



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

44th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

House of Commons Debates

Official Report
(Hansard)

Volume 151 No. 176
Thursday, March 30, 2023

Speaker: The Honourable Anthony Rota



CONTENTS

(Table of Contents appears at back of this issue.)

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, March 30, 2023

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayer

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

• (1000)

[*Translation*]

CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND ETHICS COMMISSIONER

The Speaker: Pursuant to subsection 15(3) of the Conflict of Interest Code for Members of the House of Commons, it is my duty to lay upon the table the list of all sponsored travel by members for the year 2022, with a supplement as provided by the Conflict of Interest and Ethics Commissioner.

* * *

[*English*]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8)(a), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to five petitions.

These returns will be tabled in an electronic format.

* * *

[*Translation*]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

INDUSTRY AND TECHNOLOGY

Mr. Joël Lightbound (Louis-Hébert, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 11th report of the Standing Committee on Industry and Technology in relation to Bill C-244, an act to amend the Copyright Act (diagnosis, maintenance and repair).

The committee has studied the bill and has decided to report the bill back to the House with amendment.

I also have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 12th report of the Standing Committee on Industry and Technology in relation to Bill C-288, an act to amend the Telecommunications Act (transparent and accurate broadband services information).

The committee has studied the bill and has decided to report the bill back to the House with amendment.

I also have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 13th report of the Standing Committee on Industry and Technology in relation to Bill C-294, an act to amend the Copyright Act (interoperability).

The committee has studied the bill and has decided to report the bill back to the House also with amendment.

ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Francis Scarpaleggia (Lac-Saint-Louis, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the eighth report of the Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development, entitled “Main Estimates 2023-24: Votes 1, 5 and 10 under Department of the Environment, Votes 1 and 5 under Impact Assessment Agency of Canada and Votes 1, 5 and 10 under Parks Canada Agency”.

• (1005)

[*English*]

CANADA–PEOPLE’S REPUBLIC OF CHINA RELATIONSHIP

Mr. Ken Hardie (Fleetwood—Port Kells, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the second interim report of the Special Committee on the Canada–People’s Republic of China Relationship entitled, “Canada and Taiwan: A Strong Relationship in Turbulent Times”.

Pursuant to Standing Order 109, the committee requests that the government table a comprehensive response to this report.

* * *

NATIONAL FRAMEWORK ON ATTENTION DEFICIT HYPERACTIVITY DISORDER ACT

Ms. Heather McPherson (Edmonton Strathcona, NDP) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-329, an act to establish a national framework respecting attention deficit hyperactivity disorder.

She said: Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to stand today to table this bill on behalf of the residents of Edmonton Strathcona and all Canadians who recognize the value of creating equitable access to attention deficit hyperactivity disorder treatments and support in our country.

Routine Proceedings

I want to thank the member for London—Fanshawe for seconding this bill. I also want to thank all the advocates, the teachers, the doctors and those from the Centre for ADHD Awareness for their incredible work on this.

I am also delighted to tell the House that my father Duke, my nephew Angus and my son Maclean are joining me in Ottawa today to help me table this important legislation. The reason for that is my son Mac has ADHD, so for my family this is a different piece of legislation.

ADHD is one of the most common psychological disorders that affects children in this country. We have no system to ensure that teachers, doctors and those working with children receive the training they require and that there is a framework to ensure that young people across the country can get the support they need. The reason this is so important is that, when children are supported and are provided with the tools they require, there are nothing but good outcomes for those children. However, if they are not given the support they require the outcomes are very difficult, as are the economic impacts on our communities.

Therefore, today I am so proud to stand here and table this bill. I am proud to be able to stand here and speak on behalf of my family, the teachers and the doctors across this country, and the many people who have worked so hard to bring awareness to ADHD.

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)

* * *

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there have been discussions amongst the parties and if you seek it, I believe you will find unanimous consent to adopt the following motion:

That, notwithstanding any Standing Order, special order, or usual practice of the House, the 11th report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs, presented to the House on Tuesday, June 21, 2022, be deemed concurred in.

The Speaker: All those opposed to the hon. member's moving the motion will please say nay. It is agreed.

The House has heard the terms of the motion. All those opposed to the motion please say nay.

(Motion agreed to)

* * *

PETITIONS

FALUN GONG

Mrs. Carol Hughes (Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapusksing, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I rise to table a petition that highlights the ongoing persecution of Falun Gong practitioners in China.

The petitioners state that Falun Gong is a traditional Chinese spiritual discipline that consists of meditation exercises and moral teachings based on the principles of truthfulness, compassion and tolerance.

They note that they are the victims of various forms of persecution in China, including forced organ harvesting and trafficking.

The petitioners call on Parliament to pass a resolution to establish measures to stop the Chinese Communist regime's crime of systematically murdering Falun Gong practitioners for their organs, to amend Canadian legislation to combat forced organ harvesting and to publicly call for an end to the persecution of Falun Gong in China.

• (1010)

SEAL ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE

Mr. Chris d'Entremont (West Nova, CPC): Mr. Speaker, today I am presenting a petition about the Seal Island Lighthouse, which was established in 1831 as a crucial guide for ships entering and leaving the Bay of Fundy area.

Strong tides, weather systems, and reefs and rocks around the island have made Seal Island a major hazard to shipping for more than three centuries. Those dangers continue today. The original settlers of the island, the Hichens and the Crowell families, lobbied for the building of the lighthouse.

Samuel Cunard, founder of the Cunard Line, as commissioner of lighthouses, was instrumental in having the Seal Island Lighthouse established.

The Seal Island Lighthouse is extremely important to local residents in Southwest Nova Scotia and to seasonal island dwellers, many of whom have direct ties to those original lighthouse dwellers and lightkeepers who served that lighthouse from 1831 to 1990.

The petitioners call on the Government of Canada to continue the maintenance of the 1831 Seal Island Lighthouse, as it is currently being managed by the Canadian Coast Guard.

THE ECONOMY

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner (Calgary Nose Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour of presenting two petitions today, the first being a petition regarding the cost of living.

Many Canadians are concerned about the increased cost of living and the lack of government action thereof.

The petitioners call on the Government of Canada to immediately table a plan to address the affordability crisis in Canada. The petition has over 500 signatures.

JUSTICE

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner (Calgary Nose Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I also have the pleasure and honour of tabling a petition concerning provincial sovereignty.

The over 3,000 petitioners note that the government's continued appeal of decisions regarding Bill C-69 and the constitutionality thereof is a violation of provincial sovereignty and jurisdiction.

The petitioners are calling upon the government to respect the ruling of the Alberta Court of Appeal by not seeking further appeals, to recognize Bill C-69 as unconstitutional and to immediately repeal this legislation.

RIGHTS OF THE UNBORN

Mrs. Cathay Wagantall (Yorkton—Melville, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is well established that the risk of violence against women increases when they are pregnant. This is the concern of these petitioners.

Currently, the injury or death of preborn children as victims of crime is not considered an aggravating circumstance for sentencing purposes in the Criminal Code of Canada.

Canada has no abortion law, and this legal void is such that we do not even recognize preborn children as victims in violent crimes. Justice requires that an attacker who abuses a pregnant woman and a preborn child be sentenced accordingly. The sentence should match the crime.

The petitioners are calling on the House of Commons to legislate the abuse of a pregnant woman, and or the infliction of harm on a preborn child, as aggravating circumstances for sentencing purposes in the Criminal Code.

SENIORS

Mr. Len Webber (Calgary Confederation, CPC): Mr. Speaker, today I am presenting a petition from many concerned Canadians from Alberta and B.C., including in my own riding of Calgary Confederation.

The petitioners are justifiably concerned that individuals with a history of sexually inappropriate behaviours are permitted to live in close quarters with vulnerable seniors in care homes. The petitioners highlight a tragic case involving an Alzheimer's patient, Ruth, and they believe her sexual assault could have been prevented if care homes took these threats more seriously.

The inability of care homes to separate known sexual abusers from very vulnerable populations is allowing them to commit their crimes with little recourse. This is wrong, violates the vulnerable and causes untold stress for their families.

The petitioners want the government to bring forward legislation that prevents known sex offenders from cohabiting in facilities with known vulnerable seniors.

FIREARMS

Mr. Tako Van Popta (Langley—Aldergrove, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present a petition signed by thousands of Canadians across the country who are deeply concerned that the government's proposed freeze on the sale and transfer of handguns is an ineffective way to combat violent crime and that these regulations disproportionately affect law-abiding firearms owners. The petitioners are calling on the government to immediately repeal this freeze and instead to direct resources to combat the smuggling of firearms across our borders, to combat the prevalence of ghost-gun manufacturing and to establish common-sense firearms laws that protect legal firearms owners.

Routine Proceedings

• (1015)

SALMON FISHERY

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is a huge honour and privilege to table this petition today on behalf of constituents of mine from Tofino and Clayoquot Sound. They cite that migrating juvenile wild salmon stocks are under serious threat from pathogens, pollutants and sea lice originating from open-net fish farms. Wild salmon supports first nations cultural traditions and complex ecosystems, including contributing to coastal forests, which produce the oxygen we breathe.

In spite of the serious risk that domestic piscine orthoreovirus poses to the migrating juvenile wild salmon stocks, the Department of Fisheries and Oceans refuses to screen for domestic PRV and to stop the transfer of farmed fish that are known to be infected with PRV. Pacific salmon runs on the Pacific coast and in B.C. are in a state of emergency.

The petitioners are calling on the government to immediately stop the transfer of PRV-infected smolts into open-net fish farms. They also ask that it complete the transition of open-pen fish farms to land-based closed containment by 2025 and follow through with the removal of its promise of open-net fish farms from B.C. waters by 2025.

[Translation]

CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

Ms. Lena Metlege Diab (Halifax West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition.

[English]

The petition is relating to Canada's response to the tragic earthquakes in Turkey and Syria on February 6. The petitioners note that at the time of the petition's creation, over 40,000 lives had been lost and more than 150,000 people had been injured. They note that the growing Turkish diaspora, with over 150,000 people, have family members who were injured, lost their homes and have no place to stay.

The 2,826 signatories call upon the Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship to create a special visa program for family members of Canadian citizens and permanent residents in Turkey. They also ask the minister to expedite the processing of family reunification applications for primary applicants who live in the earthquake zone.

I want to thank all our Turkish and Syrian communities for their advocacy in the aftermath of this tragedy.

Routine Proceedings

FIREARMS

Mrs. Tracy Gray (Kelowna—Lake Country, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to present a petition from members of my community in Kelowna—Lake Country and the surrounding area. To summarize, the petitioners are calling on the government to stop targeting law-abiding hunters, sports shooters and farmers with gun legislation; to revise Bill C-21 so that it would effectively address the illegal use of firearms by criminals, while respecting the rights of law-abiding citizens; and last, to focus law-enforcement resources on gangs, drug traffickers, illegal gun traffickers and those who purchase firearms illegally.

HUMAN RIGHTS IN PAKISTAN

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have a number of petitions to present to the House today, and I am grateful for the opportunity.

The first petition concerns the human rights conditions of the Ahmadiyya Muslim community, which has contributed so much to our country but sadly faces serious persecution in many parts of the world. Petitioners note horrific comments made by a senior cleric of the Tehreek-e-Labbaik party in Pakistan, advocating violence against pregnant Ahmadiyya women and calling for horrific violence targeting the Ahmadiyya community.

Petitioners also note that Ahmadiyya Muslim children are being expelled from school in the Attock district simply because of their faith identity. They note that Pakistan is a signatory to the United Nations' Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which states that "everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion", and that this right includes freedom to "manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance".

Canadians who signed this petition are concerned about the safety of minorities in Pakistan, including Ahmadiyya Muslims, but also Christians, Hindus, Sikhs and other Muslim minority communities. They call on the government and the House to condemn the encouragement and calls to violence we have seen from certain figures in Pakistan, especially Muhammad Naeem Chattha Qadri, the cleric I referred to earlier; to defend the right of Pakistani Ahmadiyya children to attend school; to urge the Pakistani government to condemn violence against the Ahmadiyya Muslim community and all religious minorities; and also to urge the Government of Pakistan to reform or eliminate blasphemy laws, which are used to disproportionately target religious minorities.

I thank petitioners for their work on that very important issue.

- (1020)

UKRAINE

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the next petition responds to the horrific, unprovoked genocidal Russian invasion of Ukraine and the human rights crisis it has caused.

Petitioners want to see the Government of Canada immediately waive visa requirements and grant visa-free travel to Ukrainians. This was a proposal that had the majority support of the House but sadly does not have the support of the government.

MEDICAL ASSISTANCE IN DYING

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the next petition is surrounding proposals we have seen for the legalization of euthanasia for children in Canada.

Petitioners are opposed to euthanasia for children. They believe killing children is always wrong. They note that Louis Roy of the Quebec college of physicians recommended expanding euthanasia to "babies from birth to one year of age who come into the world with severe deformities and very serious syndromes". Again, petitioners say that infanticide is always wrong.

The petitioning citizens and residents of Canada call on the government to block any attempt to legalize the killing of children.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am next tabling a petition in support of Bill C-257, my private member's bill that seeks to combat political discrimination.

Petitioners say that Canadians have a right to be protected against any form of discrimination, that Canadians can and do face political discrimination, that it is a fundamental right in Canada to be politically active and to be vocal and not face discrimination as a result, and that it is in the best interests of Canadian democracy to protect public debate and the exchange of differing ideas.

Petitioners call on the House to support and pass Bill C-257, which would add political belief and activity as prohibited grounds of discrimination in the Canadian Human Rights Act. They also want the House to defend the right of Canadians to peacefully express differing political opinions.

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the next petition is also in support of a private member's bill, Bill C-281, which is currently before the foreign affairs committee.

Petitioners note the importance of Canada's standing up for the rights of ethnic, religious and other minority groups targeted by human rights violations around the world, and they see this bill as an important step and an important tool in that fight for greater Canadian engagement in international human rights. They want to see the House act quickly to adopt Bill C-281, the international human rights act.

CHARITABLE ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the next petition I am tabling is also on an issue of human rights and freedom of conscience and religion.

It highlights the Liberal 2021 platform proposal to deny charitable status to organizations that have different perspectives on the issue of abortion than the Liberal Party does. This threat to the charitable status of organizations that do not share the political outlook of the government could jeopardize the charitable status of hospitals, houses of worship, schools, homeless shelters and other charitable organizations doing important work. The proposal from the Liberals follows a previous proposal for a values test associated with the Canada summer jobs program. Now they want to apply it to charitable status in general.

Petitioners argue that charitable status should be allocated on a politically neutral basis based on objective criteria, not based on agreement with the political positions of the government of the day. They call on the House, therefore, to preserve the application of charitable status on a politically and ideologically neutral basis, to not impose new values tests and to affirm the right of freedom of expression for all Canadians.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I ask that all questions be allowed to stand at this time.

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

The Speaker: The Chair would like to make a statement concerning the management of Private Members' Business. As members know, certain constitutional procedural realities constrain the Speaker and members insofar as legislation is concerned.

[*Translation*]

Following each replenishment of the order of precedence, the Chair reviews items so that the House can be alerted to bills that, at first glance, appear to infringe on the financial prerogative of the Crown. This allows members to intervene in a timely fashion to present their views on the need for those bills to be accompanied by a royal recommendation.

● (1025)

[*English*]

Following replenishment of the order of precedence with 15 new items on Thursday, March 16, two bills concern the Chair. One is Bill C-318, an act to amend the Employment Insurance Act and the Canada Labour Code (adoptive and intended parents) standing in the name of the member for Battlefords—Lloydminster.

[*Translation*]

The other is Bill C-319, an act to amend the Old Age Security Act (amount of full pension), standing in the name of the member for Shefford. The Chair is of the view that these bills may need a royal recommendation.

S. O. 57

Members are therefore invited to make arguments regarding the requirement of a royal recommendation for Bills C-318 and C-319 at the earliest opportunity.

I thank the members for their attention.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

MOTION NO. 2—SENATE AMENDMENTS TO BILL C-11

MOTION THAT DEBATE BE NOT FURTHER ADJOURNED

Hon. Mark Holland (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in relation to consideration of Motion No. 2 respecting Senate amendments to Bill C-11, an act to amend the Broadcasting Act and to make related and consequential amendments to other acts, I move:

That debate be not further adjourned.

[*Translation*]

The Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 67.1, there will now be a 30-minute question period.

[*English*]

I invite hon. members who wish to ask questions to rise in their places or use the “raise hand” function so the Chair has some idea of the number of members who wish to participate in the question period.

Questions and comments, the hon. member for Lethbridge.

Mrs. Rachael Thomas (Lethbridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, what we just heard from the government is that it has moved closure on Bill C-11 and our discussion with regard to the amendments that came back from the Senate.

Closure means that the government is shutting down debate. I find this rather interesting because, really, Bill C-11 is a censorship bill, so we have a government that has moved a censorship bill and now is moving censorship on that censorship bill. Let us talk about a government very committed to censorship; it not only wants to censor what Canadians can see, hear and post online through Bill C-11, but the government also wants to censor us as opposition members in our ability to speak to the bill.

It should be further noted that the Quebec government, under Premier Legault, issued an open letter asking to be heard with regard to this legislation, because it has significant concerns. It asked that the bill be referred to committee, but it was not.

S. O. 57

Therefore, not only was referral to committee not permitted, but now thorough debate is not permitted. Let us talk about a government committed to shutting down voices, not only the voices of the individuals in the House but also the individuals online who have something to say within that space. Why is this government so hell-bent on shutting down freedom?

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos (Minister of Health, Lib.): Madam Speaker, let me start by thanking all members in the House, as well as members of the other chamber, for having spoken so long and so well on the matter of this bill. I have information that, in the House, we spent 34 hours debating the bill, plus an additional 22 hours at committee. In the Senate, they spent 18 hours debating the bill in the chamber, plus an additional 65 hours in clause-by-clause debate.

That is historic, because it is the longest time ever that the Senate has taken to look at a bill clause by clause. It is historic in the amount of time and effort that members of Parliament spent on the bill. This indeed is very important, because it is an important bill.

We look forward to bringing it forward to Canadians.

• (1030)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ): Madam Speaker, it is too bad that we are facing yet another closure motion on such an important bill. It is true that hours and hours have been devoted to studying this bill in committee. Those hours were often monopolized by the Conservatives, who did not want to allow the work to advance because they were sticking to their position and were inflexible. A little more flexibility could have led to a compromise, but that did not happen.

My colleague from Lethbridge talked about the Quebec government's requests. I think it is very interesting to hear the Conservatives suddenly take an interest in Quebec culture. Quebec's requests were made to the government and not necessarily to the entire committee.

Was it not the government's responsibility to take that into account when the time came to do so and at least share the Quebec government's requests with all the members of the committee?

The Conservatives might not have been here today making this argument, and we might have been wrapping up the work on this very important bill that our culture and broadcasting system have been so eagerly awaiting.

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos: Madam Speaker, I would like to thank our colleague from Drummond and his Bloc Québécois colleagues for all the work they have done in recent months to restore some reason and reduce the confusion surrounding this important bill. Unfortunately, there are many conspiracy theories and misunderstandings. Fortunately, they are rarely the product of bad faith.

It is 2023. The ways content is broadcast have changed dramatically. Creators, musicians, artists, technicians, screenwriters across Canada, including Quebec, need the Canadian government to do its job and ensure that web giants support Canadian culture and artists. I am very happy and very grateful for the Bloc's work and support in this regard.

[*English*]

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Madam Speaker, there is no doubt that Bill C-11 is needed. We have seen a hemorrhaging of our artistic and cultural sectors. We have seen the loss of thousands of jobs. What Bill C-11 would do, in effect, is allow for more support for our cultural sector and more ability for Canadians to find Canadian content, to actually see Canadian artists and hear messages from other parts of Canada. This is absolutely essential.

That being said, two parties have approached this differently. The NDP approach Bill C-11 with the idea of improving the bill. We brought in important amendments to uphold the freedom of speech, to ensure indigenous peoples and racialized Canadians would be a bigger part of broadcasting and their content would be more available online.

Conservatives have been throwing wacky conspiracy theories onto the floor of the House of Commons, hour after hour, comparing Bill C-11 to what goes on in North Korea. There is nothing about mass starvation, prison camps or systemic torture in Bill C-11.

I want to ask my colleague across the way this question: Is the fact that the Conservatives wasted all of this debating time by throwing in wacky conspiracy theories part of the importance of actually getting this bill through to help Canadian artists in the cultural sector?

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos: Madam Speaker, let me also express my words of thanks on behalf of the minister and the government, and on behalf of all artists and members of the cultural communities across Canada. My congratulations and my thanks go to the member opposite and his party for pointing out the importance of modernizing and making more equitable the Broadcasting Act. Again, we are in the 21st century. We are not back in the 19th century, when we used other means of communication and technology.

It is very important that we can depend on everyone's input to be reasonable, focus on facts and avoid conspiracy theories. There is nothing in this bill that goes against freedom of speech. In fact, it would support the freedom of expression of our artists in Canada, who depend so much on our support and do not get the support they need from web giants these days.

• (1035)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, could the minister expand on just how this legislation is meant to modernize the Broadcasting Act? We would have to go back to the early 1990s to look at the last time there were any significant changes. At that time, things like Netflix and Crave did not exist, let alone the technological advancement of the Internet over the last 30 years.

Could the minister provide his thoughts on just trying to keep up with the times?

S. O. 57

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos: Madam Speaker, it is exactly that, keeping up with the times and looking forward to an ever-stronger and prouder community of artists, musicians and creators in our field in Canada.

We are so proud of Canadian culture. We know, however, that web giants are making enormous amounts of money on the backs of Canadian artists. On this side of the House, we are certainly not preoccupied with their bottom line or how much profit they make. We are more focused on how much support they can provide to our artists and communities in Canada, and that is what we are going to continue working on.

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner (Calgary Nose Hill, CPC): Madam Speaker, in spite of the minister's assertions, this bill would not in any way help Canadian voices. What it would do is prop up a failing business model of other types of legacy content producers.

There is one line in a review of the bill that says, "C-11 will take money away from young entrepreneurs, funnel it back to traditional media and fund content from the established and well-connected culturati." I believe that this is an accurate assessment of the bill. I do not believe that the government has addressed concerns that have been raised by thousands of Canadians, which is why we need more debate. We need more debate on this bill because it would impact so many Canadians in a negative way.

Given all these facts, why is the government curtailing debate on its censorship bill?

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos: Madam Speaker, there is indeed an impact on people here, and the impact is on the CEOs of web giants. There are very few of them in my riding. I live in a riding where there are lots of artists, where people come from outside of my region of Quebec City to visit festivals and support culture in my community. That is where people want to work and live.

I am not particularly concerned about Netflix and big giants in my riding. They obviously do their job and make profits. What I am more interested in is providing the support the communities and artists need in my riding.

Ms. Lindsay Mathysen (London—Fanshawe, NDP): Madam Speaker, one of my concerns about this piece of legislation is the Conservatives wanting to delay closure on it and the passage of it, even though it has gone through quite a lot of debate in this place and the other place. I am concerned about their desire to fundraise off of it by continually bringing forward misinformation around the bill. Furthermore, I am concerned about their use of the bill as a political tool, as opposed to debating its actual substance.

Could the minister comment on their desire to fundraise off of it as their core desire?

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos: Madam Speaker, the Senate spent 83 hours of its time looking at the bill, and House of Commons committees spent 56 hours on it. As we mentioned earlier, this is the longest-ever amount of time the Senate has spent on the study of a particular bill. That is why we are so proud and so pleased about the enormous amount of work that people in the House and the other chamber did over the last months and years. It is why we look forward to moving on with the bill.

Artists, musicians and cultural communities in Canada need our support, and that is why we are so proud to be able to provide it to them.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Madam Speaker, I cannot tell the hon. minister how distressed I am to see the hon. Minister of Health defending closure on debate on a bill that has nothing to do with his portfolio. Everything about closure offends basic democracy within Parliament.

I have said this before, and I will say it again. When I was first elected in 2011, I watched the then Conservative majority start the process of using closure on almost every bill. Sitting over there, my colleagues in the Liberal Party and I bemoaned and railed against this horrible abuse of our democratic process in Parliament. They did so only to turn around and use closure as often and then more often than the previous government did.

I do not particularly enjoy the debate on Bill C-11. It is not a battle of wits but a disinformation campaign versus facts. However, the reality is that every MP in this place has a right to debate, and closure is wrong.

● (1040)

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos: Madam Speaker, I think we all regret that too. We would prefer to be able to move on a different path with the Conservative opposition, as has been mentioned by the Bloc and the NDP, and as the leader of the Green Party just reminded us. This is unfortunate, but that is the only path to helping Canadians and artists in our communities go forward in a challenging world. Social media, modern technology and all that can support cultural development in Canada, but it needs to be done in a manner that is adapted to the reality of the 21st century.

Mr. Pat Kelly (Calgary Rocky Ridge, CPC): Madam Speaker, there is no doubt that the bill is a disaster. Liberals have been flailing away with it for months. They tried it in the last Parliament. They steadfastly refuse to exempt user-uploaded content. It has been to the Senate; indeed, as the minister said in his remarks, the Senate spent a record amount of time debating this bill because it is a disaster. The bill needed the 20-odd amendments that were sent back, which still do not even fix it, and the government is ramming it back and just accepting a few of the amendments.

Can the member not grasp, or does he not agree, that a bill that required this much extra work to fix it within the Senate should at least, at a minimum, continue to be debated here and referred to a committee in the House of Commons? Then we could maybe have a chance to cobble this together into something that is not the disaster it is.

S. O. 57

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos: Madam Speaker, the member is right in pointing to the important work the Senate did. It is why a very large number of the amendments the Senate is proposing are being approved and accepted by the government. We look forward to moving forward with them. That is why, as has also been said, we are grateful for its work and the 83 hours of time it spent on the bill. It is a very important bill; the member is correct. It had to have specific efforts and time to—

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: You still reject those amendments.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I just want to remind the hon. member that while someone has the floor, it is not proper to interrupt. I also indicated this a while ago. If the hon. member has questions and comments, she should wait until it is time for questions and comments and attempt to be recognized.

The hon. minister can continue.

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos: Madam Speaker, the member who was speaking is totally right to be able to focus her attention on that.

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: Thank you. Thank you.

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos: Madam Speaker, I look forward to more questions from her, as she keeps speaking as I try to answer the other person's question. It is fair and fine that this is happening. It is a right of all members of this House to speak at the appropriate time, as the Speaker just said, and I look forward to answering more questions.

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Madam Speaker, it is an honour and privilege to be able to rise in this discussion.

I was just at the first-ever Qualicum Beach Film Festival. It was led by a grade 12 student in my riding. It just shows the opportunity for film and the importance of media in our communities. In fact, in Qualicum Beach, there is \$18 million being spent in the film sector alone. The opportunity is endless, but they are playing at an unfair advantage.

Groups across the country, such as the Coalition for the Diversity of Cultural Expressions, FRIENDS of Canadian broadcasting, the Writers Guild of Canada and the Canadian Media Producers Association, are getting behind this bill and calling for action.

There have been delays. We hear Conservatives say that this bill is a disaster and everything is broken. Some things are broken. This is something that is broken, and it needs to be fixed. We are here to fix things. Instead of wanting to fix things, Conservatives want to keep things broken. They want to tear it down.

We need to move forward. Can the minister speak about the sense of urgency there is to support Canadian producers?

• (1045)

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos: Madam Speaker, the member for Courtenay—Alberni said it really well. There are challenges, pressures and stressors that cultural communities, artists, musicians and others in our communities face. We know how hard-working they are, but they are working in a different environment now in 2023 than they were in the 20th century. That is why, as he rightly says, fixing things is absolutely essential. That is why we are so proud and so grateful for his efforts in trying to support his community,

including the diverse community of artists in his riding, and in mine as well.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Martin Champoux: Madam Speaker, we talked earlier about Quebec's demands. This is a very important subject.

Quebec's demands are extremely important, even Quebec has not communicated them to all the parties and to the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage which is studying the bill. We are preparing to vote, under a gag order, on a bill that will have a significant impact on broadcasting in Quebec and on Quebec culture. Quebec is making a legitimate demand. It is asking that Quebec be consulted on all matters relating to francophone broadcasting and culture.

How will the government respond to these very legitimate demands from Quebec, even though we are passing Bill C-11 under a gag order?

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos: Madam Speaker, I again thank my colleague from Drummond for all he is doing and for his kind words about the artists and arts community in Quebec, including in my riding of Quebec City.

The actors, screenwriters, composers, technicians, musicians, all the people who bring our culture to life in Quebec and make it vibrant have said that they support this bill and want it to move forward.

With respect to collaboration with the Government of Quebec, it is not just about consultation. As I mentioned earlier, it is about collaborating with the Government of Quebec. We have different roles and different responsibilities, but we all have the same goal, and that is to support our artists across Canada, including in Quebec.

[*English*]

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons (Senate), Lib.): Madam Speaker, my question actually comes on the heels of the question from the member for Saanich—Gulf Islands. The reality is that we are seeing a tremendous amount of disinformation coming from Conservatives within the House.

As a matter of fact, this is what the member for Saanich—Gulf Islands said after listening to the member for Oshawa on Monday night. She said:

Madam Speaker, as the hon. member for Oshawa was speaking, all I could think is that somewhere there is a Liberal war room clipping all of that to use in ads to make sure no one votes Conservative.

The reality is that we have heard misinformation and disinformation, time after time, with a total of 29 speeches from Conservatives at second reading and another 19 at the current stage we are in. Conservatives are just trying to slow this down.

Despite the fact that I empathize with the member for Saanich—Gulf Islands in the concern she raised, she knows just as well as everybody else in the House that the bill will not move forward unless one of two things happens: we invoke closure or we change the rules so that they do not allow this endless disinformation and misinformation campaign to continue.

Could the minister comment on that?

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos: Madam Speaker, it is indeed troubling. We live in a world in which we should be able to speak about facts, and in the process, reassure Canadians that this is done for the right purposes and in a manner that is supported by so many artists and artists' representatives in Canada.

It is sad, as the Green Party leader also said earlier. However, as the parliamentary secretary mentioned, we can either do nothing or move forward.

Doing nothing would be unacceptable in the context of the 21st century.

Mrs. Tracy Gray (Kelowna—Lake Country, CPC): Madam Speaker, before I begin, I just wanted to acknowledge the fact that when we are calling on people to ask questions, we look at the proportionate representation that we have in the House for those who are standing and asking questions on the opposition side.

First of all, I want to comment that this is shutting down debate on Bill C-11.

Yes, there were comments that this has spent a lot of time in both the House and the Senate. However, that is because the bill was so poorly planned and poorly written. That is why there has been so much debate and so many amendments on the bill: It is just so awful.

What has happened now, just to make it really clear, is that the amendments have come to the House, but the government has turned down those amendments going to committee. Therefore, there is no opportunity for the public to comment on any of the amendments.

It is also very interesting that the minister who is here answering questions today on Bill C-11, a Broadcasting Act and Internet-related bill, is the health minister.

Rather than listening to all the people who had testified on this, all the digital content creators, the experts or the academics, he commented that his response was solely about how this would help organizations in his riding. That was very interesting.

My question is: Why are you shutting down debate and not allowing this to go to committee so that you can hear from Canadians?

• (1050)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I will remind the member I am not shutting down the debate.

The hon. minister.

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos: Madam Speaker, I sure the member for Kelowna—Lake Country is very proud of her riding too. That is why I sometimes speak about my riding. Although I am the Minister of Health, more important, I am a proud representative of the Quebec City area and the member of Parliament for Québec.

She is right to point to the fact that we have spent, and are spending, enormous amounts of time on this bill in the House and in the other chamber. We have spent a total of 56 hours in the House of Commons, including in committee, and 83 hours in the Senate.

S. O. 57

As the parliamentary secretary said a moment ago, we have heard almost 50 different speeches from Conservative MPs. We congratulate them for speaking so much on this bill. We know it is a concern for everyone and we are grateful for everyone's contributions.

Ms. Lisa Marie Barron (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, NDP): Madam Speaker, it is completely exhausting to hear the Conservatives continue to spread misinformation and disinformation, and then campaign and fund raise off this misinformation. This is a theme that we hear over and over again. This is most definitely the case right now.

Could the member share his thoughts on why we are not seeing the Conservatives apply the work that needs to be done to ensure we are protecting Canadian artists? What are the impacts on Canadians across the country, who are set up for failure in a system stacked against them? Instead, it could be providing opportunities for Canadian artists to show off their amazing talents across our country.

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos: Madam Speaker, the member has asked me why Conservative members do not want to move forward. I am sure it is not because they would like to support the bottom lines of web giants. I suppose that is not the case. It would seem to be the case when there is so much focus on protecting their interests and the interests of artists in Canada.

I am also very proud of what she said when it comes to supporting the cultural diversity and cultural strength of our communities in Canada. Canadians are very proud, as she said so well, of what we have in Canada, a cultural identity that depends on the talents and efforts of so many artists, musicians and others. However, they need and want to prosper in a modern world where technology is changing and where the Broadcasting Act and the regulations associated to it also need to evolve.

Mrs. Cathay Wagantall (Yorkton—Melville, CPC): Madam Speaker, I want to comment on the amount of conspiracy theories on the other side of the floor that keep being presented, along with misinformation and disinformation on Bill C-11.

The responses on this side of the floor have come in reaction to witnesses who have come to the House, to us, to other individuals and to the committee. The truth of the matter is this. I believe the concern on the other side of the floor, and the reason the Liberals want to shut down debate, is because, just like on other issues where we have been attacked as having conspiracy theories, the world is definitely finding out the truth on all of these issues. That would apply to this one as well, because those very methods of getting information, outside of what the government would like to see as the source, are revealing a great deal of truth about these issues. Yes, the CRTC needs to be improved, and I totally agree with that, but it needs to stay out of this realm.

• (1055)

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos: Madam Speaker, 56 and 83 are the number of hours that we spent in the House and that senators spent in their chamber looking at this bill. It is a great source of gratitude to see the extensive efforts that we all made and provided collectively in looking at the bill.

S. O. 57

As we know, things are changing. Canadians expect us to progress on matters that are important to them, and artists, musicians and cultural communities are also looking to us to support them. That is why we need to progress, having listened to the great input of everyone in this place and in the other place.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Denis Trudel (Longueuil—Saint-Hubert, BQ): Madam Speaker, a little earlier my colleague opposite spoke about the arts community in his riding of Quebec City. Those artists support the bill. I can attest to that because I recently attended a meeting of the Union des artistes in Montreal. The artists are currently renegotiating agreements with producers on different platforms and in the film industry. I spoke at a meeting of the Union des artistes, where I said that Bill C-11 would soon pass and that there would likely be more money for artists. Obviously, Quebec artists support this bill. Not only do they all support it, they cannot wait for it pass.

Could my colleague talk a little more about the importance of passing this bill as quickly as possible?

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos: Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague from Longueuil—Saint-Hubert, not only for his more recent work, but for all that he has done during his career. He has put in so much effort and brought so much talent into the arts community throughout Quebec. It is a great source of encouragement and hope to know that, even though we work in different political parties in the House, we, in Quebec, are all focused on the same goal of supporting those who need us, such as the community of francophone artists in Canada and Quebec.

The artists need help. They are very strong and their skills are solid. They have a lot of talent. However, because they are working in a minority context, the Canadian government must also assume responsibility.

[*English*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): It is my duty to interrupt the proceedings at this time and put forthwith the question on the motion now before the House.

The question is on the motion.

[*Translation*]

If a member of a recognized party present in the House wishes that the motion be carried or carried on division or wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

[*English*]

Mr. Glen Motz: Madam Speaker, we would request a recorded vote.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Call in the members.

• (1140)

(The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(*Division No. 290*)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Ali	Anand
Anandasangaree	Angus
Arseneault	Arya
Ashton	Atwin
Bachrach	Badawey
Bains	Baker
Barron	Battiste
Beech	Bendayan
Bennett	Bibeau
Bittle	Blaikie
Blair	Blaney
Blois	Boissonnault
Boulerice	Bradford
Brière	Cannings
Casey	Chagger
Chahal	Champagne
Chatel	Chen
Chiang	Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Collins (Victoria)	Cormier
Coteau	Dabrusin
Damoff	Davies
Desjarlais	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Diab
Dong	Drouin
Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Dzerowicz
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith	Fergus
Fillmore	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fragiskatos	Freeland
Fry	Gaheer
Garrison	Gazan
Gerretsen	Gould
Green	Guilbeault
Hajdu	Hanley
Hardie	Hepfner
Holland	Housefather
Hughes	Hussen
Hutchings	Iacono
Idlout	Ien
Jaczek	Johns
Joly	Jowhari
Julian	Kayabaga
Kelloway	Khalid
Khera	Koutrakis
Kusmierczyk	Kwan
Lalonde	Lambropoulos
Lametti	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Lattanzio
Lauzon	LeBlanc
Lebouthillier	Lightbound
Long	Longfield
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacDonald (Malpeque)	MacGregor
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maloney
Martínez Ferrada	Masse
Mathysen	May (Cambridge)
McDonald (Avalon)	McGuinty
McKay	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod	McPherson
Mendès	Miao
Miller	Morrissey
Murray	Naqvi
Ng	Noormohamed
O'Connell	Oliphan
O'Regan	Petipas Taylor

Government Orders

Powlowski
 Robillard
 Rogers
 Sahota
 Saks
 Scarpaleggia
 Serré
 Shanahan
 Sidhu (Brampton East)
 Singh
 Sousa
 Suds
 Taylor Roy
 Turnbull
 Van Bynen
 Vandal
 Weiler
 Zahid
 Zuberi— 173

Qualtrough
 Rodriguez
 Romanado
 Sajjan
 Samson
 Schiefke
 Sgro
 Sheehan
 Sidhu (Brampton South)
 Sorbara
 St-Onge
 Tassi
 Thompson
 Valdez
 van Koeverden
 Virani
 Yip
 Zarrillo

Rayes
 Reid
 Richards
 Rood
 Savard-Tremblay
 Schmale
 Shields
 Sinclair-Desgagné
 Soroka
 Ste-Marie
 Strahl
 Thériault
 Thomas
 Tolmie
 Uppal
 Vecchio
 Vien
 Vignola
 Vis
 Wagantall
 Waugh
 Williams
 Zimmer— 145

Redekopp
 Rempel Garner
 Roberts
 Ruff
 Scheer
 Seeback
 Shipley
 Small
 Steinley
 Stewart
 Stubbs
 Therrien
 Tochor
 Trudel
 Van Popta
 Vidal
 Viersen
 Villemure
 Vuong
 Warkentin
 Webber
 Williamson

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif
 Albas
 Arnold
 Barlow
 Barsalou-Duval
 Bergeron
 Bérubé
 Blanchet
 Block
 Brassard
 Brunelle-Duceppe
 Caputo
 Chabot
 Champoux
 Cooper
 Dancho
 DeBellefeuille
 Desbiens
 Doherty
 Dreeschen
 Epp
 Falk (Provencher)
 Ferreri
 Gallant
 Gaudreau
 Genuis
 Gladu
 Goodridge
 Gray
 Jeneroux
 Kitchen
 Kramp-Neuman
 Kusie
 Lantsman
 Lawrence
 Lemire
 Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
 Lloyd
 Maguire
 May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
 McCauley (Edmonton West)
 Melillo
 Moore
 Morrice
 Motz
 Nater
 O'Toole
 Paul-Hus
 Perkins
 Plamondon

Aitchison
 Allison
 Baldinelli
 Barrett
 Beaulieu
 Berthold
 Bezan
 Blanchette-Joncas
 Bragdon
 Brock
 Calkins
 Carrie
 Chambers
 Chong
 Dalton
 Davidson
 Deltell
 Desilets
 Dowdall
 Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
 Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
 Fast
 Fortin
 Garon
 Généreux
 Gill
 Godin
 Gourde
 Hallan
 Kelly
 Kram
 Kurek
 Lake
 Larouche
 Lehoux
 Lewis (Essex)
 Liepert
 Lobb
 Martel
 Mazier
 McLean
 Michaud
 Morantz
 Morrison
 Muys
 Normandin
 Patzer
 Pauzé
 Perron
 Poilievre

PAIRED

Members

Hoback
 Vandenberg
 Simard
 Wilkinson— 4

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

* * *

ONLINE STREAMING ACT

The House resumed from March 27 consideration of Motion No. 2 in relation to the amendments made by the Senate to Bill C-11, An Act to amend the Broadcasting Act and to make related and consequential amendments to other Acts, and of the amendment.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what a pleasure it is to rise again on important legislation that in essence sets the framework of where we need to go to support our creators and artists from coast to coast to coast.

Before I get into the substance of the legislation, I want to provide a commentary on my disappointment in the Bloc. Bloc members like to talk about how they believe in culture and heritage and how they want to protect the interests of the arts community in the province of Quebec. However, the only members of Parliament from Quebec whom I saw stand up today to ensure this bill passed were the Liberal members of Parliament and one NDP member of Parliament. Whether they were Bloc or Conservative members of Parliament from the province of Quebec, they sent a message that they do not support the passage of Bill C-11.

Let us be very clear. Conservative Party members have said they do not want to pass Bill C-11. They have been crystal clear on that.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Martin Champoux: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. My colleague from Winnipeg North, who just started his speech, is speaking as if we were still debating the closure motion.

I simply want to tell the member that we just voted on the closure motion. We can now talk about Bill C-11, which is before us today. The vote is over, and there is no need to insist on the subject.

Government Orders

The Deputy Speaker: I thank the hon. member.

The hon. parliamentary secretary.

• (1145)

[*English*]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc should be uncomfortable about this. Had the Bloc's will prevailed, we would not have had closure on Bill C-11.

An hon. member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, a Conservative member across the way just said “hear, hear!”, supporting that it did not pass. The Bloc needs to realize that the Conservative Party of Canada does not want this bill to pass. The Conservatives believe it is about freedom. They believe it is about censorship. The Bloc, much like it has been conned in the past on issues in the budget, is being conned by the Conservatives once again on this legislation.

I have seen the Bloc vote in favour of time allocation, even for closure. Bloc members have said that if it is a priority for the Bloc or a priority for Quebec, they will vote for it, as it is a benefit to Quebec. How does the province of Quebec benefit from allowing the Conservative Party to debate this bill endlessly? The Conservatives have made it very clear that they do not want the legislation to pass.

The only members of Parliament from the province of Quebec standing up for the passage of Bill C-11 are in the Liberal caucus, with one member from the NDP. I was surprised at the manner in which the Bloc chose to vote today.

Nothing has changed from the government's perspective. From the government's perspective, this is important legislation. It has been thoroughly debated. We are talking about hours and hours of debate. The bill has seen record amounts of debate in the Senate too.

This bill has gone through first reading, debates at second reading and debates, discussions, questions, answers and amendments at the committee stage. Then it came back to the House for report stage and third reading, and again there were debates. It was then sent to the Senate. The Senate had debate, it went to committee and they came up with a number of amendments. The Minister of Health made reference to the fact that we are talking about a historic number of hours. It is one of those bills that, considering the history of the Senate, has had so much discussion.

I want to highlight the fact that the Senate took its time in going through the legislation and looking at ways to add strength to it. Most of the amendments being proposed by the Senate to make changes after the efforts it put into the legislation are in fact being adopted by the government.

The bill had thorough discussions, debates and amendments, both in the Senate and in the House of Commons. However, because changes were made in the Senate, there was a need for us to bring forward the legislation once again in the House of Commons.

Let us look at the debate that started just the other day. The Conservatives are making it very clear that they are not going to allow the bill to move forward, because they have more members who

would like to speak to the legislation. They have gone out of their way to prevent this legislation from passing, even with all the debate, questions and amendments that have gone forward.

Canadians have priorities that are reflected in the types of things the government is doing. The budget was just released yesterday, and we all have things we like about it. I like the fact that we have a grocery rebate. We are providing an opportunity for Canadians to get relief from inflation by providing them support and giving them more money in their pockets so they can deal with the cost of groceries. These are the types of debates we should be having inside the chamber.

• (1150)

In the budget yesterday we talked about a dental plan, and ensuring it will be there. If we look Bill C-11—

Mr. Brad Vis: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would love to have a debate on the budget right now, but we are debating Bill C-11. It is a comprehensive bill. I hope the member will speak to it on his fifth, sixth or seventh iteration, as he speaks on it more than anyone else. I just hope he can stay on the subject a little longer before—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I want to remind members that there is some latitude granted during debate. However, the hon. parliamentary secretary needs to make sure he is referencing the bill before the House, which applies to any member who stands to speak on this issue.

The hon. parliamentary secretary.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I trust the time spent on the point of order will be deducted from my speaking time on the issue.

Bill C-11 is in fact relevant, because the Conservative Party is refusing to pass it when the government has a restricted amount of time to debate its agenda and show leadership, which is what Canadians expect of the government. Conservatives might not care about what Canadians have to say, but this is a government that does care. When we are dealing with the agenda of the House of Commons and Bill C-11, there is an expectation that they will at least recognize that, although we are in a minority situation, the official opposition has a responsibility to behave in a responsible fashion and recognize that there has been ample debate on the issue.

This is legislation that makes a difference. Specifically, it will bring online streaming services under the jurisdiction of the Broadcasting Act.

I made reference to the Broadcasting Act in a question I had posed a bit earlier. Things have changed. The last time there was any significant change made to the Broadcasting Act was in the early nineties, when Netflix, Disney+ and Crave did not exist. This legislation levels the playing field. Why should the mainstream CTVs and CBCs, whether with respect to radio or television, have to comply with CanCon, but those other platforms do not?

Government Orders

There is this thing called the Internet, which has changed the dynamic. If we look back at 1991, and then look 30 years later, many technological changes have taken place. I say that to emphasize to my Conservative friends that they should be living in the real world and should understand that because of those changes there is a need to modernize the legislation. That is what this bill does. It levels the playing field and modernizes the Broadcasting Act to ensure that Canadian content is available on the Internet in a very selective way. However, what it does not do is what the Conservatives are telling Canadians.

This is interesting. On Monday, I was speaking on the legislation and talking about the misinformation the Conservative Party continues to put on the record here in the House and also tells Canadians. When I commented on how the freedoms of Canadians would not be limited in any way whatsoever by Bill C-11, this is what the Conservative critic had to say.

Immediately following the comments I made, the member for Lethbridge stated:

There is nothing progressive about censorship. That is exactly what this bill is about. It is about censoring Canadians and what they can see, hear and post online. It is about censoring artists, whether they have access to an audience and to what extent that access is granted.

● (1155)

Let me give a clear indication of some of the comments that I made. I said, just before she spoke, talking about what is actually in the legislation, that Conservatives have to stop spreading misinformation, whether it is in the chamber or publicly.

I said that this bill would not “impose regulations on the content that everyday Canadians post on social media...impose regulations on Canadian digital content creators, influencers or users.”

Here is a big one. I said this to the member, who was listening attentively, because she was going to be speaking right after me: “It would not censor content or mandate specific algorithms on streaming services or social media platforms” or, and here is where I would like to underline it, “limit Canadians' freedom of expression in any way, shape or form.”

How much clearer can we be? Yet the member stands in her place and gives this misinformation.

One has to ask: why? What is the motivation of the Conservative Party? It is definitely not in the best interests of Canadians, I will say.

If it were in the best interests of Canadians, I suspect that Conservatives would approach Bill C-11 with, at the very least, a little bit more integrity and honesty. I suspect that one would see more sympathy toward our artists and creators and a basic understanding of the importance of modernizing the legislation. I would suggest that the Conservative Party is not doing what is in the interests of Canadians.

The Conservatives are appealing to that far right group of people from whom they are hoping to raise money. They are using this legislation as a fundraising tool. They are saying that it is about freedom, that the government is going to take away one's freedom, that it does not believe in freedom of speech and it is going to prevent

people from uploading wonderful videos of their cat or dog or all of these wonderful things in their community.

They are telling Canadians that the Government of Canada is going to limit their freedoms and the only way to prevent that is to donate \$5, \$100 or \$500 to the Conservative Party of Canada. That is their motivation. It is more about how they can use this to ratchet up the rhetoric to generate funds and to get people angry.

That is what this legislation is really about, according to the Conservative agenda. It is not about what is in the interests of the industry.

