quite a feat. The total federal debt from 1867 to the day this government was elected in 2015 was \$616 billion. Now, it's over \$1.2 trillion. The fiscal irresponsibility of this government is really astounding.

Mr. Carney apparently supports those deficits, though, according to his speeches. He also supports the carbon tax, and that's another reason we'd like to have him here, because I think Canadians deserve to know how much he wants to jack up the carbon tax on them. There are questions that we would have for him, and it's also clear that Mr. Carney wants to be the leader of the Liberal Party. He is anything but a random Liberal. He is likely the next leader of the Liberal Party of Canada, and I think Canadians deserve to hear what he thinks, and that's why we would like him to come to this committee. It's so that we can ask him a few questions.

It is clear that he is angling for that position. He may not want to axe the tax, Mr. Chair, but it's very clear that he wants to axe the Prime Minister. I think that if he wants to be the leader of the Liberal Party, it's time for him to come here and answer a few questions. It's not like he hasn't been to the finance committee before; he was the Governor of the Bank of Canada. He is very familiar with this environment, and I'm sure he would do quite well here.

With all that, what I'm leading to is to introduce a subamendment, Mr. Chair. My subamendment is to clause ii. I'll read it.

The words I would like to add come after the words "to consideration of the subject matter study of Bill C-69,". After the comma, I would like to add the following words: "the week of the 28th one meeting be dedicated to hearing from the Minister of Finance for two hours and one meeting be dedicated to hear from Mark Carney for three hours", and then the rest of the clause, starting with the words "barring referral" and ending at the last word of the clause, the word "committee", would remain intact. Again, it's inserting the words after "Bill C-69,": "the week of the 28th, one meeting be dedicated to hearing from the Minister of Finance for two hours and one meeting be dedicated to hear from Mark Carney for three hours".

I don't know if this has been circulated yet or if the clerk has seen it and it's in translated form.

I'm getting the thumbs-up, so we've met all of our procedural obligations with respect to this amendment.

I'm putting that subamendment on the floor for further consideration, and I'm sure it will be an interesting debate.

With that, I am going to cede the floor for the time being to the next speaker, but I'm going to ask my friend Mr. Clerk to add my name back on to the speakers list for later. Thank you.

• (1620)

**The Chair:** Thank you, MP Morantz.

We have MP Kurek, MP Ste-Marie, MP Goodridge and then MP Davies.

**Mr. Damien Kurek (Battle River—Crowfoot, CPC):** On a point of order, Mr. Chair, just to confirm, is the subamendment to the amendment in order?

**The Chair:** It is. That's what I've heard. Clerk...?

We will suspend.

• (1620)

(Pause)

• (1620)

**The Chair:** It is in order.

**Mr. Damien Kurek:** On the same point of order, just to clarify, is there a new speaking list or do you continue with the same speaking list? I'm just curious as to what the tradition of the finance committee is. I'm not a regular member of this committee, but I'm happy to take guidance. I would like to be put on the speaking list if it is a new one, and if not, I think I'm on it.

**The Chair:** You're next on the speaking list. Go ahead.

**Mr. Damien Kurek:** Okay. I appreciate that, and if I could, I'll stay on the speaking list to the previous one as well.

I think my friend and colleague Mr. Morantz did a great job in outlining some of the aspects that have led us to the debate today. I won't get too much into the details, because there may be a chance later on in the meeting to talk about the backroom deal, the not giving notice, the fact that we had officials here.... It's just unfortunate. I know that quite often in the House we hear how the government is quick to say that committees are masters of their own domain, yet it certainly seems that sometimes there is a puppet master pulling the strings.

I won't get into the into the details of that, but I think it's very prescient to the issue that Mr. Morantz has brought forward. I'm going to first talk about this.... Some of my my colleagues may find this a little hard to believe, but I'm going to put the contemporary political situation aside for just a moment, if I could, and outline why I think there is relevance to adding Mr. Carney. I'll get to the politics of that in a moment.

If we look at Mark Carney's past and his history, certainly we see that finance and Mr. Carney have gone hand in hand throughout his entire life. It's interesting, because he has done terms not only as Governor of the Bank of Canada but also as Governor of the Bank of England. I know that there is a whole lot of commentary that's been provided, and certainly there were some very tumultuous times, I know, having been a member of the Canada-U.K. parliamentary friendship group and having some U.K. family members. In fact, congratulations to my cousin Les Fry, a former police in-

spector, who just won one of the unitary council seats. Inspector Fry just won election as an Independent in the Dorset County unified council.

Keeping in tune with some of what has transpired in the U.K. over the last number of years, I think it's interesting, because it builds up, and I'm not necessarily confident that they're positive attributes in a resumé, and I'll get into the politics, as I said here, in a moment. I would think that when it comes to being able to hear from a former governor of not only the Bank of Canada but of the Bank of England, in light of the issues we're talking about.... Just going through his resumé, I see that he has had experience in private sector finance in working with Goldman Sachs and, I believe, in a number of locations in their global offices that were certainly not locations that somebody in the middle class would move around to—Boston, New York, Toronto, Tokyo—but there certainly is a lot of experience there.

He spent, I believe, over a decade with Goldman Sachs and spent a number of years at the Department of Finance. Then what is interesting is that in the lead-up to Mr. Carney's appointment as Governor of the Bank of Canada, I know there were a whole host of conversations.

In fact, it was a minority Parliament under a former prime minister, Conservative prime minister Stephen Harper, that oversaw that appointment. Especially in a minority parliament, I know that Mr. Harper took this very seriously. In fact, he was able to govern, if you can believe this, Chair, not to go off on too much of a tangent.... Former prime minister Mr. Harper was able to govern for five years without a coalition arrangement and without a confidence and supply arrangement. He did a tremendous amount of good work for our country and set our economy on a good footing, including during what were some of the most trying times economically in a very long time. I think there's a certain level of relevance to the conversation on being able to have Mr. Carney questioned.

• (1625)

I did watch when he came to committee, which was probably two and a half years ago. I know that it was in the height of the pandemic, and I'm not sure that he would necessarily be thrilled to come back—

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Damien Kurek:** Mr. Erskine-Smith is getting all kinds of shout-outs today, but he seems to be at those pivotal moments. Maybe we can look forward to his intervention shortly here, before, as he said, he has to head to another commitment.

Now, to start to get into some of the political dynamics, I think it speaks to how we shouldn't be afraid of asking for some hard opinions and being able to question those who seem to be asked for their advice on significant matters. Here's where there's an intersection from Mr. Carney's resumé to where Mr. Carney seems to be at what many are suggesting....

This is not simply me as a rural Alberta member of Parliament. I'm not the only rural Alberta member of Parliament here and I'm certainly not the only Alberta member of Parliament here. It seems that there is a "draft Carney" campaign, if you will. There seems to be almost an undertone of how the Liberals are approaching the fledgling leadership of the current Prime Minister, Mr. Trudeau, who is down in the polls and faces frustration wherever he goes. It seems that there's even frustration from within the ranks of the Liberal Party, certainly within the backbench, and I found it really interesting.

If I could just opine on this for a moment, there have always been leadership questions. That's not specific to one party. One doesn't have to spend much time in Ottawa to know that to be the case, but what is very interesting is that over the last number of weeks—and months, rather—we have seen some very direct conversations about a post-Trudeau Liberal Party.

Now, there are, I would suggest, two dynamics to that. One is in the context of speculation from those who are probably not on the inside, so to speak. We have a scathing editorial written by, I believe, a former Liberal Party president. It talked about how Justin Trudeau is dragging the Liberal Party down to the depths of destruction. I'm paraphrasing. I don't have that article right in front of me, but I think it's a fairly accurate depiction of what was a very scathing article about Mr. Trudeau's leadership.

We have other open questions being asked by the press gallery about Mr. Trudeau's future. Certainly my constituents ask me those questions on a regular basis, and I can say confidently that my constituents are ready for a change. They're ready for a new prime minister and they're certainly not ready for another Liberal prime minister. We do have a solution to that, but I want to keep things focused, of course, on the issue at hand with Mr. Carney. What has been interesting to observe over these last number of months is how open questions about Mr. Trudeau's future and the leadership of the Liberal Party have not been slapped down, have not been refuted, and I think that I could suggest a couple of reasons for that.

• (1630)

**Mr. Don Davies:** I have a point of order.

**The Chair:** Go ahead, Mr. Davies.

**Mr. Don Davies:** I think we're still discussing a programming motion for the committee and—

**An hon. member:** Mr. Carney—

**The Chair:** We are on the subamendment.

**Mr. Don Davies:** We're on the subamendment. I'm sorry, Mr. Carney, but—

**Mrs. Laila Goodridge (Fort McMurray—Cold Lake, CPC):** It's quite relevant.

**Mr. Don Davies:** Is the political future of Mr. Trudeau relevant to calling Mr. Carney? I fail to see that. I'd ask for a ruling from the chair as to whether or not that's relevant.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Davies.

Mr. Kurek, we want to keep it relevant to the subamendment and to Mr. Carney. If that's what you want to discuss, you could discuss Mr. Carney, and I think you should stay on topic.

**Mr. Damien Kurek:** Absolutely. I wouldn't want to stray too far away from the bounds of what would be relevant.

Mr. Chair, I think this context is very important, because we are talking about the future political leadership of the country. What I suggest is that there is significant political involvement. I wasn't privy to the conversations or the heads-up that the Liberals gave to the NDP when it came to this particular programming motion. I'm certainly not present in the backroom dealings of Liberals contemplating Mr. Trudeau's future, nor am I aware of what exactly the parameters are around Mr. Carney's possible coronation as future leader of the Liberal Party. However, it's so significant, because we have seen—and this is where it really intersects with the true relevance of what we're talking about here—that the leader of our government, the Prime Minister, the head of the cabinet, exerts a tremendous amount of control and influence in the context of our governmental system.

I'll spare the committee my feelings on Westminster democracy. However, Mr. Chair, what I would share simply—and then I look forward to being able to pass it over to my colleagues, as well, because I'm sure they'll have more to say about this—is the amount of influence that the leader of the government has. When we have such open questions surrounding Mr. Trudeau's future.... Minister LeBlanc not that long ago was openly saying that he was looking into it. We have Mark Carney who, although denying specific timelines for what a leadership run would look like, certainly seems to be positioning himself, as Mr. Morantz mentioned, on the lecture circuit, talking about all the challenges and how he would do things differently.

What I think, and the message that I hope we can get support from my colleague from the NDP on, since it will be called into question, I would suggest—the confidence and supply agreement that they signed with Mr. Trudeau—if there was a change in executive leadership in the Liberal Party resulting in a change in prime minister.... We certainly have a lot of questions that need to be asked. There are a host of concerns, especially with regard to how Mr. Carney seems to be very much talking about the matters that are before not just this committee but the House of Commons.

I think that it makes good sense. It would provide a valuable opportunity. Of course, Mr. Chair, as you know in stewarding these meetings, the neat thing about calling witnesses forward is that it is truly one of those few circumstances in parliamentary debate when there is equal opportunity, unlike the bringing forward of this motion.

Again, I don't want to get too much into that, because I'll speak to the motion more generally when we get to it. However, if Mr. Carney were to come, there would be opportunity for all members of this committee.... For Canadians watching, it is important to note that when a witness comes, there's agreement among the parties. Each committee passes a series of guidelines for different rounds of questions, and they're distributed among the political parties to ensure that there is that equal opportunity to ask those tough questions, to contribute to witnesses. If I could—although it's a somewhat terrifying prospect—put myself of the shoes of some Liberal members, I think I certainly would want to have the opportunity to question somebody who might be my future leader.

I would certainly suggest that there would be valuable input that could be provided in terms of the context of having not only a former Bank of Canada governor but also a former Bank of England governor. I think this is the sort of thing that would provide that opportunity among all parties to be able to get some answers to some very serious questions about where Mr. Carney is trying to lead some of these conversations in his lecture circuit.

• (1635)

We need to ensure that some larger questions about the future of some of these big economic arguments.... Right now it comes down to this, and I would conclude with this, Mr. Chair. The reason these questions are so important is that Canadians are hurting. I host town halls across my constituency, around 20 or so a year, representing about 60 different communities. A few of the larger centres, the communities of 1,000-plus, I get to every year, and I get to some of the smaller communities of less than 1,000 every two or three years.

What I found very tragic over the last number of years is how there is pain and hurt beyond what I've certainly seen in rural Alberta, and that's not just me talking as a Conservative MP from rural Alberta. There is pain with respect to the cost of living, the cost of housing, the challenges associated with being able to pay the carbon tax and some of the onerous regulations and red tape that exist in terms of being able to start and sustain a business. Canada used to be a country where we would hear that if you buckled down and worked hard, you could succeed and live out the Canadian dream. A lot of that has to do with that entrepreneurial spirit, and being from the west, that pioneer mentality. Much of that has been pulled away from the future of so many Canadians.

I would hope that my colleagues from all political parties, but specifically those in the Bloc and the NDP, would support calling Mr. Carney here so we could be able to ask those tough questions, because people at the very root of it are hurting. They are hurting. Why should we deprive them of this chance? What was a frustration.... I don't want to get into too much of the specifics of the motion and the context in which we're debating it, but when life gives us lemons, we're trying to make some lemonade.

Let's get Mr. Carney before this committee. Let's make sure that we can ask some of those tough questions of somebody who seems to be the incoming leader of the governing Liberal Party, although we hope that party won't be governing for too much longer. Let's have that opportunity for not just Conservatives to ask questions,

but for every party represented in the House of Commons to ask those tough questions.

Mr. Chair, I would simply ask that my name be put back on the list, because there are a few more things I'd be happy to share. I look forward to being able to continue the conversation.

I'm hopeful that Mr. Morantz's subamendment to the amendment to the motion will be successful.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you, MP Kurek.

I have MP Ste-Marie, MP Goodridge, MP Davies, MP Morantz and MP Kurek.

MP Ste-Marie, go ahead, please.

• (1640)

[*Translation*]

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

I will speak to the proposed subamendment in the context of the amendment. I will start by saying a few words about the amendment.

For me, the dates that Mr. Hallan is proposing would enable us to do a better job of studying Bill C-69. The proposal that the deadline for sending amendments be Thursday, May 30, seems fine to me. I don't feel that the proposal that the clause-by-clause study of the bill begin on June 3 would delay the process very much, since it only adds one week, which is a minimum, in my opinion.

I would like to remind my fellow committee members that, normally, when we study the budget implementation bill, we sit throughout the May constituency week to meet with witnesses. If we don't do it this time, at a minimum we'll have to make up an extra week.

Having said that, Mr. Hallan is proposing four meetings to study proceeds of crime and money laundering. I am certainly interested in this important topic, but other matters have been raised that deserve the committee's attention. So I think we should have a discussion about that.

Concerning the subamendment proposed by Mr. Morantz, as I said at previous meetings, I would like to hear from Mark Carney, for whom I have enormous respect and who has significant political experience. It would really be worthwhile to hear from him on the issues that come under our committee's purview.

I especially hope that we will be able to come to an agreement in committee. I hope the parties negotiate to come to an agreement during this time of debate. Otherwise, we will remain at an impasse; I can tell you from experience because that's how it is every year. Until the parties talk to each other, we won't come to an agreement. Everyone has to do their part.

I am less directly interested in the topics that will be selected for study after Bill C-69. I want to remind committee members that a key measure in the budget, which would help minimize the deficit, is the changes to the tax treatment of capital gains. However, it is not in the notice of ways and means motion or in Bill C-69.

I don't know if this is the case for everyone, but my Bloc Québécois colleagues and I have been receiving tonnes of emails, phone calls, interpretations and requests for meetings on this subject. For the time being, we can respond that the details are in the budget, but that there is still no bill on the matter. Can we make sure that this other bill will be fair to everyone and that we will be able to study it and improve it? This other bill will be referred to the committee by the time Parliament rises in June. In my opinion, once the committee has studied this potential bill, in addition to Bill C-69, we will almost be in the summer recess of Parliament.

In closing, I would like to remind my committee colleagues that this is something of a Groundhog Day situation right now. The government has appointed a lot of parliamentary secretaries to the Minister of Finance. Every time there is a new one, it seems as though everything starts over again: We proceed in a cavalier manner, and the rebuttal results in endless hours of debate, unproductive hours, as long as there is no parallel negotiation between the various parties, between the Liberals and the Conservatives. I can tell you from experience that it can go on for days and days. So I hope that the various parties will come to an agreement as quickly as possible so that we can work on Bill C-69.

On that point, we have only had one of the two hours planned with senior officials for parts 1 to 3 of the bill. I hope we can invite them back for at least another hour. For example, if we reached an agreement before Thursday, we could have the minister for an hour on Thursday and the officials we had today for the second hour. As for studying part 4 of the bill, since it contains so many provisions and raises a lot of questions, it would take at least two hours. That would be the minimum in terms of the time proposed here.

I hope my proposal has been heard. I urge the Liberals, their parliamentary secretary and the Conservatives to negotiate quickly.

• (1645)

Mr. Chair, I would ask that the debate be adjourned while they negotiate.

Thank you.

[English]

**The Chair:** Are we going to take the vote? He's asked for adjournment of debate.

**Mr. Damien Kurek:** I have a point of order, Chair, to make sure that we understand exactly what we're voting on. Was the motion for adjournment of debate on the subamendment or the motion or somewhere in between?

**The Chair:** I'm going to suspend for one second.

Monsieur Ste-Marie, was the adjournment of debate on the subamendment?

[Translation]

**Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie:** I was asking for the meeting to be adjourned while the negotiations are taking place.

[English]

**The Chair:** I didn't get the translation.

**Mrs. Laila Goodridge:** He didn't ask for an adjournment of the meeting. He asked for an adjournment of the debate on the vote. He didn't ask for that initially.

**The Chair:** Listen, I didn't hear it. He's asking for an adjournment of the meeting.

(Motion negated: nays 6; yeas 5)

**The Chair:** Next on our list, we have MP Goodridge, and then MP Davies, MP Morantz and MP Kurek.

**A voice:** Doesn't Gabriel get to keep talking?

**The Chair:** I think he's done.

MP Goodridge is next.

**Mrs. Laila Goodridge:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. It's wonderful to be back here at the finance committee today.

I think that this is an incredibly timely opportunity for us. As many of my colleagues have mentioned, this is an omnibus bill, and the budget has much wider implications, to a point that we don't quite understand what the implications of all of the changes in the budget are because we haven't had the opportunity to actually have those conversations, so then it becomes a bit of a circular conversation.

One thing I'm going to bring up that is rather concerning to me and that many Canadians have brought to me is the amount of government money that is going toward so-called safe supply contracts. We see this happening and we don't quite know exactly how much. The government hasn't been very clear or upfront with exactly how much this is. This is precisely why my colleague Garnett Genuis, from Fort Saskatchewan, brought forward a motion specifically to deal with getting to the bottom of where the government contracts are when it comes to so-called safe supply or prescribed alternatives, or whatever *mot du jour* the government has decided is the moniker they will use for hydromorphone, Dilaudid or any other drug that's being used in so-called safe supply programs.

We don't want it just from the Government of Canada; we would like to have the contracts with all provincial and territorial governments, because it's absolutely important that we actually be able to see these in an unredacted form so that we can get to the bottom of how much government money is actually going toward this because, effectively, it is tax dollars that are going toward this program.

Just yesterday there was a really interesting podcast. I would recommend everyone listen to it. It was with Brian Lilley and Dr. Julian Somers. Dr. Somers is an addiction physician in British Columbia. Through the course of this podcast, he talked about how not only did the B.C. government flood the streets with dangerous opioids, as I think most everyone at this point is well aware of, but it was using flawed and unproven studies to justify this in the first place, under the guise of the pandemic.

The truly alarming information that came out of the podcast was that those who were responsible for leading the charge on pushing for the so-called safe supply to be put into place in British Columbia also created businesses so they could profit from the so-called safe supply, and these same promoters of the so-called safe supply grew friendlier and friendlier with big pharma through this process. If that's not a conflict of interest, I'm not quite sure what would be considered to be more of a conflict of interest. I think this points to the need to get to the bottom of this.

On this budget, we haven't had the opportunity to have these conversations. I think it is incumbent upon us to hear from Mark Carney. He has been able to present on a number of different topics since his time as the Governor of the Bank of Canada, as he is preparing himself for what will be his Liberal Party leadership bid here, or the supposed leadership bid. He has gone on a number of podcasts. I've actually listened to him on a number of different occasions talking about—

• (1650)

**The Chair:** Go ahead on a point of order, Ms. Thompson.

**Ms. Joanne Thompson (St. John's East, Lib.):** I don't see how this is relevant. Could we get back to the motion and stay within the context of the motion so that we can continue to have conversation that is relevant and timely and important for this committee?

**The Chair:** Thank you, MP Thompson. Yes, so just the relevance to the subamendment—

**Mrs. Laila Goodridge:** This is actually exactly where I'm going with this.

Mark Carney has, in fact, presented a number of topics that I think are quite relevant. He's done a variety of podcasts that I've had an opportunity to listen to. Subamending this motion to have Mark Carney come will allow us to be able to hear his thoughts and opinions not only on the impacts of the budget, on which we desperately need to hear from him, but also on a variety of other topics. He hasn't limited his views and his sharing to just fiscal policy or monetary policy. We have some questions regarding what the housing policy would be under him. I think all Canadians deserve to understand this.

I understand that the Liberals don't necessarily want to have us go into these spaces, but it's worth noting that he is planning to attend the Senate committee tomorrow, so it is not as though he is somehow afraid of attending a committee. He's more than well versed. I believe there are very few people who have attended the finance committee more times than Mark Carney did in his former role as the Governor of the Bank of Canada. It comes back down to this being a programming motion that is trying to stifle debate.

When I look through the budget, being a northern Alberta member of Parliament, I always look at the budget forecast for West Texas Intermediate, which is the crude oil price, to see what the government expects will be their price for selling crude. This government, which has had no qualms about expressing its distaste for and absolute hatred of, in many cases, Alberta's energy industry and Canada's world-class energy industry, puts the budget forecast at \$78 across the board all the way to 2028. It's worth noting, and I've noted it in speeches in the chamber, that the Government of Alberta, which is actually a proponent of oil and gas, was criticized

for its rosy outlook on West Texas Intermediate when they put it at \$74 a barrel. I highlight this fact because these are all questions on which we need to hear from people, and we need to hear specifically from Mark Carney. I'd love to hear his opinion on whether \$78 U.S. is a good number and where he believes they would have found such forecasting or whether he, as someone who is very up and current on a variety of the monetary and fiscal policies of this country and around the world, has any publicly available information and whether he thinks that's a responsible number or that it actually means our deficit is even larger than what has been presented in this current budget. That's one of the big pieces. Frankly that is a large stake in terms of where the budget comes from.

Another thing that I think is worth highlighting in this piece of legislation is that they plan to change the Greenhouse Gas Pollution Pricing Act, which on the surface seems okay. However, as I read through it, I'm very curious as to whether this is just an attack on Saskatchewan for refusing to charge people in Saskatchewan the punishing carbon tax. We don't have an opportunity to even have those conversations, because the NDP-Liberal government has decided that they're going to ram through a programming motion.

I think every person in Saskatchewan deserves to have an answer as to exactly what that will mean for them and whether there will be major implications for their provincial Crown. This is a piece of legislation that is not going to have just a small impact on a few people's lives; this is going to have an impact on the life of every single Canadian.

I've had the opportunity, in the last few weeks, to talk to a number of students from right across my riding. The number one concern that was brought up by these students was the cost of living crisis. The number two concern brought to me by these students was their frustration with the fact that members of the NDP, the Liberals and the Bloc seem to attack our energy industry at every opportunity. They don't understand why they hate our region, why they hate the economic driver of not just my riding but also of Alberta's economy as well as Canada's economy.

As I've cited, the Liberal-NDP government has no problem using a very high forecast number for WTI and they have no problem taking the money from the oil industry; they just have a problem supporting the industry and allowing it to grow in any capacity.

• (1655)

We have seen this very clearly with the number of world leaders who have come to the Canadian Prime Minister, Justin Trudeau, asking him for LNG, Canadian liquefied natural gas. The answer from this Prime Minister time and time again is that there is no business case. This allows countries like Germany, Poland, Japan and others to continue to have to buy their energy from dirty dictators, which fuels Putin's war machine.

I think this is an absolutely insane space, but that is exactly what this Liberal government has done every time it says no to a business case on this. Effectively, by opposing clean Canadian energy, we are supporting Putin. That is exactly what we are doing here. This is something that the finance committee needs to get to the bottom of, going line by line through this budget, to actually ensure that there are no unintended consequences.

However, we know that there are going to be unintended consequences because history is a good predictor of what we're going to see. We know this government has previously hidden things in its budget. This isn't a conspiracy theory or something out of the blue; this is something that has happened in the past.

Mr. Chair, I appreciate the opportunity that I've had to speak on this bill. I do think that this is critically important.

I think it is also an interesting space. I understand that numbers matter when it comes to Parliament. This is Bill C-69. In my riding, most people don't understand or pay attention to bills. They don't really care about the numbers of the bills. They might possibly know the names of them, but almost every single person you talk to.... Mr. Chair, if you were to come to my riding and talk to people on the street—actively canvass people—and you said “C-69”, they would say, “No more pipelines; that is shameful”. In my area and across northeastern Alberta, they understand the punishing impacts that the bill carried. The fact that this government decided to choose that same number for this budget implementation act shows an absolute distaste for Albertans and the impact that the anti-pipeline bill had on Alberta families and on the hard-working energy workers who keep the lights on and the heat on in our -50° winters.

It is just another point of proof to the hard-working people throughout my riding and throughout Alberta that this government doesn't consider them when it's making decisions. That is quite unfortunate.

With that, I will pass my time on to my next colleague.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you, MP Goodridge.

I have MP Davies, MP Morantz and then MP Kurek.

**Mr. Don Davies:** While I empathize with my Bloc colleague, who I think expressed a genuine attempt to move this forward, I'm finding myself a little bit concerned that I'm not really seeing a way forward. The Conservatives are filibustering and talking endlessly about all sorts of issues in an attempt to delay, without offering constructive proposals on how we move forward.

I will repeat that there seems to be either a misunderstanding or an attempt to misdescribe, I guess, what happened last week.

When we had our subcommittee meeting on the agenda, these are the exact issues we discussed. What we're trying to do here is schedule the finance committee's meetings for May and June. That's what we're trying to do, if Canadians are watching this. I haven't counted up the meetings, but it looks like we have about another 10 or 12 meetings. We're trying to use that time efficiently.

I heard references from Mr. Morantz that it was as if I was doing something nefarious by discussing with my Liberal colleagues, following that meeting last week, how we could come together and make a proposal at this committee in lieu of the fact that the Conservatives wouldn't come to an agreement last week. We put forward exactly these proposals about how we could schedule the budget meetings for the next three weeks, and then how we could move ahead on studies on green financing, on house financialization, and on inflation—studies that all three parties really want.

When we couldn't reach an agreement last week, you wouldn't have to be a parliamentarian to know that the other parties would talk to each other about how we could come to this meeting today, in lieu of no agreement, and put a motion forward to deal with it. The Conservatives can't not come to an agreement in subcommittee last week and then come here and complain when the other parties try to work productively to come up with an agenda. The agenda is not going to magically appear. It's going to take all of us working together and speaking to the issues at hand, not filibustering and not talking about the political fortunes of Mark Carney or the political ambitions or future of Mr. Trudeau or what's going on in Fort McMurray or any of the other issues that may be important in their own right but really don't have anything to do with how we schedule the budget matter before us.

There was a reference to how moving the motion to schedule the remaining meetings for May and June was “to blow up the committee”. That was a quote from my Conservative colleague. That's just nonsensical. We need to have a motion adopted by this committee to determine how we're going to move forward. I will tell you that one of the biggest difficulties of working on committee—I think we've all experienced this, if we're honest—is moving ad hoc, meeting to meeting. It's very difficult to prepare. It's very hard on the analysts. It's very hard on the clerk. It's unfair to the witnesses.

Mr. Morantz went through a number of the questions he would like to have put to the witnesses who were here today. Well, that's exactly how I felt when the Conservatives were filibustering during the fall economic statement. One of the witnesses who was testifying here about water in this country ended up leaving without any questions being asked of him. He actually wrote a letter to this committee, asking to come back, because of the time that was wasted. The Conservatives claim to want to get to the issues, but then they continue to filibuster. That's an oxymoron that I just don't think can be squared.

There have been references to this being an omnibus bill. The Harper government was the king of the creators of omnibus bills. That's all they brought in for budget bills. They were omnibus bills. In fact, they were the first major government to regularly use omnibus bills as a routine matter. I remember how they changed the way riverways and waterways in this country were regulated in a budget bill, as an example. There were hundreds and hundreds of pages that went way too far in amending legislation.

I agree that the Liberal government has brought in omnibus bills. I don't think that's appropriate either. I know that there's some reason to go a little wider in budget bills, but for the record, I agree that we should resist the temptation to use budget bills as mega bills that make all sorts of changes to legislation. I remember that in the last budget bill, there was a change to the way pharmaceuticals were regulated in this country. That didn't even come to the health committee. That's a problem, I think, because as parliamentarians, our first job is to scrutinize government bills.

• (1700)

While I do agree with that, I don't think it lies in the mouths of Conservatives to appear pure on objecting to omnibus bills when the last Conservative government used them every year for 10 years. I hope it will be different if and when the Conservatives are in government again.

We'll see. I think there was a reference to the Harper government being pure. I remember Senate scandals, Nigel Wright secretly writing a \$90,000 cheque to pay for Mike Duffy's legal bills. I remember the G8 Muskoka scandal: Tony Clement was overspending for the—

• (1705)

**Mrs. Laila Goodridge:** I have a point of order.

**The Chair:** Go ahead on a point of order, MP Goodridge.

**Mrs. Laila Goodridge:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I am very curious as to what the relevance to any of this would be, specifically when the subamendment we're supposed to be discussing is regarding Mark Carney coming to the finance committee. I would love to hear that.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

MP Davies, be relevant and stick to the subamendment.

**Mr. Don Davies:** The relevance is clear. I'm responding to the point made by the Conservatives about the Harper government being ethical and providing clean government. That's what was said by my opponent. I'm responding to that, so it's clearly relevant.

I remember them using Conservative logos on government cheques, giant government cheques. Talk about misusing government taxpayers' dollars for partisan purposes. I remember their tough on crime legislation. Just about every bill they ever brought in was struck down as being unconstitutional. Those are the kinds of things I remember from the Harper government's days, and I'm afraid that the current Conservatives will be even worse.

**Mrs. Laila Goodridge:** Point of order.

**The Chair:** On a point of order, MP Goodridge.

**Mrs. Laila Goodridge:** Again, we are discussing a subamendment on having Mark Carney come to the finance committee. I and all of my colleagues in the Conservatives that I have had the opportunity of listening to have been quite clear in keeping to the matter of the subamendment and talking about having Mark Carney attend. Unfortunately, our colleague Don Davies from the NDP insists on bringing up the ghost of Harper from 10 years ago rather than talking about whether he supports having Mark Carney, yes or no.

I truly believe that this isn't something we should continue having to bring up. This is purely not relevant.

**The Chair:** Thank you, MP Goodridge.

**Mr. Yvan Baker (Etobicoke Centre, Lib.):** I have a point of order.

**The Chair:** On a point of order, go ahead, MP Baker.

**Mr. Yvan Baker:** What I'm struggling to understand is where Ms. Goodridge is coming from. Mr. Davies is responding to points that she and her colleagues made. If it's out of order for Mr. Davies to respond to her comments, then her comments were out of order in the first place. What's good for the goose is good for the gander.

**The Chair:** Thank you, MP Baker. I understand where everybody is coming from. We have given a lot of latitude in this committee. I don't know how many hours we spent on elvers, Clerk. I don't even want to count them. There's been a lot of latitude.

I do ask for people to be relevant and to be focused on whatever we are discussing. As I said, there's been a lot of latitude. MP Goodridge maybe has not been around here on our committee, but we have allowed for a lot of latitude.

MP Davies, the floor is yours.

**Mr. Don Davies:** Thank you.

We are talking about Mr. Carney. Ms. Goodridge was talking about pipelines in Fort McMurray, if I recall, only five minutes ago, and I don't know what that had to do with Mark Carney either.

It's funny that Conservatives like to criticize and throw condemnations at other people, but if you bring up their record at any time, are they sensitive. Maybe there's a lesson there that if they don't like hearing about their own problems, issues or failures in government, maybe they should be a little bit more careful in how they attack others.

The points I was making are facts as opposed to things like repeatedly saying that the NDP has been in government with the Liberals for nine years, when that's just factually incorrect. I have told that to my Conservative colleagues many times, but they still say it, so they have disrespect for the truth. I don't know how far you can get into a debate if someone has that little respect.

With regard to Mark Carney, Conservatives seem to have an unhealthy obsession with this issue. I'm not quite sure. The funny thing about it, though, is this. It would be somewhat psychiatric to analyze, except that—and this is the part that I think Canadians who are watching should be concerned about—this is the finance committee, and we have a budget in front of us. Conservatives are concerned about the political future and possibilities of Mark Carney; I'm interested in the economic needs of Canadians. The funny thing about Conservatives is that they've slipped up. They have clearly revealed, on many occasions, that they want Mark Carney to come to this committee because they view him as a future leader of the Liberal Party. They view his political future and want to bring him here to this committee to question him on that.

It would have been one thing if they tried to hide it by limiting their interests to something that he might say about this budget or about the financial situation of Canadians but, of course, they can't do that because Mark Carney is a private citizen now. He was the Bank of Canada governor at one time and he was the governor of the Bank of England, but he is no longer, and they are clearly obsessed with his potential future as a leader.

I don't think that Canadians are interested in the political future of Mark Carney when we have a budget to pass that has immediate economic impacts upon them, their pain and their hurt, and I will say this: I give Conservatives credit, as do all colleagues around this table in the Liberal Party and my Bloc colleagues, because I think we all share an accurate description of many Canadians suffering and having a legitimate desire to have meaningful supports from government. We can disagree on what those supports may look like, and that's what we should be focusing on in the budget. For some reason, Conservatives want to hold that up. We've been talking for hours here. We're in extraordinary meetings at the finance committee because they insist on having Mark Carney come here instead of our being able to schedule the budget.

The pain and hurt that Canadians are feeling are not going to be ameliorated by our grilling Mark Carney on his political future. What will be of assistance to Canadians is debating the issues that arise in this budget, and there are major legitimate issues there. I want to hear from my Conservative colleagues where they think this budget gets it wrong and their suggestions for improving it. I want to hear my Bloc colleagues' suggestions in that regard, and I have my own thoughts as well, so I wonder where this filibuster by the Conservatives is going. They seem to have made a decision that they want to hold up this committee until they get Mark Carney to testify. Interestingly, there was a way to do that last week in a sub-committee when we were sitting there trying to decide on an agenda. Conservatives well know that there were different possibilities.

I've said this before, and I'll say it for the record: We have to call witnesses to this committee on the budget. We have meetings scheduled in two weeks. According to the motion, if we pass it, we'll have meetings in two weeks. Every party around this table will be able to nominate witnesses, and Conservatives can nominate Mark Carney as a witness if they want. Nothing stops them from doing that. That's how witnesses get here. They know that. Canadians should know that. If Conservatives want Mark Carney at this committee, they can have him here in two weeks if they want. They just have to put him down as their number one witness.

Of course, the reason they will deny that and the reason they're filibustering is that they're afraid Mark Carney may turn down their request, as witnesses have the right to do.

• (1710)

Given the way the Conservatives are speaking about Mark Carney and given that they have zero interest in hearing Mark Carney's legitimate thoughts on the budget or on finances but really want to grill him on his political aspirations, I well understand why Mark Carney wouldn't want to dignify that kind of approach by coming here, because it's subterfuge. The Conservatives are pretending to want Mr. Carney to come here on the economy, when in fact what they really want to do is a political—

**Mrs. Laila Goodridge:** I have a point of order.

**The Chair:** We have a point of order.

**Mr. Don Davies:** I'm talking about Mark Carney, which is the motion before us.

**The Chair:** Thank you, MP Davies. There was a point of order.

Yes, MP Goodridge, go ahead, please.

**Mrs. Laila Goodridge:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Imputing false motives is not parliamentary and—

**The Chair:** MP Goodridge, I think what MP Davies is speaking to is relevant.

**Mrs. Laila Goodridge:** I didn't question it on relevance. I'm questioning it on imputing false motives and talking about how Conservatives are pretending as if somehow we're not genuine, and I believe—

**The Chair:** That's the member's prerogative, MP Goodridge.

MP Davies, the floor is yours.

**Mr. Don Davies:** Not only is it not imputing false motive: I'm imputing the actual motive.

Ms. Goodridge didn't have the benefit of being here for the last several meetings. She's new to the committee, so I understand why she wouldn't know this, but I've sat at this committee and heard the Conservatives speak repeatedly about why they want to call Mark Carney. From Mr. Hallan to any other person on this side....

I shouldn't say that. There are some of my colleagues who have not said that, but I've heard Mr. Hallan repeatedly go on at length about Mr. Carney and how he's going to be the next Liberal leader and using that as a reason to want to call him here for committee. They've said it. It's on the record. Check the Hansard. That's not imputing false motive. I'm reciting back the motive that's been stated.

Even if he didn't, why would we be holding up the budget?

Let's assume the Conservatives didn't say what they said and that they want Mr. Carney here only because they're interested in his economic ideas. Why would they be holding up the budget? Why would they be filibustering the scheduling of the BIA because they want a particular citizen to come here and testify on the budget? There are thousands of people who can come to testify on the budget.

It's obvious. Let's not be disingenuous here: The Conservatives want Mr. Carney here because they want to politically attack him. That is not an appropriate use of a witness. In my opinion, it's not an appropriate reason to hold up a budget implementation act and it's not an appropriate reason to delay giving relief to Canadians who are suffering, whom the Conservatives claim to care about, but their actions belie it.

• (1715)

**Mr. Marty Morantz:** I have a point of order.

**The Chair:** On a point of order, MP Morantz, go ahead, please.

**Mr. Marty Morantz:** I just want to circle back for a second to the use of the word “subterfuge”, because I just looked—

**The Chair:** That's not a point of order, MP Morantz.

MP Davies, go ahead, please.

**Mr. Marty Morantz:** No, it is a point of order.

**The Chair:** How is it a point of order?

**Mr. Marty Morantz:** It's a point of order on whether it's parliamentary. If I might just finish my point, I'll tell you what the definition is.

The very first word of the definition is deceit: "deceit used in order to achieve one's goal".

Mr. Chair, the NDP member, Mr. Davies, accused my colleagues, Conservative members, of subterfuge. He accused us of being deceitful. I ask you to rule if you think that word is parliamentary.

**The Chair:** MP Morantz, I'll look into it.

MP Davis, you may continue. You have the floor—

**Mr. Marty Morantz:** No, you can't just look into it, Mr. Chair.

Is that your ruling? I'll challenge it right now. I want to challenge that ruling, if that's your ruling.

You can't just look into it, Mr. Chair. You're the chair.

**The Chair:** Okay, you've challenged the chair.

**Mr. Marty Morantz:** You should say—

Maybe you should confer with the clerk.

**The Chair:** He's challenged the chair, Clerk, please. Just take a vote.

**Mr. Marty Morantz:** What's your ruling?

**The Chair:** It's a vote.

**The Clerk of the Committee (Mr. Alexandre Roger):** The question is, shall the decision of the chair be sustained?

If you are in agreement with the chair's decision, you vote yes. If you are against, you vote no.

**Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan:** On a point of clarification, we don't know the ruling that he gave to us. There is no ruling.

**Mr. Marty Morantz:** Is "subterfuge" parliamentary? It means "deceit".

**The Chair:** What my ruling was is that I would look into what MP Morantz had to say—

**Mr. Marty Morantz:** That's not a ruling.

**The Chair:** Yes, that is my ruling.

MP Davies has the floor again.

**Mr. Don Davies:** Mr. Chair, I'm happy to withdraw that word.

**Mr. Marty Morantz:** Thank you.

**Mr. Don Davies:** That wasn't the intention.

**The Chair:** It's been withdrawn.

**Mr. Marty Morantz:** Good. Great. Thank you.

**Mr. Don Davies:** I'm happy to withdraw that word.

**Mr. Marty Morantz:** I appreciate it.

**Mr. Don Davies:** What I was getting at is that I think it's not appropriate to call a particular witness for, in my opinion, clearly political purposes and to hold up the work of this committee any longer.

I'm also a little concerned that once we run out of time at this committee, we also have the Minister of Finance, who's scheduled to come on Thursday. If this continues, then we're going to lose that time as well. At some point, we're going to have to come to an agreement about how we schedule our time. Our time is limited.

I haven't heard the Conservatives dispute, in any real way, the need for the government to get this budget passed by the end of June, before the Senate rises in the summer. I think we all realize as parliamentarians that this what the norm is, and that's what we've done. After 15 years of being in Parliament, I know that is what has happened every year. It has to be done then for all sorts of reasons.

Reasoning backwards, we have only a limited number of meetings between now and then. I'm going to exhort my colleagues to be creative. I did amend the motion was put forward by Mr. Turnbull to give us an extra two meetings of six hours. That's 12 hours of meetings. Altogether, that comes to 16 hours of meeting on the budget. If we don't come to an agreement on that quickly, we're going to lose the next two meetings. We already lost one today. Mr. Morantz, I think, was right to point out that we lost an hour today.

I don't think I've ever filibustered at a committee in 15 years. I think I can honestly say I've never caused any of my colleagues the disappointment that Mr. Morantz felt by not being able to ask questions. I've been in many meetings where the Conservatives have filibustered, while witnesses are sitting there, so that the rest of us have not been able to ask questions, and it's not pleasant. I don't think it's fair to the witnesses. I don't think it's fair to us as colleagues. I feel his pain, but I also want to point out that it was the Conservatives filibustering in the second hour on this motion that caused us to not be able to ask the questions for the last hour. We could have voted on that motion quickly.

My final point is that this is a minority Parliament, but we still live in a democracy, and in a democracy, the majority rules. That doesn't mean you get your way all the time; it means you have voice.

The question I would ask my Conservative colleagues is this: If you don't like this motion, why not move to amend it? Let's vote on it and let's live with the result of the motion. You may not like the result. I've been in opposition 15 years, and if I had a dollar for every vote I lost, I'd be retired. It's important that we do come to a conclusion on this as soon as we can.

I think the motion by Mr. Turnbull is reasonable. It gets us everything that we need to do to move forward. We could be grilling the finance minister of this country on this budget in two days. We could be putting forth witnesses, probably dozens of witnesses, by the end of this week, and we can have them scheduled two weeks from now, and then we could put those important questions to them.

We could also be working on the amendments. I think this motion would give us a minimum of 12 hours to debate amendments. That's lots of time to debate amendments. We just did it with the FES, the fall economic statement, which is a document similar to what we have here.

I don't know what we're fighting over at this point. Is it an extra meeting or two? I'm not sure. However, I think the Conservatives, if I'm not mistaken, put forth a motion to call Mr. Carney, and I think it failed. If it didn't, I would invite them to put forth a motion, and we'll let democracy rule. If the majority of people in this committee want to call Mark Carney, then we will, and if they don't, we won't. That's the way it works. Holding up the process because you hold a minority opinion and don't get your way is not appropriate.

I'll conclude by saying that I want to bring it back to Canadians, some of whom may be watching, although most will not be. We are all here as finance committee members to try to pass a federal budget that brings the best possible benefits to Canadians and to Canadian businesses. The only way to do that is to call the witnesses to move this forward, to ask the penetrating questions that need to be asked and that I know my colleagues on all sides will ask, and to move the amendments that we think need to be proposed, if that's the case.

• (1720)

Thanks.

**The Chair:** Thank you, MP Davies.

I have MP Morantz and then MP Kurek and MP Hallan.

**Mr. Marty Morantz:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I just want to take a moment to thank Mr. Davies for withdrawing his unparliamentary language. Obviously, referring to honourable members as deceitful is inappropriate, and most competent chairs would agree with that sentiment—

**Mr. Don Davies:** I have a point of order.

**The Chair:** MP Morantz, I'm just going to—

**Mr. Don Davies:** That's unparliamentary. I would ask Mr. Morantz to withdraw the implication that Mr. Fonseca is not competent.

**The Chair:** Thank you, MP Davies.

MP Morantz, as I said, I would look into it to see if that word was unparliamentary, but I did not want to stop the conversation from happening. MP Davies had the floor. What I was going to do was look into that word.

**Mr. Marty Morantz:** I appreciate that, Mr. Chair.

Now, since—

**Mr. Don Davies:** I'm sorry. I'd like a ruling on my request.

I'm calling Mr. Morantz to account for what I consider to be unparliamentary language in the implication that the current chair is incompetent. I think that should be withdrawn. It's unparliamentary.

**The Chair:** Go ahead, MP Morantz.

**Mr. Marty Morantz:** I withdraw it.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

**Mr. Marty Morantz:** Many people tune in to these meetings, and this meeting's been going on for quite some time. Some people tune in and then tune out. Some members come to sub in for other members. They come and then they leave, so it's a bit of a turnstile. A lot of people are coming and going, so I think it's important that from time to time we recap what we're actually talking about.

Earlier today, we had a regularly scheduled finance committee meeting. In the middle of the meeting, the Liberal member, Mr. Turnbull, tabled a motion on which there had been no consultation with our members. Apparently he had provided it to the NDP member of this committee. They were, I guess, collaborating to try to schedule meetings for this committee until the end of June.

The problem is that the Liberals got fewer votes than the Conservatives in both the 2019 and 2021 elections. They don't have a majority of members in the House of Commons, so for these committees to function properly, they need to collaborate with all members. They can't just be heavy-handed in their approach.

Therefore, Conservative members quite rightly protested. We said, "What is this?" They can't just hammer us with a motion that's going to program the next two months of meetings without consulting.

Because so many people are probably getting off work now, getting home, turning on their computers or looking at their phones, and logging into ParlVu in droves, I think we should remind them or at least bring them up to speed on what we're talking about.

This motion basically blew up the meeting. We had eight or 10 finance officials here to answer questions about the budget, which is massive. I don't know if people realize that it's a huge document. It has 659 pages and 468 clauses, so there are a lot of questions to ask that people want the answers to.

This motion that really derailed the democratic right of elected members of this committee to ask public officials about the budget was this: It starts with the words, "As relates to the committee's future business".

What they're referring to there is the next couple of months of meetings, through to the end of June. That's the future business that this motion is specifically addressing, Mr. Chair.

It continues, "it be agreed that". In other words, it's asking that all members agree—or at least the majority of members on this committee—and vote in favour of this motion that would program all of these meetings.

It's to agree that:

- i. the committee dedicate its meeting on Thursday May 9th, 2024, to hearing from the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, and officials, on the subject matter of Bill C-69.

That's fair enough. Of course, the finance minister should come to the committee. This is her budget, and she would certainly be able to answer a lot of questions for Canadians, particularly around the affordability crisis, the fact that housing prices have doubled under their watch, that inflation went up to 8% at one point under their watch, that the dream of home ownership has been destroyed by her government's policies and all that stuff. All those questions we could ask, as well as about whether she understands—well, I know she understands, but whether she appreciates—the fact that many economists have said that exorbitant government spending has clearly led to inflation, which has jacked up interest rates in this country.

There are many questions like that around monetary policy. I think she probably likes to think about monetary policy—I think she's a thoughtful person—and I know the Prime Minister doesn't, so somebody in cabinet better be thinking about monetary policy, and I think it's likely the Minister of Finance.

I think that paragraph i is reasonable.

• (1725)

By the way, as I go through this motion, Mr. Chair, I'm going to be incorporating the various amendments and subamendments, because people who have just tuned in after work need to understand exactly where we are in the story of this motion.

