



HOUSE OF COMMONS  
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES  
CANADA

44th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

---

# House of Commons Debates

Official Report  
(Hansard)

Volume 151 No. 092  
Monday, June 20, 2022

---

Speaker: The Honourable Anthony Rota



## **CONTENTS**

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

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, June 20, 2022

The House met at 11 a.m.

---

*Prayer*

---

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

• (1105)

[*English*]

### CANADA INFRASTRUCTURE BANK ACT

The House resumed from April 6 consideration of the motion that Bill C-245, An Act to amend the Canada Infrastructure Bank Act, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

**Mr. Ken McDonald (Avalon, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, after two years hampered by a global pandemic, Canadians are starting to rebuild. Communities large and small across the country are looking to a brighter, sustainable and inclusive future.

The Government of Canada is committed to bolstering that rebuild. The Canada Infrastructure Bank is playing an important role in that effort. The bank's innovative approach is empowering the work by provinces, municipalities and indigenous communities to bring key projects to fruition. It is doing so, from planning to design to delivery, with the added benefit of a reduced reliance on public dollars.

By leveraging the expertise and capital of private and institutional investors, the Canada Infrastructure Bank brings its investment, advisory and know-how to all orders of government, including indigenous investment partners. This is a partnership that is transforming how infrastructure is planned, funded and delivered to Canadians.

That means bringing innovative financing tools to the table. It means getting more projects built. It means advancing Canada's demonstrated success in leveraging public-private partnership, or P3, models to bring better trade and transportation, public transit and green infrastructure to Canadians, and to further broadband connectivity, develop clean power and support indigenous projects.

The G20 and OECD have for several years encouraged countries to promote more long-term private investment in infrastructure. Moreover, there are large pools of private and institutional capital available for investment, including our pension funds, that are looking to support long-term public policy priorities. The Canada Infrastructure Bank works to attract this capital to help address public

policy objectives in the infrastructure space, particularly in projects that generate revenue, such as transit fares, electricity rates and other forms of revenues that support service delivery and provide the underpinning of the new innovative financing structures.

These influential organizations are now looking to Canada as a global leader in advancing the P3 model and the next generation of innovative financing and partnerships with the private sector. Stakeholders are watching and learning as the Canada Infrastructure Bank moves to deliver on its important mandate.

To date, the Canada Infrastructure Bank is actively involved in 33 projects, including the commitment of over \$6.8 billion in capital, while attracting over \$7.2 billion in private and institutional investment. This investment is making a real difference for projects such as rural broadband in Manitoba, zero-emission buses in communities across the country and energy retrofits in Quebec with the Société de financement et d'accompagnement en performance énergétique.

The Canada Infrastructure Bank is also supporting the advancement of key projects such as high frequency rail, helping to find innovative ways to transition Atlantic Canada off coal through clean power transmission with the Atlantic Loop, and supporting Manitoba fibre's plan to provide broadband access to tens of thousands of additional households and businesses. Realizing these vital projects will mean connecting Canadians, creating good jobs and helping us to reach our climate goals as we navigate a path to net-zero emissions by 2050.

To advance the government's commitment to close the indigenous infrastructure gap and support the prosperity of indigenous communities, the government has set a target for the Canada Infrastructure Bank to invest at least \$1 billion in total across its five priority sectors for revenue-generating projects that benefit indigenous people. The Canada Infrastructure Bank has developed and implemented its indigenous community infrastructure initiative, which provides low-cost and long-term debt for indigenous community-based projects.

*Private Members' Business*

This initiative is designed to bring results to indigenous communities through projects that can bring greater renewable, sustainable and reliable hydro power to Canada's north and projects that support connections, such as through the maintenance and modernization of Tshuettin Rail Transportation, the first indigenous-owned and operated railway company in Canada. The Canada Infrastructure Bank is a key resource for driving Canada's recovery and a key partner to investors banking on Canada.

Moreover, since its introduction in 2017, the Canada Infrastructure Bank has succeeded at adapting its role and priorities to respond to evolving circumstances and opportunities, enabling the bank to better support Canada's response to the pandemic and the transition to a low-carbon economy. The Canada Infrastructure Bank has done so under the stewardship of a board of directors that is skilled, bilingual and diverse, a board that benefits from indigenous representation, gender parity and representation from across Canada. Members of the board of directors are appointed through a transparent, merit-based and competitive process.

The Canada Infrastructure Bank represents a crucial conduit for communities, provinces, territories and indigenous partners seeking to get things done for Canadians. It is making a difference by enabling a number of projects to be planned, financed and constructed.

It is an innovative and effective way to spur investment in key projects, to build confidence in our economy after two years of unprecedented challenges and to work with Canadians to ensure a strong, inclusive recovery that works for everyone. It is a crucial resource to promote improved infrastructure, with a reduced need for public dollars, through collaborative efforts that leverage the expertise of each partner to meet clearly defined public needs through the appropriate allocation of resources, risks and rewards.

For Canadians this is a win-win. It is an arm's-length Crown corporation working co-operatively with all levels of government and indigenous communities to facilitate and accelerate the delivery of high-quality infrastructure through new and innovative investment models. Also, through the Canada Infrastructure Bank's innovative financial tools, it is a means to reduce the burden on taxpayers and constrained government budgets, while expanding private sector investment and promoting innovation.

It is working for investors, workers and communities. It is working for Canadians.

• (1110)

**Mr. Kelly McCauley (Edmonton West, CPC):** Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to rise on Bill C-245, especially after about three hours of sleep due to a late flight. Thanks, Air Canada. I wish we were debating something about Air Canada. I am in the mood for that right now.

Bill C-245 would nominally change Canada's failed Infrastructure Bank from a colossal, failed boondoggle that is wasting taxpayers' money to a potentially massive failure that is also wasting taxpayers' money but in a different way and under different leadership.

Bill C-245 wants to change infrastructure investment to something that is in the public interest and relates to climate change miti-

gation or adaptation, except we already basically have a department for that. It is called Infrastructure Canada. The idea is that we are going to take \$35 billion from the failed Infrastructure Bank, move it from one failed institution and hand it over to another poorly led institution.

It reminds me a bit of the even-steven *Seinfeld* episode where Jerry Seinfeld always ends up even at the end of the day. He gains a friend and loses a friend. He takes \$20 out of his pocket and throws it out the window, then grabs a jacket and finds \$20. That is all this is. We are shuffling things from one failed department to another failed department.

We have immense problems at Infrastructure Canada. The old PBO, Jean-Denis Fréchette, who is retired now and beekeeping, and I wish him well, noted often that billions could not be found from infrastructure spending. The 2018 PBO report showed the federal government was able to reduce its deficit in 2018, which is shocking, I know. It is almost heresy for this government. However, that was only because it did not spend the infrastructure money that was set aside.

I want to read a quote from the PBO report:

The PBO has published 4 reports regarding [Infrastructure Canada]. Our previous findings indicated that data gaps existed in the tracking of federal money; planned spending lagged; job creation and economic growth was lower than anticipated; and, increases in federal spending were partly offset by decreases in provincial money.

There is limited evidence that increased federal money resulted in increased provincial spending (while federal...transfers increased by \$1 billion...overall provincial [transfers] decreased by \$733 million).

The Senate did a report on infrastructure spending, and it said that the only measurement for success for all this spending on infrastructure was not actual results. It was not whether it actually helped the economy. Was it whether it helped the environment? No. Was it about productivity improvements? No. The only measurement of success the Senate was able to find for Infrastructure Canada was whether dollars were spent. This bill wants another \$35 billion spent by the same people, who just want to spend the money, and the only metric of success is spending the money, not achieving results.

This is right from GC InfoBase on the Treasury Board's website on results: In 2021, Infrastructure Canada only achieved 25% of its goals for 2020-21. If we think about that, this bill wants to add \$35 billion more to Infrastructure Canada to not achieve targets.

I have some of the missed targets for Infrastructure Canada. Again, this is right from the government's website, GC InfoBase. It missed out on the value of infrastructure spending. It failed to achieve its goal on projects that it was committed to. Here is a good one: It failed in its goal on changes in GDP, or increases in GDP attributed to spending. Again, what is the point of spending all this money when it is failing on its goals? Now it wants to add another \$35 billion.

There is another good one, and the NDP should be interested, especially given where the riding of the member for Churchill—Keelewater Askani is. The Liberals failed on the percentage spent toward clean drinking water and percentage spent on improving transit. Again, these failures from the government and failures on infrastructure are certainly telling us we should not be moving money from this failed boondoggle to another group that shows it can fail quite spectacularly. There is another good one: The Liberals actually failed on their projects for reducing GHG emissions.

That is Infrastructure Canada. Let us move on to the other half of our Laurel and Hardy pairing, the Infrastructure Bank. The Infrastructure Bank, when we look at it, is certainly in the competition for the most inept government department.

• (1115)

The Canada Infrastructure Bank has a lot of competition for this top ranking, including of course PSPC, Public Services and Procurement Canada, which has managed to bungle the jet fighter procurement and the ship procurement. We found out about its buying 100 million dollars' worth of vaccines that went to waste.

Another runner-up is, again, Public Services and Procurement Canada, on Phoenix. It has been six and a half years since the Liberals pushed the start button on Phoenix, and we are still dealing with that.

The Canada Infrastructure Bank is in a tight race for the most incompetent with the CRA. Of course, this was before it started taking people three hours to finally get through to a CRA agent only to have the agent hang up on them. During the pandemic, the CRA managed to send CERB cheques to dead people and send cheques overseas.

Of course, recently, number one or number two would be Global Affairs. Despite Russia committing genocide, murdering children and women and targeting civilians, Global Affairs sent a top official to the Russian embassy tea party last week.

Service Canada, of course, wants to be recognized for its incompetence with respect to passports. We gave it months of notice. I rose in this same seat several months ago with respect to the complaints. The health minister got up and commented on how hard the staff were working. We found out that two-thirds of them are still sitting at home. They may be working from home, but probably not as efficiently as is needed to get passports to Canadians.

Rounding that out with another competitor, we have CATSA through Transport Canada, which ironically oversees the Canada Infrastructure Bank. With respect to the results of its departmental plan, through the public accounts we found out that one-quarter of CATSA funding for screeners had lapsed. It kept all the bureaucrats

### *Private Members' Business*

working, but not the screeners, the ones who are hired on contract to take a look at and screen the luggage that goes through, a vitally important cog in the scheme of airports. Twenty-five per cent of that lapsed, even though in January, February and March, the final three months of the fiscal year, the department produced numbers that very clearly showed that the number of Canadians being screened was growing exponentially. I think at one point it was within 70% of prepandemic numbers, but the department let the money lapse and let the screeners stay at home. Then we found out, just last week, that the department was unprepared for the increase. It had actually released its own numbers showing exponential growth in air travel, but it was caught unawares.

Apparently, the government was also caught unawares with respect to Service Canada and passports. Who would have known 10 years ago that a 10-year passport would be expiring at this time? I certainly would not have expected a 10-year passport to expire in 10 years. Who would have possibly known that we would see an increase in travel with the pandemic? The government said it was caught off guard.

The Canada Infrastructure Bank, knowing it had tough competition, doubled down for the goal of most incompetent government department. It has been over five years and it does not have a single project built. One more year, and the Canada Infrastructure Bank will be eligible for an MP pension. Like most MPs, it also has not done much in five years. There has been \$35 billion put into the Canada Infrastructure Bank, and nothing has been completed. One year it actually spent more money on termination benefits for executives than on salaries in its own department. The Canada Infrastructure Bank was set up to guarantee decent returns for large for-profit companies and investment firms, not to look after Canadian taxpayers. Those companies would be guaranteed profits, while the taxpayers would be guaranteed any risks or losses.

The main project the Canada Infrastructure Bank is so proud of, the urban rail project in Montreal, has been a disaster, which is no surprise. People do not want it. The actual construction does not look at all like the design. The cost has been \$7 billion and growing, and this is its best product.

• (1120)

I understand the intent of the bill, but I have to say it is rather silly to take money from one failed government department to give it to another failed government department. Therefore, I will not be supporting it.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Jean-Denis Garon (Mirabel, BQ):** Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to see you today, as always, and it is very interesting to debate Bill C-245 and the Canada Infrastructure Bank.

*Private Members' Business*

The bank is a newly designed institution. It has only been around for a few years and, even though it is still in its infancy, there is already talk about a lack of transparency and changes to the management approach and the board of directors. This institution has hardly been around for any time at all and we are already talking about the many problems with it.

The Bloc Québécois's position has always been clear. This bank never should have existed, for the very simple reason that we did not need it. To date, the bank has basically been a failure, not because it did not fund any projects, but because it failed to do its job properly and to ensure that projects were carried out. To understand why the bank makes no sense, we need to look back at the past.

Let us go back to 2015. The current Prime Minister was on the campaign trail. He said that there was an economic slowdown and that we had to invest, in particular in infrastructure, since it was urgent that we help Quebec, the provinces and municipalities.

When things are urgent, the thing to do is to sit down with partners and finance projects. However, the government's Liberal reflexes took over. It decided that, instead of taking action, it would waste time: It would create a new institution with various layers of public servants and invest in a big machine in Ottawa instead of delivering for Canadians.

That was what it announced in the 2015 electoral campaign and again in 2016. In 2017, the bank was legislated into being. However, it was still not in operation, and it was finally up and running when the economy was no longer in a slowdown.

So far, they have not learned from their mistakes. Since then, we have had a pandemic and another slowdown. The bank has not changed since then, and has not met its objectives. The government is once again behind in its projects. This is an example of poor service delivery and an inappropriate investment vehicle.

With his banker's mentality, the finance minister at the time, Mr. Morneau, said that taxpayers would benefit. He said that the bank would drive job creation and economic development and that, for every dollar invested by taxpayers, it would draw four, five or six dollars in investments from the private sector. It was supposed to be a windfall.

Finally, nothing much happened, except for a few small projects that could very well have been financed more quickly using other methods, such as bilateral agreements.

If we look at the three-year growth plan of the Canada Infrastructure Bank, we can see that, by 2028, \$2.5 billion will be invested in clean energy. We have a list of emergencies. At the same time, the Liberals tabled a budget in which they plan to invest—surprise, surprise—\$2.5 billion a year, and not by 2028, in dirty energy. They are investing \$2.5 billion in clean energy through the Canada Infrastructure Bank with their right hand and doing five times worse with their left.

That is what we call an inconsistent government. The Liberals are investing \$1 in clean energy and \$5 in dirty energy, and then they will tour the country this summer saying that oil is green. That is our federal government for you. They are investing \$2.5 billion

in broadband connectivity projects. The digital transition should have accelerated during the pandemic but, because we were wasting time with the Canada Infrastructure Bank, we were unable to speed up the process.

They are also investing \$2 billion in building upgrades. These projects are closest to those on the ground, closest to the people, while the federal government is the level of government farthest from the people. The government thinks it is smart to invest like that.

There were a few good projects. I know that the hon. member for Winnipeg North will be talking about zero-emission vehicles. There were also good projects in Ontario, but that is not enough.

Here is what the Liberals did: They made a list of emergencies and created a huge bank. After years of wasting time, the projects were not carried out in time. However, the Liberals told us that they were urgent. Today, when we look at the institution's performance, we can see that all of this was so urgent that they did not meet their commitments. That is exactly what happened with the bank.

No one can ask us to like the Canada Infrastructure Bank, because we like our people, we like Quebec, we like our infrastructure projects and we like our economy. That is why we do not like the Canada Infrastructure Bank.

• (1125)

Today, we are in a situation where they will try to meet their targets. They have money to spend and they have to meet their targets. They are looking for projects, because there are not enough of them.

I will give the same example as the Liberal member just gave, namely the famed high-frequency rail line between Quebec City and Windsor. This is not a high-speed train. It is a bad project. Everyone wants a high-speed train, but everyone is resigned to never getting anything from the federal government. We will therefore get a tortoise that passes by twice as often and we will be told that it is a great project.

The project, which is supported by the Canada Infrastructure Bank, will prove to be a bad risk for taxpayers and a good risk for the private sector. The project's sponsor, VIA Rail, has decided that we should privatize the public infrastructure in the profitable corridor. However, the key mission of the government, that is to say, projects that provide a public return, will be paid for by taxpayers. They will privatize the good part and leave the bad part for the taxpayers.

Things are so bad that in the last budget, the Liberals had to set aside \$400 million in public funding for the project. We asked public servants what was going to happen with the \$400 million and they said it would be used to find partners for the train project. I do not know of any functioning bank that has so few projects or friends, or that operates so poorly that it has to invest that kind of money to find partners. When you have to spend \$400 million to find friends, maybe you need to change the way you do things.

