



HOUSE OF COMMONS  
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES  
CANADA

44th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

---

# Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage

EVIDENCE

**NUMBER 131**

Wednesday, October 9, 2024

---

Chair: The Honourable Hedy Fry





## Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage

Wednesday, October 9, 2024

• (1630)

[*Translation*]

**The Chair (Hon. Hedy Fry (Vancouver Centre, Lib.)):** I call this meeting to order.

[*English*]

Welcome to meeting number 131 of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage.

Before we begin, I would like to do a little housekeeping and tell you not to put any of your devices on the table so we don't create feedback.

Don't forget that you are not allowed to take photographs of what's going on here; you can get them afterwards off the website. Don't forget that, when you speak, you should address everything through the chair.

Yes, Kevin, go ahead.

**Mr. Kevin Waugh (Saskatoon—Grasswood, CPC):** Thank you, Madam Chair.

Good afternoon, everyone.

On a point of order, I see that the deputy minister is here for the first hour. Is there any chance that she could stay for the second hour?

**Ms. Isabelle Mondou (Deputy Minister, Department of Canadian Heritage):** I will make myself available.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

I want to welcome the minister. Thank you for taking the time to come and for replying so promptly to our request.

Now we're going to begin with the study, which is Canada's anti-racism strategy. Pursuant to Standing Order 108(2) and the motion adopted by the committee on Thursday, May 30, the committee will begin its study of Canada's anti-racism strategy.

The minister is here for the first hour. From the Department of Canadian Heritage, we have Isabelle Mondou, deputy minister, and Gaveen Cadotte, assistant deputy minister.

Minister, you have five minutes for your opening remarks, and then we will open the floor to questions.

Welcome and begin, please.

**Hon. Kamal Khara (Minister of Diversity, Inclusion and Persons with Disabilities):** Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

Good afternoon, colleagues and committee members. Thank you for inviting me to speak today.

As you indicated, Madam Chair, I'm joined by my wonderful officials, who have said that they'll be able to stay later, so thank you.

Madam Chair, when we got elected back in 2015, we started a very important conversation in this country about systemic racism and how we can address the impact that discrimination has on Canadians. We know that two in five Canadians say they face discrimination in Canada, and these proportions rise to 50% among indigenous people and to 78% among racialized people. We also know that the rise in hate incidents disproportionately affects indigenous people, Black and racialized people. At the same time, Jewish and Muslim Canadians are also disproportionately being impacted by the rise in anti-Semitism and Islamophobia.

Whether it is online or in our streets, hateful words and actions have a devastating impact on our communities and our country. Whether it is places of worship being attacked, communities being divided or losing loved ones, we have seen first-hand what hate and racism can do. When we look at the pain and damage that hate causes, one thing is clear: We cannot allow hate to go unchecked. The cost of inaction is far too great and, as a government, we have been very clear from the very beginning: Hate, racism and discrimination have absolutely no place in Canada.

We can all agree that every single person in Canada has a right to feel safe, regardless of where they're from, who they love and how they pray. To that end, in the last six months, our government has introduced two historic measures to address the critical situation our country is facing.

In June, we announced Canada's new anti-racism strategy, which is investing over \$110 million to fight racism and discrimination, of which \$70 million is being invested directly into communities to promote equity and to ensure communities have the resources they need to fight racism and discrimination, and to also break down systemic barriers that racialized Canadians face.

Additionally, just two weeks ago, we launched Canada's first-ever action plan on combatting hate. The plan represents an additional \$273-million commitment from our government that is going to support 20 different initiatives that will empower communities to identify and respond to hate, that is going to support victims and protect survivors, and that is going to build community trust and improve institutional readiness within our institutions.

Combined, these two plans represent a whole-of-government approach that is fundamentally about security and unity. This is about being proactive, this is about safety and this is about building trust.

Just to give an example of the kind of work we're talking about, earlier this year I was in Halifax, and there I announced funding of \$800,000 for an organization, Imhotep academy, which aims to improve BIPOC representation in STEM by providing after-school tutoring and mentorship for BIPOC youth in Halifax. I had an opportunity to meet a young man named Joshua, who, because of the mentorship he received, is now going to study engineering at Dalhousie University.

He's not the only one. Thanks to the program that we as government have been funding, working alongside community groups, there are 10 times the number of BIPOC students in STEM at Dalhousie University. This is just one of the hundreds of different projects that we have been supporting across this country. They are not just transforming lives; they are transforming and changing communities.

As a government, we are stepping up and doing what any responsible government would do to support communities on the ground and to continue to fight to keep Canadians safe. It is also important to remember that there is only one way to combat hate and racism, and that is to do it together. That is to do it with allies and partners on the ground. It's incumbent upon all of us to stand up against hate and racism and to build a Canada where everyone feels safe, and to reflect that when we work together, we actually bring people along, together. It's not just the right thing to do. It's the Canadian thing to do. That is the vision of Canada that our government is working to build.

I'm happy to take any questions from my colleagues. Thank you, Madam Chair.

• (1635)

**The Chair:** Thank you very much, Minister.

We will now begin the question-and-answer period. The first session is going to be a six-minute round, and we're going to begin with the Conservatives and Jamil Jivani.

Mr. Jivani, you have six minutes, please.

**Mr. Jamil Jivani (Durham, CPC):** Thank you, Madam Chair.

The minister said in her opening remarks that we cannot allow hate to go unchecked, so I'd like to ask her if she joins me in unequivocally condemning the Samidoun protests on October 7 in Vancouver, where there were chants of, "death to Canada, death to the United States and death to Israel", and even the burning of the Canadian flag.

Do you unequivocally condemn that?

**Hon. Kamal Khara:** I absolutely condemn such acts of anti-Semitism and acts of hate that we have seen across this country. They need to stop—full stop.

We condemn them in the strongest terms possible. We're working really closely with our colleagues at Public Safety. The local jurisdictions are very much engaged on this issue.

As I mentioned, we have been very proactive in the work we have been doing. Also, as I mentioned, we have put forward Canada's first ever action plan on combatting hate. This came out of the work we have been doing with community members and working alongside stakeholders. This came out of the two summits our government held on combatting anti-Semitism and Islamophobia. This came out of the work my colleague Minister Ien has been doing for the action plan for the 2SLGBTQ community.

The \$275 million that we're putting forward is to support communities on the ground in preventing hate.

We're enhancing the Canada community security program, which helps communities on the ground to provide support.

• (1640)

**Mr. Jamil Jivani:** Minister, we have seen a sharp rise in hate crimes of various kinds over the last nine years. Some statistics measured it at a 251% increase. Why isn't your anti-racism strategy reducing hate crimes? Hate crimes are getting worse.

**Hon. Kamal Khara:** It's important to recognize that, as a government, we have been very deliberate in making a choice to be inclusive. We have been very deliberate in reducing systemic barriers and supporting communities on the ground, and making sure that the plan we have put forward has a whole-of-government approach.

We know there's no one single solution to combatting hate. We need to work with partners on the ground to make sure that communities have the supports they need. At the same time, we need to work alongside StatsCan to make sure that we're collecting disaggregated data and we need to make sure that our institutional readiness is available for our police forces.

That's the work that's happening on the ground and those are the supports for victims and survivors. This is a whole-of-government approach that we have put forward to support Canadians.

It's important to recognize that it's been an extremely difficult time for many Canadians. As Canadians, we have a responsibility to work alongside communities, to bring people together, to really hone in on the values I know we're all so proud of as Canadians—unity and compassion—and to make sure that we're supporting communities on the ground.

**Mr. Jamil Jivani:** Thank you, Minister.

The government's anti-racism strategy claims to make our communities "more prosperous". That's a quote from the website. Since 2020, there's been a 134% increase in food bank usage in Ontario.

Has your anti-racism strategy failed to make Canadians more prosperous?

**Hon. Kamal Khera:** It's important to recognize the fact that when we got elected back in 2015, we made a very deliberate choice to be inclusive. I fundamentally believe, and I've said this many times, that diversity is a fact in Canada—it exists—but inclusion is a choice. As a government and as Liberal members of this House, we have been very deliberate in making that choice to be inclusive, because we know that when you remove systemic barriers for Canadians, we all win. We know that when you support communities on the ground and empower them....

There's the example I gave of a young man in Halifax whom I met, called Joshua. Because of the work that's happening on the ground, which is enabling and removing barriers and getting people access to the supports we are providing them, we're seeing amazing results in the economic empowerment of Canadians, and we're going to continue to do that.

**Mr. Jamil Jivani:** Minister, I'll ask a clarifying question. Is your strategy to make the food bank lines more diverse and inclusive? How exactly is the country more prosperous?

**Hon. Kamal Khera:** I reject the premise of that question, Madam Chair. As I mentioned in my remarks earlier, Canada's anti-racism strategy is to ensure that every single person, regardless of how they look, regardless of how they pray and regardless of whom they love has equal opportunities to contribute to Canadian society and is able to do it in a successful way so that they can continue to grow. That is a responsible way that we include people.

I will always say that when we include people, whether it is in our government.... With the diversity that exists, whether it is in businesses or in our institutions, we all win, because that's the beauty of Canada. Those are the values I know. We all agree they're what make us who we are as Canadians.

**Mr. Jamil Jivani:** I'm not sure the Canadians lining up at food banks would think they're winning as part of the government's strategy.

Moving on, do you believe part of your responsibility is to remove some of the economic challenges facing Canadians of all races and backgrounds, and perhaps even advocating for an end to the carbon tax, which is driving up the cost of living?

**Hon. Kamal Khera:** I want to give you one example: the Black entrepreneurship program.

Because of the work we have been doing, that program has supported more than 16,000 businesses among Black entrepreneurs across this country, enabling them able to enter markets they could never get into before. That's because of the work we're putting in to support communities on the ground.

• (1645)

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Now I'll go to the Liberals for six minutes.

Mr. Coteau, you have six minutes.

**Mr. Michael Coteau (Don Valley East, Lib.):** Thank you, Chair.

Thank you, Minister, for being here, and thank you to your team.