That brings me to paragraph ii. It says, “the committee dedicate its regular meetings on May 9th, 21st, 23rd, 28th, and 30th, 2024, to consideration of the subject matter study of Bill C-69”. Fair enough; that's the bill we're talking about here. It's the budget bill.

Then there's the subamendment that I added probably 45 minutes or an hour ago. We'll call it the Carney subamendment. It says that in the week of May 28, one meeting be dedicated to hearing from the Minister of Finance for two hours and one meeting be dedicated to hearing from Mark Carney for three hours.

Speaking about the subamendment for a second, what's really fascinating about this is that I know Mr. Davies is okay with this. He said it last week: “I look forward to Mr. Carney's coming to this committee at the appropriate time in the appropriate study, which can happen in the next two months.”

It's the words “in the appropriate study” that I find interesting, because Mr. Carney is going to be at a Senate committee tomorrow testifying on green finance, which is actually one of the subjects that is in the initial iteration of this motion. There we have what would be a great opportunity for my colleagues on this committee to ask Mr. Carney about green finance, and I don't see why they would object to that. I mean, their colleagues in the Senate will be asking questions about that tomorrow.

There are all kinds of reasons for Mr. Carney to appear before the committee, not the least of which is the fact that the Liberals and the New Democrats are trying to program a meeting on green finance, which Mr. Carney is an expert in, and he's going to be speaking at the Senate finance committee tomorrow. There you have it. It's hard for me to understand why that would be objectionable at all.

It goes on to say, “barring referral of the bill to committee”. I think it's somewhat awkwardly worded. It's probably not how I would have written it, but fair enough. It continues, “and that all evidence gathered as part of the pre-study be considered as evidence in the committee's full study of the bill, once referred to committee.” It's a bit jargonistic. It has a bit of legalistic jargon there, but the bottom line is that the idea is to basically tell Conservatives, “We're going to program out these meetings and we don't really care what you think.”

I want to back up for one second to what I also find interesting. I really appreciate the fact, by the way, because I made a big deal of this last year, that Mr. Davies doesn't like omnibus bills either. I made the point earlier in this meeting that I think the classic example of why they're bad is the SNC-Lavalin affair. In this case, a clause was inserted in an omnibus bill just like this one for the specific purpose of giving one company a special deal for a deferred prosecution. I don't know whether such a clause exists in this bill. I would like to know, because it has happened before. The Liberals did it before. Mr. Davies doesn't like omnibus bills, and I don't either.

There used to be a time when the NDP was actually an opposition party in this country. Tom Mulcair would cross-examine the prime minister. He was very effective in question period. Jack Layton was an incredible opposition leader. May he rest in peace. I know he is sorely missed.

However, this iteration of the NDP will talk a big game. The New Democrats will talk about not liking omnibus budget bills. You know, I think the New Democrats make a good point when they say they didn't like the amount of the disability payments, but then they'll vote for the budget. They're going to vote for it, despite the fact that they don't like it.

It's a bit rich. I have a bit of trouble getting my head around that. People expect their elected officials to stand on principle. If you don't like something, don't vote for it. If you like something, vote for it. The worst of both worlds is to say that you don't like something and then go vote for it. It's kind of a weird situation, Mr. Chair.

• (1730)

Anyway, for those tuning in right now to this meeting to know what we're talking about, I'm going to go on to item iii of the motion, which says “that any amendments to the bill be submitted no later than 5:00 PM EST on Thursday, May 30th, 2024”. For those watching, what that means and what we're talking about is that the budget was introduced, but the budget isn't legislation. The government then tables a piece of legislation called a ways and means motion for the budget implementation act, which has, in this case, 468 clauses.

Members of this committee have the right to suggest changes or amendments. Every member of this committee has the right to do that, and then the committee will vote at some point on whether those changes are acceptable or not. At the end of the day, the committee fashions a bill that gets referred back to the House of Commons for more debates and more votes.

When it says “that any amendments to the bill be submitted no later than 5:00 PM EST on Thursday, May 30th”, what it's saying is that members like me; Mr. Hallan; my colleagues from the Liberal Party, Mr. Baker and Mr. Turnbull; and of course Mr. Davies can all draft amendments and submit them to the clerk. We will discuss those amendments and debate them.

I think I have that right, Mr. Clerk, don't I? Thank you.

For those watching, that's a very important aspect of this motion. The ability of elected members to actually have an input on the content of the budget bill is fundamentally important to the democratic process. I really appreciate that part as well.

Then it says, under item iv, “clause-by-clause consideration of the bill start no later than 12:00 PM EST on June 3rd, 2024, and that the chair be empowered to set up extended hours and request additional House resources on that day”.

What does clause-by-clause consideration mean? If you're just tuning in.... I'm sure that people aren't really familiar with all of our jargon and what actually goes on. Even though it's a 468-clause bill, we're going to go through every one of them, every single clause. That's why it's called clause-by-clause consideration. We're going to vote. We're all going to have the opportunity to vote. It's part of the democratic process to vote on every single clause. Just like we did last year—and I'm hoping that we will do it again this year—we will actually vote on every single clause, one by one.

I think that's really the most democratic way that we can do it, because that's what we're sent here to do. We're sent here to vote and to represent our constituents. It's the most important thing that we're sent here to do: to vote and to represent our constituents and bring their concerns to the table. The budget is obviously the signature piece of legislation of any government throughout the year. It's a prime time to meet our constituents where they are, to bring their concerns to the budget. Clause-by-clause consideration is a very, very important part.

I think we're going to need a lot of time for it, Mr. Chair, because it will take quite a bit of time to debate and vote on 468 clauses. I'm really looking forward to it, I have to say. I know it's long hours, but I know Conservatives aren't afraid of long hours. We'll stay here morning, noon and night to talk about every single clause to make sure that Canadians are getting the best representation that they can possibly get through the clause-by-clause process.

This brings me to item v, which says that following the completion of the study of Bill C-69, there will be no fewer than two meetings on the study of proceeds of crime and money laundering, a very important study.

• (1735)

I guess it has been proposed to be amended out. We haven't voted on all of this yet, but there's the possibility of a continuation of an existing study we're doing—I think it was Daniel Blaikie's study—on what they call the “financialization of housing”. This is the idea that somehow people are trading houses like they trade stocks on the stock market, but we know that's not true. The vast majority of homes are used for people's residences. They're not trading homes like they are shares in bank stocks. It's a woke ap-

proach to the whole real estate market to call it “financialization of housing”, but we'll entertain them and let them talk about their little financialization thing.

Then there's this other issue I talked about earlier. The former governor of the Bank of Canada, Mr. Carney, is going to be in the Senate tomorrow to talk about the state of play on green finance. As I mentioned earlier, Mr. Davies said last week, “I look forward to Mr. Carney's coming to this committee at the appropriate time in the appropriate study”, which can happen in the next two months. If he's talking about the state of play on green finance at the Senate and if the committee decides we're going to have meetings on the state of play on green finance, I don't see any reason that Mr. Davies would object to his coming for that meeting.

• (1740)

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

**The Chair:** There's a point of order.

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** I think we've gone around on this particular motion, amendment and subamendment quite a number of times. I think members have expressed their points of view. I don't think we're getting anywhere on this tonight. I would respectfully ask to suspend for this evening.

**An hon. member:** You can't do that on a point of order.

**The Chair:** No, you can't.

It's up to the chair to suspend, but I agree that we're not getting anywhere here, from what I've seen. I think we need to come back to this, because members—with a bit of time to think this through—may come back with a different perspective.

We will suspend at this time. We'll get back to this on Thursday.

*[The meeting was suspended at 5:41 p.m., Tuesday, May 7]*

*[The meeting resumed at 11:04 a.m., Thursday, May 9]*

• (5900)

**The Chair:** Welcome to the continuation of meeting number 142 of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Finance.

Pursuant to Standing Order 108(2), the committee is meeting to discuss the subject matter of Bill C-69, an act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on April 16, 2024.

Today's meeting is taking place in a hybrid format pursuant to the Standing Orders.

Before we begin, I'd like to remind all members and other meeting participants in the room of the following important preventative measures.

To prevent disruptive and potentially harmful audio feedback incidents that can cause injuries, all in-person participants are reminded to keep their earpieces away from all microphones at all times. As indicated in the communiqué from the Speaker to all members on Monday, April 29, the following measures have been taken to help prevent audio feedback incidents.

All earpieces have been replaced by a model that greatly reduces the probability of audio feedback. The new earpieces are black in colour, whereas the former earpieces were grey. Please only use the approved black earpieces. By default, all unused earpieces will be unplugged at the start of a meeting. When you're not using your earpiece, please place it face down in the middle of the sticker for this purpose, which you will find on the table. Please consult the cards on the table for guidelines to prevent audio feedback incidents.

The room layout has been adjusted to increase the distance between microphones and reduce the chance of feedback from an ambient earpiece.

These measures are in place so that we can conduct our business without interruption and to protect the health and safety of all participants, including the interpreters. Thank you all for your co-operation.

I'd like to make a few comments for the benefit of members and witnesses. Please wait until I recognize you by name before speaking. For members in the room, please raise your hand if you wish to speak. 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 understanding in this regard. Also, all comments should be addressed through the chair.

We are resuming debate on the motion of Mr. Turnbull, the amendment of Mr. Hallan and the subamendment of Mr. Morantz. Going back to my speaking order, MP Morantz is not here, so I have MP Hallan next to speak.

● (5905)

**Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan:** Thank you, Chair.

I will cede the floor to my friend Philip Lawrence, who will talk about this very common-sense subamendment to a very common-sense amendment.

**The Chair:** Thank you, MP Hallan.

I have another person on the list after MP Lawrence. It's MP Dzerowicz.

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

To be candid, it's a little disappointing that we don't have the ability to talk to the Minister of Finance and Deputy Prime Minister, Chrystia Freeland, today. We were looking forward to having a robust discussion. I've personally had many interesting discussions with Ms. Freeland about such things as the gap in GDP per capita between Canada and the U.S. and some of the financial struggles.

Just to set the stage, as it were, for the discussion—and unfortunately I suspect it will be a lengthy discussion on where we are right now—I don't want to tell tales out of school, but I did have a discussion with the parliamentary secretary, who was very upfront

this morning. I appreciate his candour. However, the challenge is that we started off on the wrong foot. He surprised us with a programming motion. For those in the media or simply watching at home, a programming motion sets up the organization of business. Normally this is done through a collaborative, co-operative process, even when parties are having a very heated exchange over their various different ideas and thoughts as to how the government... There have to be certain administrative and procedural agreements.

In the last couple of years, while sitting on the finance committee, I've had the privilege of negotiating those with various Liberal members, including Mr. Terry Beech. Yvan and I have also had some chats in the interim. They were not always friendly, but they were always respectful. Mr. Beech, for example, would nearly always give me the opportunity to discuss and have input on a motion prior to it being brought forward. While we didn't always agree, I very much appreciated that from the former parliamentary secretary, whose title is now "minister of fixing government" or something like that, I believe.

As I said, I try as much as possible to be an advocate for the truth. In fairness, there was a subcommittee meeting, but that meeting broke down. I would have expected maybe a courtesy call, as I got this morning, and I appreciated that.

Mr. Turnbull, I would very much have appreciated a call beforehand, and maybe we would have had a discussion. What we have is a programming motion that calls for, really, a very small amount of testimony. I understand that the government and the NDP brought a subamendment to increase it, so that's a positive sign. However, this programming motion is still deficient in a number of different ways, and I want to characterize it correctly. It's not that I'm objecting on behalf of Philip Lawrence or on behalf of the Conservative Party or Pierre Poilievre. I'm objecting on behalf of the people of Northumberland and the people of Peterborough South.

This is a massive document. It's over 600 pages, and I think even just some of the finite tax provisions in it could be the subject of lengthy debate and discussion, because anytime you're amending the Income Tax Act—it's a massive document—there are nearly always knock-on effects from that amendment. We need significantly more. I am pleased that Mr. Davies brought a subamendment to expand that. I think that's a step in the right direction.

The challenge is that Conservatives really want to know what the direction of the government is. In order to know the direction of the government, we need to hear from them. We've certainly heard enough from their current leader, but we need to hear from their future leader to know what the direction is to help us understand it so we can convey that to our constituents.

• (5910)

For example, we have seen Prime Minister Trudeau be absolutely unequivocal that he's going to continue with his carbon tax. He's actually going to quadruple that carbon tax. It is said that there will be no variation from this plan. In fact, his environment minister has said that if there's any deviation from the carbon tax, he will resign. That is absolutely crystal clear. What we don't know is what the Liberal plan is with respect to the carbon tax going forward if there is a change in leadership.

We have the Deputy Prime Minister, who is, of course, one of the likely Liberal candidates, for one hour. It's not really sufficient enough to discuss even her role as Minister of Finance, much less as a future potential leader of the party. We have an hour to discuss a 600-page document that will affect every Canadian through one provision or another. Some of these are quite in-depth; these are not simple provisions.

We can talk about some of the tax changes specifically. One of those changes could easily take up two or three hours. I suspect that many individuals haven't had the briefing they need to fully understand some of the ramifications of tax policy. We really need Ms. Freeland, the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, for at least two hours.

There's another challenge that Conservatives have. We would really like to hear from Mark Carney. It's no surprise that to many Liberals that he is the heir apparent as we move forward. I don't know whether we'll see a resignation from the Prime Minister; I don't know if he knows that. Clearly, things are not going well. While it doesn't appear that Liberal members will push the Prime Minister out the door, it does appear as though he's frustrated. Clearly, the economy and other factors are pointing to an early exit. With that being the case, there's a high likelihood that we're going to have Mark Carney as the new Liberal leader.

What we're asking for is to have Mr. Carney, who has in the past been an outspoken advocate for the carbon tax, appear. He's a huge proponent of the consumer-driven carbon tax. However, in recent days, including in recent Senate testimony, he has seemed to equivocate. When asked directly about it, he wouldn't give a yes or no answer. In fact, he quite adeptly equivocated, I guess getting ready for his career in politics. We want to ask him whether a Carney-led Liberal government have a consumer carbon tax.

We've heard the NDP equivocate on this point in recent months with the leader of the NDP stating that maybe the consumer-led carbon tax was not the best direction to go in, while they continue to support and prop up the regime of Prime Minister Trudeau's Liberals, which is on track to quadrupling the carbon tax. Canadians deserve to know whether the future Liberal leadership candidates, whether it's Deputy Leader Freeland or former governor of the Bank of Canada Mark Carney, would indeed support a consumer carbon tax.

The other issue that I would really like to talk to Mr. Carney about is what his thoughts are on the actions of the current Governor of the Bank of Canada, Tiff Macklem. Of course, during the pandemic, Mr. Macklem said that interest rates would be low for long, and many Canadians relied on that. They selected variable mortgages and had shorter renewal terms on their mortgages think-

ing that interest rates would be, as Mr. Macklem said, unequivocally I might add, low for long.

I would really like to know whether Mr. Carney would criticize Mr. Macklem's actions. I'd also like to know, because inflation doesn't seem like it's going down, as is often the case with inflation.... We saw this in the 1970s and in the 1980s. Getting that first part of inflation down is oftentimes the "easy part". It's in that last mile that inflation gets really sticky and hard to remove.

• (5915)

We've heard past comments from Tiff Macklem that excessive government spending is unhelpful because it boosts demand, which increases the prices and costs of nearly everything and raises inflation. I'd love to hear from the future Liberal leader on whether he would reduce spending or continue with the \$54 billion of interest at which the debt is being paid. That's more than the entire amount in health care transfers. Just imagine if we did not have a national debt in Canada. We would be able to double our health care spending. That's really amazing.

Another issue was pointed out by Thomas Mulcair, former leader of the NDP. What he said, which is interesting, is that the amount of interest is equal to the entire revenue collected by the goods and sales tax, the GST, across the country. If we didn't have that \$1.3-trillion national debt, we would be able to cancel the GST, which was a Liberal promise from many years ago that still has yet to come to fruition.

I think that having Mr. Carney here is an absolutely reasonable request. He went before the Senate, so he's clearly not shy, and he has a willingness to go before public officials. It does get to me. I try not to, in politics—or as little as possible—speculate on people's intentions, because I believe that most people's intentions are good. I think you get into a dangerous world when you start speculating on the intentions of our colleagues. It's hard to look into someone's heart, but it does make you wonder where the brakes are here.

What is the Liberal government so afraid of that they will not allow Mr. Carney to testify in front of the finance committee? Maybe they're protecting.... Maybe the Prime Minister prefers his successor to be the Deputy Prime Minister, and he doesn't want Mr. Carney to come here and outshine him. Maybe it's a Paul Martin-Jean Chrétien type of thing, where they're afraid Mr. Carney will make too much of a splash.

I hope it isn't that Mr. Carney is afraid to answer questions. Clearly, as a former governor of the Bank of Canada and the Bank of England, he's hopefully faced tough questions. In fact, I'm mindful of an exchange that I saw between the current leader of the official opposition, Mr. Poilievre, asking Mr. Carney some difficult questions. I don't think anyone can say that Mr. Carney did a great job of answering those questions, but if I were him, I might want an opportunity to redeem myself and come before the finance committee. If nothing else, for altruistic reasons, I would think Mr. Carney would want to share his experience with us.

Specifically on that, I have talked at length about productivity and the importance of economic growth in bringing prosperity to our country. I'm not the only one, of course; there's a wide symphony of voices across economic experts. I can rattle off the names of Bill Morneau, John Manley, the C.D. Howe Institute and the Fraser Institute. Even the current finance minister, Chrystia Freeland, has talked about it. Of course, most recently, Carolyn Rogers gave her famous "break the glass" speech about productivity. Do you know who else has spoken about productivity? It's Mark Carney. He's criticized this government for their lack of focus on economic growth and their lack of focus on productivity, so I would welcome him into the discussion.

• (5920)

It is a nut that Canada hasn't been able to crack. Out of fairness, it has been a 30-odd-year problem, but it's gotten significantly worse over the last 10 years. You can see that; it comes through in the numbers. If you look at a chart—I tried to show the chart to the Minister of Finance, but the chair said I wasn't allowed to use props—a clear departure between GDP per capita in the United States of America and GDP per capita in Canada started in about 2015 and 2016. The gap is now wider between income per Canadian and income per American. It has never been wider in recent history—in the last 100 years.

Of course, the productivity crisis has led us to the lost decade in Canada. We have had virtually no economic growth in the last 10 years. Our GDP per capita has more or less been flat. That really is an outlier. We are the worst in the G7 in the last five years in growth of GDP per capita, and we continue to be a laggard. Actually, our GDP per capita is, I believe, in its seventh negative quarter. I would have asked the Minister of Finance some questions: Have you looked at these numbers? Could you explain to the committee why our economy is the worst in the G7, looking at a GDP per capita lens? Why do Canadians have to suffer through the seventh quarter of declining GDP per capita?

These were the questions I would have asked Minister Freeland and quite frankly, I'd put them to former governor Mark Carney as well. We really need to have these discussions for the BIA, because I think it's important for Canadians. We need to have these discussions now about the economic changes that Canada needs in order to get back on a strong footing.

As I said, it's not just me talking about this. It is the C.D. Howe Institute. It's Bill Morneau. It's John Manley. It is the Fraser Institute. It's Ian Lee. It is Jack Mintz. They're noted economists, and it doesn't really matter whether they're left, right or centre. There's a near consensus across this country that the numbers are the numbers and that we are struggling mightily when it comes to productivity.

These challenges will continue to plague our country as we go forward. We really need to have a discussion, not just at the boardroom tables on Bay Street but at the coffee shops on Main Street, about how Canada can get out of this economic hole. As my colleague Damien Kurek talked about a bit in his speech last night in the House, when you're at the beginning of piloting a boat or a plane and you have a long journey, even a slight error in navigation

early on in that journey can have massive consequences down the line.

We actually saw this under Pierre Elliott Trudeau. Of course, Pierre Elliott Trudeau ran up massive deficits, and that left the Mulroney government in a difficult position. It ran structural surpluses, meaning that if you took out the debt that was accrued under the Trudeau government, every year under the Mulroney government, it took in more than it spent. Part of that was because of tremendous economic growth, no doubt spurred on by the free market policies of the Mulroney government. The challenge was that they carried along with them a Pierre Elliott Trudeau legacy.

• (5925)

We're really, sadly, at the beginning of a debt or deficit crisis if we don't get ourselves back on course. Right now, we're at \$54 billion in interest. If the minister were here, I'm sure the first response to some of my economic questions would be that we have a AAA credit rating, and that's true for now. The reality is, though, that if we don't course correct on the debt and deficit, we won't, because sooner or later the interest will get to be such a big force. In fact, Albert Einstein said that the most powerful force in the universe is compounding numbers or compounding interest, meaning that if you are on the wrong side of this—and we are now on the wrong side of it, with \$54 billion of interest being paid—it starts consuming more and more. Eventually, it will get to a point where Canada will no longer be able to pay its bills. Already we're at the point where we're spending more on interest than we are on health care, and there's more interest being paid than the entire amount collected by the GST. Alarms should be going off.

The challenge, too, is that there is a bit of a spiral effect. The more resources in general—and I'm sure my NDP colleague might add some caveats here—that businesses have for spending on investment and on their workers.... Quite frankly, I agree with him on that, but in general, the more resources the private sector has, the more effective it can be at investing and innovating, at becoming competitive and at creating prosperity for the country.

As you suck more of the revenue, the wealth, from the private sector and give it to the public sector, not for goods and virtuous services like some of our social safety nets, our health care or our productive resources, but to banks and bondholders in the form of interest payments, you reduce the efficiency and the effectiveness of the economy. Then the economy actually starts to shrink, which means there's less revenue and the government has to increase rates. Then it goes back again: The economy shrinks more and rates go up more, and you get into a negative debt-spiral trap. We've seen this in non-advanced economies, and it has had devastating consequences. We've had many economists talk about this, so we need to get our spending under control.

The leader of the official opposition has put forward a dollar-for-dollar plan, saying that every new dollar we need to spend—and there will certainly be new dollars we have to spend—will be matched with savings from somewhere else. The Liberal government has talked about potential savings, but as the member for Simcoe North has talked about, while the government has planned to generate savings through attrition in the public sector, it has yet to publish any type of plan that will allow that to happen. All we see is a government that continues to spend more and more money.

As Ed Fast, the member for Abbotsford, has talked about many times, we can't let that spending get out of control. The reason is not that Conservatives want, in any shape or form, any type of austerity when it comes to government or otherwise, but that it would prevent the type of austerity we saw during the nineties era, under the Chrétien-Martin Liberal government. They dramatically cut health care transfers because the debt, which was largely accrued under Pierre Elliott Trudeau, got to a point where banks and bondholders basically cut the country off. That led to very dramatic reductions in health care transfers and other spending. Conservatives want to protect health care and other government spending by making sure that we are fiscally responsible now.

● (5930)

If the Minister of Finance and Deputy Prime Minister were here, she would no doubt tell me that we are on track to hitting all three of our guardrails. The reality, though, is that that's on very shaky ground, and I'll tell you why: A number of the economic forecasts in the budget are very positive, bullish forecasts, such as increasing GDP.

The other issue is that we haven't yet seen capital gains legislation, and to make that budget work, they need \$7 billion in the first year from capital gains. Otherwise, they miss two of the three guardrails. I confirmed that with testimony from the PBO. Those guardrails would be the debt-to-GDP ratio not increasing and the deficit not increasing. They would miss two out of three of those guardrails. Quite frankly, right now that capital gains legislation hasn't appeared.

You might say, "Well, Mr. Lawrence, we have the whole year to gain additional revenue from capital gains, so just relax. We might even get some retroactively." However, no, that's not the case here because the government has set up an artificial fire sale by saying that the legislation goes into place on June 24 or June 25. I have no doubt that there are Canadians right now preparing to sell their property to take advantage of the current capital gains rate as opposed to what it will be. Until there's certainty and Canadians know that the capital gains rate will go up through the introduction of legislation, I'm sure many will just wait to see whether this legislation comes into place. We're quickly approaching—I think it's June 24, but I can never remember if it's the 24th or the 25th—that timeline. If the government doesn't introduce this capital gains legislation—which, for political purposes, they decided to pull out of the budget—they will not hit two out of three of their guardrails. That means we will have more spending, which is going to put us further down the debt and deficit spiral going forward and will worsen our economic growth.

When last I checked in, Mr. Davies wasn't sure whether he agreed with me. However, I'll say it again, and maybe he'll have a chance to agree or disagree. We'll see. It's my contention that, while Canada's GDP growth has been just high enough to keep us out of a technical recession, if you look at GDP per capita or the economic reality of the average Canadian, it has been negative for much more than two quarters continuously, which is the definition of a technical recession. We're at seven quarters, and that means that while Canada as a country is not in recession, Canadians are. In fact, we are in one of the longest recessions to occur since the Great Depression, and that is a great segue into talking about what Philip Cross said on GDP per capita or the economic circumstances of the average Canadian: We are in the worst economy since the Great Depression.

When we look at the severity and the seriousness of the economic situation we're in, I don't think Conservatives are being unreasonable—I really don't—by asking for three things in total. One of them has already been agreed upon, which is additional hours of study. For 665 pages, I don't think 30 hours is much. In fact, I've thought about a good change in process. For those who don't know, parliamentarians get a technical briefing for maybe a couple of hours, and we are responsible for, within 24 hours, reading 665 pages of extremely technical information. By the by, I say 665 pages, but those 665 pages are amending thousands of other pages. In order to understand those 600 or so pages of amending legislation, you have to understand the other thousands of pages of legislation.

● (5935)

While I have the floor, one of the changes of process I'd love to put forward to the government for the next budget would be to have the bureaucrats, many of whom have great depth of understanding of these changes and the context around them, give a presentation of five or 10 minutes on the substance of the changes. In a budget, there might be 100 different substantive changes, so it might be a couple of days. I would sign on to working from dawn until sundown to fully understand that and to have some of the knowledge held in our bureaucracy transferred to the politicians. That's one of the changes I thought would be a great idea.

I was a little bit surprised, although Mr. Davies did, in fairness, ask for additional time. I appreciate that, and Conservatives agree. He said that some of the testimony got repetitive. I didn't really see that, but to the extent that it did, I think that we could have eliminated that by having the public service put forward a substantive discussion of each of the provisions being changed. I don't think it would be unreasonable, when you look at the provisions in place that would affect literally every Canadian from coast to coast with millions, billions or, in some cases, if you look at it globally, trillions of dollars, to have a discussion on each one of the objects for five or 10 minutes and let them present to parliamentarians the substance of the issue. I think if we did that, we would give parliamentarians a good base for having fruitful, meaningful and constructive discussions about the individual areas.

The way the budgetary process works is that when we have the briefing, it is within 24 hours. By the by, the night before, we were working hard at the finance committee trying to get the fall economic statement through, which left us very little time to study those 600-odd pages and to fully understand that budget. Then, instead of being briefed on some of the technical provisions, we were told to ask any questions we wanted to.

I certainly did my best to try to review and understand it, but it's hard to consume such a massive amount of information in a very short period of time. That's why I believe a great change to the budgetary process would be to have members of the bureaucracy brief us on each one of those changes. Therefore, as I said, if there are 100 changes at five or 10 minutes a pop, it might be 500 or 1,000 minutes. I'm sure each one of those minutes would be worth hundreds of thousands of dollars in changes that we would effect in each minute. I would throw that out as a constructive suggestion.

I do want to respond to what I expect will be some comments from the parliamentary secretary, among others, that Conservatives are holding up this legislation. I think, quite frankly, our track record, specifically over the beginning of this year, rebuts that quite conclusively. Clause-by-clause consideration is where the rubber meets the road and where we as parliamentarians decide what will be in the legislation and what won't be in the legislation. Conservatives were actually agreeable, candidly, to the NDP's request to start grouping sections so we could move quickly. In fact, my colleague Mr. Singh Hallan actually withdrew some of his amendments so that we could get through the fall economic statement quickly. I would also point to the fact that it was a very constructive process in which my colleague Mr. Chambers said he had not, in his considerable experience, seen a budget amended as thoroughly as the fall economic statement implementation act was, so it was also a thorough process.

• (5940)

Conservatives were willing to do that going forward. We have, I think, a very reasonable—I won't even put it as a demand—request to have Mr. Mark Carney for at least three hours and then to have the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance for two hours.

Quite frankly, I don't like it when people speculate on my intentions. I don't think it's fair, and I try not to do that as well. I would just throw this out as free advice to that side. Minister Freeland is a very intelligent, eloquent speaker, and so if I were one of them, I would try to get Minister Freeland up as much as I could, and Mr. Carney has always acquitted himself fairly well. I'm not exactly sure why they're afraid of having two of their future leaders answer some questions.

As Minister Freeland has said before, certainly our exchanges in the past have been respectful. I don't believe I asked Minister Freeland any inappropriate questions. Maybe I asked tough questions, but that's the job. It's my job to ask those questions to make sure that the people of Canada and the people of Northumberland—Peterborough South, soon to be Northumberland—Clark, are given the answers so they know, so they understand.

In context, of course, during the early part of our calendar every year as parliamentarians, a fair amount of our time is spent in our constituency. Like all other 337 of my colleagues, I spend a lot of

time at events talking to people. Soon we'll be on the barbecue circuit again, talking to thousands of people. In all sincerity, it really hit home. I've never had a series of interactions of the kind I have had in the last two or three months, with nearly every individual saying one of two things, or both. One is, "I am really struggling. I've never had these economic conditions before. I've never gone to a food bank. In fact, I have a lifetime of donating to food banks, and now I'm a recipient of the food bank." These are very serious issues. I'm sure we've all received those calls or emails or have had those direct one-on-one interactions. I don't think I'm in a vacuum at all.

Quite frankly, I think having the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance here for two hours and having the future Liberal leader, Mark Carney, here for three hours to explain their economic plans, their commentary on why Canada is in such a terrible economic shape, is reasonable.

Right now we will agree to the scheduling put forward by the NDP and the Liberals. All we're asking is that we get a little bit of insight for two hours from the current finance—

• (5945)

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

I'm sorry to interrupt your stream of consciousness and riveting speech, Mr. Lawrence, but I just wanted to make a quick point. It's not really a point of order, but I'll just make a quick comment that might be helpful. The Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance is here and is willing to appear today. We have committed to that.

You've said multiple times in your speech today that you'd like to ask the Minister of Finance your tough questions, so I would respectfully seek unanimous consent to pause this debate and return to it after her appearance. That way you would get your questions in.

**The Chair:** It was not a point of order, but the members have heard what PS Turnbull has had to say. I don't know if members want to speak to that.

Go ahead, MP Lawrence.

**Mr. Philip Lawrence:** Conservatives are agreeable to that.

**The Chair:** Conservatives are agreeable to that.

Okay. Are the Bloc and NDP agreeable to this?

Yes? Okay.

MP Lawrence, the floor is yours still, and then it's MP Chambers after that.

**Mr. Philip Lawrence:** Thank you.

We are agreeable to the UC motion.

What time is the minister coming?

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** She's coming at 12 o'clock.

**Mr. Philip Lawrence:** Will we just continue to debate until 12 o'clock, Chair? Is that what the plan is? We can suspend if you want, as riveting as my speech was.

**The Chair:** I'm looking to everybody.

We're suspended.

• (5945) \_\_\_\_\_ (Pause) \_\_\_\_\_

• (5955)

**The Chair:** We're back.

First let me say, Deputy Prime Minister—Minister Freeland—thank you very much for extending an opportunity to have you come here before our committee, and the members have agreed to that. You'll be here with us from 12 o'clock to one o'clock. We will be discussing the budget and Bill C-69. On that, Minister, you may have some opening remarks.

I also want to welcome Mr. Jovanovic.

• (6000)

**The Chair:** I'm sure that the members have many questions for you, Minister. Now you'll have an opportunity to provide some opening remarks, and then we'll get to members' questions.

**Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance):** Thank you very much.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chair, I am pleased to appear before you and the members of the committee to discuss the bill to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on April 16, 2024. The bill would implement many of the important measures in this year's budget. Our budget and the measures in this bill are intended to provide a fair chance for all generations.

These measures include a plan to make housing more affordable. This plan will help millennials and generation Z become homeowners, and it will enable them to save for a first down payment by offering them non-taxable shares, which is very helpful.

[*English*]

We're also putting more homes back on the market by cracking down on short-term rentals and by banning foreign buyers of Canadian homes. We're making life cost less, and we're strengthening Canada's social safety net for every generation, from expanding the Canada student loan forgiveness program to supporting workers across health care and social services who work in rural and remote communities to launching a national school food program to making switching Internet and phone plans easier and more affordable.

We're also increasing investment and productivity, including by delivering two more major investment tax credits to attract more private investment, create more good-paying jobs and grow the economy.

Mr. Chair, these investments are built upon a fiscally responsible plan. Last week, Moody's, one of the leading credit ratings agen-

cies, reaffirmed Canada's AAA rating with a stable outlook. Moody's also predicts that over the medium term, Canada will see more growth than some other AAA economies and that inflation will remain near the Bank of Canada's midpoint target of 2%.

This is a powerful, independent, objective proof point. A AAA credit rating means that Canada's economy is strong and resilient. It means that our economic plan is fiscally responsible. It means that we can afford to make the investments Canada needs and create the good jobs Canadians need. It means that the federal government can responsibly invest and borrow at lower costs, as can other orders of government and Canadian businesses.

[*Translation*]

Our triple-A credit rating also shows that the Conservative leader would rather make inflammatory statements and mislead Canadians than admit the truth. Our government's plan is fiscally responsible. The reality is that the Conservative leader simply does not want to make the investments needed to give young Canadians the opportunities they deserve. While the Conservative Party is looking for excuses to reduce investments in Canadians, our government is taking action.

That is why I am asking my parliamentary colleagues to pass the bill to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on April 16, 2024, as quickly as possible. Young Canadians are counting on us.

Thank you very much. I look forward to your questions.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Thank you, Minister Freeland.

We're going to go to our first round of questions.

Minister, I'm sure you are aware that we have a new member to our committee, MP Don Davies for the NDP, and a new parliamentary secretary, MP Ryan Turnbull, here on committee.

Now we'll go to our first round of questions. Each party will have up to six minutes. We're starting with MP Hallan, please, for the first six minutes.

**Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan:** Thank you, Chair.

Minister, do you think it was fair to increase the carbon tax 23% when 70% of Canadians told you not to, as two million Canadians visit a food bank in a single month? Was that fair?

• (6005)

**Hon. Chrystia Freeland:** Mr. Hallan, eight out of 10 Canadians get more money back than they pay in with the price on pollution. We also know that the only way to have a credible, effective economic plan in 2024 is to also have a climate plan. That is what our customers, Canada's customers, are requiring. That is what foreign investors are requiring.

We're seeing the results. In 2023 Canada had more FDI, foreign direct investment, per capita than any other G7 country. That's because we have a strong economic plan that includes a strong climate plan.

**Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan:** Minister, your carbon tax is actually a tax plan and not an environmental plan. The PBO, on multiple occasions, came to this committee and proved that a lot of the stuff you're saying is misinformation and false.

For example, he said just a few weeks ago that a majority of families pay more into this carbon tax than what they get through these rebates that you're talking about.

The last time you were here, for example, your own words were that an average Albertan family gets "\$1,800" in rebates, but I have the PBO report here in my hand that says an average Albertan family pays \$2,900 into the carbon tax.

Do you think it's fair that an average Albertan family has to pay \$1,100 more into the tax? Is that fair to them?

**Hon. Chrystia Freeland:** Mr. Hallan, I think the people who are trafficking in misinformation when it comes to a price on pollution are, I'm sad to say, the Conservatives.

**Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan:** Is the PBO wrong?

**Hon. Chrystia Freeland:** The average eight out of 10 Canadian families, very much including Alberta families, get more money back—

**Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan:** But he said a majority of families are worse off. Is he wrong?

**Hon. Chrystia Freeland:** —than they pay in on a price on pollution. That is simply the reality. It has been verified by economists across the country, including the most esteemed economists in Alberta. The reality is that this is a revenue-neutral plan that is giving money back to Alberta families. I am delighted that we are now giving money back to small businesses across the country, including small businesses in Alberta.

The final thing that is just so important—it's important for the province that you and I love a lot, which is Alberta—is that the only way for us, as an open trade-exposed economy, to have an economic plan that actually works, to actually be able to attract foreign investment and to actually be able to sell what we produce, is to have a strong and credible climate plan. That's what our government has.

**Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan:** Minister, I think it's clear to see, by you ducking and dodging the facts, that you absolutely are still peddling misinformation about the carbon tax. Someone who claims to love Alberta wouldn't take an extra \$1,100 in a carbon tax over what what people get in rebates. I just want to make that clear.

I will move on. Mark Carney testified yesterday at the Senate committee. As someone who will probably be your next leader and as someone who's rumoured to be also a leadership candidate in the next Liberal leadership race, Mark Carney was also ducking and dodging the question on whether he supported the carbon tax.

Before you launch your campaign, we want to know this: Will you continue down the path of Justin Trudeau and quadruple the carbon tax?

**Hon. Chrystia Freeland:** Mr. Hallan, I'm not sure that the best use of this committee's precious time is to indulge in political speculation and political horse racing—

**Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan:** I think the committee needs to know, if you're running for leadership, if you'll quadruple the tax.

**Hon. Chrystia Freeland:** I'm sorry, Mr. Hallan. I didn't interrupt you with your very long comments. I would ask you politely to do me the same courtesy.

**Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan:** Sure.

**Hon. Chrystia Freeland:** Let me just be clear, because you have waded pretty far into waters of political speculation, that our party has a leader and our government has a Prime Minister. He has the full support of our cabinet and our caucus.

**Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan:** Fair enough, Minister, except I have a short amount of time—

**Hon. Chrystia Freeland:** Mr. Hallan, please don't interrupt me.

**Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan:** —so on that note—

**Hon. Chrystia Freeland:** You used up your precious time speculating about party politics. You leave me no choice—

**Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan:** As a follow-up to that question, Minister—

**Hon. Chrystia Freeland:** —but to answer. I'm quite happy—

**Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan:** I just wanted to ask you if you support his quadrupling—

**Hon. Chrystia Freeland:** I'm sorry, Mr. Hallan. I didn't interrupt you.

**The Chair:** Minister and Mr. Hallan, perhaps we could try to find the right balance here so that we can hear and we can get some answers.

**Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan:** Sure.

I'll move on, then, because I just wanted to know—

**Hon. Chrystia Freeland:** I wasn't finished with my answer, Mr. Hallan.

**Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan:** That's fine. I'll take my time back, because I only have a limited amount of time.

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** I have a point of order.

Mr. Chair, I think it's customary, when members ask questions, to give witnesses an equal and weighted amount of time to answer, and I don't believe the minister has had her time to answer.

**The Chair:** What I would ask for is respect here in the room. We do have the minister. It is precious time. We have one hour. I'm sure you want to hear from the minister.

MP Hallan, I'm sure you want to pose your questions, so let's find, as I said, the right balance to make this happen.

• (6010)

**Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan:** All I want is to move on to my next question, because I have only a limited amount of time.

Minister, under the nine years of your government, rents have literally doubled. They were half what they are now before your government took over. Rent prices are outpacing income for the first time in 60 years. Your \$89-billion photo op slush fund, supposedly for housing.... After you announced that, it has doubled rents. I want to know how you spent \$89 billion to double rents.

**Hon. Chrystia Freeland:** I am glad to see all of us paying attention to housing. I think it is one of the most pressing issues for Canada and Canadians. That is why, with this budget and the actions we have taken, our government has put forward the most ambitious plan to get more homes built faster than at any time in Canadian history. All of the measures taken together will mean that nearly four million new homes will be built by 2031. That is what Canada needs. That is what we are doing. That's what we're investing in. Conservative austerity will not accomplish that.

You also offer me a nice opportunity to point out that when your current leader was responsible for housing, he managed to get only six homes built. That is a record we're happy to stand against any day of the week.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Minister.

We're going to our next questioner, MP Thompson, for the next six minutes, please.

**Ms. Joanne Thompson:** Thank you.

Welcome again to committee, Minister. I'm sorry that I'm not there in person, but I'm pleased as well that I'm back in my riding today.

I would like to reference the school nutrition program.

Specifically, we know that every child in Canada deserves to have the best start in life, but nearly one in four kids just doesn't get enough food. This, obviously, has a real impact on their ability to learn and to grow.

Certainly, while the Conservatives seem to be against supporting fairness for every generation, our government—I'm very proud of this—is taking action, and we're certainly seeing this with the launch of the national school food program.

Would you outline some of the benefits of this program, please?

**Hon. Chrystia Freeland:** I know that you, like me, are a mother. I know that you have worked as a nurse. I know how much you know and care about Canada's children.

I must say that the national school food program is one of the things in this budget that I am most pleased that we're able to invest in. This investment means that an additional 400,000 Canadian children will get some food in school, before school. I know that you, like me, have had heartbreaking conversations with school teachers who talk about how, in Canada today, they have students who come to school and can't focus because they're hungry. I know that you, like me, have talked to teachers who say that they spend their own money to buy some snacks to bring to school to give to those kids. We, thanks to this investment, are going to be able to

provide nutritious, healthy snacks to 400,000 more Canadian children. I think that is surely a measure we should all support.

I do have to point out that this is just one example of why we need a government that recognizes the importance of investing in Canada and Canadians. This is why austerity and cuts always, always hurt the most vulnerable. They hurt the people who need help the most. They hurt Canada's children.

That's why I am so glad that our government, with this budget that promises fairness for every generation, is investing in the youngest Canadians.

• (6015)

**Ms. Joanne Thompson:** Thank you.

I wanted to stay with young Canadians or younger Canadians for another moment.

We know that young Canadians were disproportionately affected by the COVID-19 pandemic. It's interesting to me that in so many of the comments we hear here at committee, we seem to forget that it was a very difficult period of time that this government, I believe, did a remarkable job in navigating Canadians through, but young Canadians certainly faced the worst of the pandemic, and they're still feeling the economic pinch. I certainly feel, and I believe the government does, that it's very important that we address the struggles that young Canadians are experiencing, particularly around the high cost of living. I'm glad and very pleased that so many of the investments in budget 2024 address these concerns for young Canadians.

I'm wondering if you could speak to this. You referenced some of the programs in your opening statements, but I'd be really interested. I think it's important to outline in a little more detail the specifics of what is in the budget to help young Canadians who are feeling that the opportunities are not available to them that were available to their parents.

**Hon. Chrystia Freeland:** Thank you very much, Ms. Thompson. I could not agree more.

This is a budget for fairness for every generation, with a particular focus on millennials and Gen Z. That is because we recognize that today the promise of Canada—the good middle-class life, if you study hard and have a good job—is just too hard to reach. That's why in the budget we are aggressively investing in housing, in measures to make life more affordable, in economic growth and productivity, and we're doing it all in a fiscally responsible way, because we understand that that is also part of our promise to young Canadians.

Then how do we make the math work? We're doing that by asking those who are doing the very best in our society to contribute a little bit more. That's a budget that delivers fairness for every generation.

Specifically for younger Canadians, I want to highlight two measures. One—and I'm going to smile at Don Davies—is free prescription contraceptives. It is high time to deliver this for Canadians, for all Canadians. It is especially important for young Canadian women.

As we were putting together this plan, I spoke to gynecologists and obstetricians, who said to me that every month they have young women who come to their offices who are pregnant and don't want to be. The reason is that these young women—teenagers, some of them—can't afford to pay for prescription contraceptives, and they're too scared to ask their parents for the money, or maybe their parents don't have the money. It is a tragedy for every woman who goes in to see a gynecologist or an obstetrician in that situation, and it's a tragedy for our country, and I am really glad that we are now taking action to change that.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Minister.

We'll move to MP Ste-Marie.

Thank you, MP Thompson.

[*Translation*]

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

Good afternoon, Minister and Mr. Jovanovic. Thank you for being here.

There are four areas I'd like to discuss today, if I have time. However, I'm going to focus on just one topic during this round.

I'm talking about the part of the bill that regulates open banking. We understand that there will be a follow-up to Bill C-69 in the fall to regulate consumer protection and other aspects. In this bill, though, you're laying the groundwork for open banking.

I am really concerned because the purpose of the proposed regulations is to ensure that everything is controlled by the federal government. However, you could have chosen to use the co-operative model in the area of securities, where each province has equivalent standards and there is mutual acceptance among the provinces.

So I am concerned about the possibility of a two-tiered system. Banks in Toronto are under federal jurisdiction, but caisses populaires such as Desjardins, credit unions and financial institutions such as Alberta Treasury Branches Financial come under Quebec and provincial legislation. If those institutions want to enter the 21st century and participate in open banking, they must have the authorization of their province, which must then give up its right to legislate to the federal government.

It would be a concentration and a centralization of powers. In addition, based on what we have heard, the provinces were not consulted on this until very recently.

Why did you choose to do that?

• (6020)

**Hon. Chrystia Freeland:** Thank you for the question, which is concrete and specific.

I would like to begin by reassuring you that we respect the role of the provinces and territories in the financial system. We are not going to and do not want to impose anything. We understand the importance of working closely with the provinces and territories, and that is what we will be doing by moving forward with this system.

I would also like to take this opportunity to thank Quebec's Minister of Finance, Eric Girard, with whom I have an excellent relationship. Our entire team works in co-operation with Quebec and all the provinces, but perhaps somewhat particularly with Quebec. This is an important issue, and we take it seriously.

I also take seriously the role of credit unions, which you mentioned. They are an important part of our financial system and we must always include them. There's another thing we need to think about: The world is moving forward, as you said, and it's important to have open banking in order to have a modern, productive economy in this country.

However, I really want to reassure you by telling you that, as we move forward with this, we will take very seriously the position, ideas and wishes of the provinces and territories, including those of Quebec, and that the role of the caisses populaires is very important to us.

I would like to make another point. Quebec investors, innovators and entrepreneurs already play a key role in the financial technology ecosystem. That group of entrepreneurs is among the most advanced in this system. In my conversations with entrepreneurs in Quebec, I am being told that it is important for our country to move forward because we already have the capacity to innovate in this sector.

**Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie:** Thank you for your answers and comments, as well as for your show of respect toward Quebec and the provinces, their areas of jurisdiction and institutions such as the caisses populaires Desjardins.

However, the choice put forward in Bill C-69 is to stay in the 20th century or to move forward into the 21st century. However, if institutions under provincial jurisdiction want to move forward into the 21st century, the first step is to regulate open banking. Given the architecture of Bill C-69, that step goes through the province, which must voluntarily relinquish its jurisdiction and announce to institutions that the portion of their operations under open banking will be regulated by the federal government from now on.

Ultimately, it is worrisome to see that it's the province that would give up one of its areas of jurisdiction. In addition, institutions that would remain under provincial jurisdiction would have to double their legal services in order to comply with the requirements of the province on the one hand, and those of the federal government on the other hand, as a result of open banking. That would be a competition issue. Why would an institution want to remain under provincial jurisdiction if costs were higher?

So there is a real fear that the federal government will go for a power grab and could use its power over the banks to regulate all businesses that interact with them. In my opinion, what your government is trying to do with this bill is to squeeze out Quebec and the provinces in the world of finance. Based on the skeleton of the proposed system, that gives me some concerns.

In order to respect jurisdictions, could you not instead consider a system such as the one for securities, or a system such as Interac, where there is self-regulation?

• (6025)

[English]

**The Chair:** I'm sorry, MP Ste-Marie, but you're going to have to hold on to that. Ms. Freeland can answer that in another round, because we're way over time. I'm sure you'll also have an informal chat to speak to that issue.

MP Davies, go ahead, please.

**Mr. Don Davies:** Thank you, Minister, for being with us today.

Minister, I know we have about a \$40-billion deficit and that there are different ways of addressing deficits over time. We can cut expenditures, as I think the Conservatives would do, and there's growth in the economy, which I think everybody hopes for, and there's raising revenue in, hopefully, a fair and measured way.