The same is true for the REM light rail project. It did not need the Canada Infrastructure Bank. Normally, this would have been a Quebec government project. Investissement Québec would have bought shares, and the federal government would have helped. It would have been done quickly and properly, in a bilateral manner. We have a loan for the REM here, but this could have been done more efficiently without the new layer of administration in the federal government.

That is quite the bank we have. It is slow and does not meet its objectives. The Parliamentary Budget Officer said that the Bank of Canada would likely never be able to disburse the \$35 billion it has to spend by 2028. There is now a \$19-billion discrepancy. This is \$19 billion for emergencies, according to the Liberals, that will never be used to meet the needs on the ground for the people who really need infrastructure. The bank does not work.

Now, if we are going to have a bad bank, we might as well improve the way it operates. That is why Bill C-245 is interesting. There is a lack of transparency in the management of these funds and in the reporting to the House. Even the Parliamentary Budget Officer said that the Canada Infrastructure Bank did not provide information or respond when his office tried to evaluate its performance, on the grounds that it was keeping trade secrets confidential. The bank is becoming like Export Development Canada, which is one of the major funders of oil projects in Canada and which also hides behind supposed trade secrets.

Another positive aspect of the bill is that it requires that the board of directors include indigenous and Inuit members. The idea behind this is that we are our own best advocates. This proves that the Canada Infrastructure Bank is not listening to people on the ground, and that is the least of it. I would be surprised if the Liberals did not support this bill for that reason.

The Canada Infrastructure Bank was supposed to be a miracle. My grandfather, and I am sure many others, used to say that if something looks too good to be true, it likely is neither good nor true.

The federal government is capable of meddling in Quebec's affairs. It has been no better at delivering infrastructure through its Canada Infrastructure Bank than at managing passports, airport services, unconditional health transfers or the temporary foreign worker program, as Quebec and the provinces have been calling for.

This is a reminder that Quebec must be in charge of its infrastructure projects, that the federal government needs to be smaller and that it needs to provide the money to Quebec and the provinces.

As Quebec's national holiday approaches, I want to take this opportunity to remind members how important it is for Quebec to have all of its revenue and resources and that it be the master of its own destiny. This bank serves as a reminder that Quebec must be free. *Vive le Québec libre.*

• (1130)

[English]

**Ms. Rachel Blaney (North Island—Powell River, NDP):** Madam Speaker, I am here today to speak to Bill C-245, an act to amend the Canada Infrastructure Bank Act. I want to thank the

### *Private Members' Business*

member for Churchill—Keewatinook Aski for bringing this bill forward. I am very proud to stand in the House to speak in support of it.

The bill looks at something that is fundamentally important. It would take the Canada Infrastructure Bank Act and change it to focus on things that matter. The thing that matters most right now in this country is addressing the realities of climate change.

It is on the record since 2016 that I am not in support of the Infrastructure Bank. I am tired of seeing public money going to support private infrastructure and making the wealth of those few grow while the rest of us struggle. To me, it just makes sense that we have profound support and input into public ownership of public infrastructure, especially as we take on the crisis of climate change. If we are going to be serious about addressing this issue, we need to look at how we are going to adapt and respond in local communities, and make sure that those areas are recognized. We do not see that happening in this country right now under the leadership of the Liberals.

I come from a large rural riding, and one of the biggest challenges is transportation. A lot of people in my communities have to take one or two ferries and drive a long distance to get to the health care supports they need. There is very little support for bus services or for looking at how we are going to get people from one place to another in a safe and affordable way. This continues to be a massive concern and one that this bill addresses. This bill looks at the reality that more needs to be done, and it looks at taking the priorities of the Infrastructure Bank and supporting communities.

In the last Parliament, I put forward Motion No. 53. That motion talked about the fact that we are not seeing enough sustainable funding and resources going to smaller communities across the country to respond to the changes that we are seeing in the climate.

We are also not seeing funding to support adaptation to, and mitigation of, what is happening in the climate, or to address the issue of making sure there is sustainable employment in our areas. We need to have the climate addressed by local solutions. The people in communities and regions know what they know, and what they know often works. My motion, similar to this bill, also brought forward the idea of making sure that at every step, we acknowledge and recognize UNDRIP and look at following the leadership of indigenous communities across the country. We need the voices of rural and remote communities, and of indigenous communities, to actually be heard because they are on the front lines. As we look at what is happening in our country, we see that they are on the front lines of climate change and its impacts.

*Private Members' Business*

I live in B.C. Our region is seeing the impacts of climate change significantly. Last year, we saw heat domes that killed so many because we were not prepared for that level of heat in our region. We saw excessive and extreme flooding that wiped out whole highways and made areas inaccessible. We actually had to have the military fly in and take out people who were stranded in their vehicles. They could not get out because those areas were completely destroyed. We have seen forest fires eliminate a whole community and threaten so many more. This is the new reality that we are living in today, and it concerns me greatly because it is expensive and it is threatening our way of life.

What is frustrating to me as well is the fact that we are not seeing the level of action that we need to see from the current government. For the past six years, the Prime Minister has pretended to care about the climate crisis, but at the same time his government has looked at raising subsidies for oil companies. They are higher now than they were under former Prime Minister Harper. Over \$4.5 billion in public money was used to buy a pipeline, and we do not even know where that is going to end.

• (1135)

Canada has the most GHG emissions per capita in the G7. Greenhouse gases emitted by the government have increased by 11%, and Canada is the only G7 country where GHG emissions have increased since the Paris Agreement: so much for our Prime Minister standing in that place saying that Canada is back. We are not back. We are not doing what we need to do to invest in a future that is safer for our children, and we are not investing in a future that leads us to opportunity for business and growth, because the future will be dealing with the climate. We have already pushed things that far.

It is time for action. It is time for a vision, and this bill addresses these very important issues. We need solutions that focus on growing and sustaining the wealth of everyday Canadians and not just the top 1%. One part I spoke of earlier that is so pivotal to this bill is following the leadership of indigenous communities in this country.

The first people of this country need to be at every single table, and this bill would assure that this is the reality. We need to listen to those voices, we need to listen to traditional knowledge and we need to accept that there is a long history of awareness in regions all over Canada that only indigenous voices can bring to the table.

We also have to acknowledge that, when it comes to adapting to climate change, indigenous communities are largely underfunded for basic infrastructure. I think of the Dzawada'enuxw in my riding up in Kingcome. It is a very remote community. They have been facing immense flooding from the river for multiple years, and they have been very clear that they need an access road so they can get to the ocean in case the community floods, as it has. I want members to understand that they have been building their houses up every year to address the fact that their whole community is being flooded, and all they need is a road so that a boat can come to get them. Right now, their only solution is to stand and wait for a helicopter to land on a pad, which means only a few people can be taken out at a time. This leads to higher risk, and we do not see any

support in that. Exactly what this bill would say is that we need to address these issues.

I live in, work in and serve communities that are small, rural and indigenous, and I will tell members that the leaders of those communities are often working very hard with their staff to write the proposals and do the work that needs to be done so they can get the support they need. Often, when they are trying to find the resources to do those key things they do not have them, and the complex processes do not acknowledge the different sizes of communities.

This bill really would open the door for these communities to have a voice. We know there is \$35 billion in the Canada Infrastructure Bank. This is so important, because we need to start addressing these really important issues.

I think I will end there. All I can say is that this bill would make a difference for communities trying their best to adapt to a climate that is going to win. If we do not take action soon, we are going to see devastation, and all of us will have to take a part of that responsibility.

• (1140)

**Mr. Taylor Bachrach (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP):** Madam Speaker, I thank my friend for North Island—Powell River for that excellent speech. I also want to recognize my colleague for Churchill—Keewatinook Aski for bringing forward this important bill that we are debating today.

There are a couple of things I want to do in the next 10 minutes. First of all, I want to take us down memory lane to talk a bit about the infrastructure bank and what it has achieved, and more importantly what it has failed to achieve, over the past five years. I also want to talk about the infrastructure context and the needs of communities.

We are debating this bill in the context of an infrastructure crisis in our country. The infrastructure deficit in Canada is estimated at \$150 billion. The AFN estimates that the infrastructure deficit in indigenous communities alone is at least \$30 billion, and we have this deficit in the face of a global climate crisis that is pounding our country. Communities are feeling the effects more and more every year, and the damage and the implications for our infrastructure are only going to get more severe as time goes on, so this is a very important topic to be discussing.

I would also note that the Standing Committee on Transport, Infrastructure and Communities just recently tabled a report in the House with a single recommendation: to abolish the Canada Infrastructure Bank altogether. The bill we are talking about today proposes a different route. It proposes to reform the enabling legislation so that the Canada Infrastructure Bank can recover from its many failings and troubled track record, and meet the infrastructure needs of Canadian communities.



I thought perhaps we could go back to the origins of the Canada Infrastructure Bank, because I think it is very illustrative and speaks to the strategy that the Liberal government has tried to employ in addressing infrastructure. Of course, this all started with a meeting at the glitzy Shangri-La Hotel in Toronto, where the Prime Minister invited the who's who of private capital. I believe Blackrock even wrote the PowerPoint presentation for the government at that meeting. The promise was a simple one: that public infrastructure could be used as an opportunity to deliver private returns of 6% to 7% for these investors. Of course, that was a promise that this government has not been able to deliver on, I would say thankfully.

Early in the bank's five-year history, it tried to get a pilot project going in the small community of Mapleton, Ontario, to prove that its vision of public-private partnerships and using public infrastructure as a private-profit opportunity could work for communities of all sizes. Mapleton had a very important waste-water and drinking-water project that it needed funding for. The bank came in. It put \$20 million on the table, and promoted the approach of bringing in a private investor to deliver these critical public amenities at a profit.

I come from a community not dissimilar in size to Mapleton, so I know how important those conversations are. Members of that municipality engaged in good faith with the bank. They spent a whole bunch of time and a whole bunch of money assessing the risk and value of the approach that the bank was proposing. In the end, they came away and said, "The risk is too great, the value is not there, and it is going to cost our taxpayers more", so they chose to go with a more conventional financing model for that important project. Of course, they were left with legal fees of over \$300,000, and at the end of the year ended up posting a significant deficit to which that contributed significantly. The private-public approach that the Infrastructure Bank was touting certainly was not a Shangri-La for the community of Mapleton, Ontario.

At the transport and infrastructure committee, we did a detailed report on the bank's track record to date. We heard from expert witness after expert witness. We heard from academics, unions and communities. Many of them were telling us that this public-private approach to infrastructure results in two things: higher costs for Canadians and longer project timelines and delays.

The PBO, in a recent report, had some very critical words about the track record of the Canada Infrastructure Bank. His report said that "funding delays are pervasive for public-private infrastructure investors." This should give us all pause because, of course, we know that we need infrastructure to be delivered in a timely way. Communities are depending on it.

• (1145)

Now the next project, of course, that we are talking about when it comes to the Canada Infrastructure Bank is high-frequency rail. My colleague here from the Bloc spoke a little bit about that project. It is incredibly concerning. The Canada Infrastructure Bank has been a part of the design of that project since the very beginning through the joint project office, so we are talking about high-frequency rail on Canada's busiest passenger rail corridor from Toronto to Quebec City.

### *Private Members' Business*

This is a very important infrastructure project. Canada is way behind the rest of the world when it comes to rail transportation. The Liberal government insists that it has to be a part of this model, this failed model of bringing in private investors. Back in March, it put out an expression of interest for a private partner to design, construct and operate passenger rail on that critical passenger corridor between Toronto and Quebec City. Going back to the expression of interest documents, there is a very telling statement saying, "the Private Partner is expected to receive income from the farebox and other ancillary income.... These combined revenues will be used to pay for operating expenses, to service debt and to provide equity returns".

This passenger rail corridor contributes a huge amount of revenue to Via Rail, Canada's public passenger rail provider. What is going to happen to Via Rail when the Liberal government hands over this busy passenger corridor to a private investor? We can look to the U.K. In the U.K., the House of Commons Library just tabled a report on rail privatization in that country. They found that, since rail was privatized in 1995, the cost to passengers has gone up 20% in real dollars.

Again, we are seeing evidence that this approach of trying to deliver private profits using public infrastructure has to be paid for somewhere. It is going to come out of someone's pocket, and the pockets it will come out of are those of the users of that infrastructure, the people who need to use the train to get to where they need to go, the people who need to use the infrastructure every day. We are very concerned that that project is not going to deliver what Canadians need. It is an important opportunity. We cannot take that risk.

I talked a little bit about the failings of the bank. I do not want to belabour that. I could easily use up 10 minutes just going through all of the many critiques in the media and the evidence that we heard at committee. However, the reality is that we have to get this right. We have to get the infrastructure right. That is why this bill is so important.

This bill goes into the enabling legislation for the Canada Infrastructure Bank and it does four key things. The first would be to replace the mandate of leveraging private capital and delivering private profits. It would replace that mandate with a focus on rural, remote and indigenous communities because we know that their infrastructure needs are so huge right across this country. The second would be to explicitly set out the mandate of the bank to focus on responding and tackling the climate emergency, which is probably the biggest threat to Canadian infrastructure that we face. The third would be to reform the governance of the bank so there would be indigenous representation. That is important, I think, for any of our institutions, but particularly for one that is going to focus on the needs of indigenous communities. The fourth would require the bank to report regularly to this place, so we can have accountability and ensure that the bank does not suffer from the many failings and shortcomings that we have seen over the past five years.

*Private Members' Business*

I represent northwest B.C. It is entirely a rural and remote part of this country. There are so many communities that have critical infrastructure needs, from the village of Klemtu, which needs to replace its power lines, to the Heiltsuk, where they need to build a governance building. They also have an ambitious climate action plan. Smithers has waste-water and drinking water projects that need to be built. In Takla and so many other indigenous communities, they are struggling to build housing. There is shoreline erosion in communities such as Old Massett. Skidegate has waste-water needs, and Prince Rupert, one of the biggest cities in the part of the world that I represent, has an infrastructure deficit in the hundreds of millions of dollars.

Communities need this bill. They need the Infrastructure Bank to succeed. I appreciate having had the time to speak to how that might be done.

● (1150)

**Mr. Mike Morrice (Kitchener Centre, GP):** Madam Speaker, it is an honour to stand this morning in support of Bill C-245, an act to amend the Canada Infrastructure Bank Act.

It is important to note that it was just over three years ago when parliamentarians in the chamber admitted that we are in a climate emergency. If it is an emergency, then we should probably act like it is one. In fact, that is what international climate scientists called for in their most recent report from April. The co-chair of an IPCC working group said, "It's now or never, if we want to limit warming to 1.5°C". That is the internationally agreed upon maximum to ensure that we are taking action at the pace that science tells us is required.

One way to do that is to take existing Crown corporations and direct their resources toward solving the climate crisis we are in. That is why I support Bill C-245, along with the member for Saanich—Gulf Islands, and that is why I really appreciate the member for Churchill—Keewatinook Aski bringing this legislation forward as her private member's bill. The bill recognizes that communities are at the forefront of the climate crisis and, as such, it would shift the priorities of the Canada Infrastructure Bank to be explicit about supporting climate adaptation and mitigation efforts. The bill would do this in three ways: one would be to remove the parts of the Infrastructure Bank's mandate that allow it to seek out private investments; two would be to increase the transparency of the bank by requiring regular reporting to Parliament; and three would be to ensure that first nations, Inuit and Métis communities have a seat at the table on the board.

As it stands today, the Canada Infrastructure Bank was established back in 2017 as arm's length from government, with a budget of \$35 billion. What an opportunity that is. Last year, the Parliamentary Budget Officer reported that it would not even spend half of that amount over the next 11 years. What a wonderful way to activate those funds if we are going to follow through.

As other speakers have mentioned, communities across the country are calling out for more. Municipalities are taking a leadership role, and Waterloo region is one example of that, but if communities across the country are going to follow through at the pace that science requires, they are going to need the federal government to step up. I recognize that the Canada Infrastructure Bank, as it

stands today, requires projects to generate revenue, meaning they have to charge public user fees or tolls, directly or indirectly, to meet the needs of private investors. Instead, if approved, this bill would redirect those tens of billions of dollars toward the infrastructure projects we need, whether it is helping communities move off of diesel or moving to high-speed rail, the list goes on and on.

One person I respect on this topic is Seth Klein. He has said that we should think about urgency of the climate crisis the same way that we might have thought in the past about wartime efforts. I would like to share a quote from Mr. Klein, who said, "But in response to the climate emergency, we have seen nothing of this sort. In contrast to C.D. Howe's wartime creations, the [Liberal] government has established two new Crown corporations during its time in office — the Canada Infrastructure Bank (a vehicle for privatizing infrastructure that has thus far accomplished very little), and the Trans Mountain Corporation (an ill-advised decision that makes all Canadians the owners of a 60-year-old oil pipeline). If our government really saw the climate emergency as an emergency, it would quickly conduct an inventory of our conversion needs to determine how many heat pumps, solar arrays, wind farms, electric buses, etc. we will need to electrify virtually everything and end our reliance on fossil fuels. Then, it would establish a new generation of Crown corporations to ensure those items are manufactured and deployed at the requisite scale."