I know there's no blueprint, really, for the work you've been doing from a pan-Canadian perspective. It's the first time a government has put forward a national plan like this to tackle something that's not new.

You know, I worked on an anti-racism plan for Ontario. We noticed that, from about 2012, even the national numbers were increasing in that time period. There was a trajectory shift at that point in 2012. We've seen a constant rise in hate crimes. We always tried to figure that out. Was it because we weren't collecting the data properly? There was no standardization in how reports came in. I know the RCMP has changed some of its methods of collecting that type of data. It is tough work because there is no blueprint, and because it is new work.

Thanks to you and your department for the work you're doing.

I've always looked at it like this: Fighting racism isn't only a moral imperative. There's also an economic side to it. You started to talk about that. There's a cost to standing still and not doing anything. As Canadians, we need to look for ways to remove barriers, so we can unleash the power of our people. That's one piece of why we're trying to tackle racism.

Can you take a minute to talk about some of the economic pieces within the plan that may target the indigenous community, the Black community and Canadians as a whole? It may target, for example, the Black community, but the benefits are for all Canadians. We all benefit. When the next-door neighbour is doing well, you're doing well. Can you talk a little about the economic aspirations of this plan, and about some of the success stories within the past work that is connected to this current plan?

**Hon. Kamal Khera:** Thank you so much, Mr. Coteau.

You and I have chatted many times off-line, and I want to thank you for your leadership as we were building on this work. I know that we had been leading, but particularly your leadership as the previous chair of the Black caucus in our government has to lead this work.

I was talking about diversity existing in Canada—I think we all know this—but making sure that we include people in our economy and in our structures benefits all Canadians.

Particularly when you talk about supports for Black Canadians, you would remember in 2017 when Canada officially adopted the UN Decade for People of African Descent. Unfortunately, we adopted it late because a previous Conservative government didn't think that it was relevant to the community.

What that UN Decade for People of African Descent, when we adopted that as a Canadian government, allowed us to do is have a road map. It's the road map for how we remove those systemic barriers for Black Canadians in this country.

That led us to have an anti-racism secretariat internally so that the federal government could look at the different ways we address systemic racism within our institutions. That led us to have tangible investments into Black communities that weren't just handouts, as some members from the Conservative Party would like to say. It was doing the work, the partnership work, within the community.

I talk about the program called supporting Black Canadian communities initiative. This is a Black-led, Black-serving program that is working alongside four national funders to be able to give grassroots organizations on the ground the supports that they need to build capacity.

You and I would remember when the conversation was being had with many different stakeholders from the community. They said, "We just need to build capacity so we can help people," because at the grassroots is where people know best. They have the best solutions, but sometimes they need a little support. That has been a wonderful way we have been leading this work alongside Black communities.

I want to go back to the Black entrepreneurship program, because the success story of that program is incredible. There are 16,000 businesses that have now been able to go through this program. It wasn't just getting a little access to capital or getting some loans; it was also about mentorship and about partnerships.

I met a single mom in Montreal who had started her business in Montreal. It's a pickle business that she started from her home. Because of this program and the knowledge hub that this program has, she has her product in almost every grocery store in Canada. She's a success story in terms of the work that's been happening because of the mentorship of this work.

To your point earlier around it not just being for our own benefit, it's about creating good, well-paying jobs for the community at large, and this is how you actively work with communities.

I think we all know that, when you include people, we all win. That's fundamentally the way we have been working, and we're going to continue to do this work together.

Thank you.

• (1650)

**Mr. Michael Coteau:** I remember that, when we established the anti-racism strategy in Ontario in 2016, the consultations we did the year before were pretty tough.

I'm sure you had a lot of conversations with a lot of people across the country. What are those conversations like today?

**Hon. Kamal Khara:** I think we all recognize that it's been a difficult time, particularly as we navigate the challenging times with communities across this country. The conversations I have had with the Jewish community members and the rise in anti-Semitism that we have seen across this country are troubling.

The rise in Islamophobia that we have seen across this country is troubling, and we need to make sure that we support communities on the ground. That's work we're leading across government. It's why we've been working at putting forward strategies and making tangible investments in them.

There is not just one department leading this work; this is a whole-of-government approach. I talked about the Canada action plan on combatting hate. Twenty different departments are engaged on the work. There are 20 different initiatives with seven different departments from Public Safety to the criminal justice system and StatsCan, which plays a really big role in getting this aggregated data so we can get the right type of data.

The fact is that we're working with law enforcement agencies. Communities know best how to report this data so we can have it.

This is work that we have been doing with the communities, and we're going to continue to do it.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

We've gone a little over time there, Michael.

I'm going to go to Martin Champoux.

Monsieur Champoux, you have six minutes, please.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ):** Thank you, Madam Chair.

I hung on the minister's every word as she spoke of the woman entrepreneur from Montreal who started a pickle company. I wish the minister had brought a sample, so that we could have a taste of this lady's success; perhaps the minister will do so during her next visit.

On a more serious note, I'd like to thank the witnesses for being here today.

The issue we're discussing with you is an important one. In my opinion, it's all the more important because it's so timely. My Conservative colleague spoke earlier about the protest that took place this week on October 7, a particularly significant date in this case. During the protest, people said things that were beyond comprehension. I can't recall ever hearing such violent language used during protests in Quebec or Canada. I could be wrong—others can correct me—but it seems to me that we're hearing more and more of it, and we sense that some people believe it's legitimate, in the current context, to utter remarks that any reasonable person would say exceed the limits of what we consider to be freedom of expression in Canada. Saying things like "death to Canada, death to the United States and death to Israel" and burning a nation's flag is unacceptable here.

Minister, you say that you are quite prepared to take measures to counter this type of speech. However, a bill tabled by my party calls for the removal from the Criminal Code of the religious exemption, i.e., a section of the Criminal Code that allows a person to make this kind of statement if it is made under the guise of religious belief. I don't think I'm mistaken, but it seems to me that there's a kind of consensus within the parties and in the House of Commons that the exemption makes little sense, especially when we see protests like the one on Monday, and when we hear remarks like those made by Adil Charkaoui on November 8, 2023. I'll quote his extremely violent remarks:

Allah, deal with these Zionist aggressors. Allah, deal with the enemies of the people of Gaza. Allah, count them all and then exterminate them. And do not spare a single one!

Under the guise of his religious beliefs, that person may make such statements in public in Quebec and Canada.

You've put forward your policy, your plan to combat hate. Although this proposal is on the table, it makes no mention of the desire to remove the religious exemption from the Criminal Code.

I'd like to hear your opinion on that.

• (1655)

[English]

**Hon. Kamal Khera:** Thank you for that very important question.

The rise in hate absolutely needs to stop, and I think we all agree that it needs to stop.

There are two things I want to mention. I think, first and foremost, in Canada we have a Charter of Rights and Freedoms that actually protects people, and we have a right to peaceful protest. However, it should not and it must not cross the line into hate and intimidation. I think we all agree with that. I think that's fundamental to who we are as Canadians.

To your point around the piece around hate speech, we have our online harms legislation, which I'm sure this committee knows full well. That actually tackles some of the spread of hateful speech online as well as in the real world, which we know starts online and trickles into our communities. This is something tangible and I know my colleague, Minister Virani, is very much in touch with the Bloc and others to be able to move forward on this.

I do want to go back to one thing in particular. It has been a very difficult time for so many communities and we need to acknowledge the grief and pain, the anxiety and the fear, that the communities are feeling.

I also need to make sure that we also all understand, and I want to reiterate once again, that people have a right to peaceful protest and it should be peaceful.

[Translation]

**Mr. Martin Champoux:** Minister, you've said it twice, and you're quite right, people absolutely have the right to peaceful protest. Even if peaceful protests can at times be somewhat tumultuous, there are limits to what is acceptable. There may have been outbursts, but there was no violence.

These are calls for hatred, calls for the death of a people. These are words of unprecedented violence. However, despite the fact that the tools are currently on the table, no action is being taken. These people aren't being arrested by the police and taken to court for what is assuredly hate speech, which has no place and which most certainly goes against all our principles of freedom of expression.

I find it hard to understand why we're still at this point, despite these extremely violent remarks being repeatedly uttered during protests—

[English]

**The Chair:** You have 30 seconds, Mr. Champoux.

[Translation]

**Mr. Martin Champoux:** I find it hard to understand why there is still reluctance to quickly implement a measure or to intervene, so as to set an example, at the very least, for those who might be tempted to follow suit.

[English]

**Hon. Kamal Khera:** I know there's a law in place; we have these parameters in place. It is up to the jurisdictions. I know they're very much engaged, particularly in an event that happened on Wednesday, including in Montreal. We hope that the local law enforcement agencies will be doing their job to make sure that those who incite hate in this country are held accountable.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much.

I now go to the New Democratic Party and Niki Ashton.

Ms. Ashton, you have six minutes.

**Ms. Niki Ashton (Churchill—Keewatinook Aski, NDP):** Thank you.

Welcome, Minister.

In the foreword of the current anti-racism strategy you said:

...since the events of October 7, 2023, we have seen unprecedented levels of hate towards Jewish, Muslim, Arab, and Palestinian communities right here in Canada.

This is unquestionably true. Since then, we've seen a worrying explosion of hate and anger directed at members of these communities. The reality is that no Jewish family should worry about the safety of their kids when they drop them off at Hebrew school. No Muslim should fear violence as they walk into a mosque. We have a responsibility as legislators to do everything in our power to protect communities from hate. This is why I don't understand why your Liberal government steadfastly refused to define anti-Palestinian racism. You acknowledge that it's a problem, and the strategy explicitly recognizes Palestinians as a group that faces a unique form of racism. You acknowledge that work needs to be done, but for some reason you refuse to actually do that work. You refuse to consult with community members on the topic. Their voices were silenced.