Given that oil and gas extraction companies in Canada made a record \$63 billion in profits in 2022 and that they are, I think, on track to come close to that in 2023, can you explain why your government has declined to impose an excess profits tax on the oil and gas sector, as it did for banks and insurance companies in 2022, which made significantly lower profits?

[Translation]

**Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie:** That's a very good question.

[English]

**Hon. Chrystia Freeland:** I'm going to start just with a little lighthearted commentary, okay? You guys have to forgive me, and I hope you will forgive me, because Mr. Davies and I have known each other for longer than anybody else in this room has known each other.

The question I want to start with is this: Who are you cheering for, the Oilers or the Canucks? It's a tough question. I was facing similar challenges in my own house, but the Leafs are out.

**Mr. Don Davies:** Given where my voters live, it's an easy one to answer—go, Canucks, go!

**Hon. Chrystia Freeland:** Okay.

Well then, one thing we are going to differ on is that my house is now cheering for the Oilers with a clear conscience.

**Mr. Don Davies:** As long as a Canadian team wins the Stanley Cup, I'm happy.

**Hon. Chrystia Freeland:** I think maybe the committee could have unanimous consent around that idea.

I'm sorry to take up that time. I just couldn't resist.

Our government does believe that part of a responsible and effective economic plan that delivers fairness for every generation means you have to make the investments that Canadians need. To do that in a fiscally responsible way, you have to raise revenue.

As you know—because I heard you talk about this in the House earlier this week—the main way to raise revenue in this budget is to increase the capital gains inclusion rate. That is the right thing to do. That really is a way to deliver fairness for every generation. I think that measure, appropriately, asks those who have benefited the most from everything that is great about Canada to contribute a little bit more for the next generation. I think it does that without hurting, and it does it in a way that maintains Canada's strength as an investment destination, Canada's economic strength and the ability of our economy to grow. That's why we chose that particular measure.

I have more to say, but I think you want to say something, so I had better shut up.

• (6030)

**Mr. Don Davies:** Thank you. Maybe I can give you some more room on that. You may have anticipated a bit where I'm going to go, because another potential revenue item is corporate taxes generally.

I think I've put this to you before. In the United States, President Biden is proposing to increase the U.S. corporate income tax rate to 28% from the current 21%.

I know that it seems to be a key economic feature in Canada that we need to keep Canadian corporate taxes competitive relative to those in the United States, and I think we all accept that. Right now we're at 15%, and they're at 21%. If the U.S. is raising their corporate tax rate to 28%—another 7%—do you agree with me that it opens up room for us to have a measured increase in corporate tax rates in Canada that would help with revenue for the federal government while also keeping Canadian businesses competitive vis-à-vis the U.S.?

**Hon. Chrystia Freeland:** Mr. Davies, a thing I learned very early on in the NAFTA negotiations—and it became a rule that I set for myself—was to never make commitments based on a hypothetical, particularly when it comes to political events in the United States. However, I am going to make two general comments, because I think you raise an important issue.

Number one, I do think all of us need to be thoughtful about Canada's global competitiveness. At the Department of Finance, Mio is the head of tax policy, so he's in charge of all the harder stuff that the finance department does. The other finance people will be mad that I said that, but he has an internationally respected kind of engine that calculates METR, the marginal effective tax rate, comparing Canada to other economies.

We have a table for METR in the budget, and we look at that closely all the time to be sure we are competitive. It's a relative measure.

The second thing I'll say is that I do think that we, as people in western democracies, have been living through a period of a race to the bottom when it comes to taxation. You've seen in every single country a real corporate push to drive rates down and to tell citizens that they have to accept this because otherwise the capital will move to another jurisdiction. That's why I think the OECD two-pillar process is so important in trying to put a floor on that. I do think that this kind of collective action helps us as western democracies to maintain the revenue base that we need to make the investments that, in our case, Canadians need.

**Mr. Don Davies:** Thanks.

Mr. Chair, do I have some time?

**The Chair:** You do, for a really quick question and answer.

**Mr. Don Davies:** On the Canada disability benefit, you know that 1.4 million Canadians are living in poverty. You promised that your proposal would help lift about 600,000 people out of poverty, but it's only \$200 a month.

Minister, are you willing to increase that amount in this budget, and are you willing to look at the eligibility criteria so that every Canadian living with a disability and living in poverty in this country will actually be lifted out of poverty?

**Hon. Chrystia Freeland:** You know, Mr. Davies, that it's a very significant investment in the budget right now. It's a big deal that as a country, for the first time, we're putting a benefit in place.

Our government and I personally certainly share your aspiration that this needs to be just a first step and that we need to go further. I do think it's important to take it step by step and to carefully get the system in place. Something I think we need to be thoughtful about is to ensure that additional federal spending actually goes to the people who need it and doesn't get lost through clawbacks of various kinds, and I think acting in a step-by-step way is the best way to ensure that.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Minister.

Thank you, MP Davies.

Members, we are moving into our second round. This will be our final round, and I am going to have to hold pretty tightly to the timeline so that we can get through it.

We're starting with MP Lawrence for five minutes. Go ahead, please.

**Mr. Philip Lawrence:** Thank you, Minister, for appearing before the committee today.

Minister, I have a simple, straightforward question for you: Which country in the G7 has had the worst per-person income drop in the last five years?

**Hon. Chrystia Freeland:** It's very good to see you, Mr. Lawrence.

I think I can see the direction you're wanting to travel in, and so let me reassure you by pointing out that in the last quarter of 2023,

Canada had a healthy move in GDP. The first quarter of this year shows strong GDP growth—2.5%—and we're seeing that reflected in the productivity numbers too.

• (6035)

**Mr. Philip Lawrence:** Thank you, Minister.

What was the per capita GDP growth in Q4?

**Hon. Chrystia Freeland:** As I said, I can see the direction you're going. That's why I will take this opportunity to highlight good, solid GDP numbers in Q4 of 2023 and really good GDP numbers in the first quarter of this year. In terms of productivity and per capita GDP, I think the outlook for this year is really quite positive.

To take one project alone, the Trans Mountain pipeline, the Governor of the Bank of Canada estimates that it's going to add 0.25% to GDP growth in the second quarter of this year alone.

**Mr. Philip Lawrence:** Thank you.

**Hon. Chrystia Freeland:** Stephen Poloz thinks it's going to be 0.5%, and that will translate into the per capita numbers.

**Mr. Philip Lawrence:** Thank you.

I'm glad you're a fan of oil and gas there. That's good to hear.

I want to get back to my original question: Which country had the worst per-person income drop in the G7 over the last five years?

**Hon. Chrystia Freeland:** I think that I have spoken to some relevant measures of economic growth and talked about how we're seeing growth doing really well, particularly considering the widespread predictions about how Canada was going to suffer a recession, including from your side of the House.

I think a measure that is worth pointing to is median income, and I would point all members of this committee to some commentary recently written by Tyler Cowen, a U.S. economist, on Bloomberg, about how median income is a very important measure. That captures the life of the middle class. In median income, Canada has had steady growth over the past decade, and it looks really good compared to comparable economies.

**Mr. Philip Lawrence:** Thank you, Minister.

Could you please just answer this question? If you don't know, just say you don't know. That's fine.

What country had the worst per-person income drop in the G7 in the last five years?

**Hon. Chrystia Freeland:** I think I've spoken to where I see the important measures of growth, productivity and median income.

One of the valuable things about looking at the median income measure is that, as everyone is aware, because of some of the COVID dynamics, Canada had a real surge in the number of non-permanent residents in this country, such as international students. Obviously an international student won't have the income of someone who has been working here for many years, and that fact does have an impact on the numbers.

The budget included a section devoted to talking about these economic impacts. I would point people to median income as a really good measure that speaks to people's lives.

**Mr. Philip Lawrence:** I do appreciate that, and I would love to get to some of what underlies that, but first we need to sort of put where the baseline is.

To answer that question, Canada has had the worst income drop in the G7 over the last five years. The U.S. is at an 8% increase. Italy is at about 7%. Japan is a little shy of 4%. Then we have France and the U.K. Germany is slightly negative, and Canada is an outlier at negative 2%.

GDP per capita has a real impact on people. In fact, that's how most economists measure economic well-being. We've also had seven quarters now in which Canada's GDP per capita has been shrinking. If in fact we measured GDP on a per capita basis, we would be in one of our longest recessions. Since the Liberals formed government, our GDP per capita, our economic growth, has not grown a bit, not in the last 10 years. We are in a serious economic crisis, and it's troubling to me, Minister, that you won't answer basic questions.

**The Chair:** Thank you, MP Lawrence.

Thank you, Minister

I know the minister has a hard stop at one o'clock, and to get through everybody, we have to get to MP Dzerowicz. Maybe you could follow up when the Conservatives have the floor again.

MP Dzerowicz, go ahead for five minutes, please.

**Ms. Julie Dzerowicz:** Thank you so much, Mr. Chair.

Minister and Mr. Jovanovic, thank you for being here today.

My first question to you, Minister, is on the capital gains inclusion rate.

Since you introduced federal budget 2024, we've heard a lot of different commentary on the government's plans to increase the capital gains inclusion rate. Can you speak to us and shed light on why these changes will support investments in growth and productivity and how these changes will play a role in creating fairness for all Canadians of every generation?

• (6040)

**Hon. Chrystia Freeland:** I'll start where you concluded, which is to say this really is a budget for fairness for every generation. We recognize that means we have to make investments in Canada, for Canadians, and especially for millennials and Gen Z, and that means massive investments in housing. This budget has the most ambitious federal housing plan in Canadian history, with nearly four million new homes to be built by 2031. It means investments in affordability and in the social safety net. We've been discussing some of those, and they are really important for all Canadians, especially young Canadians.

Crucially, it means investments in economic growth. The budget includes a \$5-billion investment for students, for post-docs, for our universities and for research. That investment in our fundamental intellectual capacity is an investment in young people. It's an investment in the future.

The budget includes an investment of more than \$2 billion in AI to be sure Canada maintains its strong position in this essential frontier of the global economy. The budget includes really important investments in productivity overall, like the expansion of the accelerated CCA, the accelerated capital cost allowance. When you talk to businesses, they say that is a measure that drives investment. Of course, with this measure, plus Bill C-59, we will have four of our investment tax credits in the clean economy passed into law. That program is essential to ensure that Canada can remain an industrial and manufacturing economy in the 21st century.

We're making really big investments in Canada's economic capacity, and those investments cost money.

Now, some people would simply choose not to make any investments and follow a path of austerity. I think that would be a terrible mistake. Other people might choose to make the investments, but not do it in a fiscally responsible way. We saw that with a far-right budget, which didn't last very long, that was put forward in the U.K. I think that would be a mistake here also. Our government, which recognizes we need to make investments and we have to do it in a fiscally responsible way, is making our tax system more fair and using that fair approach to fund the investments that Canadians need.

I think the elephant in the room—in this committee, in the House of Commons, in Canada—is the Conservatives' really refusing to be clear on their view of tax fairness for every generation. I think that we're actually going to end up disagreeing: The Conservatives are going to prefer not to invest in Canadians because I think they find it too challenging to ask those who are doing the best to contribute a little more. I think that's a clear line of difference, and that would be a real mistake for Canada and Canadians.

**Ms. Julie Dzerowicz:** Thank you.

I have one quick final question. I know you talked about how a strong economy is very important for us. You talked about investment tax credits. We introduced them in Bill C-59 and now in this budget. Can you talk to us, Minister, about how you see investment tax credits helping Canadian businesses remain competitive in the global market while also pushing Canada towards a more sustainable economy?

**Hon. Chrystia Freeland:** Our chair says I can't, but I'll just say they're important.

**The Chair:** You have 15 seconds. Yes, they're very important. That's great. Okay. Maybe in another question you'll be able to follow up on that.

We go to MP Ste-Marie.

Again, you have two and a half minutes, MP Ste-Marie.

[Translation]

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

Minister, I'm going to ask you a question on another topic. Depending on how much time is left, you can answer my question and then come back to the issue of open banking.

I'm very pleased to see that part 2 of Bill C-69 includes the implementation of the OECD's pillar two, a framework for a global minimum tax. I commend all the work you are doing to combat the use of tax havens. I think this is really major, and I commend your courage.

However, in the 300 pages that are difficult to understand, there seems to be nothing about the distribution among the provinces of this tax that would be collected. In particular, what is the plan for provinces such as Quebec and Alberta, which collect corporate taxes?

• (6045)

**Hon. Chrystia Freeland:** Thank you for the question.

First, I want to quickly wrap up our conversation on open banking. It's really optional and we don't want to impose anything. However, I want to assure you that, for us, it is important to work with the provinces and territories and with caisses populaires. We are also prepared to work with you and to exchange ideas. You have raised an important concern, which we have discussed at length.

On the implementation of pillar two of the global tax agreement, I thank you for your understanding. I spoke a bit with Mr. Davies about the importance of having a multilateral regime, but it's really a complex regime. For all the processes related to the OECD and also for pillar one, it may be a good idea for us to continue the conversation among our teams to explain what we are going to do. We are currently doing work as part of pillar one, and it is not just up to us.

**Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie:** Thank you very much.

[English]

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Ste-Marie. We're right on time.

We'll now go to MP Davies for two and a half minutes.

**Mr. Don Davies:** Thank you.

Minister, just before I leave the topic of the Canada disability benefit, last June this is what Minister Qualtrough, who is responsible for disability inclusion, said:

No person with a disability in this country should live in poverty. Yesterday, the Canada Disability Benefit Act became law, creating the framework for a new federal benefit which will lift working-age persons with disabilities out of poverty. ...I look forward to working with the community this summer as we begin the regulatory process to make the Canada Disability Benefit a reality.

Minister, the reaction from the disability community in Canada is overwhelming. That \$200 a month is not going to lift anybody out of poverty, really—any person living with a disability.

Would you agree with me that maybe as positive a start as this is, this disability benefit does not meet the promise of this government

to establish a benefit that will lift people living with disabilities out of poverty?

**Hon. Chrystia Freeland:** Let me say I think we have the same values and the same aspirations, probably in general and certainly with regard to this benefit.

From my perspective, if we want to build robust and enduring programs for Canada and Canadians, we have to act step by step and ensure that we are building them with a foundation that is going to work.

I would say we have to recognize two more things. One is that Canada is very broad and diverse. As Mr. Ste-Marie was pointing out, it applies to everything. In thinking about open banking, I think we all share the same vision, but we know we have to take into account what is happening already in different provinces.

As you know very well, Mr. Davies, that is true also when it comes to treatment of people living with a disability across the country. I really believe—

**Mr. Don Davies:** I only have 10 seconds.

**Hon. Chrystia Freeland:** I'll stop there.

**Mr. Don Davies:** Is that okay?

**Hon. Chrystia Freeland:** Sure.

**Mr. Don Davies:** Thank you.

I'd like to move to the school nutrition program. Your budget says it will help 400,000 people. In my calculations, there are 2.2 million kids in Canada in grades 1 to 6. We all know that this program needs to be universal. I want to single out Ryan Turnbull, who has helped on this program.

How is this amount of money going to be allocated? What conditions may be attached to this money to make sure that all children in Canada get universal access to this program? Clearly, if it's for 400,000 kids, it won't even come close to being a school nutrition program for 2.2 million kids a year.

• (6050)

**Hon. Chrystia Freeland:** Again, we have been clear with the national school food program that this is... We currently have a patchwork, and some kids are getting support. That's great. Some of that support comes through programs supported by the federal government.

This measure is a big deal. It's saying we need to build a national school food program, but we need to be practical and build it based on what we have today in Canada and not kind of try to tear it up, but we have a patchwork. Our approach is going to be to build on that patchwork with willing partners, and that's why we're saying—

I'm sorry—

**The Chair:** Yes, we're going to have to get in there, because now we're over the time, and I don't want to take up time from the final two members.

I have MP Chambers for five minutes, please.

**Mr. Adam Chambers:** Thanks very much, Mr. Chair.

Minister, it's always a pleasure to have you here at committee. I'm sure you're always very busy, but it's nice of you to make the time to see us.

I want to take you on a vacation. Let's go to Mexico for a second. The Government of Mexico's average yield to maturity of their debt is around 18 years, and 59% of Mexico's debt is in 10-year bonds or longer.

In Canada, our average number of years to maturity is 6.9, and the number of 10-year bonds we issue as a percentage of our total debt is 33%. During COVID, 60% of the debt we issued was for three years or under. That's all renewed now at 4% or 5% interest rates instead of being locked in at, say, 1% for 10 years. In rough numbers, that's about \$10 billion a year in extra interest payments.

Do you think the government made a mistake during COVID by issuing short-term debt instead of long-term debt?

**Hon. Chrystia Freeland:** First of all, I think the people who are taking a break from their regular activities at this committee, which they're very busy with, are the people who have been filibustering the work of this committee. I'm very grateful—I sincerely am—that people took a break from that important work that the people of Canada appreciate on filibustering to have this conversation.

I would also say that it's an interesting choice to contrast Canada's fiscal position—our credit rating and our debt management—with that of Mexico. I can assure you that there is.... Well, I haven't talked to every single person in Mexico, but I talk to their government a lot. They would cheerfully trade their position for ours, given our AAA credit rating, which was reaffirmed last week by Moody's.

I'm glad that you're focusing on Canada's debt and our debt issuance, because it gives me an opportunity to highlight an important fact, which is that we issued a five-year global U.S. dollar bond. That's important, because the Bank of Canada likes to maintain some U.S. dollar debt—

**Mr. Adam Chambers:** Minister, respectfully, the question is whether we made a mistake—

**Hon. Chrystia Freeland:** No, no. You were talking about how we're issuing our debt. Let me just finish my sentence—

**Mr. Adam Chambers:** We're now halfway into the two and a half minutes here—

**Hon. Chrystia Freeland:** The spread on that debt was 10 basis points. It was issued last month, and that is the lowest spread relative to U.S. treasuries of any other issuer.

**Mr. Adam Chambers:** That's wonderful—

**Hon. Chrystia Freeland:** That speaks to the strength of Canada's fiscal position and of our debt management.

**Mr. Adam Chambers:** The truth is that the decision of the government during COVID to issue short-term debt was absolutely negligent, in that it's now costing taxpayers an extra \$10 billion a year. You would have extra money to give to Mr. Davies' or other Canadians' priorities had you not done that. We'll agree to disagree on that point.

Do you know how many people are going to be hired through the measures that are proposed in the budget?

**Hon. Chrystia Freeland:** That's a very broad question.

What I will say is that the measures proposed by the budget, I believe, will increase Canada's growth, will do so in a way that is fiscally responsible and thus allow inflation to continue to stabilize, creating conditions that will allow the Bank of Canada to lower rates.

I am very happy to take the opportunity to point out that 1.2 million more Canadians are employed today than were employed before COVID—

• (6055)

**Mr. Adam Chambers:** Thank you very much, Minister—

**Hon. Chrystia Freeland:** I think we're going to see a strongly growing economy, and that will mean more jobs for Canadians across the country.

**Mr. Adam Chambers:** Thank you very much.

For every budget bill that comes to this committee, we ask the same question every time, and nobody has an answer. Twenty-five per cent of the government's savings objectives are linked to the shrinking of the public service over time, yet no one in the government actually seems to have a plan for people.

I'll go to my very last question.

In our last exchange when you were here, I brought up an individual who's on the Infrastructure Bank board. You're the Deputy Prime Minister and you hold significant influence in cabinet.

Has this individual, Ms. Andrée-Lise Méthot, been asked to leave the Infrastructure Bank board, and are you concerned about the standard that this is setting for people who serve on our Crown corporations?

**Hon. Chrystia Freeland:** In your previous question, Mr. Chambers, you didn't specify that you were concerned with the public service. You just talked about employment in Canada, and of course my objective is for more Canadians to have good jobs. The budget does, though, make clear that we believe it's important, when it comes to the public service, to have a levelling off. You will see clearly in the budget text that we're going to see the size of the public service, over time, decrease by 5,000 employees. That is absolutely appropriate. It is part of responsible fiscal management.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Minister.

Thank you, MP Chambers.

These will be the final five minutes, MP Dzerowicz.

**Ms. Julie Dzerowicz:** Thank you so much, Mr. Chair.

Minister, I have two questions for you as well. I'm going to start where I ended last time, when we were talking about the importance of a strong economy for our federal government.

You introduced investment tax credits in the fall economic statement. You introduced additional investment tax credits in federal budget 2024. Can you talk to us about how you see investment tax credits helping Canadian businesses remain competitive in a global marketplace while we are pushing Canada towards a more sustainable economy?

**Hon. Chrystia Freeland:** Look, all kinds of ritualized jousting aside, I am really glad to have.... That was the last time, I know, but we haven't jousted that much today. I do want to be really sincere in talking about these investment tax credits. I think they are something that every MP here should support.

Mr. Davies has been clear that he is a Vancouver MP and is cheering for the Canucks, but something Mr. Davies, I and Mr. Hallan have in common is a close connection to Alberta. These tax credits are really important for Alberta, so I say to Mr. Hallan directly, "Please help us get them passed into law." The last time I was in Calgary, I heard from Alberta business that they really need these tax credits and they need the certainty that comes from their being actual law in order to make investments. That's speaking to those with Alberta connections.

Julie, you and Ryan and I and I think Mr. Chambers and Mr. Lawrence are all Ontario MPs—

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh!

**Hon. Chrystia Freeland:** —and, oh my God, our chair, so there are a lot of Ontario MPs here. Our province is so much a workhorse for the Canadian economy. I am proud of generations of Canadians who, unlike some other major industrialized economies, didn't give up our manufacturing base in the 1980s and 1990s, as happened in some other peer countries. Right now we're at a moment when, as a country, we have to decide: Do we continue to be a strong, powerful, industrialized manufacturing economy in the clean transition? These tax credits are about the government saying, "This is absolutely essential, and we're going to do it."

[*Translation*]

Mr. Ste-Marie, I want to point out that we are working closely with the province of Ontario on its investment tax credits. We also have an amazing collaboration with the province of Quebec. I must say that Mr. Legault personally agrees with the idea that today, in this period of global economic transition, we must have an industrial policy. The government has to be involved in this process because otherwise the capital will not be invested here, in Canada.

• (6100)

[*English*]

Finally, the proof of the pudding is in the results. In 2023, Canada had the most FDI per capita of any G7 country, the highest total quantum of FDI and the third highest in the world. Only the

U.S. and Brazil were ahead of us, and they are much more populous countries.

**Ms. Julie Dzerowicz:** Do I have time for another question?

**The Chair:** You have 30 seconds.

**Ms. Julie Dzerowicz:** I'll just say thank you, then.

Thank you for coming here today.

**The Chair:** Thank you, MP Dzerowicz.

Thank you, Minister.

We're right at one o'clock.

We want to thank you for coming here before our committee on Bill C-69, the budget implementation act.

We thank you even more in bringing all of us together in cheering for the Canucks or the Oilers. Hopefully a Canadian team goes on to win the Stanley Cup. We are all in agreement on that.

Thank you and have a wonderful day today.

We thank Mr. Jovanovic for coming here and being with us.

Members, we are suspended now.

[*The meeting was suspended at 1:01 p.m., Thursday, May 9*]

[*The meeting resumed at 2:08 p.m. on Friday, May 17*]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Good afternoon, colleagues. I call this meeting to order.

Welcome to the continuation of meeting number 142 of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Finance. Today's meeting is taking place in a hybrid format pursuant to Standing Order 15.1.

Before we begin, I would like to remind all members and other meeting participants in the room of the following important preventative measures.

To prevent disruptive and potentially harmful audio feedback incidents that can cause injuries, all in-person participants are reminded to keep their earpieces away from all microphones at all times. As indicated in the communiqué from the Speaker to all members on Monday, April 29, the following measures have been taken to help prevent audio feedback incidents.

All earpieces have been replaced by a model that greatly reduces the probability of audio feedback. The new earpieces are black in colour, whereas the former earpieces were grey. Please use only an approved black earpiece. By default, all unused earpieces will be unplugged at the start of a meeting.

When you are not using your earpiece, please place it face down on the middle of the sticker for this purpose, which you will find on the table, as indicated. Please consult the cards on the table for guidelines to prevent audio feedback incidents. Also, the room layout has been adjusted to increase the distance between microphones and reduce the chance of feedback from an ambient earpiece.

These measures are in place so that we can conduct our business without interruption and to protect the health and safety of all participants including the interpreters.

Please wait until I recognize you by name before speaking. For members in the room, please raise your hand if you wish to speak. For members on Zoom, please use the “raise hand” function. The clerk and I will manage the speaking order as well as we can. We appreciate your understanding in this regard. I will remind everyone that all comments should be addressed through the chair.

Thank you all for your co-operation.

The chair has convened the meeting today, pursuant to a request by five members under Standing Order 106(4), to discuss the recent revelations regarding TD Bank Group and allegations of failing to report money laundering related to the trafficking of the illegal hard drug fentanyl and other money-laundering violations across the financial sector in Canada.

Mr. Chambers, I see that your hand is up.

**Mr. Adam Chambers:** Mr. Chair, I would like to start the meeting if we may.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Sure. Go ahead, Mr. Chambers.

**Mr. Adam Chambers:** Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

I appreciate colleagues for coming together this afternoon.

As you know, money laundering is a very important issue that we've been talking about for quite some time, one for which we put a motion on notice on Tuesday, March 19. That was distributed by the clerk in both official languages. For those of you who would like to pull up that motion, it was on Tuesday, March 19, from our meeting. Verbal notice of it was given.

I'd like to move that motion officially here today, Mr. Chair.

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** On a point of order, I would like to ask the chair if he can clarify with the clerk what advice the chair was given for the conduct of our meeting in terms of starting the meeting. My understanding is that the clerk gave the advice that the previous meeting was suspended and that this meeting should start on the subamendment the Conservatives introduced in a previous meeting, which is on a motion regarding the rest of our schedule between now and June.

For clarity, could the clerk share with the chair what advice the clerk has given the chair?

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** We'll suspend the meeting for now.

● (25410)

(Pause)

● (25410)

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Colleagues, having just consulted the clerk, I would like to advise members that any discussions between the chair and the clerk are confidential. There was advice given, and we are continuing, pursuant to Standing Order 106(4), the matter that was brought forward today. That is what we just discussed.

Mr. Chambers, you may continue.

**Mr. Adam Chambers:** Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

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

**Mr. Adam Chambers:** Mr. Chair, before we do a point of order, can I get a ruling on the attire that's required at a committee meeting, please?

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Mr. Chambers, in committees, there are no attire requirements.

**Mr. Adam Chambers:** Okay. Thank you.

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** Are we back to the point of order, Chair?

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Go ahead, Mr. Turnbull.

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** Chair, have you made a ruling as to how to proceed based on the way you've opened up today's committee meeting? My understanding is that, based on the last meeting having been suspended, the clerk's advice was to start this meeting on what was suspended previously, which was the motion I introduced that was then amended and subamended by the Conservatives. What I'd like to know is what your ruling was on that, given the advice you received from the clerk.

**Mr. Philip Lawrence:** On that point of order, I think we have a very important study. Mr. Chambers is introducing a critical motion to study a problem that is costing Canadians hundreds of billions of dollars, inflating housing prices and aiding in the trafficking of fentanyl. I think this is a very serious matter, and I'm very troubled that the Liberals don't seem to want to have a discussion.

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** Could I speak to that point of order, Chair?

[Translation]

**Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie:** On a point of order, as well, Mr. Chair, there is no interpretation when Mr. Turnbull is speaking.

[English]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Mr. Turnbull, there is no interpretation. I think there were some issues with your audio before as well. I'm not sure if that's been addressed.

**A voice:** No.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** It has still not been addressed.

Mr. Turnbull, your audio is still causing issues for the interpreters. That's why there is no interpretation from your end.

I'll look to Mr. Ste-Marie. Is that going to continue to be an issue for you? I'm seeing yes. Thank you.

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

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Just one second, Mr. Lawrence.

I talked with the clerk, and he makes a good point that there may be people listening to the interpretation from across the country, Mr. Turnbull. Since your audio is not clear, it may be difficult for those who are tuning in online across Canada to hear the interpretation, which is the issue that Mr. Ste-Marie brought up.

**Ms. Arielle Kayabaga (London West, Lib.):** I'm sorry, but I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Go ahead, Ms. Kayabaga.

**Ms. Arielle Kayabaga:** Thank you.

I'm not a permanent sitting member of this committee. I'm just visiting today, but I'm a member of other permanent committees, and when there's an audio issue we usually suspend to try to resolve that issue.

For the sake of all colleagues who are here who have taken their time on a Friday in a non-sitting week to be at this committee meeting, can we just take time to suspend to figure out MP Turnbull's audio issue? He is using the appropriate devices that we're required to use, and I think we should give him a fair chance to participate.

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

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Go ahead, Mr. Lawrence.

**Mr. Philip Lawrence:** The Liberals had the opportunity, just as we did, to be here in person. Conservatives have chosen to have a member here in person. They have chosen not to.

If they're unable to fill the basic tenets of the requirement to log on appropriately, other members are able to speak, presumably. For Mr. Turnbull, just as in Parliament in general, if you're not in your seat, it's not the responsibility of the rest of the committee to take care of that.

**Ms. Arielle Kayabaga:** On a point of order, Mr. Chair, that's not factual, as we are a hybrid committee. Hybrid means that you're able to provide both services.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Yes. I would ask all members members to wait to be recognized before anyone speaks.

At the beginning of each meeting we do have audio checks, and it is a responsibility for each member to make sure their audio is working correctly. I know that on this call there are other members who have audio issues, and they've chosen not to participate until they get them resolved. Unless anyone else wants to speak to this point of order specifically, we'll move on.

Go ahead, Mr. Davies.

We can't hear you, Mr. Davies.

**The Clerk:** May I intervene?

I'm sorry to intervene.

Mr. Davies, on your wire there is a button, and sometimes we click it by mistake. If you follow the wire, there should be an on and off button on it.

We cannot hear you. You can hear us clearly, but the info from you to us is not coming through. Is there no button on your wire that goes to your computer? Okay. Then I have no idea, because you're not muted.

At the beginning, we could hear you. I don't know what's wrong. I'll have IT call you. This should be easy to fix.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Mr. Davies, I think you can work with IT in the background, from the advice I got.

I've also been advised, Mr. Turnbull, that we can't recognize you because you can't be interpreted. In the meantime, you're more than welcome to have your Liberal colleagues present on your behalf.

Moving on, we'll go to Ms. Thompson.

You have your hand up. Is it on this point of order?

**Ms. Joanne Thompson:** No. My point of order is that I would like some clarity, please, Mr. Chair. The clerk's email indicated that today's meeting, Friday, May 17, would resume meeting 142, which is currently suspended. Could the chair confirm which meeting we're on? I think we've lost focus here.

Then I would like to speak to the need to suspend and ensure we have communication and the ability for all members using House of Commons headsets to have the opportunity to participate.

Perhaps we could begin, please, with clarity on the terms of what meeting we are beginning with today.

**Mr. Don Davies:** Can you hear me now?

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Yes, Mr. Davies.

Ms. Thompson, we're on meeting 142. As I indicated before, as the chair, that is what we're on right now. I think that's pretty straightforward.

I'll move on to Mr. Davies. He has his hand up.

**Mr. Don Davies:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I agree with Ms. Kayabaga's remarks earlier. It's a question of privilege. Each one of us is a member of this committee. We have a right to participate, and we have a right to participate either in person or remotely. There's no distinction. Rights are not accorded as to whether or not you're present in the meeting room. Every person around this table has participated both remotely and in person, particularly in a break week.

Mr. Turnbull is the parliamentary secretary to the minister. He is a lead, and he has a right to participate in this. It appears, through no fault of his own, that the technology is not working. The proper answer isn't to plow forward with a meeting and remove his voice at the committee. It's unfortunate when we have technical problems, but this is not an analogous situation to being either in the House or not in the House. This is a situation where we all have a right to participate.

I would agree that this meeting has to be suspended until Mr. Turnbull's right to participate is resolved. If he were not using the proper headset or were otherwise somehow not doing proper.... It's like I did just now: I had a proper sound check and then couldn't speak. The meeting should not proceed if I am silenced because of the technical issues. It's unfortunate, but that's the way it goes. You can't just say that someone else can speak for you. We each have a right to participate equally in this committee.

I'm going to move that this meeting be suspended until Mr. Turnbull's audio issues are resolved.

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

**Mr. Adam Chambers:** I have a point of order.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Before we get to that, colleagues, I have talked to the clerk, and he's made it quite clear that it's not that any privilege is being taken away. This is much like the House of Commons. The Speaker ruled that if interpreters could not interpret, then members could not be recognized. It was a very clear ruling by the Speaker in the House of Commons.

It's not that any member's privilege is being taken away. Just as in the House of Commons, any member has the ability to have other colleagues speak on their behalf. After any speeches are given, if someone is recognized and is able to be interpreted, then they're able to speak.

That's the rule I've seen followed as well. If interpreters cannot interpret, then members cannot be recognized. It's happened to other members in this committee before, and we've never had an issue.

**Mr. Don Davies:** That being the case, Mr. Chair—

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Mr. Davies, there were other people ahead of you.

**Mr. Don Davies:** Okay, I'll—

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** I'll ask members to be recognized.

Mr. Chambers, go ahead.

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

Here's what I would propose on the point of order that we've been discussing with respect to Mr. Turnbull.

We could suspend for two minutes to allow Mr. Turnbull to try to get this worked out. If that does not work, we should continue with the meeting, as we would in any other circumstance. We would give the governing party the opportunity to find a substitute, if that's what they require, or to rearrange their affairs accordingly. However, we should get back to the meeting, called under Standing Order 106(4). I believe I still have the floor and I have moved that motion.

I offer that point of order. Whether you would like to continue and give the floor back to me I leave up to you, Mr. Chair.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** I'll just ask for a minute while I discuss this with the clerk.

Colleagues, I think that's what we'll do. We'll give Mr. Turnbull about two or three minutes to try to figure this out with IT. Otherwise, we'll do what we do in the House, and Mr. Turnbull can have his colleagues speak on his behalf.

We'll suspend the meeting until then.

• (25425)

(Pause)

• (25430)

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Thank you to the IT team for getting this back under way.

Mr. Chambers, you have the floor.

**Mr. Adam Chambers:** Thank you very much, Mr. Chair—

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** I have a point of order.

**Mr. Adam Chambers:** I'm glad we can get back to our wonderful motion here today. It's pretty good—

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** I'm sorry, Chair. I have a point of order.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Go ahead, Mr. Turnbull.

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** I really need to be clear on whether we're doing. You said earlier to Ms. Thompson's comment that we were starting our meeting as a continuation of meeting 142, which means that this is not a separate meeting and, indeed, means that we're continuing debate on a subamendment. I don't understand how Mr. Chambers could have the floor, both because we had a speaking list on that subamendment and because we were on a subamendment. We can't move to debate any other motion until that subamendment has been dealt with.

Chair, could you clarify your ruling on whether you're following the advice of the clerk? If you are, then I don't see how Mr. Chambers could be moving a motion right now.

**Mr. Adam Chambers:** On a point of order, Mr. Chair—

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Mr. Chambers, is it the same point of order as Mr. Turnbull's?

**Mr. Adam Chambers:** Yes, it is, Mr. Chair.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Go ahead.

**Mr. Adam Chambers:** My understanding is that committee members have the right to request an emergency meeting and that Standing Order 106(4) takes precedence over other committee business. I may have been mistaken on that front, but there is a bit of an unintended consequence here. You could envision a point in time when there would never be a Standing Order 106(4) request because committees could always just suspend. I don't believe the initial intent of having the Standing Order 106(4) request was that it could be frustrated by suspension.

I'll just leave that for you to consider.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Thank you, Mr. Chambers.

Colleagues, look, advice was given by the clerk on this. A Standing Order 106(4) request does take precedence in most cases. I'm the chair, and that's how we've proceeded with this meeting, as I have already announced. I think I've made that clear.

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** On a point of order, Chair, if that's your ruling, I challenge the ruling of the chair.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** We'll go to a vote, then.

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

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Colleagues, I'll suspend to get some advice from the clerk on how to proceed from this point.

• (25435) \_\_\_\_\_ (Pause) \_\_\_\_\_

• (25440)

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Colleagues, I've conferred with the clerk, and what we'll do is continue at this point from the subamendment that was put forward by Mr. Morantz at the last meeting. I have a speaking list from the last time that starts with Mr. Lawrence and then has Ms. Dzerowicz.

I'll just give a heads-up, Ms. Dzerowicz, that the interpreters cannot pick up your connection, but you're more than welcome to pass your time on to other colleagues.

Colleagues, anyone who wants to get on the speaking list is more than welcome to.

We'll go on to Mr. Lawrence.

**Mr. Philip Lawrence:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

As I said earlier, I'm deeply disappointed and troubled. Money laundering is a scourge that's affecting the Canadian economy, and that has a real impact on individual Canadians. Currently, it's estimated that money laundering is costing Canadians upwards of \$100 billion.

What's as troubling as that is where those proceeds are often directed. We've seen in recent news articles regarding TD Bank that perhaps money being funnelled illegally through a Canadian financial institution was used for fentanyl. We also know for sure that money laundering currently supports such terrible activities as—

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** On a point of order, Mr. Chair, I'd like to ask for relevance. This does not relate to the subamendment introduced by Mr. Morantz, which focused on having someone appear at our committee. I believe it was Mark Carney, if I'm not mistaken. I don't see how Mr. Lawrence's intervention has anything to do with that subamendment.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Mr. Lawrence, if you can, keep it relevant.

Continue on.

**Mr. Philip Lawrence:** As I said, a significant portion of these funds end up with some of the worst people and the worst activities you could possibly imagine, including the illegal trade of drugs such as fentanyl and other opioids, which are poisoning Canadians at record rates; human trafficking; and other horrible crimes that I know everyone stands united against.

A portion of these funds also distorts the economy. They end up driving up the cost of real estate, most notably in some of our largest cities, contributing to the worsening of housing unaffordability—

**Ms. Joanne Thompson:** On a point of order, Mr. Chair, I'm uncertain of the relevance. We are back on the subamendment about bringing Mr. Carney to committee. Given what Mr. Lawrence is saying, I'm not at all certain if there's any relevance to the motion.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Ms. Thompson, as far as I've seen, there is usually some preamble given whenever anyone talks, but I would ask Mr. Lawrence to get to his point as soon as he can.

**Mr. Philip Lawrence:** Thank you very much.

I will inform the members of the Liberal Party that I will be connecting this back to Mr. Carney. However, specifically in the amendment, there is notation of and reference to money laundering, so that is completely within the scope of the discussion.

My thought process is that, although there are many things that Liberal, Conservative and NDP members disagree upon, our problem with money laundering I would not list among them. In fact, I hope that this is a non-partisan issue.

We, of course, got a letter from the Minister of Finance, which has now lapsed, calling for a review of the Proceeds of Crime (Money Laundering) and Terrorist Financing Act.

**Ms. Arielle Kayabaga:** Mr. Chair, I want to raise the point of order that we're still hearing our colleague go off the subject. I don't know how money laundering connects to the current discussion. We're discussing the subamendment. If he wants to discuss the amendment on anti-money laundering, he can bring the subamendment to a vote. So—

**Mr. Marty Morantz:** Mr. Chair, on that point of order...

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** On that point of order, go ahead, Mr. Morantz.

**Mr. Marty Morantz:** I will just point out that in the motion introduced by Mr. Turnbull, paragraph v calls for a study on money laundering. A discussion of money laundering in the context of the motion, amendments or subamendments would be on point and in order.

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** Mr. Chair, on the point of order...

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Mr. Turnbull, go ahead on the point of order.

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** My understanding from the procedural rules is that when you introduce a subamendment, you're confined to speaking about the nature of that subamendment and to making arguments that are relevant to it, not to the whole motion.

I would welcome any advice from the clerk or from you, Chair, on that topic.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Thank you, colleagues.

I'll ask Mr. Lawrence to get to his point.

**Mr. Philip Lawrence:** Thank you, Chair.

It's difficult to respond to the various points of order when I'm not even given the opportunity to explain the connection. I can assure my Liberal colleagues, who seem very eager to point out relevance, that I've been in lengthy committee discussions before during which members of the Liberal Party have wandered far from the subject. We are given, according to Bosc and Gagnon, a wide latitude. That is a matter of principle.

I'll continue. If the members wish to make points of order, that is their right.

We have now missed our statutory obligation with respect to the Proceeds of Crime (Money Laundering) and Terrorist Financing Act. This is significant. We are becoming a pariah on the economic world scene. We have seen money laundering, and there are even terms for it now. That's how significant an issue it has become. It's called "snow washing".

We need to take this issue extremely seriously. Allowing a review from the deputy leader to lapse is not showing leadership. We are ultimately the finance committee, so reviewing money laundering and illicit financing is squarely within our rubric. Our failure to do that is, quite frankly, putting forward a signal that I'm not proud of. It's saying that Canadians are not taking money laundering seriously.

On our side of the aisle, we have been outspoken in calling for greater enforcement and improvements to money-laundering legislation in Canada. My colleague Adam Chambers, for example, brought forward Bill C-289, which would have made lying to financial institutions when opening an account a more serious offence.

This is a significant problem. We are seeing over and over again, after nine years of this NDP-Liberal government, that the country is not working as it should. The government seems incapable of doing the most basic of tasks, whether that be delivering passports or, in this case much more seriously, preventing illicit funds from flowing from around the world, which are being snow-washed in Canada and then are coming out the other side to finance illicit activities such as human trafficking, drug trafficking and even terrorism.

This is a most serious subject. That's why Conservatives called the Standing Order 106(4) meeting. Liberals are using a technicality to delay this debate. That perhaps says all you need to know about—

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** Chair, on a point of order with regard to relevance, my understanding is that the subamendment introduced

by the Conservatives on the motion that was amended and then subamended adds the following text: "the week of the 28th one meeting be dedicated to hearing from the Minister for two hours and one meeting be dedicated to hear from Mark Carney for three hours and that clause by clause not begin until the aforementioned witnesses appear for the requested times".

I still cannot for the life of me understand how any of the comments made by Mr. Lawrence thus far relates to that particular subamendment, which is the only thing this committee is debating. Perhaps Mr. Lawrence would like us to move to a vote so he can make his arguments on his colleague's amendment, which does include a reference to this.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Mr. Turnbull, from my recollection of the last meeting, the chair did give quite a bit of latitude when colleagues were talking about Mark Carney, who was also in the subamendment, and Chrystia Freeland, the Minister of Finance. As I recall, those conversations have continued, with the chair giving quite a bit of latitude on what was discussed at this committee.

Mr. Lawrence, please continue—

[*Translation*]

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

[*English*]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Go ahead, Mr. Ste-Marie.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie:** The interpreters are indicating that the sound quality for Mr. Turnbull and Mr. Weiler is not good enough for them to do their work. I'm sorry.

[*English*]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Mr. Turnbull, I'd advise you to talk to IT in the background until we get that resolved.

In the meantime, Mr. Lawrence can continue.

**Mr. Philip Lawrence:** I will connect Mr. Carney back to what I was talking about: the money-laundering issue. I want to put it very clearly on the record, though, that Conservatives are absolutely unequivocal that if we cannot conduct business in both English and French, we should not be recognizing members. As harsh as that might be, we are a bilingual country, and Conservatives will stand up at every opportunity that they have for francophones and the right to speak French and to hear French. We are unequivocal on that.

I was giving a little preamble, with the indulgence of the chair, but the connection is from a recent CBC article written by Mr. Pit-tis. Mr. Carney said with respect to money laundering that it was “deeply troubling” and that bankers have to “substantially raise their game to levels of conduct” expected “in any other aspect of life”. Mr. Carney has commented many times, quite notably, with respect to money laundering, and as he’s a former governor of the Bank of Canada, one would think there’s a fair bit of relevance to talking about the substantial problem that is money laundering.

With that point of order put to rest, I’d like to continue and discuss the importance of money laundering. We’ve seen piecemeal attempts by this Liberal government to fix some of the money-laundering issues, but what we really need is a comprehensive approach, one that approaches this head-on and sees a solution, because the reality is, as I said, that after nine years of this NDP-Liberal government, we have seen failure after failure of the government to deliver on the most basic—

**Mr. Don Davies:** I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Go ahead, Mr. Davies.

**Mr. Don Davies:** I let it pass the first time, but it’s a basic rule of Parliament that we don’t actively mislead. This is the second time that Mr. Lawrence has referred to nine years of the Liberal-NDP government. That is factually incorrect. There have not been nine years of an NDP-Liberal government. He knows that there has been a confidence and supply agreement for the last two and a half years, but prior to that, there was no basis to say this. I would just ask him to please respect that basic fact of Parliament.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Mr. Davies, the clerk will double-check that. From what I remember, there was a ruling in the House on “Liberal-NDP”, if I’m not mistaken, but we will see if we can get the clerk to verify that point of order for you.

In the meantime, I’ll ask Mr. Lawrence to continue and to keep that in mind.

**Mr. Philip Lawrence:** Out of courtesy to Mr. Davies, I’ll refrain from saying “nine years of the NDP-Liberal government”. I think Mr. Davies would grant me that in the last two and a half or three years of the Liberal government supported by the NDP, we have seen no notable or material improvement with respect to money laundering in the Canadian economy. In fact, as I mentioned earlier, there are numerous media reports on the significant impact that money laundering is having on the Canadian economy. Nearly every major media outlet has reported on that.

We’ve seen some of Canada’s largest financial institutions receive fines, both here in Canada and in the United States, for their lack of safeguards and protections against money laundering. At this committee, we’ve heard from FINTRAC, among other organizations, about the lack of enforcement and the impact this is having on the Canadian economy.

Let’s get real and serious at this committee as the finance committee. This is a scourge. It’s a blight on the Canadian economy and our country. Passing a motion to call for the study of money laundering and actions we can take would take a strong stance, not just here in Canada but across the world, on protecting our country. It would also take a strong stance on protecting, quite frankly, the

most vulnerable, whether they are young women being sucked into the horrible world of human trafficking or young folks across our country being sucked into the opioid crisis.

This is an opportunity for us to do something that’s right. It’s valid. Let’s not let partisan bickering and silliness get in the way of that. Let’s just pass this motion.

With that, I move that we adjourn debate on Mr. Turnbull’s motion to move forward to the subject of the Standing Order 106(4) request and Mr. Chambers’s motion.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Given that this is a dilatory motion, we’ll go to a vote on what Mr. Lawrence is proposing.

(Motion negatived: nays 6; yeas 4)

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Mr. Lawrence, you have the floor again.

**Mr. Philip Lawrence:** Thank you.

I’m disappointed in that. The Conservatives brought up this meeting. Just to be clear, in no way would having this meeting obstruct any other parliamentary business. We certainly could have continued the discussion and debate over Mr. Turnbull’s programming motion and had an important discussion.

We’re not even on the motion that we were here to propose, which Mr. Chambers had put on notice. We have not even set a timetable. This would have been a simple up-and-down vote. I had assumed we’d have unanimous support in the fight against money laundering.

Unfortunately, the Liberals have used a technicality to delay and deny. It’s delay and deny. We’re left in a position where the Conservatives wanted to send a strong stance out there to all the folks who—

**Ms. Julie Dzerowicz:** I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** On a point of order, I have Ms. Dzerowicz.

**Ms. Julie Dzerowicz:** Mr. Chair, it seems like Mr. Lawrence has run out of steam in speaking about Mr. Carney. If he would like to talk about budget 2024, we’re happy to vote on the subamendment on Mr. Carney and then happy to get to the original programming motion that my wonderful colleague Mr. Turnbull made. However, right now, whatever Mr. Lawrence is talking about has absolutely no relevance to Mr. Carney.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Thank you, Ms. Dzerowicz.

Mr. Lawrence, again, I know there's usually a preamble before everyone talks, but let's get to our main points.