That is why I was so surprised with the behaviour of the Bloc today. In talking about the legislation, the Bloc has been fairly clear. It talks about how the industry, Canadian content, is so critically important.

If one has a love for the French language and wants to recognize Canada as a multicultural society and wants to see our heritage reflected as much as possible, through all forms of media, this is the type of legislation one should be getting behind, because it promotes French. It promotes Canadian culture and heritage. It puts in place more opportunities for Canadian artists, whether they are from my home province of Manitoba, the province of Quebec or any other jurisdiction.

We have some amazing talent in every region of our country. This legislation is going to support and enhance those opportunities for those Canadians to share that talent and to make a better living off those talents.

● (1200)

This bill would create opportunities for more employment in our communities. There are industries that are very much alive today as a direct result of policies like the Broadcasting Act and organizations like the CRTC that contribute to our heritage. We can follow the discussions and look at what is being said inside the chamber. The NDP; the Bloc, half-heartedly; and obviously the government have recognized the true value of the arts community in making up our identity and contributing in so many ways to our society.

I made reference just yesterday, or the day before, to Folklorama in Winnipeg. For that young artist who is provided the opportunity to perform in Folklorama in Winnipeg two weeks every summer, it is a beautiful place. Every member of the House should be visiting Folklorama, and I often talk about it inside the chamber. That young individual will be rehearsing throughout the year. It becomes a part of their identity, because they have a dream of being an artist, whether it is a singer, an actor or a combination thereof. Legislation such as this will enhance future opportunities for Canadians from coast to coast to coast.

It is about levelling the playing field. It is about ensuring Canadian content, so there is a better reflection. I sure wish the Conservative Party would stop saying this, not only inside the House but more importantly outside the House. What the bill would not do is limit Canadians' freedom of expression in any way, shape or form. This is not a bill about freedom.

Government Orders

This is legislation that should have passed. It does not need to be thoroughly debated any more. We realize if we did not bring in closure on the legislation, the Conservative Party would continue to debate this legislation indefinitely. We would not be able to pass it in 2023 nor in all likelihood in 2024. That is the reason we have to bring in closure on this legislation.

Mr. Ziad Aboultaif (Edmonton Manning, CPC): Mr. Speaker, every time someone disagrees with the government, its members call them on integrity, where integrity really is not a favourable commodity on that side, since they took office in 2015. The hon. member is really calling on the fact that the bill is so good that Canadians will never have had it better. Now, there are so many voices around Canada, some professionals and some academics, that disagree with his claim about the guarantee he is giving Canadians about how good Bill C-11 is. What would he tell these people about how much concern they have for a bill that has been going back and forth in this House for so long? That tells us a lot about how bad the bill is and how bad and dangerous it would be for Canadians.

• (1205)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I suggest they reflect on the House of Commons and its 338 members of Parliament. We have members of the New Democratic Party, the Bloc, the Green Party and, of course, the Liberal Party, all saying the principles of the legislation are so very important to the industry. It not only employs hundreds of thousands of people across our country in every region, but advances the interests of artists today and future artists for tomorrow. All that support, I believe, shows very clearly that this is good legislation. At the end of the day it is only the Conservative Party that is opposing the legislation, and I explained why I believe they are opposing it.

[Translation]

Mr. Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I must say that I listened with great interest to the beginning of my colleague's speech. I soon lost interest, because it was redundant. It was just another empty speech that meant nothing and went nowhere. All it did was lay blame and point fingers.

This is from a member who spends all his time wearing out his seat here in the House of Commons and very little time doing something, anything, to help advance bills in committee. I found it a bit rich to be accused of delaying or obstructing the progress of Bill C-11. The Bloc Québécois is the party that has probably done the most to advance and improve this bill to ensure it reflects the reality of francophones in this country. The member for Winnipeg North has some nerve, to say that the Bloc is stalling the bill. That is nothing short of insulting.

Quebec made some requests under very exigent circumstances. I will, however, ask my colleague a polite question, because we try to remain as civilized as possible in the House. Quebec asked to be consulted as soon as any regulations affecting Quebec broadcasting or francophone cultural content are developed. There has not yet been any response from the government. We are preparing to vote on Bill C-11 this evening under a closure motion. The Bloc will vote in favour of the bill, but there is still some work to be done.

What will the government do to respond to Quebec's legitimate requests?

[English]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, if my memory is correct, I understand that the Quebec legislature has actually passed unanimous motions in support of Bill C-11. I believe that to be the case; I could be wrong. At the end of the day, there is no doubt that within Quebec there is widespread support for the legislation. The minister, no doubt, will continue to work with the province very closely, as he has in the past.

At the beginning of my comments today, I made reference to my surprise that the Bloc did not support closure. Thankfully, the NDP did; otherwise, there is a very good chance that this legislation would never pass the House of Commons, because the Conservatives' intent is not to allow the legislation to pass. They have made that amply clear to us.

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, a young woman, Saffron Bisiker, a grade 12 student in Qualicum Beach in my riding, just launched the first-ever Qualicum Beach Film Festival a couple of weeks ago, and she did it to support local creators and contributors. Our MLA, Adam Walker, was there from Parksville-Qualicum, and he cited that there is \$18 million being spent in the film sector just in Qualicum Beach and that area, and how important that is.

We have been hearing for many years from our local broadcasters, creators and cultural workers that they have been suffering from unfair competition from the big web giants. That is why, as New Democrats, we have been calling for an end to this unfair system for years. It is why this bill is a good first step to even the playing field.

The Liberal government has delayed this reform for many years, which has resulted in lost jobs and revenue for cultural workers. Why has the government allowed companies like Netflix to avoid paying their fair share of funding for our Canadian cultural content for so long? It is so important for people like Saffron who want a career in film to ensure that we are investing in Canadian content, in Canadian producers and curators. I just want to know why the government has taken so long to address this important need.

• (1210)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, the member raised a couple of important points.

One is the issue of Canadian content, and let there be absolutely no doubt that Canadian content would be dramatically and positively impacted as a result of Bill C-11 and its passage.

The other point is about the member's reference to his own constituency and the \$18 million. I think people underestimate the size of the industry, which, for all intents and purposes, is being developed and growing virtually in all regions of our country. We are talking about an industry that has so much potential, and that is one of the reasons why it is so very important that we pass this legislation.

In a minority situation, the government needs to have at least a partner to pass legislation, and I am grateful that the NDP has chosen to support this legislation.

Mr. Gary Vidal (Desnethé—Mississippi—Churchill River, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I listened to the speech of the member for Winnipeg North maybe a little more intently today than I have in the past. He claims in his comments that this will not limit individual content created.

On Twitter, a couple of days ago, Mr. Michael Geist said, in response to a previous intervention from this member, that the member “is just plainly wrong. Independent Senators, former CRTC chair, and many experts all agreed: Bill C-11 gives the CRTC the power to establish certain regulations involving user content. The Senate tried to fix. [The minister] rejected it.”

Cody from my riding is an indigenous entrepreneur from Flying Dust First Nation, and he shared with me that his very successful business is going to be unfairly impacted by Bill C-11, unless this is changed. That is because of the way the online marketing and social media algorithms to grow his business across Canada and the United States would be affected.

Why would Cody believe this member, who has a very partisan interest, instead of the former head of the CRTC, who has nothing to gain from this?

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, often we get emails from individuals looking for explanations on party positioning. What I have found is that there are ample amounts of misinformation being advocated, in particular from some parties inside the House of Commons, so I often need to respond to misinformation that is being espoused.

I am not trying to give the impression that the legislation is 100% supported by everyone in the country. What I am suggesting is that this legislation would modernize the act and at the end of the day would ensure that there is a fairer, more level playing field.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons (Senate), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I found it very interesting that the member spoke at great length in his speech about misinformation and disinformation, and then, when answering a question, he was heckled about a comment from Margaret Atwood. I would like to read what *The Globe and Mail* said about that: “The author said she had not read the bill ‘thoroughly yet’ and that there seemed to be ‘well-meaning attempts to achieve some sort of fairness in the marketplace.’”

The Conservatives cannot even give Margaret Atwood the respect she deserves in terms of accurately representing her statements. How can we expect them to be doing it for anybody else?

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, that is the crux of the issue when it comes to the Conservative Party. That is why I say they are manipulating the legislation and promoting false information. I believe it is because they want to try to garner political support and raise some money on the side, which is not the type of motivation they should be using in looking at and passing legislation here in the House of Commons.

Points of Order

POINTS OF ORDER

VIDEO RECORDING OF PARLIAMENTARY PROCEEDINGS

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons (Senate), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw to your attention and the attention of this House an extreme violation of our procedures that occurred this morning.

At 11:53 a.m., the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Louis-Saint-Laurent started to make a video within this House as they were exiting the chamber. In that video, one can clearly see that the mace is still on the table. That video also includes a link within it to the Conservative Party of Canada's website.

Not only is it a violation of the rules set out on pages 296 and 297 of *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, but it also goes so far as to use House of Commons resources for the purpose of politics and political fundraising specifically. That page links to a location where the Conservative Party gathers information on people and uses it to solicit funds.

I would request that you and your office look into this matter and report back on what the next steps will be in dealing with this violation.

● (1215)

The Deputy Speaker: I remind folks not to take videos inside the chamber. I also remind folks not to take pictures and those kinds of things.

We will review the information provided or go back and look at the time-stamp and come back to the House as soon as possible.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, I would ask that the Speaker's office look at getting it deleted as quickly as possible because it is not appropriate.

The Deputy Speaker: We will come back to the House as soon as practical on this matter.

The hon. member for Calgary Rocky Ridge.

Mr. Pat Kelly (Calgary Rocky Ridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. By all means, I am sure you have a responsibility to look into the issue that was raised. I am not sure what happened, but nobody really appreciates a tattler or the extent to which the member piled it on there. I think we can be more reasonable about these issues.

The Deputy Speaker: I appreciate that.

Government Orders

[Translation]

ONLINE STREAMING ACT

The House resumed consideration of Motion No. 2 in relation to the amendments made by the Senate to Bill C-11, An Act to amend the Broadcasting Act and to make related and consequential amendments to other Acts, and of the amendment.

Mr. Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I did not think that we would make it to this point. Sometimes when we are expecting a quiet day, we realize that there can be a lot of excitement in the House.

I want to begin by saying that I will be sharing my time with my very entertaining colleague from Longueuil—Saint-Hubert, which means things will be relatively calm and composed for the first ten minutes and then they should get a bit more exciting once he takes the floor.

To begin, I would like to say that I am not exactly disappointed we are approaching the end of our study of Bill C-11. We are considering the amendments proposed by the Senate. I suggest that members mark the date on their calendar because, as a Bloc Québécois member, I commend the thoroughness of the work done by certain senators. I know that some of them really took to heart their task of proposing amendments and improving a bill that, I admit, could still use some tweaking. I would like to acknowledge the dedication of those who took the work seriously and tried to change things by returning a document that they believe is better. There is a reason why the government accepted a great many of the proposed amendments in its response. The amendments passed the test and will appear in the final version the House returns to the Senate. I commend this work.

I also want to acknowledge the work of all the members of Parliament who worked on Bill C-11, formerly Bill C-10. I would remind members that the bill was introduced in November 2020. That was quite a while ago. When the bill was introduced, the cultural industry and the Quebec and Canadian broadcasting system had already been awaiting it for decades. The Broadcasting Act had not been updated since the early 1990s.

I already mentioned I was working in radio back then. At the time, we had cassettes that we inserted in cassette players. We played CDs, and some stations still played vinyl records. Young people can do an online search to see what a vinyl record looks like. All this to say that, today, we no longer know what the equipment looked like, given how much the industry has changed. The technology, recording methods and ways of producing and consuming culture have changed in surprising and unexpected ways over the past three decades. There is no reason to believe things will be any different in the next three decades. That is why we need to implement a flexible broadcasting law that can handle the technological changes we will see in the years to come.

Today there is a lot of talk about artificial intelligence, and we are already questioning that technology because we are concerned about where it will lead. We do not know what broadcasting will look like in the coming years. That is why we need to implement a flexible broadcasting law that can adjust to change.

One of the Bloc Québécois's proposals was retained by the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage and found its way into the version of Bill C-11 we are currently studying. It was the proposal that we should not have to wait another 30 years to revise the new act. It is a sunset clause. Every five years, we will be required to reopen the act and see whether it is still sufficiently up to date. I think that it is a responsible and intelligent provision that will make us do our job properly.

Every time I have spoken about Bill C-11, the underlying concern has always been Canadian culture. Francophone Quebec culture is what really matters to the Bloc Québécois, but we did not limit ourselves to proposing amendments and improvements to Bill C-11 just for the benefit of Quebec culture. Of course, that is what is most important to us, since it is in our nature, but our proposals to promote Quebec culture will have an impact on all French-speaking Canadians.

We stood up for francophones across Canada, and everyone will benefit. The Bloc Québécois made substantial improvements to Bill C-11. Thanks to these improvements, consumers will be able to find content produced by Quebec creators, artists, singers and songwriters on digital broadcasting platforms, just like they hear it on the radio. They will also see our talented creators' work on video streaming platforms such as Netflix and Disney+.

• (1220)

That is huge, because right now, we are under-represented on those platforms.

There is a lot of disinformation circulating around the concept of discoverability. The Conservatives came up with this idea that web giants would be required to tinker with their algorithms in order to force Quebecers and Canadians to watch one type of content rather than another, or to stop them from watching one type of content rather than another. I do not understand how Quebecers and Canadians could swallow such claptrap.

That is not at all what these regulations will do. What they will do is showcase our culture, our industry that generates billions of dollars annually. This will enable it to keep thriving in this new realm, which will also continue to evolve. We need to make room for our culture.

Discoverability is not a matter of imposing content on people, but of making content available. Take the playlist of someone who listens to Bryan Adams. I may be showing my age with that example. Perhaps I should have said Justin Bieber. Why not show that person some francophone artists? They are only suggestions. This is just about suggesting that culture. That is all.

Right now, the cultural industry is losing millions of dollars a month because there are no regulations requiring web giants to contribute the same way broadcasters and cable companies have contributed in the past. In addition to the tens of millions of dollars in lost advertising revenue, there are also tens of millions of dollars in royalties that artists are not receiving.

That is what Bill C-11 will fix. It will force web giants to follow the same rules as traditional broadcasters. I do not see how anyone can be against making billion-dollar companies like Netflix, Apple TV+, Disney+, Amazon Prime Video, Spotify, YouTube and Apple Music contribute to the industry they are making their money off of.

This industry is not just made up of CEOs and big-shot producers. There are also people like self-employed cultural workers, film crew and recording studio producers. Many of them left the industry because they knew that it would take time for things to get back to the way they used to be, especially because of the pandemic. If, on top of that, we do not enact regulations to promote investment in the sector, they will never return, and we will lose an incredible valuable resource.

Remember, I am talking about hundreds of thousands of jobs in Quebec and Canada. Culture and broadcasting represent billions of dollars in revenue. To me, it is a no-brainer that those who benefit should also contribute.

We are finally approaching the end of our study. We will be sending our response to the Senate. I hope that the senators will waste no time doing what we expect them to do, that is, ratify what is coming so that the web giants have to contribute and that our cultural industry can prosper and continue to show the world what it means to be a Quebecker or a Canadian.

Our culture is not American, Chinese or European. We have our very own culture, and it is up to us to protect and showcase it. That is what this bill is all about.

• (1225)

[English]

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons (Senate), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I know members of the Bloc have been very supportive of this bill through the process and getting us to where we are today in debating it.

We hear, and I know he hears, a lot of rhetoric and lot of misinformation and disinformation, in particular that rights would be trampled upon with this legislation. I wonder if the member can comment on whether Bloc members agree with the relentless position that the Conservatives have had on this bill, as though it somehow would trample on individual rights and freedoms.

[Translation]

Mr. Martin Champoux: Mr. Speaker, I have never agreed with that position. When this idea of trampling on Quebeckers' and Canadians' freedom of expression and fundamental rights was first brought up, we did our job. To borrow a popular catchphrase, I did my own research.

Government Orders

We checked and made sure that the wording of the bill would not endanger consumers' freedom of expression or rights.

That is disinformation, and it was probably very lucrative. I think that our Conservative friends have made money off this shameful campaign of disinformation.

The damage has been done, as we know. Artists and the cultural community are the ones paying the price.

Ms. Lisa Marie Barron (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, NDP): Mr. Speaker, for years now, as my colleague said, companies like Netflix and Disney+ have not been paying their fair share to fund our Canadian cultural content.

Does the member think the Liberal government should have acted earlier to prevent all the job losses in our cultural sector?

Mr. Martin Champoux: Mr. Speaker, yes, absolutely. My colleague asked an excellent question.

It is not only the Liberal government. We had a Conservative government before this one, and we know that the Conservatives are not big on culture, so we cannot expect too much from them.

The cultural industry's alarm bells went off in the early 2000s. There was already an urgent need to regulate digital technology at that time, but the CRTC refused to do so.

Governments should have stepped up and done something long before now. It might even be too late in some sectors. Dozens of businesses in the cultural sector have unfortunately already disappeared. Radio and television stations have had to close.

In short, that is a great question, and the answer is yes.

[English]

Mr. Jeremy Patzer (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, CPC): Mr. Speaker, one of the fundamental concerns, and there are many, that we have on this side of the House would be the fact that the CRTC would be the arbiter of what is allowed online. It would be the one in control possibly of the formula.

When we look at the potential for user-generated content to be regulated, it would be the CRTC, a big government approach to this, rather than just letting it be an open environment where people can put the content that they want online so it can be discovered by anybody from any region of the country, or possibly even outside of the boundaries of our country.

Would the member not agree that it is a good thing to have more discoverability rather than having a narrow-minded focus that the CRTC and the government are going to apply to user-generated content?

[Translation]

Mr. Martin Champoux: Mr. Speaker, the premise of the question would suggest that the government and the CRTC will interfere with what people can and cannot watch. This shows that the member does not understand the bill's intent. I will leave it at that.

Discoverability is not about an open market. Discoverability is about ensuring that our culture has its place. For that, we need a framework and regulations.

Government Orders

This does not mean that the government is going to decide what people can or cannot watch. That is another example of the misinformation that we have been denouncing from the beginning.

• (1230)

Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I have a lot of questions about what we have been hearing from the Liberal side today.

Let us forget about Bill C-11 for a second, because I think our colleague has set the record straight. He reminded us that it was actually the Bloc Québécois that proposed fast-tracking it two years ago because of a likely election, meaning the session would end.

There has been talk equating being in favour of proposed legislation with being in favour of using a gag order to get it done. I am very concerned about that. We are talking about rights and freedom of speech. I am also concerned about the rights of parliamentarians. We represent the people.

The fact that some are equating the two is concerning to me. Should gag orders be the norm? I believe that is what is being suggested.

Mr. Martin Champoux: Mr. Speaker, I think the question was for the Liberals, but I will answer it anyway.

The Bloc has a principle of respecting the parliamentary process. Using a gag order does the exact opposite. It upends the parliamentary process.

Of course, there are exceptions. The Bloc has voted in favour of closure motions in exceptional cases. I do not think this an exception. We are against the principle of gagging the House, but we do support the bill.

Mr. Denis Trudel (Longueuil—Saint-Hubert, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour of rising to speak to Bill C-11 for the second time. I gave a speech about it about one year ago.

We have been talking about this for a long time. My hon. colleague from Trois-Rivières is not here today, but I often have conversations with him. He always gives very brilliant speeches, choosing his words carefully and speaking with intention. He told me about a word that aptly describes what is being done with Bill C-11: “lantiponner”. I do not know how the interpreters are going to translate it, but it means to fool around, to hedge, to delay, to procrastinate, to quibble needlessly when the issue at hand is urgent.

I think that this word is fitting because we have been back and forth on this issue for two or three years. People have been waiting 30 years for a bill that addresses the challenges of our time in order to support our artists.

One year ago, I gave a speech in which I spoke at length about culture and also about the fact that this bill is important because it helps minority cultures, the world's small cultures, stand up to the platforms that threaten to steamroll over them. That is very important when we fight for a small culture. With respect to language, Pierre Bourgault once said that when we fight for the French language in Quebec, we fight for all the minority languages in the world.

This is the type of challenge we are facing when working on Bill C-11. I talked about culture in that speech, but today I feel like taking a more personal approach and talking about my artist friends. Thirty years ago, before becoming a member of Parliament, I attended the National Theatre School. Artists are my friends. I love them. In fact, I do not just love them; I adore them. They are my brothers, and they have very difficult living conditions. The situation of artists is very precarious. We need to do everything we can to support them because artists are the heart of who we are. They add spice to our lives. I do not know whether my Conservative colleagues have ever tried to do the test. At one time, there was a campaign to raise awareness of the importance of culture in our lives. The test was to try to see if you could get through an entire day without listening to the radio or music or watching TV or a movie.

Let us try to see what life would be like without music, movies and television series, without all of these things that reflect our stories, our ways of living, our traditions, our values, our interests, the things that basically show who we are. Let us try that just for a day so that we can understand the value of artists and what they bring into our lives, this very special way of seeing things. These artists need our help. They need our support.

I will now talk about an artist who is famous in Quebec, Sylvie Drapeau. She is a friend of mine. She may be the greatest stage actor of all time in Quebec, and perhaps even in Canada. She is absolutely sensational, extraordinary. When you see Sylvie Drapeau on stage, you remember her. She did a solo performance at Théâtre du Nouveau Monde, or TNM, a few years ago, and it was a rather personal and remarkable tour de force. There was a time Sylvie Drapeau was in five plays in Montreal a year. She performed at all the major theatres and played all the major roles. She would perform Shakespeare at TNM in the evening and rehearse Chekhov at the Théâtre du Rideau Vert during the day. She would then perform Chekhov in the evening and, the next day, rehearse Marivaux or Molière at TNM—and she always had the lead role. In the middle of all that, she would fit in a play by Racine and do a bit of television, if she had the time. Playing a lead role on stage for two or three hours and rehearsing another play every day takes a lot of energy.

We are talking about a remarkable actress. We are talking the Wayne Gretzky of theatre. We could also say Maurice Richard, as one of my colleagues mentioned.

• (1235)

We have heard our Conservative friends talk about culture as if it started and ended with Tom Cruise, the red carpet and the Oscars, but that is not the case. There is a whole world out there. I know some of the people in it, they are my friends. They are creating art. They are producing remarkable works that need to be seen and appreciated. With Bill C-11, we can fight for the artistic ecosystem. All of these actors, creators and writers are part of artistic life in Quebec, across Canada and around the world.

Even when she was playing the five roles I mentioned, as well as all the starring roles in the repertoire, Sylvie Drapeau was earning \$35,000 a year. It is important to point that out, because there are a lot of people like that, whether we know their names or not.

Government Orders

The Conservatives have a rather narrow vision of the arts. I would just like to remind them that, in Quebec, 80% of the members of the Union des artistes earn less than \$20,000 a year. Only 1% of those members make more than \$100,000. When someone tells me that an artist's life is all cocktails and glamorous premieres, I say no, that is not true.

I know a thing or two about it myself. When I graduated from the National Theatre School of Canada in 1987, I wanted to change the world through theatre, and I know plenty of people who had the same goal. They dreamt of changing the world through films and plays. I am talking about actors, but there are also dancers, singers, and other artists who want to put on productions that move people, that speak, that touch the heart and soul. At the very least, we need to help these people pay the rent.

When I left the National Theatre School of Canada, I wanted to change the world. I started a theatre company called Béton Blues. I worked for two years with two or three colleagues to start a company and apply for grants to keep it afloat. I had never done that in my life. After filling out grant applications, we needed to get to work to try to get money from major private donors.

That was something. I remember the first time I called Hydro-Québec. We had prepared a highly researched document to tell its representatives that they should give us money because we were young creators of the future and what we were doing was very important and that our plays would really move people. It had to be sent to the person in charge of arts and donations at major corporations. Then, we had to call to ask them if they were going to give us the money. I was not prepared. I did not know what to say to these people. I remember calling a gentleman at Hydro-Québec. I was on the phone with the person in charge who could give us \$2,000 for our performances. I just asked whether he had any money or something like that. We had no idea how to do it but we did it.

Essentially, what I am saying is that this was important work to me. I worked for two years. Ultimately, we put on a show. We adapted *As You Like It*, a play by Shakespeare, in the Old Port of Montreal's hangar number 9, now home to an IMAX theatre.

It was a kind of like a big warehouse spread out over 300 feet. It was an absolutely stunning sight. We had nothing. Four sets were used in the show. People arrived and the show began with 20 minutes in one spot. Then, the back of the stage would open up to reveal 300 feet of space and three more sets. The audience would move around, following us.

I will talk about this show in another speech because I think it was remarkable. We really made headlines with that show in the spring of 1988. All that to say, I worked on that show for two years. Can any of my colleagues guess how much money I made? I made \$1,200 for two years of work.

In that case, it was my decision. However, all my friends, all the actors, writers, directors, set designers and decorators, all these people who are planning shows in Montreal, Toronto, Vancouver, all these artists who are struggling to make ends meet—we have to support them.

• (1240)

That support begins by voting for Bill C-11 so that it can pass as soon as possible.

[*English*]

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons (Senate), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I agree with almost every single passionate word that member said today. I have never heard both Shakespeare and Wayne Gretzky referenced in the same speech, but nonetheless, it was very impressive.

I cannot help but think of my own childhood. I grew up watching TVO, TV Ontario, and being exposed to shows like *Today's Special* and the *Polka Dot Door*. I look at my kids now. My youngest two are four and six, and they are watching all this YouTube content. I have no idea where it is being generated from, and there is certainly no degree of Canadian content in there. I am sure that this member can speak in the same way about what was seen back in the day on Quebec TV stations versus what young children in Quebec are being exposed to today.

Could he speak to the impact that this would have culturally on young Quebecers and young Canadians?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Denis Trudel: Mr. Speaker, that is an excellent question.

This will have a major impact. As far as fighting for language and culture is concerned, I think that everyone in the House knows that I am here in the House because of my involvement in the fight for French in Quebec. That is how I got involved in politics.

My son is 14 and became bilingual on YouTube. I have nothing against being bilingual, but when I talk to him about fighting for the French language, for now, it does not resonate with him. Imagine how it breaks my heart to hear him say that.

By passing Bill C-11, we will be able to work on making francophone content discoverable. This is not going to solve everything, but the chances of my son accessing francophone content on these platforms will be much higher than if it is up to me to tell him to watch it.

[*English*]

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for his passion. He clearly understands the inequality that is happening right now with the web giants not paying their fair share in Canada and the impact it is having on Quebec and Canadian producers and artists.

I talked a little bit earlier about Saffron Bisiker, a local filmmaker in my riding. She created the first film festival in Qualicum Beach, which occurred for the first time ever just a couple of weeks ago and celebrated many of our local artists. We have a young filmmaker from Ahousaht in my riding, creating films with an indigenous lens.

Government Orders

I think it is so important that we do what we can right now to start evening out the playing field. Could my colleague speak about the impact of the delays from the Liberal government in tabling legislation to create a balanced playing field and how important it is for young people like Saffron and the young indigenous filmmakers in my riding?

• (1245)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Denis Trudel: Mr. Speaker, the 2021 election was seen as a real disaster for the cultural sector in Quebec, mainly because it delayed the previous version of the broadcasting bill. We had to start over from scratch and we were not able to pass the bill.

I agree with my colleague. There are so many people and so many creators. I cannot count the number of times I was in a short film by film students at Concordia University, the University of Montreal or UQAM. I made movies. I was not paid, but I told myself that these young creators were the filmmakers of tomorrow. They want to make a name for themselves. These are young people from all over.

I remember making a movie with a young Venezuelan director who was studying at the University of Montreal. That was around the time we were filming *Octobre*. When *Octobre* was released, this student went to see it, and he had serious questions about the independence movement in Quebec. Venezuela is a country with a lot of upheaval. We had some really extraordinary discussions.

It is extremely important to protect creators across Quebec and Canada against the hegemony of these major platforms.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, I thank my Bloc Québécois colleague.

I think we have a different strategy for our arts and culture sector. Imagine if there were a movie being filmed in Quebec that generated money for the economy but that was entirely in English, with American actors and screenwriters who speak only English and write only in English. Would that support Quebec's cultural industry?

I think that is why we have a different opinion, a different understanding, than our Conservative Party colleagues do. Unless the efforts are rooted in Quebec culture, then it is not a demonstration of our culture.

Mr. Denis Trudel: Mr. Speaker, that said, I would like to clarify something. I know many people who work in the cultural industry, particularly technicians, who earn a living thanks to American productions filmed in Montreal. It is an important industry, and we want it to stay that way.

I make a point of going to see every Quebec film that comes out. We have had a great year. I would invite all those who are listening to go and see the Quebec films that came out this year, such as *The Dishwasher* and Luc Picard's most recent movie, *Confessions of a Hitman*. Some amazing movies are being made, and we must support our creators.

Quebec has a population of only eight million, but our movies are captivating audiences all over the world. Take Xavier Dolan, for example, or the phenomenal director Denis Villeneuve, who is now

making movies in the United States, but who got his start here. We need to support our industry.

Mr. Arif Virani (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade, Export Promotion, Small Business and Economic Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in the House.

[*English*]

As I rise today, it is a bit like Groundhog Day. I am rising to speak on Bill C-11. The reason why it is so familiar to me is because I rose to speak on virtually the same bill in the last Parliament, when it was known as Bill C-10. I am rising again today on this issue because, once again, it is before Parliament.

There are certain issues that perhaps do not transcend from one Parliament to another, perhaps they are more temporal in nature, however, this issue has only become exacerbated with the passage of time. The issue and the pressing need to address the Broadcasting Act, to modernize that legislation and bring it into the 21st century has become even more acute and more critical. Thus is the reason why it has been presented by our government and why it is being debated today, and being debated with urgency. I do believe that the passage of this type of legislation is urgent.

When we are talking about the Broadcasting Act, we are talking about fundamentally Canadian content. We just heard a very impassioned speech by my colleague from the Bloc Québécois, talking about the importance of promoting English Canadian and French Canadian cultural content. This has been a critically acute issue for Canada for literally decades. The principle reason is because of our geographic proximity to our friend and ally, a nation whose president was in this chamber literally short of a week ago, a cultural behemoth that has the potential to overshadow and really eclipse content that is being produced in other nations, including the nation that is its most proximate neighbour.

We realized this many decades ago, and that is why we put in place, as a government, as parliamentarians, protections for Canadian content, so we could have Canadian stories told, told via television, film and music. Those were important protections. Those protections were put in place in legislation that hearken back to a different era, when people received their content through things like the radio. It is not coincidental that in French, when people talk about the CBC, it is called Radio-Canada, because that was the principle medium for the transmission of communications, including entertainment at the time.

Radio and television dominated the landscape for nearly a century. However, things have changed. In the old era, what we would do and what we continue to do today is put, as a condition of a licence for a television or a radio broadcaster, that it must invest in Canadian culture and Canadian artists. That has produced significant results.

However, the status right now is very different. I will include myself as one of the Canadians who have changed. Times have changed. Canadians are not using cable very much anymore. I think I might be one of the rare households in this chamber that still has cable. I use it for watching things like the Toronto Blue Jays, and God bless them today on the opening day of the season. I hope they have great season.

Independent of sports, most people are consuming their content online, on streaming services. Streaming is everywhere. People stream on their phones, in their cars, on their televisions. Many people are enjoying this.

I was actually looking up some of the statistics, and it is quite startling. Right now, eight out of 10 Canadians, or 80% of our entire country, uses at least one streaming service. Just in 2016, one year after our government took office, that number was five out of 10. Again, I will include myself in the people on the outside looking in back in 2016. People would talk to me about streaming Netflix and I did not know what they were talking about. I am being quite honest.

Now, not only am I streaming Netflix, but we have a Disney account, and my kids want me to get Amazon Prime, which I really do not know about. There is a number of different streaming platforms that people are attracted to or are already using. Six out of 10 Canadians, or 60% of the country, subscribe to two platforms or more.

However, the basic point is that while we have, on the radio and television side, things like Bell and Rogers contributing to Canadian content, which is a good thing and it is something we want to continue, streaming platforms, such as the Amazon Prime, YouTube, Crave, Netflix and Spotify, are broadcasting to Canadians, using Canadian content to market to those Canadians, but they are contributing absolutely nothing to the flourishing and development of more Canadian content on their platforms. They do not have the same requirements applied on those platforms as are applied on standard radio and television broadcasters.

There is the problem. From a very basic perspective, what are we here for as parliamentarians, if it is not to identify problems and seek to address them for the benefit of Canadians. That is something quite fundamental, and I think all 338 of us try to do that every day, that we are privileged to hold these types of positions.

● (1250)

Nevertheless, the legislation has not kept pace. I found it quite fascinating that the last time the Broadcasting Act was amended was in 1991. I was in my second year of university at McGill at that time. I do not even think I had an email address at that point. I think I got one my fourth year. It was really long and basically never used, because in order to use it, I had to walk into a separate office on the west floor of the building to access something called email. At that point, the Internet was mainly the purview of the U.S. military that had invented it years before.

There was no such thing as smart phones. There was certainly no such thing as apps. We were living in a completely different world and that was merely, on my account, about 32 or 33 years ago.

Government Orders

Back then, given that landscape in 1991, the Broadcasting Act was perfectly useful and suitable to the landscape as it was then. It dealt with radio and television broadcasters, because that was where people found their content, and we ensured that those radio and television broadcasters were promoting Canadian content.

It is now 2023 and the landscape has changed dramatically in the last decade, but certainly in the last few years. What we are seeking to do with this legislative amendment to the Broadcasting Act is to ensure that we promote, and continue to promote, great Canadian stories *dans la langue de Molière, mais aussi en Anglais* wherever those stories are found.

This bill would give the CRTC the ability to require that online streaming companies that profit from playing Canadian content, including Canadian music, film and TV shows, make financial contributions to support Canadian creators. This is a critically important objective.

What I am equally pleased about with the bill is that if we are to reopen a piece of legislation, we may as well improve upon it. We are modernizing it to deal with this new online landscape. We are also doing something that is quite targeted and deserves some attention. We are promoting the diversity of Canadian creators. What do I mean by that? We are promoting indigenous creators.

I spent a lot of time in our first Parliament working on indigenous language protection when I was the parliamentary secretary to the then minister of heritage. What we heard, in all the consultations we did and in all the work that turned into what is now the Indigenous Languages Act, which thankfully got support from everyone in this chamber, every party, as it should have, was that in order to promote indigenous language, the restoration and revitalization of those languages, we needed to ensure that we were also supporting indigenous creators. This bill would do that. It is an important aspect.

It also addresses persons with disabilities. We talk a lot about changes to things like the accessibility act. We talk about the Canada disability benefit act that we are rolling out. At the same time, we need to ensure that people's sense of inclusion and understanding of persons with disabilities is enhanced by ensuring that persons with disabilities are seen and included in the Canadian content we all absorb.

The same can be said for people of diverse sexual orientation. The LGBTQ2 community is specifically mentioned in this legislation as a group of creators whose content we want to promote.

I will finish on this idea of other diverse creators, which is Black and persons of colour. As a racialized member of this chamber, this has been a weak spot for our country, quite frankly. Our Canadian content creators need to have an applied focus that directs them to enhance and empower the voices so Black persons and persons of colour can see themselves reflected on what they are consuming on television, in film and on musical platforms when they are streaming. It is important for all Canadians to be able to see themselves in the content.

Government Orders

I need to address an issue that was raised repeatedly in the last Parliament and it has been raised repeatedly during this Parliament about this bogeyman of restricting freedom of expression. I have two broad responses to what I feel is an improper and incorrect attack on this legislation.

It is logically flawed to posit that this is a challenge to freedom of expression. It is also inaccurate in terms of the substance of the bill. It is a logical flaw.

On the logic of this kind of argument, the fact that we have been promoting, for decades now, through financial contribution requirements, things such as radio and television broadcasters, those promotion efforts would have restricted or diluted the creation of Canadian content as opposed to enhanced it.

We know for a fact that the enhancement has occurred by ensuring that broadcasters, in that physical and traditional context, are required to apply money and funds from their profits toward the creation of Canadian content. We have had, on the musical side, the Arkells and The Tragically Hip. We have had Rush and Drake from my city.

• (1255)

On the television side, we have had everything from the *Beachcombers* to *Kim's Convenience* and everything in between.

We do not get those great Canadian success stories without that applied directive to ensure there is financial enhancement in the industry by broadcasters to support creators. Therefore, with that simple logic, if this model were flawed, it would have diminished the amount of Canadian content as opposed to enhancing it, and the same reasoning applies here.

The same would apply for ensuring that online streaming companies are classified as broadcasters. What we will see, far from diminishing Canadian expression, is enhanced Canadian expression. What do I mean by that? It is going to compel the Amazon Primes, Netflix and the Spotifys of the world to ensure that they are making Canadian content discoverable and are contributing monetarily from their very healthy bottom lines, balance sheets and profits to the creation of more Canadian content. That is a good onto itself.

However, the argument on the challenge of freedom of expression is flawed even in terms of the bill itself. If there is one thing that changed between the last Parliament and this Parliament is that, although the framework of the bill is the same, and we heard this argument so many times in the 43rd Parliament, we went to great lengths to ensure that there would be multiple provisions, not just one, that stipulate that this bill was not about restricting freedom of expression.

The bill would not dictate what Canadians can see and do on social media. The bill explicitly excludes all user-creator content on social media platforms and streaming services. Those exclusions mean that the experience for users creating, posting and interacting with other user-generated content will not be impacted whatsoever. Multiple clauses in the legislation explicitly state that the regulations the CRTC imposes on platforms through the Broadcasting Act cannot infringe on Canadians' freedom of expression on social me-

dia. Provisions indicate that the act would not apply to uploaded content.

All regulatory requirements and obligations in the bill would only affect the broadcaster or the platform and never the user or the creator. For the individual Jane and John Doe in their basement seeking to upload something, create a music video or put something online about how they are playing the guitar, how their guitar level is increasing or singing a song and uploading it online, this does not speak to them. It speaks to the Amazons and Spotifys of the world, and that is an important delineation that has been emphasized by the text of the legislation.

Why is it important to support these creative industries? It is critical. Not only is it about the value, which I indicated at the outset of my comments, it is about the importance of telling Canadian stories particularly when we are threatened by a sea of non-Canadian stories from our neighbour south of the border. It is also important when we think about what Canadian creators, many of whom I am very privileged to represent in Parkdale—High Park, do for us as a nation.

During the pandemic, we heard extensively about the contributions of Canadian creators to Canadian society. When people were going through difficult times, when there were higher levels of anxiety and depression through lack of physical contact with one another, it was our Canadian creators who were there to support all of us, to tell stories and support us in some of our most troubling times as nation, literally since probably World War II.

Those creators are also economic contributors to Canada. It is not just the people who actually make the film, direct, act and produce the screenplay, it is not just the people picking up the instruments or microphone, it is a whole host of supplementary supports for the industry that contribute to the economic uplifting of Canadian society. For no other reason than the economic benefit, I would hope His Majesty's loyal opposition would support the bill for the economic productivity that stands to be gained by this type of legislation.

It is really important to look at the host of cultural creators who have lined up in support of this bill: The Canadian Association of Broadcasters, ACTRA, SOCAN. I will read what Alex Levine, the president of the Writers Guild of Canada, has to say. He says:

Private, English-language Canadian broadcasters have reduced their spending on Canadian television production every year for nearly a decade, while foreign streaming services have taken over more and more of the Canadian market. This threatens our whole industry, and the tens of thousands of jobs it supports. Canadian broadcasters have long been required to contribute to the culture and economy of this country. It's time for global streamers profiting in Canada to be held to the same standards.

• (1300)

Mr. Levine is talking about levelling the playing field. It is a very simple concept. If something benefits from Canadian content and access to the Canadian market, it needs to contribute to the Canadian content it is benefiting from. It is as simple as that. By pursuing a level playing field and modernizing this legislation, we could bring the Broadcasting Act into the 21st century. For that reason, I hope every party in this chamber will support this legislation.

Government Orders

Mr. Tako Van Popta (Langley—Aldergrove, CPC): Mr. Speaker, my colleague went to some length to explain that Bill C-11 would not impact user-generated content, so my simple question would be this: Why would we not just accept the amendment proposed by the Senate to do exactly that? It would remove user-generated content from the bill. Would the bill not, thus amended, still have all the other positive effects the member is promoting?

Mr. Arif Virani: Mr. Speaker, I think the Senate amendments deserve scrutiny and careful study. We are thankful for the intense study that took place on the Senate side. We believe that, given the extensive study of Bill C-10 in the 43rd Parliament, and given the nature of the legislation we have tabled in the House already, which is replete with user-generated content protections that relate to the exact issue my friend opposite is raising, those protections are already in place and that potentially introducing further aspects of this would be superfluous and unnecessary.

• (1305)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Denis Trudel (Longueuil—Saint-Hubert, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I will not go back over all the reasons why we need to pass this legislation as soon as possible. I addressed this at length earlier in my speech.

It is hard for us to imagine this bill passing without the Quebec government weighing in in some way or giving its opinion. It appears that this will no longer be possible. However, the Government of Quebec has indicated its desire to weigh in on Bill C-11.

Is my colleague aware of what the federal government plans to do to ensure that the Government of Quebec is involved in the implementation of Bill C-11?

Mr. Arif Virani: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his comments and his question.

We are well aware of the Quebec government's position, which is of interest to us. It is quite clear that Quebec's objective is exactly the same as ours, specifically to work to promote and revitalize Canadian culture, which includes anglophone and francophone culture across Canada.

We know very well that the economic spinoffs from the Quebec's creative industry are huge and disproportionate compared to other provinces. We will take this into account when we implement the bill.

[*English*]

Ms. Lisa Marie Barron (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for sharing his information around the importance of us having Canadian stories at the forefront. I would be remiss if I did not quickly mention something applicable to the bill.

This April, Vancouver Island's annual film festival will be kicking off again. Last year, the then festival director Hilary Eastmure was talking to *The Discourse*, which is a local media outlet, about the importance of this film festival. She talked about the importance of local film being seen alongside films around the world. She talked about the importance of “smaller stories” and how they “reveal something really intimate about people's daily lives and

challenges that they face.” She talked about the directors in last year's film festival, including three Iranian directors, two of whom were women.

I am wondering if the member could share a bit about why he feels the Conservatives are continuing to fundraise on misinformation around Bill C-11, instead of putting forward sound solutions that could move us forward with protecting and supporting Canadian cultural content.

Mr. Arif Virani: Mr. Speaker, I wish I had an answer to that. We all have an interest in sharing Canadian content, in promoting it and in producing more of it to tell Canadian stories. There is at least an economic interest that all members of the House would share. I am very pleased to learn about the Vancouver Island film festival. Obviously, in my hometown we have TIFF, which is world renowned. There are festivals throughout this country that promote those Canadian stories.

It is pleasing to see that Canadian content is being consumed internationally. This was mentioned by the member from the Bloc Québécois. We know that *Seeing Red*, which is an animated film that depicted an Asian family in the city of Toronto, received an Academy Award nomination. That is exactly what we need more of, and that is exactly what this bill would produce.

Mrs. Rechie Valdez (Mississauga—Streetsville, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I grew up in that era also. Radio was what I had to rely on to listen to my favourite R and B and hip-hop songs: the privileged era of boom boxes, vinyl and cassette tapes. The member is so right that so much has changed.

This bill would provide us with an opportunity, since 1991, to ensure that the broadcasting sector is inclusive of all Canadians. I would like the hon. member's perspective on how important it is to ensure that tech giants should pay their fair share to support the diverse and inclusive aspects of our Canadian culture.

Mr. Arif Virani: Mr. Speaker, I share the member opposite's passion and her fondness for the nostalgia of boom boxes and cassette tapes. I still have some cassette tapes at home. My kids do not know what on earth they are.

What is critical is that this is part and parcel of a broader agenda of our government and, I hope, of this Parliament in terms of what we are doing to address the presence of digital platforms in our lives. We have Bill C-11 and we have Bill C-18. We are very committed to addressing online harms and online safety. In previous Parliaments we have addressed things like electoral advertising in online spaces.

Our commitment is to ensure that digital platforms that benefit from what they do in Canada and how they promote themselves or advertise in Canada, and that reap dollars from Canadian pockets, will also contribute back to Canadian communities and to the creation of Canadian content. That is a fundamental theme that informs all pieces of our legislation, and it will continue to do so.

Government Orders

• (1310)

Mr. Martin Shields (Bow River, CPC): Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague's speech is interesting, as I see that my colleague is much younger than I am, yet some of the things he talks about are from a long time ago. It is interesting that in February, for example, vinyl outsold CDs, which is a change that is happening.

I have a challenge with what the member is saying. I sat on the heritage committee for Bill C-10 and Bill C-18. Bill C-18 talks about money transfer, but it does not talk about the CRTC. That is the challenge that I have with Bill C-11. The Liberals could do the monetary thing but not involve the CRTC. People understand support for artists and understand royalties or whatever they want to call it. However, why involve the CRTC?

Back when Bill C-10 was passed, it was without that “user-generated” part. It was in there and the Liberals took it out. However, why do we need to involve the CRTC if they keep talking about monetary support going to the artists? The Liberals quote a lot of professional organizations that like the money, but why are they not talking about the artists themselves and a mechanism for where the money would go? In Bill C-18 they talk about where the money goes. Why do we need the CRTC? If they want the money to go to artists, why is that not what they are doing?

Mr. Arif Virani: Mr. Speaker, I have two responses. One is that the CRTC is part of Canada's cultural landscape and it has been for many decades. It is a known and trusted institution. It is at arm's-length from the government and it is quasi-judicial with regard to the decisions it makes. We are reusing a known institution that we are comfortable dealing with and that Canadians are comfortable dealing with.

I appreciate the member opposite's perspective, and I am actually a lot older than he thinks. I am 52 this year.

However, the point is that they are also not mutually exclusive. As I have read it, the legislation dictates the need for financial requirements and obligations to be put on large online streaming platforms that are monetizing Canadian content. However, in terms of how that money is paid and where that money is paid is equally something that the CRTC could opine upon and direct the platforms with respect to it.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons (Senate), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of disinformation coming from Conservatives specifically. One of the narratives they like to use is that, on this side of the House, we are trying to give control to cabinet to set the algorithms that would determine what people see. However, the Conservatives are somehow assuming that every other political party in here, including the Green Party and the Bloc, are willing to go along with that plan. That sounds quite ludicrous to me. I wonder if the parliamentary secretary can weigh in on it.

Mr. Arif Virani: Mr. Speaker, there is no hidden agenda in this bill. Algorithmic control would remain with the online streaming platforms.

What is important is the notion of ensuring that a portion of the profit that online streaming platforms, particularly those from other parts of the world, are already making from Canadian content is contributing to the creation of that Canadian content. That is a win

for Canadian creators. Arguably, it is probably a win for Netflix as well, because it will just have more like The Tragically Hip to put on their streaming platforms.

The Deputy Speaker: I want to point out that everybody is talking about cassettes and records, but not one person mentioned anything about eight-tracks.

Resuming debate, the hon. member for Carlton Trail—Eagle Creek.

Mrs. Kelly Block (Carlton Trail—Eagle Creek, CPC): Mr. Speaker, you stole my thunder.

I am pleased to have this opportunity to rise and speak to Bill C-11, the online streaming act, which, as we know, amends the Broadcasting Act and makes consequential amendments to other acts. I want to start by recognizing my colleague, the member for Lethbridge, who has done incredible work to bring to light the facts about the impacts this bill would have not only on the rights of Canadians but also on content creators here in Canada.

I will be splitting my time with member for Calgary Nose Hill.

This is an immense bill, as it would affect not only online streaming but also user-generated content online, including on social media. Let us review. The first iteration of this bill, Bill C-10, was introduced in 2020. The government claimed that the purpose of it was to modernize the Broadcasting Act and to make large online streaming services meet Canadian content requirements and to bring them in line with TV and radio stations. We have heard that again here.

In its original version, the former bill, Bill C-10, included an exemption for programs that users uploaded onto their social media or “user-generated content”. During the committee's study, the Liberals voted to remove this exemption from their own bill and refused to allow the Conservatives to reintroduce it. The bill died on the Order Paper when the 2021 election was called, but was reintroduced by the government in this Parliament. Here is what it did.

