



NATIONAL ASSEMBLY

FIRST SESSION

FORTY-FIRST LEGISLATURE

Votes and Proceedings

of the Assembly

Thursday, 8 December 2016 — No. 220

**President of the National Assembly:
Mr. Jacques Chagnon**

QUÉBEC

The Assembly was called to order at 9.40 o'clock a.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Statements by Members

Mr. Fortin (Pontiac) made a statement to thank spouses who make balancing work and family easier.

Mr. Bérubé (Matane-Matapédia) made a statement to congratulate Mr. Patrick Lavoie, a team member of the Ottawa RedBlacks, Grey Cup winners.

Mr. Morin (Côte-du-Sud) made a statement to wish the citizens of Côte-du-Sud riding Happy Holidays.

Mr. Lemay (Masson) made a statement to thank politicians' families for their support.

Mr. Poëti (Marguerite-Bourgeoys) made a statement to pay tribute to Mr. Littorio Del Signore, painter.

8 December 2016

Mr. Roy (Bonaventure) made a statement to thank politicians' families for their support.

Mr. Habel (Sainte-Rose) made a statement to congratulate École Curé-Antoine-Labelle, recipient of the "Développement pédagogique" award.

Mr. Lamontagne (Johnson) made a statement to underline the 35th anniversary of the Voltigeurs de Drummondville.

Mrs. Simard (Charlevoix-Côte-de-Beaupré) made a statement to pay tribute to Mrs. Dominique Maltais for her snowboarding career.

Mr. Turcotte (Saint-Jean) made a statement to underline the 35th anniversary of the Conseil économique et Tourisme Haut-Richelieu.

At 9.53 o'clock a.m., Mrs. Gaudreault, Second Vice-President, suspended the proceedings for a few minutes.

The proceedings resumed at 10.01 o'clock a.m.

8 December 2016

Moment of reflection

Introduction of Bills

Mr. Coiteux, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Land Occupancy, moved that leave be granted to introduce the following bill:

121 An Act to increase the autonomy and powers of Ville de Montréal, the metropolis of Québec

The motion was carried.

Accordingly, Bill 121 was introduced in the Assembly.

Presenting Papers

Mr. Leitão, Minister of Finance, tabled the following:

Québec Pension Plan public hearings consultation document on reinforcing intergenerational equity entitled “Consolider le Régime pour renforcer l’équité intergénérationnelle”;

(Sessional Paper No. 2848-20161208)

Québec Pension Plan public hearings supporting document on Québec retirement findings entitled “Constats sur la retraite au Québec”;

(Sessional Paper No. 2849-20161208)

The actuarial valuation of the Québec Pension Plan as at 31 December 2015.

(Sessional Paper No. 2850-20161208)

8 December 2016

Mr. Fournier, Government House Leader, tabled the following:

The reply to a written question from Mrs. David (Gouin) seeking to obtain certain statistics on last-resort financial assistance recipients covered by the Aim for Employment Program implemented by Bill 70, An Act to allow a better match between training and jobs and to facilitate labour market entry – Question No. 196, *Order Paper and Notices* of 4 October 2016;

(Sessional Paper No. 2851-20161208)

The reply to a written question from Mrs. D'Amours (Mirabel) on the impact of changes to the farm property tax credit program – Question No. 216, *Order Paper and Notices* of 23 November 2016.

(Sessional Paper No. 2852-20161208)

The President tabled the following:

A letter, dated 7 December 2016, he had received from Mr. Philippe Couillard, Premier, asking that he take the necessary measures for the National Assembly to meet for extraordinary sittings on 9 December 2016 at 3.00 o'clock p.m., according to the calendar and timetable established by the Assembly, to complete the consideration of Bill 106, An Act to implement the 2030 Energy Policy and to amend various legislative provisions.

(Sessional Paper No. 2853-20161208)

Presenting Reports from Committees

Mr. Auger (Champlain), Committee Chair, tabled the following:

The report from the Committee on Planning and the Public Domain, which met on 7 December 2016 to hear the interested parties and undertake clause-by-clause consideration of Private Bill 220, An Act respecting Ville de Saint-Augustin-de-Desmaures. The report contains one amendment to the bill.