I invite members to think of the jobs we could create in this transition, and they would be good, unionized, well-paying jobs to transition our economy to that of the future. When I reflect on Mr. Klein's words and look at what is in this bill, that is what excites me about this.

● (1155)

Bill C-245 would be one step along a long journey, not only aligned with Mr. Klein's vision, but also with that of climate scientists, who are telling us that this is required and that action is not in eight years. It is certainly not thinking about net zero by 2050. The action is required now, and there are bills before the House, such as Bill C-245, which would equip us to do it.

That is the most important thing. It is not what one party or another is bickering about with each other. It is not about partisanship at all. Future generations will judge us and what we did in this chamber, and whether we collectively acted at the pace scientists tell us is required, rather than giving billions of dollars in new subsidies to fossil fuels, and invested it in the infrastructure we needed.

The bill is one we should all embrace, and I am proud to support it.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès):** The hon. member for Churchill—Keewatinook Aski for has the floor for her right of reply.

**Ms. Niki Ashton (Churchill—Keewatinook Aski, NDP):** Madam Speaker, I rise today for the second time to proudly speak to my bill, Bill C-245, an act to amend Canada's Infrastructure Bank, with a plea.

Time is running out, and our communities need help. It is clear the climate emergency is here. Our region is already being hit hard. Yesterday, in Winnipeg, we saw record high temperatures. Over the last month, Peguis first nation has seen unprecedented flooding. First nations such as Tadoule Lake had winter storm warnings in June, and we are already experiencing extreme forest fires, which have caused extensive damage. In parts of Ontario and Quebec, tornados and severe storms have been wreaking havoc the last number of weeks.

The bill is rooted in this reality, the reality that communities on the front lines, particularly indigenous and northern communities, need action to survive climate change now. Since I tabled this legislation, I have heard from many indigenous and northern leaders across the country who have advocated tirelessly for federal support, support they have yet to receive. I have also heard from many who have reached out to the Canada Infrastructure Bank only to be rejected.

I have heard stories of first nations that were refused funding to upgrade a community hall in desperate need of fixing because they could not show the Canada Infrastructure Bank how it would be profitable, and of a northern community that was trying to switch off from diesel and were told to apply for solar panel funding without any recognition of the infrastructure needed to transition the community.

Communities do not need band-aids. They want to work with government to build infrastructure that mitigates and adapts to the increased precarious realities they face. Two first nations in our region, Poplar River and York Factory, have been left stranded in the last few weeks. It is clear they need all weather roads.

The government might show up to put a on band-aid for a short-term solution, but that is it, and we continue slowly and surely down a path, and we know where it ends. This is not how the federal government should be governing. Canadians deserve better. Communities at the forefront of the climate crisis deserve better. Time is running out and communities need our help.

Instead of getting that help, indigenous and northern leaders, and advocates can tune into this debate and hear the Liberals tell us that the Infrastructure Bank is doing great and that nothing needs to change. It is business as usual.

What we heard from the Liberals today on the bank is pure fiction. Communities know it. Canadians know it. The bank is a corporate welfare scheme. It is not doing the job the Liberals promised it would. Ironically, this week marks five years since the bank was founded. Five years later, the bank does not have a single success story to point to. It has given plenty of ammunition to those that were critical from the beginning, and it reinforces what many of us believe, which is that Liberals are more concerned with helping their wealthy friends than standing with Canadians.

In committees, in the House and in private meeting with Liberal MPs, I have consistently heard an acknowledgement that the bank

*Private Members' Business*

is not what the government hoped for. We in the NDP have made serious propositions to fix it so it is there for the communities that need it most. We believe that public ownership is a critical tool in taking on the climate crisis. We believe that reconciliation ought to mean investing in critical infrastructure in indigenous and northern communities.

We cannot afford to miss this opportunity. When this historic agreement between the NDP and the Liberals was signed, there was talk about our shared principles on the environment and reconciliation. The Liberal opposition to our bill flies in the face of the spirit of that agreement. It used to be that the Liberals would steal good ideas from the CCF and the NDP. Now they cannot even see the value of a good idea in front of them.

The bill has unprecedented support, and for that I am thankful, from indigenous and northern leaders, climate activists, labour leaders, economists and Canadians from coast to coast to coast. We need to wake up. The world is burning. Indigenous and northern communities are fighting to survive. We do not need the Liberal greenwashing.

Indigenous and northern leaders are fighting for a better future. We cannot miss the opportunity to create a livable future for the communities that are already on the front lines. I hope that members of Parliament will read the hundreds of letters they have received from constituents and communities on the front lines. Time is running out. Our communities need help. Bill C-245 is a step in that direction.

● (1200)

[*Translation*]

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès):** The question is on the motion.

[*English*]

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

**Ms. Rachel Blaney:** Madam Speaker, we request a recorded division.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès):** Pursuant to an order made on Thursday, November 25, 2021, the division stands deferred until Wednesday, June 22, at the expiry of the time provided for Oral Questions.

*Government Orders***GOVERNMENT ORDERS***[English]***CRIMINAL CODE**

The House resumed from June 9 consideration of the motion that Bill C-21, An Act to amend certain Acts and to make certain consequential amendments (firearms), be read the second time and referred to a committee, and of the amendment to the amendment.

**Mr. Bob Zimmer (Prince George—Peace River—Northern Rockies, CPC):** Madam Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the member for Yellowhead.

This is a real opportunity to speak against Bill C-21. The premise of my whole talk today will be that Bill C-21 would actually make Canadians less safe, as it spends sparse resources in ways that are ineffective and targets law-abiding firearms owners instead of the real problem, which is gangs and guns in our inner cities.

In 2018, Public Safety Canada put forward a paper, “Reducing Violent Crime: A Dialogue on Handguns and Assault Weapons - Engagement Paper”. It starts off by explaining what I am trying to explain today:

The vast majority of owners of handguns and of other firearms in Canada lawfully abide by requirements, and most gun crimes are not committed with legally-owned firearms.

It goes on:

Recent estimates indicate that there are about 900,000 handguns registered to individuals in Canada. In most cases, individuals own handguns either in the context of sport shooting activities or because those handguns form a part of a collection.

Later it states:

Any ban of handguns or assault weapons would primarily affect legal firearms owners...

It is not just Conservatives who are saying this; the former public safety minister himself actually said that he knows that handgun bans would not work. In a 2019 interview with *The Globe and Mail*, he said that months of consultation have led him to the conclusion that banning handguns would be costly and ineffective. Again, that is from the Liberal former public safety minister across the way:

I believe that would be potentially a very expensive proposition but just as importantly, it would not in my opinion be perhaps the most effective measure in restricting the access that criminals would have to such weapons, because we'd still have a problem with them being smuggled across the border.

I could not agree more. That is why I find it strange that the government has not imposed a handgun ban previously and has admitted that it is going to be ineffective and very expensive. Again, the premise is very expensive, and I do not even necessarily want to speak to that, because how can we quantify the life of one of our children? We cannot. They are priceless. Instead, let us actually deal with the problem in a way that would actually save lives on our streets instead of prolonging the problem.

This is a quote from a police officer. Staff Superintendent Sean McKenna of Peel Regional Police recently tweeted:

Another illegally owned firearm seized by Peel Police. This is becoming a far too common occurrence in our community. A municipal, provincial or federal ban on firearms will not stop criminals from carrying them. Root cause issues need to be addressed.

Exactly. Here is somebody who sees the problems on the streets daily and knows where the real problem lies.

Another police officer, Ron Chhinzler, tweeted, “In my time in the integrated gun and gang task force, I don't recall ever seizing a legally owned firearm from any of the investigations that I was involved in.

“The law-abiding population should never suffer or pay because of the unlawful criminal.”

Again, here is someone who is actually on the streets, seeing this first-hand. What I am going to talk about later is how we should give those police officers better resources to deal with the root problems, like recidivism. Criminals get to walk free and commit crimes all over again. We are also not dealing with some of the root causes that cause violence in the first place.

Here is another quote from another police officer, Steve Ryan, who tweeted, “I investigated 150 homicides—never seized one legally owned gun as a murder weapon. In my opinion, it makes more sense to ban legally owned kitchen knives and scissors! Those I have seized as murder weapons. Banning legally owned guns won't decrease violence. Root cause will!”

There is a consistent message coming from our police officers today: The focus should be on the problem instead of on the diversion, the law-abiding firearms community.

• (1205)

Chris Lewis, a former OPP commissioner who works for CTV, is a crime specialist who has been a very vocal opponent of wasting resources on gun bans. Here is a quote from Mr. Lewis: “They aren't legally owned handguns, nor are they shotguns and hunting rifles. Taking more guns from lawful owners and putting a toothless municipal handgun ban in place will do the square root of sweet”...nothing, I will say, because he uses another word, “to impact violent crime.”

There it is. Even the former commissioner is saying the same thing.

I will go on. I have a few more quotes, and then we will get into more discussion. I am sure there will be questions.

The deputy chief of the Toronto Police Service, Myron Demkiw, stated, “The City of Toronto's experience is that guns are not from law-abiding citizens that are being used in crime. They're guns being smuggled from the United States. Those engaged in handling those firearms are not law-abiding, licensed gun owners; they are criminals with no firearms licence.”

*Government Orders*

I am a firearms owner. I have my RPAL. I know that it is a very rigorous process to purchase a firearm in Canada, whether it is a non-restricted firearm or restricted. It is very difficult. There is training that is involved and there is a vetting process that is involved, and every day they look at our records to make sure that we can still legally and safely own our firearms.

I will go on to a quote from somebody who is very important. This was part of the recent public safety study. It is from Marcell Wilson. He is the founder and president of the One By One Movement, an organization founded by former gang members, extremists and organized crime members to help identify, address and research strategies on effective social programming for youth outreach.

He explained:

...when speaking on gun control, when we hear the phrase, it should always be synonymous with illegal gun crime and illegal gun trafficking as over 80% of the gun violence we [witness is] committed with illegal firearms smuggled in from the USA.

It has not just been me. I always like to quote other individuals with expertise a lot of better than my own, such as actual police officers on the streets. This is from Marcell Wilson, former gang member, who is really trying to fix the root problem of the issue of kids dying on our streets as the result of illegal firearms.

I think that as Conservatives, this is where we take quite a different position from the Liberals across the way. We Conservatives actually support dealing with the real problem. We saw a Liberal long-gun registry that cost \$2 billion the last time. We have another bill, Bill C-21, that is part of resurrecting another long-gun registry and a confiscation regime too. It is going to be in the billions.

My argument is always to just take even a fraction of that money and put it into places where it is going to be effective, such as giving border agents better resources to inspect containers as they cross the border. I do not even want to say the percentage of the containers that are actually inspected, but how about we triple that, or even increase it times 10 to an exponential number of inspections to actually deal with these firearms and stop them right at the border? How about we give inner city police the tools to crack down on illegal firearms and gang activity? How about we give resources to help these police officers deal with these young gang members and try to get them out of those gangs and into productive lives?

We support stopping the revolving door. We even saw recently, with Bill C-5, that the Liberals want to let people who are convicted of firearm crimes out the door sooner than they should be, just to recommit those crimes. Why do we not deal with all of those situations? That will actually cause a real effect, a real, positive change in safety in our inner cities and on our streets.

At the end of the day, I started off by saying that the bill actually makes our country less safe. What the Prime Minister is touting is a bait and switch. Just because he is talking about guns and getting rid of them does not mean he is talking about the right guns to get rid of. He needs to get rid of the illegal firearms on our streets. Once he starts tackling that and stops misleading Canadians about what really will make a change, my hope is that he will finally realize what that is, but I think he uses this issue to divide Canadians. I

would rather see us tackle the real problem with illegal firearms on our streets.

• (1210)

**Ms. Pam Damoff (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I thank the hon. member for mentioning the excellent study that the public safety committee did on guns and gangs. I wonder if the hon. member is aware that the government is actually investing \$250 million into community groups exactly like the One By One Movement that the hon. member mentioned. By no means is the bill intended to be the one solution for gun violence; it is meant to be comprehensive.

In Saskatchewan, the people who are dying by firearms are actually white, rural, older men who are dying by suicide. I am wondering if the hon. member supports the red flag provisions that are in Bill C-21.

**Mr. Bob Zimmer:** Madam Speaker, the member across the way highlights the problem. She said there was \$250 million to basically deal with the issues in inner cities and to support folks like Marcell Wilson, but it is a fraction of what is necessary.

She is talking about spending probably upwards of \$5 billion on tackling the wrong problem, a problem that really does not exist, because lawful firearms owners are not the problem. She is saying that we should keep spending that \$5 billion and only spend \$250 million on this other problem. How about we spend all that money on what the real problem is? We would be in agreement and would probably support the bill. When the Liberals constantly say they are going to protect Canadians by making laws more difficult for law-abiding firearms owners, it is just ill-focused.

**Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP):** Madam Speaker, because I know the member is very knowledgeable as a gun owner, is there any part of Bill C-21 he finds useful as a reform and that would be beneficial? If the bill would go to committee, where would we want to look for making amendments?

**Mr. Bob Zimmer:** Madam Speaker, I will answer the question by answering the previous member's question on red flag laws. We already have a very robust system for checks and balances in our firearms owners community. Again, I am a firearms owner. Every day, my name gets sifted through a database to see that I am still capable and safe to own firearms. That already happens. To have more applied to that just to make it more robust is not necessary. We already have that.

*Government Orders*

What I am saying, and this is maybe what the member is alluding to, is she might believe it is necessary to have Bill C-21, but I do not. I do not see anything that is really of value in Bill C-21 to make Canada more safe. Again, it is misleading the country to say the Prime Minister is doing something positive about firearms. He is not. He could, and I wish he would.

• (1215)

**Mr. Rob Morrison (Kootenay—Columbia, CPC):** Madam Speaker, the member's speech was an evidence-based speech from investigators who have been investigating criminal activity, especially with firearms.

How or why did the government start using evidence from, maybe, politicians to start looking at seizing legal firearms from legal firearms owners when that is not the problem, as he clearly stated?

**Mr. Bob Zimmer:** Madam Speaker, again, that is the mystery, is it not?

I do not see what the rationale is. The following is from the Prime Minister himself, who said, "The long-gun registry, as it was, was a failure and I'm not going to resuscitate that". The current Prime Minister also said, "There are better ways of keeping us safe than that registry which has been removed."

Here is a person who is in our House today and is bringing forward other rules to probably, I believe, divide Canadians, which is what he does and how he wins. If he really wants to actually crack down on illegal firearms crime and make our streets safer in this country, he needs to look at what the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security has looked at, what some police officers are saying and what some of the anti-gang task force are saying to do, and to follow what they are saying to do. He should not spend those scarce and much-needed resources on the law-abiding firearms community. We are not the problem.

**Mr. Gerald Soroka (Yellowhead, CPC):** Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise in the House today to speak on Bill C-21, an act to amend certain acts and to make certain consequential amendments with a particular focus on Canadian firearms legislation. It is yet another bill that proves this NDP-Liberal government's incompetence and vendetta against Canadians by being too soft on crime, particularly gun crime, while being punitive towards law-abiding Canadians.

The main premise of the bill is generally to ban the future legal sale of handguns in Canada and increase the allowable penalties for gun smuggling and trafficking. Bill C-21 also outlines an untested buyback program based on a similar approach attempted by New Zealand. The program proved to have numerous substantial issues that the NDP-Liberals conveniently omitted from the contents of the bill. Ultimately, the government claims to advance laws to protect Canadians. However, upon closer inspection, Bill C-21 is riddled with contradictions and faulty premises that are simply an attack on Canadians' safety and security. How can the government claim that it is keeping guns off our streets when the bill itself is grounded in unfounded statistics and a faulty premise from a country that implemented a similar approach, and claim that the increase of maximum penalties will deter crime?

It is incredibly contradictory that the government is introducing Bill C-21 to pair with the equally problematic Bill C-5, further proving that the government prioritizes political gain over the protection and security of innocent, hard-working Canadians already being subjected to the government's ineffective draconian rule.

For the sake of brevity, I will focus my speech on the following: one, the flawed statistics that the government based its argument on in the first place; two, the equally faulty premise riddled with issues from New Zealand's Arms Amendment Bill; three, the government's focus on protecting offenders while punishing law-abiding, licensed Canadians; and four, the NDP-Liberal government's critically misdirected approach to address gun crime and firearms legislation through Bill C-21.