Bill C-11 would create a new category of web media called “online undertakings” and would give the CRTC the same power to regulate them and would require them to invest in Canadian content, even though they would not be required to apply for licences. While the government put the exemption back in this new version, it went on to also include an exemption to the exemption, which made it effectively meaningless. Unfortunately, this is another bill that the government seeks to pass that would dictate to industries what is best for them, rather than listening to the experts and stakeholders.

Numerous experts such as law professors and former CRTC commissioners believe that this bill would threaten the right to free speech. As we know, section 2(b) of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms guarantees the right to free speech, which can only be exercised effectively if one has the ability to be heard. Law Professor Michael Geist explains this:

To be clear, the risk with these rules is not that the government will restrict the ability for Canadians to speak, but rather that the bill could impact their ability to be heard. In other words, the CRTC will not be positioned to stop Canadians from posting content, but will have the power to establish regulations that could prioritize or de-prioritize certain content, mandate warning labels, or establish other conditions with the presentation of the content (including algorithmic outcomes). The government has insisted that isn't the goal of the bill. If so, the solution is obvious. No other country in the world seeks to regulate user content in this way and it should be removed from the bill because it does not belong in the Broadcasting Act.

The government wants to give bureaucrats living in Ottawa the sole discretion of determining what content should be considered Canadian and what should be shown to Canadians at large.

Setting aside concerns regarding free speech for a moment, this bill would also threaten the livelihood of individual content creators, artists and influencers who earn their living through the videos they post on social media and the advertising revenues that they generate. By their testimony, many fear they will not qualify under the CRTC's rules promoting certified content. They are also afraid of the effects of regulation on their international audiences.

Canadian creators do not need the Canadian media industry to intercede for them to succeed. Canadians are already punching above their weight, and there are many success stories. The reason we have so many Canadian success stories is that we allow the creativity of Canadian creators to flourish. We do not throttle it with excessive bureaucracy or red tape.

• (1315)

In the current landscape, content creators rise to the top through the merit of their content. The Internet offers infinite opportunity for new creators to reach audiences worldwide, allowing small creators to build up audiences through their own creativity and determination.

The bill would seek to stifle that freedom, only allowing those creators that the government deems worthy to be seen. Instead of one's search bar directing one to the content one is looking for, it would direct one to the content that the government has approved and wants one to see. This would be yet another case of government gatekeepers picking winners and losers based on their own arbitrary criteria.

It is important to note that the Senate made approximately 29, mostly minor, amendments to Bill C-11. This is why it is back before the House of Commons. The most significant amendment proposed would attempt to narrow the scope for social media regulation by adding discretionary criteria that appear to encourage the CRTC to focus on regulating professional audiovisual content rather than amateur user uploads.

While this makes the bill less bad, given that the criteria are discretionary, they do not change the powers of the CRTC to regulate social media or its discoverability powers. Besides that, the heritage minister has already indicated that the Liberal government will reject this amendment.

Points of Order

We should make no mistake: Homegrown talent and creative content here in Canada will no longer succeed based on merit. Content will be subject to a set of criteria that bureaucrats in Ottawa will use to determine its level of Canadianness, resulting in traditional art forms being favoured over new creative content.

Over 40,000 content creators affiliated with Digital First Canada signed letters calling for the discoverability rules in Bill C-11 to be removed.

Since the bill was introduced in its first iteration as Bill C-10, I have heard from many constituents who do not want the government dictating the content that they are allowed to see. They have written to me and expressed their shock and dismay at the government's attempt to control speech and online content.

They want the ability to find their favourite creators and enjoy the content that appeals to them. They do not want to see the favourite content of an Ottawa bureaucrat.

For all the Liberals' claims, Canadians understand that if this bill passes—

• (1320)

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. parliamentary secretary to the government House leader is rising on a point of order.

* * *

POINTS OF ORDER

VIDEO RECORDING OF PARLIAMENTARY PROCEEDINGS

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons (Senate), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to add to the point of order that I raised with you about an hour ago. Since then, the Leader of the Opposition has gone, once again, and retweeted the same video. In it, he says that the Liberals are speaking out in the House of Commons, right now, trying to censor this video and get it banned from the Internet.

I think the Leader of the Opposition is treating the procedure and the common practices that we have in the House callously. I think that, in your consideration and forthcoming judgment, you should consider this new information as well.

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you for the input.

The hon. member for New Brunswick Southwest is rising on a point of order.

Government Orders

Mr. John Williamson (New Brunswick Southwest, CPC): Mr. Speaker, if the Liberals are going to put forward a bill that would censor the Internet, they are going to wear it and get called out on it. We are not going to sit quietly back, as the opposition, and allow them to pass a bill like this that would censor what Canadians see.

If they are doing this, Liberals should be prepared to wear it.

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor West is rising on, I believe, the same point of order.

Mr. Brian Masse (Windsor West, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I think it is obvious, though, that one cannot use one's technology here in the chamber while it is sitting. It is a well-established practice that we have had, and any disrespect for that has always been corrected.

Unfortunately, we are in real time right now, and it is obviously more complicated. I am hoping that perhaps this will be expedited, at least as to whether the allegation is accurate. I do not know. I have not seen the video just yet, but I understand that it is pretty serious.

If it is in real time, happening right now, it is just going to create more egregious debate in the House of Commons. That is unfortunate. If it is true, then that should also be reflected because there is an attempt on the outside to do what one cannot do on the inside.

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Winnipeg North is rising on the same point of order.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let us be very clear: It is a violation of a rule if the mace is on the table and one is taking a picture or a video. Traditionally, in the past, when the issue has been raised, we have often seen the Speaker call for an immediate deletion. It has nothing to do with censorship. It is 100% about rules inside the House.

The leader of the official opposition is blatantly disobeying a rule. He should be deleting it, not because of censorship but because he should be respecting the procedures of the House of Commons.

I would ask, and suggest, that he be called upon to delete the video that is in direct conflict with our rules.

Mr. Bob Zimmer (Prince George—Peace River—Northern Rockies, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I just think this is such a classic example of an attempt by the government to censor what a member is saying on this very debate. It is very ironic that we have a government talking about it not being about censorship while attempting to censor a member of this House.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, the rules and procedures of this House are not up for debate. It is not about trying to censor anything; it is about respecting the rules. If Conservatives want to change the rules so the Leader of the Opposition can film a video in here while the mace is on the table, they should bring forward a motion to change the rules. We have rules in this House; they need to be respected. We are blatantly seeing support for that coming from the other side.

Like the parliamentary secretary said before me, the Speaker needs to review this matter, report back to the House immediately

and take the necessary actions against the Leader of the Opposition regarding this matter.

• (1325)

Mr. Bob Zimmer: Mr. Speaker, I just think it is interesting that the government, which has been in breach of ethics laws, is raising this point of order. How many ethics laws has the party been in breach of over the last number of years—

The Deputy Speaker: I believe we are now delving into debate.

The only thing I can say at this point is that we are not supposed to take pictures or videos while we are in the chamber. However, I am in the chair right now and cannot review that. I know the Chair is looking at it, and maybe the Speaker is looking at it. We will hopefully come back with a response as soon as we possibly can.

Continuing debate, the hon. member for Carlton Trail—Eagle Creek.

* * *

ONLINE STREAMING ACT

The House resumed consideration of Motion No. 2 in relation to the amendments made by the Senate to Bill C-11, An Act to amend the Broadcasting Act and to make related and consequential amendments to other Acts, and of the amendment.

Mrs. Kelly Block (Carlton Trail—Eagle Creek, CPC): Mr. Speaker, for all the Liberals' claims, Canadians understand that if this bill passes, the government will regulate what can be seen or posted online and control which videos they will see more or less often on their feeds.

After eight years, the government has lost the trust of Canadians. Transparency and accountability are not its strong suit. It avoids both at every opportunity, whether it is by providing inaccurate testimony in committees, refusing to allow witnesses to appear before a committee to shed light on very serious issues or refusing to answer questions in this place like who stayed in a \$6,000-per-night hotel room during the trip to the U.K. for the Queen's funeral.

We can all understand why Canadians are dubious about the Liberals' intentions in introducing this bill. They see it for what it is, which is an unacceptable attempt by the government to target the freedoms of individual Internet users in Canada. This is clearly not a government that will be accountable to Canadians, and it cannot be trusted with the power of regulating user-generated content.

Lastly, Conservatives understand that government censorship of the Internet is something that happens in totalitarian societies, not free ones. That is why we have fought so hard, both in this place and in the other place, to amend Bill C-11 in order to narrow its scope and fully exempt the content Canadians post on social media. However, the Liberal-NDP coalition rejected those amendments.

After eight years, it is time for a government that protects free speech, protects consumer choice and encourages Canadian creators instead of getting in their way. A Conservative government would repeal Bill C-11 and pass legislation requiring large streaming services to invest more of their revenue into producing Canadian content, while protecting the individual rights and freedoms of Canadians.

Ms. Julie Dabrusin (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Natural Resources and to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, listening to the member opposite, I wonder if she sees any value in Canadians having maybe a button on one of their streaming services or a special carousel dedicated to Canadian shows like *Heartland* or *Corner Gas*, which employ many Canadians and tell our great Canadian stories. Is there no value in making sure that when Canadians use these streaming services, we can find them easily?

Mrs. Kelly Block: Mr. Speaker, I can already find the things I want to watch quite easily. That is not what this bill is about. Bill C-11 would prevent Canadians from seeing and watching the content they choose. It would instead mean, as I said in my statements, that Ottawa bureaucrats would control what Canadians could see and watch online and through streaming services.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yves Perron (Berthier—Maskinongé, BQ): Mr. Speaker, what we have to take away from this debate is that our culture needs a boost, that it needs more discoverability.

If we do not help our culture, we will only see the culture of others on our networks, the culture of our bigger neighbour, which has tons more money to invest in its industry. I would like the Conservatives to understand that and also that the bill has nothing to do with censorship but seeks to present more local content.

The Bloc Québécois has done its homework. We spoke with the cultural sector before studying this bill. Members of this chamber have a responsibility to consult people affected by the bills that we must vote on.

My question is very simple. Did the Conservative members consult Canada's English-speaking cultural sector? The Conservative Party does have 10 members from Quebec. Someone must have spoken to people in the cultural sector in Quebec, who are asking us to pass this bill as quickly as possible.

• (1330)

[*English*]

Mrs. Kelly Block: Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, I will take the word of law professors, former CRTC presidents and Canadian content creators themselves when it comes to the impacts this bill will have not only on what Canadians are allowed to see but also what they are allowed to post online. There is a huge difference between giving supports through tax breaks or funding and directly deciding who should be featured as Canadian content and who should be suppressed. On this side of the House, we believe that Canadian creators have proven they are capable of building large international audiences.

Mr. Brian Masse (Windsor West, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the former CRTC chair is well known for supporting large Internet

providers and being against consumers. This is one reason that we have some of the highest prices in the world for our system.

Where I come from, we are a peninsula surrounded by the United States. Therefore, Windsor-Essex and Chatham-Kent counties basically get inundated with U.S. content on a regular basis. If we do not do anything with respect to this right now, it will be Alphabet that controls what we see and do not see.

I wonder if the Conservatives have reached out to the artists in the border communities about their concerns with respect to being shut out by some of the structural positions the United States has taken. These not only limit them from even going into the country but also from sharing their information. Have they reached out to those artists and dealt with the fact that, with so many Canadians living on the border like us, we are being inundated?

If we look at the hearings taking place in the U.S. Senate and Congress, there have been admissions that this is not a red or blue issue. Instead, it is being called the green issue with respect to what Fox and others are showing. This is because it is all about money and not about truth. Have the Conservatives talked to the artists in the regions who are affected by the border?

Mrs. Kelly Block: Mr. Speaker, when it comes to this piece of legislation, the bottom line is that the government is about to give itself the authority to control what Canadians watch. Instead of giving Canadians more of what they want, as the member is proposing, YouTube will be instructed to give viewers more of what the government wants for them.

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner (Calgary Nose Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we are here today in the middle of a debate where the Liberal government has curtailed debate on a censorship bill. It has actually censored debate on its censorship bill.

To put into perspective what is happening here today, people who have reviewed this bill, from all political stripes, all walks of life and all backgrounds in Canada, have said this bill would create in Canada the most authoritarian media-control regime in any western country. This is a fight worth having tooth and nail. Every member of the governing caucus needs to give their head a shake, including members of the NDP as well, who are in coalition on this bill, on the fact that this would censor Canadian content.

In the brief time I have today, because we know the government is shutting down debate on this, I want to make an appeal directly to my colleagues in the NDP and on the backbench of the Liberal government caucus, to really think this through.

Government Orders

First of all, the government's talking point is that this bill is needed to modernize the Broadcasting Act, to bring Canadians into alignment with what is happening today versus 30 years ago, pre-Internet. However, the reality is that this is not about what Canadians want or need; this is about the few elite media broadcasters and content creators who, in the past, have been creating content based on criteria of #MeToo incidents and doing what is best for profit. Frankly, they have been marginalizing racialized voices, women's voices and independent women creators.

That is the history of the elite companies that need this bill to squeeze the dregs of profits out for their shareholders in a last-ditch attempt to prop up a failing business model they did not have the foresight, the wherewithal or the innovation to keep competitive while small, independent creators gradually built up platforms and voices for themselves on new content creation platforms like YouTube or even streaming services. This is not the fault of Canadians, and Canadians should not be subject to government censorship because a few well-connected producers, media companies and whatnot want to have more profit for their shareholders

Again, for parties in this place that purport to stand up for intersectional, racialized and women's voices, in the long run, what anybody voting for this bill in this form is doing is actually taking away those voices. At the end of this day, what this bill would do is give the government the power to select what Canadians see. That is what this bill would do. Morally, that is wrong.

Other colleagues here, even colleagues from the NDP, have asked about large platforms like Alphabet or Meta. This bill would do nothing to improve algorithmic transparency; it would only make it worse. In fact, what it would do is keep censoring those platforms and add another layer of censorship where the government also would get to downgrade what voices are heard.

Imagine if Steven Harper had introduced this bill in the House of Commons and if he had created a government ministry where his appointees got to control what was upgraded or downgraded. There would have been pitchforks and torches in the street. The NDP would have been outraged. There would have been signs across the country. Instead, because we are acquiescing to the Liberals, who have a long history of propping up elitism in this country, elitism in thought and elitism in production, somehow it is okay.

People from all political stripes across the country, with so many disparate political voices, are saying this is wrong. Instead, what our government should be doing is modernizing legacy archaic bills like the Broadcasting Act, to get out of the way of innovative new forms of producing content so we can have more choice and more innovation. Then, those groups, people who have traditionally been without platforms, would not have the sword of Damocles of the government's CRTC regulation looming over them while wondering whether they are going to be successful.

• (1335)

There is no transparency in this bill. The worst part of it is that people would not even know what is being downgraded or upgraded by the federal government. How is that possible in a western democracy, where freedom of speech is supposedly and purportedly the cornerstone of what we do?

I will make it about me for a minute, or any other woman who is in this place. This place has typically repressed female politicians' voices. The Canadian media, for generations, has had a hard time putting women at the forefront. In my time in office, I have been able to use platforms like this to get around the elites, who might not allow me any voice, to be able to talk directly to my constituents. How do I know that I, or any of my female colleagues in this place, am not going to have my content upgraded or downgraded based on whether or not the government and its appointees think what I am saying or what I am advocating for is right?

This bill would benefit only elites. It would prop up a model that no longer works in this country, and I guarantee that the people who would suffer are the people who need these platforms the most.

I cannot believe that the government is curtailing debate on this bill. What it should be doing is listening and working collaboratively with the opposition to come up with amendments on this steaming pile of garbage so the thoughts of Canadians who have vociferously voiced that we cannot have curtailments on the freedom of speech in this country are appeased.

Why would the government not accept an amendment to exempt user-generated content? The only reason it is that it intends to downgrade and hide user-generated content in Canada. That is motive. Why is that not in there? The government has refused it time and time again. If the government really wants to create more freedom of speech, it should be trying to work with these big platforms to have more algorithmic transparency. It is not doing that. It is adding another layer of algorithmic downgrading. The government should be putting amendments in this bill.

Frankly, people are talking about content that has been created in Canada. We put \$1.5 billion into the Canadian Broadcasting Company every year. My colleagues from the Bloc were talking about French-language content. Is that money being well spent on French-language content? The CBC has had atrocious human resources issues in the last year. There are all sorts of questions about their conduct and what is happening. Instead of objectively looking at these legacy, elite institutions and how they should be forced to modernize and come up with the change in how Canadians communicate, the government is putting in more elite blockages to what Canadians can see and which Canadians can be heard.

Government Orders

That is not my Canada. We should have more diverse voices. Frankly, how many journalists in the parliamentary press gallery are from western Canada? There is one, maybe. The only way we get heard is through these types of platforms, and now, and I intend no offence, the government does not have the best track record on supporting western Canada. It is telling us the CRTC would get to regulate what content is seen from western Canadian content creators. I say “no”.

This is 100% a violation of every Canadian's right to free speech. I cannot believe that any Liberal backbencher who actually cares about supporting women and marginalized voices would think this is a good idea. This is designed to prop up a legacy model that is going directly into rich shareholders' profits, while small, independent voices would be downgraded.

There is no transparency in what the government is talking about. It is vague. It is a steaming pile of garbage. It has been panned by every political stripe; by experts from academia, law and media; and by content creators themselves. The only people speaking in favour of this are people who have already made it and have benefited, for a very long period of time, from a system that no longer is in line with the times. That is why it is wrong.

That is why the government should not be censoring debate. We should be robustly debating it. This should be amended. It should be scrapped.

• (1340)

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons (Senate), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we do not hear as much from the member as we used to, and I miss that. I am being genuine. She is actually one of the more progressive in the Conservative Party and I wish we would hear her voice more often, notwithstanding the fact that I disagree with her on this particular issue.

I did take note that the member spoke specifically about the government backbench and the NDP as though they were the only members in the House who support this, but that is not true. The entire Bloc Québécois caucus and the Green Party caucus support it as well. Therefore, the only party here that does not support this is the Conservative Party. I think it is a huge stretch to suggest that the Bloc Québécois, the separatist party, is somehow going along with a scheme to allow cabinet to make decisions on algorithms and what people see.

I am wondering if the member can comment on why she talked just specifically about the Liberals and the NDP in her statement and completely left out the Bloc and Green Party.

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner: Mr. Speaker, I want to start with my colleague's first statement. Speaking in this place is a privilege. It is about quality, not quantity, and that is a lesson the member should undertake.

The member should also understand that speaking truth to power is something that is our responsibility, rather than being a toady for the PMO.

Mr. Colin Carrie (Oshawa, CPC): Mr. Speaker, my colleague pointed out some of the flaws in this bill. Professor Michael Geist, whom I know she has worked with in the past, said that this bill is

going to restrict how people can be heard. I want to read the definition of “censorship” into the record. “Censorship” is defined as “the suppression of speech, public communication, or other information”.

I was wondering if the member could please comment on why the government cannot be trusted with any type of legislation like this, on Margaret Atwood's comment that this is creeping totalitarianism and on why we have to be very cautious of it.

• (1345)

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner: Mr. Speaker, I think Margaret Atwood presents a lot of tales we should take into consideration, like the need to continuously protect women's rights under any circumstance. I also think, though, that Margaret Atwood is one of those voices that would not necessarily speak in favour of a Conservative Party position, but would certainly speak in favour of the fact that free speech is an underpinning of Canadian democracy and something that should be protected at all cost.

The government is in the middle of a foreign-interference scandal, it has had multiple ethics violations, and it kicked out Jody Wilson-Raybould, Canada's first indigenous minister, for speaking truth to power. I do not trust the government as far as I can throw it.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Denis Trudel (Longueuil—Saint-Hubert, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my colleague stated in her speech that Bill C-11 would only benefit certain elites. I have no idea who she is speaking about. I stated earlier in my speech that, in Quebec, 80% of the members of the Union des artistes earn less than \$20,000 a year. I do not know which elites she is talking about, but my friends who are writers, playwrights and theatre and film technicians are not elites. All these people want us to vote for and to pass Bill C-11 as quickly as possible.

[*English*]

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner: Mr. Speaker, my maiden name is Michelle Godin. I was one of the many people in Canada who, frankly, I will just say it, were the victims of anglicization. Thus, I understand how important it is to ensure that French-language programming and the right to French-language learning are made available to all Canadians, because they are part of our cultural heritage.

However, the 20,000 artists the member just talked about have been, for generations, blocked by elite media corporations that pick and choose whom they want to come forward. The reality is that the government, with the billions of dollars we have seen wasted in recent years, could have done so much more for Quebec content creators to help them thrive in a new media market. All this bill would do is strengthen the capacity of the people who have typically repressed French voices in the past, and we need more of those voices.

Government Orders

That is why I implore my colleagues from the Bloc to use their power and their passion to convince the government to come up with something that is better and that would support all Canadians, particularly francophones.

Mr. Brian Masse (Windsor West, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is a fair criticism by the member about using closure. It is a very serious issue in terms of our parliamentary democracy.

The member also mentioned the Stephen Harper era. I was here during that time, and she knows that 114 or 117 times, I think, the Harper administration used closure on 11,000 pages of parliamentary law. I am wondering whether she has some reflections on all of those things, which actually involved women's issues, environmental issues, issue over pipelines and issues related to the economy. There were even some things that went to the Supreme Court and were brought back.

Maybe the member could give some reflections about when and how this issue should be resolved. It really goes back to the 1950s, when, for the first time, there was closure on a debate, which was over a pipeline issue. Perhaps we could get a little insight on that.

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner: Mr. Speaker, I would love to take a trip back down memory lane. In 2015, houses were half the cost in Canada, people could actually afford rent, the budget was balanced, we had economic growth and our international peers looked upon us to actually get things done instead of with embarrassment. Those were the golden days. If we could only have them back.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons (Senate), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we will not have those days back because that Conservative Party is gone. Believe it or not, Stephen Harper's Conservative Party no longer exists. As extreme right as that party was, we are now dealing with something even more to the right. It is a complete engulfing of everything populous that anyone could ever imagine.

I am going to talk about disinformation in my speech, in particular disinformation from the Conservatives. The first example that comes to mind is the last interaction between the member for Calgary Nose Hill and her Conservative colleague, who asked a friendly question about Margaret Atwood. There was disinformation about what Margaret Atwood said and her intentions.

I want to read to the House what The Globe and Mail reported regarding Margaret Atwood: "The author said she had not read the bill 'thoroughly yet' and that there seemed to be 'well-meaning attempts to achieve some sort of fairness in the marketplace.'" The Conservatives are not properly representing the thoughts of Margaret Atwood, yet they use her as a vehicle for disinformation repeatedly.

Unfortunately, what this issue has turned into for the Conservatives is nothing more than a fundraising cash cow. That is what this is. They are using every opportunity to raise money off this issue. They are using this House to raise money off this issue. They are promoting disinformation and misinformation to raise money off this issue.

I would like to read some of the outlandish things we have heard from Conservatives throughout this debate.

The member for Lethbridge said, "I wish for Canadians to know that this bill would impact them in two damning ways: One, it would censor what they see; and two, it would censor what they say."

The member for Carleton himself said, "The bill is about controlling the people."

The member for Sarnia—Lambton asked, "Could the member tell me how this legislation is different from what happens in communist countries?"

The member for Leeds—Grenville—Thousand Islands and Rideau Lakes said, "it is a government that wants to control what Canadians see and control what Canadians think."

The member for Kildonan—St. Paul, quoting Jay Goldberg, said, "If government bureaucrats get to choose what content to push on Canadians, there's a very real risk the government will be tempted to use its filtering powers to silence its critics."

The member for Medicine Hat—Cardston—Warner said, "Ultimately, Bill C-11 would put Canada in step with countries like North Korea, China, Iran and Russia".

The member for Oshawa, and this blew us away on Monday, said, "Bill C-11 is an online censorship bill designed to control search engines and algorithms so that the government can control what Canadians see and hear." He also said:

Sadly, this legislation models practices directly from the Communist Government of China.... It blocks unacceptable views and connections that the CCP considers harmful to the Chinese public. The goal of its Internet is to reshape online behaviour and use it to disseminate new party theories and promote socialist agendas.

The House was literally in a state of disbelief when we heard the member for Oshawa say that. The first person to get up and make a comment was the well-respected member for Saanich—Gulf Islands, who is not in the Liberal caucus, and she said, "Madam Speaker, as the hon. member for Oshawa was speaking, all I could think is that somewhere there is a Liberal war room clipping all of that to use in ads to make sure no one votes Conservative."

This is the rhetoric we have been hearing from that side of the House, and it is for nothing more than to clip and create videos to put out there, to generate money and to fundraise. I have been the subject of that myself. A tweet of mine regarding this issue was used in a fundraising email sent out by the Conservatives, with a gigantic "donate now" button at the bottom.

Statements by Members

• (1350)

Perhaps one of the most egregious forms of improperly utilizing House resources, which I hope the Speaker will come back to this House with a ruling on in short order, was what the member for Carleton, the Leader of the Opposition, did with the member for Louis-Saint-Laurent, who, by the way, has been in this House for a very long time and is a former House leader who knows the rules inside and out. As they were walking out of the chamber, while the chamber was still in session, they held a phone and started recording a video as they walked into the lobby. They were still in the chamber. The mace is still visible on the table in their video, and the member for Carleton was talking about how the Liberals are trying to silence people. Of course, what is at the bottom? It is a big “donate now” button so people can click the link and support the Conservative Party.

This has obviously been a cash cow for them, and they are using it over and over. Of course, we rose on a point of order trying to get the Speaker to rule on this egregious act of not just filming in this House, which we are not supposed to do, but using House of Commons resources to promote something. When we rose on a point of order regarding that, what did the Leader of the Opposition do? He retweeted that tweet, saying we are trying to silence it. Of course, what is at the bottom of that retweet? It is a big “donate now” button linking people right to the Conservative Party.

Not only does he completely disrespect the rules of this House, but he will then blatantly use the proper calling of procedure to fundraise further. This is the Leader of the Opposition. This is the leader of His Majesty's loyal opposition doing this, and it is absolutely unacceptable. The Speaker knows that. I know that. Every member of this House knows that. However, the Leader of the Opposition continues, and he does not care. He does not care what gets in his way to fundraise, even if it is proper decorum and practice within this House.

The Conservatives get up and say that the Liberal Party and the Liberal government, in cahoots with the NDP, are somehow trying to give cabinet the ability to generate and write the algorithms that would shape what people see. For someone to believe that, they would also have to believe that the Bloc Québécois, a separatist party in this country, is going along with that scheme. How ludicrous is it to think that the Bloc Québécois would say it would turn over the reins to cabinet to generate and make up the algorithms? It is completely ludicrous. The Conservatives know it.

Years ago, when this bill was first introduced in the House, the Conservatives, to their credit, jumped on top of what was possibly a misstep with respect to introducing it. They sensed a little blood in the water, and the sharks were swarming around trying to generate controversy and conspiracy theories on this issue. Of course, because of the way things work on social media, it did not take long for everybody to jump on board those conspiracy theories, and the Conservatives have done nothing, and I mean absolutely nothing, to try to set the record straight. Instead, they have used it for political gain, they have used it for fundraising and they have used it time and time again to try to delay moving anything forward in this House.

If the Conservatives want to get up and talk about closing debate on this issue, they really have to reflect on how many times they have spoken to it. I am sure all they need to do is look at the fundraising emails, because every time this debate comes up, another fundraising email goes out.

An hon member: Thank you for your donation.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, they continue to heckle, and they are only helping my point. “Thank you for your donation” were the words heckled to me.

This is only about one thing for the Conservatives. This is about fundraising. This is about getting money, and the Leader of the Opposition knew it himself this morning when he realized his cash cow was about to dry up in a second and that he better film one more video. He could not even wait until he got outside of the chamber to film that video. He had to start doing it while walking up the aisle.

I look forward to my remaining time after question period.

• (1355)

The Deputy Speaker: When we return, the hon. member will have 10 minutes to revise his thoughts and expand on those thoughts.

Some hon. members: More.

The Deputy Speaker: We have a point of order from the hon. member.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, I believe if you seek it, you will find unanimous consent to push question period forward by 20 minutes so I can finish my speech.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Deputy Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: I heard a few “nays”, but it was not as vigorous as I expected.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

• (1400)

[English]

ELMIRA MAPLE SYRUP FESTIVAL

Mr. Tim Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I invite everyone to join us in Kitchener—Conestoga this weekend as we welcome patrons back to the 59th annual Elmira Maple Syrup Festival on Saturday, April 1. Since its start in 1965, the festival has grown to be the largest single-day maple syrup festival in the world. The community of Elmira, with a population of 12,000 people, will welcome up to 80,000 guests. Individuals and families can take part in the pancake-flipping contest, family fun arena, live music, and the toy and craft show and, of course, enjoy pancakes drenched in maple syrup.

Statements by Members

I thank the committee for its dedication and perseverance. I thank the sponsors for their financial support. I thank the volunteers who worked tirelessly to make this festival happen. All proceeds from the festival are returned to our community's charitable and not-for-profit organizations. From morning breakfast to savouring the food, appreciating the vendors and enjoying the artists, I know my family and I will have a great day, and others will too. Everyone is welcome to join us at the Elmira Maple Syrup Festival. I will see them there.

* * *

UGADI

Mr. Colin Carrie (Oshawa, CPC): Mr. Speaker, *namaskaram*. Last weekend, I, along with our leader, the member for Carleton, had a wonderful time celebrating Ugadi, Telugu new year's day, with both the Durham Telugu Association and the Ontario Telugu Foundation.

This festival is celebrated across the world on the first day of the Hindu lunar calendar and includes a reading of predictions for the upcoming year by a priest or the eldest member of the family. It is a time to celebrate with family and friends and to reflect upon the past year's achievements and challenges.

We felt so privileged to be included in the celebrations with this vibrant community that values tradition, family and culture. Their warm hospitality, rich traditions and colourful celebrations are so beautiful and fascinating. I would like to thank Srimi, Murali and so many others from the Durham association and the Ontario foundation for the opportunity to experience it first-hand.

Ugadi subhakankshalu.

* * *

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Michael McLeod (Northwest Territories, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Mackenzie River basin drains nearly 20% of Canada's land mass. Waters in Alberta and B.C. flow north toward Great Slave Lake, down the Mackenzie River and into the Arctic Ocean.

The illegal, unreported Kearn tailings leak is just the most recent risk to one of the largest freshwater sources in the world. It is yet another industrial project south of 60 that threatens the basin. Even before this leak, NWTers had long had concerns about the impacts of these projects on our waters. Creeks and small rivers are drying out. Ice is more treacherous. Ponds and small lakes have disappeared. Water is less deep and warmer. Mammals and fish are disappearing.

Regulating this specific cleanup and developing a monitoring plan with all those impacted is necessary and important. Northern indigenous peoples and the Government of Northwest Territories are impacted and are a necessary part of the discussions. The Mackenzie River basin must not be used as another tailings pond.

[*Translation*]

MAUREEN BREAU

Mr. Yves Perron (Berthier—Maskinongé, BQ): Mr. Speaker, on Monday night in Louiseville, Sergeant Maureen Breau was serving her community. Dedicated and available, she had in fact volunteered to do overtime. She was experienced, attentive and well-liked. She had just been promoted and had a brilliant future and many plans.

Maureen Breau did not go home Monday night. She lost her life during an intervention to restore peace and security in her community.

The circumstances of those events are signs that we, as a society, have a duty to understand what happened in order to prevent similar tragedies from occurring in the future. All of Berthier—Maskinongé and all of Quebec are in mourning.

We stand with the family, friends, partner and children of Ms. Breau. Our thoughts are with her colleagues at the Sûreté du Québec. I salute them. Today, we mourn an everyday hero who made the ultimate sacrifice. We will not forget.

* * *

[*English*]

LES SUPRÊMES NOVICE

Ms. Patricia Lattanzio (Saint-Léonard—Saint-Michel, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today I would like to recognize the hard work and dedication of a group of 17 young female athletes in my riding and members of Les Suprêmes Novice de Saint-Léonard, who won gold at the 2023 Novice Canadian Championships, 2023 Skate Canada Cup.

Les Suprêmes delivered an outstanding performance in the synchronized skating competition held in Calgary. Congratulations go to Siena Ferrante, Lilirose Ouellette, Sophie Beliveau, Keira Frattasio, Linda Petreccia, Noura Boni, Daliyah Don, Noëlie Exina, Yifan Mo, Lea Boumghar, Emma Valente, Zoe Deslauriers, Keerah Lorzinsky, Ashlynn Alex, Alice Sigouin, Maïka René and team captain Megan Lucarelli.

Les Suprêmes is an inspiration for us all and a source of pride for both Saint-Léonard and Canada.

* * *

● (1405)

GLENLAWN COLLEGIATE INSTITUTE

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner (Calgary Nose Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, what do CTV bureau chief Bill Fortier; the president of Save the Children Canada, Danny Glenwright; film director Adam Smoluk; Alana Warnick, star of *Canada's Ultimate Challenge*; and I all have in common? Well, we all graduated from Winnipeg's Glenlawn Collegiate Institute 25 years ago, and this May the school will celebrate its 100th anniversary.

This western Canadian public school has quietly had an enormous impact on Canadian culture. Countless leaders, including Nobel Prize-winning astrophysicist Jim Peebles, graduated from Glenlawn.

Statements by Members

Glenlawn's teachers deserve our thanks, including Theresa Oswald, for teaching us to speak truth to power; Arpena Babaian and Irene Nordheim, for teaching us the power and value of volunteerism; and a person who has had a long-standing impact on my life, band teacher Bill Kristjanson, for teaching that beauty is always found as harmony is wrested from cacophony, a lesson this place could learn once in a while.

To the Glenlawn family on the 100th anniversary of this remarkable institution, we let out a collective roar of Lions pride: Happy anniversary.

* * *

LAKESHORE SOCCER CLUB

Mr. Francis Scarpaleggia (Lac-Saint-Louis, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on May 6, the Lakeshore Soccer Club will be named one of Canada Soccer's organizations of distinction.

Founded in 1966, the club is a pillar of Montreal West Island's sports and recreational life and is home to around 4,000 players each year. In addition to its dynamic house leagues, Lakeshore Soccer fields regional and provincial teams at the A, AA, AAA and semi-pro levels and has brought home multiple women's and men's national youth titles.

[Translation]

The women's team are three-time Coupe du Québec winners. The club also offers the Super Sonics program, which allows children with special needs to play this sport in an inclusive and welcoming environment. In 2017, this program received the Prix à part entière award from the Quebec government.

[English]

Club alumni include Rhian Wilkinson, who won Olympic bronze in 2012 and 2016; and James Pantemis, currently a goalkeeper with CF Montreal.

I congratulate Lakeshore Soccer on being chosen for this honour, and I thank the thousands of volunteers who have contributed to the club's longevity and unparalleled success.

* * *

ALLISON HERBERT WHITEHEAD

Mrs. Jenica Atwin (Fredericton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise to pay tribute to and say a few words in celebration of the life of Mr. Allison Herbert Whitehead, or "Al" as he was known to everyone.

For decades, Al was a prominent contributor to our community in Fredericton. He was a dear friend to one of my wonderful predecessors, Andy Scott.

Anyone who knew Al knew that he played hard and worked harder. He built a successful law practice over 47 years in Fredericton's Northside, the strong side. He was known for being dedicated to his clients and for being kind and generous, but he was above all a family man. Al and his wife Marlene built a family of three daughters, Jennifer, Kate and Brittny. Al's heart was at its fullest when he had his family together, often at the family camp in Ju-

niper, New Brunswick, telling stories to his granddaughters Ella and Allison or teaching them how to fish and hunt.

Al and I shared a connection through our love of hockey. He was also a loyal Yankees fan, and one of his favourite hobbies was teasing Red Sox fans when the Yankees beat them.

A lover of life and people, a fighter, he will remain with us forever through our memories and everlasting life lessons. My sincere condolences go to his family and many friends.

* * *

[Translation]

TIGRES DE VICTORIAVILLE

Mr. Alain Rayes (Richmond—Arthabaska, Ind.): Mr. Speaker, with the arrival of spring comes the start of hockey playoffs across the country.

Starting Friday, the Victoriaville Tigres will face their long-time rivals, the Drummondville Voltigeurs, in the first round of the Quebec Major Junior Hockey League playoffs.

I have witnessed the hard work and determination of the Victoriaville players, who are led by an incredibly talented and passionate group of coaches, and supported by loyal, vocal and knowledgeable fans. That is why I can confidently issue a friendly challenge to my colleague from Drummond: The series loser will have to share a video on his social media accounts touting the quality of the winning team's hometown poutine.

I am confident that he will accept my challenge, that he will proudly wear the Victoriaville Tigres jersey in his video, and that we will win this series. It is going to be an exciting one.

Go, Tigres, go!

* * *

● (1410)

[English]

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, yesterday an executive from McKinsey finally showed up at the operations committee. Opposition members were excited about the opportunity to finally ask tough questions of the company that fuelled the opioid crisis, helped Saudi authorities identify dissidents and received over \$100 million in contracts from the Liberal government.

Liberal members were excited about the opportunity to pitch their resumés and consider career options for after the next election.

Statements by Members

Liberals have long claimed that all the rules were followed in their contracts with McKinsey, but on Friday they admitted otherwise. A government press release contradicted the government House leader, saying that rules were, in fact, not consistently followed for the awarding of these contracts. There are no surprises here. Again, Liberals ignore the rules in order to reward their well-connected and ethically deficient friends.

It is time to privatize McKinsey. Canadians have had enough of the Liberal-NDP-McKinsey coalition. They want austerity for McKinsey and opportunity for Canadians. They want a government that will finally put the people ahead of the high-priced consultants.

* * *

HUMAN RIGHTS IN RUSSIA

Hon. John McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the continued imprisonment of the courageous Vladimir Kara-Murza is a gross violation of his human rights and the human rights of all Russians. He spoke the truth to Putin's power, and now all Russians live in a fog of truth and lies.

Vladimir Kara-Murza had the temerity to tell his fellow citizens the truth about the Ukrainian invasion: that it was illegal, a gross violation of human rights and a waste of human life. For his courage, he languishes in a Putin jail. He has lost 50 pounds and has been poisoned twice by Putin's thugs. His health is precarious. In photos, he looks emaciated. If he is not released immediately, there is a real chance he will die in jail, a triumph for Putin and a tragedy for Russia. We must not let this happen.

I ask members to add their voice to the freeing of Vladimir Kara-Murza.

* * *

CORINNE KLINE

Mr. Kelly McCauley (Edmonton West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that we learned last week that Edmonton has lost another of its finest. Constable Corinne Kline passed away after a brief illness.

She knew she wanted to be a police officer from the moment she started volunteering with the Edmonton Police Service. She served with the EPS for 21 years, working in multiple roles, including patrol, assisting domestic violence survivors and victims, and in the community engagement unit.

I was fortunate to work with Constable Kline in teaching anti-fraud seminars to seniors. She was so engaging. She was literally the only person I have ever met who could make PowerPoint presentations seem interesting.

Despite the stresses that all officers must face and endure, she was always the embodiment of positivity and kindness. She truly had a servant's heart, and our community, the community that she loved and served so much, will miss her dearly.

2020 SHOOTINGS IN NOVA SCOTIA

Mr. Rick Perkins (South Shore—St. Margarets, CPC): Mr. Speaker, profound loss never leaves us. I cannot imagine the life-long horror, grief and questions never answered when a loved one is murdered.

A few hours ago, the report of the Nova Scotia Mass Casualty Commission was released, on the murder of 22 of my fellow Nova Scotians and an unborn child. The commission's work had minimal input from the families, who were not allowed to question witnesses. They deserved better.

Lisa McCully, Constable Heidi Stevenson, Sean McLeod, Alana Jenkins, Jolene Oliver, Emily and Aaron Tuck, Jamie Blair, Greg Blair, Corrie Ellison, Gina Goulet, Tom Bagley, Elizabeth Thomas, John Zahl, Joe Webber, Lillian Campbell, Dawn and Frank Gulenchyn, Heather O'Brien, Joy and Peter Bond, Kristen Beaton and her unborn child all deserved better, as do their families.

They lived in the community of the member for Cumberland—Colchester, where he is today with the families. The past three years have been a nightmare for them. Today, let us remember their vibrant lives and pray for them.

* * *

● (1415)

[Translation]

HOCKEY IN VAUDREUIL—SOULANGES

Mr. Peter Schiefke (Vaudreuil—Soulanges, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, after dozens of games and practices, and after more than one return trip home because someone forgot something, the end of another incredible hockey season for our kids in Vaudreuil—Soulanges is upon us.

As the Hawks, Riverains, Prédateurs, Vikings, Gladiateurs and my son Andy's team, the Titans, hang up their skates for the season, I want to pay tribute to those who made it all possible, the incredible parent volunteers who stepped up to be coaches, managers, referees and even drivers.

[English]

Our kids got better because of them. They learned teamwork because of them. They made new friends because of them. Their dream of one day playing in an NHL jersey got just a bit closer because of them.

[Translation]

On behalf of all the parents and children who have benefited from their time and energy, I would like to offer them one last cup of coffee at 6 o'clock in the morning and simply say thank you.

*Statements by Members**[English]***ATTENTION DEFICIT HYPERACTIVITY DISORDER**

Ms. Heather McPherson (Edmonton Strathcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, there are at least a half a million kids spread out across the country trying to deal with a disorder that makes it hard for them to succeed in school and in life. Without support, many of them will not graduate and will face a lifetime of problems, such as addictions, troubles with school and challenges in their lives.

ADHD is the most common childhood psychiatric disorder, and Canada is not doing enough to help these kids and their families.

Today, with the help of my son Maclean, I tabled Bill C-329, an act to establish a national framework respecting attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, because I know we can do better.

I know how important this is. As an MP, I have heard from countless parents and teachers about the challenges they face. As a teacher, I understand the frustration of not knowing how to help. As the mother of a teenager with ADHD, I know how difficult it can be for these kids and their families.

It does not have to be this way. Canada can do better.

* * *

*[Translation]***DRUMMONDVILLE VOLTIGEURS**

Mr. Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I salute the bravery of the member for Richmond—Arthabaska because one has to be brave to challenge the fans of the Drummondville Voltigeurs and, moreover, to call into question a source of regional pride, poutine.

I confidently accept his challenge because I believe that our Voltigeurs will give it their all to safeguard our region's honour. Our red team is not like the red team in the House. Our Voltigeurs are reliable and know how to make us proud.

My colleague believes he can win based on the regular season standings, as his Tigres are in third place and my Voltigeurs are in 13th. However, I impatiently await the defeat of his “Victoriaville pussycats”. He is going to come to eat our local specialty right where it was invented, at Le Roy Jucep in Drummondville.

The rivalry of the 122nd season has been rekindled. It starts on Friday. Therefore, I accept the challenge issued by the member, my neighbour from Richmond—Arthabaska. May the best team win.

Go, Voltigeurs, go.

* * *

*[English]***LEADER OF THE LIBERAL PARTY OF CANADA**

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Regina—Qu'Appelle, CPC): Mr. Speaker, what is in a name? Let us ask the provincial Liberal parties. We would think that having the same party name as the federal governing party would be an advantage, but clearly it is not.

Provincial Liberals, suffering from the brand damage that the Prime Minister is doing, are barge polling away from the PM's party name.

The Saskatchewan Liberal Party had a long history in my province. In fact, six out of seven of our first premiers were Liberal. However, the PM has destroyed the party's name so badly that the Saskatchewan Liberals just voted to end their embarrassment and stop calling themselves Liberals altogether. They do not even have a name for the new party. They would rather be called the “no-name party” than have any association with the Prime Minister.

The Liberals in B.C. recently made the same decision, realizing that to win elections, they cannot have any association with the disastrous Prime Minister either.

I am told that the Alberta Liberal provincial caucus was considering doing the same thing until it realized it does not exist.

This comes as no surprise. After decimating Canada's energy sector, dividing Canadians and 40-year high inflation, it is no wonder nobody wants to be associated with him.

* * *

● (1420)

CRITICAL MINERALS

Ms. Viviane Lapointe (Sudbury, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, mining is one of Sudbury's economic cornerstones. With our government's commitment of \$3.7 billion and the launch of the critical minerals strategy earlier this year, the Conference Board of Canada has predicted that Sudbury's economy is primed to outperform Ontario and Canada in the coming year.

Our government's plan is working. The number of jobs related to critical minerals rose by nearly 20% in the last two years alone, reaching a 14-year high. With nine operating mines, two mills, two smelters and a nickel refinery, Sudbury is home to over 300 mining and mining supply firms that generate approximately \$4 billion in annual exports.

With the world's demand for critical minerals, Sudbury is poised to play a major role in the continuation of job creation, economic opportunity and continued prosperity.

I want to highlight Sudbury's potential and how we can continue to play a role in ensuring Canada will become the world's green supplier of choice for critical minerals.

*Oral Questions***ORAL QUESTIONS***[Translation]***CANADIAN HERITAGE**

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, today, the government took unprecedented action by censoring debate on its bill to censor what Canadians can say or see on the Internet. It gives a woke agency here in Ottawa the power to control Quebecers.

It is hard to believe, but the Bloc Québécois is in favour of giving Ottawa and the federal government greater censorship power. Only the Conservative Party is opposed.

When will the government stop its attack on freedom of expression?

Hon. Greg Fergus (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and to the President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there is a consensus in Quebec that we need to make web giants pay their fair share. Everyone—actors, authors, composers, producers, directors, musicians, singers, technicians—is on the same side regarding Bill C-11. Everyone but the Conservatives, that is.

I invite the Conservatives to get on the right side and support Quebec and Canadian culture.

[English]

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, there is no culture without freedom of expression, just to point out the disinformation from that member.

He says that all artists support this, even Margaret Atwood. No Conservative has said that this bill represents creeping totalitarianism. It gives the power to a woke agency, the CRTC, named by Liberals, to manipulate social media algorithms in order to shut down voices it does not want people to hear.

When will the government realize that Orwell's *1984* was not an instruction manual?

Hon. Greg Fergus (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and to the President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, those are the same old talking points from the Conservative Party and they happen to be the same talking points of big tech.

Why do the Conservatives not finally stand up to the big guys and big tech in the country and try to do what we are doing, which is making sure that big tech is paying its fair share to Canadian artists and Canadian producers, to our local media? Instead of standing up for Canadians, those folks are standing up for the Googles, etc.

I ask them to come on to the right side, and please support Canadians and people who produce this content.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, therein lies the problem. The government will get to decide what is the right side of the debate and shut down everyone it considers to be on the wrong side.

Let us be clear that this bill does not hurt big tech. It will still monopolize all of social media. Its platforms will still dominate. It

is just that government bureaucrats will be able to manipulate the algorithms to shut down the voices of individual Canadians. Top experts on freedom of expression online say that and so does Margaret Atwood, who calls this “creeping totalitarianism”.

If the Prime Minister is not afraid of debate, why is he so determined to shut it down?

Hon. Greg Fergus (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and to the President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the reality is that right now the tech giants are not paying their fair share. Seventy-one per cent of Canadians agree that they should be doing so. This is the reason why. This is why we are making sure that we have Bill C-11 to deal with this job.

We know that the web giants must do more, more for our culture, more for our local media, more to protect our children. That is exactly what we are doing. Why are the Conservatives against that?

● (1425)

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we are in favour of freedom of speech; it is very simple. Big tech has no problem with this bill. It will keep making money hand over fist because of its oligopoly. The government does not want to break up that oligopoly. It has been sucking up to big tech for the last eight years. What it wants to do is to shut down debate.

Canadians want the freedom to express themselves without government control—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: I ask the hon. member to put his prop down, please. I think he has been around long enough to know what a prop is. I do not have to explain it.

The hon. member has seven seconds left.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: Mr. Speaker, it is a book and it is still legal, at least for now.

When will the government stop its attack on freedom of speech and freedom of expression?

Hon. Mark Holland (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, like the member opposite, the Leader of the Opposition, I have dedicated my life to ensuring that free speech occurs in our country. Holding up a book and pretending that this is about anything other than making sure that big tech pays its fair share to our artists and creators in our country, trying to pretend that there is anybody in the House who believes anything other than free speech, is the very reason that member can go all over the country and say all kinds of nonsense that I disagree with, because we have free speech in our country.