(Sessional Paper No. 2854-20161208)

The report was concurred in.

8 December 2016

Mrs. Richard (Duplessis), Committee Chair, tabled the following:

The report from the Committee on Labour and the Economy, which held public hearings on 25 August 2016 within the framework of special consultations on the process that led to the sale of shares in RONA by Investissement Québec. The report contains observations and conclusions.

(Sessional Paper No. 2855-20161208)

Mr. Spénard (Beauce-Nord), Committee Vice-Chair, tabled the following:

The report from the Committee on Public Finance, which met on 7 December 2016 to hear the interested parties and undertake clause-by-clause consideration of Private Bill 222, An Act to allow the conversion and amalgamation of L'Assurance Mutuelle de l'Inter-Ouest and L'Assurance mutuelle des fabriques de Montréal. The report does not contain amendments to the bill.

(Sessional Paper No. 2856-20161208)

The report was concurred in.

Presenting Petitions

Mr. Bérubé (Matane-Matapédia) tabled the following:

The abstract of a petition on opposition to exploratory drilling and petroleum resources development on ZEC Bas-Saint-Laurent territory, signed by 558 citizens of Québec.

(Sessional Paper No. 2857-20161208)

By leave of the Assembly to set aside Standing Order 63, Mr. Bérubé (Matane-Matapédia) tabled the following:

8 December 2016

The abstract of a petition on opposition to exploratory drilling and petroleum resources development on ZEC Bas-Saint-Laurent territory, signed by 1,325 citizens of Québec.

(Sessional Paper No. 2858-20161208)

By leave of the Assembly to set aside Standing Order 63, Mr. Lelièvre (Gaspé) tabled the following:

The abstract of a petition on implementing additional hemodialysis services in Gaspésie, signed by 2,897 citizens of Québec.

(Sessional Paper No. 2859-20161208)

Complaints of Breach of Privilege or Contempt and Personal Explanations

The President ruled on the point of privilege or contempt raised by the Member for La Peltre and Deputy Second Opposition Group House Leader and the Member for Matane-Matapédia and Official Opposition House Leader on 26 and 27 October 2016.

In their notice, they allege that Mrs. Dominique Savoie, former Deputy Minister at the Ministère des Transports, de la Mobilité durable et de l'Électrification des transports, infringed the rights of the Assembly by filing false documents and by providing false or incomplete testimony when appearing before the Committee on Public Administration on 18 May 2016.

The Member for Matane-Matapédia and Official Opposition House Leader also held that Mr. Michel Boulard, former Director of Inquiries and Internal Audits at the Ministère des Transports, acted in contempt of Parliament by deliberately misleading the Committee on Public Administration by validating a departmental memo concerning two reports filed with the National Assembly and the same Committee on 18 May 2016.

RULING FROM THE CHAIR

As parliamentary jurisprudence has frequently indicated, at this stage, it is not the Chair's role to determine whether contempt of Parliament occurred but whether the facts submitted could constitute prima facie contempt of Parliament. The Chair must determine whether the facts are sufficiently compelling to allow the Committee on the National Assembly and the Assembly to continue the process aimed at determining whether contempt of Parliament did, in fact, occur. Only the Assembly has the power to decide whether the situation actually involved a breach of privilege or contempt of Parliament.

However, we must remember the importance of the compelling nature of the facts in assessing the prima facie receivability of complaints of breach of privilege or contempt. The evidence submitted to support such matters must be complete and take into account all elements available, since the compelling nature must be evident from the facts prima facie.

In the context of a democratic system like ours, the Chair's duty, indeed its primary role, is to protect the Members' rights. In other words, the Chair must do everything in its power to ensure that the Members have access to the appropriate means to fully exercise their parliamentary role. That being said, the Chair must not ignore the rights of third parties who could be affected by the Assembly's actions. Given the extraordinary powers the Assembly has in keeping with its parliamentary privileges, when a third party is targeted by a point of privilege, it is imperative to consider all available elements in order to render a decision that is balanced and respectful of all. It is with this in mind that the Chair has considered the affidavit and documents transmitted by Mrs. Savoie on 13 September 2016.