This can't come as a surprise. Thousands of Canadians wrote to you, calling on you to define anti-Palestinian racism. I've raised this repeatedly with officials in your office, and we've also raised it here at committee. I would argue that ignoring these calls is, frankly, a clear and explicit example of systemic anti-Palestinian racism. You've refused to give a clear reason for why you refuse to define anti-Palestinian racism.

My question is this: Did you intentionally leave out anti-Palestinian racism from your Liberal anti-racism strategy, yes or no?

• (1700)

**Hon. Kamal Khera:** I want to be very clear to all Canadians that this strategy is designed to support all Canadians who experience discrimination and racism, including Palestinian Canadians. That is very clear in the strategy.

I think it's also important to recognize the fact that this strategy is meant to be evergreen. We never had a strategy. We put it forward in 2017, alongside community members, because we knew we needed to do this work. We then extensively met with community members across this country to talk about what more we can do to support communities. This came out of the two summits that our government held on combatting anti-Semitism and, of course, Islamophobia. We are obviously going to continue to listen to Canadians from all different backgrounds because we need to make sure that this is a policy that all Canadians can see themselves in. This is meant for every Canadian, including Palestinian Canadians.

**Ms. Niki Ashton:** With all due respect, the actual substance of the anti-racism strategy does not actually call out anti-Palestinian racism.

I want to go back to that question of consultation and definition.

Given the fact that you refuse to define anti-Palestinian racism, I thought it would be appropriate to read into the record the definition provided by the Arab Canadian Lawyers Association.

Anti-Palestinian racism takes various forms including: denying the Nakba and justifying violence against Palestinians; failing to acknowledge Palestinians as an Indigenous people with a collective identity, belonging and rights in relation to occupied and historic Palestine; erasing the human rights and equal dignity and worth of Palestinians; excluding or pressuring others to exclude Palestinian perspectives, Palestinians and their allies; defaming Palestinians and their allies with slander such as being inherently antisemitic, a terrorist threat/sympathizer or opposed to democratic values.

Why do you take issue with the Arab Canadian Lawyers Association's definition of anti-Palestinian racism? Why wasn't their voice and their work—which is cutting edge on this front—included as part of your anti-racism strategy?

**Hon. Kamal Khera:** We are going to continue to listen to all Canadians. This strategy is designed to support all Canadians who face racism and discrimination, including Palestinian Canadians. Those words are exactly in the strategy.

I also want to take a moment to recognize the fact that this is meant to be evergreen. This is meant to evolve with the needs of the communities. We're constantly going to be listening to communities to make sure that their voices are included and to ensure that we are at the forefront of leading this work. We continue to have very meaningful conversations, and it's not just me. My predecessor had many conversations prior to my taking on this role. This is

work that takes time. This is work in which we need to make sure that we are pragmatic and that we're thoughtful in the conversations that we have with people. Everyone can see in the strategy that they're reflected in it.

Thank you.

**Ms. Niki Ashton:** I'll outline that it's not evergreen to exclude substantive action on anti-Palestinian racism. This is a very clear type of racism. It's very disappointing to see the Liberals exclude it from the anti-racism strategy but continue to play games with Palestinian and Arab communities, trying to score points by doing consultations that are not actually part of the department's work or influencing your anti-racism strategy.

I'll move on to another critical issue, which is anti-indigenous racism. We know that an insidious form of anti-indigenous racism is residential school denialism.

**The Chair:** You have 30 seconds, Niki.

**Ms. Niki Ashton:** I'm proud of the work that my colleague MP Leah Gazan has done on this front with her bill, but we know that neither your party, the Liberals, nor the Conservatives have come out with a clear position on this bill.

From the Conservatives, we've heard some very problematic statements, including from at least one candidate, Aaron Gunn, who thinks the only injustice of the residential school system isn't the genocide but what's said about John A. Macdonald—an absolutely horrifying example of anti-indigenous racism.

Do you support my colleague Leah Gazan's bill—yes or no?

**Hon. Kamal Khera:** Madam Chair, I think we can all agree in this place that the tragic—

• (1705)

**Ms. Niki Ashton:** It's a yes-or-no answer.

**Hon. Kamal Khera:** Madam Chair, as we all know, and it's in the strategy as well, anti-indigenous racism has plagued our system systematically for generations. We as a government have been doing everything we can to support communities on the ground. There's the work that my colleagues Minister Anandasangaree and Minister Patty Hajdu have been leading. We know the impact of that on the ground.

It's unfortunate that the member is playing political games with this. I think this is fundamentally something that we need to be working on together—

**Ms. Niki Ashton:** Will you support the bill? It's not a game.

**Hon. Kamal Khera:** —and we'll continue to do this work.

**The Chair:** Thank you. This is not a debate, Ms. Ashton.

I think the time is up.

We'll go now to the second round. This is a five-minute round.



We will begin with Mr. Jivani, please, for the Conservatives.

**Mr. Jamil Jivani:** Thank you, Madam Chair.

The minister's colleague MP Anthony Housefather is actually on Twitter right now agreeing with the Conservative position that Samidoun should be listed as a terrorist entity. I wonder if the minister responsible for anti-racism would agree with her colleague Mr. Housefather and the Conservative Party on that position.

**Hon. Kamal Khera:** Madam Chair, I'm not sure if my colleague was in the House during question period. This was a question that was posed to the Minister of Public Safety. I think he was very clear in his answer. Any indication or—

**Mr. Jamil Jivani:** But his answer wasn't good enough for Mr. Housefather. I thought maybe the party's position had changed since then.

**Hon. Kamal Khera:** Madam Chair, through you, I think we can all agree that any listing of a terrorist organization is not done by politicians. It's done on the advice of national security and intelligence. We take public safety extremely seriously. This is the work that our intelligence does on a daily basis with our Five Eyes partners.

The minister, as he mentioned in the House of Commons today—

**Mr. Jamil Jivani:** I think the minister may want to meet with Mr. Housefather to discuss this, but okay—answer received.

**Hon. Kamal Khera:** Madam Chair—

**Mr. Jamil Jivani:** It is customary that the witness has only as much time as the questioner.

**Hon. Kamal Khera:** —I think it's important to get the answer on the record. I think it's important to get my answer on the record. Thank you.

As the Minister of Public Safety indicated, he has urgently asked for expedited advice from national security and intelligence. He'll have an answer in the next coming days.

**Mr. Jamil Jivani:** I don't think that's fast enough for Mr. Housefather. I hope you guys can have a conversation.

**The Chair:** Mr. Housefather is not a member of the committee at this moment.

**Mr. Jamil Jivani:** It's on Twitter. You could look at it.

**The Chair:** Let's move on.

**Mr. Jamil Jivani:** Okay. We'll keep moving.

Does the minister support the government's Black justice strategy as part of the anti-racism strategy?

**Hon. Kamal Khera:** Absolutely.

**Mr. Jamil Jivani:** Thank you.

Are you familiar with some of the radical criminal justice policies that your government's Black justice strategy is considering at the moment?

**Hon. Kamal Khera:** Madam Chair, I think it's important to recognize that the work we are leading, working alongside Black communities right across this country, is fundamentally something that we have heard from community members on the ground in terms of

addressing systemic racism within our criminal justice system. It is important that we address it.

This is work that my colleague Minister Virani is leading. No decisions have been made yet around the strategy, but I know we'll be working alongside community members to make sure that communities—

**Mr. Jamil Jivani:** Is the minister familiar with a document called “A Roadmap for Transformative Change”, which was released this summer?

**Hon. Kamal Khera:** Madam Chair, this is work that my colleague Minister Virani is leading. We have very meaningful conversations on how to address systemic racism within our criminal justice system, which we know—

**Mr. Jamil Jivani:** No, you're not familiar.

Your colleague, Minister Virani, described this document as “history-making” for the Black community and “an important milestone” for the Black community. It seems like something the anti-racism strategy leader may be familiar with, but it sounds like you're not.

Just to recap a couple of the—

**Ms. Jennifer O'Connell (Pickering—Uxbridge, Lib.):** I have a point of order, Madam Chair.

**The Chair:** Ms. O'Connell.

**Ms. Jennifer O'Connell:** It's not appropriate for a committee member.... They may ask their questions, but suggesting things that have not been said into the record is inappropriate.

I would ask that Mr. Jivani stick to his thoughts and not try to speak on behalf of the minister. She's more than capable of doing that on her own. If he would like to just continue with his question, then committee can get back to it.

**Mr. Jamil Jivani:** That's not a point of order, Madam Chair.

As a Black Canadian, I've been assured the anti-racism strategy is a whole-of-government approach. If my community is told by the Minister of Justice that something is “history-making” and “an important milestone” for Black people...the leader of the anti-racism strategy would be familiar with it. I think that's a fair question.

Nonetheless, some of the policies that are included in this include mass decarceration, reducing the number of incarcerated people by 30% over the next 10 years, decriminalizing a supply of 30-days' worth of hard drugs including cocaine, heroin and meth, and also defunding police departments by removing 25% of federal grants from eligibility to police organizations.

● (1710)

**The Chair:** You have 30 seconds.

**Mr. Jamil Jivani:** The question I have is, do you support these radical criminal justice policies that your government has published as part of the Black justice strategy?

**The Chair:** You have 20 seconds, Minister.

**Hon. Kamal Khera:** Madam Chair, I think it would only be a Conservative making a joke out of systemic racism. We have seen an overincarceration of Black and indigenous people—

**Mr. Jamil Jivani:** This is not a joke. You want to flood our communities with drugs.

**Hon. Kamal Khera:** —in the criminal justice system. To be making a joke about that it is disgraceful. I would expect better from people.

**Mr. Jamil Jivani:** I have a right to ask you question about that.

**The Chair:** Order, please.

Mr. Jivani, allow the minister to answer the question, please.

**Mr. Jamil Jivani:** Nobody's laughing, Madam Chair. They're flooding our communities with drugs. That's the problem.

**Hon. Kamal Khera:** That's not true.

**The Chair:** We'll go to the second round of questions for five minutes, please. We'll go to the Liberals and Jennifer O'Connell.