**Mr. Philip Lawrence:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I respect parliamentary procedure and that members have the right to make points of order. However, I did mention previously—and I guess I'll mention it again—that Mr. Carney is on record as saying that money laundering is “deeply troubling” and that the financial institutions need to step up and do more. The subamendment is with respect to Mr. Carney. Having Mr. Carney appear here would provide us greater light on Canada's money-laundering issue. Also, it's directly on today's topic.

I can tell that perhaps our Liberal members are frustrated with hearing me talk, so I'll sum up here out of courtesy and respect to them. What I'd like to put on the record is that Conservatives came here today in good faith to put forward a motion to fight money laundering. That is a significant issue for Canadians. However, Liberals have chosen, at the finance committee, to delay and deny this important motion, this important fight against illicit financing activities that finance human trafficking, finance drug trafficking and even finance—

**Ms. Joanne Thompson:** I have a point of order, Chair.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Go ahead, Ms. Thompson.

**Ms. Joanne Thompson:** Again, it's on relevance. I appreciate that Mr. Lawrence is concluding his remarks, but let's stay with the subamendment on bringing the minister to the committee and also Mr. Chambers—Mr. Carney.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh!

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Go ahead, Mr. Lawrence.

**Mr. Philip Lawrence:** I appreciate that, and I would like to hear from Mr. Chambers at any opportunity, but in all seriousness, Mr. Carney has testified before the Senate and is outspoken in the media. We've asked him to come here, and he has denied our request to speak at the finance committee. If he can speak to The Globe and Mail, the CBC and the Senate, I'm unsure as to why he wouldn't want to come to the finance committee. I would certainly invite him to speak on anti-money laundering, as he has been outspoken on it in the past.

We're not sure why he's not being allowed to speak and whether it's maybe internal Liberal politics. He does appear to have an edge on the deputy leader, Ms. Freeland, according to recent polling, so maybe the PMO doesn't want to hear him speak. As there has been, of course, repeated speculation that the Prime Minister will be stepping down towards the end of this session, maybe it's the Prime Minister who's a bit nervous about Mr. Carney.

I believe the time is right for Mr. Carney. He looks to be the future Liberal leader, and as we have done, we will continue to interrogate witnesses and ministers about the failures of the Liberal Party. However, we also want to know what the plans are going forward.

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

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Go ahead, Mr. Turnbull.

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** I wonder if the member making broad, sweeping claims could back up some of the things he's saying with evidence and perhaps quote the polls that he's referring to.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh!

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Mr. Turnbull, that's not a point of order.

Go ahead, Mr. Lawrence.

**Mr. Philip Lawrence:** Well, how does one respond to that? I presume that Mr. Turnbull is backing Ms. Freeland in the upcoming Liberal leadership. That's the only reasonable conclusion I can draw from that.

In all seriousness, money laundering is a completely important topic. It's one that's squarely within our rubric. I beseech the Liberal members to just vote for this. Send a signal to the world markets. Send a signal to those who would profit from human trafficking, from drug trafficking and from terrorism, so that we can at least take a bite out of some of those horrible things today. Let's get past partisan politics and pass this sensible motion.

Thank you.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Thank you, Mr. Lawrence.

Next on the speaking list I have Ms. Dzerowicz.

**Ms. Julie Dzerowicz:** It is my pleasure to be speaking to this motion.

Because we have spent so much time on things that are not relevant to the motion and subamendment at hand, I just want to remind everyone where we are.

Originally, my very fair and fine colleague Mr. Turnbull put forward a programming motion. It includes how we are going to spend our time this month and next month and how we are going to get through government legislation, the budget before us and other issues that are important and before this committee. That was put before us. The Conservatives seemed to be very upset, saying this was thrust upon them, so they were utterly surprised and bewildered. How could we have proposed such a programming motion without notifying them?

We reminded our colleagues—who at that moment had short-term memories—that in a subcommittee meeting, we discussed all of the ideas and all the things we wanted to discuss for May and June. We discussed how we could get through the budget, how we could get to important issues like money laundering, how we could get to green financing and how we could get to the housing study that is important to all members of our committee. Alas, the Conservatives decided they wanted to play a few games, so we unfortunately have a programming motion and some amendments that were put forward. One of the amendments, which we are debating today, asks that as part of our programming motion, we have Mr. Carney come and present.

What I would like to do is reiterate some points I made previously.

The Conservatives would like to have Mr. Carney present on budget 2024, and as everybody knows, everybody has witness lists. The NDP has witness lists, the Bloc has witness lists, the Liberals have witness lists and the Conservatives have witness lists. Everybody can put forward their names. If the Conservatives would like to have Mr. Carney present, or if they would like to have anybody present—they could ask any Canadian they'd like to present on any of the studies before the finance committee—they can. However, I would like to remind my colleagues, particularly my Conservative colleagues, that it is not the job of finance committee to interview possible future politicians.

Irrespective of whether Mr. Carney has opined on things like money laundering, affordability or housing, I would say that most business leaders and leaders from every different sector are very concerned about money laundering. Any of them, equally, should have the chance to present before the finance committee. I don't think it's only Mr. Carney. I would say most business leaders in our country have opined on money laundering.

I would plead with the Conservatives to stop using the finance committee for their fishing expeditions, and to use the important role that has been thrust upon us by Canadians to continue to look at critical legislation coming before our committee. We have important work to do. We are in the final six weeks of this part of our Parliament before we rise for the summer. It's really important for us to be looking at federal budget 2024, among many other things. That is an urgent request, because almost every day in the House, the Conservatives talk about—

**Mr. Adam Chambers:** On a point of order, Mr. Chair, I question the relevance. That was such an important topic to government members with respect to Mr. Lawrence's intervention, so I'd make the same request of you with the current intervention.

**Ms. Julie Dzerowicz:** I would say it's completely relevant, Mr. Chair.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Thank you, Mr. Chambers.

Ms. Dzerowicz, just wait to be recognized, please.

As I told Mr. Lawrence, I understand there's a bit of a preamble, but please get to the point.

**Ms. Julie Dzerowicz:** It's not a preamble at all, Mr. Chair. Everything I'm saying is completely relevant to exactly what we're talking about. There's not one thing outside of that. There's not a little tippy-toe outside of it. I'm also not using any of this for any social media video.

You can intervene at any point, Mr. Chambers, or anyone else who wants to say "point of order", but I can assure you that everything I'm saying is completely relevant and exactly to the motion at hand.

Let's move forward. We are talking about the programming motion before us and the subamendment that has been made to it. It is absolutely relevant.

I was talking about how there are a lot of really important initiatives that are important for us to pass and consider as part of the 2024 federal budget. The Conservatives, and I would say all members of the House, have been rightly concerned about housing, affordability and a number of the measures that our 2024 federal budget has been addressing. It is urgent that we turn the attention, focus and energy of our very important committee to looking at federal budget 2024 so that we can make sure that Canadians are able to access some of the new programs, funding and supports that our government is proposing in it.

What else would I like to say?

I'll mention one point, and if you'd like to call a point of order on it, Conservatives, that would be funny for me. You may not know this, but in federal budget 2024, we have proposed a number of items to combat money laundering and terrorist financing. I worked with my team to look at all of the federal budgets we have introduced since 2016, and almost every year, we have introduced anti-money laundering legislation.

If you truly care about anti-money laundering legislation—which we all care about—then we want to get to federal budget 2024, because there are a number of outstanding measures in the budget that are going to continue the excellent work—

**Mr. Adam Chambers:** I have a point of order.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Mr. Chambers, go ahead on a point of order.

**Ms. Julie Dzerowicz:** Oh, that's wonderful.

**Mr. Adam Chambers:** I'm having a really hard time. I'm struggling to understand how a question of relevance can be raised by a government member when an opposition member talks about money laundering, but when a government member talks about money laundering, it's supposed to be relevant. I'm confused about how we're applying the rule of relevance or how we're thinking about relevance.

I appreciate Ms. Dzerowicz's intervention. However, it seems a bit hypocritical to, on the one hand, question the ability of Mr. Lawrence to talk about that issue, but then freely decide to cite it themselves.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Thank you, Mr. Chambers.

I agree that we should stay on topic. I did find that when Mr. Lawrence tied in the money laundering with Mark Carney directly, that kept it relevant.

Ms. Dzerowicz, I would ask the same of you. Keep it relevant. Of course, there is latitude, as every chair in this place has given, but tie it in to the subamendment.

**Ms. Julie Dzerowicz:** I am very happy to address that issue directly, Mr. Chair, and I want to thank the honourable member for his intervention.

I was talking about the programming motion and then the amendment to the programming motion, which includes Mr. Carney. Mr. Carney is in the amendment to the programming motion, which is on how we're going to spend our time both this month and next month before we rise for the summer. One of the key items that we talk about in that programming motion—which is still directly tied to the amendment that we're talking about right now—is federal budget 2024. I was merely pointing out—very much in order, I would say, Mr. Chair—that there are a number of outstanding measures in federal budget 2024 that address money laundering and terrorist financing.

It's completely different from what Mr. Lawrence did earlier. Not only am I tying it back to the amendment to the original motion that we put in place, but I'm also talking about the key elements that were included in the original motion put before this committee, which was a programming motion.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Ms. Dzerowicz, I'm sorry. I was just talking to the clerk. We are just talking about the subamendment, not the amendment or the original motion.

**Ms. Julie Dzerowicz:** Would you like to read out the subamendment, Mr. Chair?

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** The subamendment reads as follows: “the week of the 28th one meeting be dedicated to hearing from the Minister for two hours and one meeting be dedicated to hear from Mark Carney for three hours and that clause by clause not begin until the aforementioned witnesses appear for the requested times”. That is the subamendment.

**Ms. Julie Dzerowicz:** Okay. Well, I think I already addressed the subamendment, and I was going back to the programming motion.

There's really not much to say other than to repeat again—perhaps we should repeat it several times—that if the Conservatives would like to have Mr. Carney or anybody as a witness, I would suggest they put Mr. Carney or anyone else on their list once we get to studying federal budget 2024. I also indicated, and I'm happy to indicate it again, that it's not the job of the finance committee to interview any possible future politicians or anybody the Conservatives are fearful might run for the Liberal leadership any time in the future.

I would urge our Conservative colleagues to stop playing games. We have important work before us. I say that genuinely. We started—we had a beautiful beginning—by looking at the budget implementation act. There are so many really important elements within federal budget 2024. They deserve questioning. They deserve our time and attention.

I ask our colleagues to get past the games. Let's get back to the original programming motion, come up with a way to move forward and get back to the business at hand for Canadians.

Thank you so much, Mr. Chair.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Thank you, Ms. Dzerowicz.

Next on the speaking list is Mr. Davies.

**Mr. Don Davies:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I was a lawyer for a lot of years. I think a number of people on this committee were as well. I always noticed that when a lawyer said, “with the greatest of respect”, what was about to follow was generally anything but respectful. Similarly, in politics, when someone says, “we're not being partisan”, pretty much what follows after that, in my experience, has been extraordinarily partisan.

I would really like this finance committee to focus on the work that I think Canadians expect us to focus on. I want to thank Mr. Chambers for bringing forth his motion. Listening to everybody here, I know that all of us care deeply about money laundering and terrorist financing, and there's an appropriate place to get to that.

I will address my comments briefly, if I can, Mr. Chair, to the subamendment. I note, by the way, that the subamendment doesn't speak—

**Mr. Marty Morantz:** I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Go ahead, Mr. Morantz.

**Mr. Marty Morantz:** I just want to get clarification. I know that five members of the committee, including Mr. Ste-Marie from the Bloc, signed a letter that was submitted to the chair under Standing Order 106(4). It called for this meeting to be a study of the issues that have arisen with respect to money laundering. It's unclear to me, again, why we're back on the programming motion. As a signatory to that letter, I didn't request a meeting about the programming motion. I requested a meeting about money laundering. I think this whole discussion is out of order.

I would remind my colleagues that when a Standing Order 106(4) letter is signed, it is mandatory for the chair—not the vice-chair but the chair, who is Mr. Fonseca—to call a meeting. It's in the Standing Orders. I think any discussion of a programming motion is out of order. We should be discussing the Standing Order 106(4) request.

I'd like a ruling from the chair as to why we're not doing what members requested under the Standing Orders and why we're not respecting the Standing Orders.

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** I'd like to speak to that point of order, Chair.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Go ahead, Mr. Turnbull, and then it's Mr. Chambers.

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** My understanding is that the clerk provided an email that contained advice to the committee, which said that this committee would reconvene on meeting 142. That was the direct result of the previous meetings being suspended. That was the procedural advice based on procedural consistency with the House. It has nothing to do with anybody else.

I understand that the Conservatives didn't want to follow procedure, and that's why the committee overturned the ruling of the chair on that. I found it pretty disappointing the way we proceeded at the beginning of the meeting, because what wasn't made clear was the ruling of the chair based on the very clear advice given by the clerk. I would note that other clerks have made the same ruling in other committees where meetings had been suspended previously.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** On that point, Mr. Turnbull, as I mentioned before, any communications between me, as the acting chair, and the clerk are private. I can't confirm any claim that it's anything other than that, because those conversations are private.

I explained before the reasoning behind continuing with the Standing Order 106(4) request, which was asked for by this committee. In the experience I've had, when a Standing Order 106(4) request is brought forward by more than one party, which is what happened in this case, a meeting is called.

We discussed the Standing Order 106(4) request. In that discussion, Mr. Turnbull challenged the chair, and the ruling was overturned. After that, the discussion went back to the subamendment from the last meeting we had. Once Mr. Lawrence brought forward another motion to continue with the Standing Order 106(4) request, as far as I remember, there were four votes to continue from the Conservatives and the Bloc. It was voted down by the Liberals and the NDP. That is why we are where we are right now.

That's an answer both for you, Mr. Turnbull, and for Mr. Morantz.

Next I have Mr. Chambers on this point of order.

**Mr. Adam Chambers:** Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

I'm saying the word "precedence" so that I can find this in future years in the Hansard transcript.

We have found a loophole in the Standing Orders such that any committee—if I understand the ruling correctly—at the end of every meeting could suspend the meeting to essentially frustrate a Standing Order 106(4) request from being called over the summer, as an example. You could call a meeting, but all of a sudden, you're back in the suspension.

I don't believe the intention of the Standing Order 106(4) rule is that it does not take precedence and that it is supposed to be subservient to a suspension. I don't believe that's the initial interpretation. If this is in fact true and a ruling is confirmed here today and perhaps has even been used in other committee meetings, in the future, all that committees will have to do is suspend every meeting before there's a break, and they'll never have to deal with the substantive nature of a Standing Order 106(4) request.

I apologize for intervening before my friend Mr. Davies, as I understand he's waited a long time to chat, but I felt I was required to put it on the record that future parliaments may use this power in a different way from how the government intends to use it today—or perhaps in the same way, but even more aggressively.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Thank you, Mr. Chambers.

Mr. Davies, you have the floor.

**Mr. Don Davies:** Thank you.

I had intended to speak to the point of order, so I'll briefly do that. Then I'll go back to the subamendment, Mr. Chair, if I may.

Mr. Chambers makes some good points. What I would add to this is that different consequences flow from a meeting being suspended versus being adjourned. When a meeting is suspended, there are advantages that members can take from that. For instance, when you come to the next meeting, you pick up where you left off, which, for some parties' purposes, may be advantageous. Second, you preserve the speaking order, which can be advantageous as well.

I will point out that when the meeting was suspended last time, nobody objected. Sometimes parties want a meeting to be suspended for the purposes I just mentioned, and at other times it should be adjourned. I agree with him, though, that were a future government to abuse the distinction between those two, that would be cause for concern, and it would be up to the parties and Parliament to amend the Standing Orders to deal with such a situation. In my 15 years of Parliament, I have not seen any government of any stripe or any committee chair ever abuse this by suspending every meeting to prevent a Standing Order 106(4) request.

I'm going to speak briefly about why I took the position I did on the request, and it wasn't because I'm opposed to the substance of the motion to study money laundering. I think that is a good thing to study, which I'll talk about briefly in a moment.

Here's what I got when the Standing Order 106(4) request came in, which, by the way, I was not asked to sign, nor was I even aware of it going in. I looked into this, and this is the advice I received. The information sent by the committee directorate regarding finance's meeting on Friday says that as the committee has a meeting that is currently suspended, it cannot simply convene a new meeting on a 106(4) request. It must first deal with the business from the suspended meeting even if it is to simply set that business aside and move on to the 106(4) meeting. It goes on to say that in such a situation, the committee clerk would discuss with the chair in order for the chair to determine how best to proceed in the circumstances, and the clerk could suggest that the chair discuss with the vice-chairs about the approach for the meeting.

I think it's quite clear that we had to begin this meeting—because it had been suspended—with the business under consideration, but Mr. Chambers is correct, and I think this speaks to his point about how a future government could control this. If every meeting were to be suspended, it still is open to committee members at the next meeting of the suspended meeting to adjourn that debate and address the Standing Order 106(4) request. A government can't stop a that simply by suspending meetings. It will always be open to the majority of members at the committee to end the suspended meeting and begin a Standing Order 106(4) request, which we could have done today.

Let me just speak briefly about the merits of the subamendment, which I'm going to say for the moment is not restricted to Mr. Carney. The subamendment says to call the minister for an hour as well. When the Minister of Finance is called to this committee, that leaves it pretty wide open to talk about any issue one could put to the Minister of Finance. I've been listening carefully to people's points of order and what's relevant or not. Maybe the part about Mr. Carney might be relevant to Mr. Carney, but if the subamendment calls for having the minister come, I think there's much more latitude when speaking.

Here's why I have taken the positions that I have today. I agree that money laundering and terrorist financing sanctions and other measures are a critical issue that this committee should look at, but I want to point out, if we're all being completely frank here, that the Conservatives are engaged in a filibuster right now to prevent us from considering the BIA, the budget implementation act.

I want to read to you a bit of what's in the BIA.

Part 4, division 34, proposes amendments to the Proceeds of Crime (Money Laundering) and Terrorist Financing Act, the Criminal Code, the Income Tax Act and Excise Tax Act to support stronger anti-money laundering and anti-terrorist financing compliance, enhance information sharing and continue to provide new tools for financial crime investigations, prosecutions and asset recovery. It goes on to describe that in detail.

The first area is on strengthening supervision and the anti-money laundering, anti-terrorist financing framework. Here it says that amendments proposed would enable the introduction of regulations to cover cheque-cashing businesses and factoring, leasing and financing companies. Coverage of these sectors under the legislation would ensure comprehensive and consistent coverage of businesses providing financial services in Canada. I'll skip the rest of it.

The next major heading is on enhancing the sharing of information and financial intelligence. Here it says that amendments are proposed to the legislation to enhance the ability of businesses with obligations under the Act to share information with each other. Information sharing between private sector entities can improve their risk mitigation practices and promote higher quality reporting to FINTRAC, Canada's AML-ATF regulator and financial intelligence unit. This, in turn, can lead to better intelligence in support of financial crime investigations and prosecutions. Amendments are also proposed to permit FINTRAC to disclose financial intelligence to provincial and territorial civil forfeiture offices to support their efforts to seize assets linked to unlawful activity, and also to Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada to administer the Citi-

zenship Act. This would help ensure citizenship applicants do not pose national security or organized crime concerns.

Another major heading is on improving tools to investigate and prosecute financial crimes. Here it says that amendments are proposed to the Criminal Code, the Income Tax Act and the Excise Tax Act to strengthen investigative powers and support the operational effectiveness of Canada's anti-money laundering and anti-terrorist financing regime. Two amendments are proposed to the Criminal Code to support the enforcement of laws dealing with money laundering and associated crimes. First is a new order to keep an account open or active for a limited period of time to assist in the investigation of a suspected criminal offence. Financial service providers often close accounts suspected to be linked to criminal activity, which can hinder investigations into financial crimes. Second is a new repeating production order to enable law enforcement to obtain information regarding ongoing activity in an account believed to be linked to criminal activity on pre-established dates over a set period of time. This would provide law enforcement more consistent and timely information to support criminal investigations and would include robust safeguards to respect charter-protected rights.

I'll just stop there. Those are measures in the BIA on money laundering and anti-terrorist financing that are being held up by the Conservatives' filibustering. They put a Standing Order 106(4) motion in today that wasn't properly drafted, meaning that we had to first deal with the suspended meeting. However, we could deal with this next week. We could call witnesses from FINTRAC, TD Bank and the RCMP next week to talk about these provisions in the BIA, and we could work towards getting this bill passed to provide legislative measures to address the very concerning stories we saw in the media this week about TD Bank, the Royal Bank and the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce.

I'm new to the committee, so please forgive me for any mistakes, but from my research, I'm pretty sure this committee has already started its mandatory statutory review of anti-terrorist financing laws or the money-laundering laws. I believe there was one meeting at which we heard from officials. I see Mr. Chambers nodding his head, so I look forward to his correcting me on that, but that's my information.

We have proposed that if we can get this budget passed by late May or maybe early June, we will have six or eight days of hearings for this committee in June, out of which I would be more than open to devoting at least two meetings to anti-money laundering or anti-terrorist financing. I've had discussions with everybody from all sides of the House, and I think everybody would agree to that, including those on the government side.

I think it's important to note for the record that I believe all of us want to get at these issues. We're in politics, so we can be a bit partisan, but I don't think it's correct or fair to assert that nobody is interested in this. I will say, however, that there is a clear pathway to getting at these issues, and that is by stopping the Conservative filibuster and getting to the BIA and the scheduling of hearings in June, to which we could be calling witnesses and hearing evidence on this right away.

On Mark Carney, I just want to say a couple of things.

I don't think it's unfair to say that the Conservatives have spoken extensively on why they want to call Mr. Carney. Some of their reasons are stronger than others, but what is absolutely clear—and they've put it on the record repeatedly—is Mr. Carney's potential political ambitions. I won't out the colleague who said this last time, but last meeting, a Conservative member spoke about how unfair it was to speculate on his motives. However, all I hear on this issue is speculation about Mr. Carney's motives. I don't think that's fair either. The point is that the basis upon which the request to call Mr. Carney has been made is not exclusively his thoughts or ideas on any matters under consideration. It's been repeatedly pointed out that he might be a potential future Liberal leader, and that's why they want to call him to committee.

Now, if we talk turkey here, the Conservatives don't just want to proceed with the business and call Mr. Carney as a witness, which they have every right to do. They could call him next week if we proceed with the BIA. They're worried that Mr. Carney won't come. He may or may not; I don't know. I do know that he testified before a Senate committee a week or two ago, so he's no stranger to coming to Parliament.

He may have different reasons, depending on the motivation. If he's being called to be grilled on his political ambitions, that may make him less interested in coming than if there's a bona fide interest in hearing his comments on, say, money laundering. The Conservatives said that they want to call him for money laundering because he has expressed that money laundering is troubling. Well, that's hardly insightful. Who wouldn't say that? I could probably call 55,000 Canadians who would say that money laundering is troubling. That's not a basis to call someone before this committee.

More importantly—and this is my main concern about this—I think it would create a very improper if not dangerous precedent—I'll get that word on the record too—for us to explicitly use the rare power of a parliamentary committee to issue a summons. Let me stop there. That's why the Conservatives want there to be a motion of this committee to call Mr. Carney. It's because if there's a motion passed by this committee and Mr. Carney doesn't come, we're in a position to potentially issue a summons. This is what I find to be a dangerous precedent. For a parliamentary committee to use its ancient and very rare power to summons—essentially subpoena—a

private citizen to this committee to be grilled on his or her political views or political ambitions is, I find, an improper use of the power to summons.

With great respect to my colleagues in the Conservative Party, they could not be clearer that that's why they want to call him. What's next? If I don't like the political prospects of the person who wants to run for the Conservatives in my riding and I want to use my power as a parliamentarian to haul that person before this committee so I can grill them on their political ambitions, that is improper, in my view. Worse, it's dangerous. Again, you can go back to the record and read any number of interventions from the Conservatives—even today—showing that that's why they want to call Mr. Carney.

Now, if Mr. Carney was the current Bank of Canada governor, if he was currently in the position, there might be a basis for calling him to this committee. However, he's a private citizen now. He has every right to talk to the media and talk to any economic club to express his views like every Canadian does. These are the basic fundamental charter rights of freedom of expression, assembly and association. You shouldn't have to risk being hauled before a parliamentary committee to be grilled on your views for partisan purposes. Unfortunately, again with great respect to my Conservative colleagues, that's exactly what they want to do. They said it themselves. That's why I am resistant to this.

It would be easy to pass a motion to call Mr. Carney as a witness. However, having knowledge that this bona fide request is contaminated by overtly partisan reasons makes me absolutely opposed to misusing the power of our committee for that purpose. I would say that to any government of any hue. If the Liberals were trying to call a potential Conservative leader here and said they wanted to bring him before Parliament because he might be the next Conservative leader of this country, that is the politicization of the finance committee. It's worthy of a third world dictatorship. It's banana-republic politics, in my view.

That's why I wanted to put on the record why I've taken the position I have today. We must follow proper procedure at this committee. That's why the suspended meeting meant that we had to start this meeting with the suspended business. It also meant that we could have moved to the Standing Order 106(4) request. It would have been improper to begin with that, but we could have suspended and gone to the Standing Order 106(4) subject matter if we'd wanted to.

I find that to be disingenuous, because everybody here knows that we could be talking about these very subjects next week, but the Conservatives are blocking that. We could be scheduling this in June, so I don't believe the Standing Order 106(4) request to get to money laundering this week is entirely sincere. Certainly, it cannot be said by anybody on this committee that the Liberals and the NDP, or anybody else for that matter, are not interested in dealing with money laundering or anti-terrorist financing, because we have taken the position we have today. I want us to be dealing with that very issue on Tuesday. However, we can't unless the Conservatives release their filibuster.

My understanding is that when we come to the finance committee next week, the fifth last week of Parliament, we're going to face a filibuster. There will be endless talking about all matters under the sun, such as the price of tea in China and the mating rituals of the wombat. We're going to talk about everything except the BIA, which includes anti-terrorist financing and money laundering provisions. Those are the facts.

Again, for Mr. Carney, I've already said my piece. I have never met Mr. Carney, and I have no track or trade with Mr. Carney. I wish him all the best as a private citizen. However, it doesn't matter to me what his views are. I'm a New Democrat. His potential participation in other parties is of no interest to me. If I felt that he had relevant evidence for the BIA, I would be happy to call him as a witness, but I do not see a basis for taking the very unusual step of issuing a summons to call him before this committee to be grilled for partisan purposes. I just don't think that's appropriate.

I respect each and every one of my colleagues, and I have been very impressed in my three weeks on this committee by the degree of knowledge, commitment and, I think, bona fide interest. We have different views on financial matters, and that's what makes a democracy a vibrant and interesting place.

There are good ideas on all sides, but what I don't think is appropriate is for us to be holding up and stalling the business of the finance committee at a critical time in May, when we have a budget to discuss. I don't think that is appropriate, especially holding up the business because one party wants to grill a particular private citizen on his potentially partisan, political interests. I don't think that's an appropriate use of the filibuster.

We've all done it. There are appropriate uses of a filibuster, like if there's a very important matter of principle or there's an important political narrative, but it doesn't resonate with me that holding up the entire budget of Canada so that we can have a three-hour grilling session with Mark Carney is appropriate. I really hope we can get to the business of the people, battle out the budget and grill it, criticize it and praise it—it probably deserves all of those things—in the next couple of weeks. Then we'll have a democratic vote on whether it passes or not. That's what I sincerely hope this committee can get back to next week.

Thank you all, and thank you all for not interrupting me with points of order.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Thank you, Mr. Davies.

Mr. Davies, before I move on, you brought up a point of order before about the Liberal-NDP government, and the clerk graciously looked into it. I'd just like to point to the ruling that was recently made on March 29, 2022. It pointed back to a ruling that was made by Speaker Milliken on September 24, 2001, on the same basis of what you asked about. The Speaker noted:

...Speaker Milliken, dealing with the question of the identification of parties, specified at page 5491 of Debates:

...these are matters that the House has always left entirely to the discretion of MPs. They identify themselves as individuals and are free to identify themselves as a group. Their spokespersons are theirs to select. Neither the Speaker nor other members has a say in such matters.

It is clear to the Chair that there is no change in the status or designation of the members of the New Democratic Party, nor in that of their officers, as a result of this agreement.

Thank you, Clerk, for looking into that.

Next on the speaking list I have Mr. Morantz.

**Mr. Marty Morantz:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

At the outset, I want to correct Mr. Davies on one thing. Nothing in my subamendment calls for the committee to issue a subpoena for Mr. Carney. He said that several times, but that's just not accurate, and I think for the record it needs to be clear.

There's another thing I want to say with respect to Mr. Davies. I'm somewhat surprised to hear what he's saying today, because just a couple of weeks ago in committee, he said, "I want to be clear on the record: I look forward to Mr. Carney's coming to this committee at the appropriate time in the appropriate study, which can happen in the next two months." I don't know if his position has changed from two weeks ago. Maybe it will be different next week or whenever we finally get to vote on the subamendment. It is odd to hear him change his position depending on where the politics are most advantageous for his party.

Speaking directly to the subamendment, I want to start with the issue of bringing in the Minister of Finance. One of the reasons it's really important to have the Minister of Finance at committee is that the Minister of Finance wrote a letter to the committee chair on October 6 that had to do with the five-year review of the Proceeds of Crime (Money Laundering) and Terrorist Financing Act. The appearance of the finance minister would be directly relevant to discussing the issue of money laundering in Canada.

This is a request from the Minister of Finance in a letter to Chair Fonseca:

The last review of the [act] was completed in November 2018...

I am requesting that the Standing Committee on Finance conduct the review.

After conducting the review, the Committee would be required to submit a report to Parliament recommending any changes to the PCMLTFA or its administration. I suggest the review of the PCMLTFA be initiated this fall and completed by winter 2023-24.

Obviously, “this fall” was last fall. That has passed and the committee hasn’t done anything. We’ve essentially ignored her request. No study has commenced. For Mr. Davies’s clarification, the meeting we did have was on a motion, which I believe was brought forward by my colleague Mr. Chambers, to at least do some groundwork in advance and in anticipation of conducting the study.

The appearance of the finance minister is directly relevant to the issue of money laundering, and the issue of money laundering is very serious. We’ve had many banks fined across the country. We’ve had reports that money laundering in Canada has increased home prices by 7.5% because of the increased demand generated by people trying to launder money through home acquisitions. I think earlier last fall, before Mr. Davies joined the committee, we talked about Sam Cooper’s article, where he identified the issue of HSBC accepting fraudulent income verification letters from foreign students in order to get loans and launder money through housing. It is a really serious problem. We have banks being fined in the United States and in Canada for not adhering to the rules set out by FINTRAC on how they’re supposed to manage their money laundering.

What was supposed to happen today was that we were supposed to have a meeting about this. We followed all the rules. Someone said earlier that the Standing Order 106(4) letter wasn’t done properly. It was done exactly properly. The people who signed it needed to sign it. It was worded properly, but here we are at this point.

It shouldn’t come as a surprise to me that Liberal members of the committee don’t want to talk about money laundering. Their record is abysmal. After nine years in office, the problem has gotten so much worse. Canada’s enforcement of money laundering is being noticed internationally. We have other countries, the United States in particular, whose fines have been much more aggressive than fines here in Canada. The problem has only gotten worse and worse.

This meeting was supposed to be about that. We issued a Standing Order 106(4) request, yet here we are. We have the NDP again carrying water for the Liberals. For the life of me, I don’t understand why. I don’t understand why they would hand this to the Liberals on a silver platter and put up with the political price they’re going to pay for trying to stall this important meeting about money laundering in Canada—money laundering that creates chaos and crime in our streets. They are propping up a Prime Minister who is simply not worth the cost of that chaos and crime. The Conservatives are here today trying to do something about it, and Liberal members are blocking it.

We have other examples. If the Minister of Finance comes to the committee, I’d like to talk to her about this letter and ask her if she’s disappointed that Liberal members of the committee won’t support Mr. Chambers’s motion, which is actually about—

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** I have a point of order, Chair. Mr. Chambers never moved a motion. I don’t know what Mr. Morantz is talking about. We had only a few utterances from Mr. Chambers, and obviously we knew that the meeting was supposed to start as a continuation of the previous meeting. I’m sorry that Mr. Morantz hasn’t gotten his way. Following procedure is not within his general values and ethics, but it’s strange.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Mr. Turnbull, this is not a point of order.

Go ahead, Mr. Morantz.

**Mr. Marty Morantz:** I have a point of order. Before I get the floor back, is it parliamentary for a member to question another member’s ethics?

**Mr. Philip Lawrence:** Mr. Chair, on that point of order, of course, in Parliament you can’t do indirectly what you can’t do directly. You can’t call someone a liar or say that they are lying. Calling on someone’s ethics is, in my view, analogous to that. Quite frankly, it undermines the collaboration within this committee.

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** On that point of order, Chair...

**Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan:** Go ahead, Mr. Turnbull.

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** My intervention was based on the interpretation I have that Mr. Morantz doesn’t want to follow the procedural rules of the committee. Perhaps he interprets them differently, but the advice of the clerk was sent around to committee members in an email, and I’m glad to see that we upheld the procedural requirements and procedural rules of the House of Commons.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** I didn’t hear too many points of order on that. I let it go on, but I will say that I hope we continue to stay on topic.

I’ll turn it back over to Mr. Morantz.

**Mr. Don Davies:** Mr. Chair, with Mr. Morantz’s indulgence, I have a point of clarification that might help us all. I’m looking at a notice of meeting from February 8, 2024, which reads, “Statutory Review of the Proceeds of Crime and Terrorist Financing Act”. There are three Department of Finance officials there. For my own benefit and for others, that may not be adequate, but did we not have one meeting with officials? Did that meeting occur or didn’t it?

**Mr. Adam Chambers:** On that point of clarification, Mr. Chair, my understanding—and perhaps the clerk could confirm this—is that the committee has not agreed to undertake any study of the proceeds of crime and money laundering act, as in no motion has been adopted by the committee to review that act.

What I believe occurred in February was that we invited individuals to a meeting to discuss money laundering that we may decide to incorporate into a future study if the committee decides to embark upon a study of the proceeds of crime and money laundering act or to fulfill the statutory obligation to do so. However, the committee has not decided to embark on the statutory obligation to study that act, as we have not agreed to accept the Minister of Finance’s request, because we have not adopted a motion as such.

**Mr. Don Davies:** If I might, I’m reading from the transcript—

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Mr. Davies, wait.

**Mr. Marty Morantz:** Mr. Chair, do I have the floor? Are we still on a point of order? What are we doing?

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Colleagues, I will just say to wait to be recognized before you speak.

I want to clear up some of the points that have been brought up.

Yes, officials were here to talk about money laundering once. That's correct, Mr. Davies.

Mr. Chambers, you're also correct in the sense that no motion has been passed as of yet with regard to money laundering. I thought that's what the Standing Order 106(4) request today was for, but obviously it was overturned when Mr. Chambers was trying to bring forward a motion on money laundering.

That's where we're at now. I hope that clears up the points that have been brought up.

I'll turn it back over to Mr. Morantz.

**Mr. Marty Morantz:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

On the issue of the finance minister appearing at committee and her letter to the committee asking for the study, Conservatives have been trying to do their part. We did have that one meeting, because Mr. Chambers acted on it. Mr. Chambers did try to introduce the motion. It is on notice, so I think it would be appropriate to at least read Mr. Chambers's motion into the record so that Mr. Turnbull and Mr. Davies will both be aware of it. I'm going to do that right now. It says:

Pursuant to Standing Order 108(2) and with regard to section 72 of the Proceeds of Crime (Money Laundering) and Terrorist Financing Act, the committee undertake a study to review the Act and the current situation regarding money laundering and terrorist financing—

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** On a point of order, Chair, my understanding is that you can't move a motion—

**Mr. Marty Morantz:** I'm not moving it. I'm reading it into the record.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Mr. Morantz—

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** It's highly inappropriate. It's not relevant to the—

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Mr. Turnbull, Mr. Morantz is reading a motion into the record, not moving a motion currently.

Mr. Morantz, you have the floor. I would just suggest that you read the motion again.

**Mr. Marty Morantz:** I'm not sure where I left off, so I'll just start from the beginning, Mr. Chair, if that's all right. "Pursuant to Standing Order 108(2) and with regard to section 72 of the"—

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** On a point of order, Chair, are you ruling that it is in order for Mr. Morantz to put on notice a motion during a debate on a subamendment?

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Mr. Turnbull, as I indicated, Mr. Morantz is neither putting a motion on notice nor moving a motion right now. He's reading into the record a motion that pertains to his remarks because he has the floor right now. He

did not indicate at all that he would be moving or putting one on notice.

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** Chair, is that your ruling?

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** I'm not sure what ruling is there. Mr. Morantz is not moving a motion right now or putting one on notice. Neither of those things is happening, which is what your question was about. Is Mr. Morantz allowed to read out a motion? Is he allowed to put it on notice, or is he allowed to move it? He's doing neither of the last two things. He's just reading out a motion, as far as I see.

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** Chair, my understanding, just for clarification, is that if he's reading a motion into the record, he's putting it on notice, and that is not appropriate—

**Mr. Marty Morantz:** I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** —given the fact that he's on a subamendment. That means he cannot put a motion on notice, and I would like a ruling on that if possible.

**Mr. Marty Morantz:** On that point of order, Mr. Chair...

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Colleagues, as the clerk has clarified for me, you can read a motion either to put it on notice or to move it. In my opinion, neither is being done right now. Mr. Morantz is simply reading a motion that's on notice; he is not moving it. That was not his intent, and Mr. Morantz can clear that up. Is he intending to move a motion, is he intending to read it into the record or is he intending to put it on notice? As far as I know, it has already been put on notice, and maybe Mr. Morantz can clarify whether he's just reading it into the record or he's moving it.

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** Chair, if I may, I would say that it's not relevant, though, to the subamendment. How is he reading something into the record or allowed to do so if it is not relevant? That's a legitimate point of order. I can refer to the standing order if you'd like, but I think you know that calling a point of order on relevance is legitimate, so I'd like to call relevance.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Mr. Turnbull, that was not your question originally. In your original question to begin with, you were asking me if he was allowed to move a motion or put it on notice. That was your original question.

What you have asked now is completely different from that. I will point that out, and I think, given the discussion, Mr. Morantz is reading into the record a summary of where we're at. I know that he did mention the Minister of Finance in his remarks, based back on the letter on money laundering and where we got to here. I feel that clarified what you were originally asking, so I'll turn the floor back over to Mr. Morantz.

**Mr. Marty Morantz:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I realize that Mr. Turnbull is new to the committee, so I'll just bring to his attention that on Tuesday, March 19, a motion was put on notice. This is the motion that I'm reading into the record. I'm not putting it on notice and I'm not moving it, but I think it's relevant to the discussion of the subamendment, which calls for the Minister of Finance to appear at this committee. That speaks to my intent with respect to reading the motion and relevance.

I'll continue.

It reads, "Pursuant to Standing Order 108(2) and with regard to section 72 of the Proceeds of Crime (Money Laundering) and Terrorist Financing Act, the committee undertake a study to review the act and the current situation regarding money laundering and terrorist financing in Canada; that as part of the study, the committee call the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance for no fewer than two hours, the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada for no fewer than two hours, the Minister of Public Safety—

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

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Go ahead on a point of order, Mr. Turnbull.

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** I still cannot understand the relevance of this intervention in relation to the subamendment. It's not relevant. It's clearly not relevant to the subamendment on Mark Carney, which is what we're debating.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Mr. Turnbull, I will say that this is I think the third time I'm answering to this point. I did, in my intervention before this, explain that there was a tie-in, I felt, between what Mr. Morantz was talking about in talking about the Minister of Finance, who is in the subamendment, tying it back to the letter that she had sent to this committee, to the chair, and that the relevance is based on that.

This is, I think, the third time. I will turn the floor back over to Mr. Morantz again.

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** Chair, can I clarify?

**Mr. Don Davies:** Could I speak to the point of order briefly?

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Yes. Go ahead, Mr. Davies.

**Mr. Don Davies:** It's my understanding that a motion is confidential until it's moved in committee. That's why you can't read it in right now. It's either moved or it's not. It's confidential until it's moved.

Mr. Morantz can't simultaneously decline to move and respect the fact that the motion is confidential. This is a public meeting.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Just to clarify that point, Mr. Davies, as far as I know, the motion was put on notice publicly by Mr. Chambers. Am I correct in that?

**Mr. Don Davies:** You can put it on notice. The motion is confidential. It's not to be spoken about in public until it's moved in committee. I'd like the clerk to advise on that.

**Mr. Adam Chambers:** I can clarify, Mr. Chair, if I'm able to.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Mr. Chambers, go ahead on that point of order.

**Mr. Adam Chambers:** Thank you very much.

Just for a point of clarity or a point of information, Mr. Davies is in fact correct. You cannot do that. However, the sequence of events was the following: The motion was put on notice. It was distributed to committee members. In fact, I did read that motion into the record during that meeting, so it is already a matter of public record.

I believe that Mr. Morantz is refreshing people's memories. I believe that's what he's doing, perhaps for the benefit of Mr. Turnbull, who I don't believe was present at the meeting when it was read into the record. He may not have seen it before.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Thank you, Mr. Chambers.

Yes, that's what I was talking about: that it was read into the record once before, so it is not a private motion at all. It has been read into the public record once before, and as far as I've seen, Mr. Morantz is just reiterating the same motion once again into the record.

Mr. Morantz, I'll give you the floor again.

**Mr. Don Davies:** Mr. Chair, can we hear from the clerk on that?

I think it would be helpful for all of us as committee members, because I don't know what the meaning of a motion being confidential before it is moved is if you can talk about it repeatedly in a public meeting. I understand reading it into the record, and it's been read into the record, but I don't think that gives licence to abrogate the rule that a motion is confidential until it is moved.

Could I hear from the clerk on that? What is the clerk's advice to the committee on this?

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** I can turn it over to the clerk to reiterate that, but once again, I will say it's not a confidential motion because it's been moved and read publicly into the record once.

**Mr. Don Davies:** With respect, Mr. Chair, you're the vice-chair. I want to hear from the clerk on this. I want to get the advice of the clerk.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** I will....

Mr. Davies, I'll just ask you to please wait to be recognized before you speak.

I will turn it over to the clerk now so that he can explain it.

**The Clerk:** Motions are indeed confidential when they are sent to me and before they are proposed at committee by the member, and I will not distribute them to the media or the public domain. I will distribute them only to the members of the committee.

However, it has happened on every side that members give notice of a motion by verbally stating it and reading it out loud during committee proceedings. Mr. Chambers did it for this motion, and it's happened many times in the past and in other committees as well.

As soon as a motion is read into testimony, it becomes public, and I am then free to send it out to the media and the public, to whoever wants to have it. It's also in the minutes of proceedings at that time.

**Mr. Don Davies:** Thank you.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Thank you for reiterating that, Clerk, and for all the hard work.

Mr. Morantz, I'll turn the floor back over to you.

**Mr. Marty Morantz:** I'll continue from where I left off.

It reads, "...the Minister of Public Safety for no fewer than two hours; the Minister of National Revenue for no fewer than two hours; department officials for the departments of justice and of public safety; the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, the Financial Transactions and Reports Analysis Centre of Canada, the Canadian Security Intelligence Service, the Canadian border security agency, the Office of the Superintendent of Financial Institutions, the Financial Consumer Agency of Canada, the Ombudsman for Banking Services and Investments, the Cullen commission lead counsel, Royal Bank of Canada, TD Bank, Bank of Montreal, Scotiabank, CIBC, National Bank, the Ontario Securities Commission and other witnesses as submitted by the members of the committee; that the committee take no fewer than 10 meetings for this study, and that it report its findings to the House."

I'm just reading this into the record. I'm not moving it. It's already on notice. It's been read into the record before, but it is relevant to the fact that the subamendment calls for the Minister of Finance to appear, and she has specifically made a request of this committee, which the committee has ignored. The motion, if it were moved and passed, would address that.

Having said all that, Mr. Chair, I'd like to move that this committee consider the Standing Order 106(4) request at this point in time.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Mr. Morantz, are you asking to adjourn the current debate and move on to the Standing Order 106(4) request? Is that what you're saying?

**Mr. Marty Morantz:** Yes. I'd like to move on to the Standing Order 106(4) meeting and adjourn the current debate.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Okay. It's dilatory.

Colleagues, because the motion that was put forward has a condition on it to move to the Standing Order 106(4) meeting, it is a debatable motion and is up for debate.

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** On a point of order, Mr. Chair, my understanding is that you can't move a motion that's not dilatory if we're already on a subamendment debate.

Therefore, Mr. Morantz cannot move a non-dilatory motion while he has the floor. That would circumvent debate on the very subamendment we've been debating for the entire meeting.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Mr. Turnbull, what Mr. Morantz is moving is a dilatory motion. It has a condition to move to the meeting requested under Standing Order 106(4) as well. Given that it also has a condition on it and is not just the dilatory motion to adjourn, it is debatable, according to the clerk.

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

My understanding of the definition of a dilatory motion is that it has to move directly to a vote without debate, so how can it be a dilatory motion if it then has a condition on it that would require debate? That doesn't make sense. That's not consistent with every procedural rule that I've learned in the past five years since coming to the House of Commons.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Mr. Turnbull, of course a dilatory motion is to end the debate, but since this one has a condition on it, which was verified by the clerk, it is debatable. That's where we're at right now. That's the decision we've made after talking to the clerk, so I do see—

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** I'd like to challenge the chair on that.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Okay. We'll go to a vote on that.

I'd like to have the clerk explain it before we go to the vote so that it's clear that this is direction from the clerk as well.

Would the committee be open to hearing the official ruling from the clerk on this, just so that it's clear that this is following full procedure? Can we get everyone's consent to that?

Go ahead, Mr. Turnbull.

**Mr. Don Davies:** Mr. Chair, first of all, it's not a ruling from the clerk.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** It's on advice from the clerk.

**Mr. Don Davies:** It's advice from the clerk, but it's your ruling, though. We're not listening to a ruling from the clerk. The clerk gives advice. It's your ruling, Mr. Chair.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** That's fair enough, but I did get advice from the clerk on that.

I mean, I don't have unanimous consent. I see Mr. Turnbull is shaking his head. He doesn't want to hear from the clerk.

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** I see all of us shaking our heads, Mr. Chair.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** We'll go straight to the vote.

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** Your ruling is what I've contested.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Mr. Turnbull, I'll just ask that you ask to be recognized before you speak.

I will go to the clerk to take a recorded vote.

**The Clerk:** Ms. Kayabaga—

**Ms. Arielle Kayabaga:** I'm sorry, Clerk. Can you repeat what we're voting on? There's too much chatter.

**The Clerk:** Yes. The question is this: Shall the decision of the chair be sustained?

Just like earlier, if you agree with the chair's decision, you vote yes. If you do not agree with the chair's decision, you vote no.

(Ruling of the chair overturned: nays 6; yeas 4 [See *Minutes of Proceedings*])

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

Because voting on a ruling of the chair is dilatory, I didn't have a chance to interject, of course, but we just voted against the chair enforcing the rules that are written in Bosc and Gagnon. I'm not sure exactly what that means, but that can't be a good thing, guys, so....

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Mr. Morantz, you have the floor again.

**Mr. Marty Morantz:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

On the issue of the Minister of Finance appearing at committee, I think I've made my position clear vis-à-vis the importance of discussing the important issue of money laundering, in particular given the fact that she actually wrote a letter to the committee asking for the five-year review. We've not met our statutory obligations with respect to that review, and that definitely needs to happen.

Despite Mr. Chambers' efforts today, that is still not happening, which is unfortunate. I'm not sure why the Liberals and the NDP on this committee are so against dealing with the scourge of money laundering in this country. It's really shameful. I'm not going to question the ethics of Mr. Turnbull and why he's opposed to that. I'll leave that for viewers to decide.