Mr. Michel Boulard

The Official Opposition House Leader alleged that Mr. Michel Boulard acted in contempt of Parliament by validating a departmental memo dated 19 May 2016. According to the House Leader, Mr. Boulard deliberately sought to mislead the Committee through this memo.

8 December 2016

Parliamentary jurisprudence has clearly established that knowingly misleading the House or its committees may constitute contempt of Parliament. This same jurisprudence has also determined that the deliberate nature of the act in question must be clear in order to conclude that an individual knowingly misled the House. Further, the assumption that a Member must always be taken at his or her word does not apply to third parties testifying before a committee. In such cases, it is necessary to assess the criterion of knowingly wishing to mislead the Assembly or its committees in greater detail.

New Zealand's parliamentary jurisprudence specifies that to establish contempt of Parliament from a third party's testimony, intent to deceive the committee must be very clear.

In the case at hand, it is impossible for the Chair to conclude that Mr. Boulard intended to mislead the Committee based on the testimony of Mrs. Louise Boily, former Director of Inquiries and Internal Audits at the Ministère des Transports, who claimed that the memo was used to validate two false documents.

The Committee did not hear Mr. Boulard, and the departmental memo he signed was not intended for the Committee members.

The facts submitted to the Chair do not allow it to conclude that Mr. Boulard drafted the memo to deliberately mislead the Committee. Consequently, the question raised with respect to Mr. Boulard is not *prima facie* receivable.

Mrs. Dominique Savoie

It is submitted that Mrs. Savoie contravened paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of section 55 of the *Act respecting the National Assembly*.

Section 55(4) of the *Act respecting the National Assembly*

Section 55(4) of the *Act respecting the National Assembly* provides that “forging, falsifying or altering, with intent to deceive, any document of the Assembly, a committee or a subcommittee or any document tabled or presented before it” constitutes a breach of the Assembly’s privileges. This section specifically covers cases in which official documents of the Assembly or one of its committees are falsified with intent to deceive, and cases in which documents tabled or filed with the Assembly or one of its committees are falsified for the same purpose after being tabled or filed. Section 55(4) is not applicable in this case since the documents in question do not originate from the Assembly or one of its committees but are documents from the Ministère des Transports. Nor does this case involve documents already tabled in the Assembly or in committee that were subsequently forged, falsified or altered with intent to deceive.

Section 55(3) of the *Act respecting the National Assembly*

Section 55(3) of the *Act respecting the National Assembly* provides that “presenting a false document to the Assembly, a committee or a subcommittee with intent to deceive” constitutes a breach of the Assembly’s privileges. Parliamentary jurisprudence has specified that this provision may not be raised simply because a document is incomplete and that only a false document filed with intent to deceive is subject to sanctions under this section.

In addition, section 55(3) includes the expression “with intent to deceive”, which, in jurisprudence, is understood to mean “knowingly mislead”. Including this expression clearly means that fraudulent intent must be shown to prove breach of the Assembly’s privileges. In other words, a false document must have been introduced in the Assembly or one of its committees, and done so with intent to deceive.

What of the three reports in question?

The first report appears *prima facie* to be a draft version of the second report. Aside from the documents that accompanied the first report, a few typographical errors, corrections or differences in formatting and a change in the order and wording of the recommendations, the contents of the first and the second reports are very similar in terms of substance.

8 December 2016

The core contents of the second and third reports are, apart from a few minor changes, even more similar. The most notable difference is the addition, in the third report, of a separate report in Appendix 3 and the addition of Appendix 4.

Which is the final version of this report...the second or the third?

According to Mrs. Savoie, it is the second version, while Mrs. Boily claims it is the third.

In light of the elements submitted to the Chair, if one of the documents was indeed false—which the Chair is not in a position to affirm—it would be difficult to determine whether the false document is the second report, tabled by Mrs. Savoie, or the third report, tabled by Mrs. Boily.

Since the Chair has no compelling evidence showing that the first, second or third reports are false documents, the point of privilege from this angle is not *prima facie* receivable.

Furthermore, for there to have been a violation of section 55(3) of the *Act respecting the National Assembly*, intent to deceive must be shown. After analysis, nothing leads the Chair to conclude that there was, in this case, intent to deceive the Assembly or the Committee.