Ms. O'Connell, you have five minutes.

**Ms. Jennifer O'Connell:** Thank you, Madam Chair.

Through you to the minister, thank you for being here today.

Mr. Jivani spoke about what's on Twitter, so let's talk about a few things that are also on Twitter.

We've talked a lot here, from all colleagues, about the increasing rise in anti-Semitism and Islamophobia. Certainly Holocaust denialism is something I have never seen before like this. When members of the Conservative Party dine with German politicians who actually, within their party, believe the Holocaust was a hoax.... I wonder if Conservatives, who care a lot about what happens on Twitter, posting and amplifying hateful rhetoric toward the Jewish community and still sit in the front row of Conservative benches.... There has been no retribution or reprimand for promoting people who share hateful Holocaust denialism.

I wonder if you think that is helpful in the reduction of the anti-Semitic hate we're seeing in this country.

**Hon. Kamal Khera:** Thank you, Ms. O'Connell.

I think we're all shocked. That's why I find it a bit rich every single time Conservatives members get up and talk about hate when their own members actively meet with neo-Nazis from Germany and still do not denounce and apologize for that. The fact that their own leader will go and meet with the white supremacists of Diagon, which we know is an organization that fundamentally believes that people like you and I, Madam Chair, do not exist in Canada—

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

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

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Madam Chair, I expect that when a minister comes here, they're going to behave with such decorum that we can have a discussion around the topic at hand, instead of trying to bring disorder to this area.

I would ask you, Madam Chair, the same way we would ask the Speaker in the House, to encourage members to remember that—

**Ms. Jennifer O'Connell:** You don't like it when your hate is called out.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** —we are all honourable members, and not to use their pedestal to throw such aspira— Such rhetoric—

**Ms. Jennifer O'Connell:** It's an aspiration of hate.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Excuse me, I have the floor.

**Ms. Jennifer O'Connell:** I mean, it is on Twitter.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** She's a minister of the Crown—

**Ms. Jennifer O'Connell:** This isn't a point of order.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** —and is simply throwing out things that cause disorder.

Madam Chair, I believe this goes against the whole purpose of this meeting.

**The Chair:** I will allow the minister to answer.

Go ahead, Minister.

**Hon. Kamal Khera:** Madam Chair, thank you.

I think my honourable colleagues needs to realize that there are consequences to their actions. There are consequences to the actions that the leader and members of the Conservative Party take. When their leader actively puts hashtags on his YouTube videos that attract men who hate women, it has consequences. When he meets with a far-right extremist and does not denounce that, it has consequences. Diagon is an organization that fundamentally believes that you and I, Madam Chair—people of colour—should not exist in Canada. That has consequences. When they meet with German neo-Nazis and do not denounce that, it has consequences for people on the ground.

It is shameful for the Conservative members to sit there and pretend they care about hate in this country when they know, within their own caucus, there are people who court far-right extremism, which has real consequences for people on the ground. We have seen that in our communities. We have seen how, unfortunately, lives have been taken away. There are consequences to hate.

They need to apologize to Canadians and denounce such hate when it occurs in this country.

• (1715)

**Ms. Jennifer O'Connell:** Thank you, Minister.

I'll follow up on recent meetings between Conservatives and those who distribute hate on our streets, which their question spoke about off the top.

Mr. Cooper, another MP in the Conservative Party, was just a couple of weeks ago seen meeting with those who were protesting and holding up Russian flags. They were really comfortable—

**Mr. Kevin Waugh:** I have a point of order.

**The Chair:** Go ahead on your point of order, Mr. Waugh.

**Mr. Kevin Waugh:** Mr. Cooper did not meet with them. He was at a restaurant when those individuals were there.

**The Chair:** Kevin, you can't answer that. This is a point of order.

What I see here is this: When we allow questions to be asked about members—people like Mr. Housefather—and name groups as hate groups, I think it is fair game to ask questions about other groups considered to be hateful, and about who meets with them. I think this is a reasonable question to ask.

Ms. O'Connell, go ahead.

**Ms. Jennifer O'Connell:** Thank you, Madam Chair.

They opened that door and that's precisely why I am raising these questions.

Mr. Cooper met with groups in Ottawa that we saw, first-hand, were spreading disinformation about queer kids and trans people in this country—a level of violence that the Conservatives, in particular, have not raised....

Can you speak about hate towards our queer kids and how, once again, meeting with individuals who spread such hate on our streets only emboldens them and does not reduce hate or create a culture of inclusivity?

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Minister, I will give you 30 seconds to answer that, because I took off the time for the points of order and the discussion on the floor.

Go ahead. You have 30 seconds.

**Hon. Kamal Khera:** Thank you, Madam Chair.

My colleague is absolutely right. There are consequences to hate. If you leave it unchecked, it has real consequences on the ground.

As Ms. O'Connell mentioned, seeing members of Pierre Poilievre's Conservatives meeting with groups that incite hate within communities has consequences for people on the ground.

They need to apologize to Canadians. They need to denounce these acts, because Canadians deserve better. Lives are at stake.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

**The Chair:** I'll now move to the Bloc Québécois and MP Champoux.

You have two and a half minutes, Martin.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Martin Champoux:** Thank you.

Minister, I'm going to go quickly, and I may interrupt you here and there. I apologize in advance.

Do you think Amira Elghawaby is doing a good job? Do you endorse Ms. Elghawaby's public statements and positions since her appointment?

[*English*]

**Hon. Kamal Khera:** Madam Chair, our special representative on combatting Islamophobia does incredibly important work to support Muslim Canadians right across this country, and—

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Martin Champoux:** Minister, as I was saying—

[*English*]

**Hon. Kamal Khera:** Yes, she has my full support.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Martin Champoux:** Very well.

In 2019, Ms. Elghawaby said that there is widespread anti-Muslim sentiment in Quebec. Would you agree?

[*English*]

**Hon. Kamal Khera:** I think it's important to recognize, Madam Chair, that Ms. Elghawaby speaks to many Muslim Canadians right across this country, including in Quebec. It's important to recognize the important conversations she has with community members and to make sure we're addressing some of those concerns, as we do with all Canadians.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Martin Champoux:** So, Minister, you think it's acceptable to generalize by saying that, in Quebec, people are generally anti-Muslim.

In 2021, Ms. Elghawaby responded on Twitter to an op-ed by a philosophy professor at the University of Toronto, Dr. Joseph Heath. He wrote that French Canadians were the largest group in the country to have experienced British colonialism. We can debate that or have an opinion on it, but Ms. Elghawaby's reaction was to say, "I'm going to vomit."

Recently, she said that universities should hire more Muslim, Palestinian and Arab professors to help people better understand....

Finally, you answered one of my questions in the House some time ago concerning documents, particularly emails, that Ms. Elghawaby was to submit—which she did not submit, despite an access to information request.

Minister, do you maintain that Ms. Elghawaby is a good person to build bridges between communities and foster a calm social climate? Given, as well, the National Assembly's desire to have her removed from her position and to see this position abolished, don't you think that Ms. Elghawaby is doing the opposite of what she was appointed to do?

● (1720)

[*English*]

**Hon. Kamal Khera:** Chair, through you, if I may, the honourable member talked about universities and colleges. I think it's important to recognize that universities and colleges make decisions about their own hiring practices. They all have their own rules about diversity and inclusion.

Ms. Elghawaby does important work talking to community members in her role as a special envoy on combatting Islamophobia in this country. We know systemic racism is real within our institutions across this country. She plays an important role in talking to community members and makes recommendations to ensure that we're supporting communities on the ground. I think it's important to have those important conversations alongside members. I hope the member from the Bloc will agree that we need to be doing this work.

[Translation]

**Mr. Martin Champoux:** Minister, we agree that conversations—

[English]

**The Chair:** Time is up. Thank you.

Now I'm going to go to Niki Ashton for the NDP. You have two and a half minutes, please.

**Ms. Niki Ashton:** Minister, you've referred a fair bit to the whole-of-government approach that is very important for your department, so I want to just reflect on that for a moment.

Take, for example, the lawyers who represent Canada in court, as they have been this week, fighting first nations like Shamattawa and Tataskweyak Cree Nation in my region in northern Manitoba. In arguments filed with the court and obtained by my office, lawyers hired by the Liberal government argued that first nations don't have a right to clean drinking water, and that seeks to blame first nations for this government's own failures.

I struggle to take this seriously when the same Liberal-hired lawyers say that any proclamation is just context-specific, which, as one lawyer explained to me, is basically just legalese for political theatre. We have the Prime Minister, who has been quoted as saying, "Everyone in Canada should have access to clean water. The Government of Canada continues to work in partnership with First Nations". However, your government's lawyers deny that there is a partnership. Former minister Marc Miller said, "But one thing has not changed—the right for every individual to have access to potable water." He said that they were determined to ensure that this right was upheld for everyone. Once again, Liberal lawyers this week argued that this right should not, in fact, be upheld for everyone.

You've come here to talk about your anti-racism strategy that incorporates a significant piece on anti-indigenous racism. You've talked about the importance of a whole-of-government approach, and yet your government is fighting 59 first nations, including some of the poorest first nations in Canada that do not have clean drinking water. You're telling them that your commitments don't actually apply to them, that they are context-specific, that your government does not actually have an obligation to provide clean drinking water. Is that not an example of systemic racism at play? Does that not fly in the face of the commitment to reconciliation your government has made? How can you stand by with a commitment to a whole-of-government approach, with a commitment to anti-indigenous racism and action on that front, when your own government is denying one of the most basic human rights to first nations—the right to clean drinking water?

**Hon. Kamal Khera:** I think we all agree that every single person should have access to clean drinking water. That is fundamentally something that we, as a government, after years of underfunding by the Conservative government, have been working on alongside members of our community, our indigenous partners right across this country. We'll continue to do this work until we make sure that there is no one left who cannot have clean drinking water in this country.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

**The Chair:** We're still on the second round. Mr. Gourde, you are sharing time with Kevin Waugh, are you not? Go ahead.