CARBON PRICING

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we do for now. I want to assure the member that as long as we have free speech, I will keep beating that party in debate after debate.

Let us turn to another falsehood the government spread. It claims that its carbon tax would make everybody better off, but now the government's own Parliamentary Budget Officer has revealed that Nova Scotians and Newfoundlanders, just like people right across the country, pay about \$1,500 more in carbon taxes than they get back in rebates. This directly contradicts the government.

Why has the government misled the people of Atlantic Canada with this sneaky tax?

Mr. Terry Duguid (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, indeed, good news is coming to Atlantic Canada on July 1. The climate rebate will be coming to Atlantic Canada.

That would mean up to \$1,000 for a family of four in Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick, and \$1,300 in Newfoundland and Labrador. Eight out of 10 families would be better off.

If the member does not believe me, perhaps he would believe Conservative Premier Blaine Higgs, who said, "We need to make a choice that is in the best interest of New Brunswickers, and what this does now is provide relief from inflation".

I agree with the Premier of New Brunswick.

* * *

[Translation]

DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS

Mr. Alain Therrien (La Prairie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, let us talk about Chinese interference. In the budget, the government is creating a new scheme, the national counter-foreign interference office.

By doing so, the Prime Minister is confirming that all the committees, expert panels and robust measures he has been talking about for weeks do not work, and he knows it. He is proving that his government was duped by China in the last two elections, and he knows it.

Does this not prove that we need an independent public commission of inquiry?

[English]

Mr. Maninder Sidhu (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we will never tolerate any form of foreign interference into our democracy and internal affairs.

That is why, through budget 2023, we are providing \$48.9 million to the RCMP to protect Canadians from harassment and intimidation, engage with communities at greater risk of being targeted and establish a national counter-foreign interference office. In a robust Indo-Pacific strategy, we have provided more capabilities to our security agencies to deal with any form of foreign interference by any country.

Oral Questions

We will always defend our democracy.

[Translation]

Mr. Alain Therrien (La Prairie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, let us talk about the independence of the special rapporteur. The Prime Minister does not need him in order to take action. The proof is that he did not wait for his recommendations to create his national office. He is dictating the findings of the rapporteur before the rapporteur even gets a chance to speak, and he is adding that to the budget. Hello independence.

The special rapporteur and this new national office are constructs invented by the Prime Minister and under the control of the Prime Minister, because the Prime Minister wants to use them to his benefit and the Prime Minister wants to control the information. Those are the facts.

Quebeckers are no fools. They want an independent public inquiry.

• (1430)

Hon. Mark Holland (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when it comes to public safety, it is absolutely essential during debates to rely on facts. Certainly, Mr. Johnston's independence is unmistakable. He is a former governor general of Canada, someone appointed by Prime Minister Harper. He has clearly demonstrated throughout his career that he is here for Canada. No doubt, this will still hold true in this instance.

* * *

[English]

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Mr. Speaker, today's report from the Mass Casualty Commission identified myriad failures. Our thoughts are with the victims and their families. Nova Scotians paid for the many failures in policing.

For years, we have had recommendations to fix these problems, which have been ignored by the government. The report also clearly identifies the link between gender-based violence and this horrific mass killing.

Tonight, hundreds of women and children will be looking for shelter from violence, and they will not have anywhere to go. Will the government provide urgent funding to ensure that all those fleeing violence have a safe place to stay tonight?

Ms. Pam Damoff (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today is a difficult day for the families and communities in Nova Scotia. All MPs in this House are thinking about them and holding them in their hearts.

This morning was the release of the Mass Casualty Commission's report. We will be considering and carefully reviewing the recommendations in the report. We will also be working with the provinces, territories and civil organizations, including those that deal with gender-based violence, in order to respond to the recommendations in due course.

Oral Questions

[Translation]

EMPLOYMENT

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, in budget 2023, if the NDP had not pushed this government, there would not have been any funding to create good union jobs to help fight climate change. However, much more remains to be done.

For years now, the Liberals having been missing their target and giving billions of dollars to oil companies, and that is making the climate crisis worse. Joe Biden is investing in green industrial policy.

Will the Liberal government finally show leadership by investing in the infrastructure, renewable energies and the good jobs of today and tomorrow.

[English]

Hon. Seamus O'Regan (Minister of Labour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in fact, all the infrastructure that he is talking about will be built by workers with union jobs or workers who are paid prevailing union wages. That is a game-changer in this country. That is something that union leadership, from the Canadian Labour Congress to Unifor, the Alberta Federation of Labour and Trades NL have all been asking for. They have all asked for a seat at the table. We have told them for years they will lead that table, and this budget proves it.

* * *

CARBON PRICING

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the government says to the people, "Believe not your eyes". When we look at page 3 of the Parliamentary Budget Officer's report today on their carbon tax, it says that the net cost for a Nova Scotia family when this carbon tax is implemented is \$1,513 more in carbon tax costs than in rebates. For Newfoundlanders, the number is \$1,300 in net costs.

If the government is so proud of driving up the cost of gas, heat and groceries for Atlantic Canadians and consumers everywhere, why has it worked so hard to mislead everyone about the real cost?

Mr. Terry Duguid (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives never talk about the costs of climate change, and the Parliamentary Budget Officer has talked about those costs, predicted to be \$25 billion by 2025, a \$9-billion impact to the B.C. economy from floods, fires and drought. The town of Lytton burned to the ground, and 600 people lost their lives in the heat dome.

When are the Conservatives going to stop the denial and get serious about climate change?

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, notice he is not even contesting the facts now.

After falsely stating for half a decade that Canadians will be better off with the carbon tax, the government is now admitting what its Parliamentary Budget Officer reported. This is that, on average, Newfoundlanders and Nova Scotians will pay approximately \$1,500 in net additional costs above and beyond any phony re-

bate they get back. Worst of all, it has not even worked. It has missed every single emissions target.

Why will the Liberals not ditch this tax plan and come up with a real climate plan?

● (1435)

Mr. Terry Duguid (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, something is not sinking in. The climate rebate will put more money in people's pockets. The member should look at page 5 of the original PBO report that says eight out of 10 families will be better off.

What will not make families better off is investing in cryptocurrency. That is reckless economic advice by the Leader of the Opposition. Will he stand in his place and apologize to Canadians for his reckless environmental advice?

* * *

GOVERNMENT APPOINTMENTS

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, for the Emergencies Act commission, the government named a Liberal staffer as the independent commissioner. For the foreign interference rapporteur, it named a member of the Trudeau Foundation and the Prime Minister's ski buddy. Now it needed someone to be an ethics commissioner, so it named a Liberal minister's sister-in-law to that position of independent Ethics Commissioner. This is the same minister who has already been found guilty of violating the law.

When is the Liberal government going to run out of family and friends to name as independent officers?

Hon. Mark Holland (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the ski buddy that the hon. member refers to is David Johnston, an eminent Canadian whom Stephen Harper actually chose to be governor general of this country. He stood in his place and commended David Johnston as being a good and appropriate choice for governor general. To suggest that David Johnston does not have the best interests of Canada at heart as he looks at the issue of foreign interference is ridiculous.

With respect to the position that he has just referred to, the interim Ethics Commissioner, again this is somebody who has been in that office for 10 years, who came in when Stephen Harper was in office and is second in command in that office.

Oral Questions

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, one can almost imagine the conversation between the Liberal intergovernmental affairs minister, who was found guilty of breaking the ethics law, and the Prime Minister, who has twice been found guilty of breaking the ethics law. One can imagine them saying, “How are we going to quit getting found guilty? I know, we’ll appoint my sister-in-law as the Ethics Commissioner.” What a plan. It is foolproof.

The problem is that pretty soon they are going to run out of family and friends. After they do, how are they going to avoid their next conviction for breaking the law?

Hon. Mark Holland (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there is a place where comedy routines can be tried out; I would suggest that it is not on the floor of the House of Commons.

What I will say about the conversations that have taken place in the Ethics Commissioner’s office is that, for 10 years, the individual in question has absolutely made hard decisions on the government, as well as other parties, and she has comported herself with total professionalism. She was appointed as number two in charge in the Ethics Commissioner’s office during Stephen Harper’s time in office.

What is not professional is to take somebody who has worked in the public service for 10 years making hard decisions, including hard decisions that affected the government, and treat them in that way.

Mr. Michael Barrett (Leeds—Grenville—Thousand Islands and Rideau Lakes, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Prime Minister and his gang of serial lawbreakers were told by the outgoing Ethics Commissioner to take remedial ethics training. Instead, at Sunday brunch, the Liberal cabinet minister turned to his sister-in-law and said, “How about we make you the new Ethics Commissioner?”

When are the Liberals going to take their responsibilities seriously and appoint someone who is independent and can restore accountability to this place for all Canadians?

Hon. Mark Holland (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Ethics Commissioner’s role in our democracy is extremely important. Over the last 10 years in which the person they are referring to has been in the office, they have taken a lot of difficult positions against the government, and frankly, against that party. The person was appointed at the time of Stephen Harper, in the number two position. These decisions have been well-received in the sense that the Ethics Commissioner’s job is to hold us to the highest possible standard. The idea that a public servant cannot do their job or set aside differences, when they have a screen in place, is not realistic.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L’Érable, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the arrogance of the Liberal government is stranger than fiction. Even the writers for the Simpsons could not have dreamed up such satire. The Prime Minister, who has twice been found guilty of ethics violations, has appointed as interim ethics commissioner, the sister-in-law of his best friend, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, himself found guilty of ethics violations for awarding a contract to his cousin.

Is the brother-in-law of the interim ethics commissioner, the minister, going to take advantage of family get-togethers over Easter to ask her if it is ethical for his best friend, the Prime Minister, to appoint his sister-in-law to rule on his ethics?

• (1440)

Hon. Mark Holland (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the person in question was part of the Office of the Conflict of Interest and Ethics Commissioner when the decisions were made on the matter involving the Prime Minister and on other issues. Clearly, this person is capable of acting independently. She was appointed to the office during Prime Minister Harper’s government and has been at that office for 10 years.

* * *

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Ms. Louise Chabot (Thérèse-De Blainville, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we better not be sliding into a recession given that the Liberals have once again dropped the promised EI reform from the budget. In the midst of all this economic uncertainty, they just told 60% of workers that if something bad happens to them, tough luck, because they will not be able to rely on EI or the federal government.

Every economist is wary of the year ahead, so how can the Liberals abandon the only safety net that workers have if they lose their job?

[*English*]

Mr. Irek Kusmierczyk (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Disability Inclusion, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we know Canada’s EI system is complex, and that is why we are focused on improving it. In the past two years, the minister led more than 35 virtual, national and regional round tables with workers, employers and academics. EI reform is a priority. We are on it, and we will get it done.

At the same time, we are making historic investments in skills training and in support like child care to help more Canadians re-enter the workforce, and it is working. Over 830,000 more Canadians are working than before the pandemic. On this side, we will always, always have workers’ backs.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Louise Chabot (Thérèse-De Blainville, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals promised to overhaul EI in 2015, then in 2019, then in 2021, then last summer at the very latest, then before Christmas, guaranteed. They always push it further down the line, always later. Even now, the Liberals are completely abandoning that reform in the budget.

If the Liberals cannot keep their promise to working people today, when economists are worried there is going to be a recession, when are they going to do it?

Ms. Rachel Beldayan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Tourism and Associate Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague for her question because it is a very important question.

Oral Questions

We have always been there for workers across Canada. We have promised EI reform and we will deliver.

In this budget, we have demonstrated once again that we are there for Canadian workers across the country and we will continue to be.

* * *

SENIORS

Ms. Andr anne Larouche (Shefford, BQ): Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely nothing. Here is what seniors will find in the budget to help them deal with the cost of living: absolutely nothing.

We still have two classes of seniors. Pensions for those aged 74 and under have not increased. Seniors receiving the guaranteed income supplement who want to continue working are still heavily penalized. Others who also want to help mitigate the labour shortage have no incentive to do so.

In a 300-page budget, why did the Liberals not spare a single thought for people aged 65 and over?

[English]

Hon. Kamal Khara (Minister of Seniors, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, budget 2023 continues to grow our government's plan to support seniors, but do not take my word for it. FADOQ, the largest senior-serving organization in Quebec, said it "welcomes the financial support offered to seniors in the federal budget, notably with the one-time grocery rebate and the expansion of the Canadian Dental Care Plan." Our new dental care plan will help nine million Canadians, including seniors, get the dental care they need, and our grocery rebate will put hundreds of dollars back in their pockets.

I hope the member opposite will vote for this budget so she can continue to support seniors in her riding, in Quebec and all across Canada.

* * *

CARBON PRICING

Mr. John Barlow (Foothills, CPC): Mr. Speaker, what a surprise. The Liberal carbon tax is not revenue-neutral and actually costs Canadians thousands of dollars a year. It is only going to get worse when the Liberal-NDP costly coalition increases the carbon tax on Saturday. We know when they triple the carbon tax, it will cost Canadian farmers \$150,000 a year, but every single Canadian will pay the price when they buy bread, pasta, fruit, vegetables and milk. Higher carbon taxes mean higher inflation and higher food prices.

How high does the price of bread need to be before the Prime Minister realizes Canadians cannot afford it anymore and axes the carbon tax?

• (1445)

[Translation]

Hon. Marie-Claude Bibeau (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of good news in budget 2023 for our farmers, starting with the vaccine bank for foot and mouth disease. This was a request made by the various meat sectors in Canada and it was very important to them.

In addition, the advance payments program has been increased, which means we can offer interest-free loans up to \$350,000. This is very important to our producers.

[English]

Mr. Dave Epp (Chatham-Kent—Leamington, CPC): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, despite the Liberal Party, this House passed Bill C-234, which exempts farm fuels, grain drying and farm heating from the carbon tax. However, the carbon tax does not just apply to the farm. It applies to the entire food value chain, from the mining and manufacture of fertilizers to the delivery of farm inputs to the delivery of farm production to the packaging of farm inputs, farm production and groceries, at every step of the way. The result is that now a family of four is going to pay \$1,100 more for their groceries in 2023.

When is the costly coalition going to get the facts and stop the tax?

[Translation]

Hon. Marie-Claude Bibeau (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, once again, our government is always there to support our agricultural producers in different ways.

We signed the sustainable Canadian agricultural partnership, which will give \$3.5 billion to the agricultural sector.

When the Conservatives were in power, they cut funding for science and risk management programs. We are there to help producers in several ways.

Mr. Richard Martel (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the carbon tax will increase on April 1. Unfortunately that is not an April Fool's joke.

The carbon tax increases the cost of food and the cost of fuel for truckers. It also directly impacts our farmers and our producers.

According to Canada's Food Price Report 2023, if the tax triples, a 5,000-acre farm will pay more than \$150,000 in taxes.

The Liberals have until tomorrow night at midnight. Will they stop it? Will they cancel it?

Hon. Fran ois-Philippe Champagne (Minister of Innovation, Science and Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have a great deal of respect for my colleague, but I think he skipped part of the budget yesterday.

One of the key measures will help Canadians with the cost of living. The much-discussed grocery rebate will help more than 11 million Canadians across the country.

For those watching at home, the Conservatives are going to vote against assistance for Canadians. That is what is shameful.

*Oral Questions***SENIORS**

[English]

INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Ms. Lori Idlout (Nunavut, NDP): *Uqaqtittiji*, while the federal government had many wins for some Canadians, indigenous peoples were again neglected in the federal budget. Promises for long-term funding while delaying its rollout is not good enough. For years, urgent and unmet housing needs have been spoken about in this House, yet indigenous peoples will continue to live in homelessness and in overcrowded and mouldy housing, forcing indigenous peoples to leave their lands.

Why does the government continue to put indigenous peoples at the bottom of its priority list?

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Indigenous Services and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I agree with the member opposite that we cannot take our foot off the gas pedal when ensuring that every single indigenous person in this country sees themselves as having the same access to success as every other Canadian does. That is why our government has made historic investments in infrastructure, with over \$7 billion committed in budget 2021.

We are going to continue to make those investments with indigenous communities to ensure that kids can get to school in healthy schools and that we can have indigenous people living in healthy houses. I am excited about the \$4 billion of urban, rural and northern indigenous housing money in the budget, which I welcome the member to work with us on.

* * *

HEALTH

Mr. Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Canadians need to know their government is using public money responsibly, especially when it comes to their health. However, the Liberals are refusing to tell taxpayers how much money they lost on a failed \$200-million vaccine factory in the health minister's own riding, a scheme that did not produce a single dose of the COVID vaccine.

When will the Liberals do the right thing and invest in a public drug manufacturer instead of no-strings-attached giveaways to big pharma?

● (1450)

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of Innovation, Science and Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is a bit rich for my colleague to criticize this government when, at the time, what we did was the responsible thing. The responsible thing we did at the time was to invest in a different family of vaccines. Why? It was to protect the lives of Canadians.

Since that moment, we have invested a record amount of money in Canada to make sure that we have onshore biomanufacturing. Do members know why? We did not choose to have a pandemic and we are not going to choose to have another one, but we choose to be better prepared to save the lives of Canadians.

Ms. Joanne Thompson (St. John's East, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with seniors representing one of the fastest-growing populations in Canada, we require strong public policy measures to ensure they can retire with dignity and respect. Can the Minister of Seniors please update the House on the efforts our government outlined in the budget to support seniors?

Hon. Kamal Khera (Minister of Seniors, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, budget 2023 continues to grow our government's plan to support seniors, which has already seen poverty rates for seniors drop significantly since 2015. Through this budget, we are bringing in the largest expansion of health care in 60 years by providing seniors access to high-quality dental care. We are helping seniors with their daily costs through a grocery rebate. We are also helping more seniors access supports, such as the guaranteed income supplement, through the automatic income tax filing. Seniors can rest assured that we will continue to have their backs.

* * *

CARBON PRICING

Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan (Calgary Forest Lawn, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals' campaign of misinformation continues. The claims that Canadians get more back in rebates for the failed carbon tax have been proven false by the public budgeting officer. He said the largest net loss will be felt by Alberta families, who will pay \$2,773 in tax. In a bid to look more virtuous to eco-radical groups, the costly coalition is going to jack up its failed carbon tax this Saturday.

Why do they not axe the failed carbon tax and stop punishing families for eating, heating and driving?

Mr. Terry Duguid (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, every time we put forward an affordability measure, the Conservatives vote against it. However, good news is coming to the Prairies, where the member and I live. As of April 1, a family of four will receive a climate rebate of up to \$1,500 in Alberta and Saskatchewan, and \$1,000 in Manitoba.

This is going to help families. It is going to help families because the cheques are going to arrive quarterly. Eight out of 10 families will benefit. I do not know what the Conservatives have against good news.

Oral Questions

Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan (Calgary Forest Lawn, CPC): Mr. Speaker, that is more misinformation. Every prairie province is going to pay more in carbon tax than what it gets back, and it is proven by the public budgeting officer. This week, the woke Liberal budget already uppercut every single household with an extra \$4,200 in costs, all because the minister of inflation cannot balance a budget—

The Speaker: I have warned members already about calling each other names, but I am just going to point it out. I am going to let the hon. member continue, but please treat each other with respect and in a parliamentary manner.

Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan: Mr. Speaker, the minister responsible for the inflationary problem cannot balance a single budget in this country, and the more the Liberals go woke, the more Canadians go broke. Why do they not cancel their failed carbon tax and give Canadians a break?

Hon. Gudie Hutchings (Minister of Rural Economic Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives' lack of recognition of climate change and, frankly, lack of awareness of climate change are pretty frightening for me.

In the southwest coast of my riding, where the impacts of the hurricane are still being felt, the snow is melting, so my communities are now getting ready to rebuild infrastructure and rebuild bridges. There are 105 families getting to build their new homes because they have lost everything.

I am proud to be part of a government that has a plan to address climate change, and our plan is working. I would like to hear what their plan is.

[Translation]

Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC): Mr. Speaker, small and medium-sized businesses are the backbone of Canada's economy. Unlike the government, the men and women behind these businesses are in direct contact with Canadians and know how to run a company.

Lo and behold, the Canadian Federation of Independent Business consulted over 4,300 business leaders, and the result is a scathing indictment of this government: 61% of Canadian business leaders are opposed to the carbon tax increase this Saturday.

The government may look down on the Conservatives, but could it at least listen to business leaders?

• (1455)

Ms. Rachel Bendayan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Tourism and Associate Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is very interesting to hear my Conservative colleague talk about the Canadian Federation of Independent Business, because the CFIB highlighted just how extraordinary budget 2023 is for small business.

It is this Liberal government that has an agreement with the banks and credit card companies to reduce credit card transaction fees for small businesses, resulting in over \$1 billion in savings. That is absolutely incredible, and it will benefit Canadians.

Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal government has a talent for ballooning the credit card statements of every Canadian with its compulsive deficits.

That same report is rather scathing for other reasons. Again, 4,300 small business leaders say that 40% of them will reduce investments, 45% will cut salaries, and 56% will increase the cost of products. This has a direct, meaningful and very tangible impact on Canadians if, by some misfortune, the government increases the tax on Saturday.

Could the government act for the good of all Canadians and cancel this tax on April 1?

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of Innovation, Science and Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Louis-Saint-Laurent, for whom I have a great deal of respect.

In addition to having listened to entrepreneurs, we have listened to all Canadians. Canadians are asking us to do three things: help them with the cost of living, invest in health and build an economic future that will foster prosperity and clean jobs for the future.

I can assure my colleague from Louis-Saint-Laurent that Canadian entrepreneurs are looking at our plan and its different credits and seeing that we are headed to a green economy. That is the best way to create jobs for today and the future.

* * *

DENTAL CARE

Mr. Luc Thériault (Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Speaker, there are plenty of health care needs in Quebec.

Rather than responding to those needs in the budget, the Liberals are creating a new dental care program on top of the one we already have in Quebec. That is close to \$3 billion that Quebec could put into areas where it would be more useful or use to improve the existing program. That is why the Quebec National Assembly just unanimously called for Quebec to have the right to opt out with full compensation.

Will the government commit to honouring the unanimous request of Quebec's elected officials?

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question.

First, it gives me an opportunity to acknowledge what we heard from Quebec today. People across the country believe in the importance of dental care, which is essential to overall health. Second, two to three million Quebecers will be able to benefit from the Government of Canada's new dental insurance plan in the coming years. Lastly, all of this will be done in co-operation with all of the provinces, including Quebec.

Mr. Luc Thériault (Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Speaker, there are needs throughout Quebec's health care system. The system is in crisis.

Oral Questions

The Liberals did not prioritize those needs in their budget. The Liberals prioritized the needs of the Liberals. They have not listened to Quebec's demands. Their main concern is to make sure they stay in power by maintaining their alliance with the NDP. Their priority is insuring a majority, not insuring dental care.

Is the government committed to respecting Quebec's unanimous request? I repeat: It is asking for the right to opt out with full compensation.

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for making that connection and focusing on Quebecers' needs, which are just as important as the physical health, mental health and oral health needs of all other Canadians.

The Quebecers I have been talking to for quite some time now are happy to see that between two and three million Quebecers, families with average and modest incomes, will be able to take advantage of this new Canadian government dental plan over the next few years.

* * *

[English]

CARBON PRICING

Mrs. Shelby Kramp-Neuman (Hastings—Lennox and Addington, CPC): Mr. Speaker, gas, home heating and groceries are more expensive than ever before. This is not new news. That costly coalition is punishing families by pushing people further into debt, and the additional financial stress brought on by this budget will wreak havoc and chaos on so many levels.

In Ontario, the Parliamentary Budget Officer reported that carbon tax would cost approximately \$1,800 per household. The government has created a new class: the tax-poor class, people who are going to work hard all of their lives and have little to show for it. Canadians need solutions.

Will the Liberals cancel their plans to increase the carbon tax this Saturday?

• (1500)

Mr. Terry Beech (Parliamentary Secretary to the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, everyone knows that the first thing we did when we came into government was lower taxes for the middle class, but our government has also increased the amount that every Canadian can earn before paying even a penny of federal income taxes. We have increased that to \$15,000. That is \$3,673 more that one can earn tax-free. It is just another way that we are making life affordable for all Canadians.

Mrs. Anna Roberts (King—Vaughan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, seniors are struggling. This Saturday, the Liberals' plan to increase taxes will make things worse. The cost of gas, heating and groceries is going up.

Carmela, a senior, struggles to put food on her table each week and often skips a meal to make ends meet. That costly coalition is increasing the carbon tax and it will make the problem worse. Carmela wishes that this was just an April Fool's joke.

Will the Liberal government cancel the planned increase of the carbon tax this Saturday?

Hon. Kamal Khera (Minister of Seniors, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have been there, delivering for seniors. The party opposite has opposed every single measure that we have put forward.

Once again, in this budget, we are providing targeted support for Canadians who need it the most, including seniors, with our new grocery rebate that is going to give seniors additional money to pay for their groceries, with our new dental care plan that is going to get that dental care for seniors about whom they care. We are expanding the free automatic filing system so vulnerable seniors can have access to critical supports like the GIS.

If the Conservatives care about Canadians or seniors, they should vote for the budget.

Mr. Bob Zimmer (Prince George—Peace River—Northern Rockies, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister's new spending spree will cost every Canadian household \$4,200 more. A family of four will pay \$1,100 more for groceries this year alone and even more if one lives in the north.

On top of that bad news, families in the Northwest Territories that have already had to choose between paying for their heating bills or buying groceries will now see the Prime Minister increase the cost of home heating oil by 17¢ a litre this Saturday.

When will the Prime Minister and the costly coalition cut the carbon tax?

Ms. Ya'ara Saks (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Families, Children and Social Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my colleagues across the way do not seem to understand or recognize that 2.7 million more Canadians have been lifted out of poverty since this government came into power; that 830,000 more Canadians are working since the pandemic; that with the new grocery rebate we are proposing, a family of four will receive \$467 to meet its daily needs.

On this side of the House, we stand up for Canadians. Those members do not ever stand up for them.

* * *

[Translation]

AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

Mrs. Sophie Chatel (Pontiac, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, budget 2023 does a great deal to address affordability, including access to nutritious food. One of the really important measures in the budget is additional investments in the local food infrastructure fund, the LFIF.

Could the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food tell us more about this program and its impact on communities from coast to coast to coast?

Oral Questions

Hon. Marie-Claude Bibeau (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague from Pontiac. It is my pleasure to inform all our colleagues that budget 2023 includes a \$10-million enhancement to the local food infrastructure fund.

This program was created as part of Canada's first official food policy and is designed to strengthen our local food systems and support the creation of more food banks, community gardens and collective kitchens. Even youth centres will be able to upgrade their equipment and enhance their services for those who need it most.

* * *

[English]

CARBON PRICING

Mr. Rick Perkins (South Shore—St. Margarets, CPC): Mr. Speaker, gas is going up. Home heating is going up. The cost of groceries is going up. This week, the NDP-Liberal costly coalition spendathon projects that the Liberals will collect another \$69 billion in Canadian taxes because of its ineffective carbon tax.

Today's independent report on the carbon tax says that Nova Scotians will pay \$1,513 more than they receive. The Liberal carbon tax punishes families and paycheques.

Will the Liberals show a little compassion and cancel their carbon tax grab?

• (1505)

Mr. Terry Beech (Parliamentary Secretary to the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are closing tax loopholes on the wealthiest Canadians to make life more affordable for the middle class. Ninety-nine per cent of these measures will be affecting people who make over \$300,000. Eighty per cent of these measures will be affecting Canadians who make over \$1,000,000 a year.

Let us be clear that when the Conservatives talk about lowering taxes to protect powerful paycheques, they are actually talking about cutting taxes for the 1% and cutting services for workers, seniors, youth and everyone else.

Mr. Clifford Small (Coast of Bays—Central—Notre Dame, CPC): Mr. Speaker, when the cost of living increases, women's shelters are extremely hard hit. Safe havens for those fleeing domestic violence could face closing their doors.

Yesterday, the Parliamentary Budget Officer reported that when the Liberals triple their carbon tax, it will cost a Newfoundland and Labrador family an additional \$1,316 a year. Women's shelters incur expenses 40 times that of an average family.

Will the costly coalition show an ounce of compassion to those most vulnerable by cancelling this Saturday's carbon tax increase?

Hon. Gudie Hutchings (Minister of Rural Economic Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I was proud to be parliamentary secretary and part of the Liberal government when the pandemic hit, and we stepped up to get money out the door right away to every single one of those women's shelters from coast to coast to coast.

When I stood up before and made a comment about the hurricane in my riding, someone on the other side said, "Oh, here she goes

again." Members should know that I am going to keep talking about that hurricane, because it is hundreds of millions of dollars of damage to small craft harbours, hundreds of millions of dollars of damage to infrastructure and hundreds of millions of dollars of damage to people's homes.

We are going to keep talking about that, because we have a plan to fix it.

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, CPC): Mr. Speaker, today's report by the Parliamentary Budget Officer is clear: the carbon tax is a tax is a tax is a tax. It is costing Ontario families \$1,800 more per household than they are getting back. It is raising the cost of fuel and food. Canadians are being played for fools by the costly coalition.

In 48 hours, the carbon tax is due to go up again. Will the Liberals cancel their plans to increase the carbon tax this Saturday?

Mr. Terry Duguid (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, every time we put forward an affordability measure for dental, rental or supporting children, the Conservatives vote against it.

I will just emphasize, for the 29th time, that the climate rebate puts more money in people's pockets. It makes families better off.

What will not make families better off is investing in cryptocurrency. The hon. Leader of the Opposition had a chance to stand in his place and apologize for his reckless advice. The hon. member of the opposition has no plan for the economy—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Vaughan—Woodbridge.

* * *

HOUSING

Mr. Francesco Sorbara (Vaughan—Woodbridge, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, budget 2023, a made-in-Canada plan, introduces various affordability measures, such as the first-time homebuyers account, and also demonstrates our government's unwavering commitment to reconciliation by investing in urban, rural and northern indigenous housing.

Could the hon. Minister of Housing and Diversity and Inclusion tell the House about these initiatives and what they mean for our country?

Oral Questions

Hon. Ahmed Hussen (Minister of Housing and Diversity and Inclusion, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, through budget 2023, we are showing real leadership on housing. We are launching the first-time home buyer's tax-free savings account of \$40,000. I am thrilled to share that financial institutions will be able to offer this to Canadians as of April 1. We are also issuing new guidelines to protect those with mortgages, as well as investing a historic amount of \$4 billion in the urban, rural and northern indigenous housing strategy.

We shall not rest until each and every Canadian has access to a safe and affordable place to call home.

* * *

SPORT

Ms. Niki Ashton (Churchill—Keewatinook Aski, NDP): Mr. Speaker, recreation in regions like ours saves lives. Today, I stood with indigenous and northern athletes, coaches and leaders from northern Manitoba, calling on Canada and FIFA to support soccer in our communities in the lead up to Canada co-hosting the World Cup. This is a historic moment for Canada on the global stage and the government has a responsibility to ensure that all our young people are part of it.

Will the government work with indigenous and northern communities to invest in soccer infrastructure and programming for all our youth in the lead-up to the World Cup?

• (1510)

Mr. Adam van Koevorden (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health and to the Minister of Sport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I could not agree with my colleague more. While Canadians are really excited that Toronto and Vancouver will play host to games during the FIFA 2026 men's world cup, we have to do more to ensure that everybody has access to sport, physical activity and recreation.

That is why I was so glad to get out to Canmore, Alberta a couple of weeks ago to visit Spirit North. This is an organization that brings physical activity like cross-country skiing, mountain biking and skateboarding to indigenous youth. First nations kids across the Prairies are experiencing that.

I could not agree with my colleague more. Sport saves lives.

* * *

THE BUDGET

Mr. Kevin Vuong (Spadina—Fort York, Ind.): Mr. Speaker, budget 2023, a.k.a the stay-in-power-billions bonanza, threw Toronto under the bus. The city's deputy mayor warns of significant cuts to city services due to the federal government walking away from its election promise and ignoring Toronto's request for help with COVID shortfalls. The GTA is the engine of the Canadian economy and it is about to stall.

What services would the government like to cut during soaring food prices and a recession? Which homeless shelters should close? How many fire trucks, police cars and ambulances should be parked? Which after-school and day care programs should be cancelled? Which bus routes?

The Liberals relied on Toronto votes to cling to power. MPs have forgotten. In the next election, Torontonians will remind them.

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Infrastructure and Communities, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as a former councillor, I can tell the House first-hand that no federal government has invested in municipalities more than this one. I would like to inform the member opposite that on transit alone our government, since 2016, has invested over \$8.6 billion in the city of Toronto. If the member opposite thinks he has the pulse of Torontonians, he should be reminded that we are there for Toronto. We are investing in real infrastructure projects that make a big difference in the lives of Torontonians.

* * *

PRESENCE IN GALLERY

The Speaker: I wish to draw the attention of members to the presence in the gallery of the recipients of the 2023 Governor General's Awards in Commemoration of the Persons Case: Dr. Lynn Gehl, Dr. Shimi Kang, Farrah Khan and Judy White.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

* * *

MAUREEN BREAU

The Speaker: I understand that there have been discussions among representatives of all parties in the House and that there is agreement to observe a moment of silence in honour of the fallen police officer in Louiseville, Quebec.

[A moment of silence observed]

Hon. Robert Oliphant: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I can safely say that everyone in this House shares at least two things in common: We are all committed to working for human and civil rights in Iran, and we all get frustrated from time to time.

Last week, after three hours of a Nowruz event, organized by the wonderful Tirgan community, I became frustrated with what I felt were inaccurate and unfair comments by one speaker and I left, maybe ironically to go home and write a sermon on reconciliation, making an intemperate comment on the way out, and for that I am sorry.

Business of the House

However, let there be no misunderstanding. I remain committed to working with, holding and supporting the families of the victims of PS752 every day. I remain committed to working to hold those who committed those atrocities accountable. I continue to work for the human and civil rights of all people in Iran, and the “Women, Life, Freedom” movement.

• (1515)

Mr. Jake Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I am looking for unanimous consent to table in the House an updated report from the Parliamentary Budget Officer that shows the cost of the federal carbon tax on households in Nova Scotia, P.E.I., Newfoundland and Labrador. It will cost Nova Scotians \$1,500, Prince Edward Islanders \$1,500, and Newfoundlanders and Labradorians \$1,300 when the Liberals triple their carbon tax.

The Speaker: This is turning into debate and it is clear that we do not have unanimous consent.

[Translation]

The hon. member for Shefford on a point of order.

Ms. Andr anne Larouche: Mr. Speaker, I want to clarify the comments made by the Minister of Seniors.

I want to be certain that she is not misleading the House when she says that organizations in Quebec support the budget. I just re-read various press releases that welcome maybe two measures in the budget but lament the fact that the federal government does not take sufficient action for seniors in the budget.

They condemn the many omissions in the budget. They condemn the fact that the guaranteed income supplement, assistance—

The Speaker: In my opinion, this is becoming a debate.

The hon. Minister of Indigenous Services.

[English]

Hon. Patty Hajdu: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am really disappointed with the pattern of sexism and undermining of women we hear from some members opposite.

Today, when the member for Calgary Forest Lawn was speaking about budget 2023, he referred to the Minister of Finance as the “minister of inflation”.

This is a pattern we see from the members opposite who undermine women and refuse to use titles that are appropriate in this place. I ask that—

The Speaker: I believe I dealt with that during the question.

I want to remind all members on both sides to respect each other and to not call each other names.

* * *

POINTS OF ORDER

VIDEO RECORDING OF PARLIAMENTARY PROCEEDINGS—SPEAKER'S RULING

The Speaker: Following the point of order raised earlier by the member for Kingston and the Islands concerning the posting of a video on social media, I would like to remind members that the tak-

ing of any photo or video during the proceedings of the House of Commons and its committees is strictly forbidden.

[Translation]

Following the intervention from the member for Kingston and the Islands, I considered the matter and reviewed the video in question. It is absolutely clear to the Chair that the beginning of the video was taken during our proceedings and subsequently made available on social media.

[English]

I am sure the Leader of the Opposition knows full well that members are not allowed to take pictures or record videos when the House is sitting.

The Chair has reminded members of this on many occasions, and as has been done in all those cases, the Chair's expectation is that the Leader of the Opposition will remove the portion of the said video that is in contravention of the rules of the House.

I want to thank all members for their attention.

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Regina—Qu'Appelle, CPC): Mr. Speaker, related to your ruling, I want to indicate that, of course, Conservatives will respect your ruling and we hope the Liberals will too.

On February 2, the Liberal Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Southern Ontario posted on Twitter a day-in-the-life video, which includes footage of members sitting in the House during question period. I will be happy to provide the Speaker with a link to that video so that he can take a look at it and I—

• (1520)

The Speaker: I look forward to that link. I am sure the member will provide me with others as well, and I will examine each and every one of them. If they are during this session, we will act on them.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Regina—Qu'Appelle, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is now time for the Thursday question. Before I go to it, I want to wish everyone a blessed Good Friday and a happy Easter. Christians in the western world will be observing both. Easter is coming up and I know it is a time when family members will get together, visit and take a bit of a break. A lot of Canadians are going through a lot of hardships and I want them to know we are thinking of all the vulnerable Canadians who might be facing extra struggles given the current economic woes that are afflicting many hard-working Canadians across the country.

I want to wish everybody in this place, from the pages to the support staff, you, Mr. Speaker, and members of all parties a fruitful two weeks working hard in their constituencies, meeting with their constituents and taking a bit of time with their friends and families.

As it relates to House business, I would like to know if the government House leader can update us as to what the business of the House will be. We were hoping we would have more debate on Bill C-11, which would grant unprecedented powers to the government to control the Internet. I note that debate will end today because the government is stifling that debate, but I hope the member will update us as to what we will be debating when the House comes back after the Easter break.

Hon. Mark Holland (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me join with my hon. colleague, the opposition House leader, in wishing everyone a joyous Easter. I hope that members who are celebrating Easter take time with their families. This is also a very busy time for many of our other faith communities as we recognize Vaisakhi. We are in the holy month of Ramadan right now and we have Passover. This is a time that is very rich, one when I know people will be visiting churches, mosques and temples in our communities to share with the rich faith traditions in our constituencies. I hope all members are able to profit from those opportunities to be with their constituents and families.

With respect to Bill C-11, I will simply state that I do not think there is any amount of time that would satisfy Conservatives. In fact, I would challenge the opposition House leader to indicate just how many days of debate he would like. I do not think there is any end. Conservatives have indicated they want to obstruct this bill. This bill has had more time in the Senate than any bill in history. It was in the last Parliament and it is in this Parliament. It is time our artists get compensated for their work and that the tech giants pay their fair share.

Tomorrow, we will start the second reading debate of Bill C-42, an act to amend the Canada Business Corporations Act, and then we are going to be switching to Bill C-34, the Investment Canada Act.

When we return, we will continue with the budget debate on Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday.

On Thursday, we will start the day with a ways and means vote relating to the budget implementation act. Following the vote, we will proceed to the debate on Bill C-27, the digital charter implementation act, 2022, followed by Bill C-42.

Finally, on Friday, we will commence debate on the budget bill.

Hon. Andrew Scheer: Mr. Speaker, I want to add my voice to the government House leader's comments, in the spirit of recognition of events that are being acknowledged in the upcoming weeks. The Standing Orders make reference to Easter, but it is also the time for Passover for our Jewish friends and fellow Canadians. Many members will be invited to wonderful Vaisakhi events and many Iftar dinners as well during the holy month of Ramadan for our Muslim friends.

I wanted to join my voice to the government House leader's on those recognitions.

The Speaker: I want to remind both the hon. member for Regina—Qu'Appelle and the government House leader that it is the Thursday question, not the Thursday questions and comments. I just wanted to point that out.

Government Orders

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

ONLINE STREAMING ACT

The House resumed consideration of Motion No. 2 in relation to the amendments made by the Senate to Bill C-11, An Act to amend the Broadcasting Act and to make related and consequential amendments to other Acts, and of the amendment.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons (Senate), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am glad to continue my discussion on this very important debate that I started before question period. I focused primarily on what I saw as the Conservatives' agenda and the reason for their continual interest in trying to promote the disinformation and misinformation that is out there, prior to question period. I would like to take some time to focus on the parts of this bill, and in particular the parts that would affect and help artists who are trying to make a career of it in our country.

Whenever I have had the opportunity to speak to this bill, I have specifically gone back to what I thought was a very powerful intervention in committee by Gord Sinclair, who is a bass player for The Tragically Hip. Mr. Sinclair, in his testimony, said—

Mr. Bob Zimmer: He is not biased at all.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, I got a heckle. I would not mind hearing what that heckle was.

Mr. Bob Zimmer: If you are asking me a question, I can answer.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: We will get to questions after.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to hear the heckle about Mr. Sinclair, if the member wants to say it a little louder.

I was going to read from his testimony, which I thought was very good. He said:

Times change. In the 30 years that the Hip were performing, we went from producing vinyl records and cassettes to CDs, videos and DATs through Napster, and to iTunes and YouTube, and now to streaming and its dominant platform, Spotify. Through it all, until recently, there have been live shows to make ends meet, but people no longer buy the physical products our industry produces. In the digital age, people haven't given up on music—just the idea of paying for it. That business model is unsustainable.

Mr. Sinclair goes on to later say:

Our potential as a creative nation is as vast as the country itself. Songwriters are our best cultural ambassadors. We are compelled to create, to express what we know and what we feel. We need partners in government and industry, including streaming.

Right now, somewhere in Canada, a young artist is searching for their voice, the right bit of melody to go with the perfect words. We need your help to hear those voices.

Government Orders

I thought it was really interesting in the speech by the member who spoke before me, the member for Calgary Nose Hill, when she said in her comments that the only people who are interested in this bill and seeing it go through who are artists are those who have made it and those who are successful, and I can only assume she is putting The Tragically Hip in that category. I would remind that member that The Tragically Hip specifically has done countless things in our community and in our country to help build up various different charities. They have given back tremendously, and one of the ways they have given back is to new and emerging artists. They were trying to lend their stardom to those who are trying to make it.

When Gord Sinclair comes before committee and pleads with the committee that this is necessary for young struggling artists, reflecting on how CanCon and the rules in the nineties, in particular, helped The Tragically Hip get to where they are, he is not doing it because he thinks there is some advantage to The Tragically Hip. They have made it. He is doing it because he wants to see new emerging artists not just survive, but flourish and see their full potential.

The reality is, when we live next to an economy that is 10 times our size, there is a tremendous amount of influence being projected into Canada from the United States. We see it on a daily basis, and it shapes the culture of Canada. If we want to ensure we can keep our unique Canadian identity, as it relates to English, French and indigenous culture, it is critically important that we invest and help. We will be swallowed up by the impacts and the effects from the United States.

I asked a question earlier, and I will repeat it.

● (1525)

When I grew up in the 1980s, I watched TV Ontario, or TVO. It was channel 2, which we watched after dinner. I would watch *Today's Special*, the *Polka Dot Door* and all those other shows a five-, six- or seven-year-old would watch. Now, for my two youngest children, my six-year-old and four-year-old, it is a fight over who gets to use my wife's iPad to watch YouTube, and the content they are watching is not influenced by Canadian culture and Canadian identity like the shows I watched in the 1980s were.

Conservatives can come in here and try to mislead, and to misrepresent the reality of this bill. I actually think they are so caught up in the rhetoric that many of them actually believe it. They actually believe what they are saying, which I think is even more alarming, because the reality is that, when we look at the content of the bill, members will see that this is not about government trying to impose its own views. It is not about government propaganda, as it has been conflated, by several Conservative MPs, with what happens in communist dictatorships. This is about ensuring Canadian content can survive when we live next to a cultural, social and economic superpower, the United States, which is 10 times the size of our country. I think Conservatives know that.

I think Canadians understand what this is really about, unless they are living in the bubble of the Conservatives and Michael Geist, who, I am sure, is tweeting all of this. Let me say "hi" to Michael and ask how he is doing. Unless they are living in that bubble, I think Canadians really get what this is all about. It is not about control; it is about trying to ensure Canadian content survives

into the future. From my perspective, it is most important with young people, who are being influenced for the first time, like my children, in watching all of these videos.

Canadians might have concerns and be thinking, "Well, I don't know where to land on this. I don't know, because I'm not getting all the information. Are the Liberals telling the truth? Are the Conservatives telling the truth? Who is really telling the truth?"

I would tell them to look at who supports this bill in this chamber. The Liberals support it, the NDP supports it and the separatist party supports it. Can members imagine the separatist party going along with the government and cabinet to create algorithms on what people could see in Quebec? It is probably the most ludicrous suggestion, and it is coming from Conservatives, but they have no problem doing it.

The Conservatives have no problem doing it, because it all goes back to the way I opened this speech before question period: It all goes back to fundraising. It all goes back to stirring their base and generating more fundraising for political gain. It is extremely unfortunate that Conservatives have taken an issue so incredibly important for Canadian culture and turned it into a cash cow, and they have successfully done that. I tip my hat to them. If that was their objective, they succeeded. However, they are not helping Canadians, they are not helping Canadian culture and they are not helping Canadian artists the way Gord Sinclair and The Tragically Hip, along with countless other Canadians, are trying to help them.

● (1530)

Mrs. Cathay Wagantall (Yorkton—Melville, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I love that conversation. I appreciate it, and I am pleased to respond to it.

Speaking of the youth in this nation, never before in the history of this country have young people engaged in choosing a leader and joining a party in the way that has happened over the past while here. They are excited about the freedom they have on the Internet and the opportunities they have to present themselves. Of course, Canadians around the world are recognized for all the good things about the values we have.

I would say to the member that, if there is fundraising that is being successful here, we cannot beat money out of Canadians. I suppose we can if we tax them. However, in this case, people in this nation support what they believe in with their pocketbooks. People in Canada are doing that, and I would encourage the member to do what he can to express their views and see if people support it in the same way.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, they are not beating money out of Canadians; they are scaring it out of them.

● (1535)

Mrs. Jenica Atwin (Fredericton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his honesty today and for dealing in facts and evidence. It is very refreshing to hear, considering this debate.

Government Orders

I came to the House to fight for Canadians and to stand up for the Charter of Rights of Freedoms. When members opposite are making a case that we are against free speech or that we are somehow here to control the Internet, it is scary to me because what I then get at home in my riding, and which my staff have to deal with, is a barrage of hatred. I wonder if the member can comment on how dangerous this kind of rhetoric really is.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, that is a great question, because it is extremely dangerous for a political party to look at the opportunity to raise money as being more important than the consequences that come with the misinformation and what that could potentially translate into. That is what we are seeing. As I said earlier, I believe that some of the Conservatives actually are at the point where they believe their own rhetoric because they have been saying it so much.

We have a situation here where money, generating revenue, is more important. Nowhere was that clearer than earlier today when the Leader of the Opposition realized that this cash cow is about to dry up because we are about to vote on this, and that he had better start recording a video on it with a link to his donation page. He started recording a video while he was still in the chamber with the mace sitting on the table. That should tell Canadians where this issue lies for Conservatives, because it is extremely telling.

Ms. Lori Idlout (Nunavut, NDP): *Uqaqtittiji*, this is such an important bill because it would especially help marginalized independent content creators and producers like IsumaTV. I just wonder, though, if this bill is passed, when the member thinks web giants like Netflix and Disney+ would be required to pay their fair share so that smaller, independent producers like Isuma could benefit from this bill.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, the member is absolutely right. This would help the independent artists. It would do that because all we are saying is that the rules that apply to the traditional media outlets and helping to fund those independents should apply to the web giants too. That is all that this is. There is great opportunity here and great potential.

I would say, to Conservatives who are saying this is a violation of freedom and rights, that we will see what happens the day after this legislation receives royal assent. Would the Conservatives take it to the court to have a charter ruling on it? I am going to guess they would not, because any lawyer who would advise them would most likely tell them they do not have a case.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, as the member knows, I intend to vote for Bill C-11, but I would vote for it with more enthusiasm if the government had accepted the amendment from the Senate that excluded user-developed content. I wonder if the member could explain, because so far I have not had any explanation that makes sense to me, why the government has rejected that amendment from the Senate.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that it had already been dealt with, that it is already very explicit that user-generated content would not be affected by this piece of legislation, and that everybody knows that user-generated content was never the intention here. The intention was about getting to the web giants and making sure they pay their fair share.