Section 55(2) of the *Act respecting the National Assembly*

Section 55(2) of the *Act respecting the National Assembly* provides that “giving false or incomplete testimony before the Assembly, a committee or a subcommittee” constitutes a breach of the Assembly’s privileges. For a question raised under this provision to be *prima facie* receivable, two elements are necessary.

First, compelling evidence must show that the witness did, in fact, give false or incomplete testimony.

Second, although, unlike sections 55(3) and 55(4) of the *Act respecting the National Assembly*, section 55(2) does not include the expression “intent to deceive”, it is still essential to ascertain a certain intent to deceive or hinder parliamentary proceedings in the false or incomplete testimony. It is important to differentiate between an error made in good faith and inaccurate testimony resulting from deliberately failing to provide information before a committee or the House. For the Chair to declare a point of privilege receivable on the basis of section 55(2), the Chair must, at the very least, be able to clearly deduce the witness’s fraudulent intent from the facts submitted. In other words, more is needed than an unprepared or poorly prepared testimony, since false or incomplete testimony involves an underlying intent that must be shown. Filing false documents or giving false or incomplete testimony before the Assembly or a committee are acts which, under Québec parliamentary law, are tantamount to the notion of “deliberately misleading”, recognized in other British-style parliaments.

A precedent from the New Zealand Parliament is a good example of the requirement to detect fraudulent intent in order to ascertain a *prima facie* breach of rights or privileges in such a situation. These same criteria apply in Québec.

What of Mrs. Savoie?

It is held that Mrs. Savoie gave false testimony before the Committee both in terms of her comments about contract-splitting at the Ministère des Transports and in her affirmation before the Committee that the first and second reports were identical and that no pages had been added or removed.

With regard to the allegations of contract-splitting, Mrs. Boily testified that she had noted contract-splitting in certain files, that this contract-splitting was documented in the audit reports and that she had informed Mrs. Savoie of the situation. Her statements contradict those of Mrs. Savoie, who stated that, to her knowledge, there had been no contract-splitting at the Ministère des Transports. When questioned on the subject, she stated that the department had analyzed these contracts and that she had received explanations justifying what may have looked like contract-splitting. Ultimately, this is a case of one person’s word against another’s.

8 December 2016

Without other compelling elements proving that Mrs. Savoie lied in her testimony about contract-splitting, it is impossible to establish prima facie that her testimony was false. The point of privilege on this subject thus is not prima facie receivable.

Regarding the difference in the reports' contents, Mrs. Boily's and Mrs. Savoie's testimonies show a difference of opinion as to what might constitute the "real report" and as to the nature of the differences among the versions. Nonetheless, they cannot be qualified as false testimony. More than anything, Mrs. Savoie's statements illustrate a certain laxity in her answers. The Chair has no compelling evidence showing that Mrs. Savoie gave false testimony with intent to deceive the Members about the differences noted in the contents of the reports. Further, nothing in her affidavit contradicts the content of her testimony before the Committee. In her affidavit, Mrs. Savoie mainly clarifies certain assertions made in her testimony and expands on her point of view on certain elements on which Mrs. Boily contradicted her. Mrs. Savoie makes no statements contradicting the content of her own testimony before the Committee. The point of privilege is therefore not prima facie receivable on that basis.

As to giving incomplete testimony, it is clear that Mrs. Savoie's testimony could have been more precise with respect to the differences in the reports. If she was unable to answer the Members' questions in greater detail when she appeared before the Committee, she could have told them so and asked for time to further verify or ask that further verifications be carried out to ensure that the information submitted to the parliamentarians was complete. Instead, as stated in her affidavit, Mrs. Savoie chose to answer the parliamentarians immediately from her memory and, in doing so, was not uncomfortable insisting that the two versions of the report were identical.

In addition, Mrs. Savoie's explanations, which helped better quantify the differences in the versions of the report, were only forwarded to the Committee several months after she appeared before it. During that whole time, there was confusion as to the report's different versions, a fact that had numerous repercussions. Her cavalier attitude resulted in many questions and debates that might have been avoided had she been more accurate and acted more quickly.