[Translation]

**Mr. Jacques Gourde (Lévis—Lotbinière, CPC):** Thank you, Madam Chair.

I'd like to thank the minister, Ms. Mondou and Ms. Cadotte for being here.

My question is rather technical.

Minister, feel free to ask the deputy minister for help, because this concerns the Department of Canadian Heritage.

I was reading an article by Mylène Crête in *La Presse* on September 24. Here's an excerpt that caught my eye:

The Canadian Special Representative on Combatting Islamophobia, Amira Elghawaby, will have to provide about 3,000 pages of documents to *La Presse*. The Information Commissioner of this country recently issued an order to force the Department of Canadian Heritage, to which Ms. Elghawaby reports, to respond to an access to information request that it chose to ignore.

I understand that and it's incomprehensible. An order from the commissioner is more than an access to information request. Usually, an order is issued following a complaint—correct me if I'm wrong. To my understanding, there was a complaint because the documents were not provided. Was it Ms. Elghawaby's office or the Department of Canadian Heritage—or both—that failed to hand over the documents? Could you explain to me what happened? According to the article, there is a lack of transparency.

Can you walk me through the timeline?

● (1725)

[English]

**Hon. Kamal Khera:** This is a very important question, and I think it's important to, first and foremost, recognize that we are always committed to an open and transparent government. Because of the scope of the request, I know extension was required, but I will turn to my officials to be able to give you a fulsome answer of the process.

[Translation]

**Ms. Isabelle Mondou:** Allow me to provide some details.

First of all, the special representative's office was very small when she started, but she's obviously built her team since then. Then, as a department, we provide services to the special representative, to support her in those efforts. In that context, we should have done a better job.

From now on, notices of orders will be sent directly to my office rather than to the Office of Access to Information and Privacy.

I take personal responsibility for not having been more supportive of our special representative.

**Mr. Jacques Gourde:** If I understand correctly, you weren't aware that the deadline had passed, but now you will look after it personally.

**Ms. Isabelle Mondou:** Absolutely.

In fact, had I known, I would have allocated additional resources to help the special representative, who, as we know, has a very small office.

From now on, the procedure will be different and I can intervene if necessary.

**Mr. Jacques Gourde:** My last question is simple. Were the documents provided?

**Ms. Isabelle Mondou:** They were provided last Friday.

[English]

**The Chair:** That was two minutes and 50 seconds on the dot, Mr. Gourde, and really well done.

Kevin, you may go ahead.

**Mr. Kevin Waugh:** Thank you.

Thank you to the department officials and the minister.

According to Canada's new anti-racism strategy, the special envoy on preserving Holocaust remembrance and combatting anti-Semitism has both an "international" and a "domestic" role.

You may be aware, Minister, that I had the original PMB, Bill C-250. It proposed massive penalties for the promotion of anti-Semitism, but in the wisdom of your government, you decided to take my bill.... Bill C-250 had teeth. It was strong. You have weakened this bill. When I look at what your government has done and not done compared to what my bill would have done, it's night and day.

I'm a little concerned when you start taking bills at budget time, putting them in...and then not following up, because my Bill C-250 had major consequences. I don't see any consequences in the proposed bill, in what you have taken today. I want to know why you haven't followed up on some of my recommendations in Bill C-250.

**Hon. Kamal Khara:** Madam Chair, if I may, I'd love to hear from my colleague about some of those recommendations.

**Mr. Kevin Waugh:** It was a great bill. Why didn't you follow up on some of the consequences that I had on hate speech, on anti-Semitism or on Holocaust denial? We have more anti-Semitism because of your Liberal government today than we did when I brought in the bill a year and a half ago.

**Hon. Kamal Khara:** That is incorrect. I think we all recognize that there have been challenging times, but to imply that there's more anti-Semitism because of one individual or one party is, quite frankly, shameful.

**The Chair:** Your time is up, Mr. Waugh.

I now go to Mr. Noomohamed for the Liberals.

You have five minutes.

**Mr. Taleeb Noormohamed (Vancouver Granville, Lib.):** Thank you, Madam Chair.

Thank you, Minister, for being with us today.

I am very proud to represent a riding that has a large Jewish community and large institutions of the Jewish community: six synagogues and two Jewish schools. I'm very proud to have in my riding the oldest mosque in British Columbia. I'm very proud to have a vibrant Sikh community.

My parents told me that showing up for your community matters. It's not just about words.

On October 7, I was privileged to attend the remembrance ceremony for victims of October 7. It was interesting to note that not one Conservative member of Parliament showed up.

During Ramadan, I was privileged to be with my community, and it was important to note that not one Conservative member of Parliament showed up to meet with the Muslim community.

Showing up also matters in votes, and I would love your thoughts on this.

In Vancouver Granville alone, the Conservative Party members voted against funding for the Vancouver Holocaust Education Centre, which was a specific line item in the budget. They voted against funding for the expansion of the Jewish Community Centre in my riding. They voted against funding for the Hellenic community in my riding. They voted against funding for the Canada community safety program that has affected gurdwara, masjid and Jewish temples in my riding.

What message does it send to Jews, Muslims, indigenous people, Asian Canadians and so many others when Conservatives talk about fighting racism and don't show up where it matters in the votes that matter to Canadians?

● (1730)

**Hon. Kamal Khara:** I'd like to thank my honourable colleague for his question and for always being very pragmatic and always bringing people together. It's something I think we all fundamentally believe in, and we are lucky to have such members in our caucus.

When you talk about the work that we're doing to combat anti-Semitism in this country, you're absolutely right. We as a government have been very deliberate about making that choice to invest in Canadians by listening to Canadians. On some of the funding that you talked about, the Conservatives voted against it, which is shameful. This came from the recommendations on the summits that we held on combatting anti-Semitism. This came from the communities that said they needed to have support, and they voted against it. You're absolutely right. Millions of dollars for the first ever special envoy, Deborah Lyons, to fight anti-Semitism and to preserve Holocaust education.

We made sure that this position exists within the Government of Canada because we know how much it matters. There was \$25 million for a new Montreal Holocaust museum, which you alluded to, that they voted against. There was \$5 million for the first ever national Holocaust remembrance program within our anti-racism strategy that is going directly for education around Holocaust remembrance to make sure that it never happens again in this country and to make sure that we're supporting communities on the ground like funding for the Holocaust Education Centre, which we know is fundamental to talking about the work that needs to happen on the ground.

It's always a bit rich to hear the Conservatives say anything, because they're all about slogans; they're not about solutions. We know that these things take time. It is deliberate work, and we need to work alongside community members with partners on the ground, but we have seen them time and time again vote against and cut funding for these very organizations that the Jewish community has asked for that they have voted against. It's quite frankly shameful.

**Mr. Taleeb Noormohamed:** Thank you, Minister.

Minister, one thing that I and I know others have been preoccupied with quite substantially is the role of far-right extremism and the impact that it's been having on women, on journalists and on indigenous peoples and the role of misinformation in this.

On May 7, I gave a notice of motion and, Madam Chair, at this time I'd like to move that motion, which reads as follows:

That, pursuant to Standing Order 108(2), the committee undertake a study of no fewer than four meetings to study the concerning rise in far-right extremism in Canada; that the study include how far-right extremism plays a role in misinformation and disinformation; how to better support preventable measures for ideologically motivated extremism in Canada and the connection between far-right extremism and harassment towards journalists, women, indigenous peoples, Black and racialized communities, members of the 2SLGBTQI+ community and religious minorities; that the committee report its findings and recommendations to the House; and that pursuant to Standing Order 109, the committee request that the government table a comprehensive response to the report.

This was distributed, Madam Chair, on May 7 in both official languages, and I would now like to move that motion.

• (1735)

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

It's so moved.

That was a few months ago. We're going to get it and send it to everybody.

I'll suspend, but before I do, I want to thank the minister for coming. I want to thank the minister for her performance, on being very clear on some of the things she needed to say, and answering the questions in a way that was sometimes feisty.

They were feisty questions, Minister, so you were feisty in answering them. I want to thank you for your presence here.

I'm going to suspend now so that we can get copies of this motion.

Thank you again, Minister.

• (1735)

(Pause)

• (1740)

**The Chair:** I call the meeting back to order.

The motion was sent to everybody.

Mr. Noormohamed, you have the floor.

• (1745)

**Mr. Taleeb Noormohamed:** Thank you, Madam Chair.

When I gave the notice of motion—

**Mr. Kevin Waugh:** I have a point of order, Madam Chair, if you don't mind. I'm sorry. I thought we discussed this motion already.

**The Chair:** No. We never did. It was just sent.

**Mr. Kevin Waugh:** No. Back in May, you brought the motion out.

**The Chair:** No. It was never tabled. The notice of motion was sent.

**Mr. Kevin Waugh:** Did we never discuss it?

**The Chair:** We never discussed it.

**Mr. Kevin Waugh:** Could you get clarification from the clerk?

**The Chair:** We never discussed it.

Mr. Noormohamed, go ahead.

**Mr. Taleeb Noormohamed:** Thank you, Madam Chair.

While you check on whether it was discussed or not, I can confirm it was never voted on, to the best of my recollection. I don't even know if we discussed it fully. I want to make sure that if it has been discussed and it needs to be amended, let's amend it and let's vote on it. If it has not been discussed, let's have a proper and robust discussion, which is what I believe we should have.

When I initially gave notice of this motion, it was with consultation with other parties because there is a substantial and growing concern about the role of far right extremism in this country. The connection between the harassment and intimidation of communities, journalists and others as a direct result of misinformation being spread through far right extremist narratives is something we should all be concerned about, regardless of our political parties and regardless of which part of the country we come from.

This is something I think Canadians would expect us to take seriously. This is not about targeting any one specific ethnic group. It is actually about all Canadians. Our opportunity here as a committee is to undertake a serious, very real study of the very serious and very dangerous ways in which far right extremism in this country is impacting people's lives.