Mr. Brad Redekopp (Saskatoon West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, therein lies the exact issue we are facing here. The member just said “my understanding is” and went on to give his understanding. This is why we continue to debate this. This is why it has been at the Senate for so much time. This is why we want to talk about this more: There is not agreement.

The member talked about the group of people who must be under the dome, which I think were his words. It is an interesting group, because not only does it include Conservatives, but it also includes Margaret Atwood and it includes the current chair of the CRTC, who also said it would affect user content. It is an interesting group of people who are raising objections and concerns about this legislation. How does the member explain all who, in this interesting group of people, are also raising objections to this legislation?

● (1540)

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, this is more cherry-picking of quotes from people without providing the full context. The member referenced Margaret Atwood. The *Globe and Mail* quoted Margaret Atwood, saying “The author said she had not read the bill ‘thoroughly yet’ and that there seemed to be ‘well-meaning attempts to achieve some sort of fairness in the marketplace’.”

The member is not even properly using the context in which Margaret Atwood was making her comments. Of course they leave it out that part, because it is not beneficial to their argument, it does not support their case and it certainly would not raise any money for them if they were to send out that quote from Margaret Atwood.

Ms. Jennifer O’Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Infrastructure and Communities, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member for Kingston and the Islands spoke about the Conservatives using this legislation as a way to drive fundraising for the Conservative Party of Canada. I am curious whether he finds it a bit ironic that it is actually the Conservative Party standing in the way of content creators’ being paid fairly for their content and their ideas, and that Conservatives stand in the way to block that legislation so they can fundraise for their own party and their own partisan activities.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, that is such an interesting take on it. Conservatives are basically creating their own content by using this issue in order to fundraise and generate money for their party. It is total hypocrisy on the part of the Conservatives. They should know better and they should stop playing with an issue in a way that encourages disinformation, which is what they are doing.

Government Orders

Mr. Bob Zimmer (Prince George—Peace River—Northern Rockies, CPC): Mr. Speaker, let us talk about rhetoric from the member across the way. All he has talked about is us as a party. He has not talked about the legislation and factually defended his argument about the legislation they are proposing. It goes back several years to Bill C-10, the iteration before, and clause 4.1. That is the problem, and I do not know if he has even read that. It is not just us saying it is a problem; it is Canadians across the country who are saying it is a problem. Why does he not just simply remove that clause?

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, this is the member who was heckling me when I was reading Gord Sinclair's quote. I really wish he had given me the rest of that heckle so I could have at least heard it through his question.

It is inaccurate to suggest I do not understand the context of this bill. With respect to his suggestion that all I did was attack Conservatives, that is not true. He did not listen to the first eight minutes of my speech. The fact is, I did talk about artists, about how content impacted me as a child and is impacting my children, and about how I saw this legislation would improve the content my children are watching today.

Mr. Brad Redekopp (Saskatoon West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I will be splitting my time with the member for Abbotsford.

Today I am speaking, along with many others, about an issue fundamental to the future of our country.

Do we as Canadians live in a country that believes in the principles of our Charter of Rights and Freedoms and supports free speech on the Internet, or do we deviate and support the principles of censorship and the pursuit of wokeness and conformity? What do we value as Canadians?

The fact is that the Conservative Party is the only political party in Canada that stands for freedom of speech and the rights of Canadians to express themselves freely on the Internet. Margaret Atwood called Bill C-11 “creeping totalitarianism”.

We have, and we will, fight this legislation to the bitter end. Is it a losing fight? Probably. We have heard many times, when the Prime Minister asked the leader of the NDP to jump, that the only question he gets in response is “How high?” That does not mean that Conservatives would not fight. However, it does mean that, when Conservatives form the next government under our new leader, we would repeal this horrible attack on free speech.

Much has been said about the obvious move toward censorship and government control over what we see and post. However, I want to come at this from a different angle, which is that of *The Littlest Hobo*. I grew up in the 1970s in rural Saskatchewan. We had colour TV, I am not that old, but our house only had two channels: CBC and CTV. It was the golden age of government censorship of what we could watch on TV.

Back then, the CRTC was not as concerned about political censorship as we would see with the result of Bill C-11, but it was very concerned that we watch Canadian programming, instead of that evil, awful American programming. Every day, after school, I had to endure a half-hour of *The Littlest Hobo*, because it was literally

the only thing I could watch on TV. Now some may have enjoyed the show. I did not.

This was the result of the government dictating to Canadians what it felt we needed to watch on TV. Thankfully, we eventually got U.S. TV channels in our house, and we were able to finally watch what we chose to watch and not what the CRTC told us we could watch.

Everyone who has grown up in the Internet generation has always had full control to watch whatever they want to watch on the Internet. The government has so far been unable to censor them and force them to watch the content it deems important.

With Bill C-11, the government would be throttling the Internet and forcing Canadians to watch things it deems important: *The Littlest Hobo* of this decade. Do not get me wrong. I am not against Canadian content in any way. I just want good content, wherever it comes from.

Canada produces some amazingly good content. For example, *The Handmaid's Tale* by Margaret Atwood was written by a Canadian author and is being filmed on Canadian soil. It stars Canadian actors and it employs Canadian producers, but it fails to make the cut. It is not considered Canadian by the CRTC.

This just demonstrates the silliness of the government trying to dictate and control our creative industries. The last thing our creative industries in Canada need is more government control.

Canada has amazing content producers, from big-name actors, producers and artists down to small content creators on YouTube, Instagram and other platforms. We must keep them free to compete in a global world, rather have the government pick who are the winners and who are the losers.

How does Bill C-11 work? How does the legislation actually strangle the freedom of individual Canadians on the Internet?

At the heritage committee, one witness, J.J. McCullough, used a metaphor that I believe captures this law in a nutshell. He said, “It's like promising not to regulate books while [simultaneously] regulating...bookstores.”

The approach of the NDP-Liberal coalition is to regulate everyday social media platforms that Canadians use: Facebook, Twitter, TikTok, YouTube and others.

This would directly affect every Canadian, as the platforms would be told by the government which of the content created is allowed or not. It is as if someone walked into a bookstore but would only be allowed to see the books on certain racks. They would not be allowed to see the books on other racks in the rest of the store.

The government agency overseeing this is called the Canadian Radio and Television Commission, CRTC. These are the same people who forced me to watch *The Littlest Hobo* as a kid. The CRTC has been around for a long time, and, in theory, it is responsible for ensuring Canadian content on radio and TV. They are the reason cable is so expensive and why many of us are cord-cutting.

Basically, the CRTC is a bunch of Toronto, Montreal and Ottawa elites, appointed by the Prime Minister, whose jobs would be to decide what we consume and what we post.

• (1545)

This law would effectively give the CRTC the authority to set out conditions, requirements and exemptions for what is to be restricted or to be allowed. For example, the law would give the commission the authority to make orders imposing conditions affecting such things as “the proportion of programs to be broadcast” being “devoted to specific genres” and “the presentation of programs and programming”.

Despite its vague language, it is clear that the government plans to give the friends of the Prime Minister the power to decide what the people see, quite literally policing content.

They do this under the guise of promoting Canadian content, but that is just an excuse to grab more power and to limit the freedoms we enjoy. That is exactly what Bill C-11 does.

It gives the CRTC the authority over platforms like YouTube. These platforms would be forced to comply with regulations that prioritize content to be displayed to individuals over others, depending on what the CRTC deems to be the priority. That is exactly the problem.

This law would “encourage the development of Canadian expression by providing a wide range of programming that reflects Canadian attitudes, opinions, ideas, values and artistic creativity”.

Who will decide what content is reflective of Canadian opinions, ideas and values and exactly what those are? Of course it is the friends of the Prime Minister.

This one phrase would reprogram the algorithms of your platforms to show you what the government wants you to see, rather than having your preferences deciding what appears in your feed.

The NDP-Liberals do this under the banner of diversity and inclusivity. The truth is that, right now, open platforms allow for, and facilitate the exchange of, diverse and inclusive content better than a government with a political agenda ever could.

The party that prides itself on multiculturalism is now putting a rubber stamp on what is Canadian and what is not. Canadian culture and interests are always expanding and are being influenced by many different artists, genres, languages and the trends of the day. The government is the last organization I would want creating Canadian culture.

Government Orders

Ultimately this is the difference between the Conservative approach on this issue and the approach of the NDP-Liberals. They are concerned about government control and how to have power over Canadians. Conservatives are devoted to freedom. We want Canadians to be able to live their everyday normal lives on the internet. It is simple as that.

Let us talk about how this legislation would affect Canadians. As Neal Mohan, the Chief Product Officer for YouTube, has explained in countless interviews, Bill C-11 would harm Canadian content creators.

Some may argue that YouTube is a massive corporation simply looking after its own interests. Of course, on one level that is true, but YouTube contributes over a billion dollars to the Canadian economy and creates roughly 35,000 jobs in this country, so it does have a stake beyond the confines of Silicon Valley.

Bill C-11 would essentially decide who the winners and losers of this market are, based on the qualities and conditions set out by the CRTC. Rather than helping the little guy, this government plans on putting barriers that impede them from success.

By creating more red tape, we would not just harm the economy but, more importantly, we would harm each Canadian who depends upon the internet to generate income. Nowadays, that is a lot of people from all age groups and all walks of life. This law would cover any content individually generated that touches a user trying to make even the smallest dollar.

The Liberals will say that this bill would not touch personal content like cat videos but that is simply not true. Even the current Liberal-appointed chair of the CRTC told the truth by mistake and admitted that Bill C-11 would regulate content generated by individual users.

According to YouTube and others in this field, forcing content to be displayed in one's feed may have a negative impact on content creators within Canada and would harm the very people the government claims that it wants to protect.

We all know what happens when the government tries to force-feed us content that we don't want, like *The Littlest Hobo*.

We do not want to watch it, yet the government shoves it down our throats anyway. At least CBC TV shows are voluntary right now. Just wait until the algorithms are required by law to put these in our YouTube searches, then in our Facebook videos and then in our Insta stories.

Government Orders

There will be no escaping the government-approved content, so we will shut it off. One does not see what one wants, and the so-called Canadian content shoved down one's throat will go unwatched. It is a lose-lose situation, like most things that this current NDP-Liberal government does.

Bill C-11 is a threat to our fundamental rights and is setting up the foundation for censorship. Whether one is a YouTube content creator, a social media influencer or even just a viewer, Bill C-11 would limit Canadians from seeing and watching the content they choose.

People in Saskatoon West are worried about what is to come if this legislation passes, and that is why we must kill Bill C-11.

• (1550)

The Deputy Speaker: “Maybe tomorrow, I'll want to settle down. Until tomorrow, I'll just keep moving on.”

Questions and comments, the hon. member for Fredericton.

Mrs. Jenica Atwin (Fredericton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to put on the record that I loved *The Littlest Hobo*. I grew up watching that show, but the insulting way that the member has characterized Canadian content only serves to support why Bill C-11 is so important.

I do want to ask a question about his opening statement as part of his discourse today. He mentioned the pursuit of wokeness for our side. I would love for the member to define “wokeness” and why he is seemingly against it.

Mr. Brad Redekopp: Mr. Speaker, now I am traumatized because I heard the words of the song and I heard from someone who liked the show, although I respect the fact that she liked the show.

What is important here today, the thing that we are trying to convey, is that this bill is being rammed through Parliament. It is very ironic, actually, that the bill is partly about censorship. It is interesting that part of what is happening today in the House, right now, is that the government is closing down debate on it, which limits how much we can talk about this.

It is very clear that there are many questions still to be answered. There are many voices in Canada that support it and there are many that oppose it. There are many more questions that need to be discussed and to be talked about, and there are amendments that need to be made. There are amendments that the Senate took many hours to propose to the House and that were utterly rejected by the government.

We are here today to just highlight that we should not be done with this legislation today. We should continue working on it and trying to improve it.

• (1555)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Denis Garon (Mirabel, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his speech.

For a while now, the Conservatives have been saying that they are standing up for Quebec by opposing Bill C-11 and that their love for Canadian and Quebec culture knows no bounds.

I will do my colleague a favour. I would like to give him the opportunity to name his three favourite francophone artists from Quebec, other than Celine Dion.

[*English*]

Mr. Brad Redekopp: Mr. Speaker, that is definitely a trick question. The part of this that is really important, too, is that we do need to stand up and support our Canadian artists. What this bill misses is the fact that in Canada we have amazing artists, whether from Quebec or from English Canada. Our content creators and our artists in Canada are among the best in the world. We can compete on any stage at any time.

When the government steps in and starts to create winners and losers, that affects everything and that disrupts the natural way that things work. We need to give our artists, producers and content creators the tools they need to produce that content without trying to limit them and without trying to restrict them. Many of the messages we have heard from some of these people is that this bill will restrict them, and it will limit their ability to market themselves outside of Canada.

Hon. Ed Fast (Abbotsford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would love to hear my colleague comment on Margaret Atwood's comments about Bill C-11. She referred to this bill as representing “creeping totalitarianism”. That is a term that is very difficult to misconstrue or take out of context. It is stark.

I welcome the member's comments on that.

Mr. Brad Redekopp: Mr. Speaker, it is an interesting time, when someone like Margaret Atwood, who is a great Canadian artist, actually makes a statement that this bill is “creeping totalitarianism”. As my colleague mentioned, that is a very bold statement. It is also a very strong statement.

I know members opposite would criticize that it was taken out of context. If one looks at the context, she is questioning what is going on in the bill, saying that there have been good intentions, but the result of those good intentions is “creeping totalitarianism”. This is something that we must be very careful to avoid.

This is yet another example of a strong Canadian voice from the artist community who is questioning this bill and who is saying that we need to look at it deeper. Maybe we need to do some different amendments, but we just need to not pass it in a big rush, which is what they are trying to do today.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I believe if you seek it, you will find unanimous consent to table the Globe and Mail article—

Some hon. members: No.

Government Orders

Hon. Ed Fast (Abbotsford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have heard from many constituents who are really concerned about Bill C-11, the online streaming act, and the corrosive impact it would have on their freedom to use social media, to hear and view online information and to post user-generated content. Like so many of the intrusive actions undertaken by the government, my constituents simply do not understand why the Liberal government continues to try to fix problems that do not exist.

At the end of the day, it comes down to this: Who do we trust? Who do Canadians trust? Is it our Liberal Prime Minister, who has become so notorious for making hundreds of promises that he has no intention of keeping? Do Canadians trust a Liberal government that claims this bill is all about the Broadcasting Act, or do they trust the many experts who assert that this bill is an attack on our freedom to use the Internet and social media?

The purported premise of this bill was to ensure online streaming giants, such as Netflix, Amazon and Disney+, meet Canadian content requirements similar to those that Canadian broadcasters have to comply with. However, this bill would do much more than that. It would create a new category of media power to regulate them and to require them to invest in Canadian content, just like the big broadcasters, and that is the rub.

What the government refuses to admit, but what has been confirmed time and time again by experts and stakeholders, is that the Liberal government is for the first time ever inserting itself into the Internet space by giving the CRTC, which we know is a group of bureaucrats appointed by the Liberal government, the power to prescribe what Canadians can and cannot see, hear or post to social media. The CRTC would also have the power to regulate the algorithms that determine what information will appear in a search bar.

The bottom line is this. This legislation would prevent Canadians from seeing and watching content of their own choosing. Instead, Ottawa bureaucrats would control what Canadians can see or watch through streaming services. They would also dictate what we can or cannot post to social media. Even worse, Bill C-11 would harm Canadian digital content creators in their ability to reach international audiences and achieve global success.

Our Liberal friends across the way would have us believe that I am exaggerating, that we Conservatives are exaggerating and that there is nothing to see here, as it is just a benign piece of legislation that would make sure streaming platforms contribute to Canadian content. However, many experts, like law professors Michael Geist and Emily Laidlaw, former CRTC commissioners Timothy Denton and Peter Menzies, and even Canadian author and icon Margaret Atwood, are sounding the alarm and suggesting that what is at stake is Canadians' right to be heard. In fact, Margaret Atwood said this bill amounted to "creeping totalitarianism". Think of that term and what it connotes.

Make no mistake: This is a new form of censorship that the Liberal government is engaging in, and our ability to hear, watch and post what we want on social media is clearly at risk. Again I ask, who do Canadians trust?

The Internet and the different social media platforms have opened up a remarkable opportunity for Canadians to expose their

created content to the global marketplace. Right now, they do not have to go through the established artistic gatekeepers, the big broadcasters, like Bell Media, Rogers, the CBC and Corus Entertainment, that in the past had made it impossible for many Canadian artists and creators to promote their content within the global marketplace. The Internet and evolution of social media platforms carved out space for every Canadian to create and promote the product of their imagination without any gatekeepers getting in the way. Each Canadian now has a voice, which cannot be silenced by vested interests and corporate gatekeepers.

● (1600)

Consumers certainly do not want this bill, nor do digital creators. In fact, those creators do not want this bill because it has never been easier for producers of online of Canadian content, including those from linguistic and cultural backgrounds, to reach a global audience with the content they wish to showcase, until now.

With Bill C-11, the Liberal government is wrestling control away from consumers and giving its bureaucrats the power to tell us, the consumer, what we can and cannot watch, hear or post. The Liberal government wants to stifle our freedom. Let us not kid ourselves. This is a fight over the freedom to create, to speak, to perform, to imagine and to expose our gifts and creativity to the world. It is about the freedom to be heard and seen around the world.

Bill C-11 would take even greater control of our search bars. Instead of directing people to the things they want to view, it would direct them to things the government and its bureaucrats want them to view. Meanwhile, homegrown talent and content creators right here in Canada will stagnate and lose the opportunity to be judged based on merit within the global marketplace. Content would be subject to a set of criteria that bureaucrats in Ottawa would use to determine its level of Canadianness.

The government, of course, has protested that user-generated content would not be compromised. I ask again, do people trust the Liberals? This is the same government that promised balanced budgets, electoral reform and greater transparency yet failed to deliver. In fact, Université Laval did a study after the 2019 election, and how many of the Liberal promises were actually fulfilled? It was only 52%, which means almost half of their promises were broken. That is from Université Laval. It is the same government that has been embroiled in countless scandals and ethical failures. Again I ask, do we trust the Liberals when they tell us there is nothing to see here, not to worry and be happy?

Government Orders

When the Senate inserted a provision in this bill that would assure Canadians that user-generated content would not be captured, what did the Liberals do? They nixed it. They nixed that amendment. Again I ask, do people trust the Liberal government? The Liberals say one thing in public, and then when given an opportunity to stand behind it, they do the exact opposite.

Make no mistake: This bill would regulate what can be seen, heard and posted online. If the CRTC does not do it, people can bet their boots that the Liberals will require YouTube and Facebook to do the job for them. This bill hurts consumers and creators, and it has even drawn ire and concern from the provinces. In fact, Quebec has written a letter to the government expressing its concern and asking for more consultations before the bill moves forward.

For all of these reasons and more, we Conservatives, in this House and in the Senate, are the only ones to stand in the breach and oppose Bill C-11 in its current form. The Liberal-NDP coalition has rejected all attempts to improve the bill, including clarifying the issue of user-generated content. I want to assure Canadians that a future Conservative government would repeal Bill C-11, the censorship bill.

Let me close by saying this. After eight years of division and conflict, the government has again profoundly failed Canadians by attacking our fundamental right to free speech and by shackling Canadian creators, who simply want to expose their ingenuity and creativity to the world, proving again that the Liberal government cannot be trusted. Canadians deserve better.

• (1605)

Mrs. Jenica Atwin (Fredericton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am going to venture a guess that somewhere in this great nation, Margaret Atwood is shuddering every time she is being taken out of context and her words are being used against this bill. In this discussion, I am willing to admit that there are voices of dissent and that there are those who do not like it. However, there are, of course, many voices in support.

The member spoke a lot about trust. Does the member trust the voices of Quebec actors, singers and producers? How about bands and musicians from rural New Brunswick in my riding? Does he trust the voices of those who want to see this bill pass without further delay?

Hon. Ed Fast: Mr. Speaker, the voices I do not trust are the voices of the Liberal Party and the Liberal government. Time and time again, the Liberals make promises and give assurances, and then we find out that in fact those assurances were false.

There is no reason for Canadians to have any trust in the government. That is why we have looked at this legislation very carefully. When Margaret Atwood, the iconic Canadian, uses the term “creeping totalitarianism”, it is hard to misconstrue that statement. We understand what she meant. Unfortunately, the Liberals are hiding from that truth and are claiming that she was misunderstood and that we are taking her out of context. How does one take “creeping totalitarianism” out of context?

• (1610)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Denis Garon (Mirabel, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I will try again.

Once again, my colleague from Abbotsford, like other Conservatives, says he is defending Quebec culture. I asked his colleague to name some Quebec francophone artists, but he could not, so I will help him out.

We have, for example, our national poet, Gilles Vigneault. He is probably the most well-known artist in Quebec. Anyone concerned about Canadian culture, as he likes to say, knows who Gilles Vigneault is.

To make things easier, I will ask my colleague to name his favourite Gilles Vigneault song.

[*English*]

Hon. Ed Fast: Mr. Speaker, I will point out to that member, whom I respect very much, that the Government of Quebec has spoken about this and expressed profound concern over Bill C-11. That government has actually sent a letter to the Liberal government expressing this concern and calling for further consultations before this bill goes forward. I know what those concerns are. One is that user-generated content would no longer be free. In other words, user-generated content would be regulated by the CRTC's government bureaucrats. That is something no Canadian should be supportive of.

Ms. Lori Idlout (Nunavut, NDP): *Uqaqtittiji*, I am going to read a section of Bill C-11. It reads:

(3) This Act shall be construed and applied in a manner that is consistent with

(a) the freedom of expression and journalistic, creative and programming independence enjoyed by broadcasting undertakings

I wonder if the member can explain why the Conservatives keep talking about freedoms being taken away when the bill explicitly states that freedom of expression would be complied with.

Hon. Ed Fast: Mr. Speaker, I would encourage the member to read proposed section 4.1, which supersedes that section. By the way, I would also encourage her to explain to her constituents and to Canadians why it is that when an opportunity was presented to the Liberal government to ensure that user-generated content was not compromised in this legislation, the Liberal government removed that amendment.

There is something rotten in the state of Denmark, one would say. There is something rotten in the way the Liberal government conducts its business. It pretends to be one thing and promises to be one thing, but it will be quite another matter when this legislation comes into force. People will see what the government has done.

We on the Conservative side of the House stand for freedom. We will continue to promote the freedoms that Canadians have under the charter, and we will not have those freedoms compromised by poorly drafted, wrong-headed Liberal legislation.

ROYAL ASSENT

[English]

The Deputy Speaker: Order. I have the honour to inform the House that a communication has been received as follows:

Rideau Hall
Ottawa

Mr. Speaker,

I have the honour to inform you that the Right Honourable Mary May Simon, Governor General of Canada, signified royal assent by written declaration to the bills listed in the Schedule to this letter on the 30th day of March, 2023, at 10:03 a.m.

Yours sincerely,

Ian McCowan
Secretary to the Governor General and Herald Chancellor

The schedule indicates the bills assented to were Bill S-203, An Act respecting a federal framework on autism spectrum disorder, C-43, An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the federal public administration for the fiscal year ending March 31, and Bill C-44, An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the federal public administration for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2024.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

• (1615)

[English]

ONLINE STREAMING ACT

The House resumed consideration of Motion No. 2 in relation to the amendments made by the Senate to Bill C-11, An Act to amend the Broadcasting Act and to make related and consequential amendments to other Acts, and of the amendment.

Mr. Francesco Sorbara (Vaughan—Woodbridge, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is nice to see my hon. colleagues continue debate on a very important bill, Bill C-11. I will be sharing my time with the hon. member and my esteemed colleague for Saanich—Gulf Islands, beautiful Vancouver Island, a wonderful place on the Sunshine Coast area where I have many friends and where I was raised.

We are debating a very important bill that would modernize the Broadcasting Act, which has not been touched since 1991. It has generated a lot of debate and passion, but it is really important to stick to the facts of the bill at hand and not get lost in the rancour, hyperbole and, frankly, the misinformation, if I could be so direct.

I am pleased to rise today in support of the online streaming act, Bill C-11. The online streaming act seeks to update the Broadcasting Act to reflect the reality of Canada's broadcasting climate today and prepare for the future. For decades, broadcasters in Canada have shown us incredible Canadian content on our televisions and radios. That did not happen by accident. After all, we live right next door to the world's largest exporter of culture and entertainment. I can say first-hand, having lived in the United States for over seven years at one point in my life, it does export a lot of culture and entertainment, not only here in Canada but throughout the world. There is quite a dynamism in its entertainment business, which we

Government Orders

also have here in Canada, a very vibrant film industry and music industry.

We made a conscious decision to support our fellow Canadians, to help them share their talents and their stories with the rest of world, much like every other country does. As a condition of their licences, TV and radio broadcasters have had to invest in our culture and our artists. It is why we have all the Canadian content we love. Whenever we see *Schitt's Creek*, *Orphan Black* and *Corner Gas* or hear Lisa LeBlanc, Coeur de pirate, Joni Mitchell, Céline Dion, Jessie Reyez, Mother Mother, Classified and the Arkells, it makes us proud to be Canadian. Our culture is who we are. It is our past, our present, and most definitely and definitively our future.

The last major reform, as I stated at the outset of my comments, of the Broadcasting Act was in 1991, a year after I finished high school, which is a long time ago, and before dial-up Internet was widely available in Canada. Online streaming services like Crave, Netflix, TOU.TV, Apple TV+ and Spotify have dramatically changed how we watch television and movies and listen to music.

Today, believe it or not, most Canadians are using YouTube as their primary music streaming service. I see this with my children, who are 10 and 11 years old, two of the three, who watch much on YouTube in terms of sports and entertainment. However, those online streaming platforms are not subject to the same rules as traditional broadcasting services like over-the-air television, cable and radio. This bill would ensure that everyone who benefits from the Canadian market is paying their fair share to support Canadian culture, in both official languages, as well as indigenous languages. With a population of almost 39.6 million people, our market is continuing to grow and it is a sought-after market for content producers and platforms from all over the world.

The world has changed a lot since 1991. In the last 30 years, Canadian society has evolved, and so have our values. Diversity and inclusion are important to Canadians, so they must be key elements of our cultural policy. Improving the fairness of our broadcasting system means being more inclusive, supporting the livelihoods of Canadian artists and creators and enriching the lives of Canadians who want to see more of themselves on screen and in song. Indigenous peoples, Black and other racialized Canadians, women, LGBTQ2+ persons and persons with disabilities deserve to have the space in order to tell their stories to other Canadians and to the world. Frankly, Canadian stories are unique stories. They need to be told, we need to encourage that, and that is exactly what this bill would do.

Government Orders

• (1620)

These values are clearly reflected in the online streaming act. The bill presents us with an opportunity to ensure that the broadcasting sector is truly inclusive of all Canadians, including anglophones, francophones, Canadians from Black and racialized communities, Canadians of diverse ethnocultural backgrounds and socio-economic statuses, abilities and disabilities, sexual orientations, gender identities and expressions, and Canadians of all ages. It would ensure that the circumstances and aspirations of all Canadians are reflected in the broadcasting system, many for the first time in Canadian history.

I would like to share some of the important perspectives that were heard throughout the House and Senate study of the online streaming act to show just how transformative these changes could be for our country. We all know of the intense debate and scrutiny Bill C-11 has gone through in both Houses.

Culture can play a role in the process of truth-telling and reconciliation with indigenous peoples and healing. As part of our commitment to reconciliation, Bill C-11 proposes important updates to Canada's broadcasting system. The online streaming act would remove the language "as resources becomes available" about supporting indigenous culture from Canada's broadcasting policy goals. This is as it should be.

I will quote Jean La Rose, President of Dadan Sivunivut, "We have a unique place, and this language would better reflect Parliament's wish to recognize in legislation the principles of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples". Amendments passed in both the House and the Senate strengthened this commitment in the bill. Ultimately, this bill would create more funding and more opportunities for indigenous creators to tell their stories in the language of their choice.

Currently, programs that reflect indigenous peoples and racialized and ethnocultural communities remain few and, unfortunately, far between, and creative employment opportunities are slim. Who tells the story is as important as the story itself. Our government is committed to building a better future where Black and racialized creative voices, talent and work are celebrated, sought after and supported.

Joan Jenkinson, executive director of the Black Screen Office, told the heritage committee, "Canadians of all backgrounds have not had access to programming within the Canadian broadcasting system that authentically reflects the diversity of this country. The proposed amendments in Bill C-11 will prioritize greater equity and inclusion." This is something we should all be proud of and something we should all support.

In fact, amendments were adopted by both Houses to recognize the unique experiences of Black and racialized Canadians and incorporate their unique stories into the goals of the Broadcasting Act. Bill C-11 would also provide more opportunities for persons with disabilities to fully participate in the broadcasting system. It would update the broadcasting policy goals of Canada to ensure that our system should, through its programming and the employment opportunities arising out of its operations, serve the needs and interests of all Canadians first, specifically including persons with disabilities for the first time in Canadian history.

It would also update the act to remove language that specifies that programming that is accessible without barriers to persons with disabilities must only be provided within the Canadian broadcasting system when the resources are available to do so.

When David Errington, president of Accessible Media Inc., appeared before the Senate committee, he told parliamentarians that "By removing that qualifying language, the government is signalling that it expects that Canadians with disabilities will be treated like all other citizens for the purposes of broadcasting policy." Again, this is how it should be.

As members can see, this legislation would provide real opportunities for Canadians, including community media, local news, French-language productions, Black and racialized communities, third language programming, and so much more. Importantly, this legislation would also take steps to ensure there is space within our broadcasting system for indigenous storytelling and indigenous languages.

Canada has changed greatly since 1991. It is time that our broadcasting system reflected that. It is imperative. I hope all of my colleagues, and I understand the NDP and the Bloc are in support, will join me and our caucus in supporting Bill C-11. It is time to bring our broadcasting system into the 21st century.

I look forward to questions and comments.

• (1625)

Mr. Jeremy Patzer (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am just wondering if the member opposite could provide an answer to a question one of the independent senators had as they were going through the bill. Could he actually provide a clear definition for what the term "discoverability" means?

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: Mr. Speaker, one of the great things about the way this bill has been looked at and examined by both Houses is that it has been quite a robust discussion. I understand, from reading the notes on the bill, that many tough questions were asked, including the member opposite's question on the issue of discoverability.

What is important is that we are modernizing the Broadcasting Act for the first time since 1991. Content creators would continue to have free rein in the generation of the content they wish to produce, post online and show to users and viewers here in Canada and around the world.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Denis Garon (Mirabel, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am trying to understand the Conservatives.

Government Orders

They oppose Bill C-11, saying that it would undermine freedom of expression. However, they claim to be defending Quebec, because Quebec wrote a letter in which it asked for Bill C-11 to be passed and stated that it must be consulted when the bill will apply in the Quebec context. In other words, Quebec would be opposed, in that context, to freedom of expression but would be defended by the Conservatives. It sounds like the equivalent of a dog chasing its own tail.

Can my colleague tell me whether I have this right or not?

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question on the importance of collaboration with all the provinces in our country. It is very important to collaborate with the province of Quebec and to collaborate further when it comes to the application of Bill C-11.

I do not understand the Conservatives' opposition.

[*English*]

Like many people, I am befuddled by it. There is a lot of language being used that I am not really sure is accurate. Maybe a full briefing for members would help them to understand the importance of the bill.

[*Translation*]

This is an extremely important bill for our cultural sector.

[*English*]

It is very important to move forward with this bill.

Mr. Mike Morrice (Kitchener Centre, GP): Mr. Speaker, I would agree with the member for Vaughan—Woodbridge that there is a language being used about the bill that is incendiary. However, there are also fair critiques.

Could the member speak to his views? The Senate proposed an amendment that would have addressed a really key element of this bill, with respect to ensuring that user-generated content is not regulated by the CRTC. However, the governing party rejected that very reasonable, surgically prepared amendment that the Senate put a lot of thought towards.

Could he share his view and whether he agrees with that amendment not being in what we are going to be voting on this evening or being voted down?

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: Mr. Speaker, I too asked about this amendment and I received clarification that the way the bill is written and would be adopted is that user-generated content would not come under scrutiny or be under the application of the CRTC. What we are doing is modernizing the Broadcasting Act to ensure that service platforms like Netflix, Apple TV+, Crave and so forth are broadcasters under the broadcasting system.

That is why we have worked hand in hand with all senators and all parliamentarians. This bill has received hours and hours of scrutiny in both Houses. A lot of tough questions have been asked.

That is the way one produces good legislation.

• (1630)

Mr. Pat Kelly (Calgary Rocky Ridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to that response, he did not answer the previous question.

Why did they not include the amendment? It would have made it all clear, and there would have been much less for people to object to in this bill had they accepted that amendment.

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is an esteemed member who I have worked with in years past on the finance committee. I have a great deal of respect for that member.

I will say again that my understanding, from reading the bill and speaking to the various officials, is that user-generated content is not going to be impacted at all with regard to this bill.

The bill modernizes the Broadcasting Act. It brings platforms that we use often in our daily lives and innovation forward under the Broadcasting Act and ensures that Canadian content continues to be generated.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by thanking my hon. friend from Vaughan—Woodbridge for splitting his time. This is the first time in my life that I have been able to rise in this place and say to the hon. member for Abbotsford that I get to answer his rhetorical question: How could Margaret Atwood's words "creeping totalitarianism" be misconstrued?

I have been in constant contact over the last little while with one of Canada's most extraordinary authors, Margaret Atwood. She has directed me to what she would like me to say in the House to explain how her words are misconstrued.

Remarkable, is it not? This is Canada. One ends up admiring someone and reading their books. What an honour that they then become one's best friend.

I have to say that Ms. Margaret Atwood is not my best friend. However, Farley Mowat was. Through Farley, I got to be a good friend of Margaret Atwood. I have been writing to her for some time to say that she will not believe it, but she has now become the favourite author of leader of the official opposition. It is a caucus that really largely objects to the lessons taught to us through the dystopian novel *The Handmaid's Tale*. These lessons are that, given the chance, men in power will strip women of their rights, deny them the rights to control their reproductive health—

The Deputy Speaker: We have a point of order from the hon. member for Prince George—Peace River—Northern Rockies.

Mr. Bob Zimmer: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the member and her opinions, but I would challenge her to stick to the topic of the day.

The Deputy Speaker: On the same point of order, the hon. parliamentary secretary.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, I think the member for Saanich—Gulf Islands is just about to shut down an entire Conservative argument on this debate. What she is talking about is extremely relevant.

The Deputy Speaker: We are getting into more debate than we need to. Neither of those are really points of order.

Government Orders

The hon. member for Saanich—Gulf Islands.

Ms. Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, I agree that the hon. member for Prince George—Peace River—Northern Rockies must assume that I am about to give a rant about women's rights.

When Margaret Atwood's name is invoked so often with a novel that is entirely about women losing their rights in a dystopian future, where unbelievable things have happened like the U.S. Supreme Court overturning *Roe v. Wade* and women having to fight again for rights that were assured. That is not my theme. That just happens to be a deep irony in hearing *The Handmaid's Tale* invoked over and over again.

Let us get to Bill C-11. I have been talking via email with Margaret Atwood, who I am honoured to know. She does not wish to be associated with the idea that Bill C-11 is “creeping totalitarianism”. If shadowy figures were to be determining what we got to watch, that would be creeping totalitarianism.

I am just going to read what Margaret Atwood would like entered into this discussion. It is found on something called margarettatwood.substack.com. If someone wants to look for the article on a search engine, it is about featuring Canadian content without the benefit of algorithms.

It is called “Can CanCon or Can't It, Eh?” It was posted about Bill C-11 by Margaret Atwood. As she has pointed out to me a few times by email, there is no reference to “creeping totalitarianism” in this article. There are elements of what she wishes were clearer about Bill C-11. It is about the question of what is “content”, what is “creator” and what is “platform”.

To back up a bit, it is important to recognize that regulating Canadian content, whether it be *The Littlest Hobo*, *The Beachcombers* or whatever, was an important part of fending off the behemoth of U.S. Hollywood productions.

• (1635)

[Translation]

It is even more important for the culture of the incredible Québécois nation, which is so different from the anglophone Canadian culture. Quebec has a smaller audience which means that it faces an even greater threat from American culture and Hollywood.

[English]

We have had the benefit of Canadian content rules for many years. This takes them into protecting our creators from online streaming. I am going to quote Margaret Atwood because she has asked me to. She said the following:

Maybe the language used in the Bill is imprecise. “Content” is what goes inside the cheeseburger. “Creator” is who makes the cheeseburger. “Platform” is how the contents of the cheeseburger wend their way from the creator to consumer of the cheeseburger. Did the framers of Bill C-11 mean Creator or Platform, rather than Content?

And whose interests are to be served? Is all this in aid of “We need to hear our own stories?” That would be Content. But this doesn't seem to be exactly what is meant.

I think...that the idea is to enlarge the space available to the creative folk in Canada by helping them profit fairly from their endeavours, insofar as that is possible, and to encourage the availability of platforms via which they may serve up their cheeseburgers. Is that it?

If so, the Bill C-11 writers might think of changing the wording. Substitute “creators” and possibly “platform” for “content.” For instance: in music terms—requiring a percentage of CanCon from radio broadcasters jump-started the careers of a whole generation of Canadian musicians. But they didn't necessarily sing about Mounties and beavers. They sang about all sorts of things. CanCon in that context didn't mean subject matter. It meant who was doing the singing. Listeners were allowed to hear the music, and then could make up their own minds about whether they liked it or not.

That is what we are talking about here with Bill C-11. There is no world in which people who manipulate algorithms are censors. They promote content, but they do not exclude other content.

People can find the content they want, and the Internet, as many Conservative colleagues have called for, will forever be a magical space of unending opportunities. However, within that large amount of noise, in order to level the playing field, Canadians will be given a bit of a hint to find Canadian content and Canadian productions.

What is that playing field, and why does it need to be levelled? It is because Canadian writers, screenwriters, artists, actors and directors need to be able to make a living. In this debate, the economics of the cultural industry have been somewhat muddled. Yes, it is true that the industry is great for a local economy, and I have experienced this in Saanich—Gulf Islands in my hometown of Sidney.

My husband came home one day and said, “Honey, the town has lost its mind. It's only October, and they're putting up Christmas ornaments.” The next day there was fake snow. We realized there was a Hallmark Christmas film being produced on Beacon Avenue in Sidney. I was able to tell my husband that the mayor and council had not lost their minds but had struck a good business deal; that was a good thing.

That Hallmark film was using Canadian areas and space to produce something. It was good for the economy. However, my husband's daughter tells me all the time that with the U.S. productions made in Canada, the starring roles and the big money go to the U.S. actors; the Canadian actors work at what is called “at scale”. My husband's daughter is a brilliant actor named Janet Kidder, by the way, and she is in a lot of productions.

To promote Canadian artists, we need to be able to say to the big giants, whether Amazon, Disney or Hallmark, that when they come to Canada to make a film, they would find it advantageous to actually use Canadian stars. We have brilliant actors who have chosen to stay in Canada and not move to Hollywood, and they should be paid properly.

We also know that the screenwriters of Canada have had a rather catastrophic drop in the amount of work available to them as the online streaming giants have taken off. If one is a Canadian writer, one's chances of being a screenwriter have been reduced quite dramatically over the last number of years.

This data is kept by an organization to which I belong called the Writers' Union of Canada. In this place, in debate, I heard colleagues refer to the Writers' Union of Canada as if it were a trade union, so let us clear that up. There are no trade unions representing writers. Writers have two organizations: the Writers Guild of Canada and the Writers' Union of Canada. It is a voluntary association of published writers working together in kind of a little society. It could have been called a "society" or a "club".

It is not a union. There are no arts union bosses. Those are words I heard in this place, as if the arts union bosses are going to make money. No, they are not. There are writers in this country, and many of them are not the famous writers. They are not the Farley Mowats or Margaret Atwoods, and they struggle to make ends meet. Getting a book published or writing a screenplay in Canada is not a ticket to success. If one is lucky, it is a ticket to employment insurance at some point because one managed to put together enough to get some help between jobs.

Writers in this country struggle to make ends meet. They are not represented by union bosses. There are no arts union bosses. We need Bill C-11 to be passed for those creators.

• (1640)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate how the member put into proper context one of Canada's much-loved authors. It is important. The type of misinformation we are seeing on the legislation is causing a great deal of anxiety for many Canadians, where they feel they will lose their freedom to express themselves on the Internet or upload a simple post to Facebook. The Conservatives have been supporting that misinformation. Reflecting on the quote she read, can the member provide her thoughts on how it is unhealthy for society in general when there is that type of misinformation being talked about from elected officials?

Ms. Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, I am maybe not going to make the Liberal bench, from which the question emanated, as happy as it might have been. There are reasons that this legislation has critics, and that is a big problem. I would rather vote for this bill with the Senate amendment to refuse any regulation of user-generated content, which has now been rejected.

In fact, my colleague from Kitchener Centre brought forward a similar motion before committee because we could see where this was going to lead. User-generated content should not be included in this bill. The government's position is that it is not. The Conservatives' position is that it is. I would rather the government had accepted the Senate amendment to make that really clear and nail it down because it is that little inconsistency, shall we put it, that gives rise to the volume of what I regard as incorrect statements about the bill.

Mr. Bob Zimmer (Prince George—Peace River—Northern Rockies, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the member across the way referred

Government Orders

to this earlier when a member of the Liberal Party was talking about Bill C-11. She said that she still had a problem that user-generated content perhaps was not exempted as promised and that was the problem she had with the bill. Her Green Party colleague also said that he was concerned about this, that user-generated content was perhaps caught up in Bill C-11, and yet they said they are still going to support the bill despite their concerns.

It is not just Conservatives who are voicing their concerns about this issue. There are many issues going back to Bill C-10, when this was brought up by the current environment minister almost four years ago. This is an issue that Canadians are rightfully worried about. It would give possible control to the government to decide what CRTC can show or what it can prevent people from seeing on the Internet. Until that is laid to rest, we need to oppose the bill.

What would the member do with the concerns I have brought up?

• (1645)

Ms. Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, I respect my colleague enormously and I understand why he feels he will vote against the bill.

I am very much informed by constituents, particularly in Saanich—Gulf Islands but across the country. I am very much in touch with the artist community, with writers and actors. They are begging for this to be passed because they need protection against these digital giants, the streaming enterprises of Netflix and Amazon and Disney.

That said, I agree that there is no reason that I can see, other than stubbornness, for the government not to have accepted the sensible amendments from the Senate. I hope we will continue to stay on top of this issue. In the meantime, the artists of this country need the bill.

Ms. Lori Idlout (Nunavut, NDP): *Uqaqtittiji*, although I am not a Farley Mowat fan, I do want to say there are other great authors like Aviaq Johnston, Tanya Tagaq, Waubgeshig Rice, Thomas King and Drew Hayden Taylor. I think they are great authors as well.

However, I want to ask about the member's interpretation of the concerns continually being raised about algorithms and what this bill says about algorithms.

Ms. Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, I wish Farley had not passed away before I got a chance to introduce the member. I would have loved for him to meet my friend from Nunavut.

Government Orders

The concern about algorithms is a real one because algorithms are being used right now to do things on social media that are referred to as “rage farming”. This is a very murky and dangerous world, and I think we need to do much more to regulate it, but in this context I am not concerned about the government using algorithms to help Canadians find Canadian content if that is what they are looking for. That is the key thing. No one is going to stop any Canadian from watching anything they want to watch. The bill is not censorship; it is clumsy. I do not like the CRTC very much either. After all, it regulated and approved *Russia Today*.

Mr. Dean Allison (Niagara West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing my time with my colleague for Prince George—Peace River—Northern Rockies.

I rise today to speak on behalf of my constituents of Niagara West who have expressed deep concern with the Liberal government's online censorship bill, Bill C-11. My office has received hundreds of phone calls, emails and regular mail regarding the bill. I can confidently say that we have not received a single communication from any constituent in favour of Bill C-11, and that says a lot.

Bill C-11 would censor the Internet, but the Liberals do not seem to care. There seems to be this focus, almost an obsession actually, for the Liberals to attempt to gain more control over Canadians in every aspect of their lives.

Canadians want to live their lives without constant government intrusion. I do not understand why the Liberals cannot leave folks alone. Let folks live their lives freely. Let Canadians make their own decisions. Bill C-11 is just another attempt to gain more control, this time by censorship, and it needs to stop. We have seen what happened over the last three years with an incredibly intrusive government, and Canadians are fed up with it. My colleagues on this side of the House would likely agree. In fact, I think there are many Liberal and NDP MPs who have also heard from constituents expressing deep concern over the type of censorship that Bill C-11 would implement.

So what would Bill C-11 actually do? It is not what the Liberals would have people believe it would do. What would it actually do if it were to become law? It is simple: If the bill passed, it would take aim at Canadians' online feeds. One such affected feed could be a person's home page on YouTube where content could be prioritized based on goals set out by the CRTC, a federal bureaucracy. In other words, bureaucrats in Ottawa would determine what a person's YouTube home page would look like. Bureaucrats in Ottawa will decide what qualifies as a Canadian film, television program or song.

There is also uncertainty over how Bill C-11 would be interpreted. The uncertainty about how the bill would be implemented has been a concern from the first day that Bill C-10, the predecessor to Bill C-11, was introduced. There is also unease with the role of government officials in determining what counts as Canadian. Of course, there is the deep worry about the secrecy associated with the CRTC.

The CRTC will, of course, have an incredibly powerful role in approving and rejecting online content as to what is “Canadian”. If that is not an example of an intrusive and overreaching govern-

ment, I am not sure what is. Other social media feeds may also be affected, not just YouTube. The government-approved and pushed-for content is what we will likely see most. It is almost unbelievable what the Liberals are doing with the bill, but they are actually doing it.

I have served my constituents in this place since 2004. I can honestly say that I am deeply concerned about the direction in which this government has already taken our country. I have said it before and I will say it again: The Liberals have implemented a ballooning, intrusive and overreaching government. I am deeply concerned that they are not satisfied yet and will keep going.

On this side of the House, Conservatives, such as myself, believe in people. We believe in Canadians. We believe that individual Canadians are best positioned to make their own decisions for themselves and for their families. Our philosophy is that decisions should be made by the people, the commons, a bottom-up approach where the bosses are the people and we as politicians are their servants. It is not the politicians or the bureaucrats in Ottawa. The bosses are the people.

The Liberals do not see it that way. In fact, their approach is the exact opposite. Their philosophy is a top-down approach, a top-down decision-making approach, where Liberal politicians and bureaucrats tell people what to do and, in the case of Bill C-11, what to see or not to see on the Internet. Liberals think that politicians know best. They think that bureaucrats know best. That is the Liberal government and the Prime Minister's approach.

We have seen this style of governing for eight very long years now, which have divided our country more than ever. The divide-and-conquer approach has been the hallmark of the Prime Minister. Not many would debate that. Even their pals at CBC would agree with me on that one. With Bill C-11, things are continuing in the same direction.

At the end of my speech, the Liberals and the NDP collaborators may engage in veiled insults and some name-calling because of the stance I am taking: a small, limited government, which is part and parcel of Conservative philosophy.

However, let us set aside politicians' comments on Bill C-11 for just a minute and let us focus on what experts are saying about the bill. The reason I am saying this is that, as many of my colleagues have done and will continue to do, I want to introduce into the record the comments made by experts who deal with this issue day in and day out.

• (1650)

For example, Michael Geist, who I know has been mentioned in the House, is a law professor at the University of Ottawa, a Canada research chair in Internet and e-commerce law, and a graduate of Columbia Law School. He has received dozens of awards and recognition for his work. He has taught in some of the top schools in the world. Let us see what he has to say about Bill C-11. He has been a vocal opponent to the bill and has suggested various ways it can be improved, yet the Liberal government has ignored his suggestions.

In Professor Geist's words, "The government consistently rejected attempts to provide greater clarity with the bill and insisted that its forthcoming policy direction be kept secret until after the bill receives royal assent. If there is criticism to bear about Bill C-11's uncertainty, it should be directed in the direction of [the] Heritage Minister".

A recent article said, "professor Michael Geist said [in regard to Bill C-11] trust is waning in the CRTC because it acts like an arm of the government instead of acting like an independent regulator." The CRTC acting "like an arm of the government" is a strong statement by an expert who deals with this type of content every single day. If Professor Geist is saying that, then why are the Liberals not paying attention?