However, for a point of privilege to be *prima facie* receivable under section 55(2) of the *Act respecting the National Assembly*, two elements are essential: there must be compelling evidence that incomplete testimony was indeed given, and the intent to mislead or hinder parliamentary proceedings by deliberately concealing information from parliamentarians must be shown.

Despite Mrs. Savoie's poorly prepared, inept testimony before the Committee, the Chair cannot, in light of these criteria, conclude that she *prima facie* deliberately gave incomplete testimony within the meaning of section 55(2) of the *Act respecting the National Assembly*.

Conclusion

In short, while the Chair is not saying that this has not been a troubling matter, it has not been shown that the second report was a false document and the third report the real one. The Chair also notes that intent to deceive the Committee members or deliberately conceal information from them has not been shown.

However, the fact that the issue cannot be put before the Committee on the National Assembly on a point of privilege does not mean that another committee cannot look into the matter from the viewpoint of parliamentary oversight. In such a case, the Members would have the Chair's full-fledged analysis of the reports at their disposal.

It is clear that in the case at hand, there was administrative bungling when the documents were forwarded. Mrs. Savoie herself admitted that "errors had been made when sending the documents to the Assembly and the Committee on Public Administration" [*Translation*] and that the Ministère des Transports lacked sufficient time to provide more thorough, complete answers. The Chair considers there to be something deplorable in the manner this affair was handled by the parties involved and by the Ministère des Transports.

Someone who holds a position in the public service, particularly the position of deputy minister, must ensure that information transmitted to the National Assembly and its Members is absolutely accurate. Filing a document with the National Assembly or its committees is not a matter to be taken lightly, and neither is testimony given before them.

8 December 2016

Orders and mandates specifically targeting government department accountability are essential for the Québec State to run smoothly. Therefore, public servants asked to speak within the framework of this type of order must be perfectly prepared for their testimony and be aware of the importance of the information they communicate to the Assembly and its committees on such occasions. When someone is testifying before a committee and is unable to provide accurate information, it is better to clearly tell the Committee members and pledge to provide the information requested in the shortest possible time. In the case at hand, this is precisely what failed to occur.

Although parliamentary law permits sending a letter and an affidavit to explain such events, the Chair is of the opinion that it should have been done earlier; three months went by between the events in question and the time the letter and affidavit were sent.

As the guardian of the rights and privileges of the Assembly and its Members, the Chair would like to send a clear message. The duty of Québec's elected officials is first and foremost to protect the public interest. To exercise that role, public servants' co-operation is clearly essential. The Chair would also like to take this opportunity to reiterate the profound respect that the Chair and all of the parliamentarians have for government employees.

It is obviously of the utmost importance that persons who come to testify before a committee or report to it act in a manner that respects the Members and the important parliamentary oversight duties with which they are entrusted.

The President then tabled the following:

The text of the ruling as well as the document analyzing the disparities between the various reports.

(Sessional Paper No. 2860-20161208)

8 December 2016

Oral Questions and Answers

The Assembly proceeded to Oral Question Period.

Motions Without Notice

By leave of the Assembly to set aside Standing Order 185, Mrs. St-Pierre, Minister of International Relations and La Francophonie, together with Mr. Bergeron (Verchères) and Mr. Charette (Deux-Montagnes), moved:

THAT, on the 40th anniversary of Canada–European Union relations, the National Assembly of Québec highlight the far-reaching historical and cultural ties and values that Québec and Europe share; that the Assembly celebrate the friendship and co-operation that unite Québec and the European Union;

THAT the Members of the National Assembly of Québec attest to the importance they attach to the political, economic, cultural, educational and scientific relations and exchanges between the people of Québec and the people of European Union member states.

By leave of the Assembly, a debate arose thereon.

The debate being concluded, the motion was carried.

8 December 2016

By leave of the Assembly to set aside Standing Order 185, Mr. Traversy (Terrebonne), together with Mr. Lemay (Masson) and Mrs. Massé (Sainte-Marie–Saint-Jacques), moved:

THAT the National Assembly denounce the Federal Government's intention to allow the construction of an airport in Mascouche despite the *Environment Quality Act* and the community's opposition;

THAT it ask the Québec Government to intervene to prevent construction of the airport.