I'm hopeful that all in this committee will support this motion. We can get going on ensuring that we put time down for this study, have the hard conversations we need to have to come back with recommendations and ensure that we get a comprehensive response to that report from the government in short order.

**The Chair:** Ms. Ashton.

**Ms. Niki Ashton:** I would like to make an amendment to the motion.

**The Chair:** By the way, I checked with the analysts and it was posted. It was tabled, but it was never discussed.

**Ms. Niki Ashton:** This is the amendment. After “the committee”, which is on line one, we would add “condemn the leader of the official opposition for visiting a convoy camp that celebrated far right extremists and a group whose founder was referred to as violent extremists by Canada’s Integrated Terrorism Assessment Centre and”

We have sent you a copy.

[Translation]

The copy we sent is bilingual.

[English]

Have you received it?

**The Chair:** Thank you.

We have an amendment on the floor. We're going to discuss the amendment.

I have Michael on the amendment.

**Mr. Kevin Waugh:** On a point of order, Madam Chair, we're seeing that this was discussed on May 9. It's in the minutes of May 9. We'd like to suspend.

**Mr. Michael Coteau:** I don't think suspending can be done during a point of order.

• (1750)

**The Chair:** No, but I'm have a request to suspend so that the one party can discuss among themselves—

**Mr. Michael Coteau:** I had the floor. He raised a point of order. His point of order was to bring reference to the May 9 reference. Then he asked, “Can we suspend?” You can't do that.

**The Chair:** Yes, he can do that. He can ask for a suspension.

**Mr. Michael Coteau:** Can I just say “point of order” any time and request to suspend?

**The Chair:** No, he said he had a point of order, which was to say—

**Mr. Michael Coteau:** I won't argue with the chair.

**The Chair:** —that it was already discussed, Mr. Coteau, and now he says he wants to suspend. I don't see the problem in sus-

pending for a short period of time for the Conservatives to discuss among themselves how to deal with this.

Go ahead, and the Liberals can discuss it. Everybody else can discuss it among themselves.

Yes, we'll suspend.

• (1750)

(Pause)

• (1750)

**The Chair:** The committee resumes.

Mr. Coteau, you have the floor.

**Mr. Michael Coteau:** Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

I'd like to move a motion to adopt this motion now.

**The Chair:** Okay, so moved.

We will have a vote so that the committee can proceed to adopting this motion now.

**The Clerk:** Is it to consider this motion?

**The Chair:** We have to consider this motion, so we will resume the debate on it.

**Mr. Taleeb Noormohamed:** I have a point of order.

**The Chair:** We will resume the debate on it. Now, let's get the vote.

**Mr. Taleeb Noormohamed:** I have a point of order.

**The Chair:** Will you consider adopting the motion?

**Mr. Taleeb Noormohamed:** Just to clarify, we are now voting so that we can talk about the motion—

**The Chair:** We're voting to put the motion back on the table.

**Mr. Taleeb Noormohamed:** —and not to pass it or to fail it. We're just trying to talk about it.

**The Chair:** Yes.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Could you explain this to me, Madam Chair? Member Ashton brought forward an amendment, but she was not in order to do that because Mr. Noormohamed was not in a position to move something because the business of the committee was left undone from the meeting of May 9.

**The Chair:** We were still trying to find all of that information, and we just found it all.

• (1755)

**Mr. Dan Albas:** It was discovered by the clerk. Okay. That's good.

**The Chair:** We are now exactly where we were on that day, so we have to now vote on the motion that this committee now entertain this motion to be part of today's proceedings.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** The question I would ask, Madam Chair, is this. If Mr. Noormohamed had not...because he moved something incorrectly, so we shouldn't even be in this discussion. We actually should still be dealing with the business of the committee.

**The Chair:** No, he had to move it. We now have to decide not if we want to adopt the motion, but if we want to deal with it.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** We shouldn't be discussing his motion without a resumption first, though.

**The Chair:** We're not discussing his motion. We're discussing Mr. Coteau's motion that the committee now consider this motion.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Technically, he wouldn't have had the floor there, would he?

**The Chair:** Yes, it was his turn on the floor. His name was here.

After Ms. Ashton, it was Mr. Coteau. His name is here.

After that is Mr. Champoux.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** It was on his motion, though.

**Mr. Taleeb Noormohamed:** I still had the floor—

**Mr. Dan Albas:** That was not correct.

**The Chair:** No, but—

**Mr. Dan Albas:** I'm just pointing out that there seems to be a bit of—

**The Chair:** It's not really a discrepancy because we had suspended. He now has the floor because he was on the list. He isn't going to speak to the motion; he's just moved a motion.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Okay, thank you for explaining it to me.

**The Chair:** We have a motion on the floor that this committee consider Mr. Noormohamed's motion.

Let's call the vote.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Is this a debatable motion?

**The Chair:** No.

We're going to call the vote. Is that all right?

**Mr. Dan Albas:** I personally wanted to listen to what the deputy had to say in her role as an accounting officer, but...

**The Chair:** I know. Then you know how to vote. If you don't want to discuss the motion, then you can vote against it.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Thank you for explaining it to me.

**The Chair:** Okay, go ahead.

**The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Danielle Widmer):** The motion is this: Shall the committee proceed to the consideration of the motion from May 9.

(Motion agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

**The Chair:** The motion is now to be considered by this committee.

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

**The Chair:** You are now going to be speaking to the motion, Mr. Albas, because that's where we're moving now. We've adopted the motion, so you're speaking to the motion.

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

**The Chair:** Go ahead. Let's hear your point of order.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** The reason we moved off the business that was previously scheduled, that being the minister and the deputy minis-

ter, was that Mr. Noormohamed had made a motion during his round of questioning.

**The Chair:** Yes, he is free to do that.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Well, Madam Chair, he didn't move the motion that we just did.

Procedurally, Mr. Coteau shouldn't even have been able to have the floor to speak to his motion because, technically, his motion should have been ruled out of order at the very beginning.

**The Chair:** No, it wouldn't have because we did not have the information on the motion. If you recall, it was archived, and the clerk and the analysts were looking to find out the status of the motion in order to decide if the committee can consider it. It was found that the status of the motion meant that it had to be reconsidered by this committee. That motion was moved by Mr. Coteau because we were starting after suspending, and the committee has agreed they want to consider this motion.

That's a vote. I'm sorry, Mr. Albas.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** However, Madam Chair, Mr. Coteau shouldn't have had the floor in the first place because it was not his time to speak during questioning.

**The Chair:** Mr. Coteau had his hand up.

I can recognize you. If you had put your hand up, I would have recognized you.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Okay, Madam Chair. I am just pointing out that there seems to be a real lapse of logic here.

**The Chair:** No, I don't think there is.

Let's go ahead.

The motion is on the floor, and it's to be considered.

Mr. Coteau.

**Mr. Michael Coteau:** Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

I want to thank the member for bringing this motion forward.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Jacques Gourde:** I have a point of order, Madam Chair.

Could you allow the witnesses to leave? I believe the meeting will end at 6:30.

• (1800)

[*English*]

**The Chair:** In just a second I will do that.

Yes, Mr. Noormohamed. Do you have a point of order?

**Mr. Taleeb Noormohamed:** Yes, it's the same thing as Monsieur Gourde.

If we dispense with this motion quickly and pass it, we can get back to the officials. I don't know.... It depends—

**The Chair:** I think it's premature. Let's see what we do with this motion. It may be 10 minutes, although I doubt it very much, knowing this committee, but therefore we could go ahead with it.

Mr. Coteau, go ahead.



**Ms. Niki Ashton:** I have a point of order, Madam Chair.

Just procedurally, I made an amendment, and we obviously sent the text.

**The Chair:** You have to remake it, Niki, because we're now officially considering the motion.

**Ms. Niki Ashton:** Okay.

**The Chair:** Mr. Coteau, you're speaking to Mr. Noormohamed's motion as unamended.

**Mr. Michael Coteau:** I will take my name off the list.

**The Chair:** All right.

Ms. Ashton.

**Ms. Niki Ashton:** I would like to make that amendment to the motion at this time. It would add—

**The Chair:** We have the amendment.

**Ms. Niki Ashton:** Just to make sure.... Again, it would adding the following text after the language “the committee” in line 1: “condemn the leader of the official opposition for visiting a convoy camp that celebrated far right extremists and a group whose founder was referred to as violent extremists by Canada's Integrated Terrorism Assessment Centre and”.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

We have you speaking to your amendment, Niki, and then I see Mr. Champoux's hand up. Am I seeing other hands up to speak to the amendment when our speaking list—

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Jacques Gourde:** Point of order, Madam Chair.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** The amendment is on the floor.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Jacques Gourde:** Can we indeed receive the amendment in both official languages?

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Pardon? We have it in both official languages. We're circulating it right now to everyone.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Jacques Gourde:** Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Niki.

**Ms. Niki Ashton:** I originally put this amendment forward at the beginning of May, following a meeting of the leader of the official opposition that took place at the end of April, when he stopped at... In videos posted to social media, the opposition leader was seen thanking and encouraging people who were camped in what was described as a convoy-style protest. In that time, he also met with people who indicated support for Diagonol, which is an organization that, as I pointed out in the amendment, was referred to as a violent extremist organization by Canada's Integrated Terrorism Assessment Centre.

We have to be very clear here. We're not talking about theoretical dog-whistle politics. We are talking about the leader of the official opposition, somebody who clearly aspires to be prime minister. He met with individuals who espouse vile, racist, bigoted and far right views, then turned around and failed to condemn the organization and, obviously, the people who support it.

It's very clear, from the previous hour, that we have a real problem in Canada with the rise of the far right. We have seen an explosion of hate crimes in our country targeting minority communities. We have seen hate crimes targeted at the Chinese community and Asian Canadians. We have seen hate crimes against the Jewish community—horrible examples of anti-Semitism. We've seen clear, disturbing acts of Islamophobia. Of course, I talked about the ongoing reality of anti-Palestinian racism, which, unfortunately, the Liberals are not taking seriously, either. What's clear to me is that we need to be taking on the rise of the far right in the clearest of terms. That means condemning politicians who, dare I say, play footsie with the far right, who fail to condemn the far right and whose actions, in many cases, fuel the far right, legitimizing and normalizing absolutely abhorrent views that have no place not just in Canada but anywhere in the world.