Furthermore, regarding the Minister of Canadian Heritage's rejection of some common-sense amendments, Mr. Geist said, "It is exceptionally discouraging to the thousands of Canadian creators who spoke out". Many digital creators are extremely concerned with the negative impact the bill would have on their work and have repeatedly voiced this in their committee testimony.

Here is an example of another expert. Scott Benzie, who is the director of Digital First Canada, which represents digital creators, stated, "It's shocking that the Senate's sober second thought was dismissed, and that the government continues to act as though digital creators are not legitimate artists and entrepreneurs." These are more strong words aimed at the government's seemingly disregarding attitude toward anyone who is providing testimony that is critical of Bill C-11.

Let us talk about Margaret Atwood and what she had to say. I know we have had a lot of conversation about her from our last speaker. Let us first mention that she is a renowned Canadian author, winner of the Booker Prize and the Giller Prize, and perhaps one of the best-known authors in Canadian history.

In regard to Bill C-11, she said, "bureaucrats should not be telling creators what to write." She also said that bureaucrats should not decide what is Canadian. Most importantly, and I really hope the Liberals are paying attention, she said, "All you have to do is read some biographies of writers writing in the Soviet Union and the degrees of censorship they had to go through—government bureaucrats. So it is creeping totalitarianism if governments are telling creators what to create." We have heard that statement quite a few times today, "creeping totalitarianism". Once again, these are pointed words.

Government Orders

The member of the Green Party from across the way quoted Ms. Atwood as saying the bill was "imprecise", so it sounds like Margaret Atwood would like to see some amendments as well.

Are the Liberals taking heed? No, they just ignored this and came back with poorly written talking points, delivered in a fiery manner to stifle and end the debate on their incredibly faulty legislation.

Through Bill C-11, the Liberal government is censoring the Internet and forcing content on Canadians. It is plain and simple. We know it. Their NDP collaborators know it and the Bloc definitely knows it. In fact, the Bloc members recently admitted that they do not care if this bill is stifling freedom of expression. I have an inkling that the NDP and the Liberals agree with the Bloc on this.

In conclusion, I would like to say something I have said numerous times in this House over the last three years, and I would like to direct it at the NDP-Liberal coalition: They should let folks live their lives and leave them alone, stop interfering and stop intruding. They should let Canadians live their lives freely without this egregious overreach that has been happening, especially since the pandemic began. That includes incredibly flawed legislation such as Bill C-11, the online censorship act.

I have observed over the last couple of days some very disturbing and worrying behaviour from individuals who have made some very personal comments. I have not seen much of it today. The debate has actually been much better today. However, I think we have to watch what our discourse of debate is in this House and really work hard not to make it personal.

I look forward to answering questions. Let us hope that this time we can keep things civil, unlike what members have been doing in the House.

• (1655)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, from hundreds of individuals and stakeholders, including different provincial governments, and I would cite the Province of Quebec and its legislature, there has been a groundswell of support to see this legislation pass.

It is important to recognize that the members of the Green Party can say what they want, but I understand they are voting in favour of passing the legislation. I understand the Bloc is voting in favour of passing the legislation, the NDP is voting in favour of passing the legislation, and obviously the Liberals are. The Conservative Party is standing alone in the House of Commons in opposition to it. It is the opposition party that continues to promote misinformation on this issue.

I will ask the member a very clear and concise question. Does he truly believe that this legislation would take away the freedom of Canadians to be able to upload their personal information on Facebook, for example?

Government Orders

Mr. Dean Allison: Mr. Speaker, I do believe that. It has been spoken about here, even by some of the other parties who said that there were some concerns about amendments that were actually rejected.

We had a number of great amendments, as has been discussed today throughout the course of the debate, from the Senate, which were clearly rejected. We have the admission from the Green Party member that the comment from Ms. Atwood was imprecise and, once again, legislation that probably was not as thorough.

We have to guard against unintended consequences in the House. When legislation comes forward, we need to find ways to make it better. Quite frankly, if the government had accepted more of those amendments, it would have made this legislation better.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Denis Garon (Mirabel, BQ): Mr. Speaker, by dismissing out of hand this legislative measure that the cultural community has been calling for for years, the Conservatives seem to be suggesting that all social media networks, which are not regulated enough, do a good job of promoting Quebec culture.

I know that, like the other Conservatives, my colleague claims to be a defender of Quebec culture, including on social media. I would like him to open up a little and tell us about two or three of his favourite francophone influencers from Quebec and their work.

[*English*]

Mr. Dean Allison: Mr. Speaker, at the end of the day, we support Quebec culture, absolutely, this party does.

We also believe that some of the larger techies need to be paying their fair share. There is no question about that. Our concern is that we do not want government bureaucrats deciding what the Canadian people can have access to and what they cannot.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie (Elmwood—Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I understand the member takes exception to the idea that Canadian content might feature a little more prominently in the news feeds of Canadians on social media platforms.

I wonder then, what does the member think about the current state of affairs, which is that social media companies, behind closed doors, without any transparency, concoct these algorithms and are deciding right now what Canadians see and what they do not see based on rules that have nothing to do with the public interest and that have absolutely no transparency at all.

Does the member object to the current practice of using algorithms to filter content, which is already happening? It is just happening with corporate interests behind closed doors.

• (1700)

Mr. Dean Allison: Mr. Speaker, we have said over here that there is absolutely no way that big tech is perfect, not by any stretch of the imagination. They have major issues, and there are things that they need to do as well.

What we are concerned about is what would be suppressed at this point in time, and that is the challenge right now. If individuals are creating content and are not able to put it out there because the

government has decided that it would not go forward or see the light of day, then we obviously have a very huge concern with that.

Mr. Pat Kelly (Calgary Rocky Ridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we know this bill has been an absolute disaster in how it was managed through the House.

It was introduced in the previous Parliament, and the Liberals called an election, so they were the ones who killed Bill C-10. It was brought back as Bill C-11. It did not include the critical exemption that critics from the Green Party, as well as other critics out there and Conservatives, pointed out was a real problem. It was just a dog's breakfast of amendments having to come back.

Now the Liberals have come in with closure today to stifle debate rather than further study the amendments, something the Government of Quebec would also want.

Why are the Liberals rushing this through and insisting that the opposition are delaying the bill, when there are so many known problems with the bill and when it so clearly needs more work?

Mr. Dean Allison: Mr. Speaker, I just want to go to what Senator Dave Richards had to say:

No decree by the CRTC could, in any way, tell us what Canadian content should or should not be, or who should be allowed to bob their heads up out of the new murkiness we have created. Like Orwell's proclamation, the very bill suggests a platform that decrees, "All animals are equal, but some animals are more equal than others."

That is one of the concerns, and why we should have had amendments to deal with these issues.

Mr. Bob Zimmer (Prince George—Peace River—Northern Rockies, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this is a very important day to debate Bill C-11. I have asked this question many times before, but I am going to ask it again in this way. Do people trust the Prime Minister to defend their freedom of speech?

That is the crux of our debate from our party to the parties across the way. Other concerns have been brought up by other parties. They are still going to support the bill, but that does not mean that there are not concerns around this and possible threats to user-generated content, which could possibly be implicated by this legislation. Again, it is not just us. There are many people across Canada who have read the bill, who have been brought to testify about their worries for its potential.

I always like to use facts. Let us get right into it. Bill C-11 used to be a bill called Bill C-10. I have an article in front of me from May 20, 2021. It all started with clause 4.1, which I will be referring to quite a bit. This is a little hiccup for the Liberals that has a lot of Canadians calling it the censorship bill. The article is called "What is Bill C-10 and why are the Liberals planning to regulate the internet?" It is from The Globe and Mail.

It reads:

The bill is currently being reviewed by the House of Commons heritage committee. Members of the committee were studying the document line-by-line, but that process was disrupted in late April when Liberals on the committee moved an amendment that removed a section of the bill.

That sounds very familiar, like a particular part of Bill C-21 where they just table-dropped or pulled amendments out of legislation. The article goes on:

The change was approved “on division,” meaning there was no recorded vote to show which opposition parties sided with the Liberals. This segment, section 4.1, provided an exclusion for user-generated content. Removing that exclusion set off concerns that the legislation could then be used to regulate Canadians’ social media posts.

That is what we have been talking about across the country for the last three years, worries about censorship and the government with this particular bill. Further, the article continues:

However, other critics draw a distinction between users, specified in 2.1, and 4.1’s exclusion for user-generated content, and so maintain that social media posts could still be subjected to the legislation.

On May 7, the Liberals introduced a new amendment that they said would put these questions to rest. The text of the new amendment is very similar to the text of section 4.1 that was originally removed, but was added to a different section of the bill that defines the regulatory powers of the CRTC. The government says this change ensures that the posters of user-generated content are not regulated.

That was back in the day when we were all supposed to be reassured that it was all going to be great. The problem is that section 4.1 has remained. The government could have easily dealt with concerns of the parties and put that to bed. I am going to directly read sections of the current legislation, Bill C-10, but the numbers are still the same.

This is clauses 4.1 and 4.2. on page 9 of the actual act so that Canadians out there watching can read it for themselves. Even lawyers get confused with some of this wording but I will give it a go,

4.1 (1) This Act does not apply in respect of a program that is uploaded to an online undertaking that provides a social media service by a user of the service for transmission over the Internet and reception by other users of the service.

(2) Despite subsection (1), this Act applies in respect of a program that is uploaded as described in that subsection if the program

- (a) is uploaded to the social media service by the provider of the service or the provider’s affiliate, or by the agent or mandatary of either of them; or
- (b) is prescribed by regulations made under section 4.2.

● (1705)

It opens the door to user-generated content, wide open, that it could possibly be regulated by the CRTC.

I will go on to 4.2. Again, this is the really difficult one to follow.

4.2 (1) For the purposes of paragraph 4.1(2)(b), the Commission may make regulations prescribing programs in respect of which this Act applies, in a manner that is consistent with freedom of expression.

Sounds great, except:

(2) In making regulations under subsection (1), the Commission shall consider the following matters:

- (a) the extent to which a program, uploaded to an online undertaking that provides a social media service, directly or indirectly generates revenues;

Despite the government’s reassurance that user-generated content is going to be exempted, the door is flung wide open again. How is the government ever going to regulate content that could produce revenue? It could be a share of a post, or whatever. Some other con-

Government Orders

tent provider could share a post that was previously not funded. It opens the door to user-generated content.

The implications are as vast as what we have been saying. It is not just us who have talked about these being significant issues. I will refer to testimony at the Senate hearing committees. Hon. Paula Simons referred to the concerns of the former CRTC head. It is not just a senator making a comment in a general way.

She said:

Several expert witnesses, including Monica Auer, Executive Director of the Forum for Research Policy in Communications; Robert Armstrong, a broadcasting consultant, economist and former CRTC manager; and Ian Scott, who was, at the time, head of the CRTC, testified before our committee about their concerns that subclause 7(7) of the bill could give new and unprecedented powers to cabinet to intervene in independent CRTC decisions. As Dr. Armstrong put it in his testimony before us:

In this sense, Bill C-11 reduces enormously — potentially — the powers that the CRTC has and hands them over to the Government of Canada.

That is not just some random person walking down the street. These are the former heads of the CRTC. To all the testimony, the Liberal government just says, “Hey, no biggie. Just ignore that expert testimony.” She continues:

But I think the biggest and most critical amendment we made was to a vexing part of the bill, subclause 4.2(2), which I like to call the “exception to the exception” clause. In the wake of some of the controversy around Bill C-10, the Minister of Canadian Heritage promised that Bill C-11 would not pertain to nor capture users of social media but only big streamers who were analogous to traditional broadcasters. Indeed, that is what clause 4.1 (1) of the bill says — that the act does not apply to a program that is uploaded to a social media service by a user of that service.

Unfortunately, clause 4.2 (2) of the bill, as it came to our committee, undid that assurance by giving the CRTC the power to scope in a program uploaded to a social media service if it directly or indirectly generates revenues. That exception-to-the-exception clause rightly worried all kinds of small and not-so-small independent producers who use services such as YouTube and TikTok to distribute their programming, though they retain the copyright.

I have a lot more here. I could put stacks here and read them for the record. I started off by asking whether we could trust the Prime Minister with our privacy and to protect our freedom of speech. I take that testimony from some pretty solid folks who were actually at the head of CRTC, and they said they were worried about the potential of this legislation.

We need to heed that advice. Canadians out there who are watching this, and many who are going to watch it online from some of our content that we generate, are concerned about where this is going, in a very bad direction.

I look forward to questions, but I think the answer is very clear: we cannot trust the Prime Minister to defend our freedom of speech.

Government Orders

• (1710)

Mrs. Élisabeth Brière (Sherbrooke, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there has been a drastic shift in Canada's broadcasting sector that has directly impacted the level of support for Canadian programming and talent. Does my colleague believe that continuing to treat online and traditional broadcasters differently is fair?

Mr. Bob Zimmer: Mr. Speaker, I think there are a lot of Canadians, and we have former artists on our side, who want to see Canadians who produce content do well. I produce content myself. A lot of us in the House produce content, and we want to make sure we can continue to do that.

I think it is fine if a person can produce content, freely send it out to the Internet and people can purchase it or watch it at their choosing. However, the problem is that, if a directive were to be given by the cabinet, there is the potential, as has been warned about by the former head of the CRTC, that it would say it does not want people to watch things that have a certain word in them or that are from a particular area in the country. That is the potential this has. We have seen examples around the world where this happens. Like I said, we cannot trust the Liberal cabinet and Prime Minister to defend our freedoms.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Denis Garon (Mirabel, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we know that the Government of Quebec called for Bill C-11. Quebec's cultural community called for Bill C-11 or its equivalent. It is true that the Government of Quebec asked to be consulted when Bill C-11 is applied in the Quebec context. Despite all that, the Conservatives continue to say that the bill violates freedom of expression based on the word of a single expert, Mr. Geist, who testified in this case but also on almost every other committee for the Conservatives. He is like a Renaissance man.

Are the Conservatives also telling us that the Government of Quebec is against freedom of expression when it wants to protect and promote Quebec's French-speaking culture?

• (1715)

[*English*]

Mr. Bob Zimmer: Mr. Speaker, I would just say that the Conservative Party, compared to the Bloc, is a party that is not willing to trade away our freedoms.

Mr. Mike Morrice (Kitchener Centre, GP): Mr. Speaker, I think it is important for Canadians at home to know that tonight's vote is not on Bill C-11. It is on the message from the House of Commons going to the Senate with respect to the amendments that the Senate sent here and whether we agree with the substance of that message. In particular, it also includes a message to disagree with the amendment from Senators Simons and Miville-Dechéne with respect to addressing user-generated content.

I wonder if the member for Prince George—Peace River—Northern Rockies would like to comment specifically on the motion we are debating this evening.

Mr. Bob Zimmer: Mr. Speaker, if the amendments would address the concerns around user-generated content, I think we would have a whole bunch of viewers listening over here. However, the bill is flawed. We have been talking about this bill for many years,

since Bill C-10. It is still flawed today, and frankly does not cut it for us on this side of the aisle.

Mrs. Laila Goodridge (Fort McMurray—Cold Lake, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the member can explain some of what he has heard from some of his constituents, who, I am sure, are very similar to those I have heard from in northern Alberta who are very concerned about what this is going to mean and about what they are going to be able to see and say on social media platforms.

Mr. Bob Zimmer: Mr. Speaker, that is a great question, and I thank the member for asking about what local folks and my neighbours are saying about this. I think a lot really support it, and we support freedom in this country.

We saw an example of overreach by the government not that long ago, just over a year ago, when bank accounts of some groups were shut down because people wanted to voice their freedoms, and so it leads to the next step. What if this government does not like a particular movement, a particular party or a particular message? Well, let us just make a call to the CRTC and say, "Hey, shut it down." That is what my residents are talking about and are very worried about. They have seen examples of it already, and I think those concerns are warranted.

Mr. Ryan Williams (Bay of Quinte, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in 1951, when Ray Bradbury was writing *Fahrenheit 451*, it was a time not unlike 2023. *Fahrenheit 451* presented an American society in the year 2049 where firemen were employed to burn outlawed books, along with the houses they were hidden in, because of a government deciding what people could see and what they could say.

Ray Bradbury described his book as depicting political correctness as an allegory for the censorship in the book. He called it the real enemy and labelled it as thought control and control over freedom of speech.

When the book was written, it was a time of massive social change and technological revolution. Hearings in the U.S. investigated Americans with alleged communist ties. Nuclear warfare was fresh. The golden age of radio occurred between the 1920s and the late 1950s and the television launched into living rooms in the 1950s, which changed how people consumed media and news.

Governments took actions to make sure the news and the artists they thought should be promoted in this technological shift would be promoted, and the ones they did not like would be censored.

The house un-American activities committee held hearings to investigate alleged communist ties. The Hollywood 10, a group of influential screenwriters, were blacklisted, and of course everyone remembers the Truman Doctrine and McCarthy hearings.

Government Orders

The government's interference in the affairs of artists and creative types infuriated Bradbury, who was bitter and concerned about government intervention, and he then wrote *Fahrenheit 451*. Fast forward to 2023, and we have absolute parallels with those government interventions in Bill C-11. Just like Margaret Atwood, Ray Bradbury would not be impressed with the government's looking to interfere in the affairs of artists and creators at a time of immense technological change.

We have the Internet, social media and AI. We use smart phones every day and we use tablets. It is an incredible time and certainly we all, in the House, want to see our Canadian artists and content creators be successful. In fact, we want to release the shackles and ensure all creators are immensely successful.

It is not done by government intervention; it is done by breaking down barriers so artists can succeed. There is no culture without freedom of expression, but do not take it from me. Take it from the creators themselves. We have heard all week how Margaret Atwood called this “creeping totalitarianism”.

A YouTuber and TikToker named Kallmekris has said, “I am scared...Bill C-11 was supposed to promote Canadian storytelling online. In reality, the bill has ended up so broadly worded that it lets the CRTC interfere with every part of your online life. That includes manipulating your feed and search results.” Another YouTuber, J.J. McCullough, says, “What Canadians want is what Canadian culture is, not what the government says it should be.” According to a Regina TikToker named Teshher, “C-11 would limit that reach by requiring creators to prioritize government criteria for domestic distribution over making content optimized for global audiences.”

• (1720)

[*Translation*]

Through this legislative measure, the government is preparing to give itself the power to control what Canadians can listen to or watch online. For example, instead of offering people more content based on their interests on platforms such as YouTube, the government would force those platforms to promote content that it deems to be a priority. It argues that the order of priority would be established according to the Canadian nature of the content.

[*English*]

For example, instead of giving a Canadian more of what they want on platforms such as YouTube, the government would choose what it wants Canadians to see. Let us be clear: Big tech would still monopolize algorithms and government would shut down the voices of individual Canadians.

What is worse is that it would open the door for other governments to do the same. We already know how strict buy America has been for Canadian manufacturing, and we fight it every day. What would happen if they emulated the strategy against Canadian creators by emulating a “buy or view America” against Bill C-11? If we control Canadian content, sooner or later they would control America content, shutting Canadian content creators out of America. It is cultural warfare.

Another glaring fact is that people have to want to watch it, not be forced to watch it.

Let us talk about innovation and competition as an alternative to this bill. The answer to seeing increased competition and innovation is to release the shackles of Canadian content creators, and I have an idea for creators. Let us see a Canadian Netflix competitor created that plays Canadian content. We would call it “Canuck-Flix”. Does that not sound good? Canuck-Flix would have the ability to showcase Canadian talent, showcase Canadian television and, of course, have creators put that content online. That is real competition.

There is a great show in my riding, airing right now on Bell's Fibe, called *Stoney Lonesome*. It is filmed entirely in Belleville. It stars some really great professionals in some great local backdrops. They are 10-minute episodes that are very funny, content-created and something they want to see outside and to compete with others. That is a great example of great Canadian content, and we should be promoting it.

Tomorrow is a very special day, my eldest son Jack's 10th birthday. I look forward to his future, and all of us as parents, aunts, uncles and grandparents wish all our children, Canada's children, equality of opportunity for success in whatever each of them wants to achieve and do in this country, whether that be in sports or as researchers, volunteers or, dare I say, politicians, to be whatever they want to be. The government's role is not to tell them what to be; it is to assist in breaking down any barrier that does not allow them to be what they want to be, and this bill would not do that.

Today's creators do not function according to the same rules as previous generations did. Today's creators exist in a new space and have new ideas, freedoms and choice. Choice is a fundamental right of Canadians and an absolute necessity for competition. Competition allows Canadians to make their own choices so they themselves can choose which content goes viral and which does not. It allows Canadians to succeed or to fail, but it allows Canadians to allow the free market to dictate what success is like and what it is not.

I share the desire of the member for Lethbridge, who has been an incredible advocate for this cause and for which she deserves a round of applause, for Canadians to know that this bill would impact them in two areas. It would censor what they see and it would censor what they say. With regard to what they see, if a Canadian government determines what gets promoted and what gets demoted, it means it is censoring what Canadians can see.

Private Members' Business

Furthermore, this bill would censor what an individual can say or post online. Creative talent here in Canada would no longer succeed based on merit, as it does now. Instead, content would be subject to a list of criteria that the government has not released yet. Let us make that clear. We would have a list of criteria by which the government would determine just what Canadian content is, and yet we have not seen it. As parliamentarians, we have no idea of the content of that list or how it would determine what is Canadian or not. Therefore, it would be left up to interpretation or, as I like to say, to the greatest line I have ever heard, "I'm from the government and I'm here to help."

Through that, the government directed that those criteria have to be weighed and measured to see if they are met by the artists. If they are, they would be deemed Canadian. How do we fancy that? If they are not, they would not be discoverable, and those that are not discoverable would be bumped down the list of search engines, on YouTube, on TikTok, on Instagram, or whatever. That is censorship, not only what viewers can see but also, for creators, what we can say.

The bill is a travesty of Canadian freedoms that needs to be replaced. Here are the alternatives: a bill that updates the Broadcasting Act, that promotes all Canadian artists and creators without censorship, what one sees and says; the promotion and development of our arts and culture in Canada, celebrating great artists, great content and the arts, which we know all do well and are incredible; and a new tax code that taxes big tech. Conservatives agree with that.

Some have said this bill is all about only taxing big tech. It is a little part of this bill. A larger part of the bill is what people can say and what they can see, but we need to also have a separate bill. If that were the case, why was this bill not separated into a tax bill that just did that? We are all about doing things we say we are going to do. If this were about Canadian creators creating more content, this would be under creative arts funding and entrepreneurship. There are a lot of great things.

I am going to leave everyone with a quote before I end. It is a great quote by Diefenbaker, because it really summarizes what we believe on the Conservative side and what we believe for Canadians. He said, "I am Canadian, a free Canadian, free to speak without fear, free to worship God in my own way, free to stand for what I think right, free to oppose what I believe wrong, free to choose those who govern my country. This heritage of freedom I pledge to uphold for myself and all mankind."

● (1725)

Another great saying that is attributed to Voltaire is, "I may not agree with what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it."

Fahrenheit 451 ends with the symbolism of the legendary phoenix. It is an endless cycle of long life, death in flames, rebirth and the symbolism that the phoenix must have some relationship to mankind, which constantly repeats its mistakes, but men and women have something the phoenix does not. Mankind can remember its mistakes and try to never repeat them.

Let us repeal this bill, let us come back and get it right and let us make sure we respect the fundamental right of freedom of Canadians.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, whether it was the minister or one of the many other members, it has very clearly been said that what the bill would not do is, "impose regulations on the content [of] everyday Canadians post on social media." It "does not limit [Canadians'] freedom of expression in any way, shape or form." Why does the Conservative Party continue to give false information and plant anxiety in many individuals, and use that anxiety, when it knows it is not true?

Mr. Ryan Williams: Madam Speaker, the bill specifically states there would be criteria determined by the government that would determine what is Canadian and what is not. That very definition is what we can see and what we can say, and that is censorship. On this side of the House, we are against that.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

● (1730)

[English]

INTERNATIONAL MOTHER LANGUAGE DAY ACT

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill S-214, An Act to establish International Mother Language Day, as reported (without amendment) from the committee.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): There being no motions at report stage, the House will now proceed, without debate, to the putting of the question on the motion to concur in the bill at report stage.

Mr. Ken Hardie (Fleetwood—Port Kells, Lib.) moved that the bill be concurred in.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): If a member of a recognized party present in the House wishes that the motion be carried or carried on division or wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

The hon. member for Fleetwood—Port Kells.

Mr. Ken Hardie: Madam Speaker, I request the motion be adopted on division.

(Motion agreed to)

Mr. Ken Hardie: moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

He said: Madam Speaker, I want to recognize three people who have worked on this for a long time. Certainly, our colleague from Surrey—Newton started a long time ago to try to get something like this in place. My friend, colleague and next-door neighbour from Cloverdale—Langley City also worked on this. We cannot ever forget the work of Senator Mobina Jaffer, from the other place, who kept the flame alive until today.

If Bill S-214 is new to colleagues, its purpose is to establish February 21 as international mother language day. This is not a piece of legislation reflecting a big headline, a big opportunity or a big issue that needs resolving, and it is not a national holiday. In fact, it is a lot more important than that. It is a foundational issue. It is a true Canadian values proposition, one that involves respect, one that involves community building and one that involves understanding and connectivity, rather than isolation.

It is really intended to honour, preserve and protect the languages that make Canada what it is. There is English of course and our beautiful French language of course. However, there are indigenous languages, too, many of which are in danger of going extinct, which is why, by the way, we have a National Indigenous Languages Day, and we will observe it tomorrow.

Language diversity is defined in Canada. A recent census shows some very interesting trends. The first language is neither French nor English for 25% of household in our country. Tagalog is the most common non-official language in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and in the Yukon. There is major growth in Spanish, Mandarin and Punjabi. Especially at home in Fleetwood—Port Kells, Punjabi is almost the dominant language and I wish I spoke it. However, I rely on my friends from Surrey—Newton and Surrey Centre to carry the ball for us on that.

When we talk about language, we have to enjoy the terms that we hear and the cadence.

Listening to somebody from Newfoundland or Cape Breton speak, they will say things like “stay where you to and I’ll come where you’re at”, or “Jesus Murphy”. I never knew what a “two-four” was until I lived in Fort Frances, Ontario and Brandon, Manitoba. It is an illustration of the character of the people. A Bluenoser, a Bogtrotter or a Capser mean something in Canada. Even in English, sometimes, people need translations. In these parts, of course, it is a beaver tail and out west it is a jambuster. In British Columbia, if one says “skookum”, people know exactly what one is talking about. If one says “Ditchmond”, they also know where one is talking about.

The cadence and the tone shine through the music, the poetry and I would include the food as part of a broader language that reaches out to all. In fact, had I been the one in the Senate, like Senator Jaffer, promoting this bill, there may have been butter chicken stains on the paperwork that finally made it to the House of Commons.

Observing international mother languages day is not up there with the current headlines that this place generates, but the spirit and sentiment it represents is a fundamental and essential element of what Canada is and what we represent, something entrusted to all of us here and in the other place.

Private Members' Business

• (1735)

[*Translation*]

Mr. René Villemure (Trois-Rivières, BQ): Madam Speaker,

[*Member spoke in English, Spanish, Russian, Chinese, Arabic and Turkish*]

[*Translation*]

There are roughly 7,000 languages in the world. There is Aba, French, Bikol, Chabacano, Mandarin, Spanish, Artsi which is spoken by just a few thousand people, Kamchadal and Puelche. These are all languages that are for someone, somewhere, a mother language.

A language is a system of expression common to a group. Obviously, when we add mother to it we are talking about the idea of transmission, the idea of community, the idea of being together and living together. The study of language falls under linguistics, but is also a philosophy that I quite like and that I had the good fortune of studying for many years: the philosophy of language.

We study language to extract ideas. My colleagues surely know, as I do, Bertrand Russell and Ludwig Wittgenstein, an Austrian author I am fond of. Like all my colleagues, we ask questions when we study philosophy.

For example, we might ask about the origin of language. That is not an absurd question. It requires a lot of thought on our part. What is the relationship between language and reality? That is another question. I am sure that is all my colleagues talk about at parties. What is the relationship between language and thought? What is the relationship between language and knowledge? What is the relationship between language and other forms of expression? What is communication? Does the multiplicity of languages lead to the multiplicity of ways of thinking? Why is there not just one language?

We have all heard about Babel. The Bible provides an explanation. It seems that in certain climates, under certain circumstances, people were made to speak in different languages and then, suddenly, to understand one another.

The mother language is the first language learned, the one that guides us, allows us to learn, to understand and, sometimes, to lose ourselves in the moment. We have to be careful, because these days there is often a very strong temptation to speak English. I am not talking about Shakespeare's English, but rather what I call airport English. This form of the English language tends to reduce us to a certain kind of single-mindedness. As Orwell said, the fewer the words, the smaller the temptation to take thought. People who speak only one language must be able to transcend perfect conformity. However, globalization has resulted in a kind of single-mindedness, of conformity, which, in a way, prevents a mother language from fully flourishing. Single-mindedness means the death of literature, the death of poetry and, I am sure my colleagues will agree, the death of artistic sensibility. Please hold the applause.

Private Members' Business

I want to come back to Wittgenstein, who said that what we cannot speak about we must pass over in silence. It would be so interesting to apply that maxim here, but I will not draw any conclusions. Aristotle, meanwhile, said that the human being is the only animal with the gift of speech, and to speak is to communicate.

I want to come back to the topic of mother languages and say that a person's mother tongue allows them to evolve from silence to existence. The mother tongue allows us to understand, to learn, to surprise and even to be surprised. It is the first language a child learns, and I believe that everyone has a right to that. That is why, of course, the Bloc Québécois will support the idea of creating an international mother language day.

In conclusion, I believe my colleagues have all understood the essence of my remarks. As my friend reminded me, Aristotle said that the human being is the only animal endowed with language. Language is what allows humans, but not animals, to convey judgments and values. In fact, it is paramount for the organization of a community. Because we are animals with language, humans are political animals, which allows us to assert, propose and promote our ideas.

• (1740)

[*English*]

Ms. Niki Ashton (Churchill—Keewatinook Aski, NDP): Madam Speaker, I am proud to rise in the House on behalf of the NDP in support of Bill S-214, a bill that proposes to recognize international mother language day, that recognizes the value of linguistic and cultural diversity in our country.

This is a bill that is important, because of the value statement it makes clear, that we, here in Canada, are proud of our mother tongues, of our linguistic and cultural diversity. I am proud to be a Canadian, the daughter of immigrants, whose first language is not one of our official languages, but my own language, Greek.

[*Member spoke in Greek*]

[*English*]

I am proud to have the opportunity to be able to speak my language, Greek with my two children who are now five years old. I am proud that they are able to claim Greek as their own mother tongue.

Our mother tongues are who we are. They are our roots. They are our stories. They are our strengths. They are our future.

Today, it is important to reinforce that we cannot just recognize, we need to actively support the survival and strengthening of our mother tongues. We must do that with concrete actions. Perhaps the most important thing that we could do is support indigenous languages here in Canada.

While there are more than 70 indigenous languages spoken in Canada, many of them are endangered, as the majority of them maintain fewer than 1,000 fluent speakers. I want to acknowledge the work of my colleague, the member of Parliament for Nunavut, who often communicates in Inuktitut and is clear on the responsibility that Parliament has to interpret and communicate in Inuktitut and other indigenous languages.

We must be clear that this situation, in which so many indigenous languages are endangered, did not just happen. It is the result of genocide, of colonialism, of the residential school system, of the sixties scoop, of the foster care crisis. In saying that, we have the power to reverse that damage that has been done. That means action through funding, investment and legislation.

Canada must step up to work with indigenous communities in supporting their education and the revival, for many communities, of their indigenous language as a mother tongue.

I am proud of the work that is done in my home community of Thompson on Treaty 5 territory to bring back Cree in the Cree immersion system at Wapanohk Community School. We need to see much more being done across the country.

• (1745)

[*Translation*]

I also want to acknowledge that there is a lot of work to be done to protect French and stop its decline in our country. That is why I am proud of the work we are doing in the NDP to improve Bill C-13. The Official Languages Act is a law that needs to be modernized to stop the decline of French in the country, including in Quebec.

We need to acknowledge that the survival of the French language is key to the future of our country. We need to support it with meaningful measures, immigration measures and protection measures, such as the inclusion of linguistic clauses in our agreements. Of course, the federal government needs to have a lot more power to support French in the country.

[*English*]

I want to recognize that many of us grew up, certainly my generation grew up, proud to be part of a multicultural country, but we need to recognize and strengthen those cultures. We need to make sure that Canadian education systems and Canadian society is supporting the education of the multitude of languages of communities that come here.

We heard about Tagalog, Punjabi, Mandarin and so many languages that are spoken by so many Canadians. We need to make sure that the children of these immigrants, if their parents or if they want, have the opportunity to learn their language, through their schools, in after-school programs, on the weekends.

I am proud to have been a Greek school teacher in Winnipeg, Manitoba while I was attending university. This work is done heroically by many ethnic communities across our country to teach the next generation the language of their parents and grandparents; their language. However, that work requires resources and support, and the Government of Canada needs to be part of the solution.

So, yes, today let us recognize the importance of mother tongues. Let us recognize the strength that this recognition gives to our country. More importantly, let us act through funding, investment and support, so we can all continue to speak the languages that belong to us.

[*Member spoke in Greek*]

Government Orders

[English]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The hon. member for Fleetwood—Port Kells has five minutes for his right of reply.

Mr. Ken Hardie (Fleetwood—Port Kells, Lib.): Madam Speaker, in recognizing the effort that it took to get the international mother language day to this point, I do have to recognize the tireless efforts of our consul general from Bangladesh, because Bangladesh is where this all started. They saw something important and have been working tirelessly across all nations to bring this to where we are today.

I mentioned the food, poetry and music, but there is also the issue of humour. I will divert for a second here, because years ago, I got to attend a lecture by Marshall McLuhan who said that one could tell an awful lot about society by its language and its humour. He told a story from the Soviet Union, and this is back in the early 1960s.

The Soviet Union said it was going to lighten up a little bit and was going to build a nightclub, and it did. It opened with great fanfare, but eight months later it was shuttered, and so there was a Russian equivalent of a royal commission to find out what happened. Members of the commission asked the people questions:

What about the decor, was it okay? They said that they had copied great designs from Paris, Rome and Berlin.

What about the food or the booze? It was perfect, and things people could not get in Russia they could get at their nightclub.

What about the chorus line? It was perfect, every one a good party member since 1917.

That was a big joke in Russia back in those days, but it told a little bit about the ethos that we had at that time.

The ethos here I think was most appropriately set by our late friend and superb parliamentarian, Jim Carr, from his final speech in the House of Commons. He said, “I love this country, every square metre of it, in English, in French, in indigenous languages and in the languages of the newly arrived.”

I would like to repurpose Jim's following remarks, because his remarks were intended to pre-empt the notion that his private member's bill on greening the Prairie economy somehow encroached on provincial jurisdiction. Jim said that rather than a federal intrusion, it added leaves to the table, one that we set to build a better Canada. That, too, is the outcome of celebrating international mother language day across Canada each February 21. We are not constraining, diluting, confusing or imposing. We are adding leaves to Canada's cultural table. The feast we enjoy by doing so will be satisfying in every way.

• (1750)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The question is on the motion.

[Translation]

If a member of a recognized party present in the House wishes that the motion be carried or carried on division or wishes to re-

quest a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

[English]

Mr. Ken Hardie: Madam Speaker, I request that it be passed on division.

(Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I am rising on a point of order. I suspect if you were to canvass the House, you would find unanimous consent at this time to call it 6:30 so we can begin the debate again on Bill C-11 in Government Orders.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

ONLINE STREAMING ACT

The House resumed consideration of Motion No. 2 in relation to the amendments made by the Senate to Bill C-11, An Act to amend the Broadcasting Act and to make related and consequential amendments to other Acts, and of the amendment.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Madam Speaker, “War Is Peace, Freedom Is Slavery, Ignorance Is Strength”. Those are the words that repeat again and again throughout Orwell's legendary *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. The book is not just about massive government control by Big Brother over the citizenry. It is also about how such control is enabled by the abuse of language.

We can always smell a rat when words are used to mean something other than what they say, and this bill is filled with such false words. Let us start with the very premise. The government purports to apply the Internet to the Broadcasting Act or to apply the Broadcasting Act to the Internet, even though the Internet is not a broadcast instrument. Television and radio are broadcast instruments; online streaming is not. This might seem to be merely a matter of words, but then we go through the semantics and we catch other nice little white lies.

Government Orders

For example, the Liberals use the term “Canadian content” in their talking points and their press releases. Supposedly, the entire *raison d’être* of this bill, its reason for existing, is to promote Canadian content. Which two words appear nowhere in the 50-page bill itself? It is the words Canadian content. Not only is such content not defined, and it is impossible to define it, but it does not exist in the entire bill. Therefore, we have entire apparatus of bureaucracy that would have tentacles across the entire World Wide Web within Canadian borders tasked to do something that the bill says does not even exist. Why is this important? It is important because if the bureaucracy in question has its powers circumscribed to defining and promoting Canadian content, but there is no limit on what Canadian content actually means, then we give that agency limitless powers to control what people see and hear online.

What is Canadian content? Is it posts about maple syrup, beaver tails, hockey and maybe lacrosse? No, that is not in the act. Is it music made by Canadian musicians? No, it is not necessarily; in fact, many Canadian musicians are no longer considered Canadian because their record labels have been sold to foreign entertainment companies. Is it books that are written by Canadians? No, that is not the definition either. We have absolutely no idea what it is. In fact, we can be very sure what it is not.

Here is an example, and this will send my opposition, because they will be in the opposition soon, friends across the way into a fit of rage. Obviously, the Canadian commentator who is most widely viewed and listened to around the world today is, of course, Dr. Jordan Peterson. That is just a numerical fact when we look at the view counts that he has garnered. I see the rage across the way among those who think he is anything but Canadian. Sure, he was born in rural Alberta. Sure, he was a professor at the University of Toronto before he was censored there. However, he surely cannot be Canadian: He does not use the right pronouns, he does not mouth the right talking points and he does not meet the current government’s view of Canadiana. This Prime Minister has described people who disagree with him as un-Canadian. Surely, the bureaucracy that he appoints would have to agree.

If the association of psychologists, which gives out licences to practise in Ontario, does not believe that his views permit him to continue to practise in his field and if a university is effectively banning him from teaching his classes, what would stop yet another powerful bureaucracy from saying that this man is not Canadian enough to be considered Canadian content and therefore should not be found online by Canadian users? The answer, of course, is that nothing would stop that from happening when they give the power to the state to control what people see and say online.

The government members across the way would say not to worry; that the bill does not apply to user-generated content, once again with the fancy, confusing words.

• (1755)

To use real language, “user-generated content” is “stuff people post online”. The Liberals say the legislation would not apply to that, unless it does. Let me read the section of the bill: “specify that the Act does not apply in respect of programs uploaded to an online undertaking that provides a social media service by a user of the

service, unless the programs are prescribed by regulation”. We have to make sure to read the fine print.

Later on, the bill would specifically exempt user-generated content. This is the stuff that everyday Canadians post every day. The Liberals say the bill would not apply to any of that, unless it is posted on a platform that uses it for revenue generation. Are Twitter, Facebook and Instagram in the charity business, or do they generate revenue off of the posts that go online?

Do members know about that thing called “advertising”? That is revenue. Literally every single post that every Canadian puts online is used to generate revenue for an online platform. Therefore, everything that is posted online is captured by the essence of the bill. These are more weasel words. If they were going to regulate everything everybody posted online, and they believed they were justified in doing so, why would they create an exemption that does not apply to a single, solitary post? Of course, it once again is a use of Newspeak, putting in words that say exactly the opposite of what they mean.

I want to quote Michael Geist, who is no Conservative. He is a former critic of mine, actually, and not traditionally a friend of people on this side of the chamber. He said:

To be clear, the risk with these rules is not that the government will restrict the ability for Canadians to speak, but rather that the bill could impact their ability to be heard. In other words, the CRTC will not be positioned to stop Canadians from posting content, but will have the power to establish regulations that could prioritize or de-prioritize certain content, mandate warning labels, or establish other conditions with the presentation of the content (including algorithmic outcomes). The government has insisted that isn’t the goal of the bill. If so, the solution is obvious. No other country in the world seeks to regulate user content in this way and it should be removed from the bill because it does not belong in the Broadcasting Act.

If the Liberals did not intend to deprioritize, silence and push down the voices of some, why would they even include these provisions in the bill in the first place? The answer is that they want to regulate what can be heard and seen. They want to create the false perception that people can speak merely because they can post things online, but frankly there is no reason to post something if no one is allowed to see it. It would be like screaming into an empty forest.

Furthermore, the fact that the government would give the power to a state regulator to alter the algorithms of the Internet is, frankly, terrifying. Who are the shady operators in the back room who would be manipulating the algorithms that bring our newsfeeds and social media posts onto our screens? What are their motives? What is their direction? None of these things are defined anywhere in the bill or by the testimony of the head of the government agency that would be charged with implementing them.

Government Orders

In a world where we are already overly controlled by technology, they would alter algorithms. We can think of the devastating power of artificial intelligence. We know it because there is plenty of artificial intelligence on that side. In reality, the ability of a government bureaucracy to alter those algorithmic powers is indeed an enormous and unforgiving power.

I will quote Orwell: “This process of continuous alteration was applied not only to newspapers, but to books, periodicals, pamphlets, posters, leaflets, films, sound-tracks, cartoons, photographs—to every kind of literature or documentation which might conceivably hold any political or ideological significance.” That is exactly what we are talking about here because algorithms determine everything that appears on our devices.

● (1800)

It is mathematical programming that puts those things in front of our eyeballs. Right now, that programming is determined by a raw human emotion: greed. There is no doubt about it. The social media platforms want to make money. How do they do it? They give people stuff they want to see. One might take issue with the fact that they want to make money off that, but that is just the reality. The outcome is that we see what we want.

The economic motivation for the bill is also greed. It is the greed of the broadcasting corporations that want to dominate eyeballs, but instead of dominating them by producing things people want to see, they would dominate them by having more power over the regulator that determines what people get. That is also motivated by greed. Both of these profit motives are going to exist, one in the free world where people choose for themselves and another in the coercive world where bureaucrats choose for them.

However, do not ascribe any angelic motives to the bill. It is nothing more than a dirty alliance between big government and big corporations. Big government wants to control the citizenry, and big broadcasting and entertainment corporations want to control the advertising revenue. That is precisely why Bell, Rogers and all the other broadcasting corporations have come pleading for the bill to be put forward and advanced on their behalf, not on behalf of everyday people.

Here is the decision: Do we want the content on our phones and screens to be determined by the click or by the clique? The bill proposes to have it done by the clique. All the brilliant artists whose parents are not rich enough to have agents that will promote them with news and entertainment bodies and corporations will be shut out. It will be the rich kids, whose parents dream of them being famous, who will be able to go to these entertainment companies and have the ability over the years to get record labels set up. Those rich kids always had a head start; those shut out will be the poor kids who learned how to play the piano in their basements and would otherwise have posted it online and had it go viral. They will not have the political influence in Ottawa, in the CRTC, to get themselves on the big screen. This is once again protecting the privileged behind a wall of gatekeepers.

On this side of the House, we believe in a meritocracy, not an aristocracy. We believe everybody should get ahead by their own merits, and we believe that Canadians are intelligent enough to decide for themselves.

Let me address one other issue about social media platforms. The government claims it wants to crack down on them because they are making too much money. The bill would not affect their profit or their bottom line by one penny. It proposes to keep all the content we see on those same social media platforms. Our broadcasters do not compete with social media platforms; they compete with other Canadians who are fighting for share of voice and share of eyeball.

What the bill would actually do is simply take money and opportunity away from the individual citizen to have his or her voice heard in entertainment, news, discourse and everywhere else and concentrate it once again in the hands of the politically powerful, the well-connected and those who can find favour with the government. On this side of the House of Commons, we exist to decentralize power, to disperse it among the many instead of concentrating it in the hands of the few.

That is why we rise today with such alarm that the Prime Minister would censor debate on a censorship bill. I do not know if, in the century and a half of this august chamber, it has ever happened that a government has done so. It is an appalling precedent and one that should concern every freethinking Canadian citizen.

We inherit our rights not from the state, not from a powerful government bureaucracy, but as a gift from God. Freedom is written on every human heart. We all have the ability to express ourselves culturally, politically and in every other way, not because the Prime Minister has bestowed us with that right but because we are born with it. Conservatives would make sure people have that right.

● (1805)

The bill is designed to take away that right and concentrate it in the hands of the few. Members should not take my word for it but listen to Margaret Atwood. Again, she is no friend of Conservatives, but she said: “All you have to do is read some biographies of writers writing in the Soviet Union and the degrees of censorship they had to go through—government bureaucrats.... So it is creeping totalitarianism if governments are telling creators what to create.”

Those are her words. She said “creeping totalitarianism”. If anyone else in Canada had used those terms, they would have been called an alarmist. She is part of the literary establishment in this country, possibly among the most well known. She is someone with whom I agree on almost nothing because our views are not at all aligned. However, she understands one thing and that is that the power of words can only exist in concert with the freedom to express those words.

Government Orders

I am sure that she would vigorously debate most of the things that I say on the floor of the House of Commons, but that is only possible if there is freedom to debate. Disagreement is the lifeblood of democracy. It is the worst system of government, except for all the others, as the great Winston Churchill said. It is messy, frustrating and arduous.

Every day and every way, it would be much easier to have, as the Prime Minister has suggested, a basic Chinese Communist dictatorship where a powerful hand can decide something on a whim. That was the reason he admired it. He said they decide on the spot what to do and impose their decisions without any debate. That would be a lot easier in the short run.

Often, we are told there is too much partisanship and disagreement in Canada. There are places in the world with no partisanship and no disagreement, and they are terrible places to live. I would rather live in a place where we are allowed to disagree and speak out. That is who we are as Canadians.

The question is: Who decides? Do we allow a small group of privileged insiders close to the Prime Minister decide what we think, say and believe, or do we believe that every single Canadian is endowed by God with the ability to decide for themselves?

I believe every Canadian has that ability. That is why we will stand up every day, in every way, for the section 2(b) rights of freedom of expression. That is who we are and what we believe. It is the common sense of the common people united for the people's home, my home and our home; Canada, let us bring it home.

• (1810)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I would like to talk about misinformation. The industry has seen the value of the bill from every region of the country and wants to see the legislation pass through; the only political entity that is not going to be voting in favour of the legislation itself is the leader of the Conservative Party and his caucus.

There is a lot of misinformation out there. Let me give an example. Earlier today, I posed a question to one of his members, asking if they really believe that the government is trying to prevent people from being able to upload a video on Facebook. I used the example of a cat video. The member said yes.

The amount of rhetoric we get coming from the Conservative benches is spreading false information, when we know that the legislation does not limit freedom of expression or freedom to be able to upload to Facebook in any way whatsoever. However, the Conservative Party continues to spread misinformation.

Does the leader of the Conservative Party believe that the government, the Bloc, the NDP and the Green Party are trying to prevent individuals from uploading cat videos on Facebook?

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: Madam Speaker, do I believe that the government wants to limit people in putting cat videos online? Of course I do not.

However, his question is very telling. I would first say that it is designed, like everything the government says, to make the people feel small and tell them that they are really only concerned about

cat videos. The people of Canada are smarter than that; they are not idiots.

The people of Canada post poetry, music and beautiful stories online. They share their most beautiful moments. To distill all that down to cat videos is, once again, an insult by a Liberal snob on the common people. It is to suggest that they are interested only in frivolous and stupid things that need to be filtered out by a class of much more elite people.

We believe in the common sense of the common people. We believe they have the judgment to choose what they should post, read and do online.

[*Translation*]

Mr. René Villemure (Trois-Rivières, BQ): Madam Speaker, I really like debating in the House, and I am pleased to know that the Leader of the Opposition and I share a love of Orwell.

Orwell said, and I quote, “In a time of universal deceit, telling the truth is a revolutionary act.”

We know how Orwell defined freedom of expression, but how does my colleague from Carleton define it?

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: Madam Speaker, I define freedom of expression as every person being able to decide what to say, and when and how to say it.