Going back to numerous statistics, gun crime has climbed steadily since the government has been in power and, unsurprisingly, even more so with its "spend-DP" allies. Together, they managed to spend more to achieve less, and Bill C-21 is no different. The foundation of the bill is in reference to a series of records from Statistics Canada. Statistics Canada highlighted that firearm-related violent crime only represents a small proportion of police-reported crimes in Canada, accounting for 2.8% of all victims of violent crime reported by police in 2020.

Furthermore, Statistics Canada states that the numbers upon which the bill is founded are lacking in numerous areas. It quotes gaps in its records such as, but not limited to: one, the types of firearms used in these crimes; two, whether or not the owner of the firearm was licensed to bear arms in the first place; three, where the firearm was procured from to commit the offence; and four, whether or not the firearm was properly or improperly stored. With these piecemeal statistics, I want to know how the government has the gall to insist that it is getting tougher on crime by relying on punitive approaches to licensed gun owners over addressing the real issues of gun-related violence from gangs and their members in our communities.

*Government Orders*

Bill C-21 did introduce increasing maximum sentencing for certain offences, but increasing maximum penalties will give no reprieve when the minimum penalty would be Bill C-5's option for house arrest under conditional sentencing. Furthering the theme of faulty premises, the government introduced a buyback program that was loosely based on a similar approach adopted by New Zealand in 2019. It was called the Arms Amendment Bill. The recommendation highlighted that handguns would be sold off to authorized parties so long as they were accepted, and then the previous owner would be adequately compensated. This approach should have also highlighted the issues found by New Zealand in adopting such a program: issues the government conveniently omitted from discussions.

• (1220)

Considering that the government is introducing a similar approach, it could be reasonably inferred that Canada would be plagued by similar obstacles. Under New Zealand's Arms Amendment Bill, the program lacked fair and reasonable compensation for gun owners who had legally obtained their firearms from a reputable source, thus leaving some licensed owners scrambling to sell their firearms to select establishments that would accept them.

Inevitably, the limited market of firearms purchasing would leave it oversaturated, with firearms circulating through the buyback program, leaving gun owners undercompensated and frustrated. Ultimately, this would result in significantly more egregious gaps in the already spotty records outlined from Statistics Canada. Without an accurate track of handguns in circulation and sold or procured through the program, how can we accurately account for firearms in Canada?

This program would not account for illegally obtained or smuggled firearms. It would not contribute to the accuracy of statistics we have on firearms-related offences in Canada, and it certainly would not protect and preserve the safety and security of vulnerable and innocent Canadians comprising our communities. Instead of investing in an untested firearms program in Canada, the government should invest in improving support systems and resources for anti-gun violence.

Why is the government pampering actual offenders who are wreaking havoc in our streets with illegally obtained firearms? It should scrap the program, as outlined in Bill C-21, and reinvest the funds into anti-gun-violence resources, provide rehabilitation for demographics prone to gang involvement, and strengthen our border security to avoid the infiltration of firearms in our neighbourhoods. The lack of these common-sense solutions in Bill C-21 only proves that the government is not serious about keeping firearms off our streets. It only knows how to mismanage taxpayers' money to advance its ineffective NDP-Liberal agenda.

The lack of a grandfathering clause in Bill C-21 would force firearms owners to either surrender their firearms to the limited dealers allowed to store firearms, as noted through Bill C-21, or retain their ownership. Either way, this would do nothing to solve the issue of firearms-related crimes in Canada.

If anything, the lack of a grandfathering clause would only contribute to more backlogs and waiting times that plague the country. Canadians do not need another NDP-Liberal manufactured disser-

vice. Regardless of all the other questionable aspects outlined in Bill C-21, the lack of a grandfathering clause would be punitive toward law-abiding folks who have done their due diligence in their licence acquisition to bear arms.

This would only punish the wrong people and enable the criminals who illegally procure firearms in the first place. Where is the government's dedication to offenders' rehabilitation, support for victims and survivors, and conviction to take corrective actions to guarantee the integrity of our judicial system?

Conservatives believe that minimum sentencing should be sustained for heinous crimes, including crimes involving firearms, not only through the enactment of maximum penalties of 10 to 14 years in a correctional facility, but also by shunning the proposal of conditional sentencing, such as house arrest, for offenders. Moreover, Bill C-21 would establish no systems to deliver support or resources to survivors or potential victims of gun violence.

This is not a right-to-bear-arms speech. We Conservatives simply advocate for putting Canadians first and enforcing pragmatic, common-sense solutions to get guns off our streets and limit gun violence in Canada, while protecting the safety and security of our communities.

I now welcome questions or comments from my colleagues.

• (1225)

**Ms. Pam Damoff (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I notice that Conservatives, when they speak about gun control, always neglect to mention suicides, which account for 75% of people who die by firearms, and gender-based violence, because we know that access to a firearm increases the risk of femicide by 500 times.

I am wondering this. Could the hon. member speak to the provisions of Bill C-21 that would deal with gender-based violence when it comes to restraining orders?

**Mr. Gerald Soroka:** Madam Speaker, once again, there is the problem. The issue is actually the mental state of our society, and instead of addressing the mental state of our society, what are the Liberals doing? They are trying to ban legal handguns, which is going to do nothing to help society.

In order to make a better society, we need to make sure we improve the quality of people's lives, and mental health is a big issue. The government did promise during its own election a few months ago that it was going to invest more in mental health. Unfortunately, it did not follow through on its own commitments, as is usual with the Liberal government.

*Government Orders*

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Marie-Hélène Gaudreau (Laurentides—Labelle, BQ):** Madam Speaker, we are all trying to reduce crime. We have repeatedly proposed a registry of criminal organizations.

I would simply like to know what my colleague thinks about the Bloc's proposal.

[*English*]

**Mr. Gerald Soroka:** Madam Speaker, that is what we have been talking about. We know for a fact that the biggest issue is illegal guns and the criminal activities of gangs. If we are not going to address the main problem of the crime- and gang-related issues, how are we ever going to tackle the issue of murders or anything of that sort? We need to make sure that these criminal organizations are documented and that we have enough resources for police officers financially and enough officers in order to make sure we are able to address this. If we do not, it is just going to keep escalating, as it continually has under the Liberal government.

**Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP):** Madam Speaker, I am a registered gun owner and all my neighbours are gun owners, but I do not know very many people who have AR-15s or handguns or are interested in getting them. For the people in my region this is not that kind of issue. We want to make sure that the strong rules for licensing stay in place and the safety provisions that we have stay in place.

I want to ask the hon. colleague about the grandfather clause. It seemed to us that in the previous Parliament, having the grandfather clause for people who legally bought those weapons was a reasonable position, as it allows them to be grandfathered if we are going to say no more AR-15s on the market.

The cost we are looking at is enormous. Would the Conservatives consider supporting legislation that had a grandfather clause allowing legal gun owners to maintain their weapons, or have them bought back if they so choose?

• (1230)

**Mr. Gerald Soroka:** Madam Speaker, the big problem is that by banning these guns we are also banning a lot of opportunities for our youth to become Olympians and sport shooters. If we do not have these opportunities for them, how can they compete professionally across the world? A lot of things in this bill are quite restrictive and would actually penalize law-abiding, hard-working, honest Canadians who are trying to do the sports and programs they enjoy doing. That is why we need to look at other opportunities throughout this bill.

**Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP):** Madam Speaker, we have had atrocious gun crimes in this country and horrific tragedies where neighbours tried to warn law enforcement. I remind the hon. member of what happened in his colleague's riding of Parry Sound—Muskoka, where Mark Jones in Burk's Falls killed many members of his family before killing himself. In 2020, of course, there were the Portapique killings. Some neighbours even moved away out of fear of the man who later killed 22 people. There is also the tragic case of PTSD that took the life of Lionel Desmond and members of his family.

What do the Conservatives recommend we do about gun crimes in rural and remote areas of this country against family members and random strangers in a neighbourhood?

**Mr. Gerald Soroka:** Madam Speaker, as I said throughout my speech and even in some of the answers, we are not addressing the real problem, which is the mental state of our society, and making sure that law enforcement agencies have enough officers or the financial means to get programs in place. What we really need to start working on is solving the problems, not creating more.

**Mr. Lloyd Longfield (Guelph, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, it is an honour for me to rise in the House today. I will be sharing my time with the member for Oakville North—Burlington, the parliamentary secretary. I am looking forward to her comments.

Bill C-21 really represents a momentous step for Canada. We are looking at using this piece of legislation, among others, to eliminate gun violence in Canada. If it is passed, it will be the most significant reform to Canada's gun laws in a generation.

I would like to start by first of all thanking the stakeholders who have contributed to this bill, but more specifically the stakeholders in my constituency of Guelph who have provided feedback that has informed the measures in this bill. Our conversations with them continue.

While much of these consultations were conducted in relation to previous pieces of legislation, I am very pleased to see that this feedback has been incorporated since March 2021, when the former minister of public safety heard from the Guelph area police services, local municipal politicians and the Guelph organizations dedicated to the fight against gun violence. They were concerned that previous proposals allowing municipalities to opt in or opt out of gun control measures would have created a patchwork of regulations across the country that would not have been as effective as what we have in front of us this morning. This bill solves that, and indeed if it is passed, the bill would make it illegal to purchase or sell handguns anywhere in Canada.

This is incredibly important to my constituents and to me in the current context, because for years Guelph was considered the safest place in Canada. While it is still among the safest, Guelph has had an increase in gun violence that is concerning for all people living in Guelph. The gun-related crimes we are seeing in our community, according to public data from the Guelph Police Service, have more than doubled since 2020. There were eight charges of using a firearm in the commission of a crime, which is up from three the prior year.



This is not the direction we want to be heading in, and while the Canada Border Services Agency and other bodies have been provided with more resources by our government to help prevent gun crimes, the reality is that we need to stop handguns from being sold in the first place. Even one crime involving a firearm that could have been prevented is one crime too many. I have heard members across the way say that the illegal trafficking of guns is a concern. It is a concern, but the legal transmission of guns is something we can do today to address the movement of guns in our community.

This is important, especially when we consider the data we are getting from researchers at the Canadian Femicide Observatory for Justice and Accountability, at the University of Guelph. It shows that nearly six out of 10 women killed are murdered by their current or former partner, while only 6% of these women are killed by a stranger. Just over one-third of the total number of femicides are committed by a perpetrator armed with a gun, more than any other method of killing, while the likelihood of a woman being killed by a gun goes up to 42% for women living in rural areas.

This bill looks to address this alarming reality. It would permit authorities to revoke a firearms licence in cases of domestic violence or criminal harassment when a protection order has been issued against a current licence-holder or when a red flag order is issued. I am encouraged to see that the advice of organizations representing women and survivors has been included in the amendments to protect the identity of the person who is asking the court to apply for this mechanism of using red flag or yellow flag laws. This is just one example of how feedback from communities affected by gun violence has been integrated into this bill.

Similarly, this bill also seeks to better protect Canadians experiencing mental health crises. Over 80% of gun-related deaths are suicides, which is a heartbreaking reality. The impact of this is felt not only by the individuals, but by their families and entire communities. In fact, last week I spoke to a veteran of the Afghanistan war, and one of his comments was about how many of his comrades have died since the war to suicide. Guns are being used in those cases.

• (1235)

One of the most heartbreaking elements of this is speaking to families of individuals who have dealt with this loss. They tell me that it is possible it could have been prevented if guns had been removed from the situation in the first place. These are legally purchased firearms.

Through this bill, a yellow flag or red flag would make it more likely that such a tragedy could be prevented. As in other appropriate cases, a chief firearms officer could suspend an individual's licence for up to 30 days if a member of the public, such as a family member or neighbour, contacts the chief firearms officer with information about a licence-holder being at risk. This would allow someone to recover or seek treatment without having the ability to purchase guns or acquire them.

The urgency of this bill is clear, but unfortunately since the government has stated its intention to pass Bill C-21 into law, we have seen a spike in the number of handgun sales across the country. By introducing additional regulations, the government is preventing a surge in handgun purchases in the period between now and when it

### *Government Orders*

is passed, which is the right approach to ensure that the bill is not aiming at a moving target.

The premise and rationale of this bill are sound. It recognizes the reality that handguns are the preferred weapon of criminals and that banning their sale inherently makes other people safer. Not only is the prevalence of gun crimes increasing in Guelph, as I mentioned, but since 2009, violent offences involving guns have increased by 81%, and 47% of Canadians say that gun violence poses a serious threat in their communities.

We only need to look across the border to see that if we continue down the path we are on now, it is only going to get worse until it is many times harder to correct the situation. We need to learn from what we see in Canada and the scale of gun crimes in other countries, and not dismiss mass shootings as something that cannot happen or does not usually happen in Canada. We need to act now, and this bill takes a common-sense approach to achieve the ambitious action of reducing gun violence while respecting law-abiding owners of guns, such as farmers.

It is truly unfortunate there have been several unsuccessful attempts by some of the people here to mischaracterize this bill as something that could target law-abiding gun owners. That is simply not the case. The legislation is in no way about targeting legal gun owners. In fact, its sole purpose is to create safer communities for every single Canadian. Gun owners who adhere to the law will not face any undue hardship as a result of this bill. Clearly, handguns are not used for pest control or to shoot deer.

I would like to take a moment to address the concern that some have raised regarding the source of handguns used in gun crimes in Canada. While some have said that handguns are not legally obtained anyway, the reality is that the majority of gun crimes in 2020 involved originally legally obtained and domestically sourced guns. Over 50% of these guns can be traced.

To combat crimes committed with handguns that are obtained outside Canada, our government has invested \$350 million to strengthen the RCMP and CBSA's capacity to intercept guns coming across our borders. We know that this has been effective. In fact, last year the RCMP and border services intercepted nearly double the number of firearms than the year before.

We are heading in the right direction. We are making it tougher on people who smuggle guns by going from a 10-year to a 14-year penalty. We are looking at introducing further money to help with guns and gangs through the building safer communities fund for our communities. The provisions that we have in Bill C-21 are complementary to the other work we are doing in mental health and in controlling access to things that can hurt Canadians.

*Government Orders*

I look forward to questions.

• (1240)

**Mr. Rob Morrison (Kootenay—Columbia, CPC):** Madam Speaker, I do not know if there is any evidence you have that says that handguns—

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès):** I have no evidence.

**Mr. Rob Morrison:** Madam Speaker, I do not know whether the member has any evidence that supports legal handguns being used in the commission of an offence. In fact, I would say it is zero, as one member already talked about.

Does the member agree that to get to the root problem here, there has to be crime prevention to prevent people from being involved in illegal gun crimes? Doing that is going to cost billions, so rather than a buyback program, would those billions of dollars not be better suited going toward the actual root cause of the problem and prevention?

**Mr. Lloyd Longfield:** Madam Speaker, the reason we are consulting with police chiefs, as well as people involved in the enforcement of laws in Canada to prevent crime, to come up with legislation like this, is also why we get their endorsement. We are working locally with our chief of police in Guelph, but we are also working across Canada with chiefs of police to make sure that this legislation gets it right. We are getting great feedback from chiefs of police on this legislation.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Marie-Hélène Gaudreau (Laurentides—Labelle, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I want to congratulate my colleague on his detailed speech.

I have a simple question. They say that they want to take action on illegal arms trafficking, yet it has been documented that Bill C-21 will do nothing to prevent illegal arms trafficking. Is my colleague aware of that?

[*English*]

**Mr. Lloyd Longfield:** Madam Speaker, what we are working on through this legislation is specifically handguns that are being sold and purchased in Canada. The smuggling that the member across the way is referring to is being dealt with in other ways, such as putting \$350 million of additional resources into CBSA, and through other legislation that is specifically targeting the importation of guns and the banning of AR-15s and 1,500 other assault-type rifles from coming into our country in the first place.

**Hon. John McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, the member comes from the general GTA area, as do I. He and I have been through a number of elections. As chair of the public safety committee, I listened to endless testimony about guns. I have yet to hear a coherent reason why anyone in Guelph or anyone in Scarborough—Guildwood needs to own a handgun or an assault rifle. If he could elucidate that core point, maybe we could get somewhere with this legislation.

• (1245)

**Mr. Lloyd Longfield:** Madam Speaker, from conversations I have had with gun owners in Guelph, I know they go to the shooting range and to businesses that provide opportunities for them to

use handguns in target-shooting activities. Those facilities will still be able to have guns available for people to use, but to actually purchase a gun and use it in some way to protect oneself from the public is really what we are trying to address here. Guns are used in ways that endanger the public, rather than protect the public.

**Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP):** Madam Speaker, we had discussions in the session this morning about the New Zealand example. As I recall, we saw this legislation right before the election. It initially had a voluntary buyback program. Having said that, we have seen flaws in how New Zealand handled this. That was a point made by some Conservative members.

I know there was push-back from groups concerned with gun violence, that a voluntary buyback program was not as good as a mandatory program. Can the hon. member for Guelph bring any information forward as to why the government changed its position on voluntary versus mandatory?

**Mr. Lloyd Longfield:** Madam Speaker, unfortunately, I cannot provide that information to the hon. member. I was not part of the discussion that was going on around buybacks. What we are dealing with is to say that as many guns as we have in Canada right now is the most that we will ever have. This legislation will freeze the growth of handguns in our communities, which is resulting in the growth of crime in our communities.

**Ms. Pam Damoff (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I would like to begin by acknowledging that we are gathered on the traditional, unceded territory of the Algonquin Anishinabe people.

Working in this place as an MP is a privilege that I do not take lightly. I have had the opportunity to work on many issues since I was elected, and one that I am most proud of is the actions we have taken to prevent gun violence.

Today, we are debating Bill C-21, a milestone achievement, built in large part on the voices and advocacy of so many survivors of gun violence, their families and loved ones, and doctors who see the burden of injury of gun violence.

I would like to express my deepest thanks to PolySeSouvient, the Centre culturel islamique de Québec, the Danforth families and the Dawson families, Doctors for Protection from Guns, the Coalition for Gun Control, Dr. Alan Drummond and the Canadian Association of Emergency Physicians, Alison Irons, and every single individual and organization advocating for better gun laws in our country. They have shaped the bill that is before the House of Commons today. Their unrelenting advocacy has led to a piece of generational legislation, which, as part of a broader strategy to tackle gun violence in this country, will make Canada a safer place for all of us to call home. A sad truth about those who are called to this kind of advocacy work is that it is often inspired by indescribable pain, which comes from surviving gun violence or losing a loved one to it.

*Government Orders*

Combined with the measures the government has already put in place, as well as our investments in communities and at the border, Bill C-21 marks the next significant step in our fight to eliminate gun violence. Bill C-21 is good news for the public safety of our communities, our institutions and our most vulnerable citizens. It would add new tools that will be used to reduce needless deaths from domestic violence and suicide.

We know that gun control is a women's issue. The Canadian Women's Foundation notes that the presence of firearms in Canadian households is the single greatest risk factor for the lethality of intimate partner violence. Access to a firearm increases the likelihood of femicide by 500%. I have heard from groups like the Lethbridge YWCA, which told me that every single woman who came to its shelter had been threatened by a partner with a firearm. They are among the nearly 2,500 women victimized in this way over the past five years. Intimate partner violence accounts for nearly 30% of all police-reported violent crime in Canada. That number has risen during the pandemic. In my riding, and across the country, local organizations like Halton Women's Place are helping to shine a brighter light on the dangers of gun violence.

Lindsay Wilson was a bright 26-year-old about to graduate from university, with the world in front of her, when her ex-boyfriend stalked her and, using his legally obtained firearm, shot and killed her. I met her mom, Alison Irons, during the study on Bill C-71. I was proud to be involved in passing that bill, which requires enhanced background checks to prevent those who have a history of violence from owning a firearm. Regulations found in that bill, which have now come into force, will help police trace illegal guns and ensure that firearms licences are verified. It makes sure that those who should not own a firearm cannot own a firearm.

Just last month, the minister asked the RCMP to do more. In the recently updated mandate letter for the commissioner of the RCMP, the RCMP has been asked to work with chief firearms officers across Canada to ensure that they can respond to calls without delay from Canadians who have safety concerns about an individual who has access to firearms, and to work with police of jurisdiction to remove firearms quickly. This change responds to concerns from physicians, survivors of intimate partner violence and victims' families.

I recently talked to Alison Irons, Lindsay's mom. She told me that the actions we have already taken, as well as those included in this bill and the RCMP commissioner's mandate letter, might very well have saved her daughter's life.

Let us talk about what those potentially life-saving changes included in Bill C-21 would do. The bill aims to prevent individuals with a prior or current restraining order from obtaining a firearms licence and would empower authorities to automatically revoke the licences of those with a new restraining order. The bill also introduces new red flag laws allowing courts to remove guns from and suspend the licences of people who pose a danger to themselves or anyone else.

• (1250)

Over 75% of those who die by firearms in this country die by suicide. The proposed red flag laws are one tool to stop deaths by suicide and domestic violence, adding another layer of protection

that those supporting them, such as doctors, shelters and family, can use to prevent violence. Bill C-21 marks an important next step in removing guns from the hands of abusive partners.

We cannot forget that Bill C-21 is following the ban on AR-15s and other military-style assault weapons. This important decision prohibited over 1,500 models of these weapons. Since then, over 300 more have been prevented from entering the market. Our government is also committed to a mandatory buyback program to get these weapons out of our communities once and for all.

There is no one fix to ending gun violence. That is why we are undertaking the significant work to stop gun violence in all its forms.

Earlier this spring, the Minister of Public Safety officially launched the \$250-million building safer communities fund, which will see an accelerated rollout over the summer. In partnership with community leaders, we are helping youth make good choices to set themselves up for lifelong success.

Investments in gang diversion and gang exiting strategies are so important because the underlying causes of gun violence are varied, complex and interrelated. We will not be able to solve gun crime through this one piece of legislation or one action. We need to take an intersectional approach that addresses poverty, inequality, systemic racism, mental illness, social isolation, substance abuse, extremist ideologies and access to affordable housing, education and health care. To confront gun violence, we must confront systemic challenges within our institutions, including within the criminal justice system. That is why I am so proud to be part of a government that is willing and eager to take on these challenges.

Taking action on gun violence means taking a number of important steps: banning military-style assault weapons, taking action at our borders, building safer communities and passing this new bill. Bill C-21 represents a milestone. It introduces a national freeze on the sale, purchase or import of handguns by individuals into Canada. We have made clear that action on handguns cannot wait.

*Government Orders*

Regulatory amendments to advance the national freeze on handguns have been tabled in both the House of Commons and in the other place. In fact, recently, at the public safety committee, with the support of the NDP and the Bloc, we attempted to fast-track those regulations, but the Conservatives said no to urgently getting handguns off our streets.

The bill recognizes the role organized crime plays in gun violence. If people are in the business of trafficking guns, they will face stiffer sentences under the Criminal Code. If people alter the magazine or the cartridge of a gun to exceed its lawful capacity, they will face new criminal charges. If people are involved in organized crime, they will face new police authorities, such as wiretapping, to stop gun crime before it happens. Furthermore, this spring's budget dedicated additional funds to the RCMP and CBSA so they can build on the record number of illegal guns seized at the border just last year. These are responsible, common-sense measures that all Canadians can get behind and in fact have gotten behind since the bill was introduced.

Cumulatively, these efforts mark the most significant efforts in a generation to end the burden of injury from gun violence. We are committed to moving forward on a strategy to prevent gun violence across our country. Bill C-21 is an important part of that strategy, and I am calling on all colleagues in the House to pass the bill quickly.

• (1255)

**Mr. Arnold Viersen (Peace River—Westlock, CPC):** Madam Speaker, I want to note that it seems that Bill C-21 was brought in on the back of American politics. I am wondering what the member has to say about importing American politics into Canada.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Madam Speaker, that could not be further from the truth. As the hon. member knows, gun control was a big issue during the last election campaign. In fact, the gun lobby chose to come to my riding twice to distribute pamphlets to try to make sure that I was not re-elected to be able to take action like that contained in Bill C-21.

To say that we are following events in the United States is simply not true. Having said that, I think it is irresponsible for any of us to think that we are immune from that kind of gun violence here in Canada.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Marie-Hélène Gaudreau (Laurentides—Labelle, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I congratulate the parliamentary secretary on this step forward. Obviously, the Bloc Québécois will vote in favour of the bill. That said, as we have made clear for the past few weeks, we would really like to see improvements to Bill C-21 in committee.

As I said earlier, finding a solution to curb organized crime is nearly impossible. That has been documented. According to the Montreal police service, 95% of handguns used in violent crimes come from the black market.

How is it possible that with all this information we cannot improve a bill to address the whole problem instead of just part of it?

[*English*]

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Madam Speaker, I look forward to working with my colleague and any amendments that may be put forward by the Bloc.

It is important, as I mentioned in my speech, to recognize one bill will not fix everything when it comes to gun crime. Certainly, we heard testimony at the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security about issues at Akwesasne, the ability to patrol that border and the need for financial investments in the police service at Akwesasne.

The investments we have already made with the RCMP and with the border are important, but certainly there is more we can be doing. I look forward to working with the Bloc to ensure that we do.

**Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP):** Madam Speaker, I have a great amount of respect for my colleague. As she knows, the NDP supports the goal of getting military-style assault weapons off the street with a mandatory buyback of prohibited firearms. We also welcome the announcement that the government is getting serious about cracking down on gun crime.

However, we received letters and calls from hundreds of concerned airsoft owners and businesses who simply do not understand why there is to be a prohibition on the importation, exportation and sale of airsoft guns under this legislation. Maybe my colleague can share who the government, when it prepared the bill, consulted with from the airsoft industry, those who are directly impacted by this bill, and if it is going to consult with the airsoft industry?

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Madam Speaker, I would invite the hon. member to speak to the police service in his riding. When police officers are responding to a call, they have only seconds to be able to know whether they are dealing with a real gun or whether it is an airsoft rifle. Unfortunately, the rifles used at airsoft ranges look so much like the real thing that police do not have the opportunity to check to see and people have lost their lives.

Police officers are put in a very difficult position. I look forward to hearing from the airsoft industry. I am sure its members will be speaking to us at committee when we study the bill, but I would invite the hon. member to speak to the police in his area about the challenges it has with airsoft rifles.

• (1300)

**Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP):** Madam Speaker, I am sure the hon. parliamentary secretary heard the question I asked earlier to the member for Guelph. The first version of this bill, before it died on the Order Paper, was a voluntary buyback program. We have now moved to it being mandatory. I would appreciate any light she can shed on the government's change of heart.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. member for her work on this issue. It has been a pleasure to work with her on this. The executive director of the National Firearms Association said that we would have to rip his two AR-15s from his cold, dead hands. That is the reason we had to go to a mandatory buyback program.

**Mr. Ted Falk (Provencher, CPC):** Madam Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the member for Peace River—Westlock.

It is always a pleasure to rise in this House to speak to legislation, even bad legislation.

I will be frank. I think Bill C-21 has about as much chance of stopping gun violence as there is of me crossing the floor to join the Liberals. It is just not going to happen. The bill will not work because it is the wrong approach, and the sad thing is that the government knows it is the wrong approach. It knows it will not work, but it is doing it anyway.

I will talk about why it is doing that in just a minute, but let us be clear. Gun control is an important issue. Everyone in the House has agreed that we need sensible gun control, but in this legislation there is the same problem we have come up against every time with the government, and that is that, when it decides it wants to tackle gun crime, it completely ignores the problem. It goes after law-abiding citizens rather than doing the hard work of going after the bad guys. This is because it is easier to control the behaviour of those who already obey the law than it is to deal with those who do not.

Conservatives are eager to tackle this issue. We want to have common sense laws. There are even things in this bill we can get behind, but instead of a serious and honest conversation, we get virtue signalling. We get a Prime Minister who is so eager to import U.S. culture wars into Canada that he politicizes tragedy for his own political benefit rather than taking concrete steps to protect the lives of Canadians. Why is that?

I need to remind the Prime Minister that we do not live in the United States. He is the Prime Minister of Canada, not a pundit for MSNBC. I am not so naive as to think that what happens in the U.S. does not affect us, particularly with the saturation effect of U.S. media, but every time some controversial issue or potential wedge issue pops up south of the border, it would seem that the Prime Minister rubs his hands with glee and wonders how he can weaponize it and use it to divide and control Canadians, whether it is abortion, race, gender, immigration or, what we are talking about now, guns. He seeks to take U.S. issues, import them to Canada and weaponize them to stigmatize and divide Canadians. These are serious issues, and we need to address them, but we need to address them as Canada's Parliament. They are uniquely Canadian issues, but the Prime Minister does not want to do that because it is easier to control people through fear, anger and division than it is to convince Canadians based on the merits of a particular argument.

I spoke in the House last week on the subject of control and how the government wants to pick winners and losers. We see it in the economy. We see it in the media. We see it in society. One group gets federal funding because it agrees with the ideologically of the government and another group does not. One media outlet gets federal funding and the next one does not. Certain people can have

### *Government Orders*

their charter rights to travel because they have agreed with the ideology of getting the shot or the second, the third or the fourth. Those who question the government based largely on consistently inconsistent and conflicting information from government sources, not to mention the principle that personal medical choices are private, lost their jobs. They were stigmatized and demonized again and again, and it is still happening.

When certain folks had enough and drove to Ottawa to express their opposition to his overreach, the Prime Minister would not meet with them. He ran away and hid. He and his ministers spun a narrative about these individuals. They said things in the media that have been proven to be false again and again. Where is the accountability for that misinformation? He enacted the Emergencies Act, not, as we now know, on the advice of law enforcement, which is another untruth, but because he had to control. He crushed those people with the full weight of his powers. Why did he do that? It was not because of science or any credible threat, but because of control. He wants to control what we do, what we think, what we can see online.

It was the Prime Minister's father who stated that the government has no business in the bedrooms of Canadians. The government not only wants to be in the bedroom, but also in every other room. It wants to be on every device, and every speech and every thought, and I am not so sure if the government is doing this out of a sense of insecurity. A relationship where one side refuses to listen to the other and always needs to be in control is not a healthy relationship. A relationship where one side belittles and demeans the other is not a healthy relationship. A relationship where one side uses a power differential to force submission is not a healthy relationship. It is an abusive relationship, and right now the relationship between the government and Canadians is not a healthy relationship.

● (1305)

The government has abused power and continues to abuse power, aided and abetted by the New Democrats, who, for a lack of fortitude and courage, are willing to compromise their convictions and sell out to Canadians for just a whiff of power. This is not about public safety. It is about the government controlling the little people, the law-abiding people. Every time government adds to its power to exercise control, individual Canadians lose some of theirs. It only exacerbates and perpetuates the problem.

I look at this bill. I look at how the government went about that process and how it has conducted itself in the past two years, and all I see is another attempt to control law-abiding Canadians. Now, with my remaining minutes, I would like to shift gears a bit because I do want to talk about violence.

*Government Orders*

There is no greater evil than to perpetuate violence. It is why our criminal justice system reserves the most serious sentences for those who inflict harm on others. However, violence is not a political issue. It is not an issue of hate, but it is an issue of the heart. In my faith we call it sin, which is the corruption of the image of God in humanity. It is a moral defect, the natural expression of which is to inflict harm on ourselves and others. It is a condition and a state of being from which we must be healed if we are ever to find wholeness and peace.

It is a heart issue, and the interesting thing about a heart is issue is that we cannot legislate it. We cannot legislate against what is in a person's heart. We can try, and the government has and will continue to try, and fail, because laws do not fix hearts. Laws cannot eliminate the anger, loneliness or hopelessness that individuals who commit heinous crimes feel, but what laws can do is attempt to control the external factors that contribute to the anger, loneliness and hopelessness that lead to an individual committing such heinous acts. To that end, I would like to offer a few brief suggestions.

We are never going to be able to fully eradicate violent crime, but if we want to get serious about curtailing it, we need to start with our kids. As parents and grandparents, we need to know what they are watching in the media and on social media. We need to know what they are consuming in their minds, which eventually finds its way into their hearts, and the video games and entertainment many of our children and grandchildren are accessing.

We know kids are impressionable and that, even as young adults, people are still developing until their mid-twenties. We know what habitual consumption can do and about neural pathways that habits and patterns create in the brain.

“Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaks”, and we can naturally extrapolate that the body acts. To put it in simple terms, what we put in is likely what will come out. There is an expression that was quite familiar when computers first became very prevalent: “Garbage in; garbage out.” Studies have shown, consistently, the direct correlation between violent video games and being not only desensitized, but predisposed, to violence. As early as the year 2000, which was 22 years ago, a study by the American Psychological Association revealed “that even brief exposure to violent video games can temporarily increase aggressive behavior in all types of participants.”

We see similar patterns when it comes to sexual violence. There is no limit to the depths of depravity and dehumanizing behaviour individuals, including children, can view with just the click of a mouse. That is why in the House we have continually called on the government to take action against Quebec-based MindGeek, which owns Pornhub, one of the largest producers of pornography in the world, including illegal content that is racist, misogynistic and violent, as we have shown in the House in the past.