Canada is going down a dangerous path. We're a country that has often been a leader when it comes to diversity, multiculturalism and inclusion. We've fallen behind on many fronts. There's a lot of work to do. I believe that, at this time, we are facing a crisis when it comes to the rise of the far right. I believe supporting this amendment is a clear example of calling out the mainstream support for it that we see from the Conservative leader, who aspires to be prime minister.

Of course, supporting a study on the rise of the far right is critical. Canadians are concerned. Many Canadians are targets and have been victims of hate crimes and the rise of the far right. This is a timely, critical issue that we in the heritage committee have the responsibility to take on.

However, I believe it begins by condemning the individual who aspires to be prime minister and who has, all too often, been seen to be very close to and supportive of people whose views are deeply disturbing and definitely unacceptable.

I certainly hope members of the committee will join me in supporting this amendment. Of course, I hope we can move forward in supporting this study as soon as possible.

• (1805)

**The Chair:** Thank you, Niki.

Now we'll go to Martin.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Martin Champoux:** Thank you, Madam Chair.

In my opinion, when we propose a study, we generally try—at least if we do the work as I feel it should be done, which may be debatable—it seems to me that it's because we want to hear from witnesses and obtain information.

It also seems to me that one thing we shouldn't do is draw conclusions immediately.

As part of the study proposed in Mr. Noormohamed's motion, perhaps we could have denounced the fact that the leader of the official opposition went to meet with these people. We could have discussed it afterwards. However, stating that fact in the motion itself, through the amendment that was just proposed, is counterproductive.

With the utmost respect, I think that doing so adds a partisan note, even though I entirely agree with my colleague Ms. Ashton as to this behaviour, which has no place in politics.

However, we're now talking about conducting a study at committee that I think my Conservative colleagues might have agreed to—were it not for this amendment—because this is a subject that affects everyone and the opinions of everyone around the table are interesting to hear, even when we really don't share them.

The situation troubles me, because—I repeat—Mr. Noormohamed's motion, which we discussed in the spring, is being injected with a very partisan notion that distorts it. Nonetheless, I think the study is important in and of itself.

I will therefore oppose Ms. Ashton's amendment, without necessarily objecting to the fact that we can have this discussion once the study is under way. We can denounce the fact in question at that time, in the context of a study that has been undertaken in a much more objective manner than what is proposed in this amendment.

I completely agree with the motion's original wording, because it proposes a discussion that we'd like to have and that is somewhat in the wake of the motion adopted for the study on freedom of expression. That is also part of this discussion, because the topics are truly related, very interesting and relevant in the current context. We discussed it with the minister earlier and could also have discussed it with the deputy ministers, but, what can I say, we have an entertaining motion. The proof is that Ms. Cadotte and Ms. Mondou stayed to encourage us.

Having said that, I will vote against the amendment, but without disagreeing with the intention of discussing the issues it addresses as part of the study we will undertake on this subject.

[English]

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

On the amendment, I will go to Mr. Noormohamed, please.

• (1810)

**Mr. Taleeb Noormohamed:** Thank you, Madam Chair.

This is a really important motion. The amendment that Ms. Ashton has put forward I would love to be able to support; however, here is my challenge. Nothing Ms. Ashton has said about condemning the Leader of the Opposition for visiting a Diagonal camp I disagree with. It must be condemned in the strongest possible terms. Every political leader in this country has an obligation to not hang out with far right, violent, extremist organizations.

What I would say is that this is an important motion without the amendment. Without the amendment, I would challenge my Conservative colleagues to support this. We strip out anything that might be perceived as a partisan attack, rightly or wrongly, and we all get to work on this important work. I cannot see a reasonable-

minded Canadian who would not want us to do this work as a committee. My concern is that if we support Madam Ashton's motion, this will end up in a filibuster, which is exactly what happened when we brought this up the last time.

While I agree with the sentiment that Ms. Ashton has put forward—I think there need to be real, serious conversations about where politicians show up and what that means to Canadians—my fear is that this important study will be derailed completely if the amendment is passed, because Conservative colleagues will use that as an opportunity to filibuster.

My request, if Ms. Ashton is willing to withdraw that amendment, is that we do that and hope that Conservatives will join us in supporting and getting this motion passed. If that's not going to happen, then we will see where the votes land. If the amendment is defeated, I would hope that Conservatives would see no problem—no problem at all—in having a meaningful, thoughtful conversation about the impact of far right extremism, about misinformation and about the impact that is having on people's lives.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much.

Mr. Gourde, you are speaking to the amendment.

[Translation]

**Mr. Jacques Gourde:** Thank you, Madam Chair.

Yes, I'll speak to the amendment.

I listened to Ms. Ashton's explanation of her amendment. That said, I'm still confused about the wording. The member said that the Leader of the Opposition thanked or encouraged extremists. Was she present? Do we have any evidence that someone heard something? Personally, when I meet a truck driver, no matter where he is, I tend to talk to him about the power of his engine, the number of hours worked per week or what he is going through.

The proposed motion is based on hearsay. However, we don't condemn people on the basis of hearsay. If Ms. Ashton or someone she knows was standing next to the Leader of the Opposition and could confirm that he made comments that led to this type of amendment, I would be prepared to listen to them. It makes no sense. If this kind of amendment can be proposed, we will certainly do some research over the past 150 years in order to propose amendments, because all members have spoken to someone at some point without being sure of the person's background. We might all be guilty of talking to someone about something we shouldn't have mentioned. If Ms. Ashton is sure of those statements, she should provide us with some evidence. As a legislator, I find this type of amendment purely partisan, which I find distressing and sad. What's happening right now is serious, and we're not going to let it happen. We need to pay close attention to that. We are all guilty of talking to someone about something at some point. Does that mean that we're going to propose amendments to comments made by all members of the House over the past 150 years? You would end up with tens of thousands of amendments.

I can assure you that we will.

[English]

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

Now is Ms. Ashton, and then Mr. Coteau.

**Ms. Niki Ashton:** I think there was a fair bit of media at the end of April talking about the specific meeting in question. I would encourage Mr. Gourde to do a cursory Google search on that front. One of the particular instances that's being referred to, I believe, took place in New Brunswick.

I just want to quote here from a CBC story:

According to RCMP documents tabled at the Emergencies Act inquiry last year, the national police force believes Diagonol

—the group these folks support—

is a militia-like network whose supporters subscribe to an accelerationist ideology—the idea that a civil war or the collapse of western governments is inevitable and ought to be sped up.

I mean, that's deeply concerning. The idea that the leader of the official opposition, who aspires to be prime minister, met with people who support such an entity is also deeply disturbing.

I am disappointed to hear that there doesn't seem to be support for the amendment I've put out condemning the leader of the official opposition for meeting with the supporters of such an organization, a far right organization. I would ask that we go to a vote. I certainly look forward to passing the motion on a study on the rise of the far right in Canada, which I believe is an incredibly important issue.

• (1815)

**The Chair:** Thank you, Niki.

Mr. Coteau.

**Mr. Michael Coteau:** I move that we go to the vote, if possible, now.

**The Chair:** There are still people who want to speak.

Mr. Coteau, if there's someone else wishing to speak, I have to allow them to.

**Mr. Michael Coteau:** I think we can vote on that at any time.

**The Chair:** No, I'm sorry. That's not how it works, Mr. Coteau.

Mr. Waugh has the floor, and then Mr. Gourde.

**Mr. Michael Coteau:** Okay, I'm going to take my time, then, if that's possible.

**The Chair:** All right, take your time.

[Translation]

**Mr. Martin Champoux:** Madam Chair, I have a point of order.

[English]

**The Chair:** I think it's now 10 minutes. It would seem, from my own perspective, that this is not going to end.

Ms. Cadotte and Ms. Mondou, thank you very much for coming, and for your patience in listening to this. Hopefully we can get to speak to you again some time. Thank you very much for coming and for your time.

Mr. Coteau has the floor.

Mr. Champoux, do you have a point of order?

[Translation]

**Mr. Martin Champoux:** Yes, Madam Chair.

I'd like to ask for a clarification. While he had the floor, Mr. Coteau called for a vote to adjourn debate on the amendment and proceed to a vote.

I want to make sure I understand the procedure. It seems to me that asking to adjourn debate in order to proceed to a vote is in order. I may have misunderstood, and that's why I'm asking for clarification on that.

[English]

**The Chair:** Yesterday, if you saw what went on in the House, the Speaker ruled on the idea that you cannot go to a vote unless there is no one else who wishes to speak at the committee.

I have two names here of people who wish to speak. I'm sorry, but we cannot go to a vote yet, according to the Speaker's ruling.

Mr. Coteau.

**Mr. Michael Coteau:** It's sometimes confusing, because in my other committee, we are allowed to do that.

**The Chair:** Mr. Coteau, I've just ruled. Would you like to speak?

**Mr. Michael Coteau:** I am speaking. Is it okay for me to speak?

**The Chair:** The Speaker ruled on it yesterday in the House.

Go ahead.

**Mr. Michael Coteau:** Is it okay if I speak, Madam Chair?

I just want to support my colleague, Mr. Noormohamed, in the sense that I won't support the amendment, mainly because I think—

**The Chair:** You will? Did you say you will support it?

**Mr. Michael Coteau:** I will not support the amendment.

**The Chair:** All right. Okay.

**Mr. Michael Coteau:** I think that in the way it's written, we can talk about many different issues. It really speaks to an issue around the growth of the far right in Canada.

I keep seeing more images of people marching in the United States. In Washington, you have far right extremists and white supremacists. You start to see more things. I go through my social media now and I start to see more and more images of extremism in America, but also in Canada.