The question was put on this motion, and a recorded division was thereupon demanded.

The motion was carried on the following vote:

(Division No. **271** in Appendix)

Yeas: **107** Nays: **0** Abstentions: **0**

Mrs. Massé (Sainte-Marie–Saint-Jacques), together with Mr. Rochon (Richelieu) and Mrs. Soucy (Saint-Hyacinthe), moved a motion on dividing Bill 106, An Act to implement the 2030 Energy Policy and to amend various legislative provisions; this motion could not be debated for want of unanimous consent.

Notices of Proceedings in Committees

Mr. Tanguay, Deputy Government House Leader, convened the following committees:

- the Committee on Public Finance, to continue its clause-by-clause consideration of Bill 112, An Act to give effect mainly to fiscal measures announced in the Budget Speech delivered on 17 March 2016;

8 December 2016

- the Committee on Transportation and the Environment, to continue its clause-by-clause consideration of Bill 102, An Act to amend the Environment Quality Act to modernize the environmental authorization scheme and to amend other legislative provisions, in particular to reform the governance of the Green Fund.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Government Bills

Report Stage

The Assembly took into consideration the report from the Committee on Public Finance on its clause-by-clause consideration of Bill 87, An Act to facilitate the disclosure of wrongdoings within public bodies, together with the amendment transmitted by Mrs. Massé (Sainte-Marie–Saint-Jacques).

The amendment was declared in order.

The debate arose thereon.

By leave of the Assembly to set aside Standing Order 21, the proceedings continued past 1.00 o'clock p.m.

The debate being concluded, the amendment was negatived.

The report was concurred in on division.

Adoption

The Assembly resumed the debate, which had been adjourned on 6 December 2016, on the motion moved by Mr. Fortin, Minister of Culture and Communications, that Bill 114, An Act to modernize the governance of national museums, do now pass in principle.

8 December 2016

The debate being concluded, the motion was carried and, accordingly, Bill 114 was passed.

At 1.12 o'clock p.m., Mrs. Gaudreault, Second Vice-President, suspended the proceedings until 3.00 o'clock p.m.

The proceedings resumed at 3.01 o'clock p.m.

Passage

Mr. Coiteux, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Land Occupancy, moved the passage of Bill 109, An Act to grant Ville de Québec national capital status and increase its autonomy and powers.

After debate thereon, the motion was carried and, accordingly, Bill 109 was passed.

At 3.47 o'clock p.m., at the request of Mrs. Vien, Deputy Government House Leader, and by leave of the Assembly, Mr. Gendron, Third Vice-President, suspended the proceedings until 4.00 o'clock p.m.

The proceedings resumed at 4.01 o'clock p.m.

8 December 2016

Committee of the Whole

Mrs. Vien, Deputy Government House Leader, moved that the Assembly resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for clause-by-clause consideration of Bill 125, An Act to amend the Courts of Justice Act.

The motion was carried.

The Committee of the Whole undertook clause-by-clause consideration of Bill 125.

With the permission of Mr. Ouimet, Chair of the Committee of the Whole, Mrs. Vallée, Minister of Justice, tabled the following:

A copy of an email, dated 8 December 2016, to Mrs. France Lynch from Mrs. Nicole Duval-Hesler about amendments proposed to the *Courts of Justice Act*.

(Sessional Paper No. 2861-20161208)

At 6.00 o'clock p.m., Mr. Ouimet, Chair of the Committee of the Whole, suspended the proceedings until 7.30 o'clock p.m.

The proceedings resumed at 7.33 o'clock p.m.

The Committee of the Whole continued its consideration of Bill 125, An Act to amend the Courts of Justice Act.

8 December 2016

With the permission of Mr. Ouimet, Chair of the Committee of the Whole, Mrs. Vallée, Minister of Justice, tabled the following:

A copy of a document on the Court of Québec's positive reaction to the announced increase in the number of judges and additional resources to support legal activities entitled "La Cour du Québec se réjouit de l'augmentation du nombre de juges annoncée et de l'ajout de ressources pour soutenir les activités judiciaires".

(Sessional Paper No. 2862-20161208)

Bill 125 was thereupon reported.