We recognize that pornography not only isolates individuals, but also creates unhealthy and unrealistic depictions and expectations of sexual behaviour, which leads to violence against women. We know this, but when a young person, or for that matter an older person, is routinely exposed to violence and pornography, they will develop radical and racist views, and that is what many people are

consuming for hours a day, day in and day out. We should not be surprised when violence follows.

There is the story in the Bible of the very first murder. It is recorded in the Bible, and it is the story of Cain killing his brother Abel with a rock. The problem was not the rock. We do not read the story and say, “If only God had tougher rock control policies.” The rock was a tool. Jealousy, anger, feeling sorry for himself and feeling hard done by were what motivated the irrational rage that brought on the inability to get past himself and his own desires.

● (1310)

Cain lost control and acted out of his emotions. The problem was not the rock; the problem was the heart.

**Ms. Pam Damoff (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, the hon. member said during his speech that “personal medical choices are private”. He spoke a great deal about control.

Does a woman have control over her own body and are a woman's medical choices of sexual and reproductive health and abortion private and a choice between a woman and her doctor?

**Mr. Ted Falk:** Madam Speaker, if the hon. member was listening carefully, she knows that I was actually trying to talk about Bill C-21. That is the gun control issue, the control that the government is seeking to have over law-abiding Canadians who enjoy the sport of sport shooting, who are hunters or farmers who need firearms to conduct their business.

This bill directly attacks individuals like that and makes their lives miserable. Why does the government do it? The government does it because they are easy targets. They are not really criminals.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Marie-Hélène Gaudreau (Laurentides—Labelle, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I am going to change my question, actually.

As I was listening to my colleague, I thought he was absolutely right about how humans should be filled with love, not hate. If that were the case, we would not be here debating what the government can do to make people's lives miserable or just for kicks or whatever.

That being said, it seems to me that until such time as everyone is filled with love and goodwill, prevention is obviously in order. By that, I mean that, when something is amiss, situations should be monitored closely and there should be a list of gangs so that preventive action can be taken and people can be shown a little more love to help them feel even more at ease in their heart and soul. I would like my colleague to comment on that.

[*English*]

**Mr. Ted Falk:** Madam Speaker, the hon. member from the Bloc actually goes to the root of the whole issue here, which is what the Liberals and the NDP are failing to do. She is addressing the actual problem that is the heart of the issue.

*Government Orders*

Certainly, as I said in my speech, there need to be proper controls but reasonable controls, controls that will actually be effective and that will actually work—not controls that target law-abiding gun owners and farmers and hunters, but controls that go after gangs and seek to address the illegal importation of firearms into the country.

Those are the things that this legislation should address, and it does not address them.

**Ms. Rachel Blaney (North Island—Powell River, NDP):** Madam Speaker, my question is really around the importance of a healthy CBSA.

We know that we need to have enough people on the ground watching for the guns that are coming over the border. I represent a region with a lot of people who have guns for shooting at the range and of course for hunting. I also represent 19 Wing and I want to acknowledge the work that it has done to address some of the serious realities of drugs and guns being transported across the border.

The Conservative Party, in the last government that it formed, cut over 1,000 CBSA workers' jobs. This was a major concern then. I just do not understand how they can talk about wanting to take this challenge of getting illegal guns off the streets if they are not willing to make sure that the people are there to staff that effort.

• (1315)

**Mr. Ted Falk:** Madam Speaker, the hon. member was doing so well with that question to start with, until she started criticizing and spouting off information about cuts to the CBSA. The public accounts show that this is actually not the case and that those cuts were not made.

I do share the member's concern with properly funding the CBSA. It does a tremendous job. We expect a lot from it and we want to make sure that it is properly funded and that there are adequate resources for it to do the job of stopping the illegal importation of guns and weapons into Canada from the United States.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès):** The member for North Island—Powell River is rising on a point of order.

**Ms. Rachel Blaney:** Madam Speaker, perhaps many would think that this is a point of debate, but I do think that when a member is referring to a woman parliamentarian and indicates that she is “spouting off” instead of stating her position, maybe we should look at more respectful behaviour in the House.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès):** Well, it is not a question of debate. It is actually a question of how we address colleagues in the chamber, and it would be very helpful if members are respectful to one another when speaking in the chamber.

**Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP):** Madam Speaker, I found the hon. member for Provencher's discussion of issues of the heart and issues of the law compelling.

This quote from the Reverend Martin Luther King is relevant:

It may be true that morality cannot be legislated, but behaviour can be regulated. It may be true that the law cannot change the heart, but it can restrain the heartless. It may be true that the law cannot make a man love me, but it can restrain him from lynching me.

I wonder if, in that regard, the hon. member thinks there is a role for the state in regulating gun ownership.

**Mr. Ted Falk:** Madam Speaker, I think I said something very similar to what the member quoted from Martin Luther King in my speech. I thank her for reiterating that laws cannot regulate the heart, but certainly the actions that proceed from what is in an individual's heart can be regulated.

**Mr. Arnold Viersen (Peace River—Westlock, CPC):** Madam Speaker, I want to add my voice as well to the debate around Bill C-21, which is a very sinister bill that comes out of the evil intentions of the Liberal government.

Why do I say that? It is because the bill before us will do nothing to end the crime spree that we are seeing happen across the country. The bill will do nothing to end the violence that is happening in our streets. The bill will do nothing to support law enforcement in bringing these people to justice and holding them to account.

I hear over and over from community members that criminals are operating with impunity in broad daylight. They do not seem to fear the police whatsoever, or authorities of any sort, and that is the hard work that needs to be done. However, the Liberals are not interested in doing that hard work, because they know that this hard work will not score them political points. Therefore, I lay at their feet that the bill before us is a feeble attempt and that the Liberals should reconsider what they are doing.

Bill C-21 will not reduce gun crime and it will not reduce crime that is happening in our streets across the country. Why? It is because it would not give the authorities new tools; it would not provide new funding for law enforcement; and it would not allow for law enforcement to make quick interventions in these kinds of situations.

In Calgary, not a month ago, people in two cars racing down the street were shooting at one another. One car collided with a minivan and killed a mother of six children. Community members were asking, “How does this happen in broad daylight? Why did these criminals think that they could operate with impunity?” Well, that is because they did not see that there would be any consequence to what they were doing, and that is the challenge. That is the challenge of governing and it is what is required of government, which is to ensure a reward to those who do good and punish those who do evil.

This government is not doing that. For that, it gets a failing mark on Bill C-21.

This particular bill, although it takes the easy way out, would go after law-abiding firearms owners. The people who are already obeying the law and jumping through all of the hoops to own a firearm would only have another hoop placed in front of them. They would not be able to purchase new handguns or be able to transfer those handguns to their offspring and those kinds of things. Under this particular bill, they would be the last generation of handgun owners.

### *Government Orders*

Many of these firearms are heirlooms handed down from generation to generation. Many of my constituents speak with pride about the firearm that their great-grandfather used to own, and they have it in their collection. It is something they will no longer be able to pass down if Bill C-21 comes into force. How will that prevent criminals from operating with impunity in broad daylight? It will not.

That is a punitive, lazy and evil outcome of this particular bill. It would take away a freedom that Canadians have to pass on their heritage to their children, but it would not equip law enforcement or communities in order to prevent criminals from acting in broad daylight, making our communities less safe and a place where the gangsters rule, rather than law and order.

The Liberals claim law and order is their goal, but in reality we know that it is not. If they were actually focused on tackling some of these tough issues around restoring law and order, making criminals fear authorities, putting power behind the authorities and providing political support for law enforcement to do their job, we would see a restoration of peace and security in these communities. However, we have seen the Liberals tacitly support the “Defund the Police” movement; we have seen them radically reduce the length of sentencing that comes from participating in gun crime with Bill C-5; and we have seen their failure to adequately call out the fire-bombing of churches across the country.

● (1320)

All of these things have allowed gangsters and communities to feel like there is no law and order being upheld in particular communities. Where I come from, rural crime is a large and growing issue. People do not even phone the police anymore, because they are quite convinced that nothing will be done. The police will do the investigation and make the arrests, and the perpetrator will be out again the next evening. Then, when it does eventually go to trial, the whole case will be thrown out on some technicality. This does not bring justice for the victims, but it also does not put the perpetrators on a path to restoration to the community or a path of rehabilitation so that they can operate in the community.

These are some of the things that Conservatives have been calling for. We have been calling for the government to work to back up the police. My dad is a World War II history buff and he has a poster on his wall of a soldier going off to war. It says, “Buy Victory Bonds. Back him up!” That is essentially what we are calling on the government to do, to back up the law and order of this country and to provide the political support to ensure that law and order can be enforced in our communities. That is one of the major things we are seeing, whether it is in downtown Toronto, whether it is in Surrey, British Columbia, whether it is in Calgary, whether it is in northern Alberta or whether it is in Fairview, Alberta. That is something we are calling for.

Another thing I want to bring up as well is about some of the sports that involve firearms, particularly the handgun-shooting sports. I have a good friend up in Slave Lake who participates in a particular type of competition around this. He is of elite skill. I do not have any concern that he will not be able to get the elite skill exemption that is placed in this bill, but his question is, how does one become elite? One becomes elite by starting out as an amateur.

One becomes elite by beginning at the bottom of the totem pole: buying one's first handgun when one is 18 years old, going to the range, learning how to shoot, getting a mentor, all those kinds of things.

In hockey, we have thousands of people who play hockey who want to make it to the NHL. The same thing happens with elite handgun-shooting competitions at the Olympics. Typically, there are thousands of people who are participating at the amateur level so that we can have one or two make it to the Olympics to represent Canada on the world stage. How are we going to ensure that we have a strong and growing base of people to draw from for those things?

The other area of competition I want to talk about is paintball and airsoft. These two particular sports are going to be extremely penalized by this particular bill, because many of the paintball markers or airsoft tools look like a replica of a firearm. How does that help anybody in Canada? Many times these are replicas that are used for training purposes. They are used for simulation purposes. Again, the point is that if we want to have Canadians competing at the Olympic level, we need to ensure that we can use these particular tools.

I find that Bill C-21 is a sinister bill. Bill C-21 does not do the things that it is purported to do. I look forward to the defeat of this bill and the government providing support to law enforcement to restore law and order in our communities.

● (1325)

**Mr. Peter Schiefke (Vaudreuil—Soulanges, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, my hon. colleague during his speech spoke about trying to stop “gangsters”, trying to stop the wrong people from getting access to guns, and he made reference to the fact that we are doing nothing as a government to ensure that that is the case. However, I myself, as a former parliamentary secretary, was at two announcements held in my riding of Vaudreuil—Soulanges, at the CBSA training facility, where we announced \$30 million to provide more funding to train more canine units, whose purpose it is to sniff out contraband from entering our country, including guns, and more money for CBSA officers so that we can have more boots on the ground to stop these guns from coming into our country.

Why is it that my hon. colleague comes into this House and speaks about how we need to be doing more to stop these guns from coming in, to help ensure that we stop the “gangsters”, yet he himself and his party voted against both of those proven and effective initiatives?



*Government Orders*

**Mr. Arnold Viersen:** Madam Speaker, the thrust of my speech was around providing the political support to restore law and order in our communities. The Liberals fundamentally do not support our law enforcement and fundamentally do not support our justice system to ensure that criminals can be brought to justice. The Liberals reduce the sentencing whenever they can. They tacitly support the “defund the police” movement. They do not call out criminals when there are major crimes across the country. That is emboldening criminals and eliminating Canadians' trust in our institutions, namely our police forces and our justice system.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Kristina Michaud (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for his speech.

I recently met with the Canadian Airsoft Association, which wanted to make sure we understood that Bill C-21 targets air guns, toys and paintball guns because of how they look, not what they do. The association thinks that is wrong. I would like to hear my colleague's thoughts on that.

How will the Conservative Party be working with the government and the other opposition parties during the committee's study?

[*English*]

**Mr. Arnold Viersen:** Madam Speaker, I could not agree with my colleague more. This bill is a sinister bill that goes after law-abiding Canadians, rather than doing the hard work of going after criminals and gangsters, who are operating in broad daylight in our country. We need to ensure that our justice system and our police forces have the trust of Canadians and that Canadians, when they look out in their communities, say that our institutions are more powerful, stronger and capable of dealing with criminals who are operating in broad daylight.

Rather, under the current government, we see a deteriorating trust in institutions and a deteriorating acknowledgement that we should call the police when there is a problem because they will do something. Rather, we see that people will not call the police when a crime is committed in their community, because they do not think the police can do anything about it.

• (1330)

**Ms. Jenny Kwan (Vancouver East, NDP):** Madam Speaker, this is an issue that should be of concern for all of us in this House, and that is the use of firearms in the case of intimate partner violence. In fact, in 2018, over 500 cases involved firearms in the case of intimate partner violence. What do the Conservatives think should be done to address the use of firearms in the case of intimate partner violence? I do believe this bill is also attempting to address that as one of the issues.

**Mr. Arnold Viersen:** Madam Speaker, I would just note that for a very long time already, in order to get a firearms licence in this country, people have to have it signed off by their conjugal partner. That is a fair analysis. I also believe they can revoke that consent at any time. The law was good on that. The Liberals are tinkering around the edges once again.

Again, this is a distraction from the hard work that needs to be done around getting criminals who are operating in broad daylight off the street and empowering our law enforcement and our justice

system to hold these people to account and ensure that our communities are safe.

**Mr. Arif Virani (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade, Export Promotion, Small Business and Economic Development, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I will be splitting my time with the member for Whitby.

I want to recognize that I am speaking to the House of Commons from traditionally unceded Algonquin territory.

I am speaking today on a very important bill, Bill C-21, an incredibly important bill that addresses the proliferation of handguns in Canada and the need for greater measures to protect community safety.

Just by way of a refresh, our work on gun control, as a government, started much earlier. Since 2015, we have banned AR-15s and listed 1,500 models of assault-style firearms as prohibited. We have cracked down on illegal trafficking by investing in law enforcement and enhancing border security. We have invested \$250 million to address the root causes of gang violence.

Bill C-21 is part of the evolution of this approach and it is targeting specifically handguns. The question is why. We know that gun violence in Canada is on the rise. Since 2009, violent offences involving guns have increased by 81%, and handguns are the number one type of gun used in shooting homicides in this country.

Around 47% of Canadians have reported feeling that gun violence poses a serious threat to their communities. My community of Parkdale—High Park is no exception. My city of Toronto is no exception. We know that handguns are the preferred weapon of criminals in Canada, and that criminals obtain their guns through different means: smuggling, theft or what is known as straw purchases.

For example, the horrific Danforth shooting a few years back in Toronto involved a gun that was originally a legal firearm that was stolen in the province of Saskatchewan. We are trying to address part of the problem, which is the supply of handguns that are circulating in Canadian society.

How will we do that? This bill would freeze the market. Individuals will no longer be able to buy, sell, transfer or import handguns, subject to some very narrow exceptions. This means that there will never be more handguns in Canada than there are at the moment this bill passes. I just want that to sink in for members of Parliament, because that underscores the need to ensure community safety by passing this legislation as quickly as possible.

*Government Orders*

That begs the question, what about other sources, such as the borders? We are addressing borders and smuggling as well. While Bill C-21 limits the domestic supply of handguns, what we have done at the borders, and we have heard this injected into the debate by people like the member for Vaudreuil—Soulanges, is that we have made a \$350-million investment into the RCMP and the CBSA, in their capacity to intercept weapons coming across the U.S. border. While we venerate our relationship with our strongest ally and our largest trading partner, that trading partner also happens to be the world's single largest manufacturer of firearms on the planet.

When we made that investment, and I will note this for the people watching on CPAC, the Conservative Party of Canada voted against that investment, betraying its perspective when the rubber hit the road, in terms of voting patterns.

What happened after that historic investment? Let us look at the evidence. In 2021, the RCMP and the CBSA intercepted nearly double the number of firearms at the border than they had in 2020. The investments in border safety are working to keep our communities safe.

Both in this debate and in the context of other debates about firearms and gun control in this legislature, at least in the time I have been here, since 2015, we have heard a lot about the narrative about victims, that the focus needs to be on the victims. Let me talk about three victim groups that I feel are strongly served by a bill like Bill C-21.

The first is women. The member for Vancouver East just asked a very poignant question of the member who just spoke from the official opposition, about victims of intimate partner violence and things like gender-based violence. We have heard, and it is fairly common-sense, that if there is violence in the home, the presence of weapons in the home would accentuate the propensity of that violence to end up being lethal. That is exactly what has happened. A stat was just provided that 500 instances of intimate partner violence involved firearms. That is almost two per day in terms of how frequent that is. That is an alarming statistic for all of us who are concerned about violence, and I am sure there is no debate that all of us in this chamber are concerned about intimate partner violence.