Having said that, I think I'm going to conclude my remarks by moving a dilatory motion to move to consideration of our Standing Order 106(4) request.

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

**The Chair:** Go ahead, Mr. Turnbull.

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** My understanding is that Mr. Morantz already did that and that it has already been voted on. That matter has been dealt with. It cannot be repeated by the same member who has not given up the floor.

That's a very well-known procedural rule. I know from my time on the procedure and House affairs committee that this is not proper procedure.

**Mr. Marty Morantz:** On that point of order, Mr. Chair—

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** I'll go to you in a moment, Mr. Morantz.

Mr. Turnbull, the last intervention by Mr. Morantz to bring this dilatory with a condition motion forward was overruled by you. You brought the motion forward to overrule the chair, so we technically didn't get to this dilatory motion with a condition. Technically, it is the first time it's being brought forward.

I'll turn it over to you, Mr. Morantz, if it's on that same point of order.

**Mr. Marty Morantz:** The motion is different, Mr. Chair. The last motion had a condition attached to it. This is just a straight-up dilatory motion. It's different.

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** I'm sorry, Chair. Can I clarify?

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Before I go to you, Mr. Turnbull, I will make a clarification.

Mr. Morantz, on the way you put it forward—with advice from the clerk—it is a dilatory motion, but it has a condition on it still, which means it is open for debate. The dilatory portion is curtailing the debate, but there is a condition to continue on with the Standing Order 106(4), so it is open for debate now.

**Mr. Marty Morantz:** Do I have the floor?

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Yes, Mr. Morantz.

**Mr. Marty Morantz:** We're debating my motion to adjourn debate on the subamendments to continue a new debate on the 106(4).

Well, that being the case, the money laundering—

**Mr. Don Davies:** On a point of order, Mr. Chair, this is Orwellian. Mr. Morantz just did exactly what he did before: He introduced a dilatory motion with a condition. Whether he was able to do that or not was challenged. You ruled that it was in order. That ruling was challenged and the committee overruled that. That issue has been dealt with.

Mr. Morantz has just done the identical thing, Mr. Chair. With great respect, for you to say that he could do it again because the first one wasn't dealt with is absolutely wrong, with respect. You did deal with it. You ruled, but your ruling was overruled by the committee. The committee is the master of its own procedure and ultimately has the power to make the decision. The decision has been ruled on. The issue has been dealt with. Mr. Morantz is not permitted to then move the exactly identical motion that he just moved. You ruled on it. It was overruled by the committee.

We could do this ad infinitum. Mr. Turnbull is absolutely correct that the same member cannot introduce the same motion right after it's been defeated. If your ruling is that Mr. Morantz can proceed with this, I will challenge your ruling again.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Just for clarification, Mr. Davies, again, the clerk advised me that when Mr. Morantz originally moved this, it was a dilatory motion with a condition, and the clerk's advice was that it became a debatable motion.

We didn't get to that motion because my ruling in regard to it being a dilatory motion with a condition on it—which means it was open to debate—was overturned by Mr. Turnbull, not the motion that Mr. Morantz brought up.

Once again, this new motion that Mr. Morantz has brought forward is a different motion. It's not the same as the previous one, and we technically have not gotten to it because, once again, we are open to debate on that dilatory motion with a condition, which I got advice from the clerk on.

**Mr. Don Davies:** With respect, Mr. Chair, your ruling that it was debatable was overturned, and the committee said it's not debatable.

You are now permitting debate on a motion—the identical motion—which was dilatory and non-dilatory at the same time. A dilatory motion to proceed to the Standing Order 106(4) matter was moved originally by Mr. Morantz. You said that was debatable. The committee members challenged your ruling, arguing that it was not debatable. Your ruling was overturned.

Mr. Morantz, when it went back to him, then introduced the same motion, which is a dilatory motion to move to the Standing Order 106(4) request, and you're permitting debate on it when the committee just ruled that we do not agree with your ruling that it's debatable.

You are not following the ruling that was just made by the majority of this committee.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Mr. Davies, with that, if it's not debatable, then we will just go straight to a vote on it.

Now it becomes dilatory, so we will move to a vote on Mr. Morantz' motion to go straight to Standing Order 106(4). I'll turn it over to the clerk to take votes on this motion.

(Motion negatived: nays 6; yeas 4)

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

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Please go ahead, Mr. Lawrence.

**Mr. Philip Lawrence:** My understanding is that the procedure set out before us—I believe the sources are Bosc and Gagnon and the Standing Orders, but please correct me if I'm wrong—is that when we have a dilatory motion with a condition, it is debatable, and that is set in law or the regulations.

Can we just, on a majority basis, decide to depart from either the Standing Orders or Bosc and Gagnon at any time? It will be interesting when we form government.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Thank you, Mr. Lawrence.

The clerk has advised me that, yes, committees are masters of their own domains in here, so that is a decision that was made by the committee.

I'll move on to the speaking list that I have.

Mr. Chambers had his hand up. Please go ahead.

**Mr. Adam Chambers:** Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

I believe we're on the subamendment. Is that correct? Are we on the subamendment of the amendment?

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** That is correct.

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

Having Mr. Carney appear isn't like having any random private citizen appear. This individual has a campaign manager, has appeared at other Senate committees and at other House committees in the past as well, and is holding private get-togethers about his plans for the future of the country. For those Liberal Party members, members of caucus, who are supporting other candidates for the leadership—who also have campaign managers—they should want Mr. Carney to face the same level of parliamentary scrutiny that their preferred choice faces on a regular basis.

Note that the parliamentary secretary was the one who retweeted and reposted to amplify Mr. Carney's recent speech wherein he discussed the budget and the future of the party and the country with respect to the economy.

It's not the first time that Mr. Carney has given such speeches. In fact, he has appeared on podcasts for some 80-odd minutes in talking about the economy, the government's financial plan and the needs and the expectations that he would have for an economic growth agenda, so I think it's completely reasonable that members of the committee would like to question this individual.

As I've said, he has a campaign manager and is clearly looking to lead the party in the near future. It is completely within our obligations and duties to question those individuals and submit their names as witnesses or as requests for witnesses to appear, which I believe has already been done with this individual, but that request was rejected. I recall my NDP colleague, whom I hold in high esteem, recently suggesting that if a request to appear had been rejected by any witness, perhaps a summons would be appropriate, so it's possible that the thinking has changed on that front. That was my understanding of the discussion we had a few weeks ago, when there was a specific motion on the table requesting the appearance of this individual.

To those members of the Liberal caucus who are looking to support Mr. Carney, why not give him the platform to perform on the national stage and to give his plan to the people and have it scrutinized by the public? Mr. Carney is a capable individual who can handle himself, as he has on many occasions, both at this committee and at the Senate committee, where he appeared most recently a couple of weeks ago. I think it's completely reasonable to make this request.

I note that with the parliamentary secretary's motion was dropped in the middle of studying the bill, so in fact it's the government motion itself that's preventing the study of the bill. We were studying the bill. We were in rounds of questioning with witnesses, and the government decided to interrupt that to bring a programming motion that it knows would not have the support or consensus of the committee in order to try to frustrate the ability of the committee to perform its duties in reviewing the bill. It actually wants to fast-track this bill through the committee process, as it does every single spring. It is, in fact, the government motion that is preventing the studying of this bill. It is inadequate—as has been pointed out, by the way, by Mr. Davies of the NDP—because it doesn't provide for enough witness testimony.

Conservatives have said that it's inadequate for other reasons, and we would like to include additional items. For example, I appreciate Mr. Turnbull's recommendation as parliamentary secretary that the motion include reference to money laundering, but it is by far inadequate compared to what has previously been done to study money laundering. The last parliamentary committee that studied the Proceeds of Crime (Money Laundering) and Terrorist Financing Act had 14 meetings.

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

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Go ahead on your point of order, Mr. Turnbull.

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** Mr. Chambers continues to mislead this committee with his comments here. The truth is that we know this is a Conservative filibuster. It's on their own subamendment to a quite reasonable motion.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** Mr. Turnbull, this is not a point of order. It's a point of debate.

Mr. Chambers, you have the floor.

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

I appreciate the intervention by my friend. It is not a reasonable motion in the sense that you have multiple parties—including all opposition parties, including the coalition partner—suggesting that the motion is inadequate for one reason or another. That includes the NDP. It includes the Bloc. It includes the Conservatives.

It seems bizarre that the government would like to bring the programming motion and interrupt the study of its own legislation when it knows the end result. This happens every single spring. The government tries to have a programming motion with the shortest amount of committee study time, with the fewest witnesses testifying. It makes one wonder what's actually hiding in the 600-page budget bill. This is how we got the SNC-Lavalin scandal—the review by committee was too fast.

I think Mr. Davies has made an excellent recommendation to increase the number of meetings. The Conservatives have some other ideas as well to permit us to hear from more witnesses. We have an additional buffer of at least one week, or maybe two, when we can have more witness testimony before we have to get this bill back to the House. I don't know why we wouldn't use that time and have more witnesses come in, because what will happen is the same thing that happens every single year, which is that the filibuster will continue. Then at the last minute, we'll jam in 10 or 12 committee

meetings all week, and we'll sit all day, every day, instead of just sitting now or sitting when we get there next week, using our regular meetings and not having to have additional meetings. We'd have the amount of witness testimony that Mr. Davies likes.

The government doesn't actually need to move this motion today. We were already studying the bill. It can bring any motion at any time later if it doesn't think we're moving fast enough to call it out at committee or to start clause-by-clause consideration. It doesn't have to have the clause-by-clause requirements in this motion. This is the government that's trying to force through its legislation at committee, knowing that we'll end up in this place and we'll have very little witness testimony to begin with.

I'd also point out that we've had only one round of departmental officials testifying on the bill. It seems rather bizarre that we're preventing a Standing Order 106(4) motion because the government wants to continue to debate a programming motion.

With that, Mr. Chair, I will move that we adjourn the debate.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** We'll go to a vote.

(Motion negatived: nays 6; yeas 4)

**Mr. Philip Lawrence:** On a point of order, Mr. Chair, if a substitute comes in halfway through the vote, is that still valid?

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** I'm not really sure, after discussing with the clerk, how to even answer that.

**Mr. Philip Lawrence:** I withdraw it out of courtesy.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan):** That's fair enough, Mr. Lawrence.

Colleagues, just from reading the room I don't see that we have much agreement, so I move to suspend the meeting.

*[The meeting was suspended at 4:39 p.m., Friday, May 17]*

*[The meeting resumed at 11:02 a.m., Tuesday, May 21]*

**The Chair:** I call this meeting to order.

Welcome to the continuation of meeting number 142 of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Finance.

Pursuant to Standing Order 108(2), the committee is meeting to discuss the subject matter of Bill C-69, an act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on April 16, 2024.

Today's meeting is taking place in a hybrid format pursuant to Standing Order 15.1.

Before we begin, I would like to remind all members and other meeting participants in the room of the following important preventative measures.

To prevent disruptive and potentially harmful audio feedback incidents that can cause injuries, all in-person participants are reminded to keep their earpieces away from the microphones at all times. As indicated in the communiqué from the Speaker to all members on Monday, April 29, the following measures have been taken to help prevent audio feedback incidents. All earpieces have been replaced by a model that greatly reduces the probability of audio feedback. The new earpieces are black in colour, whereas the former earpieces were grey. Please use only a black, approved earpiece. By default, all unused earpieces will be unplugged at the start of the meeting.

When you're not using your earpiece, please place it face down on the middle of the sticker for this purpose, which you will find on the table as indicated. Please consult the cards on the table for guidelines to prevent audio feedback incidents. The room layout has been adjusted to increase the distance between microphones and reduce the chance of feedback from an ambient earpiece.

These measures are in place so we can conduct our business without interruption and to protect the health and safety of all participants, including the interpreters. Thank you all for your co-operation.

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

Please wait until I recognize you by name before speaking. For members in the room, please raise your hand if you wish to speak. For members on Zoom, please use the “raise hand” button on the screen. The clerk and I will manage the speaking order as well as we can, and we appreciate your understanding in this regard.

I remind everyone that all comments should be addressed through the chair.

On that, members, I hope you had a good week last week. I was not here on Friday. I guess a speakers list was not captured as far as who was on that list when we last left off on Friday, so the speakers list is open.

We are on MP Morantz's subamendment.

I saw the hand of an eager MP Chambers just go up, so we have MP Chambers on the list. Anybody else can let me know as we go along.

I see MP Davies, then MP Morantz and then MP Dzerowicz.

We'll get started with MP Chambers.

**Mr. Adam Chambers:** Thank you.

Welcome back, everyone. I hope everyone had a wonderful holiday weekend.

We had a great start to the weekend with a committee meeting. That's how I like to start every holiday weekend, Mr. Chair.

Now, Mr. Chair, I have sent the clerk a transcript in English, which I'm hoping he will be able to share with our translators. When I get the thumbs-up from the translators that they have it, I will commence. Until then, let's just remind ourselves where we are.

There is an amendment—

**The Chair:** MP Chambers, I'm seeing heads shaking that they do not have it.

**Mr. Adam Chambers:** I won't enter the transcript until I get a signal from our friends that they have it, but let's do a bit of a recap as to where we are.

We have a motion to fast-track this over 600-page budget bill, which apparently needs to get out of committee by June 3, according to the government. We know that's not true. There's at least one other week during which we could have committee meetings and witness testimony. We also have an amendment to hear from Mr. Mark Carney.

**The Chair:** It has been received.

**Mr. Adam Chambers:** Thank you very much.

Just to make sure we're all keeping relevant, Mr. Carney has been giving some speeches. In fact, when one speech was recently reported, the headline was, “Mark Carney says federal budget not focused enough on growth”.

An article from the fall, from the CBC of all places, had the headline, “Former Bank of Canada governor Carney questions carbon price break on home heating oil”. Mr. Carney said he would do something different. I would like to know, as I'm sure many Canadians would, what that something different is. Those members of the Liberal caucus who have already pledged their support to a leadership contestant in an upcoming leadership race, to be determined, should also want Mr. Carney to face a reasonable amount of scrutiny.

I'll remind the committee that it was a member of this committee who retweeted his speech from just a few weeks ago when he talked about the budget and lack of growth.

I want to do a bit of time travel here. I believe this was in 2021. Mr. Mark Carney was on a famous podcast, *The Herle Burly*. I have a transcript of that podcast, which our wonderful translators have. We should examine what Mr. Mark Carney had to say about a number of issues. We'll begin.

David Herle said, “Greetings, Herle Burly-ites. We're going to get right to it. It's a two-part pod today, and a very exciting two-part pod it is. First up is Mark Carney. Yep, that Mark Carney. The former governor of the Bank of Canada and the Bank of England, Mark Carney. The Mark Carney who recently spoke at the Liberal convention.”

Mr. Mark Carney has also spoken at Liberal Party conventions—very interesting. I'll go back to the transcript.

He continued, “But I have to ask, how much do you really know about this man? Today we’re going to attempt to crack open the Carney. We’ll take a deeper dive into his story. Why a young, successful master of the universe guy just quits to become a bureaucrat in the Department of Finance. We’ll talk about the thesis of his new book, *Value(s): Building a Better World for All*, and we’re going to try to demystify the link between climate action and finance policy, what that means for Canada, and maybe we’ll talk a little bit of budget. Part two of the pod is NSFW, not safe for work. Let’s face it: it may not even be safe for you to listen alone on your goddamned AirPods.”

That’s just me repeating. I’m not trying to use unparliamentary language, but I’ll be more careful, Mr. Chair.

He said, “It’s our political panel with Jenni ‘accept no [BS]’ Byrne and Scott ‘I have no need of fancy grooming products’ Reid. We’ll talk about the continuing Ford fallout in Ontario: Sick Leave? What Sick Leave? The Vance sexual misconduct story—how compelling is this politically? Does it even matter? Trudeau’s got his guns out in his vaccine photo op, but he’s been tardy on travel bans. We’ll chat about that. Plus stick around for our ‘HEY YOU!’ this week.

“Mark Carney, I want to welcome you to *The Herle Burlly*. I’m so happy to have you here. I’ve known you well for about.... I met you 20 years ago. I’ve known you well for about 10 years, but you’ve never had enough time on your hands or been unemployed [long] enough to come on this show...so thank you for [coming].”

Mark Carney said, “This is a new low, David. It’s a new low.”

David Herle said, “You never thought.... You never thought...oh my God. How are you?”

Mark Carney answered, “I’m all right. I’m good. I’m happy to be here. Good to see you. I’ve listened to you, but I haven’t seen you for a long time, so it’s good to see you. You’re looking well.”

David Herle said, “Blurry, if well.... Blurry is actually my best look. Yeah, fuzzy. It’s an effect I use on the camera.”

There’s a little bit of a pause, and then “yeah”.

David Herle asked, “What are you doing for fun? You’re in Ottawa. What are you doing for fun?”

Mark Carney said, “Yeah. The city that doesn’t wake up”. I’ll take a time out. This is a very true story. This is the city that fun forgot. Ottawa is the only city in the entire country that has to hire a night manager to make the city more fun.

I’ll go back to the transcript.

Mark Carney said, “What am I doing for fun? I mean, it’s tough at the best of times. It’s difficult. There’s not a lot. You know, we’ve got.... Two of our kids are here, so we have fun, you know, the sort of family unit. Mealtimes are fun, something to look forward to, you know, to be honest. Look, I’m in a book club. I mean, it’s good, man. It’s good. We’re doing the second loop through, you know, *Schitt’s Creek* and watching a bit of the Oilers”.

I’ll pause. I’m also watching the Oilers this year—that’s interesting—a perennial Stanley Cup favourite.

I’ll go back to the transcript.

He continued, “[We’re] on the fringes of.... Like many of us...I’m sleeping at the office sort of thing, so I spend a lot of time staring into this device for various work stuff. There’s a bit of fun, but, yeah, I’m ready to be released when we’re released.”

I’ll pause. He’s “ready to be released” when it’s time. Maybe now is that time, Mr. Chair.

David Herle said, “I’m sure. Hey, listen. We have a lot of Ontario listeners to this podcast. Would you tell them who, in reality, is the best hockey team in Canada right now?”

Mark Carney answered, “The Edmonton Oilers. I was being interviewed the other day. It was American. It was Bloomberg, I think. It was American. Yeah, and he said, ‘You know, this is the year the Leafs are going to win the cup.’ And he went on and on, and I was like, what are you talking about? The Oilers are going to win—

**Ms. Joanne Thompson:** I have a point of order.

While this is riveting, I don’t understand the relevance of the hockey, the importance, to this committee. Could you please move along to whatever point it is that you are making or attempting to make today?

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you, MP Thompson.

MP Chambers, just keep it relevant, and—

**Mr. Marty Morantz:** Mr. Chair, on that point of order....

**The Chair:** —if you can get to the substance of what you’re trying to provide here to the committee....

Go ahead on that point of order, MP Morantz.

**Mr. Marty Morantz:** I think it would be important to mention to Ms. Thompson that she can’t give instructions directly to Mr. Chambers. It has to be through the chair.

**The Chair:** That is correct; it has to be through the chair.

Thank you, MP Morantz.

We will go back to MP Chambers.

**Mr. Adam Chambers:** Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

I apologize in advance. I didn’t write the transcript. This is the transcript of a podcast interview Mr. Carney gave with the famous Liberal strategist David Herle. If we want to learn a bit more about Mark Carney, which is the subject of the subamendment, this is the opportunity to do so. Because I’m feeling somewhat generous, we’ll skip a bit of the hockey intro for Ms. Thompson.

We'll get into Mark Carney partway down the second page, where David Herle said, "sports scholarship or academic scholarship?" He's talking about where he went to university.

Mark Carney said, "I went to Harvard and they have financial aid. So you get in or you don't, and it helps if you do other things in getting in, but once you're in they just calculate based on your financial need. So I had financial aid. It wasn't a scholarship per se but some grants, some loans, including some from the Alberta government: the Noble scholarship. I was a Noble scholar. How's that? You can refer to me like that for the rest of the pod: Noble scholar."

David Herle was laughing: "Noble scholar. Yeah, I'm writing that."

Mark Carney said, "[I'm running for] the Alberta heritage fund, so I owe.... It's one of the many things I owe Alberta."

"And Peter Lougheed."

"Yes, absolutely."

David Herle said, "So there's something that's inexplicable about you to me and you need to explain it to me. And that is...you're in New York City. You're a master of the universe. You're making scads of money. You're living the glamorous life. This is the 'go, go USA' of Bill Clinton and Bob Rubin in the 1990s, and you're at Goldman. And you quit to come back to be an official in the Department of Finance—not a junior official but not the boss, either—just an official in the Department of Finance. Why did you do that?"

Mark Carney said, "Well, I've always been interested in public policy. I came from, you know... For background, my father was an academic—principally an academic—but he was a deputy minister, for a time, in the Alberta government during the Lougheed years. Al Boomer Adair was his minister, both in northern affairs and parks and recreation—not the sitcom but the very serious department in Alberta—and I'd always been interested. I had done undergrad. I worked for a few years in London and Tokyo. Then I went back and did graduate work in economics, and my intention was to go into something like public policy relatively quickly. As things happened, [I went to] Goldman [and] got a great assignment working with the ANC—the African National Congress—just as Nelson Mandela was coming into government. And we advised them. And so I came and did that. Anyways...blah, blah, blah. It took 10 more years before I executed coming into public policy. And I actually came into, initially, the Bank of Canada, David. I saw an ad in the paper for a deputy governor, and I thought, wait, you know, it's my last chance, or here's a chance, and if I'm really serious about this I should try it. David Dodge took a chance on me, and you know the rest. One thing [leads] to another after that, and I loved every minute of it."

David Herle said, "Interesting. Okay, so you have in latter years thrown yourself into the climate change file, and you talk a lot about climate change. A big butt-chunk of your book is about climate change. You're involved in a number of initiatives, but I recall from years past, talking to you, that you weren't always as focused on this issue as you are now. Did you have...? Well, I don't want to use, necessarily, Chrystia Freeland's words, but did you have an epiphany of sorts on this, and what was it?"

Mark Carney replied, "No, there's lots of issues. I worked on this issue as a civil servant, particularly when Ralph Goodale was finance minister. There was a climate [plan somehow], but then, you know, obviously, when I was governor of the Bank of Canada, we had the financial crisis and the core work there. Really, where it came to a head was once I was governor of the Bank of England. One of the things... One of the many things you're responsible for, as the Bank of England, is you oversee the insurance industry, and that means it's the fourth-largest insurance industry in the world. It includes Lloyd's of London, which is this incredible, you know, 300...three-century-plus-old institution that does things like insure hockey players' knees, which they do. But also they are one of the biggest insurers of property in the Gulf of Mexico, you know, and their biggest risk is basically climate change, so they have to be absolutely on top of it and...."

He continued, "extreme weather events had tripled in the last few decades. The cost of that had gone up five times. You know, so huge...hundreds of billions of dollars. And that's actually just the insured cost. There's much bigger costs that aren't insured, and it's very obvious that.... Well, I mean, I knew it was happening, but the scale of it happening and the speed with which it was changing becomes present."

"Then, in parallel, and this was about six, seven years ago—six years ago, I guess—I'm asked, because I'm overseeing at the time all the financial reforms post-crisis, something called the financial stability board, so the global reforms for that. I was asked by the G-20 leaders, what's the role of finance, the financial sector, in dealing with climate change? The response was, well, there's an issue here, which is, and I termed it, there's [a] tragedy [on] the horizon, which is that by the time it's a clear and present danger for everybody in the financial sector, not just the Lloyd's of Londons and the big insurance industry, it's going to be too late to meet the climate goals. It's going to be too late to keep temperatures below two degrees. You need to think about, you leaders...with the financial sector is just not going to front-run politics and policy. You have to grab this and pull it forward."

"That led to a series of reforms and measures, including...well, I won't bore you with them, but very important plumbing reforms that are now absolutely mainstream. At the time, it was viewed as.... You know, there was a wide range of opinion on that, but I think it would have been good if I—well, not 'I' but 'we'—had done that 10 years ago previously. I wasn't in a role to do that, and I wouldn't have seen it. But all of that is now becoming mainstream, and we're working on the next phase of addressing it."

David Herle asked, "What do your conversations about climate change go like with your friends from Alberta?"

Mark Carney answered, “They’ve moved over time. I think the recognition.... I’ve never had a conversation with people in Alberta about the issue of whether or not it was happening—I mean, there’s a range of opinions...or the speed with which it was happening, but what the contribution could be from Alberta or of Canada to be part of the solutions, or what the responsibilities of others are, and how seriously the world was taking it.

“I think what’s happened in terms of the financial sector, and how central this is now viewed in terms of investment and lending of major financial participants all over the world, look, we just signed up \$70 trillion—\$70 trillion, I’m going to repeat that—in American dollars, with net-zero plans from across the financial sector. That number is going to grow between now and Glasgow. I think we were a bit slow to recognize that that was coming. It’s been clear for a while that it was coming. It’s probably come a little sooner than even I would have expected. But I did expect that we would end up [here some day].”

David Herle asked what that meant—whether those with \$70 trillion have signed up to a set of targets and protocols that mean they really can’t invest in the oil sands anymore.

Mark Carney answered, “Well, I mean, this is not that per se. What they’ve signed up for...and this is very important. I’m going to go from easy to hard, okay? The easy bit is that a country or an energy company or a bank says, I’ll be net zero by 2050. You know, that’s quite far. It’s not easy to get there, by the way, but it’s easy to sort of say or make that commitment. Of course, the more reputable you are, if you make the commitment, you intend to make it, and then you pull it back and say, okay, where are you going to be in 2030?”

“Now, 2030 sounds like a long time, but it’s not a long time when you think about an energy company or an auto company. For an auto company, that’s one or two models, right? Think about all that R and D and development and plant design you have to do, particularly if you’re switching from an internal combustion engine to an electric vehicle. So we see it. You think about changing the portfolio, the generation mix of a utility, or substantially reducing the carbon footprint of the oil sands, or getting up and running in scale, real scale, not just pilot projects, carbon capture and storage, which is what we need for the oil sands—”

Mark Carney seems to be a very big fan of carbon capture and storage. I’m sure my friends in the NDP would like to question him on that kind of commitment, but we’ll go back to the transcript.

Mark Carney continued, “which is what we need for the hydrogen economy and natural gas. Nine years from now is not tomorrow, but it’s the day after tomorrow in terms of what needs to be done.

“So the key for these, looping back to what you were asking for these financial institutions and this \$70 trillion...one of the key things we’ve been trying to do is say, okay, so you have to say where you’re going to be in 2030. What proportion of the 50% reduction—the 50% reduction—does the world need to do to be on track in order to get to net zero by 2050?”

“I’m not going to explain the math, if you want, but that’s basically what’s required. And then what are you doing in the next five

years? What’s your decarbonization for the next five years—your plan—and how are you going to do it by various industries? The key thing, though, which we’re trying to get in, and I think we are succeeding, is decarbonization. So if there’s a company, and I won’t name specific ones, out in the oil patch—in the energy patch—in Alberta that is going to make a big investment or consortia of big investments that are going to pull carbon out of the process and decarbonize, then we want banks and investors to put money behind that.

“And when they put money behind the actual portfolio—I’m realizing most people will be listening to this and not watching it, so my very clear hand movements are only for your benefit—initially the carbon in that portfolio of the bank or the investor will go up, so we’re designing a system so that there’s credit for the fact that that investment initially will lead to lower carbon five years out, or 10 years out, and that’s absolutely critical. So, you know, Carville said, ‘It’s the economy, stupid’, and we’re saying, ‘It’s just the transition, stupid.’ It’s not just jumping overnight to a green future. It’d be nice if we could, but we can’t just do that, so you’d need to get the money behind it.

“So look, what it does mean for any company anywhere in the world, increasingly, is, if you are a major emitter, what’s your plan? What’s your plan to get your emissions down? What kind of investments do you intend to make? What’s your pathway to get there? And if you’re part of the solution, you’re going to get capital thrown at you. If you’re part of the problem or if you’re slow, it’s becoming very expensive and difficult to raise money. The former is definitely the case. That’s the other side of that \$70 trillion. This money needs to be put to work.”

We’ll leave the transcript for a second.

Mr. Carney is saying we need \$70 trillion to decarbonize and is suggesting that companies that don’t have a plan will face higher capital costs, which we’ve already seen happening. The investors in the market have been demanding that companies disclose their climate goals. However, what’s interesting is a regulator like OSFI, which came to this committee and bragged about the fact that, three or four years ago, it had three or four people working in a climate change division, now has 30 people working in its climate change division and is now threatening financial institutions in order to increase the capital requirements for lenders who lend to oil and gas.

It seems to me that's a bit of a stretch considering OSFI's mandate. I don't recall any debate in Parliament about changing OSFI's mandate to include such a strong focus on climate change, but perhaps Mr. Carney has a view on whether he supports the regulator taking an approach like that, especially if the regulator is now going to start evaluating all these plans. Are the regulators going to start analyzing all of the climate change plans and emissions reduction plans, or should they just let investors in the market decide what they will demand from that company?

I'd love to ask OSFI that question, but it hasn't been here in almost a year. I wonder if they're trying to avoid us, Mr. Chair.

We'll go back to the transcript. This is David Herle speaking: "I spent the first decade of my life as a farm boy in rural Saskatchewan. So here's an innovation I never thought I'd see. The most important piece of equipment in farming today isn't a tractor, a combine or a plow. It's the smart phone a farmer holds in their hand. Yes, new technologies like AI, robotics, big data and network connectivity have changed the way we farm for the better."

Mr. Chair, I apologize. This is just an advertisement in the podcast. I'm going to skip this section for Ms. Thompson's sake. I know that we don't need to give any free advertising to anyone here at the finance committee.

Now I'll get back to the podcast. Mr. Herle said, "You're doing a lot of work with the UN. What's that like? I have a pretty jaundiced view, but I only really follow the security council. What's it like to work with the UN?"

Mark Carney said, "You follow the Security Council—well done. That's good."

"What's it like working with the UN? Well, look, what I do, and I spend half my time on this, at least, is I am a special envoy—'Noble scholar and special envoy', if you could use both of those from now on—for the Secretary-General on climate finance, so what we're talking about...it's the private sector finance for climate, how to organize the financial system and get them behind being part of the solution for climate change—getting money to that example we just talked about, the company in Alberta that's going to reduce its carbon footprint—or a new renewable or a new technology, all that, but organizing the whole system."

"I'm also Prime Minister Boris Johnson's adviser on exactly the same issue."

Let's take a time out from the transcript. Mr. Carney also advised Prime Minister Boris Johnson, so Boris Johnson obviously had a lot of faith in Governor Carney. I wonder what Governor Carney thinks of Mr. Johnson's record, especially with respect to Brexit. We know that Mr. Carney was very against Brexit and that Boris Johnson wanted to bake the Brexit pie. However, that would be an interesting discussion to have with Mr. Carney as well at this committee.

Let's get back to the transcript.

Mark Carney went on, "All of this is coming together for this COP meeting, COP 26 in Glasgow, which is the big climate meeting this November in Glasgow. It's why you had the Biden summit,

why you had Canada's new target. We'll just be here...they're rolling on that.

"Look, I spend.... We have a team of about 30 people based in London—one-third private sector, one-third from Bank of England and one-third from the U.K. Treasury—and what we do is we're organizing...a whole work plan to get the plumbing in place in the financial sector to deal with this issue and to get private institutions—which, I think, the \$70 trillion number gives you a sense of the scale—lined up to be part of this solution. There's probably.... You know, I've lost count, but there are probably about a thousand people in the private sector who are working on various working groups on setting up new carbon markets, dealing with people like the World Bank so they're more effective, and on and on and on.

"To be honest, I'm not involved in the joys of the UN bureaucracy or.... Obviously, I deal with the Secretary-General and Amina Mohammed, who is the deputy secretary-general, who's outstanding. Literally, when you're talking to these people, they are coming out of a discussion or about to go into a discussion of some horrible global issue or challenge, from the pandemic through to some of the most difficult hotspots in the world, so they have my admiration. But it would be a tough place to work [there], that's for sure."

I should pause here for a moment, Mr. Chair. Mr. Carney had initially arranged a number of financial institutions that signed up to support the push for net zero and to dedicate a certain amount of funds. A number of those original signatories have now withdrawn their support, so that's another interesting point of discussion we should have with Mr. Carney. Why have some of these large financial institutions, which initially were very enthusiastic about his project, since stepped away?

In addition, companies like S&P—Standard & Poor's—are no longer reviewing ESG ratings. They're not providing ESG ratings anymore for companies. Why? It's because they're meaningless.

ESG is more of a marketing scam than it is anything substantive. The way that the E, the S and the G interplay together, the environmental, sustainable and governance.... This notion that a company could do something really badly in one of those areas—environmental, sustainable or governance—but could be saved by stellar performance in another one of those areas is a bit bizarre. For example, should a company that is an awful polluter be given a free pass because it has a gender-balanced board? I don't know, but these are the kinds of discussions that people have when we give ESG ratings, and that's why Standard & Poor's has stopped doing it. It's because the whole thing is a scam.

Let's go back to the transcript.

David Herle said, "So you've got a book out. Here it is: *Value(s)*."

Mark Carney responded, "Yeah, I've got a book."

We'll skip a little bit ahead here.

David Herle said, “Some people say they struggled with finishing it, but they just don't like big words, those people. I found the book exciting because it contains the seeds of a different governing philosophy and an intellectual break with Reagan and Thatcher, in my view.

“What's the thesis? If you could just take our listeners and viewers through it, what's the basic thesis of the book?”

Mark Carney said, “Well, let me maybe say a word on the genesis and then I'll get to the thesis, which is.... As you mentioned, I was a central bank governor—a G7 governor. I started just on the eve of the global financial crisis. I literally handed over the keys to the Bank of England in the middle of March last year, just as the U.K. was locking down and we were launching the first phases of the response to the COVID crisis. In between, we had the euro crisis, we had Brexit, and we had the mounting climate crisis. I was basically a governor through a series of crises.

“What I wanted to do is step back and think, okay, is there a common driver of this and what is there? I did feel, really, that both in looking back over the sweep of economic thought and also the experience of these crises, that we had lost a balance between some of the core values that are necessary, first for the market to function well.... I'm a big believer in markets and I'm a big believer that markets can serve a role in solving our biggest problems, but markets don't exist in a vacuum. Markets are social conventions in the end. Sorry for the big words there, but social conventions. They have.... You need fairness. You need a sense of fairness and responsibility. You need a resilience to markets. You can't have markets just crumble as they did with subprime crisis, so you need those elements.

“You need markets. Markets are also largely short term or can be short term. We are, as individuals, short term. We have this tragedy on the horizon with respect to climate. How do we bring in elements of sustainability? How do we bring in elements of solidarity—in other words, regional solidarity in Canada, solidarity with others in societies leaning against the forces of inequality? How do we marry all of those with the power of markets—what I call the dynamism of markets—which is what's going to lead the innovation, growth and better jobs, etc.? How do we bring back that balance?”

“The thesis is that the pendulum—and it's on more dimensions than just two—has become unbalanced. It walks through a number of examples. It really starts from a place where actually...how economics views value. Up until the 19th century, it was viewed as either something intrinsic to the good or the activity, or a reflection of the labour and the work that had been put into that activity. That's what Adam Smith thought. That's what David Ricardo thought. It happened to also be what Marx thought. It gets flipped around in the 19th century and intensified over the course of the last several decades, where the value of something is its price and only its price. If something isn't priced, it does not have value. That's the way things become treated.

“I mean, I use this example on climate, which is that we know precisely the value of Amazon, the company—\$1 trillion. Amazon, the region, has no value until actually you start burning the forest and convert it into farmland.

“That doesn't really make sense. We have a tendency—this is a little less in Canada, but you see it in the U.K. and the U.S. and other places—of paying for charity and bringing charitable or volunteer acts like blood donation and other charitable acts into the market. What happens is that changes peoples' behaviour. It corrodes the math underlying that.

“Okay, so that's the set of issues. I'm not explaining in purely linear form. You've got to read the book, but it goes through that and what I try to do.... Part of the reason the book is longer is to say, so what? Because it's frustrating when you get to these sorts of elaborate analyses of the problem without any suggested solution.

“What the book does is look at these three crises, climate, COVID and credit—credit being the financial crisis—and says, okay, what are some of the responses to that? What are the lessons? What does that mean if you're a leader of an organization? If you're a company or a country, what are the types of things that you should do to reinforce these broader set of values—fairness and responsibility, solidarity, sustainability—alongside dynamism?”

“I do make the point.... This is a sincere point and you would expect that I would have figured it out earlier. After 30 years, it finally came to me: Humility [being] the most important value. It is important. Humility is a very important value [like it or not] but not humility that's incapacitating. You've got to marry ambition and humility in a way that's effective. I try to draw that out.”

David Herle said, “I'll pass that along to Scott Reid.

“When [you're reading the] book, and you're describing this, my mind is turning to my nostalgic view of the 1960s, when the difference between what CEOs made and their workers made was much smaller than it is now, where rich people got taxed at high rates, where people got good union jobs that they had for life, with benefits, and business leaders cared about and lived in the communities in which their businesses operated, and they cared about the communities in which their business operated. That may all be rose-coloured nostalgia, but that's what I'm thinking about. But I don't hear anybody calling for us to return to the 1960s.”

Mark Carney said, “I think, well, first thing, there's always a danger of picking a point in time. There is this sort of *saudade*, right? You have this nostalgia for a time that never was or an interpretation of a time that never was. But there are elements...and this is not a call to go back to the sixties in any way, shape or form.

“In fact, one of the core points of the book, and I think one of the key challenges we have as a country and that others share in is how we take the technologies and opportunities and the risks and opportunities that come with them, and build, you know, a more balanced system. The book is about building a better world for all, and a lot of that can be done through greater connectivity in a way that builds the regional economy in Canada and that helps our small businesses take on the world through platforms and other things.

“Let me loop back to your core question. I think one of the issues—and I spend a fair bit of time in the book on it—is around corporate purpose and the nature of the company. I am not a Friedmanite. I think that should be clear. I think Friedman, in part, was a brilliant guy and made some good points in a variety of ways, but his fundamental shareholder primacy is fundamentally wrong and fundamentally, in my view, flawed, because he gives himself an out by saying that, in fact, the only purpose of business is making profits for shareholders.

“He says that subject to the ethics and customs of the age, and he assumes that those are unchanged by an emphasis solely on profit. In fact, he literally says, in his famous essay, that any activity that is support for the community or support for the workers is hypocritical window dressing, which, if it serves the purpose of 'hypocritical window dressing', serves the purposes of enticing people that are pulling the wool over people's eyes, and then that's okay. But it really is ultimately just for that goal, and that's wrong. That's wrong for two reasons: One, there's a corrosion...and it's the purest market fundamentalism. The book goes through it, and it doesn't matter. It's in the book. You'll see it in the financial markets.

“You see that. I lived it in the run-up, and I had to deal with it as a public official in the run-up to the crisis and afterwards. You see it in the social strains that we have because of these greater extremes that have built up between whether it's CEO compensation and those on the shop floor or how we pay our essential workers, not for what we need them for in essential times but only for normal times. It's still there. You also see it...and I think there's a real economic issue, which is you don't see it...

“If you have a sense of purpose and a sense of alignment you can get from a company.... In other words, you're solving an issue. Shopify has a sense of purpose. Its purpose is mass entrepreneurialism. Its purpose is to make it easier to start a business and sell anywhere. That animating purpose actually helps those who supply Shopify, those who go on it. It organizes the community. It has that knock-on effect, which actually is self-fulfilling. It's good for Shopify itself, but it's good for shareholders, the employees and, very importantly, the customers, the clients, the businesses that are there.

“That world, that world where you have a company with a sense of purpose, where we have that solidarity within a company, with its community and within the company: I think there is a rebalancing towards that. If I can bring it up to the level of a country and the country's objectives, we're going through two huge rewirings in the economy. We're at the cusp. We're still in early innings of the digital rewiring of the economy. It's been accelerated by COVID, but there is a lot more to come.

“I say in the book, are we going to be digital by default? Are we just going to let this happen in the way that the technology companies determine is best or are we going to be digital by design? Are we going to design policies? Are we going to help people build the skills? Are we going to organize things so that as many Canadians can benefit as possible from it? You can see ways that can happen. I go through it in the book.

“On climate and sustainability, we're getting to a point...and this is a key point and an opportunity for us. Some see it as a challenge,

but I think it's an opportunity where we have moved to.... We're going to deal with climate. We've got 130 countries, now joined by the United States, that say we're going to get net zero. We've got 1,500 of the world's largest companies who say net zero. We've got \$70 trillion of money as of last week saying we're going to go net zero, so there's an animating purpose—an objective.

“That changes the equation because that means that lots of smart people, lots of driven people, lots of inquisitive people around the world are going to be figuring out how we best get to net zero and they will get there in a way that is more effective, cheaper, quicker than a government would and that's—to go back to the title of the book, which is values, with parentheses around the “s”—how you get value in the market serving the values of society.”

David Herle said, “I'm a little unclear as to how you break the stranglehold of shareholders on corporate behaviour because.... I mean, I'm not an ethical investor. I direct my investments to wherever I can get the greatest return. We're repeatedly told, when we all rail against corporate malfeasance, that our pension funds are all invested in those and if we wanted our pension funds to invest ethically, we'd have to settle for less in our retirement.

“I know I work with a lot of CEOs that would like to be doing their jobs differently, but they've got to report to these shareholders on a quarterly basis and if the shareholders don't think they're doing everything they can to drive up the share price...the CEO will be replaced. It may be that the corporation that shouldn't run only for the benefit of shareholders, but shareholders have a chokehold on them, don't they?”

Mark Carney responded, “Well, I think the first thing is.... There's a variety of premises in that question that are wrong.... I'll grant you that you don't invest ethically. I'd like to let the record show that.

“The first is that there is this trade-off. The evidence is very strong.... I'm someone who's been in and around financial markets for three decades—the private side and the public side—so I know something about this and the book goes through this in some detail. The alignment, the correlation between broader ESG.... I won't give you all the details, but a number of them are in the book, including the footnotes. About 60% of the analyses find a positive correlation between companies that score more highly on weighing ethical, social and governance”. They score more highly—a positive correlation between companies that score on weighing ethical, social, government, sustainable and so on.

Carney continued, “Why is that the case? First...there are a series of issues. In many cases, what you're doing is you're screening out a problem. You're screening out a Volkswagen or a company that's going to do something bad and eventually going to be caught out on it. Sorry, Volkswagen.”

David Herle laughed: “That's a good example.”

Actually, we should pause there.

Volkswagen, the company that was busted and fined significant sums for misleading the entire planet, is a massive recipient of corporate welfare to build a battery plant in Ontario. The Canadian government is giving tons of taxpayer money to a company that purposely misled every buyer of its products and we're supposed to just accept that it's the price of getting production here.

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

**The Chair:** Go ahead, MP Turnbull.

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** It's actually more a point of clarification for Mr. Chambers.

I'm just giving him a chance to take a breath and have a drink of water because I'm so kind.

I also just wanted to see if he was still quoting from the transcript that he was reading for the last.... How long has it been now? I guess it hasn't been that long.

**The Chair:** It's been 48 minutes.

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** I'm wondering whether he's still quoting directly from that, because it sounded like he moved into opinion. I would just like to be clear on what his opinion is versus what the transcript he's reading is, just so we're all aware.

**The Chair:** Thanks, Mr. Turnbull.

I don't know if MP Chambers would like to answer that or not.

I do have a speakers list after MP Chambers when MP Chambers concludes. It's MP Davies, MP Morantz, MP Dzerowicz, MP Lawrence and it continues to grow.

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

When we got to the Volkswagen part, the Volkswagen comments were from Mr. Carney, but the subsequent comments on Volkswagen, about the government subsidizing a company that's misled the world, are editorial comments for sure. Let's make no mistake.

It would be good to ask Mr. Carney whether he thinks the auto subsidies are appropriate, especially as Mr. Carney has experience working in the Department of Finance during the financial crisis, during 2008-09, when the then-government bailed out General Motors and Chrysler for substantial sums.

I would point out, Mr. Chair, that when those bailouts were provided, the governments—including the U.S. government but more importantly the Canadian government—received equity. We'll just use General Motors as an example. For the bailout, the Canadian taxpayer received equity—as in shares—in General Motors, which was then able to be sold to recoup some of the initial bailout.

This government has provided—I think I've lost count—\$40-some-odd billion to subsidize electric vehicle battery plants. You could buy the entire Ford Motor Company for half of that. The government could have actually just gone out and purchased an entire car company for half of the amount of money that it's providing in subsidies and corporate welfare for the auto sector, for which we don't even get any equity. There's a promise of some jobs, but there's no upside for the actual taxpayer other than those people who live...and might actually have employment.

Set aside the fact the government just gave \$1.7 million for pasta.

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

I hate to correct my colleague, but aren't quite a few of those workers foreign temporary workers, not Canadian?

**Mr. Adam Chambers:** Indeed, Mr. Lawrence is correct.

Some of those workers we're subsidizing are coming in with their expertise as temporary foreign workers. I hope the idea is that they'll pass their expertise on to Canadian workers and members of our unions.

What's interesting is that the government has decided to play the game where they're going to subsidize everything to come. We've been told for at least a generation that, compared to the U.S., Canada stands out for a few reasons. One is a favourable exchange rate. Two is that health care costs are largely borne by government. Three is a well-trained workforce. Apparently, none of those things matter. What we have to do is now meet the U.S. dollar for dollar on the subsidies that they're going to provide. If we want to go down the same fiscal path as the U.S., then I suppose that's the way the government would like to go.

I think it's very concerning. We don't have the same amount of money that the U.S. does. We don't have the world's reserve currency. We are going to see the challenges that this government's spending and subsidization are going to have on the economy when our dollar goes down and when our balance of payments gets significantly out of whack because we're not allowing investments in productive areas of the economy. The government has a clear path, which is that we will subsidize to make it happen.

The other interesting point is that the government says to look at these new data points. Foreign direct investment is going up. The only reason there's foreign direct investment is that the government is subsidizing the investment that's coming here. That's not realistic, and it's not practical.

I mean, at this recent announcement last week with Honda, the person at Honda said Canada was their third choice. They looked at a couple of other countries before they came here. Why did they come here? It's because the government gave them tons of money. Of course, they're going to come here.

Natural gas has no business case, notwithstanding the fact that multiple countries, representatives and leaders have come here and asked for it. We're to believe that natural gas has no business case, but for some of these investments that the government is making, the only business case that exists is a subsidy. I have a hard time following that.

I appreciate the intervention from my colleague to remind everyone that those initial workers at these battery plants will be temporary foreign workers.

Mr. Chair, I'm going to pause here for a moment. Before I pass on the floor, I will come back to the transcript, because there is some good stuff in here. I think it's even more relevant to what we'll be discussing.

We were in the middle of witness testimony and hearing from officials on the budget. The government decided to put a very aggressive timeline on the budget to get it reported back to the House. We do this every single spring. The government could have brought forward a motion to have a certain number of witnesses and a certain number of hours. We could have agreed upon that and ensured that the NDP was satisfied with the number of witnesses, and then we could have deferred the decision about when to start clause-by-clause to any time. We could be dealing with it in a week from now. We could be dealing with it in two weeks from now. They could have brought a motion just on when they wanted to start clause-by-clause at any time and not taken witness time away.

I suspect that we'll wind up in the same place as we were last year. We'll run the clock all the way down to the end and have a rushed set of witnesses, or maybe not. Maybe this time it will require a House instruction. What we've been doing is not an effective way to be looking at bills.

I appreciated the fact that, with Bill C-59, we had a certain amount of witness testimony, which was negotiated with the former finance critic of the NDP. That was reasonable, but we could have the same here if we just agreed to defer the decision on the clause-by-clause start date for a couple of weeks, or even just a couple of meetings. It's unfortunate that we may be here tonight until midnight, as I understand there are resources.