[*English*]

Mr. Daniel Blaikie (Elmwood—Transcona, NDP): Madam Speaker, earlier tonight, I heard another Conservative MP talk about *Fahrenheit 451*, and I thought maybe he was about to start talking about when the Harper government closed a number of libraries that were world renowned for fisheries and oceans. It actually burned a bunch of books and other material at that time. That was not what the member chose to talk about, but it was an example of how governments do indeed have agendas.

It is important to defend the freedom of people against the tyranny of governments. However, it is equally important to defend people against the tyranny of wealthy private interests, which is a continuous blind spot of the leader of the Conservatives. When he talks about inflation, people would think it is only government spending that drove inflation. He cites the Governor of the Bank of Canada. The Governor of the Bank of Canada has also said, at the finance committee, that companies are raising prices well above the increase in their input costs.

Government Orders

The Conservative leader talks about government putting more Canadian content in the algorithms that show Canadians what they see in their newsfeeds or streams, but the fact of the matter is that right now those same social media platforms, without any supervision and transparency, also make decisions about what people see. He says that we should trust in the greed of corporations to create an online meritocracy.

Let us get real. Does he think social media platforms are not showing people more disinformation about Bill C-11 right now, because it is in their interest that—

• (1815)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: Madam Speaker, we caught him. Just at the end there, the truth jumped out of his lips. He said the problem is that disinformation, like the opinions expressed here today, would not be allowed if Bill C-11 were passed, which is an admission that the NDP believes government should be able to decide what is true and what is false and censor out what it does not like. That is exactly what we suspected from the beginning.

What happens when the government is a liar? The government said the Prime Minister did not interfere in the prosecution of SNC-Lavalin. That turned out to be false. It said the budget would be balanced in 2019. That turned out to be false too. Do I have to go down the long list of falsehoods stated by the government?

Now we are supposed to trust this same government to censor out what is true. I guess government members believe there should be a ministry of truth populated with people who agree with them. The only way to distill the truth is through the hot cauldron of debate, not through the clamping down of censorship. That is why we believe in allowing people to make their own decisions. Government members may think they are the watchmen, but the question is, who watches the watchmen? The only ones who can do that are the citizens.

Mr. Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon, CPC): Madam Speaker, as the great George Orwell said in *1984*, “We know that no one ever seizes power with the intention of relinquishing it. Power is not a means, it is an end.” What we are seeing here today is one of the biggest power grabs on the individual freedoms of Canadians. If our leader, the member for Carleton, becomes Prime Minister of Canada, what will he do to reverse this power grab of the government?

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: Madam Speaker, all of the worst atrocities in human history were committed by governments, yet we are constantly warned by the woke parties in the House that the scary thing is too much freedom, that the people have to be feared. No. Excessive power by government has been the source of every single major atrocity committed in this country or anywhere around the world. The solution to that is freedom.

What will I do to reverse this power grab? I will repeal Bill C-11 to restore freedom of speech online. I will make it my mission to transform Canada back again to the freest nation on Earth.

Mrs. Jenica Atwin (Fredericton, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I listened intently to the speech given by the leader of the official oppo-

sition, and I wonder if he would like to backtrack or apologize for characterizing the CRTC as a small group of privileged insiders closest to the Prime Minister. I would also ask him if he would like to define the word “woke”. I asked one of his colleagues for that definition, and I would like to hear what he has to say.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: Actually, Madam Speaker, I will backtrack. It is a big group of insiders. It is a big, sprawling bureaucracy with far too many people working for it. There will be fewer people working for the CRTC when I am Prime Minister, because they will have less power and a hell of a lot less to do when I restore freedom of speech and freedom of expression online and on the Internet.

As for the definition of “woke”, woke has one purpose and only one purpose. It has plenty of pretexts but only one purpose: control. It is designed to divide people by race, gender, ethnicity, religion, vaccine status and any other way one can divide people into groups. Why? It is because then one can justify having a government to control all those groups. No more woke; we need freedom.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: Madam Speaker, there is one kind of threat to free debate, which is to silence people. Another way to silence people is by putting words in their mouths. What I said earlier is that I am concerned, and I think it is naive to expect that social media platforms do not have an agenda and that as they write algorithms in private, outside of any kind of transparency or accountability, they do not consider their own self-interests in the ways they promote particular kinds of content.

The point is not to say that someone else is going to police all of that content. Bill C-11 is talking about promoting Canadian content within the feeds of Canadians. I do not think there is anything particularly nefarious about that, and there is room for reasonable debate about how that gets defined. However, what I was saying earlier is that I do not understand why this guy, who says he is so concerned about freedom, does not care a whit about what is going on behind closed doors right now with people who are accountable to no one and have all the power and control he says he is concerned about.

• (1820)

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: Madam Speaker, let us be clear. The member is not proposing to take away any power from Google, Facebook or any other social media giant. All he is proposing to do is give the government the power to manipulate the controls that those social media platforms already have.

Right now, social media algorithms are designed to give people the stuff they want to see, because that is how social media companies make money, just like a restaurant gives people the food they want to eat. The government wants to take away the power of people to choose for themselves and have government authorities decide for them.

Ms. Leslyn Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk, CPC): Madam Speaker, I will be sharing my time today with the member for Saskatoon—University.

Government Orders

I am thankful for this opportunity to rise again and speak to the government's disastrous bill, Bill C-11, the online streaming act, which would regulate the Internet and stymie free expression. It is ironic that the government claims to be modernizing the Canadian Broadcasting Act by creating a “flexible, fair and modern” approach, when in fact the bill would punish Canadian digital creators and move Canada's cultural, creative and media industries backwards.

It is disheartening to see that the criticisms and calls for reform coming from Internet and media experts, former CRTC commissioners, and Canadian artists and creators themselves are being ignored. Bill C-11 is an example of what happens to a government that has been in power for far too long. It has forgotten who it serves. Frankly, it has grown fat on entitlement and hubris.

This bill gives unacceptable and inappropriate permission to the government, and any future government, to control Canadians' use of the Internet with respect to what they choose as content, what they watch and listen to and even how to express themselves freely online in a public square. The greater danger of Bill C-11 is that it opens the door to an increasing government manipulation of technology and algorithms for the purpose of social control. Why would any government want to limit expression in a strong, free and democratic society such as Canada? It wants to do this simply for power and to seek control.

Any government can give into the temptation of overstepping its authority when it is left in power for far too long. When there are too few checks and balances in place and when institutional legacy media begins to do the bidding of the governing party, the system breaks down and the doors for the thought police open. When that happens, all of the freedoms and liberties we take for granted in this precious country slowly disappear, even freedoms in our own homes. Government, if given the chance and opportunity, will trespass into telling us what we can watch even in our own homes by using algorithms that will determine the content we see online and the narratives we hear.

This is what we must guard against. Clause 7 of Bill C-11 specifically gives permission to cabinet to direct the CRTC with regard to this legislation. The bill requires that online platforms prioritize Canadian content over non-Canadian content. It grants the CRTC the ability to require platforms such as YouTube and Facebook to change and manipulate algorithms and search engines to meet government directives. What does this mean? It means this bill gives the government control over what Canadians see, what they post and what they watch online. Bill C-11 will also give Ottawa bureaucrats the power to regulate any content that generates revenue directly or indirectly, which could apply to most user content online.

The government had a chance to accept the Senate's amendments to narrow the scope and protect Canadian content, but it failed to do that. It failed to do the right thing and voted against the Conservative amendments. Why? I would argue it is because the government does not trust Canadians with their own thoughts and their own freedoms, and is, in fact, trying to expand its control of Canadians online, even in the privacy of their own homes.

• (1825)

Jeanette Patell, the head of Canada government affairs and public policy at YouTube, explained it like this: “[Bill C-11] explicitly give[s] a government regulator authority over what content is prioritized, and how and where content is presented to Canadians, handing the CRTC the power to decide who wins and who loses”.

Timothy Denton, who is a former CRTC commissioner and chair of the Canada chapter of the Internet Society, said this about Bill C-11: “C-11 makes user-generated videos or podcasts—virtually anything involving sound or video—subject to CRTC regulation. Indeed it is a wonder the government stopped there: why not regulate email as well? Nor does the regulation of speech stop at Canada's borders. Bill C-11 permits the CRTC to exercise global authority over 'programs' in any language, from any source.” He goes on to say, “The CRTC is all about control: who gets to speak, within what limits, how often, and to what effect. Usually the control is exercised indirectly, but in this case it was overt.”

Bill C-11 would empower government-dictated algorithms to decide what one can see and which videos and sources are Canadian enough to see. Conspicuously, there is no definition of what is classified as Canadian content in the bill, which focuses on Canadian content.

Moreover, the current definition used by the CRTC is so antiquated and so narrow that it eliminates productions like *The Canadian Story* and *The Handmaid's Tale*, which were filmed in Canada with Canadian actors and Canadian producers, or Netflix's major francophone film *Jusqu'au déclin*, which was made and written in Quebec.

I would argue that the bill is a form of censorship that is more insidious than a government-issued order, mandate, or sanction because, in this case, Canadians will not know what they are being censored for. If the bill passes, bureaucrats behind closed doors, subject to the will of their political masters, will issue directives to manipulate algorithms and control the search bar in people's homes. Canadians will never know what is not being allowed. In this scenario, the government could control what is presented to them and what is put in their very mind by controlling what they see.

Canadian creators would not know the reason why their content is not going viral. Canadian creators will never know when their content is being demoted by government-dictated algorithms. This is a form of technocratic control. I fear, as many Canadians do, that this technocratic control will grow as our society becomes more digitally dependent on artificial intelligence and Internet-connected smart technologies.

Government Orders

As parliamentarians, it is our duty and our responsibility to serve the interests of Canadians and uphold the rights and freedoms of all Canadians. The bill is an attack on freedom of choice and freedom of expression of all Canadians online. We must not allow the government to creep down a path that leads to silencing critics by promoting some voices over others that politically suit its ends.

In closing, I want to say that creativity blossoms in a culture of freedom and not control. We need to go back to the days when governments served the people. As we consider the bill, I urge all parliamentarians in the House to remember our great foundations of freedom upon which this country was built: the freedom to think, the freedom to speak, and the freedom to live without government interference.

• (1830)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I want everyone to understand and have an appreciation for the contrast—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): Order. We are in a period of questions and comments. Could the hon. members listen to the questions being asked, please?

The hon. parliamentary secretary.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I want to talk about contrast. If we want to use the word “attack”, we can put it in the perspective of how the Conservative Party has made it very clear, through that member’s speech and the leader of the Conservative Party’s speech, that this is an attack on Canadian content. This is an attack on the CRTC. We now have the leader of the Conservative Party with another policy platform, and that is to diminish the role of the CRTC here in Canada.

As he and his other colleagues clap, there are Canadians who are in the arts and culture industry. That industry is so valuable to Canada, and the Conservatives are throwing it up in the air, saying they do not care. The Liberals and the government care about that community.

My question for the member is why the Conservative Party has given up on Canada’s heritage and those who promote it through arts and—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The hon. member for Haldimand—Norfolk.

Ms. Leslyn Lewis: Madam Speaker, in fact, we have not given up. We are the warriors who are fighting to preserve this heritage, because we know that this heritage can only be preserved if we have freedom of expression, and we have to ensure that governments cannot dictate what Canadians see, what they think or what they hear online. That is not the role of government. The role of government is to stay out of the lives of Canadians and let freedom reign.

Mr. Mike Morrice (Kitchener Centre, GP): Madam Speaker, I wonder if I can clarify something from the speech of the member for Haldimand—Norfolk. My understanding is that Bill C-11 already passed in this House back in June. I understand she did not

support it then, and it is clear she does not support it now. Tonight, we are debating the message being sent back to the Senate with respect to the amendments that the Senate proposed, some of which the governing party disagreed with.

Would she like to comment on that which we are voting on this evening?

Ms. Leslyn Lewis: Madam Speaker, I think it is a travesty that the Liberals, the NDP and the Bloc did not support the amendments of the Senate, specifically about excluding creator content. That would have done a lot to protect Canadian creators. It is a travesty that the Senate put so much work into that and that this House partially rejected it. I am proud to say that the Conservatives stood with the Senate proposals.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, CPC): Madam Speaker, I found it really fascinating that the Senate, which is filled with a lot of the Prime Minister’s supposedly independent senators, was upset about the bill and was pushing back. I am wondering if the member has any thoughts about what the Senate was trying to do and how the senators were actually standing up for the rights and freedoms of Canadians.

Ms. Leslyn Lewis: Madam Speaker, I think it is clear that this is one of the most dangerous pieces of legislation that have ever been passed in this nation, and I think the Senate sees the danger in the legislation, the danger of encroaching upon the freedoms of Canadians. I think that, as sober second thought, these amendments should have been taken more seriously by this House. The Senate spent a great deal of time, as the House of sober second thought, crafting these amendments to make sure Canadians’ liberty and freedom are protected in the online forum.

• (1835)

Mr. Rick Perkins (South Shore—St. Margarets, CPC): Madam Speaker, I think it is ironic that the members opposite do not understand that they are censoring the censorship bill. In second reading, the government and its costly coalition partner, the NDP, imposed closure, and then they used their coalition in the House to impose a rule on the committee study of the bill that did not allow for the amendments being proposed to even be read in the committee before committee members voted on them, which is another form of censorship and closure. Today, they are again putting closure on the Senate amendments.

I would like the member to comment on this. On a bill that would restrict the freedom of what people can do on the Internet, why would we expect anything other than the government censoring it all along the debate?

Ms. Leslyn Lewis: Madam Speaker, it is very sad. With the interest that this bill has generated among grassroots, average, everyday Canadians, it is very sad that the Liberals did not take this to heart but actually sought closure. We should have had prolonged debate on this bill so that the Liberals could convince Canadians that they were in fact not taking—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): Resuming debate, the hon. member for Saskatoon—University.

Government Orders

Mr. Corey Tochor (Saskatoon—University, CPC): Madam Speaker, what is happening in Canada? The world is watching our nation and seeing a big, bossy government close down debate on censorship. The Liberals are censoring the debate on censorship. This is what the world is seeing. This puts us in the category of the Communists of Beijing and countries like North Korea and Russia. Putin would be envious of the ability to change the algorithms of his viewers to watch content online.

This is a dangerous time in Canada. We have all had struggles for the past three years. The division in our country has never been as great as it is today, and now we have a government that wants to take it a step further, jumping on that raw nerve in Canada that distrusts government because of its actions on this bill. We are here tonight debating because of the forcing of closure on this bill. If people are watching this online, I am going to clip this and put it out there and hopefully if Bill C-11 does not pass they will still be able to watch this. People should like and share this right now, because this might be the last opportunity. People will be able to post things, but no one will be able to find them. This is what is in this bill. This is a layering-on of effects on our freedoms.

Even this beautiful Parliament, where 338 people from across Canada are elected to bring our views here, to debate ideas and policies and directions for our country with respect to what is right and what is wrong, has been affected, even before this bill. We are taking a system of communication that has been a tool of democracies all over the world and we are taking a tool out of the tool box.

There are problems in Canada. There are problems in our democracy. We have seen it with foreign influence in our country. We have seen that the state is now sponsoring media throughout our land, and when Canadians turn on the news, they are saying that it does not reflect their views and the Canada they know. Then they come to the realization that it is being sponsored by government and so they mistrust it. This goes back to the divisions that we have in our country. We have to come up with policies and ideas and laws that bring people together and not divide them. This is the problem that I have with this bill. It is another big, bossy government wanting to divide Canadians.

Censorship has been in our history in the world. History does not always repeat itself, but it rhymes. We only have to look to the failed regimes around the world, and not even that far back in our history, to the 1940s in eastern Europe. In 1945, there was a vote in Hungary. There was democracy in Hungary in 1945. In the vote, the Communists finished sixth. By 1949, it was a Communist country. How is that possible? One of the tactics they used is called a salami tactic, where they just take a slice, and every time a little slice more and a bit more each time. Right now, this is what this bill represents. The government will tell its citizens what they can watch, what they can consume, how they should be thinking or what thoughts they should be portraying.

I send pleas to the members here tonight to think about the impact if this bill becomes law in our country and in a future Parliament there is a leader who takes these tools and censors their party and their beliefs and what they want to post. This would take us into a country of Canada that I do not want any part of for myself or for my kids.

• (1840)

The bill would allow one to post all one wants, and we heard this earlier tonight, but one's fellow Canadians would not be able to view it. We still have time to stop this.

Later in my speech I will have two direct asks to Canadians who are watching live tonight or who are watching this online. I ask them to please, once again, like and share this video.

I would like to go back to some of the struggles we have in Canada because our institutions such as this place, Parliament, are not functioning how they were set up to function. Everybody in here has probably had people phone their office and say that they were watching question period and that everyone was asking questions but they were not hearing any answers. The citizens of this country see this over and over. They hear questions asked that they want to hear the answers to. They phone and write and ask why the Speaker is not telling them to answer those questions.

The problem is not so much that the Speaker needs to impose new rules on this place; it is how this was set up. We have freedom of press in Canada. How this place is supposed to work is that if we have an opposition grilling a minister or a prime minister and they are giving us garbage, the media would hound that minister or prime minister until they received answers to those questions. If they did not answer, it would heighten the question of what they are trying to hide.

We are not getting that right now in Canada. We have some great journalists who are working hard on uncovering the truths of what is happening, but those stories are not being published. This is because, like I said, when states start sponsoring media, everyone questions the stories they are hearing. We know whoever pays the piper picks the tune.

That is how this place is supposed to work. We should have the galleries full of media right now. We do not. During question period, we do not have media filling the galleries. It is because there are no stories; the opposition heckles. There is nothing they want to hear.

I do not know how this is going to end. We heard the government talking about proroguing, which is cancelling or shutting down Parliament. That could kill the bill. The bill is going to be passed to the Senate, unless the Bloc and the NDP decide they are not going to vote for it later tonight. There are still chances. I am an optimist; there is still hope.

The Canadians who are watching should not give up on hope. They can search out the petition we are circulating right now. They should be sure to sign up to get updates because we do not know what YouTube is going to show people in the months or years to come if this becomes law. However, they can have confidence. We heard earlier tonight from the Leader of the Opposition that one of the first things we would do is cancel Bill C-11.

Government Orders

I know my time is limited. I would like to thank everyone for being here tonight. I have one last ask of the people watching online. They should please like and share. I ask them to contact their NDP member of Parliament, because they can perhaps get the courage to stand up for their convictions, vote against the government and bring the government down. We could then have an election that elects a government that will protect our freedoms.

• (1845)

Mrs. Jenica Atwin (Fredericton, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it felt a lot like we were listening to a sermon of sorts with some of the fire and brimstone coming our way in regard to the bill. I wonder if the member would be willing to apologize to Canadians once this bill reaches royal assent, is implemented in Canada and inevitably the sky does not fall and it is not the end of times. Will he apologize for the fearmongering and the mis-characterization of this bill?

Mr. Corey Tochor: Madam Speaker, governments have always enacted things for people's safety. It is for their benefit, and it will all be okay, my hon. colleague has pointed out. The problem is that people will not realize that they are not watching the videos that they want to watch; they are watching what the government wants them to watch. That is the problem. This is how badly written this is: People will not realize that the content they consume in the future is what the government wants them to consume, not what the viewer is looking for.

[*Translation*]

Mr. René Villemure (Trois-Rivières, BQ): Madam Speaker, there is a guarantee that private companies cannot be held responsible for the comments that third parties post on their platforms. At the same time, the act already strengthens the protection of personal information. I would like to know why the Conservatives are saying that freedom of expression is threatened when the companies have the duty to leave the comments online.

[*English*]

Mr. Corey Tochor: Madam Speaker, I believe the analogy is a little bit about what is being spoken in the town square. The comment is that we cannot have people speaking their mind in the town square because it might go against other people's views. Instead, they would like to shut down town squares across Canada. That was in the past.

How we consume information right now is online. Anything that changes what people are viewing online is wrong, and it is censorship.

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Madam Speaker, that is the craziest, wackiest speech that we have heard from Conservatives although they have, through this debate, been crazy and wacky at every single step. It is quite clear to Canadians that there is not a single Conservative who has actually read the bill because they all have the same speech: something, something, tyranny, North Korea; something, something freedom. We saw how devoted—

Mr. Brad Vis: Madam Speaker, on a point of order, it is incorrect for the member for New Westminster—Burnaby to state that Conservatives have not read Bill C-11—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): This is a matter for debate.

The hon. member for New Westminster—Burnaby.

Mr. Peter Julian: Madam Speaker, it is quite obvious that they have not read the bill. At no point in the hours and hours of debate—

• (1850)

Mrs. Laila Goodridge: Madam Speaker, on a point of order, I have in fact read Bill C-11. Many of my colleagues have read Bill C-11. I think that it is absolutely important that we always make sure we tell the truth and the whole truth in this—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I am going to interrupt the hon. member right there. There are a lot of insults that have been flying around throughout the afternoon.

I would ask the hon. member for New Westminster—Burnaby to refrain from inflaming the debate.

Mr. Peter Julian: Madam Speaker, I am just being honest and exercising my freedoms. Obviously, Conservatives do not like that. They do not mind meeting with neo-Nazi groups that want to suppress freedoms in Europe but they object when they are challenged on the fact that their comments over the course of the dozens and dozens of hours of debate have not carried on the bill at all.

There is no tyranny here. What we are talking about is actually providing supports for a cultural sector that has been hard hit. We are actually allowing Canadians to be able to tell stories to each other. Why does the member just admit that he did not read the bill, he does not understand the bill, and as his comments have been completely inappropriate, he will withdraw them? Why does he not withdraw them?

Mr. Corey Tochor: Madam Speaker, this is the wacky NDP. They know what is best for Canadians. This is the elitist NDP who are so far removed from the working class that they have no idea what is going on out there in Canada.

People are suffering in our nation. They are looking for ideas and policies. They may look at an NDP platform or a speech that might be delivered in here by that member. The bill would limit Canadians' ability to actually see the content of that member.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Madam Speaker, I think the hon. member for Saskatoon—University might consider his recent remarks and reflect that he went a bit too far when he said that things that are on the Internet should never be censored and nothing should ever be withdrawn. I am going to give him that opportunity right now.

We have seen moments where families have been shattered by mass attacks and slaughters. Families of police officers have seen their loved ones on a video posted on the Internet and the family has begged for no one to look at that. People then take that down.

Will the hon. member reconsider and withdraw his comment that everything on the Internet should be watched, people should be at liberty to see anything and there should be no moments where we withdraw postings on the Internet with the goal of rage farming—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I have to give the hon. member for Saskatoon—University 10 seconds to answer.

Government Orders

Mr. Corey Tochor: Madam Speaker, she is misrepresenting my words. We need to watch the video again. I will post this, and she can comment on it. I will put it on Facebook. That is how freedom of speech and expression should work in Canada. Members can disagree with me. Come onto the forum, put a comment—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): Resuming debate, the hon. member for Cypress Hills—Grasslands.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, CPC): Madam Speaker, I will be splitting my time with the member for North Okanagan—Shuswap.

I do not always give a title to my speeches, but there was a movie released back in 2020 that I managed to draw my inspiration from. This is the movie called *The Social Dilemma*. As we know, it is about big tech using social media as a means to manipulate and influence people.

The public was outraged about it, and rightly so. The government apparently was too, but the problem was that it did not think of it first. That is what we are going to see with this bill as it goes through. I think I have a title for my speech. I am going to go with “The Liberal Dilemma” in the same vein as *The Social Dilemma*.

It has been amazing to see the strong response we have gotten from the general public, which has reached out to many members of Parliament. Lots of us in the Conservative caucus have heard from a lot of people. We heard from experts, both at committee and out of committee, demanding that the Liberals stop what they are doing. Sadly, the voices have been repeatedly ignored.

What is more troubling is that these same voices might eventually be silenced. However, the Conservatives have been listening to them. We have been raising the alarm and opposing the bill while it passed through this House. The other place has also taken these concerns seriously. Bill C-11 was sent back to us with several amendments from the Senate. One of those amendments is especially relevant and important to the issue of user-generated content.

The Liberals have another chance to show some good faith and correct the problem they are creating in this country. We already know that they are not taking the opportunity in front of them. The minister has made it clear that the Liberals are going to reject this exact amendment, which has been at the heart of this entire debate so far.

At least it is crystal clear where the Liberals stand, and it is not on the right side of the issue. It is exactly the opposite. The Liberals are not interested in protecting the rights of Canadians. It is not their priority. That is really discouraging to see from the federal government. It is a complete failure of leadership on their part.

That is why, on the opposite side, Conservatives have been fighting so much on behalf of our fellow Canadians. We want them to know that someone will stand up for them and their rights in Parliament. If the Liberals go ahead with this, we would get rid of it if we formed government because we firmly believe that it is the right thing to do.

There is a reason the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, when it mentions a fundamental freedom of expression, includes “freedom of the press and other media of communication”.

The ability to communicate freely is so important to our society. Whether someone was born here or chose to come here from another part of the world, Canadians know and love their personal experience with freedom. We want to make sure that our children and future generations enjoy it as well. We should never take it for granted. The same freedom is essential for our political system to function.

If the Liberals controlled the press, they would let it silence voices which disagreed with them and turn our news networks into a publicly funded propaganda machine; but in fact, it is too late.

History has shown us the worst examples of what can happen with government censorship and control. Even in our own time, there are authoritarian regimes that are doing the same thing to oppress their people, and we know that there have also been attempts to interfere in our elections and have influence within our own country.

Government propaganda spread through government media can either sway public opinion toward its ideals, or what is worse, be used to cover up the corruption and crimes carried out by the state. Given that the independence of media from the government is such an important principle to Canada and other countries around the world, why do the Liberals want to provide an opening for online censorship and interference with media communications?

That is the direction Bill C-11 is taking us. It will hand over more control of media and the Internet from the people to the government. Up until this point, Canadians have had the opportunity to participate in a media marketplace that is free and open. All content is given equal opportunity and can be judged based on its own merit.

Canadian artists have impressed us with their talents here at home, and they have also punched above their weight in the global market. That has been the case with every art form. Canadians continue to succeed as actors, video creators and musicians performing in pop, classical or other genres. Each one of them has worked hard at their craft, and they have excelled based on merit. It did not require bureaucrats in Ottawa or anywhere else to decide if they should be considered Canadian enough.

We all want to see Canadian talent thrive. As much as the Liberals want to hide behind the idea of supporting artists, that has never been the issue. They need to stop using it as an empty excuse to push forward a power grab that could eventually threaten the rights of artistic expression as much as any other ability for Canadians to speak freely.

The ability of Bill C-11 to limit what Canadians would see online would also hurt Canadian content producers. They have been saying as much. Many talented creators have not only made a name for themselves in the Canadian scene, but they have also become stars in the U.S. and all throughout the rest of the world.

• (1855)

Bill C-11 would become a gatekeeper that bars regular Canadians from reaching audiences online. How can that be, if the government is saying it would encourage Canadian content? The problem lies in the fact that, when we give the government the right to censor some content, we must consider that lobbyists from larger producers will influence the regulatory process, which in this case would be carried out by the CRTC.

Only rich, established groups can afford to hire lobbyists. Young men and women posting music to YouTube or maybe trick shot videos in their free time cannot do that. They cannot afford it. Bill C-11 would make it much harder to break into the industry because the only people who can afford to buy lobbyists are already the established media companies.

Across the board, Canada has too many gatekeepers that stop us from building homes or developing our industries. Unfortunately, Bill C-11 would expand the government's policy of gatekeeping now to our online content. When it comes to its claim about promoting Canadian content, Bill C-11 does not really make sense, nor address the major problem. The stated goal is to require that media sites give preference to Canadian content in an attempt to promote Canadian culture. However, we still have to ask: How would that rule apply in practice?

The bill fails to define Canadian culture and what content qualifies as Canadian. This vagueness is what would give the government the ability to label as “Canadian” whatever it wants us to see, and to censor anything else that does not align with its priorities. It is irresponsible and can only make people think there is some reason why it wants to leave the door open to controlling how it is that we communicate.

If the Liberals were serious at all or had any interest in defending Canadian culture, they would not allow for this ambiguity and leave so many loopholes in the bill. They would not vote against the necessary amendment to exempt user-generated content from government censorship. It was included in this new version of the bill because of careful and thorough study. Parliamentarians, both in this House and in the other place, have heard from numerous witnesses and had overwhelming feedback from constituents. Apparently, none of that matters to the Liberal government.

The legislative process of Bill C-11 has been a mess right from the start. Last year, the Liberals, with the help of the NDP, rammed Bill C-11 through the House of Commons, not allowing stakeholders to fully voice their concerns about the bill. Today, they have once again tried to censor the opposition by forcibly ending debate on this censorship bill.

As usual, the Prime Minister and his party will not listen to anyone who disagrees with their agenda. It is the same arrogance and condescending attitude that have been on display since they have been in power. That is exactly what people are worried about if they have the power to censor and remove criticism.

Earlier in my speech, I referred to serious allegations about foreign interference in Canada. It is a good example of what could go terribly wrong if we do not protect free expression. We already have a Prime Minister who has disregarded the public interest and

Government Orders

tried to cover up accusations against him about conflicts of interest. Most recently, he refused to have an independent inquiry about Beijing's interference in Canada's elections. Can members imagine how much worse it would be if the same Liberal government had the power of censorship when we have learned as much as we have about all the scandals it has been engaged in over the years?

It is a scary thought, but we are not going to give up the fight. We are going to work as hard as ever to oppose censorship and to expose the endless failures of the Liberal government.

• (1900)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it has been an incredible debate thus far, since after Private Members' Business.

I was quite taken aback by the member for Saskatoon—University and I challenged some of the thoughts he was sharing with Canadians, compared to the member for Lethbridge, for example. We cannot help but wonder whether there is something seriously wrong, but I will protect their rights and freedoms to be able to express themselves.

Let us be very clear. In no way whatsoever is this legislation about freedom of speech. In no way whatsoever does it prevent people from being able to watch what they want to watch on the Internet. However, we have listened to some of the weirdest comments, like comparing Canada to Communist countries, to North Korea. It boggles my mind how the Conservative Party of Canada has been using these weird arguments to promote untruths.

My question to the member is this: Does he believe there is any obligation whatsoever to be more honest with Canadians about what this legislation does and does not do?

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Madam Speaker, what Canadians expect is honesty from the government.

I am going to go back to the reason I called the bill “the Liberal dilemma”. Again, it is about manipulating algorithms and allowing big government to have the power to regulate user-generated content, as well as other things.

We are asking for a simple clarification in the bill. The Liberals refuse to do it. The independent Senate, which is people the Prime Minister appointed, even these Liberal senators, let us make no mistake, opposed what the government is trying to do with this bill. They made several good amendments and raised several good points in their speeches. The government has chosen to ignore each and every one those things. It is shameful what the government is doing.

[*Translation*]

Mr. René Villemure (Trois-Rivières, BQ): Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for his speech. I really appreciate his speeches. However, I would like him to set aside the briefing notes provided by Michael Geist and tell us how he himself defines censorship.

*Government Orders**[English]*

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Madam Speaker, when the government is turning over the power to big government bureaucrats to be able to make all these decisions, without taking the input of basic, everyday Canadians, that is definitely a big part of it.

One thing the Conservatives want to do, a goal of ours when we form government, is to introduce a plain-language law. What the Liberal government does is use confusing language—

- (1905)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The hon. member for New Westminster—Burnaby.

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Madam Speaker, the hon. member really did not really speak to the bill at all. He spoke about foreign interference and he spoke about freedoms.

I would like to put those two elements together, because we saw with the convoy, supported heavily by Conservatives, the denial of freedoms for the people of Ottawa. Seniors were denied the freedom to go grocery shopping. People with disabilities were denied the ability to get their medications. Families were denied the right to sleep, by the convoy, supported by Russian state actors as the National Observer and the institute for conflict studies have shown very clearly.

The Conservatives supported a takeover that denied thousands of people in downtown Ottawa their basic freedoms, and they have not denounced the involvement of foreign state actors from Russia. Could the member come clean on those two things?

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Madam Speaker, what is fascinating is that the Minister for Public Safety at the time based the government's decision-making on reports from the CBC that were proven to be false. They were spinning a false narrative, both about buildings allegedly lit on fire by the convoy, which did not happen, and that Russia interfered or huge foreign groups tried to fund this movement, which did not happen; FINTRAC said as much and CSIS proved as much as well.

What this member actually just did was spread misinformation about what was going on. That is shameful, and he should apologize for that.

Mr. Mel Arnold (North Okanagan—Shuswap, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is an honour once again to rise in the House as the representative of the awesome people and beautiful area of the North Okanagan—Shuswap.

I rise today to debate Bill C-11, what has become commonly known as the Liberal government's censorship bill. I rise on behalf of a long list of people who contacted me by email, social media, handwritten letters and on the streets, asking me to do all I can to oppose this draconian bill that would control what they will see online and what they can post online, all controlled by a government deciding what government wants them to see and post, not what users choose to see and post.

As I rise today, the government has already taken other steps to limit what Canadians can say about this bill. Today, the government has decided to further censor open debate on Bill C-11 by forcing

closure of debate on the bill and, in doing so, deny any further debate in the House today and force a vote on it tonight.

More and more Canadians are realizing the government cannot be trusted. Its actions are becoming more egregious on a weekly basis and Bill C-11 is just one more example, yet it expects Canadians to believe it, to trust it. It is no wonder we, as His Majesty's official opposition, as well as Canadians en masse, simply no longer trust the government.

When we look at the government's track record on transparency, or lack thereof, the examples are becoming too numerous to mention. I will mention a few, but there are so many instances of the government censoring the information Canadians deserve to receive, that the trend of excessive censorship is very clear.

The first significant issue was during the controversy of the SNC-Lavalin scandal, the removal of a justice minister, and the attempts to hide the truth from Canadians. That minister chose to speak truth and the Prime Minister chose to silence her. Then there was the Prime Minister's ethics breach with his trip to the Bahamas, when he refused to answer questions until the truth was dragged out and he was found guilty of that ethics breach. There was also the WE Charity scandal that eventually led to the propping up of Parliament because the government did not want the facts to come out, so it censored what could be heard by shutting down Parliament.

We also learned other facts the government would have preferred to keep secret from Canadians, that the Minister of International Trade, Export Promotion, Small Business and Economic Development—

- (1910)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I have to interrupt the hon. member. I have a point of order from the hon. member for Fredericton.

Mrs. Jenica Atwin: Madam Speaker, I am just wondering about the relevance of what the hon. member is discussing right now, so that we could get back on track for Bill C-11.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): There is a lot of latitude in how we manage debates. I am sure the hon. member will bring it to the point of the bill.

The hon. member.

Mr. Mel Arnold: Madam Speaker, I expected that the Liberals might wonder what I am getting to. What I am getting to is the fact that they cannot be trusted, so why should we trust them on this bill?

As I was mentioning, the list of egregious actions by the government just continues to grow. I spoke about the ethics breaches, how that was dragged out—

Government Orders

Mr. Peter Julian: Madam Speaker, on a point of order, it is obvious the member has not read the bill, because he is not referring to it. I would question relevance. If he has not read the bill, why is he speaking to it in the House?

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I am hoping the hon. member still has enough time in his speech to bring us to the relevance.

The hon. member for Prince George—Peace River—Northern Rockies.

Mr. Bob Zimmer: Madam Speaker, just in response to the NDP member—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): There is no debate here, as I already stated. The hon. member will bring us to the point in his time.

The hon. member for North Okanagan—Shuswap.

Mr. Mel Arnold: Madam Speaker, it is obvious the government does not want to hear the truth. It is going to try to push beyond the time allocation on this vote because it does not want to hear the truth. This is what it is trying to hide from Canadians and that is what I am trying to get at here.

We heard about the ethics breaches of the Prime Minister that he tried to hide, and how about the WE Charity scandal when the Liberals shut down Parliament?

I was beginning to speak about the Minister of International Trade, Export Promotion, Small Business and Economic Development, who hired a company co-owned by a close friend. This was another ethics breach.

How about a housing minister who granted \$133,000 to a group whose—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The hon. member for New Westminster—Burnaby is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Peter Julian: Madam Speaker, I think members of the House have been very patient. The member has not read the bill. He does not understand the bill. He is not speaking to the bill. I do question relevance when he has a speech that has nothing to do with the bill.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): We are approaching the halfway point in the time allocated for the speech, and there has been no reference to the bill in question. I recommend the hon. member get to that point, please.

Mr. Mel Arnold: Madam Speaker, the members will see, as I conclude my speech, how all of what I am saying is very much relevant.

More recently, we heard news about the foreign influence that happened in the 2019 and 2021 elections, but the Liberals were not going to tell anyone about it until the news broke in the media. Then they appointed a friend—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The hon. member for New Westminster—Burnaby is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Peter Julian: Madam Speaker, you have been very patient. This is a violation of our Standing Orders. The member has not read the bill and does not understand the bill. He must refer to the bill; otherwise, we should move on to the next speaker.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I asked the hon. member to return to the bill, and the hon. member assured us that he will get there, so I am going to take him at his word.

The hon. member for Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman.

Mr. James Bezan: Madam Speaker, on a point of order, the member for New Westminster—Burnaby continues to interrupt proceedings. He is not allowing debate to take place. He is not allowing anything to be talked about. I know he is a Liberal lapdog—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): Let us not debate and let us not start insulting people. I have made my ruling.

The hon. member for North Okanagan—Shuswap.

Mr. Mel Arnold: Madam Speaker, these interruptions are absolutely another example of the egregious actions of the Liberal-NDP government. That is what I will get to in this speech, if they quit interrupting me and allow me to finish.

Further to these attempts to limit what Canadians can see, we just heard yesterday what appeared to be more evidence of a government that wants to control and censor what Canadians see, share and read. The government has appointed an interim Ethics Commissioner with family ties to the Liberals.

This may not sound bad enough at first glance, but upon further examination, it is not just a connection of a Liberal family. It is the same Liberal family that was involved when the former fisheries minister was found in breach of conflict of interest rules for approving a deal that could see a Liberal family friend reap big benefits. The deal was clam scam. The former fisheries minister issued a licence worth \$24 million to a company that was run by his wife's cousin. Now it is the same Liberal cabinet minister's sister-in-law who has been appointed the watchdog of a corrupt Liberal government.

● (1915)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

I would like to think I have been as patient as you with regard to seeing the member become somewhat relevant. The member cannot say at the beginning of his speech that in the last 30 seconds he will be relevant to the bill, or that he will be making in the first nine and a half minutes an argument that will become relevant in the last 30 seconds. The member does need to provide some comment on the bill throughout the speech, not just in the last minute of it.

Government Orders

Mr. John Brassard: Madam Speaker, on a point of order, I ask for you to be judicious in this particular speech. This is an elected member of Parliament. He has been elected by his constituents to represent them in this place, and I ask that you not allow these interruptions to occur. You have ruled that the member will be going back to the point. He has already made that clear. He is an elected member of Parliament and has every right, in spite of the fact that they stand up and interrupt him, to—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): This is entering into debate, and I have said to the member that he will get to the point. However, I cannot stop other members from raising points of order. That is part of their democratic right.

The hon. member for Prince George—Peace River—Northern Rockies.

Mr. Bob Zimmer: Madam Speaker, on a point of order, I would like to hear what our member has to say and what he has to talk about in the debate. However, here is a great example of a coordinated effort from the Liberal Party and the NDP to stifle a debate in this House about censorship. Will these members be an example, as they should be—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): We are going to let the hon. member for North Okanagan—Shuswap conclude his speech.

Mr. Mel Arnold: Madam Speaker, this harassment from the parties that simply do not want to hear the truth is incredible, especially from the member for Winnipeg North, who is known for rambling on and on in debate in this House. His speeches have become less and less relevant over the years. I look forward to tying this all together so that we can understand what I am speaking about.

It is not just that we are speaking for Canadians who are concerned that their access to what they view online may be restricted by the government. It is about an even greater concern over what the government will do to hide its backroom deals, corruption and scandals if Canadians are not able to share and view things online without government censorship. The Liberals' track record, which I just laid out only a portion of, shows that they cannot be trusted to do what is right and what is ethical.

Bill C-11 is a piece of legislation that would impact every single Canadian who has a cellphone, a television or a computer in their home and who enjoys online streaming and viewing and listening to content online. Through this piece of legislation, the government is about to give itself the ability to control what Canadians have access to, can listen to online or can watch online. Instead of viewers deciding what they want to watch, the government would control the algorithms, which will put things in front of them that the government determines it wants them to see. People go online to see what they want to see, not what the government wants to see.

I have been asked to do all I can to stop this bill and I will. However, in turn, I ask Canadians to do what they can by contacting members of the Liberal-NDP government, MPs and senators from the other House to voice their concerns with Bill C-11, and join us as we fight on their behalf to maintain freedoms in Canada. They should tell the government that what it is doing is wrong. For the government to take control over what people can post online, view online and promote online is wrong.

I have trust in Canadians to do what is right more than I trust the government. The government has shown a propensity to hide the truth. I have given many examples of that this evening, even though members tried to shut me down with their point of order interventions. I trust Canadians to do the ethical thing, but we cannot do this alone. As Conservative members in this House, we will lead the charge. I hope Canadians will fall behind us in leading the charge to end this bill and this draconian measure.

● (1920)

Mr. Andy Fillmore (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Innovation, Science and Industry, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I listened with confusion to the member's brief history of time, the fictionalized version. I note that it had very little to do with the bill at hand, so if the member does not mind, I am going to bring us back to Bill C-11.

When the dust settles and Bill C-11 is passed, we will come to realize that the only thing changed in Canada is that Canadian creators are better supported and that there is more Canadian content entering Canadian homes. We will realize that the outrage we have been hearing has been manufactured with the nefarious purpose of raising money. This is a manufactured crisis to raise money for the Conservative Party.

When this bill passes and the changes are seen as positive, and none of the ludicrous predictions the party opposite has made come to pass, will the member apologize to Canadians? Will his party apologize to Canadians? Will you return every dollar to every hard-working Canadian you have snookered with this nonsense?

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I have not received any money, so I am guessing the hon. member meant that through me.

The hon. member for North Okanagan—Shuswap.

Mr. Mel Arnold: Madam Speaker, the member asked if I would apologize if I am wrong, but I truly believe I will not be wrong. I hope he will do the same thing when he finds out that Canadians are being censored improperly. The Liberals are so afraid that people will put the truth out there and hear the truth that they are doing everything they can, as they have done tonight, to end debate on this bill.

[*Translation*]

Mr. René Villemure (Trois-Rivières, BQ): Madam Speaker, I thank the member for North Okanagan—Shuswap for his speech, which contained many elements. I would like to ask him to summarize in a few sentences the speech in question as I could not follow it because of the many interruptions.

Government Orders

[English]

Mr. Mel Arnold: Madam Speaker, if I were to sum up my speech in just a couple of paragraphs, it would be very difficult, because I had to list off so many places where we cannot trust the government. That is what my speech was about: the track record of the government and its failure to exhibit trustworthiness. We cannot trust it with this bill.

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Madam Speaker, the member, as I pointed out earlier, has clearly not read the bill, does not understand the bill and has not taken the effort to go through the bill. What we have seen from the Conservatives over the course of the nearly 100 hours of debate over many months is that most of the Conservatives getting up to speak have not read the bill at all. They have talking points, and the talking points are “something, something tyranny”, but that does not have anything to do with the bill—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The hon. member for New Westminster—Burnaby does understand what he is doing.

The hon. member for Cypress Hills—Grasslands has a point of order.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Madam Speaker, the House is built upon the foundational principle of honour, and every time the member says that a member from this side has not read the bill, it is dishonourable. He needs to show some integrity and he needs to understand that the Conservatives are doing the best they can to represent the views of their constituents. It is dishonourable of him to insinuate that we would do otherwise.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The hon. member raises an important point, and we have to believe that members here represent their constituencies.

I invite the hon. member for New Westminster—Burnaby to be prudent.

Mr. Peter Julian: Madam Speaker, I certainly did not question that. I questioned their knowledge of the bill. They have yet to prove that they have read through and have knowledge of the bill.

Every time we spend an hour in debate in this place, it is tens of thousands of dollars that taxpayers have to spend. The Conservatives would have loved hundreds and hundreds of hours of additional debate, so my question to my colleague is quite simply this. Why would the Conservatives want to draw out debate for hundreds of hours when they do not have enough knowledge about the bill, as they have not read it, to impart any information about the bill to Canadians?

• (1925)

Mr. Mel Arnold: Madam Speaker, I will recognize the member's intervention, but I believe if he had read the bill and closely read clause 7, he would have understood that there are serious problems with the bill. We need to continue debate on it to allow Canadians and the experts to be heard and to understand why we cannot trust this NDP-Liberal coalition, which he has to speak up with because of a signed agreement between the parties to carry this corrupt government forward.

Mr. John Brassard (Barrie—Innisfil, CPC): Madam Speaker, I will be splitting my time with the member for Edmonton—Wetaskiwin.

Democracy does, indeed, die at night. We are sitting here dealing with amendments from the Senate on a deeply flawed and deeply controversial piece of legislation. I have not been in the House all day, but for the last couple of hours. I have heard the debate and the concern expressed by the Leader of the Opposition. It was a profoundly convincing argument that he made as to why this piece of legislation should not be passed.

However, it is not just the words of the Leader of the Opposition that tell us why this piece of legislation needs to be, at a minimum, overhauled or, better yet, halted at this time. The concerns of Canadians, the concerns of digital content creators, those who understand this space, those who have looked at this piece of legislation, those who have taken the time to appear before committee to express their views and all of their concerns, including the Senate amendments, to deal with one part of this deeply flawed piece of legislation are being ignored by the government, which is certainly being aided and abetted by other opposition parties.

What I thought I would do tonight is take a different tack from where this debate has gone today. There have been, like I said, hundreds of thousands of voices. There is not one issue, perhaps other than Bill C-21, the firearms legislation that I heard more about from my constituents than Bill C-11. Like the member for North Okanagan—Shuswap, I am an elected member of this place, I am the voice of the people who I represent in Barrie—Innisfil and I am going to share their voices this evening. I am going to share the voices of other eminent Canadians who have expressed a concern about this piece of legislation.

I received an email from Kim, who said, “Dear Mr. Brassard, The passing of Bill C-11 will be a sad moment in Canadian history. Please consider making sure this bill does not get passed. This kind of censorship should not come from our government or any free society.” Violet said, “Dear Sir: I want the brakes put on this Bill now! I am not a fan of this ridiculous Bill.”

Rose said, “This bill is an overreach. It needs to be scrapped. Anyone who has been following this bill understands that we do not need the government to tell us what we can read/see [online].” Peter said, “Hello John, Regarding the above, my opinion is Bill C-11 should be scrapped and the [...] government keep their hand off of our social media. I hope you are [doing your] best to keep this Bill from being passed. Hopefully the Liberals will be ousted in the next election.”

John and Corrine from Barrie said, “Trust all is going well with you and your family. We ask that you vote ‘no’ to Bill C-11. This will hurt and restrict healthy free speech and debate which is the democracy our nation is founded on. This is a great concern to us. As our constitutional freedoms and rights are restricted, this opens doors to tyranny and dictatorship which is dangerous to every level of our nation.”

Government Orders

Another says, “Good afternoon Mr. Honourable Brassard, I know you're busy so I'll be brief.” This is from Brent in Barrie. “I'm very much against Bill C-11. I don't want an unelected government official/body determining what my family can watch. Margaret Atwood is against it. The previous CRTC commissioner is against it. This bill will stifle freedom of speech and shut down contrary views under the threat of 'misinformation and/or disinformation'. Please fight for our freedom of speech.”

We have certainly heard in the arguments from the opposition, the NDP and others about this being an issue of disinformation. In fact, I would suggest the ones spreading the disinformation are those on the government side.

The other person who has been directly involved in this entire debate has been Michael Geist, who is a law professor at Ottawa University. Interestingly, I was going through some his posts earlier today and he has been watching the debate intently in this House of Commons. He made a post earlier that said, “Bill C-11 is not China, Russia or Nazi Germany. As I've stated many times, it does not limit the ability....[of] implications for freedom of expression but it does [not] turn Canada into China.”

• (1930)

Mr. Peter Julian: Bravo. Bravo.

Mr. John Brassard: Don't get ahead of yourself.