What does this bill do? This bill would provide, among other things, regulatory authority that will allow for an individual who is the subject of a restraining order to be prevented from having either a firearm or a firearms licence. We know that the number of women who are killed at home because of intimate partner violence and gender-based violence is far too large. That is why we are working to address this.

The next area I would like to address, in terms of whom we are supporting, is those who are dealing with mental illness. We know that we have a concern about mental illness, particularly in the aftermath of the COVID pandemic.

• (1335)

We know that rates of suicidality are going up. We know that when people are contemplating suicide, or having what is called suicidal ideation, the presence of a weapon can, again, be lethal. We know that guns in homes lead to greater numbers of suicides in this country. There are members of the official opposition who have

called for various measures, and they are right to call for them, to address suicidality and to address getting people support.

One way of ensuring that suicidal ideation does not result in death is by restricting the numbers of firearms in homes. This bill would do that. I found it a bit perplexing, to be candid, to hear, in the debate just prior to my intervention, about the notion of background checks. It was raised by the Conservative member who just spoke. When the issue of background checks was moved in the House of Commons in the previous Parliament, the Conservative Party again voted against that aspect of the legislation. That is really troubling for a party, when all parliamentarians need to be addressing the need to ensure that lawful firearms are only put into the hands of people who should have firearms, not people who may perhaps be suffering from mental illness.

Let me address a third group, and this one is really important to me in the work that I have been doing for the past seven years. What this legislation would do through the red flag provisions is address people who could be targeted by hatred. I am talking about people who might be racial minorities and religious minorities. I am talking about people who could be targeted online, and the women I spoke of earlier. If such people have a legitimate basis or reasonable grounds to believe that a firearm should be removed from the home of a potential assailant, or someone who was stalking or threatening them, etc., they could apply for a court order to do just that. The court order raising a red flag could be for a limited period as short as up to 30 days. A long-term prohibition order could be all the way up to five years, if there continued to be a reasonable basis to believe the individual posed a public health risk.

The removal of the weapons could be done immediately, via a court order that they be surrendered immediately to law enforcement. This is important because we heard from, and listened to, women and minority groups who are targeted by violence. They are targeted by hatred and are threatened. They told us that their fears are real and that there are fears of reprisal.

I am going to get to an aspect that we have improved in this legislation. What they have said is that they were not going to come forward because if they did so, it would put them in even greater vulnerability. They would have a greater sense of jeopardy, with a higher likelihood of potentially fatal consequences. What we have done with this iteration of Bill C-21 is we have improved it. We have listened to those stakeholders, and we have cured what we feel is an aspect of the old Bill C-21 that needed curing. This is in terms of protecting the identity of those persons who would apply for such a court order.

Under the current version of the legislation that we are now debating, a court could close the court hearing to the public and the media. A court could seal the documents in the record for up to 30 days and remove identifying information for any period of time, even permanently, if the judge felt that was necessary. That is important because it gets to the heart of this issue: that people who are facing threats and have very legitimate fears need to be emboldened to come forward and not be afraid to come forward. This is what this legislation would do. It would allow for such people to be protected.

I want to point out the types of people who have been calling for the red flags. One amazing group is a group of physicians called Canadian Doctors for Protection from Guns, and I salute their incredible work. I had the occasion to meet with some of them, including Dr. Najma Ahmed and Dr. Julie Maggi. Many of their colleagues were doing incredible work from a medical perspective about this being a public health crisis that we are dealing with, in terms of firearms violence.

I also want to salute the lifetime work of my constituent, Ms. Wendy Cukier, a professor at TMU in Toronto and also the president of the Canadian Coalition for Gun Control. I first met Wendy when I was a parliamentary intern in this chamber in 1995. She was doing work back then, 27 years ago, to promote better gun control. She has never wavered in those 27 years. I salute her for the success that this legislation has achieved.

The last piece I want to address in closing is the idea of having municipalities deal with this on a one-off basis. Having bylaws in individual municipalities would create a checkerboard. It would not serve the constituents of Toronto if guns were banned in Toronto but available in Markham or Mississauga. The same would apply across the country.

We are taking a national approach because this is a national issue and a national crisis. It is important for victims. It is important for women. It is important for people who are suffering with mental illness. It is important for racial and religious minorities. I firmly support this bill, and I hope my colleagues will, as well.

● (1340)

**Mr. James Bezan (Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman, CPC):** Madam Speaker, the parliamentary secretary made his speech and said that ending the sale of legal handguns, handguns that are bought by individuals who have already gone through the clearance of getting a restricted possession and acquisition licence, is somehow going to take illegal guns off the street. He made the outrageous statement that this would hypothetically put a stop on how many handguns are in circulation in Canada today.

We know that handguns are being used on the streets by gangs, thugs and people involved in the illicit trade of drugs and other contraband. They are the ones who are actually trading in illegal and smuggled handguns that have come from the United States and other ports of entry. How are they going to stop that and instead go after the actual criminals committing the crime rather than the legal, law-abiding firearms owners in Canada?

**Mr. Arif Virani:** Madam Speaker, obviously we have a very strong philosophical and principle difference on this issue. As a basic proposition, I would put to him that Canadians' safety is im-

### *Government Orders*

proved when we restrict the number of firearms in circulation. Any efforts in that regard, of which this bill is one, will benefit Canadians' safety. That is my first point.

The second point is that I do not dispute that there are concerns with the border. That is what I identified in my opening intervention. When issues come up about supporting the CBSA and RCMP at the border, in terms of their ability to intercept weapons, I hope this time the member for Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman and his colleagues on the Conservative benches will vote in favour of those investments instead of opposing them.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Kristina Michaud (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia, BQ):** Madam Speaker, my colleague spoke at length about what is in Bill C-21. I would like to hear his thoughts on what is missing from Bill C-21, starting with a ban on assault weapons.

The government has decided to proceed through regulatory changes. Some 1,800 models of assault weapons are currently banned. The government has proposed a mandatory buyback program, but it is still not in place. Public consultations have yet to begin.

If the government takes a model-by-model approach, there is a risk that some will be forgotten or that new ones will appear on the market. We proposed amending the Criminal Code instead, in order to clearly define what a prohibited weapon is. That way, they can all be dealt with at once.

The Liberal Party seemed happy with that proposal, and I would like to hear my colleague's thoughts on it.

**Mr. Arif Virani:** Madam Speaker, I appreciate my Bloc Québécois colleague's question and her work on public safety.

Among the possible options, we decided to proceed through regulations rather than a bill, because this approach is sometimes faster.

I understand my colleague's impatience and why she is eager to see regulations on assault weapons. Let me assure the member that several of my Liberal colleagues and I will fight to have these regulations made as soon as possible.

● (1345)

[*English*]

**Ms. Pam Damoff (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, the hon. member spoke about the doctors who have spoken out in favour of gun control. I have heard doctors talk about gun violence being a public health issue and the burden of injury from gun violence being too high. That includes not only people who die from guns used in crime but from suicide and gender-based violence.

*Government Orders*

I wonder this. Could the hon. member comment on the fact that our colleagues across the aisle in the Conservative Party never seem to mention that burden of injury from gender-based violence and suicide, and completely ignore all the women and men who die by suicide or as a result of gender-based violence?

**Mr. Arif Virani:** Madam Speaker, it is lamentable. What I recall is actually being with that member at the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights in the last Parliament and doing a study on acts of coercion and acts of aggression. Witnesses came from all parts of the country, including witnesses invited by the Conservative Party. When we put to those witnesses whether the presence of a firearm in the home increased jeopardy and vulnerability or decreased it, the answer was very straightforward. It obviously increases jeopardy. This is not something that should be partisan. This is not something that should be politicized. We all have a stake in addressing domestic violence. This is one way to do it.

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull (Whitby, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, thank you for the opportunity today to join this important debate.

Let me begin by saying two words: Resolute and realistic. I think the Minister of Public Safety said it best. Resolute and realistic is what this government has strived to be since we began tackling gun violence as soon as we were elected to lead this country almost seven years ago, and these adjectives have been our true North Star. We know that no single bill or initiative has the power to single-handedly end gun violence. That is being realistic.

We also know that morally, ethically and humanely we are bound to do all we can, using all resources at our disposal, to stop senseless deaths and injuries from firearms. That is exactly what we are determined to do. In other words, we are resolute. We believe it is the only appropriate response to the tragedies we have seen in our communities, from the École Polytechnique in 1989 to Portapique in 2020 and all the deadly incidents in between that did not receive widespread media coverage precisely because they were all too common. Let us not have any doubt about it: These are preventable deaths. The grief of the victims' loved ones will never be fully soothed, and those who survived will always carry with them the trauma of what they experienced. We must resolve ourselves to do anything and everything that we can to ensure no one else has to live through these horrors. That is why we have introduced decisive actions such as implementing a national freeze on handguns so that no new handguns can be brought into Canada or bought, sold or transferred within the country, and implementing red flag laws to protect those who are most vulnerable from gun violence at the hands of intimate partners. These are the strongest gun control measures this country has seen in over 40 years. These measures will save lives.

I would like to share a few important statistics with my colleagues. We know that the more available guns are, the higher the risk of homicides and suicides. Handguns are the most commonly used firearms in homicides. Suicide by firearm accounted for 75% of all firearms deaths in Canada between 2008 and 2018. Victims of intimate partner violence are about five times more likely to be killed if a firearm is present in the home. Members should think about that. Of guns used in crimes, 58% are traced to domestic sources that are predominantly from straw purchasing and theft. This means that, contrary to what the Conservatives keep telling us,

these guns are legally obtained initially. Making handguns unavailable to buy, transfer or sell and prohibiting new handguns from being brought into Canada just makes sense. Reducing the number of guns in our communities means reducing the number of victims of gun violence.

Let us be clear. We are realistic. We know that a national freeze on handguns, however strong and effective a measure it will be, cannot end all forms of gun violence, of course. That is why this bill contains numerous other measures to complement and strengthen Canada's gun laws. A priority for this government is protecting women who are disproportionately victimized by intimate partner violence that often involves guns. Bill C-21 contains legislation to revoke or deny firearms licences for people who have a protection order against them or have been involved in domestic violence, criminal harassment or stalking.

The red flag provisions of this bill are also designed to protect women and other vulnerable persons. Under these provisions, anyone could apply to a court to remove firearms from someone who may be a danger to themselves or others. We can imagine the utility of a law like this. We can imagine the lives saved in situations where people were experiencing abuse and feared for their lives at the hands of their partners who owned a firearm, or for firearms owners who tell their friends they have suicidal thoughts or ideation. Bill C-21 also contains yellow flag provisions, where anyone can ask a chief firearms officer to suspend and examine a licence if there are grounds to suspect that person is no longer eligible to hold a firearms licence.

● (1350)

These are all strong measures, and we know there are those who, as responsible firearms owners, may worry that these new laws would affect them. Canadian gun regulations and requirements are already robust, and we know that the majority of firearms owners take great care to own and operate their firearms safely in accordance with these rules. We have taken care to ensure that the privileges of lawful gun owners would not change. Current handgun owners would continue to be able to possess and use firearms for as long as they own them.

Bill C-21 is targeting handguns, not firearms used for hunting or sport shooting. However, as the Prime Minister has said, there is no reason other than these activities that the general public should need guns in their everyday lives. Let us think about it. All it takes to take a life is the pulling of a trigger. Do Canadians really need to own lethal force to be used at any moment? I do not think so.

Firearms owners can rest assured that, as always, we will consult with Canadians before finalizing and implementing regulations. The bottom line is that Canadians know that this government is serious about gun control and has been since we were elected. Since 2016, we have invested more than \$920 million to address gun violence and keep guns out of the hands of gangs and criminals.

Budget 2021 committed \$312 million over five years for the CBSA and RCMP to increase intelligence and investigative capacity at the border and increase the RCMP's ability to trace gun crimes and detect straw purchasing. We have made significant strides in combatting gang violence as well, with \$250 million committed to support municipalities and indigenous communities with anti-gang programs through the building safer communities fund. This builds on the \$358.8 million under the 2018 initiative to take action against gun and gang violence for provinces and territories. This is not to mention that under the leadership of the previous minister of public safety two years ago, we took the bold step of banning assault-style weapons, prohibiting over 1,500 models of such firearms.

This is how we are combatting gun violence and how we will end it. We have a suite of comprehensive measures that prevent it from taking root in the first place, that protect vulnerable individuals when there is reason to believe violence is imminent and that remove guns from the hands of those who have malicious intentions. We cannot wait to take action.

I speak for all my colleagues when I say that we have already seen too much violence in each of our home constituencies. I know I have. There have been too many tears with too much grief, because even one person lost to gun violence is too many. I implore my colleagues to pass Bill C-21 as quickly as possible. Let us end gun violence in Canada now.

**Mr. Dane Lloyd (Sturgeon River—Parkland, CPC):** Madam Speaker, I read a number of days ago with great interest a story about an Ottawa-area lifelong hunter who had his firearms taken away because of a tip from a local community mental health area that said the man was not taking his medication. Police moved immediately and seized this man's firearms. It was only after petitioning a judge and demonstrating to a judge that he did not have any mental issues that he got his firearms back.

I found it curious that the member said we currently do not have the capacity to take firearms away from people who are going through mental distress, when we see quite clearly here in the Ottawa area that it is already happening. Would the member not agree that the government and the police already have these tools?

• (1355)

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** Madam Speaker, I do not know the specific example the member speaks of, but embedding red flag and yellow flag laws within legislation would only give additional tools to law enforcement and individuals who suspect that someone has suicidal ideation or may harm others. That is a good thing. We can all probably agree that the fewer the number of individuals who commit suicide via a firearm and the fewer the number of people who are in firearms shootings, the safer Canada will be.

### *Government Orders*

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Kristina Michaud (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I would like to know why my colleague's government decided to go with a freeze rather than a ban. As members will recall, the May 2020 assault weapons ban and regulations came into effect immediately. Now, the government is proposing a freeze on handguns but has realized that it will not take effect for 30 business days.

Why did the government not take a different approach to ensure that this could be implemented quickly? If the government were really serious about getting handguns off our streets, it would have taken a different approach.

I would like my colleague to explain to me why his government decided to go with a freeze rather than a ban.

[*English*]

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** Madam Speaker, the hon. member's question is a good-faith question, and I appreciate it.

The freeze on handguns definitely limits the market. It starts to regulate the market so that there will be no more handguns in circulation in Canada from the moment this bill reaches royal assent. That allows us to start to understand and work on the issue of getting guns off the streets in a way that respects the lawful possession and acquisition of the firearms that many legal, law-abiding gun owners have. It is a compromise and a good step forward.

**Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP):** Madam Speaker, one thing my colleague's party promised in 2019 was to make sure that the CBSA had the resources it needs to detect and stop the flow of weapons at our borders. Just like the Conservatives did with Veterans Affairs when they cut a third of the staff, which has led to a backlog of over 40,000 disability applications for veterans, they cut 1,000 positions at the CBSA, which are required to stop the flow of weapons at the Canada-U.S. border.

My colleague touched on some of the improvements the government is going to make at the CBSA, but when will it fully restore all of the positions that were cut by the Conservatives, and in fact bolster them, given the increase in gun violence and the illegal importation of weapons coming into Canada?

*Statements by Members*

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** Madam Speaker, our government knows that illegal gun smuggling is important, as is increasing the investigative capacity of the CBSA and the RCMP to investigate purported gun smuggling and crack down on it. We have increased the penalties for those who are caught, from 10 to 14 years. To my knowledge, we are increasing capacity at our borders and ensuring that our law enforcement agencies can share data and information to have better intelligence on these matters.

**Mr. Mike Morrice (Kitchener Centre, GP):** Madam Speaker, very few recent mass shooters in this country had criminal records of any kind. Consider shootings in Fredericton, Danforth, Quebec City and Moncton. Could the member comment on how Bill C-21 would help reduce and even eliminate mass shootings across the country?

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** Madam Speaker, this goes to show that just because people are law-abiding gun owners when they purchase a gun does not mean they are not capable of committing an act in a heated moment. It is important for us to realize that limiting gun ownership and restricting guns are going to help reduce gun crime.

---

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

• (1400)

[*English*]

### FREEDOM IN CANADA

**Mr. Ken Hardie (Fleetwood—Port Kells, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, Canada Day is coming up a week from Friday, and it is a good moment to think about freedom in an age of COVID.

Most Canadians exercise their freedom to contribute toward the common good by getting vaccinated, wearing masks and understanding that vaccine and mask mandates were about short-term restrictions in the interests of long-term health and safety. Others exercise their freedom to oppose those measures, some on principle and others with agendas exposed as exceedingly dark. In our parliamentary precinct, some gave themselves the freedom to exercise their lungs, their rhetoric and their truck horns. Some of them, we are told, are planning to return.