I'll have to find another podcast with Mr. Carney to regale you all with, but it's pretty clear that Mr. Carney is looking to enter the political arena so I think we should give him the opportunity. He's been to this committee before. He's always held himself very well. He's capable on a number of fronts. He's a dynamic individual who already appeared at the Senate committee last week. He appeared at the finance committee a couple of years ago. He's going on podcasts. He's giving speeches.

Those Liberal caucus members who are supporting other candidates should want Mr. Carney to face a certain level of scrutiny because it's not fair that members of cabinet who are also running have to stand up in the House of Commons and receive questions every day from opposition members, or they have to show up at a committee to be grilled. Those leadership contestants are facing a level of scrutiny. What Mr. Carney has been able to do is basically enter the political arena with very little scrutiny, so we'd like to provide him the opportunity to give his plan for Canadians and where he demarcates from the current government, as he's been talking about in a few of these examples such as that the budget is not focused enough on growth.

By the way, back in this podcast, which I didn't get to yet, but we will later, he talks about how it's going to be a couple of years before we see the benefits of the government's budget. I wonder if he thinks that those benefits have come true. It doesn't look like it by his recent comments.

Three years ago he said we needed to wait and see, and three years have gone by. I don't think he's as happy. Look, I quite like Mr. Carney. I think we would all learn something. It's not very often you have an opportunity to talk to somebody who's been the Governor of the Bank of England, the Governor of the Bank of Canada, the senior associate deputy minister in the Department of Finance, someone who was in the financial sector for 30 years and someone who has obviously thought a lot about public policy, has written a book about it and is now interested in contributing. I give him an immense amount of credit for wanting to think about how he can contribute to the country. I also think it's just reasonable to say, why don't you come in and talk about it?

I'd also say that those of you who are very upset with and hold dearly central bank independence should ask what's been done more to erode the independence of the central bank. There's the fact that in the U.S. the former fed chair is now the Secretary of the Treasury, and in Canada you have a former Governor of the Bank of Canada who wants to run for a political party. He has been at least very open about which political party he belongs to. I would submit that this actually has a lot to do with the eroding independence of the central bank.

By the way, just a couple of weeks ago, the Prime Minister said that interest rates would come down, which I found very surprising. I know my colleague, Mr. Lawrence, will likely have something to say on that later, but there's a news flash. The central bank isn't really that independent.

Anyway, you look at how much communication goes back and forth between the Department of Finance and the central bank on a regular basis. The government picks who leads it. The government at any time can send a letter or instructions to the central bank, in writing, on issues with respect to monetary policy. For example, back in 2013, there was this discussion about quantitative easing, and Jim Flaherty took some criticism for saying that Canada would not do quantitative easing. Guess what. Quantitative easing is the reason why we have inflation today.

There are a number of people now who have been questioning the use of quantitative easing. It was well within the finance minister's comments then, as he was able to write a letter or instructions to the central bank, but those individuals who thought that quantitative easing had no consequences for 10 years are now all basically backpedalling.

By the way, with MMT, modern monetary theory, and the fact that you could just print money with no consequences, those people are very quiet on Twitter these days, because it's created a significant amount of inflation. I think someone like Mr. Carney would have a lot to say about the intersection between monetary policy and fiscal policy. I also would love to ask the current central bank governor how he would feel if a former central bank governor was the Prime Minister. I wonder how those conversations would go.

I think it would be a wonderful opportunity to hear from Mr. Carney. As I said, I hold him in very high regard, and I think we should want the opportunity to hear from someone with a résumé like his and a desire like his to make the country better. I'd like to give him the platform to do that, and that's why I hope that my colleagues will at least agree to the subamendment, or a version of the subamendment, that would see Mr. Carney appear here as a witness as he has previously done before.

Quickly, before I pass the floor to the next speaker, we still haven't dealt with this money laundering motion yet. I see that there are four meetings in the main motion for money laundering. The last review of the Proceeds of Crime (Money Laundering) and Terrorist Financing Act was 14 meetings I think. It's inadequate. The government, which claims it's doing so much on money laundering, hasn't even kept its statutory obligation to review the act.

The government has been doing amendments to the money laundering act on a piecemeal basis, claiming that every time they make one little change it is the biggest monumental change. How about actually just completing the systemic review of the act to fulfill our obligation?

They're doing the exact same thing with money laundering that they're doing with competition. Every six months they come out with some new changes to the Competition Act and say that these are the most monumental changes that have ever been seen to the Competition Act. Now they're doing the same thing with money laundering. Are they making progress? Yes. Is it piecemeal? Yes. Is it inadequate? Yes, because they're not looking at the whole system.

I hope we can get through this motion. I also don't support the few meetings. I think we need to have many more meetings on money laundering. I hope that Mr. Carney will come and give us some ideas about how we can organize ourselves and our government better for the purpose of Canadians.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Thank you, MP Chambers.

I'll go to the list again. Next is MP Davies, MP Morantz, MP Dzerowicz and MP Lawrence.

**Mr. Don Davies:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. It's déjà vu all over again.

**Mr. Philip Lawrence:** I have a point of order. I believe there's a vote going on.

**The Chair:** Did the bells go? We're just checking if it's the bells.

It is the bells. Okay.

Members, as we do, I'll ask the committee if we have UC to continue.

**Mr. Marty Morantz:** No.

**The Chair:** I heard a no, so we do not have UC. We're suspended until after the vote.

• (34805) \_\_\_\_\_ (Pause) \_\_\_\_\_

• (34855)

**The Chair:** We're back.

MP Davies, you're right. I just heard you say, "five minutes". That's what we have—five minutes. Then, unless we get to a vote, we will suspend until this afternoon.

Go ahead, MP Davies.

**Mr. Don Davies:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Well, I have five minutes. I started to say déjà vu all over again. I think it's where I started, and we seem to have picked up where we were on Friday, which I think is unfortunate.

My colleague Nathan Cullen, who served in this place for quite a long time, used to say that the currency of Parliament is time. I think that was a really astute observation. We all come here from various parts of the country. We all have important issues and constituencies. We're here to do important business, and there never seems to be enough time to hear from enough people to get enough feedback and study bills in the detail that we need, so I think it's really vital that we use the time we have in as intelligent and useful a way as possible.

I'm new to this committee. I've only been on this committee for about a month. This is my first budget, and I am really looking forward to hearing from stakeholders about it. I think I said on Friday that budgets are unique pieces of legislation. I'm reminded of a quote that I think was attributed to Joe Biden. He said, "Don't tell me what you value. Show me your budget—and I'll tell you what you value."

It's the document that sets the course for the governance, the stewardship, of our country for the next year. I think this is my 16th budget. There are always things in there that I vehemently disagree with, things that I vehemently agree with and everything in between, but what is really important, I think, is to hear from Canadians. I want to hear from farmers. I want to hear from small and medium-sized businesses. I want to hear from the tech industry. I want to hear from NGOs. I want to hear from your average Canadian. I want to hear from as full a panoply of people as we can to get their feedback on the budget. However, we're not able to do that. Instead, we are engaged in what is clearly and obviously delay. I have great respect for my Conservative colleagues, but I have to name it. It's the Conservatives who are delaying and preventing that feedback from happening.

I put in an amendment the week before last that would have seen dedicating six hours to hearing from witnesses today and another six hours on Thursday. That's 12 hours, the equivalent of six meetings, and of course, we had two meetings the week before scheduled for this, one with officials for two hours and one with the minister for what was supposed to be two hours. We only had an hour because that's where the breakdown occurred, and I'm certainly prepared to have more meetings for witnesses next week.

Instead, we had to listen to the reading of a podcast interview of Mark Carney on *The Herle Burlly*. That's what we've spent most of the last two hours doing. I don't think that's a good use of our currency. I don't think Canadians think that's a good use of our currency.

Now, there may be a good reason for it. I've been in opposition my entire career. I respect that there are tools at our disposal, and sometimes oppositions have to slow down government for good reason, because government with majorities can act oppressively. They can act with undue haste, and they need to be slowed down, so tools can be used. However, there's a reason I'm doubtful that that's the case here. First of all, the Conservatives insisted on delaying the budget of this nation, the pre-eminent document, because they wanted to hear from Mark Carney. I heard today that this wasn't the reason. Now the reason is that the clause-by-clause, which is the final stage of dealing with this bill, was on a date not to their liking. Frankly, neither of those two issues, in my view, is sufficient to hold up a budget of the nation, but the fact that they've changed their position tells me that there's a lack of commitment to those reasons.

I've said before, and I think Canadians have to understand, that each party at this table is allowed to submit the names of witnesses they want to hear from on the budget, and there was nothing stopping the Conservatives from making Mark Carney their first witness to be called on this budget if they wanted to. I don't know why they're holding up the budget when they could do that, unless they are afraid or worried that Mr. Carney won't come. It's the prerogative of every witness to not come to committee if they don't want to. Sometimes they can't because their schedule doesn't allow them to, but sometimes they just don't want to.

I said this on Friday and I'll say it again. In this case, the Conservatives have been very blatant about why they want to call Mr. Carney. It's not because they're interested in hearing his views on the budget. They're interested in giving him a grilling and a good once-over because they think he might want to run for Liberal leader. As I said on Friday, that's what I think is inappropriate.

Parliament has a lot of power. We can call people to the bar. I've seen twice in my time here that someone has been called to the bar in the House of Commons. It's unusual. It happens a handful of times a century. That's the power Parliament has. We can summon someone to come to this committee.

Imagine this Parliament using our power to force someone to come here to answer questions about their political beliefs. That's not the action of a modern responsible democracy. That's the action of a tinpot dictatorship. That's what banana republics do. They misuse their power to attack private citizens who are simply exercising their civic rights. That's what's wrong.

That's why I will not agree to call Mark Carney. If we wanted to call him to hear his views on the budget, maybe, but even in that case, it's a weak case to be made. Mr. Carney is no longer the Bank of Canada governor. He's no longer the U.K. bank governor. He's a private citizen. While I'm interested in his views, I'm not any more interested in his views than I am in those of another 10,000 Canadians.

I think Canadians have to be aware that's what we're doing here today. We're wasting the valuable too-short time that Parliament has in what is, to me, a political witch hunt to go after a person who has political ambitions that one party here doesn't like, and they're prepared to hold up the nation's finances to do that. That, to me, is not appropriate. That's not a partisan shot. I would say that to any party that does that, including my own.

I want to mention a few things that are in the budget.

There's a school nutrition program in this budget. I think every person around this table has children, is an aunt or uncle or has children in their lives. We could pass this budget and have 400,000 kids receive a nutritious school meal in September, this at a time when one in four kids is suffering from food deprivation. That's 25% of kids, and it's probably higher. There are kids in school at 10:30 in the morning trying to concentrate on their math lesson whose stomachs are empty, and the Conservatives are holding up this bill for political purposes.

Never mind their families' budgets. My first concern is that child, but there are a lot of families struggling with high prices. The Conservatives have prosecuted an excellent case in the House and on the hustings about the difficult situation Canadians are in. They're right about that. This budget would do something about it. Five days a week, it would help a family know that their child is getting a nutritious meal. If they have more than one child, it might be two or three kids. This could save hundreds of dollars per family per month. If you think of who those families are, it's probably the families who need it the most: low-income Canadians and single-parent families. They're the ones who are probably struggling with food insecurity the most. That's who's affected by the Conservatives holding up this budget.

This budget has pharmacare funding in it to ensure that people living with diabetes can get their medication and their devices. I was a health critic for eight years. I've talked to many people living with diabetes who have to pay thousands of dollars out-of-pocket every year. I talked to one person who told me that he was diagnosed with type 1 diabetes when he was 20 years old. He's 50 now and he figures he has spent over \$100,000 out of his own pocket for syringes, needles, test strips and his medication. These are people who didn't choose to have diabetes. It was no choice of their own. They have it. This budget would provide not only health but also fiscal relief for them. That's being held up.

There are tax credits for businesses that want to invest in clean technology. Isn't that something we all want? Don't we want to create Canadian champions in our economy? We want to give businesses that are at the cutting edge of technology in this century's sustainable energy economy a leap forward and some assistance by giving them tax credits so they can make investments. We've heard them at this committee say they're waiting to make those investments.

I worked for a union for 16 years before I came here, and we had 275 private sector employers in the union I represented. I sat at many tables dealing with businesses from mom-and-pop trucking operations to Purolator, UPS, Jazz and B.C. rail—small operations to big. Every one of them is operating in an extremely competitive environment where every day counts. Their competitors are not waiting.

American competitors, who are getting buckets of money from the Biden administration, are making investments that our Canadian businesses are hampered from making. Why? It's because the Conservatives are holding up the business of this nation at this committee. Again, I could understand if there was an important issue of principle, if the government were acting oppressively or if there was an extremely important issue in the budget. However, to hold up this budget because the Conservatives insist on calling who they think is the next Liberal leader is untenable. It's unjustifiable. It's unparliamentary. It's wrong. I think people need to know this.

We're going to be coming back after question period today, and sitting from 3:30 to midnight today and probably 3:30 to midnight tomorrow, while the Conservatives read from Mark Carney's autobiography. Every one of those hours could have been devoted to hearing from witnesses. It's funny, because my wonderful colleague Mr. Chambers said that they want to hear from witnesses. How Orwellian. It's the Conservatives' filibuster that's preventing us from hearing from the witnesses they claim to want to hear from. That's just not right.

This is my first budget, and I don't know what the previous practice was, but I have to believe there's a better way. I have to believe that we need to find a way together. We can express our different policy positions. We can grill witnesses. We can express our different economic views, and we should. Frankly, no party has a monopoly on good ideas. I'm looking forward to hearing some of the suggestions from my Conservative colleagues on the budget. However, what is not right is holding up the debate itself. It's May 21. We only sit for five more weeks. What is that, 20-something days left to pass the budget?

We're past one. Are we still going? I'm happy to—

**The Chair:** MP Davies, we'll suspend, and we'll come back after question period.

**Mr. Don Davies:** Will I have the floor when we come back?

**The Chair:** You will have the floor.

**Mr. Don Davies:** Okay. I'm happy to stop there.

**The Chair:** We're suspended.

● (34905)

(Pause)

● (35140)

**The Chair:** We have a quorum.

MP Davies still has the floor.

After that, I have MP Morantz, MP Dzerowicz, MP Lawrence and MP Hallan.

**Mr. Don Davies:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

What I was talking about before we broke for question period was what I consider to be an irresponsible waste of this committee's time by the Conservatives, who are filibustering and delaying us from getting to the budget. In my view, the reasons are not justifiable. Again, there are two reasons. First, they would not let the budget proceed in the House until this committee called Mark Carney as a witness. However, today, they've shifted from that, saying that the real issue for them is when the clause-by-clause study of this bill starts. They are not staying consistent with their putative reasons for why they're holding up the budget.

I want to finish my point on diabetes. I don't think I expressed it as certainly as it should have been. This budget contains monies that will provide the federal government with the ability to sit down with provincial governments and negotiate a transfer from the federal government to the provincial governments. That would result in every person with type 1 or type 2 diabetes, in any province or territory, receiving the medications and devices they need for free.

The result of the Conservatives' action is that it will compel people with diabetes to either not get the medication they need or pay out-of-pocket for these expenses. I want to be really clear that it's rare that a budget has such direct health impacts on people, but that's a direct health impact. By the way, it will also prevent Canadians in need of contraceptive products from getting those contraception devices and medications for free. There's a real cost there, because lack of access to contraception means unwanted and unplanned pregnancies. Unplanned pregnancies lead to all sorts of family implications—social, psychological, physical, medical and economic. Every day the Conservatives delay this bill, that's what will happen.

I've done some research, and to anybody who might think that the Conservatives' reasons for delaying the budget are restricted to the finance committee, I found out that that's not the case. They're delaying the business of Parliament at multiple committees—for example, at industry. What that tells me is that this is part of a strategy—

**The Chair:** MP Davies, I'm going to interject here.

The bells are ringing, members, and I need unanimous consent to go on.

**An hon. member:** No.

**The Chair:** We do not have unanimous consent, so we're suspended.

• (35145) \_\_\_\_\_ (Pause) \_\_\_\_\_

• (35250)

**The Chair:** We are back.

MP Davies had the floor, but I have a list. On the list is MP Morantz, MP Dzerowicz, MP Lawrence, MP Jivani, MP Hallan and then MP Turnbull.

Mr. Davies, the floor is yours.

**Mr. Don Davies:** Thanks, Mr. Chair.

I just want to wrap up. I'm not quite sure what the objective of the Conservatives is in holding up the budget and holding up parliamentary business at so many other committees. I can only conclude that they are trying to frustrate the business of Parliament in an endeavour to make it seem like everything is broken, which seems to be their slogan.

The thing about addressing something that's broken is it's presumed you're not doing your part to break it. What I see here is the Conservatives deliberately frustrating the work of Parliament and trying to make it look like we can't get things done, and then pointing to that as a reason, politically, to support them. I find that cynical. Certainly, there are enough broken things in our country and in this Parliament to fix without politicians deliberately doing their share to add to them.

I want to conclude by saying I think it's very unfortunate and, frankly, unacceptable to continue to delay the important business of the finance committee, because we want to hear from Canadians. As I said, what the Conservatives are holding up here, by way of an endless series of delay tactics—like reading from a podcast of *The Herle Burly* show and reading from books on Mark Carney—is hearing from Canadians. That, I think, is totally wrong. We need to hear Canadians' feedback on the budget. We should be doing that right now. If the Conservatives had supported the NDP amendment, we'd be doing that right now. We would probably be in our sixth hour of hearing from witnesses today, with another six hours on Thursday. Instead, we're going to hear the Conservatives talk about everything but the budget. Most importantly, we're preventing Canadians from having their say on this important document.

I hope an agreement can break out and that common sense can prevail. I hope that Conservatives, in particular, will stop their filibuster and allow us to proceed. I'm more than willing to work with them, and all members of committee, to schedule an agenda for the rest of May and June that reflects everybody's priorities.

As I said from the beginning, when I first proposed that we have a subcommittee on agenda meeting, I wanted there to be several days of hearings on the financialization of housing, which is an NDP priority. I think the Liberals wanted two days of hearings on green financing, which is really important as we deal with the environment and the important issues affecting the development of a sustainable economy and how to finance that in the proper way. As for the Conservatives, I was happy to schedule in their priority. I think they wanted anti-money laundering days, or whatever priority they had. It was so that all the parties could have some hearings in June. We're not going to be able to get to that because, again, Con-

servatives continue to delay getting to the substantive business of this committee by filibustering, delaying and talking about everything but the work of this committee and the budget.

This is going to come to an end. That's the one thing we know for sure. It will come to an end one way or the other. The only question is how much time we have to waste to get to that. For my part, I want it to stop now. I would like the filibuster to stop now. I'd like us to get to business. We can start scheduling witnesses for this Thursday and next week. I'm prepared to sit extra hours next week so that we can get as much feedback as possible before we get to the important business of doing clause-by-clause on this bill, and I'm willing to work collaboratively and co-operatively with all parties at this table, including the Conservatives, to try to make sure that their priorities are reflected in June.

I ask my colleagues to put down their delay tactics, get to the business of this committee and do the job Canadians sent us here to do, which is not to sit here and talk endlessly about subjects that aren't important.

Thanks, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Thank you, MP Davies.

I see a hand up.

MP Thompson, please go ahead.

**Ms. Joanne Thompson:** Thank you.

Could you add me to the list, please?

**The Chair:** Okay.

Now we will go back to the list.

I had MP Morantz, but he's not here.

MP Dzerowicz, you're next on the list.

**Ms. Julie Dzerowicz:** Thank you so much, Mr. Chair.

I'm sad to be taking part in this filibuster. I do so reluctantly because I'd rather be listening to witnesses. We have a huge budget implementation act before us, which contains a number of measures that would help address some of the top issues that Canadians are facing today. There are also a number of measures in here that would help set Canadians up for current and future economic success, and it's really important that we get to them.

I'm very sad, because this money- and time-wasting Conservative filibuster will not allow us to have many witnesses, if any. It will not allow us to delve into some very important aspects of the budget implementation act. It will not allow us to talk to officials. It will not allow us to contemplate amendments that might make this budget implementation act even better than it is.

We started off today's meeting with Mr. Chambers reading a transcript of a *Herle Burly* online interview that Mr. Carney did in the past. It is not uncommon—and I don't think this is a surprise to anyone around the table—for former Bank of Canada governors or, indeed, business leaders to comment on a federal budget put out by a Liberal government, a Conservative government or any government. We have had a lot of business leaders and former bank governors comment on federal budgets, but I don't think that's reason enough to include Mr. Carney as part of the programming motion we have before us.

I want to reiterate, probably for the hundredth time now, that Conservatives can add Mr. Carney to their witness list once we get through this programming motion. Nobody disagrees with Mr. Carney being added to the witness list. The Conservatives can take the liberty of doing so.

What I didn't like about Mr. Chambers' intervention this morning is that it seemed like it could leave the public with the impression that this committee doesn't want Mr. Carney on the witness list. However, that's not true at all; we would be very happy to have him speak here, again, as an invited witness. It's the prerogative of all parties and this committee to include him on our witness list.

It's important for us to continue to reiterate that it is not the finance committee's job to interview possible future politicians. I plead with our Conservative colleagues, who I know care about their constituents and this country, to stop using the finance committee for fishing expeditions, because it is stopping us from playing our important role in reviewing, improving and passing critical legislation that has come before us. Right now, we have limited time to do the work around Bill C-69, which we know we have to delve into and look at.

There are a lot of really important initiatives in Bill C-69, and it's really important for us to run through some of them. However, our Conservative friends have decided to engage in this time-wasting filibuster at the finance committee, and they are stopping us from moving forward. The faster we move forward on Bill C-69 and make sure we get it right, the faster we can get it back into the House of Commons to go through the legislative process, and the faster we can put it into action.

I'll go through some of the key components.

One key part is the doubling of the volunteer firefighter and search and rescue tax credits. We all know wildfire season is already upon us, and we know that a historic number of forests burned last year in Canada. We have to double down on our efforts and come up with a different plan to make sure we are being more preventative in fighting forest fires and are better supporting our communities, firefighters and all the different stakeholders involved in keeping Canadians safe. We're trying to tackle the direct effect of climate change. Not looking at doubling volunteer firefighter or search and rescue tax credits is a key problem.

The next thing is that we're enhancing the Canadian journalism labour tax credit. I'm a very passionate supporter of independent, fact-based Canadian journalism. Canadian journalism—I would say journalism around the world—is going through a massive transformation and transition. We have to help our Canadian media through

this transition. It's about looking at the Canadian journalism labour tax credit and making sure it's right. Making sure we continue to support independent, fact-based journalism here in Canada is critical. We say this a lot, but it is true: Working from the same facts and having strong, independent, fact-based media are critical to the strength of our democracy in Canada. We are being stopped from talking about that.

There's also the Canada carbon rebate for small businesses. Often, the Conservatives—and I would probably say all of us—talk about how concerned they are about our small businesses and what they're struggling with: the high costs of inflation, how business has changed coming out of the pandemic, how buying patterns have changed and how costs have increased because we had a global pandemic and subsequent inflation. Small businesses are struggling to come up with new business models. I think part of how we as the federal government can support small businesses is through this Canada carbon rebate.

We know we have to tackle climate change. We have a responsible plan to do so. One of the key promises we made when we put a price on pollution—also called a carbon tax or carbon pricing—was making sure not only that eight out of 10 Canadians would get more money than what they pay, but also that we would provide additional funding for small businesses and rural Canadians. Small businesses have been waiting for this carbon rebate. They have been waiting, in my opinion, a little too long. I'm very anxious to get this Canada carbon rebate discussed and passed as part of this bill. Small businesses will be very happy to know they will be getting this carbon rebate back.

**Mrs. Laila Goodridge:** I have a point of order.

**The Chair:** Go ahead on a point of order, MP Goodridge.

**Mrs. Laila Goodridge:** While I appreciate hearing all the talking points about the budget from this member, we are discussing a subamendment about having Mark Carney come in. I question the relevance of the filibustering that's happening among the Liberals. They are complaining about filibustering, yet they are filibustering and not even talking about the subamendment at hand.

**The Chair:** Thank you, MP Goodridge.

**Ms. Julie Dzerowicz:** Mr. Chair, does this mean they would like to vote on the subamendment right now? I think we're happy to do that. That would shut down debate. We're okay to do that.

Do you want to check with the Conservatives to see whether they would like to vote on it?

**The Chair:** I don't know if that's what has been asked for.

**Ms. Julie Dzerowicz:** I'm only talking because I don't want to be.... Last year, we talked for 60 hours about eels.

**The Chair:** No, I'm—

**Ms. Julie Dzerowicz:** Would they like to vote on the subamendment right now? Is that what they're saying?

Are you ready? I heard that I'm in charge of a filibuster, but I'm not. We're only engaged in it because you're not ready to vote. I'm happy to put it on the table.

**The Chair:** MP Dzerowicz, you can continue with—

**Ms. Julie Dzerowicz:** Okay.

**Mrs. Laila Goodridge:** Relevance is my point.

**The Chair:** I heard the name Mark Carney a number of times. There is relevance to what is being said, and there is a lot of latitude on this committee.

MP Dzerowicz.

**Ms. Julie Dzerowicz:** Yes, we're talking about the budget implementation act, which is great.

**Mr. Don Davies:** Mr. Chair, could I speak briefly on the point of order?

**The Chair:** Yes, go ahead, MP Davies, on the point of order.

**Mr. Don Davies:** I think this will be helpful for all members, particularly as people sub in and out.

The subamendment is about adding the words “the week of the 28th one meeting be dedicated to hearing from the Minister of Finance for two hours and one meeting be dedicated to hear from Mark Carney for three hours” and asks that the clause-by-clause not be completed. It's not restricted to Mark Carney. Mr. Morantz's subamendment also calls the minister here. If the subject is about calling the minister here, that opens up a whole range of issues. These would be open for my friend Ms. Dzerowicz to talk about, if she wants to. It's not limited to Mr. Carney.

**The Chair:** Thank you, MP Davies.

MP Dzerowicz, you may continue.

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

Again, I'm ready to vote on that subamendment any time the Conservatives would like to allow us to vote on it. We're happy to do so.

I was talking about small businesses because I know they're anxious for any type of support from our federal government. We've already provided them with a number of supports. Many of them that I talked to are very happy that our federal government has negotiated with Visa and Mastercard. Starting this September, they will be getting a 27% reduction in the credit card fees they're paying to Visa and Mastercard.

When I tell them about the Canada carbon rebate, they're very happy to hear about it. What's also great, as many people might not know, is that we're proposing that this rebate be retroactive for up to three years. That is a game-changer for a lot of small businesses, and I will tell you that any small businesses listening right now are saying to get on with it: “Stop wasting time, finance committee. Get on with passing Bill C-69 because we need that money. We need to invest back into our businesses, back into our local economies.”

We also have some additional support and additional information around the clean hydrogen investment tax credit and the clean tech-

nology manufacturing investment tax credit. This builds on the investment tax credits that we had in the fall economic statement.

One of the key messages we heard from industry, which I would say was unanimous, was to get going on the investment tax credits. Businesses need reliability. They need an idea about when these tax credits will be available or they will not be able to move forward on planning—planning for today, planning for tomorrow, planning for jobs and planning for how they can ensure their companies are competitive and prosperous, both today and tomorrow. If we heard through the fall economic statement that the timeline and implementation were critical and urgent, then I bet they would say the same about the clean hydrogen investment tax credit and the clean technology manufacturing investment tax credit. However, to be honest, I would prefer to hear from them directly, and my biggest fear is that we'll continue to waste time, because the Conservatives are forcing us to have this filibuster, and we won't hear from any of the witnesses. I would love to hear directly from witnesses.

I also want to relate to this committee, and remind particularly my Conservative friends, what else we are holding up right now that would be very helpful to all Canadians. Indeed, we have an affordability crisis in our country after a massive global pandemic and subsequent inflation, and a lot of transitions are happening in our world. I'm very proud that in this budget we have introduced a number of measures that are going to be very helpful to Canadians.

What's been mentioned before is the national school food program. There's rarely a day in the House of Commons that a Conservative doesn't talk about how there are families and kids who are struggling. We have a very direct additional measure that we are planning to put in place through the national school food program. I can tell you that it is absolutely lauded unanimously as a positive program. It has been much asked for by Canadians of all political stripes right across the country. By us filibustering, by us not moving forward on Bill C-69, we are holding up the implementation of the national school food program.

It isn't just the school food program that we think is going to help support Canadians. It will be the continued implementation of the national child care program, the dental care program, phase 1 of our pharmacare program and phase 1 of our disability tax credit. The disability tax credit, which is in phase 1, and phase 1 of our pharmacare program are also being held up by us not moving forward with Bill C-69 and discussions here at the finance committee.

Regarding the student loan forgiveness program, there are a number of measures in Bill C-69 that are going to provide some additional supports to students. Specifically, what Bill C-69 has, which I'm really happy about, is Canada student loan forgiveness for family doctors and nurses. Essentially what we're trying to do is provide a student loan forgiveness program to health care professionals if they work in a designated or underserved rural or remote community. The benefits act as an incentive to graduates who are paying back their federal student loans to work in underserved communities that have challenges accessing care services.

Too many Canadians do not have access to primary care in this country, and we desperately need to provide incentives for nurses and doctors to go into rural and hard-to-serve communities across this country. By not moving forward with Bill C-69, that is another big program that we are slowing down and stopping from being implemented that will help Canadians, particularly in rural and hard-to-serve communities.

On the Canada Education Savings Act, many of us who come from immigrant families know—and I think that's all of us in some generation—that education is the salvation to create better lives for ourselves and for our families moving forward. I was really pleased to see that we have made some adjustments to the Canada Education Savings Act. Essentially what we are proposing in Bill C-69 is automatic enrolment in the Canada learning bond, which I think is really fantastic. We're trying to make sure that children are automatically enrolled in the Canada learning bond. It is a way for us to help families save for their children's education, and that really bodes well for Canada's economic prosperity both now and moving forward.

I could go through many other sections, but I'm going to go through one other one: “Money Laundering, Terrorist Financing, Sanctions Evasion and Other Measures”.

One thing that I've been very disappointed in our Conservative colleagues about is that they seem to give the impression that our federal government does not care about money laundering or about terrorist financing. Indeed, we have been investing in anti-money laundering heavily since 2017 in subsequent budgets, and we've taken a number of steps. I'll be reading through the steps we've taken because I think they're important.

There seemed to be a concern from the Conservatives that we're not doing very much and that whatever we're doing is not very effective. I'd like to say to my Conservative friends that not only have we done quite a bit—and I think they'll be very proud to hear the list of all the things we are doing—but there's a significant section on money laundering, terrorist financing, sanctions evasion and other measures in Bill C-69. They continue to force us to do this filibuster, which I do not want to be a part of. I would rather hear from witnesses. I would rather be considering the different sections of the the budget implementation act, and I would rather be asking questions that would make sure this budget is accountable and responsible to Canadians.

I'll read some key sections, just because I think they are relevant.

What we indicate as part of the budget implementation act is that since 2017, our government has undertaken significant work to

crack down on financial crime. We've invested close to \$320 million since 2019 to strengthen compliance, financial intelligence, information sharing and investigative capacity to support money laundering investigations. We are creating new integrated money laundering investigative teams in British Columbia, Alberta, Ontario and Quebec, which convene experts to advance investigations into money laundering, supported by dedicated forensic accounting experts. We launched a publicly accessible beneficial ownership registry for federal corporations. It was launched this year, on January 22, 2024. Our government continues to call upon provinces and territories to advance a pan-Canadian approach to beneficial ownership transparency.

We're modernizing Canada's anti-money laundering and anti-terrorist financing framework to adapt to emerging technologies, vulnerable sectors and growing risks such as sanctions evasion. We're also establishing public-private partnerships with the financial sector, which are improving the detection and disruption of profit-oriented crimes, including human trafficking, online child sexual exploitation and fentanyl tracking.

In federal budget 2024—and it's covered by the budget implementation act—we take further action to protect Canadians from financial crime. Here's what we're doing.

In budget 2024, the government intends to introduce legislative amendments to the Proceeds of Crime (Money Laundering) and Terrorist Financing Act—the PCMLTFA—the Criminal Code, the Income Tax Act and the Excise Tax Act. Proposed amendments to the PCMLTFA will enhance the ability of reporting entities under the PCMLTFA to share information with each other to detect and deter money laundering, terrorist financing and sanctions evasion, while maintaining privacy protections for personal information including an oversight role for the Office of the Privacy Commissioner under regulations.

We're also proposing, in budget 2024 and under Bill C-69, to permit the Financial Transactions and Reports Analysis Centre of Canada, FINTRAC, to disclose financial intelligence to provincial and territorial civil forfeiture offices to support efforts to seize property linked to unlawful activity, and permit Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada to strengthen the integrity of Canada's citizenship process. We'll enable anti-money laundering and anti-terrorist financing regulatory obligations to cover factoring companies, cheque-cashing businesses, and leasing and finance companies to close a loophole and level the playing field across businesses providing financial services. We will also allow FINTRAC to publicize more information around violations of obligations under the PCMLTFA when issuing administrative monetary penalties to strengthen transparency and compliance, and we'll make technical amendments to close loopholes and correct inconsistencies.

Proposed amendments to the Criminal Code include the following: allowing courts to issue an order to require a financial institution to keep an account open to assist in the investigation of a suspected criminal offence; and allowing courts to issue a repeating production order to authorize law enforcement to obtain ongoing, specific information on activity in an account or multiple accounts connected to a person of interest in a criminal investigation.

We're also proposing amendments to the Income Tax Act and Excise Tax Act, which will ensure Canada Revenue Agency officials who carry out criminal investigations are authorized to seek general warrants through court applications, thereby modernizing and simplifying evidence-gathering processes and helping to fight tax evasion and other financial crimes. In addition, through our Canada financial crimes agency, in budget 2024 we're proposing to provide \$1.7 million over two years, starting this year, 2024-25, to the Department of Finance to finalize the design and legal framework for the CFCA.

Just because I don't want the Conservatives to think we're not trying to implement as many measures as possible to tackle what we all know is a really serious issue in Canada—although I'd say this is an equally serious issue around the world—in addition to that, we also have a number of measures to fight trade-based fraud and money laundering. What we plan on doing in the budget is build on the work that was already proposed in the 2023 fall economics statement, which announced enhancements to the Canada Border Services Agency's authorities under the PCMLTFA to combat trade-based financial crime, with the intent to create a trade transparency unit. Building on this work, we're providing an additional \$29.9 million over five years, starting in 2024-25, with \$5.1 million in remaining amortization and \$4.2 million ongoing, for the Canada Border Services Agency to support the implementation of its new authorities under the PCMLTFA to combat financial crime and strengthen, for our allies, efforts to combat international financial crime. Furthermore, we're continuing to modernize our anti-money laundering and anti-terrorist financing framework to adapt to emerging technologies.

What we're doing in this budget is proposing to introduce amendments to the Proceeds of Crime (Money Laundering) and Terrorist Financing Act, the Criminal Code, the Income Tax Act and the Excise Tax Act, with consequential and coordinating

amendments to other statutes, to strengthen the supervision, enforcement and information-sharing tools of Canada's anti-money laundering and anti-terrorist financing framework.

I know we had a discussion on Friday about the importance of us spending a number of sessions looking specifically at anti-money laundering and what more we could be doing. There are some national examples that the Conservatives wanted us to focus on. I want Canadians and anybody who's listening to know that, indeed, we take this seriously.

Since 2017, we have been investing very heavily in this area. We've been working with international bodies to make sure that we're coordinating our efforts on this. In addition, in this budget and the budget implementation act, we're introducing a significant number of measures that will be very helpful in tackling money laundering, terrorist financing, sanctions evasion and other measures. I know that's important not only to us, but to all those within our Parliament.

I'll mention two other things.

I always say to Mr. Davies that he steals all my lines, because there are a lot of things I want to say, and he's often one step ahead of me in saying them. They really are part of my notes.

This is my fourth year on this committee. I'm very privileged to be part of it. Last year, we had 60 hours of filibustering and it was very painful. The only people who didn't benefit from it was Canadians. To be honest, we as a committee also didn't benefit, because we didn't hear from witnesses. I think we really had an opportunity to listen to witnesses.

We have an opportunity now to listen to witnesses. There's still some time left. If we decide we're going to vote on this programming motion and the amendments that are part of it, we might get to a few days of witnesses to hear from them, particularly on key sections that really concern us. They can make very thoughtful suggestions about ways we could strengthen Bill C-69.

I predict what's going to happen when we get to a point where Bill C-69 is before this committee is that the Conservatives will say we have no time to hear from witnesses and that the Liberals are really awful because we're trying to pass this legislation really quickly. I want to say to all Conservatives that there is time right now—not a lot, but maybe some time—for us to listen to witnesses and hear from them and to ask questions of our officials. There is time to give this bill, which is a significant piece of legislation with a lot of really outstanding measures for Canadians, the real consideration and review that Canadians expect us to do as part of our jobs and as part of this committee.

This is the final point I'll make, and Mr. Davies also mentioned it. Part of what I'm starting to hear from the Conservatives in the House, and I hear it sometimes at this committee, is that it's almost as though we want to prove that Parliament isn't working. We want to prove that committees aren't working. To them, our House of Commons—everything—is broken. However, I think what can happen is that we actually break things. We make it seem like things are broken when they're really not broken.

We have an opportunity to do the job that Canadians have elected us to do. I would encourage Conservatives to allow us to get to a vote on the amendments before us and the original programming motion before us. Allow us to do a few meetings where we have some witnesses, and allow us to move forward and hopefully pass Bill C-69, pass the budget that we know will have tremendous benefits for many Canadians and that has a tremendous number of sections that set our economy up for prosperity both today and tomorrow.

Our committees can function better. I would say this to all of us: Let's do the work that Canadians expect us to do.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Thank you, MP Dzerowicz.

I have a number of MPs on the list for this debate: MP Jivani, MP Hallan, MP Turnbull, MP Thompson and MP Goodridge.

MP Jivani.

**Mr. Jamil Jivani (Durham, CPC):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I'd like to very specifically speak to the part of the motion asking for the finance minister, our Deputy Prime Minister, to appear before the committee for a full two-hour meeting and, in particular, to why I think that's very important for the sake of ministerial accountability.

I certainly don't have the amount of experience of my colleague Ms. Dzerowicz; I don't have four years of service under my belt yet. I've been here for less than two months. I think it would be fair to observe that it is very hard to get a straight answer out of a lot of the ministers in this government in the House of Commons. You sit there, and for 35 seconds you have a chance to ask a question, and then for the next 35 seconds you rarely get an answer to the question that you've asked. It's a pretty consistent theme. In fact, it happened for an entire hour today. The idea that it is important for the finance minister, our Deputy Prime Minister Chrystia Freeland, to appear before this committee for a full meeting and answer ques-

tions presents hope and opportunity that perhaps we can get some questions answered about this budget.

I find it interesting that for weeks now, we have seen the Deputy Prime Minister and this Liberal government run around the country claiming that this budget is achieving generational fairness. It's been emphasized over and over again, with them pleading to millennials and gen z that somehow this budget is a magic recipe for fairness for a generation failed by this government for nine years. I think there are some deserving questions coming out of that.

For example, how exactly is a high-deficit budget good for young Canadians? It just amounts to kicking the can down the road, with young people paying the bill for the Liberal government's current expensive photo ops and high-priced broken promises. I don't know how anyone would call that generational fairness. Then there's the fact that the budget continues to make promises about affordable housing for young people after nine years of those very same promises leading us nowhere but to double mortgage payments and double rental payments.

There is an opportunity for a two-hour meeting where the Deputy Prime Minister may have to answer questions about this, and it seems like that would be in the best interests of Canada. It seems to me that Canadians deserve that, at least. If you're going to make these bold, lofty promises despite all the evidence to the contrary, there may be some ministerial accountability built into that.

However, there are more reasons for the Deputy Prime Minister to appear and answer questions before this committee. This budget continues to push a regressive carbon tax onto the Canadian people, and let me be very clear when I say that. This is absolutely a regressive tax from a supposedly progressive government. The Liberal carbon tax continues to punish hard-working families by making life more expensive. Gas, food and everything that a person needs to survive and thrive in this country are becoming more expensive.

I appreciate that Deputy Prime Minister Freeland may not fully understand how much this hurts hard-working families. After all, it was only recently that she suggested a solution to the cost of living crisis would be that everyone just adopt her lifestyle of taking bicycles and public transit everywhere. Well, most people don't live in downtown Toronto. In fact, most families in this country need a car to get to work or school and function in a basic manner. It is very clear that a tax that punishes those very necessary activities can be considered nothing but regressive, and the Deputy Prime Minister should answer questions about that.

Why would a government that claims to be progressive and makes a big show and dance in the House of Commons all the time about caring for young people be hitching its wagon to a regressive policy that, in fact, punishes working-class and middle-class families? To put into perspective what the continued carbon tax in this budget is doing to people in this country, I would like to draw attention to the 2023 report from the Parliamentary Budget Officer, which details that the carbon tax will cost the average Ontario family \$592 this coming summer alone from Victoria Day to Labour Day.

Again, I think many Canadians may be concerned that the Deputy Prime Minister Freeland does not appreciate how much money this means to most families, but the reality is that it means a lot. This is an issue that deserves a fulsome conversation and a full meeting at which the finance minister answers questions from the finance committee.

The Liberal elite bubble in Ottawa may not appreciate \$592 over the summer, maybe because the leader of the party lives off a trust fund. I don't know. Maybe for him it's pocket money; he finds that in the middle of his couch, perhaps. However, to most Canadians, it's a pretty big deal. It could be the difference between being able to pay their bills in a given month or over the course of the entire summer and perhaps going into debt.

Last summer, the insolvency firm MNP LTD conducted a survey of Canadians, and most Canadians who responded to that survey—52%—said they are \$200 or less away from not being able to pay their bills at the end of the month due to higher interest rates and a rising cost of living. Those statistics come from Canadians who completed the MNP survey, not from billionaires like Warren Buffett or friends of the Liberal Party with Ph.D.s who the Liberal Party likes to cite as evidence that their carbon tax economy is good for the Canadian people. Unsurprisingly, the Canadian people have a very different perspective on the economy than Warren Buffett does.

If most Canadians say that they are less than \$200 away from not being able to pay their bills every month, the cost of the carbon tax this summer—\$592—is actually a big deal. For that majority of Canadians, \$592 could help pay their bills for two or three months. The carbon tax is just taking money away from Canadians this summer and is having real-world consequences that the Deputy Prime Minister Freeland should address before this committee.

While I'm here and have the chance to speak, I'd also like to draw attention to some local issues. My home community of Durham is home to many families that feel the economic pressure the Deputy Prime Minister Freeland has created with inflationary spending and a regressive carbon tax. According to Durham region's health department, 16.4% of households in the Durham region are considered food insecure. In short, that means over 16% of households in the Durham region report they are worried that the food they have in their house will run out, that they will have to compromise on the type or the amount of food they eat, or that they will have to skip meals. This is a very real problem attributable to both food inflation and the rising cost of basic living.

I must say that it is a real shame that the Liberal MP for Whitby, my neighbour to the west, continues to downplay this problem. Ryan Turnbull, the Liberal MP for Whitby—I'm sorry; I have to pause as I shudder—is the parliamentary secretary for the Deputy Prime Minister Freeland, and I have seen him personally over the last few weeks stand in the House of Commons and paint a false picture of the very serious economic problems impacting Canada, the Durham region and Whitby in particular.

This is relevant because Mr. Turnbull has put forward a way of measuring success and progress in the economy that the Deputy Prime Minister Freeland should probably answer to. Let me provide some examples.

Two weeks ago, the Liberal MP for Whitby, Mr. Turnbull—the Deputy Prime Minister's parliamentary secretary—stood in the House and cited Warren Buffett to explain that the Liberal carbon tax economy is going great. He said that Warren Buffett is not uncomfortable “putting [his] money into Canada”, quoting the American billionaire as if that's evidence that the government's inflationary spending is good for Canadians. Mr. Turnbull may believe that the measure of a healthy economy is Warren Buffett's point of view—

**Ms. Joanne Thompson:** I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

My understanding is that, as part of the subamendment, we're speaking about Mr. Carney coming to committee for three hours. Are we now expanding this, and is there another subamendment that we're going to move for Mr. Buffett? I'm a little uncertain, Chair, of what's happening.

**Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan:** I want to speak to that point of order, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** On MP Thompson's point of order, go ahead.

**Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan:** Mr. Chair, I think it's very relevant. He did tie in what Mr. Turnbull has been saying about the carbon tax economy and Warren Buffett with Chrystia Freeland. I think that there is quite a bit of latitude that you granted others.

**The Chair:** Thank you, MP Thompson and MP Hallan. I do ask for relevance and to keep it as tight as you can, but we do allow for latitude on committee.

MP Jivani.

**Mr. Jamil Jivani:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I just want to quote our colleague from the NDP who said calling the minister here opens up a range of issues. I would say this is within the range of issues.

Once again, as I was saying before I was interrupted, Mr. Turnbull, parliamentary secretary to the Deputy Prime Minister, said two weeks ago in the House, when explaining the high cost of groceries, that Warren Buffet is not uncomfortable putting his money into Canada, quoting the American billionaire as if that's evidence the government's inflationary spending is good for Canadians.

This actually raises the question of how this government, how the parliamentary secretary to the Deputy Prime Minister, how the Minister of Finance, is measuring what a successful and progressive economy looks like. Is it Warren Buffett's opinion? Is it the economic outlook of an American billionaire, or is it much more serious measures?

For example, there's increasing demand at food banks, which I would say is a much more serious measure of whether the carbon tax economy is actually good for Canada. It would be very important and I think helpful to the Canadian people when the Deputy Prime Minister is called before this committee to have a fulsome discussion of how exactly the economy is being measured, how exactly this government is determining that this is a good economy for the Canadian people.

On this idea of measuring the economy, how do we know that things are as bad as some would say they are? I do think that food bank demand is a very good measure. We have millions of Canadians accessing food banks, many of whom never accessed a food bank before. Again, I'd like to go back to the Deputy Prime Minister's parliamentary secretary, Mr. Turnbull, because on May 2, in Whitby, a new food bank opened up. It's a new food bank, an innovative model styled after a grocery store.

That occurred on May 2. On May 3, just the day after, Mr. Turnbull rose in the House defending the Deputy Prime Minister's policies, and I'm going to quote this because it is shocking stuff. He said, "I know that the member opposite feels that grocery prices are too high, and they have been, certainly. However, the CPI index has shown that food prices are stabilizing in our economy, which is good news for Canadians."

There are a couple of important things here that the Deputy Prime Minister may want to respond to. First, is it good to stabilize high food prices? Most Canadians have made quite clear that we want grocery costs to go down, not to keep them high, as the parliamentary secretary to Chrystia Freeland would suggest. I couldn't believe it when I heard it. It sounds quite illogical and warrants some dialogue, some questions and some answers, some Q and A.

If these prices for food continue to stay high, as Mr. Turnbull is thrilled to report, the food bank lines in Whitby will continue to grow. The food bank lines in many other parts of Canada will continue to grow and that is not good news.

When we talk about ministerial accountability there are some very serious questions embedded in this. They are questions that warrant a fulsome two-hour meeting at least, to answer questions and to make clear to the people of Canada what exactly the measure is that this government is using when putting forward this year's budget. What exactly do they mean when they say this is good for Canadians? Is the measuring stick they're using just fundamentally broken, and is that why they're able to put this budget forward with such glee and enthusiasm?

Certainly the Deputy Prime Minister shall have to answer for this. Canadians want to know that the Liberal government actually understands the challenges before us, given the evidence that they do not. Making excuses for very serious economic problems in this country as Mr. Turnbull has done, and is busy doing, is not helping.