The report was concurred in.

Passage

By leave of the Assembly to set aside Standing Orders 22 and 230, Mrs. Vallée, Minister of Justice, informed the Assembly that the Honourable J. Michel Doyon, Lieutenant-Governor of Québec, recommended Bill 125, An Act to amend the Courts of Justice Act, for its consideration and then moved that this bill do now pass.

A debate arose thereon.

By leave of the Assembly to set aside Standing Order 21, the proceedings continued past 10.30 o'clock p.m.

The debate being concluded, the motion was carried, and Bill 125 was accordingly passed.

8 December 2016

At 10.35 o'clock p.m., Mr. Gendron, Third Vice-President, adjourned the Assembly until Friday, 9 December 2016 at 9.40 o'clock a.m.

JACQUES CHAGNON

President

8 December 2016

APPENDIX

Recorded Divisions

On the motion moved by Mr. Traversy (Terrebonne), together with Mr. Lemay (Masson) and Mrs. Massé (Sainte-Marie–Saint-Jacques):

(Division No. 271)

YEAS - 107

Arcand (QLP)	Fortin (QLP)	Marceau (PQ)	Roy (CAQ)
Auger (QLP)	(Pontiac)	Martel (CAQ)	(Montarville)
Barrette (QLP)	Fournier (QLP)	Massé (IND)	Samson (CAQ)
Bergeron (PQ)	Gaudreault (PQ)	Matte (QLP)	Sauvé (QLP)
Bérubé (PQ)	(Jonquière)	Ménard (QLP)	Schneeberger (CAQ)
Billette (QLP)	Giguère (QLP)	Merlini (QLP)	Simard (QLP)
Birnbaum (QLP)	Girard (QLP)	Montpetit (QLP)	(Charlevoix–Côte-de-Beaupré)
Blais (QLP)	Habel (QLP)	Morin (QLP)	Simard (QLP)
Blanchette (QLP)	Hamad (QLP)	Nichols (QLP)	(Dubuc)
Bonnardel (CAQ)	Hardy (QLP)	Ouellet (PQ)	Soucy (CAQ)
Boucher (QLP)	Heurtel (QLP)	(René-Lévesque)	Spénard (CAQ)
Boulet (QLP)	Hivon (PQ)	Ouellet (PQ)	St-Denis (QLP)
Bourgeois (QLP)	Huot (QLP)	(Vachon)	St-Pierre (QLP)
Busque (QLP)	Iracà (QLP)	Pagé (PQ)	Surprenant (CAQ)
Caire (CAQ)	Jolin-Barrette (CAQ)	Paradis (QLP)	Tanguay (QLP)
Carrière (QLP)	Kelley (QLP)	(Brome-Missisquoi)	Thériault (QLP)
Charbonneau (QLP)	Khadir (IND)	Paradis (CAQ)	Therrien (PQ)
Charette (CAQ)	Kotto (PQ)	(Lévis)	Traversy (PQ)
Charlebois (QLP)	Laframboise (CAQ)	Picard (CAQ)	Tremblay (QLP)
Chevarie (QLP)	Lamarre (PQ)	Plante (QLP)	Turcotte (PQ)
Cloutier (PQ)	Lamontagne (CAQ)	Poëti (QLP)	Vallée (QLP)
Couillard (QLP)	Lavallée (CAQ)	Poirier (PQ)	Vallièrès (QLP)
Cousineau (PQ)	LeBel (PQ)	Polo (QLP)	Vien (QLP)
D'Amour (QLP)	Legault (CAQ)	Proulx (QLP)	Villeneuve (PQ)
D'Amours (CAQ)	Léger (PQ)	Reid (QLP)	Weil (QLP)
David (QLP)	Leitão (QLP)	Richard (PQ)	
(Outremont)	Lelièvre (PQ)	Roberge (CAQ)	
de Santis (QLP)	Lemay (CAQ)	Rochon (PQ)	
Drolet (QLP)	Lessard (QLP)	Rotiroti (QLP)	
Fortin (QLP)	Lisée (PQ)	Rousselle (QLP)	
(Sherbrooke)	Maltais (PQ)	Roy (PQ)	
		(Bonaventure)	