Madam Speaker, his post continues, “To the claims that user content regulation is excluded from the bill, Section 4.1(2)(b) and 4.2.2 clearly scope such content into the bill, an interpretation that has been confirmed by dozens of experts and the former Chair of the CRTC. Liberal and NDP MP claims to the contrary should be regarded as disinformation, a deliberate attempt to spread false information. Indeed, the Senate proposed a fix. The government rejected it. That was supposed to be the focus of the debate, yet Liberal MPs such as [the member for Winnipeg North] falsely claimed that it is not there.”

He continued, “There were many other misleading or inaccurate statements throughout the day. Contrary to what some claim, the bill will not result in hundreds of millions of new spending or lead to increased consumer choice (the opposite is true). It will require the CRTC to re-examine Canon rules, which experience suggests are only loosely correlated to the professed goal of “telling Canadian stories.” But leaving all of these things aside, there was really only one question that needed answering: if the government's intent is not to regulate user content and the Senate passed an amendment consistent with that goal after concluding that Bill C-11 in its current form opens the door to CRTC regulation, why is the government rejecting the amendment?”

That is the fundamental question to this debate, and it is a question that has not been answered by either the government or any other members of the opposition.

In fact, Mr. Geist goes on and actually references a Bloc MP's intervention. He says, “[It probably provides] what is likely the most accurate, if deeply troubling answer. When asked to confirm that the bill maintains freedom of expression safeguards, [this Bloc member] responded with the following per the House of Commons

translator 'if violating freedom of expression means ensuring that Quebec content is well represented online then that's worth it.'”

To hell with everyone else.

We need to be able to protect freedom of expression online for everyone in this country, not just based on a geographical region. That is what is most egregious about this bill.

Mr. Geist goes on, “in the zeal to court support from the Quebec culture lobby, [the] Canadian Heritage Minister and the government are choosing in Bill C-11 to sacrifice some freedom of expression, which includes both the right to speak and the right to be heard.”

I mentioned earlier there have been other Canadians who spoke out against this. Timothy Denton, former CRTC commissioner and president of the Internet Society Canada Chapter, spoke out against this, as did Peter Menzies, former CRTC commissioner, and Scott Benzie, content creator and director at Digital First Canada. J.J. McCullough, in a well-documented Twitter intervention, posted his video. He talked about his concerns, and he is a journalist and commentator, about the impact this is going to have on user-generated content.

The Digital Media Association has expressed concern, as did Jeanette Patell, the head of Canada government affairs and public policy at YouTube. We have heard all of these interventions at committee all expressing concern about this particular piece of legislation and the impact it is going to have on the ability for Canadians to be seen and heard for the type of content they create.

As I said at the outset, we are dealing with Senate amendments. The Senate found it within itself, many of its members who are Liberal-appointed senators, to approve the amendments and send those amendments back to this place so we could have a wholesome debate. What is so sad throughout this whole process is the fact that this debate is being stifled at this point by closure by the government because it does not want to hear the truth from many of those Canadians who have expressed serious concern with this bill. Of course, the government is being aided and abetted by its coalition partners within the NDP.

• (1935)

We will always stand for the rights and freedoms of Canadians. We are not going to sit idly by and allow the government to kill democracy at night.

Government Orders

Mrs. Jenica Atwin (Fredericton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I listened intently to the hon. member's speech. I am grateful to hear the voices of Canadians. They can rightly voice their opinions about this issue. I have received similar emails and phone calls to my office, largely after receiving fundraising emails from the Conservative Party that are filled with the misinformation that is then repeated in their correspondence back to us.

It is our duty in this House to ensure that we do our due diligence, and we respond calmly and accurately, and share information about what is actually in the content of the bill. That is what I have been doing.

I am wondering if the member has also been listening to the voices who are in support of this bill, or does he also believe that they are liars and coercive bad actors.

Mr. John Brassard: Mr. Speaker, as I said during my speech, there has not been any other issue that I have been seized with other than Bill C-21, which is the firearms legislation, more than this piece of legislation.

I have heard from more people who are opposed to this piece of legislation, because of the impact it would have on user-generated content. I have listened to the voices of those people I represent. I have heard, at committee, the testimony of people. I read many of their comments about their concern about this piece of legislation. The Senate has a concern. The only sides that are not concerned about this are the Liberal and NDP side, and to some degree the Bloc. It is understandable why the Bloc is in support of this piece of legislation, but the NDP and the Liberals are not doing what they need to do, and that is to listen to those people who have expressed concerns.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Denis Garon (Mirabel, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in response to the misinformation put forward by my colleague, I wish to point out that the Bloc Québécois has always supported and will continue to support freedom of expression, including the freedom of Quebecers to live and thrive in their own culture.

Mr. John Brassard: Mr. Speaker, I did not say that the Bloc Québécois does not support freedom of expression. We agree with the Bloc on that.

What I said is that there are a lot of people across the country who do not agree with this bill for the reasons I have already outlined.

[*English*]

Ms. Bonita Zarrillo (Port Moody—Coquitlam, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I spent many hours listening to the debate in this House, and I have listened to many Conservatives, the majority of whom are not speaking specifically to the bill. They are speaking about freedom and the freedom to have anything on the Internet.

I just wanted to hear from the member. This is from the B.C. Association Chiefs of Police. As a past municipal councillor, child exploitation is one of the fastest growing crimes in Canada. The former president of the B.C. Association of Chiefs of Police said:

New social media applications create new opportunities for predators to target and exploit children online. As social media continues to grow, it's important for police to keep pace and prevent the victimization of children.

I wonder if the member has some comments about how we protect children from online predators.

• (1940)

Mr. John Brassard: Mr. Speaker, I do, it is called the Criminal Code.

To conflate the issue of child sexual exploitation with amendments or legislation that deal with the Broadcasting Act is disingenuous to say the least. None of us in this place want to see child exploitation manifest itself through online channels. The Criminal Code addresses that. The police services across this country address that. We have already addressed that. Could we do more? Absolutely.

However, this is about the Broadcasting Act, and this is about user-generated content and the impact for what people could see online.

Mr. Bob Zimmer (Prince George—Peace River—Northern Rockies, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have a quick question.

This is from the Senate testimony:

Ian Scott, who was, at the time, head of the CRTC, testified before our committee about their concerns that subclause 7(7) of the bill could give new and unprecedented powers to cabinet to intervene in independent CRTC decisions....

In this sense, Bill C-11 reduces enormously — potentially — the powers that the CRTC has and hands them over to the Government of Canada.

I have a simple question for my colleague. Can the Prime Minister be trusted with our freedoms?

Mr. John Brassard: Mr. Speaker, I think we have already seen examples of an overreach with this particular government on many aspects. I talked about Bill C-21 during my speech. My colleague from North Okanagan—Shuswap highlighted many of the egregious events of the government in taking down or limiting the rights and freedoms of Canadians. I think that is a concern and certainly a concern that I have heard from people as well.

Hon. Mike Lake (Edmonton—Wetaskiwin, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise and to speak to this debate tonight. In 2023 alone, I have held 15 constituent round tables of two hours each. I have heard from a couple of hundred constituents on a variety of issues, and this is among the top issues that constituents have raised with me.

I am not an expert to the extent that the member for Lethbridge is. She has done such fantastic work for our party on this issue. I am not as eloquent as our leader was tonight in his articulation of the issue, but I am here to represent my constituents.

I have been around here for 17 years, and today there is not only an observation about Parliament but also an observation about Canadian society that, if anything, we have to be a society that has more conversations not fewer conversations.

Government Orders

We need to be more open to approaching political debate and trying to persuade people. We need to be more open to being persuaded. Having as free of an Internet as possible, of course with safeguards for criminal justice issues and those kinds of things, and using the means available to us and the technology available to us is absolutely critical to the functioning of our democracy and the furtherance and the betterment of our society.

I have been watching and studying this, as I have been listening to the debate and also preparing for today, and I recognize that many experts have said that, under this bill, user content would be subject to CRTC regulations. The government has said, no, that is not the case. However, experts have come before committee and said, actually, it is the case.

The bill went to the Senate, and the Senate, dominated by Liberal-appointed senators, believed the experts. The senators came up with a reasonable amendment to address the issue. The Liberals in the House, led by the Prime Minister, decided that they were going to reject it. They were going to reject the wisdom of the senators who studied this and the experts who appeared before the Senate.

The senators came up with a common-sense amendment to address the issue. Liberals rejected it. The experts raised an alarm, and what did the Liberals do?

These are not hard-core Conservatives, by any stretch. These are people who, when we were in government, would appear before a committee and they used to be widely respected by Liberals. They are people like Michael Geist.

Now the government, members from the Liberal Party, call them names. They go to the Internet and criticize them publicly. They go to war with experts who have the courage to disagree with them, the people who have spent their lives looking at these things.

In the House today, it was interesting listening to an NDP member, earlier, down the way, talk about us wanting to debate this issue on behalf of our constituents, like somehow that is wrong and that we are wasting time raising the concerns of our constituents.

The NDP used to stand to debate, overnight, talking about things that the NDP wanted to talk about and debating. Its members used to stand up day after day, alongside the Liberals as well, complaining about the use of closure, every time closure was used. Now the NDP-Liberal coalition shut down debate at every opportunity.

Today, they are shutting down debate and limiting what Canadians hear about a bill designed to limit what Canadians see and hear on the Internet. That is the height of hypocrisy, and it is only in Liberal Canada today that we see this. We have a crisis of civil discourse in Canada.

At the root of this crisis is the fact that people do not feel heard. People do not trust the government. People do not understand the algorithms at play on Internet platforms either. We have those three things at play here, and this bill would exacerbate all those problems.

The Liberal and NDP members will say that the bill does not limit what people can post. Technically, that might be correct, but instead the bill just limits what Canadians see. It is called discoverability. The bill limits what Canadians see. We can think about what

the challenge is with that. Right now, we are in a world where people feel like they are not heard, and there is increasing frustration among people who feel like they are not heard.

● (1945)

Right now, Canadians who have something they think is important to say, maybe through poetry, music, speech, dance or some form of the arts, will post it on the Internet. It might be anything in whatever form of expression Canadians have. Let us assume that what they post in this hypothetical situation would go viral today with whatever mysterious algorithms are at play in the social media world. If we are on YouTube searching for something, it gives us a list of suggestions to watch. It suggests things based on what we have watched, and we get a chance to see something. It does a pretty good job of feeding us what we want to see. In that case, the post would go viral.

However, there are two very negative potential outcomes with the legislation. One might be that a person posts some incredible Canadian content that might go viral around the globe today, but under the legislation, it does not meet some vague, undefined criteria laid out by government-appointed public servants. Therefore, it would not be shared. This is not because it would lack popularity but because it would fail to meet what the government is trying to do. Thus, people will not get to see it. This incredible content that would otherwise have been shared would not get shared.

The second thing that people do not talk about as much is this: Let us say the post is one that would go viral otherwise and it meets the government-designed criteria, whatever they may be, and is shared with Canadians on the basis of criteria that are different from what fits with their interests. Therefore, it gets shared with me as I am surfing the Internet, watching YouTube or whatever is the case, and it is shared on the side. However, it is not shared with me because it might be something I am interested in; it is shared because the government thinks I should see it.

Thus, I do not engage with it because I am not interested in it. Now comes the profit motive. The regular algorithms kick in on social media, and because that post has been shared with a whole bunch of people who do not engage with it, instead of sharing it with people on the basis that they would actually like it, the algorithms do not share it with anybody else at a global level. Therefore, people around the world who otherwise would have absolutely loved this amazing Canadian content never see it. The algorithms do not share it because the government has limited the number of people who see it by sharing it with the wrong people according to government priorities as opposed to people's actual interests.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Government Orders

Hon. Mike Lake: Mr. Speaker, I am being heckled from the other side. They will not stand up and actually debate today, but they will stand up and heckle me. Then, they will probably ask questions about misinformation without making any arguments or trying to persuade anybody. They know they have the numbers tonight to just ram this through, regardless of what Canadians think. This is the issue we are talking about right now.

I am standing up in the interests of my constituents, who have massive concerns about the bill and already do not trust the government. It has been proven time and time again that the government will take steps against the interests of the constituents of Edmonton—Wetaskiwin, which I will mention is the largest constituency in the country. It has a population of about 230,000 constituents who feel completely abandoned by the government. When they take steps to share their feelings with Canadians and people who might be interested, or share anything on the Internet, they now feel that their sentiments and perspective are going to be further throttled by a government that already does not listen to them, neglects their point of view and never comes to visit or hear what they have to say.

I will wrap it up there. Hopefully, the questions I get from the Liberal, NDP and Bloc members will indicate that they have heard some of the concerns my constituents have raised and reflect that maybe there is an openness to being persuaded in some way.

• (1950)

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Brenda Shanahan (Châteauguay—Lacolle, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to reassure my colleague that I listened to his speech. Frankly, I did not hear anything different from what I heard the other night when we sat here in the House until midnight. However, that is what freedom of speech looks like.

I am a member of Parliament for a riding in Quebec that is home to creators, artists, people who work in the film industry. It is very important for me and my constituents that Bill C-11 be passed by the House.

I would like to know why my colleague insists on continuing this exercise.

[*English*]

Hon. Mike Lake: Mr. Speaker, this exercise is called democracy. The hon. member talks about how she listened until midnight the other night and did not hear anything different from me than what she might have heard the other night. I do not know what she heard the other night, but she certainly did not hear the member of Parliament for Edmonton—Wetaskiwin, representing the 230,000 constituents who I represent, standing here, representing the views that I have spent hours listening to at my constituency round tables.

That is the problem with the government. The views of constituents in areas that it does not represent are completely disregarded.

Ms. Lori Idlout (Nunavut, NDP): *Uqaqtittiji*, I have not been surprised, I guess, by the Conservative rhetoric during this debate on Bill C-11. They are quite repetitive in their interventions. They have not shared any real interventions on the actual text of the bill, including on discoverability, which in this act will be to ensure that

cultural content created by artists is accessible and promoted and that discoverability requirements will not authorize the CRTC to impose conditions that require the use of a particular computer algorithm or source code.

I wonder if the member can explain to us what the Conservatives understand the discoverability clauses to be in the bill.

Hon. Mike Lake: Mr. Speaker, there are a couple of things to that point. The bill is many pages long, and experts who have spent their entire lifetime studying this stuff have, in large numbers, come before multiple committees of the House to say that user-generated content is open to being regulated by the government through the CRTC.

On the cultural side of things, I trust that Canadian creators, from across the country, in whatever language they come up with, in whatever form their content takes, will come up with something that will be really special and demanded by people all over the world.

• (1955)

Mr. Mike Morrice (Kitchener Centre, GP): Mr. Speaker, over the last few hours we have heard a lot of talk of censorship, knowing there is no censorship in this bill. I appreciate that the member for Edmonton—Wetaskiwin focused his time on speaking about concerns from his constituents, which is exactly what we should be talking about in this place.

My question for him is this. Is he at all concerned with how talk about censorship could take away from and erode trust in legitimate, real concerns with the government's response to the Senate amendments?

Hon. Mike Lake: Mr. Speaker, it is actually the flip side of that argument. I think the government's response to the Senate amendments, by way of completely ignoring them and then taking to the Internet to actually attack people who criticize the government's approach, is what erodes Canadians' confidence and trust in their government, more than anything else.

Mr. Damien Kurek (Battle River—Crowfoot, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as always, it is an honour to be able to rise in this place to talk about the issues that are so important to the people whom I represent in Battle River—Crowfoot across east-central Alberta, and also to ensure that the voices of Canadians are heard within this place. Certainly, when it comes to the amount of correspondence and calls I receive, or the people who come up to me in the grocery store or on the street, or who walk into my office on the main street in Camrose, or when I chat with them across the many communities I represent in Battle River—Crowfoot, time and time again I hear from constituents who share their concern and who share their dismay at the fact that the Liberals and the Prime Minister would perpetuate a type of censorship that would limit the ability of Canadians to express themselves online.

Government Orders

It is unbelievable that in the 21st century this would happen in Canada, yet we are seeing it now, not only through Bill C-11, but we saw it through the previous Parliament's Bill C-10. Liberals seem to stop at nothing to control what Canadians believe and think, control everything to do with their lives. My submission to this place today, on behalf of so many constituents, is to plead with the government to reconsider.

As we discuss specifically the bill, which has been studied thoroughly, what I find interesting, now that it is back before this place, with the government's response to a thorough debate that took place in the Senate, is that we see so clearly that there is no consensus on the path forward for the bill, which is very contrary.

In fact, I would like to call out a very significant falsehood that is often perpetuated by members of the government. They somehow suggest, and in fact in question period earlier today they said it very clearly, that every Canadian supports the bill and that nobody is opposed to it. They asked the Conservatives what we are doing and said that we stand alone. I will definitively answer that question and say categorically that it is a falsehood, because of what we have heard throughout the course of this study. I know for a fact that there are some Canadians who live in constituencies represented by Liberals and by New Democrats who have reached out to me and other colleagues and have said unequivocally that they do not support Bill C-11.

I want to call out that falsehood in this place today, because government ministers, parliamentary secretaries and other talking heads of the government stand and say it is only the Conservatives who are somehow opposed to this great idea called "Bill C-11". They forget to talk about the substance of it; rather, they would simply make the case that everybody is on their side and that nobody opposes them. That is categorically false, and I am going to call out that falsehood here today, as my constituents expect me to.

We face a unique circumstance. We are facing not only a censorship bill that is before this place, in the form of Bill C-11, but we are facing the limiting of debate. Can members believe it? We see that not only does the government want to control the online feeds of Canadians, but it is truly stooping to a new level by limiting the debate in the people's House of Commons.

Can members believe it? The Liberals, with their coalition partners in the NDP, would do everything they can to silence opposition voices and to silence the voices of so many Canadians. It is not just Canadians we have heard from on this matter. It is not just regular folks who are living their daily lives, but we have seen that there is certainly no consensus across the artistic community in Canada. In fact, we have heard from many of Canada's most talented individuals, those in the more traditional spaces like art and writing, as well as television stars and that sort of thing, but we have also seen, incredibly, the rising digital creator class speak so clearly in opposition to the bill.

In fact, I remember the previous iteration, Bill C-10. It can get a little confusing for those watching, and I am sure there are many watching this egregious attempt by the Liberals to censor not only members of Parliament, but all Canadians. The previous iteration of the bill in the last Parliament was called Bill C-10, and I remember

chatting with the president of a digital film festival. I can assure members that this person was not a natural Conservative.

● (2000)

This was not somebody who would be predisposed to vote for the Conservative Party of Canada, but the plea from this pioneer in the creation of digital content was to say to stop it, stop the Liberals from being able to control our feeds and stop the Liberals from being able to introduce a massive government bureaucracy that would endeavour to control what we see online. I am proud to stand in this place with my Conservative colleagues as the only party that stands for freedom and democracy and against censorship.

An hon. member: Kill the bill.

Mr. Damien Kurek: Mr. Speaker, we do need to kill Bill C-11. There is no question.

It is interesting because even the Prime Minister's appointed senators brought up concerns about this bill. Again, it is not simply Conservatives who are concerned about cat videos like the member opposite suggested, but it is a growing chorus of folks from across the country who are saying that this is not the right direction for our country. I would note that over the course of the study that took place in Canada's Senate, we heard time and time again from Liberal-appointed senators. It was not simply Conservatives who were appointed in the Senate. It was a chorus of Liberal-appointed senators and they were tired of the propaganda that the Liberals were trying to sell.

I know that my colleagues have done a great job of unpacking various elements of that here this evening, but certainly when it comes to some of the specifics, we see a number of examples where senators endeavoured to make a bad bill a bit less bad, in an earnest attempt for democracy to be able to play its course. Those voices, in the other place as we refer to it, those senators, include those whom the Prime Minister appointed and some of whom were artists themselves, ironically. They endeavoured to make this bill less bad, so they sent it back as is tradition and procedure and yet here we have the government rejecting most of those amendments. They were the way that the Liberals would have the opportunity, a "get out of jail free" card, to address some of the most egregious concerns that certainly Conservatives have highlighted but also that experts from across the country have highlighted.

Government Orders

The Liberals were given an opportunity from Liberal Prime Minister-appointed individuals. Here was how they could have helped them get a pass so that they could have exempted some of the biggest concerns that experts from across the country had brought forward and yet what does the government do? Margaret Atwood is no Conservative and certainly not a traditional Conservative voter, although we will see what happens in the next election. We see a “creeping totalitarianism” where all the Liberals want is control. It seems that they will stop at nothing to control what Canadians see online.

Let me take a bit of a step back, if I could, and describe what is so sneaky about this bill because we have here not a frontal assault. We have examples throughout history of direct assaults on freedom of expression. There are numerous examples that one could point to from around the world where governments specifically say individuals can or cannot believe this. There are many examples where this Prime Minister will certainly call out anything he does not like and call people un-Canadian or a fringe minority or those with despicable views. He is certainly a purveyor of that sort of divisive language that divides Canadians.

However, this bill is sneaky. Let me unpack for members why it is so sneaky. It does not say that a regular Canadian or a content creator, or whatever the case is, cannot post something online, that they cannot go onto YouTube or cannot participate in a social media platform of some kind. The bill does not say at all that they cannot post something. That is where it is sneaky. Certainly the members of the Liberal Party have bought into this. I would hope that they simply do not understand what they are actually promoting and trying to pass into law in this country because of how terrifying a precedent it sets, but here is what is really terrifying. The bill does not at all say that people could not post it. What it does do is say very clearly that the government could control who sees it. As I describe this to many constituents who rightly are concerned, we see that it is backdoor censorship at its finest.

● (2005)

We see that it is the government using a sneaky mechanism and increased government bureaucracy to endeavour to control what Canadians can see. In the guise of the government saying it will never limit what people can say, it will simply limit what they can see. It is terrifying that this is something that would be debated in the 21st century in this place.

It is the sneakiness. I would implore all Canadians and all members of this place to stand up against that sort of sneaky, creeping totalitarianism because it sets a terrifying precedent that the government can control not necessarily what people can say as they allowed to think and say whatever they like, but it will control who can see it and what they see. That is an absolutely terrifying precedent that is being set.

When it comes to the bureaucracy that has been proposed, there are many examples where government fails. In fact, I would suggest the government is not really that good at delivering much and certainly the Liberals have demonstrated time and time again that they are not very good at delivering anything, let alone the promises they make either during a Parliament or during an election, whatever the case is.

The Liberals' response to the mechanism that they will use to control the information on the Internet is the imposition of broadcasting-like codes into the way that streams and algorithms work online. The way they are going to do this is to use a government agency. The government is saying to just trust it, do not worry about it, there is no reason to be concerned, people can certainly trust anything and everything the Prime Minister says, who has demonstrated himself to be less than truthful on more occasions than he can count. We see that Liberals are saying to just trust them when the reality is that Canadians cannot. Let me unpack that a little.

By using the CRTC, Liberals are giving a tremendous amount of authority, albeit at arm's length, to individuals who are subject to cabinet orders and approval, who are subject to appointments that are made by the Governor in Council or by the Prime Minister, in essence. We see the fingerprints of the Prime Minister, this backdoor type of censorship, that would limit the ability of Canadians and gives an incredible amount of authority to a bureaucracy that does not necessarily have the best interests of Canadians in mind.

I want to provide a bit of a paraphrase of part of the debate that I had with former minister of heritage, now Minister of Environment. He certainly has a checkered record when it comes to his activism and whatnot, but during the previous debate on Bill C-10, the comment was made that as long as it is the right sort of information, then it must be okay. In fact, I think it was a Green Party member who no longer sits in this House who had made this assertion during questions and comments during a late-night sitting when the Liberals were again trying to force and censor the debate around censorship. It seemed to be in the eyes of some within the left that it was okay to censor as long as it was censoring the views that one did not like.

Let me state definitively and categorically in this place that freedom is something that cannot be dictated. Freedom is something that exists because people are free. Freedom of speech is something, as is very clearly outlined in our Charter of Rights and Freedoms, that requires the full scope of what that means. When there is a very clear attempt, a precedent that has been set, examples of the Prime Minister and other members of the Liberal Party who have demonstrated a willingness to use the authority and the power of government to get their way, to cover up their scandals, to use the massive infrastructure of government and the associated bureaucracy to influence the direction of Canadians, it is not something that Canadians want, whether they support the Conservatives or not. This is where there is a growing number of individuals.

I think that directly related to the Liberals' shutdown of debate, their censorship of the censorship discussion, we have what I suspect is a growing message that Liberal MPs, backbench and otherwise, are likely hearing from their constituents who are asking questions. They are asking what the deal is with this. Instead of Liberals being honest with those constituents, addressing those concerns and taking a pause on what would be massive government overreach, they are buckling down.

Government Orders

● (2010)

Instead of being honest and instead of representing their constituents, they simply slam the door on debate and push the bill through for royal assent so that they can have the control they so much desire.

We have seen this before. It is incredibly troubling that they are using the heavy hand of their coalition, in which nobody in either the NDP or the Liberal Party were elected. The Liberals are using that confidence and supply agreement, a fundamentally undemocratic agreement, as a weapon to try to control what Canadians can see on the Internet. I will tell members that it is wrong and it needs to be rejected.

This will be the last chance for members of the House to take a stand for Canadians and for freedom. There is so much that can, and I believe needs, to be talked about when it comes to the myriad circumstances surrounding Bill C-11. I would like to talk about the idea of Canadian content.

As the Leader of the Opposition articulately stated earlier, this is one of the sneaky ways that the Liberals are able to massage the debate around this issue to somehow suggest that Conservatives are the ones who are somehow offside with regular Canadians. On the question of Canadian content, clearly it is the Bloc that shows that the Liberals are absolutely full of it when they try to hide behind this idea. Let me unpack that a little.

It would be nice to know what Canadian content is. I think that the Conservatives, over the course of this debate, have been asking that question: "Give us a definition of what Canadian content is?" However, the Liberals seem unwilling to have that discussion, let alone meaningfully engage on the issue.

The question must be asked: Why is that significant? It is because it comes back to who is in control. When we are basing a bill on so-called Canadian content, it sounds great. Who does not love maple syrup? Who does not love being proud to be from Alberta, and the western heritage there? Who would not love to watch the Calgary Stampede for those 10 days? There are numerous examples, such as country music. Not everybody may agree with me on the best form of music, but it certainly is country music.

We see how the Liberals talk about Canadian content. I think they are endeavouring to ensure that Canadians think of the motherhood and apple pie-type messages: maple syrup, the moose and the fond memories of childhood. Those are related to various elements that people may associate with what they might call Canadian content.

What is concerning is that we see a direct attempt by the government to manipulate that term to serve its political purposes. The government is not defining Canadian content in the bill, in fact, if members can believe it, it is not even mentioned in the bill. However, the Liberals talk about it in such a forward way that it provides this, what I would suggest, massive funnel where they can say, "Okay, here are the only things that can fit" in what they would determine is the type of Canadian content they would deem acceptable.

Is that coming from a directive from the Prime Minister's Office? I do not know. However, for the Liberals to suggest that it is or it is not comes directly down and back to the question that I asked earlier as to whether or not we can trust them. I think Canadians increasingly are speaking very clearly on this issue that "we cannot". We cannot trust this Prime Minister, we cannot trust this cabinet, and we cannot trust these members of the coalition, when they have demonstrated time and time again that they simply cannot be trusted.

Where does this leave us, as we come down to what is literally the end of debate, where we will be, once again, voting on the bill? It is the last chance. I think the solution is actually quite simple. Canadians have a choice: creeping totalitarianism and a respect for a basic dictatorship, or the Leader of the Opposition, the leader of the Conservative Party, who is willing to bring home freedom for every Canadian, so let us bring it home.

● (2015)

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: It being 8:17 p.m., pursuant to an order made earlier today, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of Motion No. 2 relating to the Senate amendments to Bill C-11 now before the House.

[*English*]

The question is on the amendment.

If a member of a recognized party present in the House wishes that the amendment be carried or carried on division or wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

Mr. Damien Kurek: Mr. Speaker, I would ask for a recorded vote, please.

The Deputy Speaker: Call in the members.

And the bells having rung:

● (2045)

The Speaker: The question is on the amendment. Shall I dispense?

Some hon. members: No.

[*Chair read text of amendment to House*]

● (2105)

(The House divided on the amendment, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 291*)

YEAS

Members

Aboultiaf
Albas
Arnold
Barlow
Berthold
Block
Brassard
Calkins

Aitchison
Allison
Baldinelli
Barrett
Bezan
Bragdon
Brock
Caputo

Government Orders

Carrie	Chambers	Champoux	Chatel
Chong	Cooper	Chen	Chiang
Dalton	Dancho	Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	Collins (Victoria)
Davidson	Deltell	Cormier	Coteau
d'Entremont	Doherty	Dabrusin	Damoff
Dowdall	Dreeshen	Davies	DeBellefeuille
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Ellis	Desbiens	Desilets
Epp	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Desjarlais	Dhaliwal
Falk (Provencher)	Fast	Dhillon	Diab
Ferreri	Findlay	Dong	Drouin
Gallant	Généreux	Dubourg	Duclos
Genuis	Gladu	Duguid	Dzerowicz
Godin	Goodridge	Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Gourde	Gray	Erskine-Smith	Fillmore
Hallan	Jeneroux	Fisher	Fonseca
Kelly	Kitchen	Fortier	Fortin
Kmiec	Kram	Fragiskatos	Fraser
Kramp-Neuman	Kurek	Freeland	Fry
Kusie	Lake	Gaheer	Garon
Lantsman	Lawrence	Garrison	Gaudreau
Lehoux	Lewis (Essex)	Gazan	Gerretsen
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert	Gill	Gould
Lloyd	Lobb	Green	Guilbeault
Maguire	Martel	Hajdu	Hanley
Mazier	McCauley (Edmonton West)	Hardie	Hepfner
McLean	Melillo	Holland	Housefather
Moore	Morantz	Hughes	Hussen
Morrison	Motz	Hutchings	Iacono
Muys	Nater	Idlout	Ien
O'Toole	Patzer	Jaczek	Joly
Paul-Hus	Perkins	Jowhari	Julian
Poilievre	Redekopp	Kayabaga	Kelloway
Reid	Rempel Garner	Khalid	Khera
Richards	Roberts	Koutrakis	Kusmierczyk
Rood	Ruff	Kwan	Lalonde
Scheer	Schmale	Lambropoulos	Lametti
Seebach	Shields	Lamoureux	Lapointe
Shipley	Small	Larouche	Lattanzio
Soroka	Steinley	Lauzon	LeBlanc
Stewart	Strahl	Lebouthillier	Lemire
Stubbs	Thomas	Lightbound	Long
Tochor	Tolmie	Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
Uppal	Van Popta	MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacDonald (Malpeque)
Vecchio	Vidal	MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Vien	Viersen	Maloney	Martinez Ferrada
Vis	Wagantall	Masse	Mathysen
Warkentin	Waugh	May (Cambridge)	May (Saarnich—Gulf Islands)
Webber	Williams	McDonald (Avalon)	McGuinty
Zimmer— 113		McKay	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
		McLeod	McPherson
		Mendès	Mendicino
		Miao	Michaud
		Miller	Morrice
		Morrissey	Naqvi
		Ng	Noormohamed
		Normandin	O'Connell
		Oliphant	O'Regan
		Perron	Petitpas Taylor
		Plamondon	Powlowski
		Qualtrough	Rayes
		Robillard	Rodriguez
		Rogers	Romanado
		Sahota	Sajjan
		Saks	Samson
		Sarai	Savard-Tremblay
		Scarpaleggia	Schiefke
		Serré	Sgro
		Shanahan	Sheehan
		Sidhu (Brampton East)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
		Sinclair-Desgagné	Singh
		Sorbara	Sousa
		Ste-Marie	St-Onge
		Sudds	Tassi

NAYS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Ali	Anand
Anandasangaree	Angus
Arseneault	Arya
Ashton	Atwin
Bachrach	Badawey
Bains	Baker
Barron	Barsalou-Duval
Battiste	Beaulieu
Beech	Bendayan
Bennett	Bergeron
Bérubé	Bibeau
Bittle	Blaikie
Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas
Blaney	Blois
Boissonnault	Boulerice
Bradford	Brière
Brunelle-Duceppe	Cannings
Casey	Chabot
Chagger	Chahal

Government Orders

Taylor Roy
Therrien
Trudeau
Turnbull
Van Bynen
Vandal
Villemure
Weiler
Zahid
Zuberi— 205

Thériault
Thompson
Trudel
Valdez
van Koeverden
Vignola
Virani
Yip
Zarrillo

Fortier
Fragiskatos
Freeland
Gaheer
Garrison
Gazan
Gill
Green
Hajdu
Hardie
Holland
Hughes
Hutchings
Idlout
Jaczek
Jowhari
Kayabaga
Khalid
Koutrakis
Kwan
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Larouche
Lauzon
Lebouthillier
Lightbound
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacGregor
Maloney
Masse
May (Cambridge)
McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McPherson
Mendicino
Michaud
Morrissey
Ng
Normandin
Oliphant
Pauzé
Petitpas Taylor
Powlowski
Robillard
Rogers
Sahota
Saks
Sarai
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Brampton East)
Sinclair-Desgagné
Sorbara
Ste-Marie
Sudds
Taylor Roy
Therrien
Trudeau
Turnbull
Van Bynen
Vandal
Villemure
Weiler
Zarrillo

Fortin
Fraser
Fry
Garon
Gaudreau
Gerretsen
Gould
Guilbeault
Hanley
Hepfner
Housefather
Hussen
Iacono
Ien
Joly
Julian
Kelloway
Khera
Kusmierczyk
Lalonde
Lametti
Lapointe
Lattanzio
LeBlanc
Lemire
Long
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacDonald (Malpeque)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Martinez Ferrada
Mathysen
McDonald (Avalon)
McKay
McLeod
Mendès
Miao
Miller
Naqvi
Noormohamed
O'Connell
O'Regan
Perron
Plamondon
Qualtrough
Rodriguez
Romanado
Sajjan
Samson
Savard-Tremblay
Schieffe
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Singh
Sousa
St-Onge
Tassi
Thériault
Thompson
Trudel
Valdez
van Koeverden
Vignola
Virani
Zahid
Zuberi— 202

PAIRED

Members

Hoback
Vandenbeld

Simard
Wilkinson— 4

The Speaker: I declare the amendment defeated.

The next question is on the main motion.

If a member of a recognized party present in the House wishes that the motion be carried or carried on division or wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

Mr. Mark Strahl: Mr. Speaker, I request a recorded division.

• (2110)

[*Translation*]

(The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(*Division No. 292*)

YEAS

Members

Aldag
Ali
Anandasangaree
Arseneault
Ashton
Bachrach
Bains
Barron
Battiste
Beech
Bennett
Bérubé
Bittle
Blanchet
Blaney
Boissonnault
Bradford
Brunelle-Duceppe
Casey
Chagger
Champoux
Chen
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Cormier
Dabrusin
Davies
Desbiens
Desjarlais
Dhillon
Dong
Dubourg
Duguid
Ehsassi
Erskine-Smith
Fisher

Alghabra
Anand
Angus
Arya
Atwin
Badawey
Baker
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Bendayan
Bergeron
Bibeau
Blaikie
Blanchette-Joncas
Blois
Boulerice
Brière
Cannings
Chabot
Chahal
Chatel
Chiang
Collins (Victoria)
Coteau
Damoff
DeBellefeuille
Desilets
Dhaliwal
Diab
Drouin
Duclos
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury
Fillmore
Fonseca

Aboultaif
Albas
Arnold

NAYS

Members

Aitchison
Allison
Baldinelli

Government Orders

Barlow
 Berthold
 Block
 Brassard
 Calkins
 Carrie
 Chong
 Dalton
 Davidson
 d'Entremont
 Dowdall
 Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
 Epp
 Falk (Provencher)
 Ferreri
 Gallant
 Genuis
 Godin
 Gourde
 Hallan
 Kelly
 Kmiec
 Kramp-Neuman
 Kusie
 Lantsman
 Lehoux
 Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
 Lloyd
 Maguire
 May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
 McCauley (Edmonton West)
 Melillo
 Morantz
 Morrison
 Muys

Barrett
 Bezan
 Bragdon
 Brock
 Caputo
 Chambers
 Cooper
 Dancho
 Deltell
 Doherty
 Dreeshen
 Ellis
 Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
 Fast
 Findlay
 Généreux
 Gladu
 Goodridge
 Gray
 Jeneroux
 Kitchen
 Kram
 Kurek
 Lake
 Lawrence
 Lewis (Essex)
 Liepert
 Lobb
 Martel
 Mazier
 McLean
 Moore
 Morrice
 Motz
 Nater

O'Toole
 Paul-Hus
 Poilievre
 Redekopp
 Rempel Garner
 Roberts
 Ruff
 Schmale
 Shields
 Small
 Steinley
 Strahl
 Thomas
 Tolmie
 Van Popta
 Vidal
 Viersen
 Wagantall
 Waugh
 Williams
 Zimmer — 117

Patzer
 Perkins
 Rayes
 Reid
 Richards
 Rood
 Scheer
 Seeback
 Shipley
 Soroka
 Stewart
 Stubbs
 Tochor
 Uppal
 Vecchio
 Vien
 Vis
 Warkentin
 Webber
 Williamson

PAIRED

Members

Hoback
 Vandenbeld

Simard
 Wilkinson — 4

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

It being 9:15 p.m., the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m. pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 9:15 p.m.)

CONTENTS

Thursday, March 30, 2023

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Conflict of Interest and Ethics Commissioner	
The Speaker	12823
Government Response to Petitions	
Mr. Lamoureux	12823
Committees of the House	
Industry and Technology	
Mr. Lightbound	12823
Environment and Sustainable Development	
Mr. Scarpaleggia	12823
Canada–People’s Republic of China Relationship	
Mr. Hardie	12823
National Framework on Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder Act	
Ms. McPherson	12823
Bill C-329. Introduction and first reading	12823
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	12824
Committees of the House	
Procedure and House Affairs	
Mr. Lamoureux	12824
Motion	12824
(Motion agreed to)	12824
Petitions	
Falun Gong	
Mrs. Hughes	12824
Seal Island Lighthouse	
Mr. d’Entremont	12824
The Economy	
Ms. Rempel Garner	12824
Justice	
Ms. Rempel Garner	12824
Rights of the Unborn	
Mrs. Wagantall	12825
Seniors	
Mr. Webber	12825
Firearms	
Mr. Van Popta	12825
Salmon Fishery	
Mr. Johns	12825
Citizenship and Immigration	
Ms. Diab	12825
Firearms	
Mrs. Gray	12826

Human Rights in Pakistan	
Mr. Genuis	12826
Ukraine	
Mr. Genuis	12826
Medical Assistance in Dying	
Mr. Genuis	12826
Human Rights	
Mr. Genuis	12826
Mr. Genuis	12826
Charitable Organizations	
Mr. Genuis	12826
Questions on the Order Paper	
Mr. Lamoureux	12827
Private Members’ Business	
The Speaker	12827

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Motion No. 2—Senate Amendments to Bill C-11	
Motion that debate be not further adjourned	
Mr. Holland	12827
Motion	12827
Mrs. Thomas	12827
Mr. Duclos	12828
Mr. Champoux	12828
Mr. Julian	12828
Mr. Lamoureux	12828
Ms. Rempel Garner	12829
Ms. Mathysen	12829
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	12829
Mr. Kelly	12829
Mr. Johns	12830
Mr. Gerretsen	12830
Mrs. Gray	12831
Ms. Barron	12831
Mrs. Wagantall	12831
Mr. Trudel	12832
Motion agreed to	12833
Online Streaming Act	
Motion No. 2	12833
Mr. Lamoureux	12833
Mr. Aboultaif	12836
Mr. Champoux	12836
Mr. Johns	12836
Mr. Vidal	12837
Mr. Gerretsen	12837

Points of Order**Video Recording of Parliamentary Proceedings**

Mr. Gerretsen	12837
Mr. Lamoureux	12837
Mr. Kelly	12837

Online Streaming Act

Motion No. 2	12838
Mr. Champoux	12838
Mr. Gerretsen	12839
Ms. Barron	12839
Mr. Patzer	12839
Mr. Savard-Tremblay	12840
Mr. Trudel	12840
Mr. Gerretsen	12841
Mr. Johns	12841
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	12842
Mr. Virani	12842
Mr. Van Popta	12845
Mr. Trudel	12845
Ms. Barron	12845
Mrs. Valdez	12845
Mr. Shields	12846
Mr. Gerretsen	12846
Mrs. Block	12846

Points of Order**Video Recording of Parliamentary Proceedings**

Mr. Gerretsen	12847
Mr. Williamson	12848
Mr. Masse	12848
Mr. Lamoureux	12848
Mr. Zimmer	12848

Online Streaming Act

Motion No. 2	12848
Mrs. Block	12848
Ms. Dabrusin	12849
Mr. Perron	12849
Mr. Masse	12849
Ms. Rempel Garner	12849
Mr. Gerretsen	12851
Mr. Carrie	12851
Mr. Trudel	12851
Mr. Masse	12852
Mr. Gerretsen	12852

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS**Elmira Maple Syrup Festival**

Mr. Louis	12853
-----------------	-------

Ugadi

Mr. Carrie	12854
------------------	-------

The Environment

Mr. McLeod	12854
------------------	-------

Maureen Breau

Mr. Perron	12854
------------------	-------

Les Suprêmes Novice

Ms. Lattanzio	12854
---------------------	-------

Glenlawn Collegiate Institute

Ms. Rempel Garner	12854
-------------------------	-------

Lakeshore Soccer Club

Mr. Scarpaleggia	12855
------------------------	-------

Allison Herbert Whitehead

Mrs. Atwin	12855
------------------	-------

Tigres de Victoriaville

Mr. Rayes	12855
-----------------	-------

Government Contracts

Mr. Genuis	12855
------------------	-------

Human Rights in Russia

Mr. McKay	12856
-----------------	-------

Corinne Kline

Mr. McCauley	12856
--------------------	-------

2020 Shootings in Nova Scotia

Mr. Perkins	12856
-------------------	-------

Hockey in Vaudreuil—Soulanges

Mr. Schiefke	12856
--------------------	-------

Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder

Ms. McPherson	12857
---------------------	-------

Drummondville Voltigeurs

Mr. Champoux	12857
--------------------	-------

Leader of the Liberal Party of Canada

Mr. Scheer	12857
------------------	-------

Critical Minerals

Ms. Lapointe	12857
--------------------	-------

ORAL QUESTIONS**Canadian Heritage**

Mr. Poilievre	12858
Mr. Ferguson	12858
Mr. Poilievre	12858
Mr. Ferguson	12858
Mr. Poilievre	12858
Mr. Ferguson	12858
Mr. Poilievre	12858
Mr. Holland	12858

Carbon Pricing

Mr. Poilievre	12859
Mr. Duguid	12859

Democratic Institutions

Mr. Therrien	12859
Mr. Sidhu (Brampton East)	12859
Mr. Therrien	12859

Mr. Holland	12859	Mr. Deltell	12864
Domestic Violence		Mr. Champagne	12864
Mr. Julian	12859	Dental Care	
Ms. Damoff	12859	Mr. Thériault	12864
Employment		Mr. Duclos	12864
Mr. Boulerice	12860	Mr. Thériault	12864
Mr. O'Regan	12860	Mr. Duclos	12865
Carbon Pricing		Carbon Pricing	
Mr. Poilievre	12860	Mrs. Kramp-Neuman	12865
Mr. Duguid	12860	Mr. Beech	12865
Mr. Poilievre	12860	Mrs. Roberts	12865
Mr. Duguid	12860	Ms. Khera	12865
Government Appointments		Mr. Zimmer	12865
Mr. Poilievre	12860	Ms. Saks	12865
Mr. Holland	12860	Agriculture and Agri-Food	
Mr. Poilievre	12861	Mrs. Chatel	12865
Mr. Holland	12861	Ms. Bibeau	12866
Mr. Barrett	12861	Carbon Pricing	
Mr. Holland	12861	Mr. Perkins	12866
Mr. Berthold	12861	Mr. Beech	12866
Mr. Holland	12861	Mr. Small	12866
Employment Insurance		Ms. Hutchings	12866
Ms. Chabot	12861	Mrs. Gallant	12866
Mr. Kusmierczyk	12861	Mr. Duguid	12866
Ms. Chabot	12861	Housing	
Ms. Bendayan	12861	Mr. Sorbara	12866
Seniors		Mr. Hussen	12867
Ms. Larouche	12862	Sport	
Ms. Khera	12862	Ms. Ashton	12867
Carbon Pricing		Mr. van Koeverden	12867
Mr. Barlow	12862	The Budget	
Ms. Bibeau	12862	Mr. Vuong	12867
Mr. Epp	12862	Ms. O'Connell	12867
Ms. Bibeau	12862	Presence in Gallery	
Mr. Martel	12862	The Speaker	12867
Mr. Champagne	12862	Maureen Breau	
Indigenous Affairs		The Speaker	12867
Ms. Idlout	12863	Points of Order	
Ms. Hajdu	12863	Video Recording of Parliamentary Proceedings— Speaker's Ruling	
Health		The Speaker	12868
Mr. Davies	12863	Mr. Scheer	12868
Mr. Champagne	12863	Business of the House	
Seniors		Mr. Scheer	12868
Ms. Thompson	12863	Mr. Holland	12869
Ms. Khera	12863	GOVERNMENT ORDERS	
Carbon Pricing		Online Streaming Act	
Mr. Hallan	12863	Motion No. 2	12869
Mr. Duguid	12863	Mr. Gerretsen	12869
Mr. Hallan	12864		
Ms. Hutchings	12864		
Mr. Deltell	12864		
Ms. Bendayan	12864		

Mrs. Wagantall	12870
Mrs. Atwin	12870
Ms. Idlout	12871
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	12871
Mr. Redekopp	12871
Ms. O'Connell	12871
Mr. Zimmer	12872
Mr. Redekopp	12872
Mrs. Atwin	12874
Mr. Garon	12874
Mr. Fast	12874
Mr. Fast	12875
Mrs. Atwin	12876
Mr. Garon	12876
Ms. Idlout	12876

ROYAL ASSENT

The Deputy Speaker	12877
--------------------------	-------

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Online Streaming Act

Motion No. 2	12877
Mr. Sorbara	12877
Mr. Patzer	12878
Mr. Garon	12878
Mr. Morrice	12879
Mr. Kelly	12879
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	12879
Mr. Lamoureux	12881
Mr. Zimmer	12881
Ms. Idlout	12881
Mr. Allison	12882
Mr. Lamoureux	12883
Mr. Garon	12884
Mr. Blaikie	12884
Mr. Kelly	12884
Mr. Zimmer	12884
Mrs. Brière	12886
Mr. Garon	12886
Mr. Morrice	12886
Mrs. Goodridge	12886
Mr. Williams	12886
Mr. Lamoureux	12888

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

International Mother Language Day Act

Bill S-214. Report stage	12888
--------------------------------	-------

Mr. Hardie	12888
Motion for concurrence	12888
(Motion agreed to)	12888
Third reading	12888
Mr. Villemure	12889
Ms. Ashton	12890
Mr. Hardie	12891
(Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed) ...	12891

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Online Streaming Act

Motion No. 2	12891
Mr. Poilievre	12891
Mr. Lamoureux	12894
Mr. Villemure	12894
Mr. Blaikie	12894
Mr. Vis	12895
Mrs. Atwin	12895
Ms. Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	12895
Mr. Lamoureux	12897
Mr. Morrice	12897
Mr. Patzer	12897
Mr. Perkins	12897
Mr. Tochor	12898
Mrs. Atwin	12899
Mr. Villemure	12899
Mr. Julian	12899
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	12899
Mr. Patzer	12900
Mr. Lamoureux	12901
Mr. Villemure	12901
Mr. Julian	12902
Mr. Arnold	12902
Mr. Fillmore	12904
Mr. Villemure	12904
Mr. Julian	12905
Mr. Brassard	12905
Mrs. Atwin	12907
Mr. Garon	12907
Ms. Zarrillo	12907
Mr. Zimmer	12907
Mr. Lake	12907
Mrs. Shanahan	12909
Ms. Idlout	12909
Mr. Morrice	12909
Mr. Kurek	12909
Amendment negatived	12914
Motion No. 2 agreed to	12915

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>