Fundamentally, it comes down to this question. Should the Deputy Prime Minister have to answer this committee's questions and stop running from accountability? I hope the committee's answer to that question is yes.

**The Chair:** Thank you, MP Jivani.

I have MP Hallan, MP Turnbull, MP Thompson and then MP Goodridge.

**Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thank you to my colleague, Mr. Jivani, for his very eloquent speech and recap of today's reality of what Canadians are facing after nine years of this Liberal-NDP government.

Other colleagues have tried to recap how we got here today, and it's important to find out why we are where we are today. Let's not forget that as a committee we tried to get Mark Carney to this committee. It was actually Mr. Davies who blocked that proposal, in whatever deal he brokered with the Liberals. We're just not sure yet, but whatever it was, it worked. Mr. Davies was the first to jump on that. He tried to block that, and he was successful. Let's turn to why we are where we are today.

This was the first time in my entire parliamentary experience I'd seen a parliamentary secretary, Mr. Turnbull, block the government's own legislation on Bill C-69. Let's not forget we had witnesses in this room, and Mr. Turnbull decided to table-drop a heavy-handed motion, which was not discussed beforehand. We know for a fact that the NDP got that motion the night before. The rest of us from the Conservative side and the Bloc side, as far as we know, did not get it, but Mr. Davies knew about it. They tried to use a heavy hand, as they always do. They have been doing that for the last nine years with their costly coalition. They've tried to stiff-arm us—

**Mr. Don Davies:** On a point of order, Mr. Chair, I tried this last Friday, but got an incredibly biased decision from the chair at that time.

There has been no coalition for nine years. You're allowed to have great latitude at this committee, but you're not allowed to rewrite history. Saying that the last nine years has been a coalition government is like saying the last nine years was an American Republican government. It's simply wrong.

I would ask my colleague to be factual. He can talk about the last two and a half years of having a confidence and supply agreement, but there was no coalition government between the Liberals and the NDP for the last nine years. You're not allowed to state outright falsehoods under the guise of parliamentary privilege. I would ask my colleague to withdraw that comment and stick to the truth.

**The Chair:** MP Hallan.

**Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan:** On that point of order, Mr. Chair, I think my NDP colleague, Don Davies, needs to listen a bit better because I separated the two things.

In the ruling our hard-working clerk cleared up for us that there was a ruling made that it is very factual to say “Liberal-NDP government”. There was a ruling made in the House. Mr. Chair, you're more than welcome to have that same email forwarded to you. There was a ruling made in the House of Commons on May 7, 2024, where they pointed to a ruling from September 24, 2021, in regard to the same point of order that Mr. Davies brought up. It was about not being able to say “Liberal-NDP government”, but it was proven that we can.

I would refer him and you, Mr. Chair, to that ruling.

**The Chair:** Thank you for that MP Hallan and MP Davies.

I will put that to the side, but I will look into what you have said here on the record.

**Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan:** Continuing on, this costly coalition Liberal-NDP government, which I am allowed to say, blocked their own legislation. Let's not forget that, when those witnesses were here, we were hearing testimony. Mr. Turnbull, the parliamentary secretary, for the first time in the history that I've been here table-dropped a motion to block his party's own legislation on Bill C-69.

What would Chrystia Freeland think about that? Is it that maybe Mr. Turnbull supports Mark Carney in his bid to become Liberal leader? He recently tweeted him, which could be an endorsement, but we don't know. Maybe out of that he tried to trick Chrystia Freeland. We just don't know. That's why it's important for Mark Carney to be here and for Chrystia Freeland to be here at the same time.

Let's not forget that Don Davies and Ryan Turnbull came here at the same time. It seems like they already had an agenda preset before they got here and have been trying to stiff-arm and use a heavy hand since they got here.

**Mr. Don Davies:** I have a point of order, Chair.

What does my honourable colleague mean by “came here at the same time”? I'd like him to explain that.

**Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan:** Let me clarify. It means that they joined this committee around the same time. In our experience, we've seen nothing but the blocking of their own legislation and other heavy-handed things that, of course, as the official opposition on behalf of Canadians, we won't let happen in this committee.

I want to address things that my colleague Ms. Dzerowicz brought up because I think it's very important, and these are some important issues that Canadians and Canadian businesses are facing as well.

When we talk about Canadian businesses, in this expensive, costly, photo op budget by this Liberal-NDP government, they're claiming that they're going to give back carbon tax rebates to businesses. These businesses have been waiting for more than five years for this—more than five years. They took this money, and emissions went up under this pretense that somehow it would fix the environment, which it didn't. Chrystia Freeland said that businesses would somehow be better off, that the environment would be better off and that Canadians would be better off, but none of those things happened. Not a single one of those things happened.

In fact, Chrystia Freeland's own environment department admitted that they don't even keep track of the emissions that are tied in with the carbon tax scam. It's a total scam. There is nothing that ties in both things, because they know it's just like Justin Trudeau and not worth the cost. That's why. That's why they don't keep track of it. They take more and more from Canadians and now, supposedly, they're supposed to be the heroes of small businesses that have suffered with higher taxes, labour shortages and all sorts of pain, which they've inflicted on not just the business owners but the workers of those businesses as well.

I want to address that. What a common-sense Conservative government would do is not take the money in the first place. You wouldn't need these phony rebates if you didn't take the money away in the first place. Chrystia Freeland has on multiple occasions come to this committee, just like the Parliamentary Budget Officer, and refused to answer what the Parliamentary Budget Officer has confirmed on multiple occasions: that most households are worse off when you factor in the economic and fiscal impacts of the carbon tax. That is exactly what the Parliamentary Budget Officer said.

Then when you have Chrystia Freeland brag, day in and day out, with the falsehood that somehow this carbon tax is supposed to make life better for Canadians, it's false. The Parliamentary Budget Officer said so himself. He proved that this carbon tax scam is not worth the cost, and emissions went up once again. In fact, it's so bad that Canada's ranking on the climate change index fell from 58 to 62. Can you believe that? However, the carbon tax went up. Can you believe that? It's crazy. I know, Chair. It's crazy that you could raise the carbon tax and fall in the climate change index. Would you believe that? That is the record of nine years of this government and their failed policies.

What did that do? Chrystia Freeland would tell you that Canadians have never had it so good. Well, this carbon tax scam is responsible for two million Canadians going to a food bank in a single month and a million more projected this year. There are families making decisions that they've never had to make before. There are moms who go to the grocery store and spend double the time because they have to pick up food and think twice about whether they can afford this. They're having to skip meals. Can you believe that? Canadians are having to skip meals in this country.

My family came here as immigrants, like many others. There are many people who grew up here all saying the same thing. This is not the same Canada that we knew, because after nine years of this government, Canada is broken. Despite what the Liberals might try to sell you, it's just like their carbon tax scam. It's just a scam. In fact, 400,000 people left this country last year, and the high cost of living was their number one reason. That never used to happen to us, and it's stuff that we've never heard before. After nine years of this government, that's the reality of Canadians today.

Canada used to be a place people wanted to come to. They could afford a home. They could run a good business. There were safe streets. They could send their kids to walk alone to school. None of those things are possible anymore after nine years of this government.

This is the Canada that Chrystia Freeland is bragging about, saying after nine years that Canadians have never had it so good. You don't have to look very far. You just have to go to some of the streets of our bigger cities to see the crime, chaos, destruction and what high-cost, high-deficit governments do to their citizens.

Can you believe that we live in a country right now where there are teachers and nurses living in their cars because, after nine years of this government, supported by the NDP, they can't afford rent because it has doubled? Mortgages have doubled. In fact, Canadians can't renew their mortgages because of the high interest rates. That's the Canada we live in.

When we talk about food banks, there's a phenomenon that we've never seen before. Double-income families, sometimes with two members who earn a good living, can't afford to eat, heat or house themselves anymore. That wasn't the promise of Canada. That wasn't the Canadian dream that was promised to those people who came here, who left everything behind to come here for a better future. They were promised they could afford to buy groceries, to heat their homes and to live in a home, all at the same time. However, after nine years of this government, supported by the NDP all along the way, this is the reality of Canada. The Canadian dream is broken. The Canadian dream has turned into a nightmare for many people we've talked to.

I think that if the Liberals and the NDP started talking to their constituents, they would realize the pain that it causes. Mr. Jivani clearly outlined what was happening in Mr. Turnbull's own riding. This wasn't a reality before. It is now, yet virtue signalling and being woke is more important to this Liberal-NDP government than actually helping out Canadians.

This budget, this \$40 billion of new inflationary net spending, does nothing to help Canadians out. In fact, everyone has seen high interest rates. The Governor of the Bank of Canada has been here multiple times and talked about higher rates for longer, and that's the pain that Canadians have to feel. When asked, he says that this government's fiscal policy and his monetary policy are rowing in opposite directions. It is a factor in why interest rates can't come down.

That's why when people are renewing their mortgages, sometimes they're renewing at double or triple the rate. That's why Canadians are now living in their cars, living under bridges and in tents. There are tent cities all across this country like we've never seen before.

That's just nine years of how broken Canada is under this Prime Minister with the help of the NDP, who, by the way, keeps the Prime Minister in his place out of greed for their own leader's pension. That's what this is all about.

This budget is no different. It's going to keep this Prime Minister in longer, causing more pain for Canadians. Canadians don't see hope right now at all. A year and a half is a long way to an election. That's why our leader called for a carbon tax election. If the Liberal-NDP government is so sure of their carbon tax scam, why not pause it?

By the way, before the Liberal-NDP government jacked it up by 23% on April 1, 70% of Canadians, including seven out of 10 pre-

miers, said to spike the hike and not to raise the carbon tax. However, government members did what they always do. They want to inflict as much pain on Canadians as possible to raise the price of groceries, gas and home heating even more. They refused to listen to Canadians, and they jacked it up, knowing that a million more Canadians would visit a food bank on top of the two million who visited a food bank in a single month, despite all of that.

When they talk about fairness, Canadians clearly see that it's not what they're talking about. It might be fairness for the government to collect more from Canadians, but for everyday Canadians, there is no fairness whatsoever.

My colleague, Ms. Dzerowicz also brought up money laundering. I'm appalled that she would even bring that up after last week when Conservatives, with our Bloc colleague, forced a meeting last Friday on money laundering.

Once again, the Liberals, along with Don Davies from the NDP, chose to block that very important motion brought by my good friend and great colleague Adam Chambers. We could have been studying this money laundering issue. It's massive. In fact, it's so big and so important, that Chrystia Freeland, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance wrote to this committee—to you, Chair—on October 6, 2023.

She wrote, “Dear Mr. Fonseca: I am writing to request your assistance with the fourth five-year parliamentary review of the proceeds of the Proceeds of Crime (Money Laundering) and Terrorist Financing Act (PCMLTFA).” This letter goes on to say that the last review of the PCMLTFA was completed in November 2018.

This review takes place every five years. It's already over what it needs to be. She literally.... Maybe she was just doing this out of formality, but we take that seriously because there have been three different banks that have been allegedly caught up in money laundering. The most recent was TD Bank. This was the reason we wanted to call that meeting, which was blocked, once again, by Mr. Davies, Mr. Turnbull and his crew of Liberals.

There was a headline that says, “TD Bank could face more severe penalties after drug money laundering allegations, says analyst. Bank could face worst-case scenario after report connects TD to illicit fentanyl profits”.

Another headline is “TD probe tied to laundering drug money, says Wall Street Journal. Court documents and sources reveal investigators found evidence of a drug-money-laundering operation”. Another is “TD bank hit with \$9.2 million penalty for failing to report suspicious transactions. Canada's financial intelligence agency fines TD as bank faces further compliance probes in the U.S.”

My question is, what do these Liberals and Mr. Davies have to hide? Why did they block a common-sense Conservative motion from going through? In fact, it's a very good motion.

I'll read it in. It's from my friend, Mr. Chambers, from Tuesday, March 19. It says:

...pursuant to Standing Order 108(2) and with regards to section 72 of the Proceeds of Crime (Money Laundering) and Terrorist Financing Act, the committee undertake a study to review the Act and the current situation regarding money laundering and terrorist financing in Canada. That as part of the study the committee calls the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance for no fewer than two hours, the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada no fewer than two hours, the Minister of Public Safety no fewer than two hours, the Minister of National Revenue no fewer than two hours, department officials for the departments of Justice and Public Safety, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, the Financial Transactions and Reports Analysis Centre of Canada, the Canadian Security Intelligence Service, the Canadian Border Security Agency, the Office of the Superintendent of Financial Institutions, the Financial Consumer Agency of Canada, the Ombudsman for Banking Services and Investments, the Cullen Commission Lead Counsel, Royal Bank of Canada, TD Bank, Bank of Montreal, Scotiabank, CIBC, National Bank, the Ontario Securities Commission and other witnesses as submitted by the members of the committee. That the committee take no fewer than ten meetings for this study and that it report its findings to the House.

What I don't understand was why, even though the Minister of Finance has been asking for this—

**Ms. Joanne Thompson:** I have a point of order, Mr. Chair. I wonder if you could clarify.

Mr. Hallan said that he wasn't passing this motion. I believe he indicated that he's reading a motion. I would like absolute clarity on what's happening.

Is he indeed trying to move this motion, or is it just another example of speaking for hours?

**The Chair:** Thank you, MP Thompson.

MP Hallan will clarify what he's doing.

Again, we are speaking to MP Morantz's subamendment.

**Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan:** Absolutely.

Ms. Thompson was at Friday's committee meeting, where she and the Liberals, along with Don Davies, decided to block the motion. As was done on Friday, I'm simply reading into the record a motion from my friend Adam Chambers. There was no mention of moving it, and there was no mention of putting it on notice. It's on notice already.

Mr. Chambers has already read it into the record once, so I was just doing that again because Chrystia Freeland, the Minister of Finance, requested this. In fact, she's the one who wanted this study to take place.

**Mr. Don Davies:** I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

The witness—

**Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP):** Chair, he's talking about a motion that has not been debated. That has nothing to do.... If they're going to—

**The Chair:** There's a point of order, MP Angus.

MP Davies, please continue.

**Mr. Don Davies:** Thanks.

Mr. Angus is my substitute. I'll make my last point, and then I'll turn it over to Mr. Angus.

On Friday, we were debating a subamendment, and no motions are permitted to be moved when we're debating a subamendment. The Conservatives—I think it was Mr. Chambers, but I'm not sure who it was—said that he wasn't moving the motion; he was reading it into the record. Therefore, it has already been read into the record.

I'd ask you, Mr. Chair, to rule on this. Some of us thought there was an attempt to move a motion at a time when it couldn't be done. If the true objective on Friday was simply to read it into the record, it has already been read into the record.

This is a continuation of that meeting. The meeting was suspended on Friday, not adjourned, so we're in the same meeting.

I don't think you can read it into the record twice. If Mr. Hallan's true purpose was to simply read the motion into the record, then that has been done. He asserts that he's simply reading it into the record, but that can't possibly be the case because it has already been done.

**The Chair:** I'm going to confer with the clerk, so we're going to suspend for 15 or 20 minutes. I think everybody needs a health break.

● (35405)

(Pause)

● (35435)

**The Chair:** We're back.

Members have received a fair bit of information, although I don't have all the information before me on these points of order for a ruling. I will be reviewing all that took place on Friday. I guess there was a fair bit. I will be looking over the video. The blues are still not available, but I'll be looking over the blues. I have conferred with the clerk, and I will get back to members once I've gone through all of that.

Are members good with that? Okay. That's where I am right now. I've heard a lot from everyone, but I have to do that work before coming back to the committee.

We had MP Davies, who has been substituted by MP Angus, on a point of order, and MP Angus on a point of order. There was also a point of order, I believe, from MP Hallan.

**Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan:** It's just a response.

**The Chair:** Okay.

MP Angus, I don't know if you heard what I just had to say. I've been looking into this. I don't have the information. I don't even have the blues, and I don't have the video. I have to look through all of it and then come back to the committee.

MP Angus, you're next on your point of order.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** Chair, my only concern with what you're offering is that if we're debating a motion and someone is filling time talking about another motion, then they're not being relevant to the discussion. If we're going to stay here all night, at least they have to stay on point and they weren't on point. They were talking about something that was peripheral to the discussion. That was my concern.

Mr. Davies explained much more clearly that he had already read the motion into the record, which I think is important information, but my objection was that if I have to listen to the member speak, he can't just keep bringing up stuff that is not relevant to the conversation. Otherwise, they're wasting our time and they're wasting enormous resources of the House.

**The Chair:** Thank you, MP Angus.

I think all committee members would agree that relevance is important and that we stick to what we are debating, and that is, really, MP Morantz's subamendment. That's what we should stick to and keep focused on.

On that, I will go over to MP Hallan, please.

**Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan:** Thanks, Mr. Chair.

We're discussing very relevant points about Chrystia Freeland, like things that she said and her failed Liberal-NDP budget, which is costly at that, and all these points are very relevant. It is Chrystia Freeland, the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, who, to the points I was making about money laundering, asked this committee back in October to study money laundering, so it's very relevant to note the negative impacts that money laundering has had in Canada.

It was sad to see that last Friday, after a forced meeting by the common-sense Conservatives and the Bloc, it was a Liberal-NDP government that blocked this important work. It could have been started. As we know, not only was TD hit with a fine, but there's also alleged money laundering happening through illicit drugs. This is very concerning because after nine years of this government, we see opioid deaths are up, and we see crime, chaos and disorder. Some of this stuff is tied in with money laundering. That's why it's more important than ever right now that we study money laundering, something that Chrystia Freeland, who is a part of this subamendment, has asked for.

I know the NDP and the Liberals don't want to talk about this because they blocked it on Friday from taking place, but it is impacting lives. In fact, it's impacting lives so much that it's common-sense Conservatives who had to bring private members' bills forward because the Liberals and the NDP are not taking it seriously. Money laundering is tied into the extortions that are happening.

**The Chair:** I'm going to interject really quickly here.

MP Angus, is the hand up for a point of order or to be on the speakers list?

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** It is a point of order, Chair.

We aren't debating money laundering. I think an investigation into money laundering is long overdue. Canada has a notorious reputation going back decades, but that's not what we're here to do.

**Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan:** This is debate.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** No, Chair, this is about relevance. He has an obligation to stay focused. If he's just going to walk around the block talking about whatever comes into his head, he's wasting our time, and you, as chair, have an obligation to ask for relevance.

Talking about opioid deaths is not what we're talking about. He can go to the health committee and do that. We are here to address this motion, and we need to get that dealt with.

I'm asking you, Chair, to keep our member focused on what's relevant.

**The Chair:** Thank you, MP Angus.

We always speak to relevance and to keeping it as focused as we possibly can.

We have MP Hallan, speaking to MP Morantz's subamendment to the motion, please.

**Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan:** Look, I don't put it past the NDP to always not just prop up the Liberals, but make sure these important topics are not talked about. It speaks to the disastrous record after nine years of this government.

To that point, Ms. Dzerowicz talked about money laundering, because supposedly it was in the budget, so I'm not sure why Mr. Angus thinks Ms. Dzerowicz can talk about it, but because I'm a Conservative I can't talk about it. It's absolutely relevant, so I will go back to the point that Chrystia Freeland, who is very much a part of the subamendment, has talked about money laundering, and the Liberals and the NDP continue to block us from studying money laundering. It is a concern.

As I said, common-sense Conservatives have put forward private members' bills that are related to money laundering. In fact, our colleague, our deputy leader Tim Uppal, put forward a bill on extortions, which are also tied into money laundering. We know that's happening. We know that with the illicit drugs that are being sold, there is some tie-in with money laundering. The auto thefts that are happening are tied to money laundering. That's why it's important. We don't have any faith in the Liberal-NDP government that their so-called budget is going to address this; it's just a costly photo-op budget that they're bragging about. It will do nothing to help everyday Canadians. That is what we're talking about here.

Please excuse us if we don't trust or believe that after nine years of this government, there will be any changes, because they're still on the same reckless path with this budget that they've always been on. It's the same path that led to Canadians having doubled rents and doubled mortgages because of out-of-control spending, with \$400 billion of non-secured, rolled-over money—debt that they've accumulated. It's also the reason that Canadians are on the hook for the Liberal-NDP government's debt, with \$54 billion in just interest charges. Can you believe that? There's going to be more money this year going to bankers, bondholders and finance minister Chrystia Freeland's Bay Street buddies than what's going to doctors, nurses and health transfers. That's after nine years of this government.

The NDP have no problem supporting this failed, costly budget, because they want to protect their leader Jagmeet Singh's pension. That's what all of this is about. It's a shame. It's a shame that they would support such a failed budget, one that's going to add another \$40 billion of net new spending—inflationary spending at that. This is what we've seen year after year, and it's only going to get worse for Canadians the longer this Liberal-NDP government stays in power.

Now, it's not just Chrystia Freeland who wants us to talk about money laundering. In fact, tied to what happened recently with TD and the allegations—the same money laundering that Conservatives tried to bring forward and the Liberals, with the support of the NDP, blocked recently—is that Mark Carney, carbon tax Carney, when he was the governor of the Bank of Canada, talked about banks as well. This is why it's so important that we follow up with what Chrystia Freeland said on money laundering, which is also supposedly in her costly budget.

There's an article by the CBC, believe it or not, from July 18, 2012, that says, "Mark Carney's new rule for banks: Don't be evil". It says, "Even Bank of Canada governor Mark Carney weighed in Wednesday, calling banking culture 'deeply troubling,' saying that bankers have to 'substantially raise their game to levels of conduct that in any other aspect of life, are expected.'" So carbon tax Carney himself has talked about this money laundering and why we need to make sure we have better rules in Canada, especially when it comes to our banks.

There's the Cullen report, which was completed in 2022. This report said that if B.C. is to stop money laundering, they need to make their own financial crimes intelligence agency, because the Trudeau government isn't doing anything. I would add in there that it's the Trudeau-NDP government that isn't doing anything, because we recently saw them block any attempt by this committee to study cracking down on money laundering and the proceeds of crime for things like extortions and auto thefts, which we're seeing rise. Just recently, experts say that the Liberals' efforts are a "slap on the wrist" with regard to the alleged TD money laundering. That is the record of this Liberal-NDP government. That's why it's important we study this.

Mark Carney's rule for banks is to not be evil. That's why we want him here. However, Mr. Turnbull table-dropped this motion and started this incredible filibuster. It is a first that a parliamentary secretary would table-drop a motion and start a filibuster on their own bill. Can you imagine, in all that time, how many times we could have heard from carbon tax Carney? Maybe he could have confirmed whether he thinks, just like Chrystia Freeland, that cancelling Disney+ means that all inflation and cost of living problems will be solved, or whether he believes, like Chrystia Freeland, that everyone should ride a bike to solve their cost of living issues, or whether he thinks that two million people going to a food bank in a single month, after nine years of this government, means Canadians have never had it better. However, we can't, because Mr. Turnbull started this incredible filibuster. As I said, this is the first time I've ever seen that from a parliamentary secretary. Maybe it's because he wants to endorse carbon tax Carney, and maybe he doesn't want to support Chrystia Freeland in her bid to become Liberal leader. Maybe he started this whole thing to protect carbon tax Carney.

What we could have done with all this time, if this filibuster had not been started by Mr. Turnbull—which was supported by Mr. Davies of the NDP—is heard from carbon tax Carney. Just as carbon tax Carney said that banks should not be evil.... Money laundering has surged like we've never seen before. Maybe that's why Chrystia Freeland wanted to have us study it here. I have some facts on money laundering, and I could have asked Mark Carney, if he were sitting here, about whether he agrees with the experts, who estimate that over \$100 billion could be laundered through Canada every year.

In 2019, the U.S. State Department described Canada as a "major money laundering country", alongside Afghanistan, the British Virgin Islands, China, Macau and Colombia. Can you believe, after nine years of this government, that "major money laundering country" is what we're known as, alongside Afghanistan, the British Virgin Islands and China? That's the reputation Canada has under this Liberal-NDP government. It's incredible, yet I see why the Liberals and the NDP want to block any type of motion studying this. It's because it would unravel the amount of corruption that would come out. It would unravel why Canadians have to live through the worst cost of living crisis seen in Canadian history. That's the record of this Liberal-NDP government.

I'll go on with more important facts that I could have asked Mark Carney about if it were not for the blocking that's happening. Global Financial Integrity concluded that \$626.3 million U.S. was laundered between 2015 and 2020, and a 2019 RCMP report estimated that \$46.7 billion was laundered in Canada in 2018 alone. It's no wonder the Cullen report said that B.C. should create its own agency because the Trudeau government isn't doing anything. That's absolutely right. It's because they're getting propped up by the NDP and letting all of this happen.

I can talk about extortion. I recently visited a very successful transport company that's seen extortion. I watched video clips and an audio clip. In the audio clip, someone calls and says they want x amount of money or they're going to shoot up the house. Then I saw a video of a white SUV pulling up to the house and someone shooting at the house. This family, like many others in this country, now has to live separately from each other in different hotels across the GTA because of the soft-on-crime policies of this government. They have led to a lot of money laundering, which Chrystia Freeland has asked us to study.

That's what nine years of this government has given Canadians. This immigrant family came here looking for a better future and risked everything for a safer future for their kids. They worked day and night and went from working as janitors to running this successful transport company, and now they are fearful because success is punished in this country after nine years of this government, which has been propped up by the NDP.

These soft-on-crime policies have real consequences for families like the one I just talked about. They live in fear every day. It was the first time I had seen bulletproof windows on a car, and it was the first time they had to find a supplier who would do that for them too. This Trudeau government, just as the Cullen report from B.C. said, isn't doing anything, and with the support of the NDP, they continue to block any type of study into it. That's the reason we continuously call for us to fulfill the ask by the Deputy Prime Minister and get right down to this report. We know that extortion is up and we know auto theft is up. They're tied into money laundering as well.

I'll move on with some more facts. In October 2020, Ottawa was criticized—Ottawa being this Liberal-NDP government, for those listening—for doing little to control the flow of illicit funds. Shortly after the Office of the Superintendent of Financial Institutions, or OSFI, announced that it would be dismantling its anti-money laundering section, a retired OSFI official, Nicolas Choules-Burbidge, said, “This dismantling is despite that banks are the riskiest part of the financial sector.” He went on to say, “This is yet another backward step by Canada as the government”—this Liberal-NDP government—“ignores the dismantling of our anti-money laundering regime. Canadian lawyers are not covered at all and are known to be the highest risk.”

Despite knowing all of this, it puzzles me why this Liberal-NDP government would want to continue to block this study. Chrystia Freeland, and even Mark Carney to some degree, knows how important it is to study this, but members continue to team up to block a common-sense Conservative motion brought by—

**Hon. Mike Lake (Edmonton—Wetaskiwin, CPC):** I have a point of order.

I'm subbing in on this committee, and I know the committee is doing great work, but I would like to get a bit of clarification, if I could, as a new temporary member of the committee. Could you read the subamendment we're talking about right now? Would it be possible to give us a quick reading of it? I don't have it in front of me.

**The Chair:** We will—

**Hon. Mike Lake:** Do you mind reading it, though?

**The Chair:** No. We will get that sent to you.

**Hon. Mike Lake:** Okay. The gist of it, though, is that there's a subamendment to suggest that Mark Carney ought to appear before the committee as the former—

**The Chair:** No.

**Hon. Mike Lake:** Is that not the subamendment?

**The Chair:** No, that is not the subamendment. We are on MP Morantz's subamendment on the programming motion.

**Hon. Mike Lake:** All right. It suggests that Mark Carney come before the committee as the former governor of the Bank of Canada—

**The Chair:** We're working on that subamendment. That's what we're doing.

**Hon. Mike Lake:** —having been pretty outspoken on some of the measures in the budget.

**The Chair:** We will have that sent to you right now. It will go to your P9.

**Hon. Mike Lake:** Thank you. I appreciate it.

**The Chair:** MP Hallan, go ahead.

**Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan:** It's more important than ever that we get down to the business of this committee. Carbon tax Carney has been okay to appear at a Senate committee. We can't confirm whether he flip-flopped on the carbon tax scam or not, so there's another question I'd love to ask carbon tax Carney while he's here: Do you agree with Chrystia Freeland and Justin Trudeau on their path to quadrupling the carbon tax scam that's made the cost of gas, groceries and home heating expensive already? They want to quadruple it. This is all a path to quadrupling it. Does carbon tax Carney agree with that plan?

When he becomes the coronated Liberal leader, does he want to continue the destructive path of the carbon tax scam? That's something that I, along with all Canadians, would like to know. Does carbon tax Carney want to continue the destructive path of high deficits and the debt that this Prime Minister has put us on? In fact, the Prime Minister has put more debt on Canadians' heads than every single prime minister before him combined. That's what led to 40-year highs in inflation and the most rapid interest rate hikes seen in Canadian history. That has led Canadians to be the most at risk in the G7 for mortgage default. Is carbon tax Carney in agreement with the Prime Minister that this is the path he wants to follow when he becomes Liberal leader? Maybe that's why Mr. Turnbull blocked our motion. Maybe that's why he started this filibuster. He wants to protect carbon tax Carney.

This is important more than ever. There are a lot of questions we want to ask carbon tax Carney. Does he agree with Justin Trudeau and the finance minister on a lot of these failed policies, including the failed drug policies that we've seen ravage the country and that are in this budget? The finance minister admits that this is the path they want to continue down, this destructive path that we've seen ravage our streets and tear families apart. That's the record after nine years of this government. These are some of the most important questions that we would like to ask of him. Carbon tax Carney also knows, as he knew back then, about the deficits. I think he made some type of comment about the federal budget not being focused enough on growth.

Let's not forget that he's not the only former Bank of Canada governor who commented on the budget. David Dodge, who's a proud Liberal and admits that he's a proud Liberal, is a former governor of the Bank of Canada. Before the budget came out, let's remember what he said. He said that this is the worst budget since 1982. So it's not just carbon tax Carney, the former governor of the Bank of Canada; it's also David Dodge. They are both Liberals who have said that this is the worst budget.

We agree. We fully agree that this is a bad budget because it will do nothing to help with the supply of homes. It's a photo-op budget. What we've recently seen is \$4.4 billion in bonuses going to CMHC for not building any homes. It gives this government an opportunity to fly coast to coast on taxpayers' dime and be in front of reannounced projects so they can look like they're trying to solve the housing issue, when what they're really doing is creating more bureaucracy, not more homes.

That's clear to see, as this year, Chrystia Freeland's housing department said that housing starts will go down. Last year that was also the case, and it will be next year. The shortfall is more than five million homes, yet this government says that the budget is about fairness. There is nothing fair about losing an entire generation's dream of home ownership. After nine years of this government, supported by the NDP, the dream of home ownership for younger generations is dead. Unless you have the bank of mom and dad, in this country, you will never be able to own a home. That is the reality of this government, yet, including with this budget, they've bragged about \$89 billion committed to housing, only to double housing costs. Can you believe that? That's the record.

I'm not sure how that's something to brag about, but time after time we see Chrystia Freeland stand up in the House of Commons and tell Canadians, including young ones who can't afford a home, that they've never had it better. The reality is that Canada is broken, broken in every way, and this Liberal-NDP government broke it. It's clear to see.

I have never seen so much pain and suffering from everyday Canadians, or from newcomers who came to this country, like me. They ask, "Why did we come here? What did we leave everything back home to come here for? This is not the Canada we were promised." The people who were born and raised here say that this is not the same Canada either. It is hard to find anyone who would say, "Raise the cost of my gas, groceries and home heating even more, even though you haven't hit a single emissions reduction target, emissions have gone up and you've lied about putting more back in our pockets than what we have to pay into the carbon tax scam." I haven't met a single Canadian who is thanking this government for that. That is not to mention that on the climate change index, we fell four places. It's embarrassing.

This Prime Minister has found every way to embarrass Canada on the world stage, not just one way, and this budget does more of that. It's an embarrassing budget. It's embarrassing that this government would say that this is about fairness, but ensure that a young person will never be able to afford a home. An entire generation of homeowners is gone. That is what this budget is about.

Nothing in this budget will help the two million Canadians going to a food bank—nothing. One in five Canadians is skipping meals. One-third of those two million people going to a food bank are children. That is the record of this Liberal-NDP government, yet according to them, everything is fine. It's all good. They say, "You've never had it better. Just keep your mouth shut and let us do whatever we're doing."

If anyone in the opposition speaks up about it, they will be called all sorts of names. Anyone who calls the Liberals out and voices the emotions of Canadians today will all of a sudden become racist

and misogynist, because they're so desperate. This budget, it's clear to see, doesn't help any of those people. However, if you criticize the budget, all of a sudden the Liberals and the NDP, the left, will, as is typical, go to their attacks of racism and sexism because they can't defend their record. This budget is more of the same old reason why Canadians can't afford to live here anymore. More and more Canadians are choosing to leave. There is nothing in this budget that would help anyone who wants to stay in Canada.

You hear stories about \$200 going a long way at the grocery store. You could basically fill up your trunk with that years ago. In 2015 and previously, with \$200 you could fill up the trunk of your car, but \$200 today doesn't even cover the front seat of your car. That's because of the carbon tax scam and the lack of competition. The Liberal-NDP government drove out all sorts of investments in all sectors, which made the cost of everything go up, yet they still want to quadruple their carbon tax scam and are proud to do it.

I have more to say, but because I see a lot of my colleagues are excited, I'll turn the floor over to the next speaker and I'll ask to be put on the list again, Mr. Chair.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** As the next speaker, I have MP Turnbull, and then it's MP Thompson, MP Goodridge—who is not here any longer—MP Morantz and MP Hallan.

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** Thanks, Chair.

I think this is about 5.5 hours now of Conservative filibustering. Let's review what's going on for Canadians at home. Yes, I'm sure they're all watching.

A couple of weeks ago we tried to have a subcommittee meeting to work out an agenda for the rest of May and June until the House rises for the summer. Obviously we had a good debate in that meeting. I won't discuss anything about the meeting, but certainly the outcome of it was pretty apparent to the committee: We could not achieve consensus around that set of priorities, even though we had a fulsome discussion.

The Conservatives were the ones who would not support any form of programming motion with an agreed set of priorities. Even though, I will say quite openly and honestly, we really tried to achieve consensus, we found that the Conservatives, as we see here today, were not really interested in working collaboratively.

They said that they opposed our budget before it was even released, so do they really want to study the budget? I would argue that what we're seeing here today is the exact opposite.

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

**The Chair:** There's a point of order.

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** Thanks for giving me a break. I appreciate that.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** You need a break already.

**The Chair:** You're not sitting as a member right now.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** I'll raise a point of order, even if I'm not subbed in, Chair.

**The Chair:** You have not been subbed in.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** I'm an associate member and I have a point of order.

**The Chair:** Have you been subbed in, MP Genuis?

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** I don't know, but I have a point of order and I'm an associate member. I claim my rights as an associate member of this committee, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** You have not been subbed in. We'll continue.

MP Turnbull, continue, please.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Mr. Chair, am I an associate member? Could you check your records?

Maybe the clerk can clarify.

**The Chair:** We're suspended.

• (35505) \_\_\_\_\_ (Pause) \_\_\_\_\_

• (35505)

**The Chair:** We're back.

We have received the substitution.

Go ahead on the point of order.

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

My first point of order is that I would have had a right to raise a point of order regardless of whether or not I was substituted in.

My second point of order, though, is to Mr. Turnbull's point. He is misleading the committee. Our Conservative leader put forward three specific demands in relation to the budget. They were to axe the carbon tax, remove gatekeepers—

**The Chair:** Hold on for one second.

The substitution has actually not gone through. Unless MP Halan leaves the room, you are not subbed in to the committee.

I'll return to Mr. Turnbull.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** I'm sorry. On a point of order, Chair, maybe the clerk can clarify, but I don't need to be subbed in to raise a point of order.

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** I think I have the floor, do I not, Chair?

**The Chair:** You have the floor, MP Turnbull.

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** Thank you very much.

As I was saying, we tried to achieve consensus with the Conservatives. Obviously, they weren't willing to work together.

**Mr. Arnold Viersen (Peace River—Westlock, CPC):** I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

**Mr. Adam Chambers:** I have a point of order.

**The Chair:** Go ahead on a point of order, MP Chambers.

**Mr. Adam Chambers:** Are you making a ruling that Mr. Genuis does not have the ability to make a point of order? Is that a ruling you're making?

**The Chair:** No, what I'm saying, MP Chambers, is that MP Turnbull has the floor. MP Genuis has not been subbed in as of yet.

**Mr. Adam Chambers:** Is that a ruling you're making? Can you confirm with the clerk whether that's a question of privilege?

**The Chair:** We'll suspend again.

• (35510) \_\_\_\_\_ (Pause) \_\_\_\_\_

• (35510)

**The Chair:** We're back.

To answer MP Chambers, members cannot just walk through the door and start screaming out "point of order".

**An hon. member:** Yes, they can.

**The Chair:** You cannot.

MP Turnbull, you have the floor.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** On a point of order, Chair, I didn't just walk through the door. I was elected by the constituents of Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan to represent them in this House of Commons.

**The Chair:** Continue, MP Turnbull.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** I was named an associate member of this committee, which means I have a right to raise points of order.

**The Chair:** MP Turnbull, you have the floor.

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** This is another example, Chair—

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** On a point of order, are you going to let me to speak or is this going to become a matter of privilege?

**The Chair:** I have MP Ste-Marie on a point of order.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie:** Mr. Chair, as all committee members and all members of Parliament know, when discussions occur simultaneously, it makes the work impossible for the interpreters. So I would ask all my colleagues to show a little decorum.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** You are very correct, MP St-Marie, on the crosstalk.

I don't have to tell MP Genuis. I've told him many times before about the crosstalk and he continues to do it.

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

**The Chair:** We are going back to MP Turnbull.

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

**The Chair:** MP Hallan is still in the room. There's been no substitute.

MP Turnbull, go ahead please.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** It doesn't matter if I'm substituted. I have a point of order.

**The Chair:** Please stop the crosstalk, MP Genuis.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Then enforce the rules, Chair.

**The Chair:** MP Turnbull.

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** Thank you, Chair.

I appreciate the ability to speak at committee. I feel like my privileges are being infringed upon by being interrupted so frequently by Mr. Genuis, but that's okay.

I was pointing out that—

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Chair, I'd like to raise a question of privilege. Mr. Hallan is outside the room, so even according to your own bizarre interpretation of the rules, I should have the right to raise it.

**The Chair:** MP Genuis—

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** I have a point of order.

**The Chair:** First, I'd ask for respect and decorum at this committee.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** I'd ask the same from you, Chair.

**The Chair:** Stop with the crosstalk, please. That's what you often do here at committee. I don't know if you do it at all committees, but you often do it here at this committee.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** I have a question of privilege to raise, Chair.

**The Chair:** MP Hallan has left. You are at the table.

I have a point of order from MP Angus.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** I have a question of privilege to raise. Are you going to recognize me, Chair?

**The Chair:** Go ahead, MP Angus, on your point of order.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** Thank you, Chair.

We've seen the tactic from Mr. Genuis where he comes in and he's abusive. He's talking over other people. I want to hear what the points are. I don't need to be bullied by Mr. Genuis. This is a common tactic.

I respect your role as chair, but I really think if he's not willing to listen, we need to talk about at least cutting off his mic. When the chair speaks, no one else is supposed to interrupt and Mr. Genuis just talks over people. He's here, I think, just to play that game. It's very disrespectful. As my Bloc Québécois colleague said, we've had multiple concerns about problems for our interpreters and the harassment that they have to endure hearing this, with people shouting.

Out of respect for our interpreters, I'm just asking if you can keep the meeting focused. You're doing a good job with it, but we need some respect for the process.

**The Chair:** Thank you, MP Angus.

Members may think it's something else, but my number one priority is the health and safety of those who work here. I read notes on the health and safety of our interpreters into the record at every meeting. I'm sure Mr. Genuis, who has been to many meetings, has heard me read them into the record and understands that some of the screaming and crosstalk are hurting and affecting our interpreters, as well as all members of the committee.

That's what I will stick to. Again, my priority and what is paramount is the health and safety of those at the table, as well as those who work here and are in this room to make our jobs possible.

With that, I'll go back to MP Turnbull.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Chair, I have a question of privilege I'd like to raise.

**The Chair:** MP Genuis.

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

I'm raising a question of privilege, and I'll start by reading the relevant citations from chapter 20 of *House of Commons Procedure and Practice* regarding the status of members and the rights of members to speak at committee. It says:

Standing and standing joint committees also have associate members. Associate members may be named to subcommittees and may act as substitutes for regular committee members who are unable to attend a committee meeting. When Members serve on subcommittees or as substitutes for regular members, they enjoy all the rights of regular members: they are counted for purposes of a quorum; they may participate in debate; they may move motions and vote; and, if required, they may submit a notice of motion. The use of associate members on subcommittees helps to reduce the workload of regular members.

The Standing Orders provide that any Member, whether affiliated with a political party or sitting as an independent, may take part in the public proceedings of any committee of which he or she is not a member, unless the House or the committee in question orders otherwise. The Standing Orders specifically exclude a non-member from voting, moving motions or being counted for purposes of a quorum.

Committees often adopt a routine motion that governs the process and time allotted for committee members to question witnesses.

It continues, but the important point is that the Standing Orders and *House of Commons Procedure and Practice* very clearly establish that associate members of committees duly elected by their constituents have a right to come to participate in committees, and to participate in all aspects of those committees within certain constraints, namely that they cannot vote, move motions or be counted for the purposes of quorum.

I was not seeking to vote, move a motion or be counted for the purposes of quorum, but was raising a point of order. What followed was a denial of my right to speak, followed by various outrageous slanders from other members impugning my approach to committee and my motivations.

The fact of the matter is, though, that I will assert the vital importance of adherence to the rules of the committee. The rules are not invented by the chair, with all due respect. The chair is responsible for enforcing the rules as enumerated in *House of Commons Procedure and Practice* and in the Standing Orders. The Standing Orders provide that I have a right to raise points of order and I have a right to speak. I was seeking to raise a point of order, and crosstalk only emerged when I was prevented from exercising my rights as a member of the committee.

I want to note, with respect to the health of interpreters, that this question of crosstalk and the impact on the health of interpreters was dealt with extensively at the natural resources committee. The Liberal chair there, George Chahal, initially claimed that the health and safety of interpreters were threatened by crosstalk. He subsequently had to retract that and admit that he had been wrong.

Of course, crosstalk makes it more difficult for interpreters to interpret. That's true. It's harder for them to interpret when there are multiple people talking at once, but it is not a threat to their health and safety. Health and safety issues of interpreters are engaged in other cases—for instance, when there is a loop created with the sound device—and this is well known. I would caution people like Mr. Angus from making things up and saying that something is a problem for health and safety when it's not.

The issue I am principally raising in relation to the matter of privilege is that I have a right to speak at committee. That is clearly established in the Standing Orders. I was denied that right by you a few moments ago.

This does engage my privileges very clearly. The most foundational privilege that members of Parliament have is the ability to speak in committees, and the denial of that privilege does constitute an issue touching on privilege. In that light, I'm prepared to move a motion of privilege that the chair be instructed to prepare a report outlining the material facts of this breach of privilege and present that report to the committee.

I will speak to that matter now.

Briefly, when a member is denied the right to speak, that is a gravely serious issue. All of us are elected, whether we're regular members of a committee or not, and however we come into the room, we have the right to speak and be heard on behalf of our constituents. The established rules and protocols around the privileges of members and the ability of members to speak are not deniable by an individual chair or by a committee acting without the clear adoption of a motion, because of the long-standing principles around these issues.

I know that some of my colleagues may want to come in on this issue of privilege, but I'll say that Speakers' rulings, going back a very long time, have established rules around the right of speakers. The way to have a committee unfold in a productive, effective, respectful manner is to have rules adhered to. I think a chair cannot and should not demand adherence to their will apart from their own willingness to adhere to those rules. This motion of privilege asking for the preparation of a report to the House will allow the committee to re-establish a footing that says all members have a right to

speak. All members are duly elected, whether they are regular members or are subbed in.

The key point is that the right to speak as a member in the House or at committee does not emanate from the leadership of one's party. Of course, we understand that systems exist for the establishment of lists that go to the Speaker or for the establishment of memberships of our committees. The various lists that establish members of a committee are submitted from party whips, but the effect of that should not be to prevent members from exercising their privileges. Although party whips establish who the regular members of committees are, those who are not assigned to be regular members of a committee may have an interest in the subject matter of the committee and nonetheless need to have their right to speak protected as part of the proceedings of the committee.

In fact, the House has taken additional steps in some cases, at the clause-by-clause stage of a bill, to allow amendments to be moved by members who are not regular members or members of recognized parties. People may leave their party caucus for various reasons, or they may be elected as independents. Their rights to speak at committee or in the House must still be protected. If we were ever to move away from the principle that the right of participation in committees stems from the status of a person as a member of Parliament and start to instead view it as emanating from their status as being chosen by party leadership, that would reduce members to merely creations of their parties and their party leadership as opposed to representatives of their constituents.

We come in here not principally as representatives of parties or members of parties, but as people who have been selected by our constituents to represent their concerns. Although I'm a regular member of the government operations committee, my constituents may and often do have concerns that relate to the subject matter of other committees, so in the process of not merely exercising my rights as an individual member of Parliament but wanting to represent my constituents, that brings me to wanting to voice the concerns, the ideas and the priorities of constituents by participating in the conversations that are happening in various other committees.

The principle established in the rules is not only that members can participate in the discussions and deliberations that are happening in other committees. It is also an important principle that they have a protected right to participate in the deliberations of other committees. If they did not, it would undermine the core principle of representation, which is about who we're supposed to serve here. This is at the heart of the principle of privilege.

What is privilege? What is the privilege of members to protect? It's not about the assertion of the entitlement of a member to want to do something or not do something; it is about the obligation of members to act on behalf of their constituents and therefore about having the ability to carry out their function as a representative of their constituents.

This is, I think, a clear-cut matter, Chair, and I'm hopeful that if we see the rapid adoption of this matter of privilege, we will be able to quickly return to the main subject matter before us.

I'll leave my comments there. I think maybe Mr. Lawrence had a comment on the question of privilege as well.

**The Chair:** MP Genuis, are you done?

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Yes, I'm done.

**The Chair:** Okay, so MP Genuis—

**Mr. Matthew Green (Hamilton Centre, NDP):** On a point of order, it's "Genuis". You don't want to give him an attribution that—

**The Chair:** You know, I never know how to best pronounce his name.

Can you tell us how to best pronounce your name?

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Generally in this business, it's worth lowering expectations, not raising them. On that basis, you can go with Genuis or the traditional Maltese Genuis.

**The Chair:** Okay.

MP Genuis, first off, let me just reiterate to you and all members, and to those here and those watching, that the paramount priority for me as chair is the health and safety of everybody in this room. The crosstalk, screaming and banging that MP Genuis has demonstrated, not just here today, but many times at this committee, have affected our interpreters.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** What are you talking about?

**The Chair:** Mr. Genuis, please.

We can go look through the video of MP Genuis screaming into the mic at this committee, with the crosstalk.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Sure, let's do that.

**The Chair:** MP Genuis, to say that those antics do not hurt our interpreters and do not cause injury to their health and safety I think is completely wrong.

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

**The Chair:** If you believe, MP Genuis—

**Mr. Philip Lawrence:** The chair is crosstalking. I have a point of order. You have to recognize me.

**The Chair:** MP Lawrence, go ahead on a point of order.

**Mr. Philip Lawrence:** I have a right to speak, guys. I know you wouldn't like it—

**The Chair:** I will give my ruling.

**Mr. Philip Lawrence:** I don't think it's necessary for you to invoke a personal attack, Mr. Chair, on Mr. Genuis. If you want to go through the facts, that's fine. That's your prerogative, but with the personal attacks, I realize it's late—

**The Chair:** This is not personal. I am sticking to the facts. I'm sticking to the point that MP Genuis made that it does not create a health and safety issue when he crosstalks, when he screams or when he does different antics at this committee. Be it MP Genuis or other members, I believe it does affect—

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

**The Chair:** Please don't crosstalk.

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

**The Chair:** Okay. I'll give you my ruling, but proceed on a point of order, MP Genuis.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Chair, you are misstating what I said. I'm not defending any of the practices that you falsely allege that I did, but—

**Mr. Matthew Green:** That's debate. State your point of order.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** I'm speaking and other members are engaging in crosstalk, so it's either verboten or isn't.