I think all of us here, every single person in this room—I hope—would agree that extremism usually occurs in hidden places. It's in places we don't often see. It's a very underground movement. I think we need to shed some light on this growth that's taking place in the country and prove that it actually is growing. Let's bring in some experts to figure out what's actually happening right now, at this moment.

**The Chair:** Are you speaking to the amendment or to the motion itself?

**Mr. Michael Coteau:** I was just saying why I don't support the amendment. It's because I think the motion itself is clear enough. That's what I was trying to get at.

I'll stop there, Madam Chair.

**The Chair:** Okay. All right. Thank you.

I have Mr. Waugh and then Mr. Gourde.

**Mr. Kevin Waugh:** Madam Chair, I was just going to move a privilege motion.

I move that the chair violated the privileges of the members of this committee when the chair arbitrarily gave the floor to Mr. Coteau when we first started from May 9. It should have been Mr. Noormohamed.

• (1820)

**The Chair:** I do not think I violated the privilege of anyone. We had suspended, if you recall, Mr. Waugh, so the committee was not meeting at that moment. We were looking to find out more about this motion before—

**Mr. Kevin Waugh:** I found it for you.

**The Chair:** All right. It doesn't matter who found it.

**Mr. Kevin Waugh:** We found that on May 9, Mr. Noormohamed—

**The Chair:** We found it. That's not the point. The point is we found out that, in fact, Mr. Noormohamed's motion could not stand as it was and we had to move a motion. Mr. Coteau moved the motion that the committee study it. That was pretty straightforward.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** On a point of order, Madam Chair, have you found his privilege motion to be in order?

**The Chair:** I have not, but you can challenge the chair, if you wish.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** No. I would just like to find out if you're going to be...because then we can have a discussion, and I would like to speak to that.

**The Chair:** Mr. Waugh, because this is quite a rare, little thing we're doing here now, I'm listening to the clerk. Why do you feel your privilege was violated?

**Mr. Kevin Waugh:** When you look back, we found that on May 9, the debate started with Mr. Noormohamed. Instead of him picking up where we left off on May 9, you gave Mr. Coteau the floor first, when it really should have gone to Mr. Noormohamed.

**The Chair:** Mr. Noormohamed's hand was not up for the floor, though.

**Mr. Kevin Waugh:** Yes, but it should have gone back to him from the—

**The Chair:** Not necessarily. I got instructions from the clerk—

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

**The Chair:** Mr. Albas, I'm explaining something to Mr. Waugh.

Go ahead.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Madam Chair, with all due respect, we do have standing motions in every committee. It is clearly pointed out that each party gets a rotation and how much time they get. The person

who had the floor was Mr. Noormohamed. He made a motion that was not in order. You've admitted as much.

**The Chair:** Yes.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** You somehow then went to Mr. Coteau, which is outside of the standing motions for the order of questioning.

We should have gone from whoever should have followed Mr. Noormohamed—

**The Chair:** I'm sorry. There was nobody to follow Mr. Noormohamed. Mr. Coteau's hand came up.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** It should have come back to the Conservatives.

**The Chair:** No, we had finished. The minister had left. That part of the meeting was over. Mr. Noormohamed was asking the minister a question. In the middle of that or at the end of it, he moved his motion.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** The motion was not in order.

**The Chair:** We did not know that, Mr. Albas. We were looking to find out. The clerk had told me it was archived.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** The business of the meeting—

**The Chair:** We were searching for it, so we did not do anything until we found out for sure. When we found out that the motion had been discussed at some point in time, the clerk said I had to therefore entertain a motion by anyone on the committee that we consider this motion. I did that. The committee voted to consider the motion. That was all in order. That was in order of procedure. There's nothing violated right now.

I am speaking to Mr. Waugh about how he felt his privilege was violated as a member. That's what we're discussing right now. Mr. Waugh has the floor.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** My question is for the clerk.

**The Chair:** You made a point of order and I said it wasn't.

Mr. Waugh, go ahead. You have the floor.

**Mr. Kevin Waugh:** Thanks a lot, Madam Chair.

We're just moving the privilege motion here. Now, these motions, as you know, trigger debate. Such a motion supersedes all other committee business, including the far right motion that we're currently discussing.

**The Chair:** I've asked you explain why you feel—because you have the floor—that your privilege was violated. Then we can continue to discuss it.

• (1825)

**Mr. Kevin Waugh:** Well, we haven't debated this.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

**The Chair:** I'm asking you that. Tell me why your privilege was violated. Mr. Albas jumped in on a point of order.

**Mr. Kevin Waugh:** That's fine.

**The Chair:** You have the floor, Mr. Waugh.

**Mr. Kevin Waugh:** Is it in order now?

**The Chair:** You brought a motion forward that you felt that your privilege was violated. I asked you to tell me why you moved that motion.

Why was your privilege was violated?

You have the floor to speak.

**Mr. Kevin Waugh:** Thank you very much.

**The Chair:** You've always had the floor. Mr. Albas just chimed in on a point of order while you were speaking.

Let's hear you, Kevin. I'm always ready to listen to you. Go ahead.

**Mr. Kevin Waugh:** Well, thank you, Madam Chair.

Thanks for the committee.

I think it's part of a privilege motion that these motions trigger a debate, as you know, Madam Chair. We haven't really had the debate.

What we started...the motion of superseding old committee business. We talked about the far right motion and that's what we're currently debating. We haven't talked—

**The Chair:** We're debating an amendment. I'm sorry, Mr. Waugh.

**Mr. Kevin Waugh:** The amendment reads as such—

**The Chair:** We haven't voted on the amendment yet. We're still debating the amendment, not the motion.

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

Again, you seem to be moving to a discussion about the amendment.

Can I ask you to maybe caucus with the clerk on whether or not we are discussing his order—

**The Chair:** Yes, we are. Mr. Waugh made a statement that we're discussing the motion. I said that we were discussing the amendment. I answered Mr. Waugh's question, Mr. Albas.

Mr. Waugh still has the floor, speaking to his motion.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** It just seems you're debating him rather than letting him speak to his colleagues.

**The Chair:** I'm not. I am answering his questions. He's asked a question. He said, basically, that we are discussing the motion.

I was just correcting him. We were, in the moment, discussing Niki's amendment. We haven't finished that; it hasn't come to a vote.

Mr. Waugh brought a question of privilege, which I thought superseded everything. That's why I went to him. We left Niki's motion to be debated later on because Mr. Waugh has precedence. That's what I just did.

Now, if you have a problem with that, I would like to hear it.

Does Mr. Waugh not have the floor?

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Again, I've never seen a chair debate with a member.

**The Chair:** I'm not debating.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** It's either in order and he can have the floor, or it's not.

**An hon. member:** It's out of order.

**The Chair:** I'm not debating with him. He made a statement. I said that we're not discussing the motion.

When we left off, when Mr. Waugh made his question of privilege, I said we had been discussing.... I was just saying that we had been....

That is a fact. That is what is on the table.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** I'd like to be able to speak after he's done.

**The Chair:** Absolutely.

**Mr. Taleeb Noormohamed:** I have a point of order, Madam Chair.

My understanding is that the motion of privilege is inadmissible. I'm just wondering whether you have ruled it to be inadmissible. Is it admissible or not? That's what I'm trying to figure out.

**The Chair:** I would like to hear why Mr. Waugh thinks his privilege was violated. I can't rule unless I hear that he has a compelling reason to say that his privilege was violated. I'm trying to get to that, except we keep having points of order and keep not letting Mr. Waugh speak.

Mr. Waugh, will you continue, please?

**Mr. Kevin Waugh:** I will say this, Madam Chair: Thank you. You acknowledge that Mr. Coteau really shouldn't have had the floor.

**The Chair:** I did not acknowledge [*Inaudible—Editor*].

**Mr. Kevin Waugh:** Well, he probably shouldn't have had the floor because Mr.—

**The Chair:** Well, you think you probably know.

**Mr. Taleeb Noormohamed:** I would have said the same thing if I had the floor.

**Mr. Kevin Waugh:** Right? You should have had the floor from May 9.

**Mr. Taleeb Noormohamed:** If we rewind back to there, I would do the same thing.

**Mr. Michael Coteau:** Just make a ruling, Madam Chair.

**The Chair:** This is not what we're discussing, Kevin. Come on. Tell me about your question of privilege.

**Mr. Kevin Waugh:** No, that's it. I just wanted to bring this up. I just thought—

**Mr. Michael Coteau:** Stop them and make a ruling. Let's vote.

**The Chair:** I think I have enough information now from Mr. Waugh. He said that he didn't have anything further to say.

I will rule, Mr. Waugh, that I don't consider this to be a question of privilege. I'm sorry.

Now, I would like to hear what everyone has to say about my ruling.

It's not a question of privilege, so there's not going to be debate on it, but you can all tell me if you agree with my ruling or not. That's what you're supposed to do.

Mr. Lightbound.

**Mr. Joël Lightbound (Louis-Hébert, Lib.):** I would never dare to question the ruling of the chair, but I think if you ruled it out of order—Mr. Waugh's point—I think we're now back on the amendment, aren't we?

**The Chair:** Yes, we are.

**Mr. Joël Lightbound:** Thank you.

If there are no more speakers, we can—

**The Chair:** No, because when.... It's out of order, so Mr. Albas cannot debate it.

Are you debating Ms. Ashton's amendment, Mr. Albas?

• (1830)

**Mr. Dan Albas:** No.

**The Chair:** Well, that's what's on the floor now. I'm sorry.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** I didn't raise my hand on her amendment.

**The Chair:** I'm looking at my list here.

**Mr. Michael Coteau:** It is 6:30 p.m.

**The Chair:** All right. We have no one else to further debate this, unless you want to.

**Mr. Taleeb Noormohamed:** We would like to vote on this.

**The Chair:** I think because we are in the middle of....

Mr. Gourde, you were trying to say something. What were you trying to say?

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Jacques Gourde:** I move to adjourn the meeting.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** It is moved that we adjourn.









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>