**Mr. Matthew Green:** I wasn't on mic.

**The Chair:** We're asking for no—

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Your microphone was on, sir.

My point was narrowly on the issue of the relevance of crosstalk to health and safety.

Ms. Dzerowicz and Mr. Turnbull are engaging in crosstalk now.

**The Chair:** MP Genuis, let me allow you to speak about your crosstalk—

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** I think you're just making things up about me, Chair, and I understand that you have a reason to do that—

**The Chair:** It's not about you, Mr. Genuis. It's about crosstalk. It's about—

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** I have a point of order now and you're talking over me.

I'm just perplexed by the idea that if I'm speaking and you start talking at the same time, I'm somehow responsible for that crosstalk. I would think that if I'm raising a point of order and you start speaking at the same time, you have at least a greater share of responsibility for the crosstalk than I do.

This issue was dealt with at the natural resources committee, and I would encourage you to speak to Mr. Chahal, who I think had a bit of egg on his face after some of the claims he made, even if he didn't acknowledge it. It's clearly in the record that he had to come back to the committee to clarify that while crosstalk makes it more difficult to interpret, it does not lead to negative health and safety outcomes. There are other things that do, but this is specifically on the issue of crosstalk.

Now, I still think crosstalk should be avoided, but I don't understand how you believe, when I'm trying to speak and raise a point of order, as I was, and you are repeatedly denying my right to speak, that I'm in the wrong for asserting a principle of the privileges of members. That's why I raised the question of privilege.

The priority should be adherence to the rules. The rules protect all of us. They protect you as chair. They protect me as an individual member. They protect the regular members. All you have to do as chair to succeed in your role is enforce the rules that are established. That's all you have to do. Don't make up new rules. Enforce the rules that are established.

**The Chair:** I will give you my ruling, MP Genuis.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** I know you're coming in at the same time, which is creating crosstalk, but I just encourage you to enforce the rules as they're established.

Now I'm done, and I'd love to hear your thoughts on how you're going to enforce the rules that are written—not make up Peter Fonseca's rules, but enforcing the rules that are in *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*.

**Mr. Matthew Green:** I have a point of order.

**The Chair:** Go ahead on a point of order, MP Green.

**Mr. Matthew Green:** I request that for every point of order, you ask that the Standing Orders be referenced, because none of that was a point of order and you have to chair the meeting. Please do that.

**The Chair:** Thank you, MP Green and MP Genuis.

Just before I go to my ruling, I will note again health and safety. I will not stop reiterating this for our interpreters. I have heard how crosstalk affects them and how many of them have been hurt, and we want to stop that from happening. I disagree with what MP Genuis had to say on that.

Now, on my ruling, and this is from *House of Commons Procedure and Practice* on page 1036—

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

**The Chair:** I'm giving my ruling.

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

**The Chair:** It is:

Substitutes for members who are officers of the committee (for example, its Chair or Vice-Chair) do not, however, assume the prerogatives or responsibilities related to these positions.

At meetings, the very principle of substitution means that it may occur only when the substituted member is absent from the meeting.

As we know and we all saw, MP Hallan was still here in the room as MP Genuis came through—I don't even know if he was sitting at the table—and started going on at the mic about whatever he was going on about.

That is my ruling, members.

MP Genuis, if you want to look at the House of Commons...that's my ruling.

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

**The Chair:** Do you want to challenge my ruling?

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Chair, you didn't rule on the question of privilege. I think you ruled on a question of order. To provide further clarity ahead of your ruling on the question of privilege—

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

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** —I at no point asserted that I was substituting.

**Mr. Matthew Green:** That's debate. Shut it down.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** It's not debate. It's a question of privilege.

**The Chair:** MP Genuis, I have given my ruling.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Mr. Green, are you engaging in crosstalk?

**The Chair:** I have given my ruling, members. That is it. We are going—

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** On point of order, Chair, you didn't reference the question of privilege at all.

**The Chair:** I have given my ruling, MP Genuis.

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

**The Chair:** Go ahead.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** You didn't reference the question of privilege at all—

**Mr. Matthew Green:** That's debate.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** —and Mr. Green is engaging in crosstalk. I don't know if you have anything to say to him about that or not, but he's still talking.

**Mr. Matthew Green:** My mic is not on.

**The Chair:** MP Genuis, I have given my ruling.

We're going back to—

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

**The Chair:** Go ahead on a point of order.

**Mr. Philip Lawrence:** Before your ruling, I asked to speak to the question of privilege. Are we discussing that now or was that your ruling on it?

**The Chair:** I have given my ruling.

**Mr. Philip Lawrence:** Was it on the privilege issue?

**The Chair:** I gave my ruling on MP Genuis coming to the table, looking to speak as a substitute and not having MP Hallan out of the room, which I asked for.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** On a point of order, Chair, I was not seeking to speak as a substitute. I was seeking to speak as an associate member and as the elected member for Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan.

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

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** You don't have to like me personally, but you are dead wrong on the rules, and I invite the clerk to weigh in. The clerk should be invited to weigh in on this. It is an important principle of Parliament—

**The Chair:** We'll suspend.

● (35530) \_\_\_\_\_ (Pause) \_\_\_\_\_

● (35535)

**The Chair:** We are back.

After conferring with the clerks, I can say, MP Genuis, that this is not a question of privilege. First, I did not recognize you as a member and you had not been substituted. There was no consent from members to hear you speak. You just barged through the doors. If 338 members wanted to run through the door and start doing what you did, it would be mayhem. It would be chaos. We would not have decorum, so to maintain decorum, that is what took place.

Once you've been substituted, you are at the table. However, there was no consent from members to hear you. You just turned on your mic and started going, and that is not allowed.

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

**The Chair:** Go ahead, Mr. Genuis.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Chair, I didn't just turn on my mic and start speaking. I said "point of order".

**Mr. Matthew Green:** That's still debate.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** The way you raise a matter of order is by saying "point of order". Then you're recognized and you continue.

**The Chair:** MP Genuis, I just said that you did not have consent and you were not substituted.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** On a point of order, I don't need the consent of other members to raise a point of order. It's a dramatically new concept to say that you need the consent of other members of a committee to raise a point of order.

**The Chair:** You would have to be at the committee, and you would have to be recognized by the chair or have implied consent. You did not have it and you just started speaking.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Could the clerk speak? I don't think your interpretation of the rules is accurate. The clerk knows the rules.

**The Chair:** I've given my ruling to members.

With that, we are now going to MP Turnbull.

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

**The Chair:** Go ahead on your point of order.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Is your ruling that associate members cannot raise points of order?

**The Chair:** MP Genuis, you were not at the table. There was no consent to have you speak. You barged into this room and into this committee.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Chair, what does it mean to say that I barged in? I opened the door and walked through it, and I sat at the table. I'm an elected member of Parliament, and I'm an associate member of this committee.

**The Chair:** MP Genuis, we are going back—

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** I don't need your permission to do my job as an MP.

**The Chair:** MP Genuis—

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Part of my job is to sit on committees.

**The Chair:** Sure, you can sit on the committee. Right now, you are subbed into the committee. You are sitting on the committee—

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Even if I'm not subbed in—

**The Chair:** No, you must be. As I said, we cannot have 338 members or 100 senators run through the door and start grabbing the mic. You do need to be recognized by the chair, and you need consent from the committee.

I'm going back to MP Turnbull.

**Mr. Arnold Viersen:** I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** We are going to MP Turnbull.

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** Thank you, Chair. I appreciate having the floor back after that display of—

**Mr. Arnold Viersen:** I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

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

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

**Mr. Philip Lawrence:** I had a point of order that got cut off and got lost in the discussion, but I did ask to speak prior to your ruling, and then you gave the ruling.

**The Chair:** Yes, I gave my ruling.

**Mr. Philip Lawrence:** Yes, but before that, I asked to speak to it and you acknowledged me.

**The Chair:** Do you mean my ruling?

**Mr. Philip Lawrence:** I said I would like to speak to the question of privilege. I don't know whether you heard me—that's fair game—but I definitely said it and you acknowledged it.

**The Chair:** No, my ruling was on MP Genuis being able to speak and being at the table.

**Mr. Philip Lawrence:** Will you be ruling on the question of privilege?

**The Chair:** I ruled that at the time MP Genuis came through the door, he was not substituted in.

**Mr. Philip Lawrence:** All right, so that was your ruling on the question of privilege.

**The Chair:** At committee, it is up to the chair to recognize somebody at the table, if they so desire, and you need the implicit consent of members. The consent of members was not there to have MP Genuis speak.

**Mr. Philip Lawrence:** My objection, if you will, is that when I requested specifically to speak to that prior to the ruling, you didn't give me the opportunity to speak.

**The Chair:** I'm sorry. I didn't hear that, but MP Viersen, you have been substituted, and MP Genuis has left the room.

**Mr. Philip Lawrence:** I'm not concerned so much with the formality of it, but I did ask to be recognized. You acknowledged me, and I didn't get recognized. A simple admission of that and perhaps an apology would be warranted.

**The Chair:** MP Lawrence, I've given my ruling. As I said, I was speaking about MP Genuis and the points that he brought up.

I've given the ruling on the substitution so that everybody is well aware of it. I'm glad that MP Viersen has now been substituted the way that it should be done, because I saw that MP Viersen was trying to speak at the table and was not recognized by the chair. He did not have consent, I believe, from members to do so, but now that he is at the table and substituted in, he is able to.

Go ahead, MP Lawrence.

**Mr. Philip Lawrence:** Mr. Chair, I've brought this up three times now, and you haven't addressed it once, so I'm going to do it again.

**The Chair:** MP Lawrence, I have addressed it. I feel that I have addressed it. You may not feel that way, but we are—

**Mr. Philip Lawrence:** I'm going to continue my point of order. I just want the opportunity to go through the confluence of events.

Mr. Genuis raised a question of privilege. I put up my hand and said that I would like to speak to that question of privilege, which, under the rules, you have to allow; it's not a choice of yours. You then recognized me. You clearly gave me some type of gesture. I assumed that it meant you were going to allow me to speak prior to you making your ruling. A simple acknowledgement of that would be great.

**The Chair:** I will have to go through the video to see what was said, MP Lawrence. What was happening was a lot of crosstalk and a lot of back-and-forth, mostly from MP Genuis. It didn't matter who was speaking; he would jump in, which was very disrespectful and did not help with the decorum at this committee. I will look into where you may have wanted to come in.

You have had the opportunity to speak. I hear what you're saying and I did give my ruling. I don't know how you feel or how other members feel, but I feel very strongly about the health and safety of the people here in this room and those who are doing a tremendous job to keep up with interpretation. It's unacceptable—and I won't allow it—for members like MP Genuis to come in here and start screaming. The antics only hurt people and the health and safety of those who work on the Hill.

**Mr. Philip Lawrence:** On a point of order, I honestly don't want to belabour this, but I believe it's important.

One thing that will help me from crosstalking is the belief that you will acknowledge my point of order, that you will acknowledge me. I had expressed a desire to speak to Mr. Genuis's question of privilege, and you ignored that and went right to your ruling. That encourages me to crosstalk, not because I want to hurt anyone—I certainly don't; our interpreters do great work—but because I have 100,000 people in Northumberland—Peterborough South who are counting on me to raise that voice.

**The Chair:** Thank you, MP Lawrence.

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

**The Chair:** Go ahead on a point of order, MP Turnbull.

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** My understanding is that if the Conservatives want to challenge your ruling, they can do that, but otherwise, I think we need to move on with the debate.

I had the floor. I was interrupted for I don't know how long, but for quite a while. I represent 142,000 people, whom I want to speak on behalf of, and I was interrupted over and over again. I'd like to finish my remarks, and I hope I can have the floor back.

**The Chair:** Go ahead, MP Viersen.

**Mr. Arnold Viersen:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I still don't think we have clarity on your ruling on privilege. While I appreciate that you read from chapter 20 of *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*—I'm reading from the 2017 edition—if you had continued reading, the next paragraph says:

The Standing Orders provide that any Member, whether affiliated with a political party or sitting as an independent, may take part in the public proceedings of any committee of which he or she is not a member, unless the House or the committee in question orders otherwise.

There is no special order governing the proceedings of this particular meeting, so any member can sit down at the table and participate in the debate. If it is a timed debate and we are moving through the order, a member of Parliament may say they will share their time with another member.

Points of order can be made by any member of Parliament who sits at this table. They don't need to be substituted to do that. That is why the privilege issue has come up. You failed to recognize Mr. Genuis as a member of Parliament who is allowed to sit here.

I hope we're making the point that you can't just decide who gets recognized at committee based on their party affiliation. I hope you can clarify that, make sure you understand the rules and rule appropriately on this question of privilege.

**The Chair:** Thank you, MP Viersen.

I thought I was clear. For a non-sitting member of the committee or someone who has not been substituted in—someone who walks through the door, such as a member of Parliament or a senator—to sit at the table and have the opportunity to speak to the committee and participate, they would need consent from members and would require consent from the chair. That was not given.

MP Genuis walked through the door, sat down at the table, turned on his mic and interrupted members who had the floor and were speaking to what we are debating at this time. That is what happened and that is how I have ruled.

MP Viersen.

**Mr. Arnold Viersen:** I'm not quite sure how to proceed from here, because I don't read any of that in the rules. The rules say that members of Parliament may participate at committee. They may not vote, they may not be counted for quorum and they may not move motions, but every member of Parliament has the opportunity to participate at committee. There is no requirement for unanimous consent for a member to participate in a public hearing.

The ability to move a point of order belongs to every member of Parliament by virtue of them being a member of Parliament. It's our collective responsibility to make sure this place works, so any member of Parliament may raise a point of order to ensure that committees are being run according to the rules. That is what we are attempting to do here today.

**The Chair:** Thank you, MP Viersen.

It says that they “may” participate, but they need consent from members. It's not unanimous consent; it's just that members must consent to someone being at the table.

Many members have participated at this committee who were not standing members of it or who had not been substituted but came to the table. The members around the room, including the chair, see and recognize members and have them at the table. What the rules do not allow for is someone barging through the door, sitting at the table, turning on their mic and saying whatever they want to say. They do not allow for that. That is my interpretation. As you know, we would not have decorum.

I'll tell you what happened here, MP Viersen, and I want to go back to MP Lawrence. Because of all the crosstalk and back-and-forth with MP Genuis, I may have missed something MP Lawrence said, but that's what happened. Again, we cannot have these types of chaotic antics from members. It would be disruptive, and it would not allow committees to do their work. I don't think any member from any party would want that at this committee.

We have a lot of work to do here, important work. We have a budget implementation act, and we're hearing debate. That is what we are working on, MP Viersen.

**Mr. Arnold Viersen:** May I interact with that, Mr. Chair? The point is that a member of Parliament, in order to move a point of order at a committee, does not have to be subbed in. Were you making the ruling that, in order to move a point of order, you have to be subbed in? Was that your ruling?

**The Chair:** MP Viersen, it's about recognizing a member or a senator who was not sitting at the table, not subbed into the committee, not recognized—when we had, actually, a member who was in the middle of debate, speaking here at committee—who came in and just interrupted at the table. No, they do need some implied consent from the members, and I did not see that for MP Genuis when he came in. That is what took place.

Once he was substituted in, sure, then the member was recognized and he was able to speak, but prior to that, that was not the case.

**Mr. Arnold Viersen:** I still dispute all of that—

**Mr. Matthew Green:** Then challenge the chair.

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** Let's vote on it.

**Mr. Arnold Viersen:** —with the fact that the rules clearly state that associate members—and every member of Parliament is an associate member of every committee—may not vote, move motions or be counted for purposes of quorum but, beyond that, are able to participate. In order to move a point of order, they don't need to be subbed in. That is the point.

I don't know what page it is on, but it's in chapter 20. It's the sixth paragraph down. I encourage you to read that again so you understand that, in order to be recognized by the committee, I don't have to be subbed in. That is the point we are trying to make here, and that is the—

**The Chair:** You made your point. I don't know if you're going to challenge.... Are you challenging my ruling?

**Mr. Arnold Viersen:** I'm not sure how that would....

**The Chair:** Thank you, MP Viersen.

We go back to PS Turnbull, please.

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** Thanks, Chair.

It's really great to get back to what I was saying. I was just talking about the good-faith attempt we made to work with the Conservatives to come up with an agenda for this committee that would move us through May and June in an orderly fashion to accomplish all the things we had on our agenda, including some of the studies that were before the committee but haven't been completed. That included, obviously, the first order of priority, which is the budget implementation act.

The Conservatives withheld support for that. That's fine. It's their prerogative to do so, but for them to come to committee and suggest that I somehow table-dropped a motion.... The motion I brought to committee was exactly what we had discussed in our previous meeting, so it wasn't a big surprise. Everybody knew what priorities we had identified. I think the Conservatives knew very quickly that they were in the minority in the membership of this committee. That's why we're in a filibuster today.

The Conservatives put forward an amendment and then a subamendment. The subamendment is what we're debating now. It is exactly what the Conservatives are avoiding a vote on. Really, what we're doing here is listening to five and a half hours—I guess it's now going on six and a half hours just today—of a filibuster from the Conservatives. I'm just pointing out what it is for anybody who's still paying attention and still has the patience to pay attention to these committee proceedings. I hope they are paying attention.

In reality, the Conservatives know the vote isn't going to go their way on the subamendment. Therefore, they're holding this committee hostage by continuing to talk ad infinitum. What we heard from MP Chambers earlier was him reading, for over an hour, the transcript from a podcast of Mark Carney on *The Herle Burly*. We had him reading that into the record, which is certainly not the most creative filibuster I've ever heard by far. Anyway, I guess some Conservatives lack imagination. That's okay.

In reality, all we want to do is get down to business on the budget implementation act. Why? In my view, that's what the 142,000 members of my community want to see me working on. The budget implementation act entails key supports for Canadians.

Conservatives are citing.... One of their members here did a kind of drive-by, insulting me and then leaving the committee room. It was Mr. Jivani. I would invite him to come back and continue the conversation.

What's interesting is that he talked about food banks and food bank lineups. We hear the Conservatives every day in the House of Commons citing food bank lineups as if they truly care about the people in those lineups. We're putting forward a national school food program, which is going to feed 400,000 children across Canada over the next five years. That's a billion dollars of investment.

How can the Conservatives, while sitting there, literally filibustering and blocking important work on the budget implementation act, tell me they actually care about people in food bank lineups? They're blocking real support for Canadians, such as dental care, additional child care spaces, pharmacare, the national school food program and the Canada disability benefit. These are key supports for those very families they say they care about.

I find it a bit rich. It's hard for me to accept them at face value when they're sitting here, spouting stuff off as if they really care about Canadian families. I don't believe it. It's just misleading. I don't know how I can interpret that as authentic and genuine commitment for their constituents.

I know my constituents care about a national school food program. They care about the clean technology manufacturing and clean hydrogen tax credits. They care about the Canada carbon rebate for small business. They care about enhancing the homebuyers' plan and extending the ban on foreign investment in Canadian housing by two years. They care about the Canada Education Savings Act and the automatic enrolment we're putting forward in the BIA, as well as many of the other things that are included in the BIA.

What's interesting, though, just to go back to last week, which was our constituency week.... I understand the Conservatives wanted to put forward a Standing Order 106(4) to call an emergency meeting. What's interesting is that I had indicated to the Conservatives in the previous week that I was more than open and that our whole side of the committee here, in terms of Liberal members, was open to studying anti-money laundering.

They used valuable committee resources and then came and got upset because they tripped themselves up. Their Standing Order 106(4) motion was during a week that we had previously suspended a meeting, so they ended up having to continue their filibuster on Mr. Morantz's subamendment. They didn't like that, of course. They, again, tried to flip it around—flip the script—and blame the Liberal members.

In reality, the budget implementation act has numerous significant measures to enhance combatting money laundering. I note that several of my colleagues have already read into the record portions of the BIA that deal specifically with anti-money laundering. I won't go into depth on that. However, I do feel that it's important to point out the fact that Conservatives say they want to study anti-money laundering, yet they're blocking the budget implementation act and the study of that budget bill includes anti-money laundering measures that are really significant.

We've also indicated that we would happily study that after we finish the work on the BIA. That's not good enough for them either. Not only are they blocking essential work on anti-money laundering through the BIA, but they're also not willing to concede that we're being reasonable and working in good faith, saying that we're willing to have meetings on anti-money laundering if the Conservatives want to continue work on that topic. We're more than happy to do that. Why? It's because we have a record that, every single year and every single FES and budget bill, there have been additional measures on anti-money laundering. Our government feels confident that we're moving forward and that we take those issues seri-

ously. There are things that we can continue to study and offer solutions and measures on to continue to combat money laundering, which is a serious topic.

I just think it's a bit rich that Conservatives are sitting there claiming that we're essentially not.... They basically claim that we're blocking our own BIA, when the truth is that the Conservatives are filibustering on their own subamendment. That's what's challenging for me to accept.

I'm just pointing out what is, honestly, before the committee. To me, this is eating into valuable committee time and resources that could be dedicated to hearing key witnesses on the budget implementation act.

I had a member from the Conservatives say earlier—I think it was MP Hallan—that he had criticism, critiques and questions for the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance. She already appeared at this committee and took questions for an hour from the members of this committee on the BIA. It doesn't quite jibe—what the Conservatives have said here at committee today and the actual truth, which is that the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance has already answered significant questions that have come from opposition parties. I think that's important. We felt it certainly was important that the minister come and answer those questions.

I think the other thing for me is this: When you have members who read the transcripts of a podcast into the record, whether they're related to the subamendment or not, it just shows that they're intent on wasting time and that they're not really interested in studying affordability. They're not really interested in dealing with any of the issues that they say they want to deal with, considering that the budget implementation act deals with affordability issues and anti-money laundering.

We've said that if you want to invite Mark Carney as a witness, go ahead. I understand that their interest is purely partisan.

I think MP Davies when he was here covered that quite well in demonstrating that Conservatives have said from the beginning that they only want to have Mr. Carney come to committee for their partisan purposes. They want to speculate on his intentions, and I just don't see.... Fine, invite him, but working him into a motion clearly has an alternative motive that I think is an abuse of parliamentary power and we shouldn't be doing that unless there's a good reason to do so. We have seen in the past Conservatives use a summons and try to summons private citizens to committee. I think we should only do that in very limited circumstances.

From my perspective—it would be really great—if Conservatives really want to get down to business on anti-money laundering, or any host of other issues that they've cited, then why don't we vote on the subamendment and why won't Conservatives allow us to vote here today on the subamendment that they put forward? Is it because they know they are going to lose that vote, or is it that they just don't really want to get to the study of the budget implementation act?

It's pretty clear to me that they don't want to study the budget implementation act at all, because if they did we could be using the valuable time and resources we have this week to hear from witnesses, which would be, I think, valuable.

I have 300 witnesses I bet would be willing to come before this committee and speak to the national school food program and the importance of it across Canada, not to mention many other witnesses for many of the other measures that are included in the budget implementation act. I think it would serve our constituents well if we were actually doing the work that this committee is tasked with doing, which is actually studying the budget that's before this committee.

I would say let's get to a vote. I don't have high hopes for the Conservatives allowing that to happen because of the obstruction that we have seen throughout this committee and many other committees. I know that it's not just this committee that they are obstructing. We saw it on the sustainable jobs act. We have seen it on the updates to the Atlantic accords. We have seen it in very many other circumstances.

Since I have been here since 2019, I have seen many a Conservative filibuster. They don't want to get down to the work of this committee even though in good faith we have said, yes, let's study AML after we finish the budget implementation act. That's not good enough. They want to have it their way, and they don't want to do the work that is, I would say, the top priority of a finance committee, which is to study the budget implementation act.

Okay, I'll leave it there, Chair. Thanks very much.

**The Chair:** Thank you, MP Turnbull.

Now I have MP Thompson, then MP Goodridge, MP Morantz, MP Hallan and MP Lawrence.

**Ms. Joanne Thompson:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I certainly want to echo some of the comments from my colleagues. I would be happy to sit in a late sitting tonight if we were speaking with witnesses, but to sit in another filibuster is not why I put my name forward as a member of Parliament. It is not what my constituents are asking me to do, especially in these final weeks of the sitting session.

To ensure that I remain relevant, I'll be very clear. Mr. Carney is welcome to come to the committee. If the Conservatives would like to put his name forward as a witness, that's their choice, but as a private citizen.... I have not heard a single argument in these very painful hours that we've been in a filibuster that supports why we should bring a private citizen to this committee.

My colleague Mr. Turnbull referenced that the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance was at committee on May 9 and she did answer our questions on the BIA.

I want to highlight and reiterate just very quickly a couple of the points Mr. Turnbull made on some of the key social programs and health programs that I know my constituents want to see moving forward. It is incredibly important: the continuation of child care and the expansion of spots; the national school food program—this is so important for children, for families, and this is food security—and pharmacare with contraceptive supports and diabetes supports.

One of the things that I haven't heard spoken about enough is how important the diabetes medication supports are in a preventative sense. Indeed, it can ensure that someone in the early stages of this chronic disease process is able to be stabilized and to not move

to the much more invasive and difficult aspects of diabetes, if they have access to the necessary medications and testing tools.

To hold up these these important programs in a filibuster when we really need to have witnesses before committee who will once again continue to speak about how important this is, I don't believe is a good use of our resources.

I want to spend a few moments to speak about the housing initiatives, because I hear so often in the House about how important housing is to Canadians, and I agree that it is. I'm very proud of the work the Liberal government is doing to ensure we address this problem. Within this budget implementation act—and again, these are the things that we should be debating—is the availability of public lands for home plans: to be able to build on Canada Post properties, National Defence lands and in office buildings. This is something that I have heard the Conservative opposition members speak about over and over. It's in our budget. Let's talk about it.

We're building more rental apartments. Again, it's something that we hear about over and over in debate, both in the House and in committee. There's \$15 billion in new loan funding for the apartment construction loan program. That could bring a total of 131,000 new homes by 2031. Let's talk about that.

We're launching the Canada builds initiative, a team Canada approach to building more affordable homes for the middle class on underutilized lands across the country. This program brings forward federal low-cost loans with provincial and territorial investments to scale up construction—again, a solid program that can expand the availability of housing for middle-class Canadians.

We're providing a \$400-million top-up to the \$4-billion housing accelerator fund. This program is in my community of St. John's East. It's incredibly important. It is welcomed by the community. My constituents want to see us move forward on this program.

We're launching a \$1.5-billion Canada rental protection fund to protect and grow the stock of affordable housing in Canada, and providing \$1 billion for the affordable housing fund to build affordable homes and launch a permanent rapid housing stream—again, very important. This is also part of homelessness prevention by having homes available along a continuum of need from true homelessness to market investment and investing an additional \$1.3 billion in Reaching Home Canada. That is the Canadian homelessness program.

Yes, we have to do so much to help the most vulnerable in our community to have a respectable place to call home. Let's talk about that. Let's look through the important allocation of funds within the budget so we can ensure that we have the rollout of supports for all Canadians across the country.

I can continue. There's streamlining foreign credential recognition for construction sectors, working to narrow the housing gap in indigenous communities and incentivizing Canada's educational institutions to build more housing for students. We heard this through the FES. We heard it in the pre-budget consultation. We hear it from our constituents—at least, I hear it from my constituents. I hear it in the House continually. I hear it in committee. We need to address housing concerns.

This is a robust plan to help all Canadians have a place to call home. I plead with opposition members to let us have a vote. Let's end the debate on the subamendment. Let's move to the work that Canadians have sent us to this important House of Commons, this Parliament, to do. It's the work of ensuring that we meet the needs of all Canadians.

I refuse to take up another 20 minutes just reading notes, but I absolutely ask my opposition colleagues to stop this. Let's get back to the work we are here to do. I'm happy to sit with witnesses. I'm happy to do what needs to be done to move this budget forward, but this filibuster needs to stop.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you, MP Thompson.

I have the list here. MP Morantz is next.

**Mr. Marty Morantz:** Thank you, Mr. Chair—

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** I'm sorry, Chair. I have a point of order.

Could you read the whole list so members know when they're coming up?

**The Chair:** Yes, MP Genuis. I have read the list many a time, but I will read it again. I have MP Morantz, MP Hallan, MP Lawrence and MP Chambers.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Can I be added to the list after that, Chair?

Thank you very much.

**The Chair:** I'm sorry, but you are not subbed in, MP Genuis.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Thank you for recognizing my point of order. I appreciate the improvement we're seeing in the adherence to the rules.

**The Chair:** Okay. Let's get back to MP Morantz, please.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** I should be added to the list, though, regardless of whether or not I'm subbed in. I have a right to be added to the list, Chair.

**The Chair:** We'll ask for the committee's consent to hear MP Genuis. Do we have consent? No.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** You don't need the committee's consent.

**The Chair:** We didn't find consent, so we're going to go to MP Morantz.

I've given you a ruling on that already, MP Genuis, here at the committee, to MP Viersen.

Go ahead, MP Morantz.

**Mr. Marty Morantz:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I think it's important to take a step back, because I know there are many people watching this committee meeting right now across the country, and it may not be clear to them what it is we're talking about. We need to take a step back—it's been a few days that we've been trying to deal with this programming motion—and explain to those watching what it is we're doing here.

Right now, we're debating a subamendment that I put forward on a motion. Basically, what it says is that on the week of the 28th, one meeting be dedicated to hearing from the Minister of Finance for two hours, one meeting be dedicated to hearing from Mark Carney for three hours, and that clause-by-clause not begin until the aforementioned witnesses appear for the requested times.

Now, in order to understand what that means, we need to back up and look at the motion as a whole—

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** I'm sorry, Chair. I have a point of order.

**The Chair:** He has been substituted.

MP Genuis.

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

Actually, I can raise a point of order, regardless of whether or not I'm subbed in. I would commend to you the reading of the rules.

Now that I am subbed in, regardless, it should not be a matter of controversy that I ask to be added to the list. Can you confirm that I've been added to the list? I know Mr. Baker wanted to prevent me from speaking, but alas, he will not be able to—

**The Chair:** You're on the list.

We'll go back to MP Morantz, please.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** —and he will have to hear from me regardless.

**The Chair:** MP Morantz has the floor.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Thank you.

**Mr. Marty Morantz:** The motion as a whole reads.... I'll just go through it so that people watching will understand what we're doing. Basically, it was a Liberal motion to program out the rest of our meetings through to the end of this session, which is probably going to be around the third week of June. They put forward a motion that.... Ironically, this motion was given to Mr. Davies the night before it was introduced at committee but it was not given to Mr. Hallan, so it was a surprise to us when this motion was dropped.

In fact, it's interesting to hear the Liberals talk about hearing witnesses because we had half of the public servants at the finance committee here the moment that Mr. Turnbull dropped this motion that resulted in this filibuster. It's a bit rich to say that we're holding up hearing from witnesses when they started this whole debacle in the first place. In any event, it is what it is. We have now this programming motion in front of us. I'm just going to go through it because I think it's important that people understand and that they're grounded in what it is that we're discussing.

It says:

As relates to the committee's future business, it be agreed that:

- i. the committee dedicate its meeting on Thursday May 9th, 2024, to hearing from the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, and officials, on the subject matter study of Bill C-69....

Now, I just want to say that I know Mr. Turnbull made the point a moment ago that the Minister of Finance came already for an hour. However, this is his motion, so he clearly wants her to come here again. He can't say that he doesn't because the first thing in his motion calls for the Minister of Finance to come to this committee. Am I not right? That's what it says. I don't know why he's now saying that he doesn't want her to be here. It's very strange. Maybe he'll vote against his own motion now.

Then it says:

- ii. the committee dedicate its regular meetings on May 9th, 21st, 23rd, 28th and 30th, 2024, to consideration of the subject matter study of Bill C-69....

Now, I think it's important to also mention to people watching that Bill C-69 actually isn't even here at this committee. It's still in the House of Commons, interestingly, because the Liberals can't seem to manage their legislative affairs. We're actually debating a programming motion about a bill that this committee isn't even seized with. Go figure. We're the ones who are blamed for delaying it, but it's still in the House. In fact, to get it out of the House and to committee, they had to bring forward a motion to cut off debate today. Of course, the NDP voted with them again.

I don't know why the NDP keeps carrying water for the Liberals. I mean, I can understand, you know.... They signed a supply and confidence agreement, but what's interesting is that they vote with the Liberals on almost everything. In fact, Mr. Davies voted with them to shut down our Standing Order 106(4) motion on Friday, which was just to study money laundering. Why is the NDP voting with the Liberals to stop studying money laundering? I don't understand it, Mr. Chair. I do remember there was a time when the NDP was actually an opposition party, when they had substantial leaders, like Jack Layton—may he rest in peace—and Tom Mulcair, who would grill Prime Minister Harper relentlessly in question period. However, they're not that party anymore. They've become sycophants for the Liberals, and I don't really understand why. Anyway, the great political minds in the NDP party, I guess, think that this is somehow a good idea.

Then comes my subamendment. It says that, on the week of the 28th, one meeting be dedicated to hearing from the minister for two hours and one meeting be dedicated to hear from Mark Carney for three hours, and that clause-by-clause not begin until the aforementioned witnesses appear for the requested times.

On the subject of the Minister of Finance, one of the reasons.... I want to touch on this issue of money laundering as well, and it is relevant, I assure you, Mr. Chair. If you bear with me for a few minutes, I'm going to make sure that this committee and its members understand exactly how money laundering is relevant to the Minister of Finance appearing at this committee, which is why it's in my subamendment.

The reason is very simple. The Minister of Finance wrote a letter to you, Mr. Chair, on October 6, 2023. Let's see: November, December, January, February, March, April and May. It was over sev-

en months ago that she wrote a letter to the Honourable Peter Fonseca, P.C., M.P., chair of the Standing Committee on Finance.

Dear Mr. Fonseca:

I am writing to request your assistance with the fourth five-year parliamentary review of the Proceeds of Crime (Money Laundering) and Terrorist Financing Act (PCMLTFA).

Pursuant to section 72 of [that Act], a committee of Parliament is to conduct a review of the Act's administration and operation every five years. This legislative requirement helps to ensure that the PCMLTFA remains dynamic and responsive to emerging money laundering and terrorist financing threats—

That is very serious business, Mr. Chair.

—and is consistent with evolving international standards aimed at combating those crimes.

That was seven months ago. Then she wrote:

The last review of [the Act] was completed in November 2018.

By my count, that's more than five years. We have a statutory obligation to review this legislation after five years, and now we're in the sixth year—seven months after the minister wrote the letter to this committee.

It says that:

The PCMLTFA does not designate a specific committee of Parliament to undertake the review. I am requesting that the Standing Committee on Finance conduct the review.

After conducting the review, the Committee would be required to submit a report to Parliament recommending any changes to the PCMLTFA or its administration. I suggest the review of the PCMLTFA be initiated this fall—

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

I have the amendment and the subamendment before me. I note that we're debating the subamendment, I believe.

I think the amendment was where AML was covered, not the subamendment, which I believe you read into the record, so I question the relevance here and suggest that this is not part of the subamendment we're debating.

**The Chair:** Thank you, PS Turnbull.

MP Morantz, this is your subamendment. Do you want to speak to that?

**Mr. Marty Morantz:** I did explain the relevance, Mr. Chair. Perhaps I'll explain it again. I'll have to back up because maybe Mr. Turnbull wasn't listening.

This is directly relevant because the subamendment calls for the Minister of Finance to come to the committee. I'll read it again: "the week of the 28th one meeting be dedicated to hearing from the Minister [of Finance] for two hours".

This issue of the letter from the finance minister is relevant because she is the finance minister, and the subamendment, which we are currently debating, calls for her to appear at this committee. I don't think you could rule that it is not relevant, Mr. Chair, but you're free to give it a go if you like.

In any event, I'll just finish reading the letter. It's almost done:

After conducting the review, the Committee would be required to submit a report to Parliament recommending any changes—

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** I have a point of order.

I'm sorry to do this again, but I believe this was already read into the record. This is the third time. Again, I question the repetition. It is a point of order on relevance. We already had it read into the record in our Friday committee meeting, and it was once again read into the record today. This is now the third time.

**The Chair:** Thank you, MP Turnbull.

**Mr. Marty Morantz:** Mr. Chair, I'll make this simple. I'll capitulate to the letter having been read in already. I think I have made my point.

**The Chair:** MP Morantz, please continue.

**Mr. Marty Morantz:** The point is that I signed on to a letter that called for an emergency meeting under the Standing Orders. Standing Order 106(4) says that the chair “shall” call the meeting when it's signed by at least four members from two different parties, so we met the standard required in Standing Order 106(4).

Maybe the clerk could correct me, but I think I recall a notice of meeting actually coming out, which was retracted afterward and then replaced with the notice for the suspended meeting. I could be wrong about that; maybe I'm confusing it with another committee.

Did that happen? It did happen, so I am right about that. A notice of meeting was actually issued according to Standing Order 106(4), and I thought we were having a meeting about Standing Order 106(4). Then, a day later, all of a sudden, an email came from the clerk saying that notice of meeting was being withdrawn. You'll see, when you have a chance to catch up and talk to the clerk about it, that the notice of meeting was withdrawn.

Do you guys remember that?

**An hon. member:** I do.

• (35625) \_\_\_\_\_ (Pause) \_\_\_\_\_

• (35630)

**The Chair:** We're back.

MP Morantz, I just conferred with the clerk, so I think he should explain what has taken place.

**The Clerk:** In the past when a meeting was suspended, 106(4) requests had been accepted in order to have a meeting between two suspended meetings. That's happened in the past, and this is a precedent that has happened, as I just said. That's the advice I gave to the chair, and that's why he called meeting 143, while meeting 142 was suspended.

The committee's directorate had a discussion when this happened and decided to change the way they were going to deal with the situation, and they no longer permit having a new meeting, while the meeting is suspended—between two suspensions.

The committee's directorate is where all the committee clerks work, including management and the logistics officer. It's the entire directorate that we work for.

The directorate, my managers, decided this would change. They told me to inform the chair that meeting 143 would be removed and would be replaced with the resumption of meeting 142 in order for the chair to fulfill the request of Standing Order 106(4) to let the committee decide what it wanted to do—if it wanted to discuss the subject of Standing Order 106(4) or resume the debate of Bill C-69, which we were in.

**Mr. Marty Morantz:** This raises all kinds of other questions for me, which I don't know whether we can cover in this conversation, but I think, from what the clerk just said, there was precedent for the 106(4) to be called as a subsequently enumerated meeting even while a suspended meeting was in place. Because of that precedent, they actually sent out a notice of meeting. I have, somewhere in my inbox, a notice of meeting for meeting number 143. Because we signed onto a 106(4) letter that met the standards of that standing order—because there were enough members who signed up from more than one political party—that notice of meeting was withdrawn. I've never seen that in the time I've been here, that a notice of meeting has been withdrawn and then replaced with a notice of another meeting. From what the clerk explained, it's because the public servants who form what he called the committees directorate decided they would rather see the committee make those decisions, which is fair enough.

My point is exactly that. Here we have a story that has just been broken about TD Bank in the U.S. having a huge problem with money laundering. We're seven months out from the finance minister, to whom Mr. Turnbull is actually the parliamentary secretary, requesting that we review that legislation, and we had the 106(4).

Even with all of that, Mr. Chair, when I moved that we do exactly what the clerk thought the committee could consider doing—I moved that in that meeting, and you'll see it when you review the tape—which was to proceed to consider the 106(4), every Liberal and Mr. Davis voted against it. I find it really astounding that they could say on the one hand that they care about money laundering, but also that we should have a look at the BIA—which isn't even before us at this committee but is actually in the House—and they won't take the opportunity to have one meeting to talk about money laundering.

However, that being said, just for the folks watching, the next paragraphs state the following:

iii. that any amendments to the bill be submitted no later than 5:00 PM EST on Thursday, May 30th, 2024;

iv. clause-by-clause consideration of the bill start no later than 12:00 PM EST on June 3rd, 2024, and that the Chair be empowered to set up extended hours and request additional House resources on that day; if the Committee has not completed clause-by-clause consideration of the Bill by 11:00 AM on May 28th, 2024, 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 all questions necessary...

And so on and so forth.

I don't think I need to read the last couple of provisions of it, but I do want to stay on the subamendment, Mr. Chair. I want to talk about the part of the subamendment that asks about hearing from Mark Carney. I don't want to hear the Liberals and the NDP say that he shouldn't come, that he is a private citizen and we shouldn't subpoena him or that there is no subpoena in here. There is no subpoena. It says that we dedicate a meeting to hear from him for three hours, so it's just disinformation to say that we're trying to subpoena Mr. Carney.

He is a private citizen, but he is the most public private citizen in the country, I would have to say. In fact, I think he is even out there. I see he is going to be raising money with Bonnie Crombie at a provincial Liberal Party fundraiser on June 11, 2024, on King Street in Toronto. It wouldn't surprise me if he did a fundraiser to raise money for the federal party, so he's out there. Not only is he doing that, but he actually appeared at the Senate banking committee, so it's not as though he's avoiding Parliament. He came to Parliament.

In fact, there were some very interesting questions and responses in that meeting. It's not quite a podcast, but there's actually a transcript from the Senate banking committee. I thought I would read into the record the transcript from the Senate banking committee because, since Mr. Carney isn't here, at least this committee can hear from him based on the words that he spoke in the Senate banking committee.

I'll start with Senator Housakos. His question was, "Mr. Carney, do you support Justin Trudeau's carbon tax, a carbon tax that seven out of ten premiers and the vast majority of Canadians feel is pummeling the working class from coast to coast to coast?"

Mr. Carney said, "I'd say the following, to go directly to the issues that we're discussing here today, as I said in my opening comments, the power of the financial sector, a financial sector that has disclosure, or a financial sector that has transition plans, a financial sector and an economy that benefits from a carbon credit market is that it pulls forward adjustment. It finances solutions. That's the core of it. It manages risks, helps workers find new and better employment.

"Where it's most powerful is where there is credible and predictable climate policy. The policy can be well into the future, but if it's credible, then the adjustment starts today and that's how we build a better economy.

"What's critical in policy—and there are a lot of different aspects to climate policy. There are regulations, subsidies, tax credits, carbon pricing and carbon credits, but what's critical, in my view, as we're building this financial system that has this power to find solutions for Canadians, is that if something is going to be changed, then something at least as good is put in its place.

"Ideally, if you are going to change something, you put in place something better that still has that credibility and predictability that has the power that drives investment. We're in a position right now where we need \$2 trillion of investment at the core of the economy".

Now, I didn't hear an answer to Mr. Housakos' question. Good on Senator Housakos, he actually followed up and said, "Mr. Carney,

can you answer the question? Are you in favour of Justin Trudeau's carbon tax? A yes or a no will suffice."

When Mr. Carney begins, "The point that I'm making", Senator Housakos interjects, "I didn't hear a yes or a no."

Mr. Carney is not answering the question. I mean, here he's literally avoiding the question. He's saying, "This is the joy of being a witness. You get to say what you think".

This is a great example as to why he should come here, because if he's going to continue to run to be the next leader of the Liberal Party, and you know, it's clear. I said this before, it's clear. It's not clear he wants to axe the tax, but he clearly wants to axe the Prime Minister.

He can't answer a simple question from Senator Housakos, so Senator Housakos continues. He says, "And the joy of being a senator is that we get to ask the question.

"Are you in favour of Justin Trudeau's carbon tax? Because to your point, Canada right now has fallen to sixty-second out of sixty-seven countries in the climate change index.

"I ask the question again: Is the carbon tax working, and are you in favour of Justin Trudeau's carbon tax?"

Mr. Carney says, "It's important that we have a forward-looking financial system that has information to manage it and that we have credible and predictable climate policy."

Again, it's painful to read this, actually. Mr. Carney is just avoiding this question, which is such an important question. If he's going to be in political life, he's got to be able to answer this question and he's not answering it.

Now, he does get a little closer to answering it, and Senator Martin did a good job. She was up next, and she said, "I wanted to go back to my colleague's question about whether you are for or against the carbon tax. I didn't hear a clear answer."

Mr. Carney says, "I think it served a purpose up until now."

Wow, that's interesting. Again, it opens up a lot of questions. What does he mean? Does he mean we should keep it? Does he mean it needs to be changed? Does he mean it needs to be scrapped? We don't know, but he obviously has opinions on it. He's just not being very up front about what those opinions are.

He says, "I think one can always look for better solutions, and as a country, we should always be open to better solutions for that.

"But the bar for those solutions—".

Senator Martin says, "Sorry, Mr. Carney. I think that was a yes, but I will move on to my next question."

Mr. Carney says, “I said it's been useful up until now. That's what I said.”

Senator Martin says, “Yes, thank you.”

There's a little bit more in the transcript that's not related specifically to the carbon tax. I won't belabour my colleagues with that.

I think I'm ready to pass the mic on to the next speaker, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Thank you, MP Morantz.

The next speaker I have is MP Lawrence.

**Mr. Philip Lawrence:** Thank you very much.

I'll just start at the outset and set the stage, as it were.

I have had the pleasure, or displeasure, however you want to frame it, of negotiating the programming for the budget. Although I certainly disagreed with Mr. Beech on a number of things, we were always able to conduct ourselves.... Mr. Beech, to his credit, always gave me the opportunity to comment, negotiate, talk and figure things out. There was never a programming motion that, quite frankly, I was not aware of.

By the time we had made it to committee, often, we had had hours in conversation. There were a couple of days back in the last budget where I think I spent more time talking to Mr. Beech than I did to my spouse, so while we didn't always come to a resolution, he certainly worked earnestly. That's why I was really surprised when we had a motion brought before us that was effectively table-dropped on us. Even in talking to the NDP's Don Davies, I learned that it was just given to him the night before.

It was generally not the way things have gone with respect to the budget. It's an incredibly important document, as has been said by numerous people, over 600 pages, so we really wanted time to negotiate it and to understand it.

If you look at the original motion, the original dates for the study of what has been called by a number of folks “the most important piece of legislation that government will put forward” were May 9,

21, 23, 28 and 30. That would be among the least amount of testimony that has occurred for a budget in recent Canadian history, which is troubling.

Now, of course, it is May 21, so we would only have three days available for meetings. To the NDP's credit, Mr. Davies's credit, he did bring forward an amendment to increase the amount of testimony, but clearly that is not substantial. I would have greatly enjoyed spending some of the break week going over this because I do believe it's of critical importance.

That being said, of course, we are where we are, which is really challenging. I would say, too, as a matter of public record, that the fall economic statement moved through the House in relatively fast order. Actually, we're still waiting, believe it or not, for, I should say, as a committee.... It took forever to get it to the House because the Liberals just wouldn't call it and put it through the House. I believe they're still speaking about the fall economic statement tonight, actually. It seems odd to me that we're almost at summer—it's the May 24 weekend—and we're still discussing the fall economic statement.

The competency of this government has never been in question, and I don't mean that in a good way, but I guess that at this point, I would like to talk about some of our substantive issues here.

**Mr. Arnold Viersen:** I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

Could you just confirm the speakers list, and if I'm not on it, could you put me on the end of it?

**The Chair:** I definitely will.

MP Lawrence has the floor right now, and then we have MP Chambers, MP Genuis, MP Green and MP Viersen.

**Mr. Arnold Viersen:** Thank you.

**Mr. Philip Lawrence:** I'd like to bring a motion to adjourn.

**The Chair:** There is a motion to adjourn.

(Motion agreed to: yeas 5; nays 4)

**The Chair:** The meeting is 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>