To them, here is some free advice. Canada is a strong, free nation, thanks very much, where we get to yell “freedom” and blast truck horns. They can fill their boots, but the sound of votes slipping into a ballot box will drown out the noise, because that is how we do things here. That is how we preserve and protect real freedom.

\* \* \*

### COMMUNITY EVENTS

**Mr. Robert Kitchen (Souris—Moose Mountain, CPC):** Madam Speaker, the summertime is upon us once again, and with it comes some great opportunities to get out into the community and take part in some of the outstanding events happening in Souris—Moose Mountain and across this great country.

After over two years of living in a pandemic, I am looking forward to being able to meet with people face to face as I travel throughout my riding to hear what my constituents have to say.

While the rising cost of living, combined with high gas prices, might make longer trips a bit more difficult, I encourage everyone to support local events and the local economy by participating in things such as fairs, rodeos, powwows, festivals, jamborees, barbecues and more. This is also a great opportunity to take the staycation we might have been thinking of while also helping local businesses, which would certainly benefit from a visit.

I know that I will be going to as many community events as I can this summer, and I invite all Canadians to do the same. Let us get out and enjoy. I hope to see everyone there.

\* \* \*

### BLUEDROP ISM

**Ms. Joanne Thompson (St. John's East, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, there was a time when no one thought it was possible to launch a global tech company from Newfoundland and Labrador, but Emad Rizkalla is a true innovator and launched our province's very first tech start-up, now known as Bluedrop ISM, 30 years ago.

Bluedrop is a global learning tech leader with customers and users in over 30 countries and on all seven continents. It is part of our province's now thriving tech industry, which contributes over \$1.6 billion to our economy and employs over 4,000 people.

Emad immigrated to Canada from Egypt when he was seven years old, co-founded Bluedrop as a student of Memorial University and is considered one of North America's pioneers in e-learning. To Bluedrop, Emad and the entire team on their 30th anniversary, I say congratulations as they continue to blaze new trails.

\* \* \*

[*Translation*]

### MARCEL JOBIN

**Mr. Yves Perron (Berthier—Maskinongé, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I am pleased to pay tribute to an incredible athlete in my riding, Marcel Jobin, an 80-year-old Olympic race walker from Saint-Boniface.

Mr. Jobin's career highlights include competing in the summer games in Montreal in 1976 and in Los Angeles in 1984, in the 20-kilometre and 50-kilometre events. He also founded the Académie Marcel-Jobin, a not-for-profit organization that promotes physical activity, organizes sporting events and supports athletes. It has organized no fewer than 25 half marathons. As if that were not enough, he is getting ready for this summer's world championships in Finland, where he is going for gold in the 80 to 84 age group.

Mr. Jobin, keep on impressing us. You are the pride of Berthier—Maskinongé and Quebec as a whole.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès):** Before we move on, I would like to know if it is possible to reduce the noise coming from the lobbies.

[English]

It is very bothersome, and it is interfering with the way we hear speeches in the House.

• (1405)

[Translation]

The hon. member for Bourassa.

\* \* \*

#### MEDAL AWARDED BY MP FOR BOURASSA

**Mr. Emmanuel Dubourg (Bourassa, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, yesterday, on Father's Day, the fourth edition of the “eminent men in Bourassa” ceremony was held to recognize five men who have made an outstanding contribution to the community.

I had the honour of presenting each of them with the Bourassa MP's medal. The recipients were Pierre Blondin, chair of the Beaulieu-Blondin Foundation; Carmine Gallo, a police officer at station 39; Dib Khanafer, co-owner of Miracle 110; Sonel Merjuste, co-owner of Tempehine; and Sam Watts, director of Mission Bon Accueil.

I am proud to rise in the House of Commons to celebrate their dedication and contribution to the riding of Bourassa.

I ask my fellow members of Parliament to join me in congratulating them.

\* \* \*

[English]

#### AGRICULTURE IN CANADA

**Ms. Leslyn Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk, CPC):** Madam Speaker, Canadian farmers have been feeding us for generations. They deserve our thanks, but instead they keep getting attacked by the Liberal government. The carbon tax was the first blow, punishing farmers and lining government pockets while doing nothing to reduce carbon emissions.

Then came the 35% tariff on Russian fertilizer applied to products purchased well before the war in Ukraine began. Now the government wants to force misleading warning labels on all Canadian ground beef and pork. There is a perfect storm brewing of record high costs, supply chain disruptions, labour shortages and poor planting conditions.

The government needs to wake up, cancel the taxes and secure our food supply before we plunge into a national food shortage crisis. Time is running out.

\* \* \*

#### SOTHYMALAR PARAMSOTHY

**Hon. Judy A. Sgro (Humber River—Black Creek, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, today I would like to honour the memory of a pas-

#### Statements by Members

sionate teacher, a dedicated volunteer and a great community leader, Ms. Sothymalar Paramsothy. Ms. Paramsothy arrived in Canada, along with her two sons, as a refugee.

Like most Tamils, she balanced several jobs to make ends meet as she integrated into a new place. A teacher by profession, she worked part time in Dufferin-Peel Catholic District School Board while teaching Tamil in various boards under the international languages program. Apart from work, she was passionately involved with fundraising for humanitarian relief efforts to the internally displaced in Sri Lanka's north and east. Following her retirement in the early 2000s, she returned to Sri Lanka to continue her humanitarian work on the ground.

I remember the day of awarding Ms. Paramsothy with the Queen's Golden Jubilee Medal for service. I will always remember her for her strong spirit, big heart and visionary mind. Until her last breath, she continued to encourage work on improving Sri Lanka's social and economic conditions. It is a painful loss for all of us and for Canada. We are forever grateful for the legacy she has left behind.

\* \* \*

#### DRAGONS ABREAST

**Mr. Nathaniel Erskine-Smith (Beaches—East York, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, Dragons Abreast is an exercise and rehabilitation program for breast cancer survivors in the form of a dragon boat team, and it is celebrating its 25th year. Through a 125-kilometre paddle on the Trent-Severn, they are raising funds for the Canadian Breast Cancer Support Fund and honouring the 55 members of the team who have died since 1997.

This remarkable journey began on June 16 with a water ceremony at Curve Lake First Nation and finishes on June 21 with a water ceremony at Hiawatha First Nation. Eleanor Nielsen is a Beaches—East York constituent, one of the most wonderful people one could ever meet, and she is a member of Dragons Abreast. She has co-authored a book called *Internationally Abreast: Exercise As Medicine* about the Vancouver origins of the breast cancer dragon boat movement, which now has 51 teams in Canada and 260 worldwide.

I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the Dragons Abreast team for the important work they do to emphasize physical exercise, raise funds for an important cause and build a strong community of support. I wish them the best of luck in their paddling journey.

*Statements by Members***BILL C-291**

**Mr. Frank Caputo (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I hearken back to my maiden speech today to discuss something I am passionate about. It is time we stop using the phrase “child pornography”. Words matter, and the term child pornography sanitizes the extreme harm caused to children. Pornography describes media between consenting adults. Children can never consent to sexual activity with adults.

This is why any sexual depiction of a child must be called what it is: sexual abuse. Last week, my hon. colleague from North Okanagan—Shuswap tabled Bill C-291 to change all references of “child pornography” in the criminal code to “child sexual abuse material”.

I am deeply grateful to him for tabling this bill, which I authored, and using his slot in the order of precedence so the bill can be passed without delay. This is a change that victims and advocates have been seeking for far too long. The time to make this simple yet meaningful change is now, and I exhort the House to do so as quickly as possible.

\* \* \*

● (1410)

**TURNING THE TIDE AWARDS**

**Ms. Yvonne Jones (Labrador, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the recipients of the Turning the Tide Awards for honouring excellence and innovation in Newfoundland and Labrador's marine industry. I especially want to highlight the Labrador Fishermen's Union Shrimp Company, which earned the industry leadership and excellence award. The company grew from humble beginnings, started by fisher people, into an industry leader. It operates five processing facilities in Labrador's south coast and boasts an impressive harvesting fleet.

I also want to recognize Richard Cashin, who received the industry lifetime achievement award for advancing the rights of inshore fish harvesters; Virtual Marine, which earned the innovation leadership award; the Crow's Nest, which was presented with the award of historical marine significance; and Jasmine Saunders, who was given the next wave leadership award. She is an indigenous woman who has played an integral role in developing relationships with indigenous partners and high school students.

I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating all those who are turning the tide in the marine industry sector in Newfoundland and Labrador.

\* \* \*

**ARCTIC SOVEREIGNTY**

**Mr. Bob Zimmer (Prince George—Peace River—Northern Rockies, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I was in Inuvik last week, and what I saw was alarming. Instead of strengthening sovereignty and security in our Arctic, I saw the government putting up a for sale sign on a crucial NORAD facility and getting rid of other essential equipment. For decades, the International Logistics Support hangar has been the only facility above the Arctic Circle able to house Canada's refuelling tankers that support our CF-18s.

Deemed no longer necessary by the government in 2021, the hangar is now up for sale. Without this hangar, the refuelling tankers are being pushed outside and now take hours to prep in minus 40 and worse winter conditions. Any quick response is now off the table. To make matters worse, fuel tanks that used to stand in front of CF-18 hangars have been noticeably removed, which is impeding our ability to repeatedly respond to Arctic threats.

Despite the minister's lofty words, we are more at risk in the Arctic than ever before. Will the minister visit Inuvik herself to see first-hand the sad state of our Arctic sovereignty and security, instead of relying on her senior level bureaucrats in Ottawa?

\* \* \*

**BILL C-11**

**Mr. Warren Steinley (Regina—Lewvan, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, we are down to the last week for the government to attempt to ram through legislation through the final session since the last unnecessary election in the fall.

There remain more questions than answers about Bill C-11. Is user-generated content covered under the act or not? Does the wording of the bill allow for platforms to censor or not? With the government bulldozing through fulsome debate on this legislation, it appears that these questions will remain unanswered.

The irony of stifling the freedom to speak in the House on the very bill that has the greatest consequences of freedom of speech in our country's history cannot be understated. Whether it is of the heritage minister, the public safety minister, the emergency preparedness minister or the Prime Minister, this bill is another example of the government's disdain for the rights and freedoms of all Canadians.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**SHERBROOKE STATION MARKET**

**Mrs. Élisabeth Brière (Sherbrooke, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, today I am happy to mark the start of the summer season for the Sherbrooke Station Market. Located on the shores of Lac des Nations, this public market is steeped in history and showcases Sherbrooke's natural and built heritage. Five permanent merchants occupy the interior space year round and, with the beginning of the summer this weekend, many market gardeners and artisans have set up booths outside and stocked them with the best products the region has to offer.



*Statements by Members*

The market also serves as a gathering place and festival site for the community. I would like to invite the entire population of Sherbrooke, as well as tourists, to come spend some quality family time at the market, which runs every weekend until the end of October, and to stock up on fresh local products.

Buying local stimulates the economy and supports Sherbrooke's entrepreneurs. We should all keep buying delicious products made close to home.

\* \* \*

• (1415)

[English]

**ALBERTA BILLY**

**Ms. Rachel Blaney (North Island—Powell River, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, Alberta Billy was an influential leader and elder from the Laich-Kwil-Tach speaking people.

Her passing fills me with a deep sadness, and it will have a profound impact on our riding. The gentleness of her spirit called everyone around her to be their very best self. She was a significant leader who educated Canadians about the deep and painful impacts of residential school. In the eighties, with friends Thelma Davis and Stan McKay, she worked years to inspire the United Church of Canada to take ownership of the part it played, which it did, becoming the first religious institution to apologize to indigenous peoples.

She did not stop there. She worked with Kathi and Meredith to educate people on the impacts of residential schools with an experiential training through The Village workshop series. She would say to me, “We do it because we must.” Her words give me strength in challenging times. The world a much sadder place without Alberta. I am so honoured to have known and loved her. I wish her husband, Daniel, and her family much love in this profound time of grief.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**ANN-RENÉE DESBIENS**

**Mrs. Caroline Desbiens (Beauport—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île d'Orléans—Charlevoix, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest assets of my riding are the high-performance athletes who bring joy to our community. One of those athletes is here today on Parliament Hill. It is Ann-Renée Desbiens, who brought Olympic gold home to Charlevoix.

A native of Clermont who now lives in beautiful Saint-Aimé-des-Lacs, the woman who is known as “the Great Wall of Charlevoix” has collected so many national and international titles that she has basically rewritten the U.S. college circuit record book. In 2017, she received the Patty Kazmaier Award for the top women's college ice hockey player.

Supported by a wonderful family, my distant cousin is a brilliant, generous and inspiring woman. She shares her medals, dreams and techniques with fans both young and old, and her famous jersey with her humble member of Parliament. Everyone loves Ann-Renée, an articulate and dynamic woman who is also down to earth.

On behalf of myself and the Bloc Québécois, I would like to salute and honour this incredibly talented athlete. My best wishes for a long and successful career to Ann-Renée Desbiens, “the Great Wall of Charlevoix”.

\* \* \*

[English]

**ENERGY INDUSTRY IN CANADA**

**Mr. Dane Lloyd (Sturgeon River—Parkland, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, in a shocking display of hypocrisy this past weekend in Montreal, German Formula One driver Sebastian Vettel had the audacity to call the production of Alberta's oil sands a “crime”. The Aston Martin driver is also sponsored by Saudi Aramco, the largest oil producer on the planet. Clearly, he does not have a problem taking money from oil companies. Meanwhile, millions of barrels of Russian blood oil continue to flood into Germany, helping to fund Putin's barbaric war in Ukraine. If Mr. Vettel wants to talk about a crime, he should look closer to home.

There is no country where the energy industry is doing more to bring down emissions and produce resources with the highest ethical standards than Canada. In fact, it is Alberta's freedom fuel that will provide the energy that the world needs to kick Putin's gas. Albertans will never apologize for our oil. My only regret is that we do not have more pipelines to supply the world when it needs it most. We will not take any lessons from high-carbon hypocrites such as Sebastian Vettel.

\* \* \*

**WORLD REFUGEE DAY**

**Ms. Arielle Kayabaga (London West, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise in the House today to commemorate World Refugee Day. Seeking safety is a human right, no matter who one is or where one comes from—

**The Speaker:** I am going to interrupt the hon. member for a moment.

This is a message that I think we all want to hear, but the noise level is getting too high. I am going to ask everyone to tone it down so we can hear. The hon. member can start from the beginning so we can all hear it.

**Ms. Arielle Kayabaga:** Mr. Speaker, I rise in the House today to commemorate World Refugee Day. Seeking safety is a human right, no matter who one is or where one comes from. Whenever one has been forced to flee, everyone has the right to seek safety.

Let us acknowledge the 100 million displaced people across our planet as the precariousness of peace and climate change continue to be growing concerns. Canada must work hard to retain its long-standing reputation as an international leader in resettlement and integration. In 2021, Canada welcomed more refugees than any other country. As we know, refugees make significant contributions and are a driving force behind our society and economy.

*Oral Questions*

We must show compassion and respect for refugees, and acknowledge every day the courage it takes to build a new life in a new country, not just today. We have a collective responsibility to support those fleeing war and persecution and to make sure that no one is left behind. As a country, Canada can be proud of the work that we have accomplished so far, but we cannot lose our sense of urgency to keep helping the world's most vulnerable.

**ORAL QUESTIONS**

● (1420)

[*English*]

**THE ECONOMY**

**Hon. Candice Bergen (Leader of the Opposition, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, Canadians are suffering with record-high inflation, and it is clear the Liberals have no plan to deal with it responsibly, except with more of the same mismanagement that got us here in the first place: out-of-control spending. Even financial institutions like Scotiabank have warned that their continued spending drives higher inflation.

We cannot spend inflation away. Is it not true that life is continuing to get worse, not better, for Canadians under the Liberals, and they have no idea how to deal with it?

**Hon. Randy Boissonnault (Minister of Tourism and Associate Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, that side ran on a platform to do even more deficit spending than we did. On this side, we have an affordability plan. We created the Canada child benefit, which is right now putting \$13,666 into the pockets of a single mother with two kids. We have indexed OAS and are increasing it. We are making sure that there is a \$500 home credit for people struggling with housing.

There is no plan for affordability on that side, but there is a clear plan on this side.

**Hon. Candice Bergen (Leader of the Opposition, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, well, one idea is to reduce federal taxes at the pump to help ease the high cost of gas. The provinces are doing it. Other countries are doing it. Even the U.S. is considering doing it. What did the Liberals say when we made this suggestion? They said no.

Whether it is lowering taxes on gas or things like removing restrictions and mandates, the Liberals always say no to good ideas. Why are the Liberals always so slow and reluctant to do the right thing when it comes to helping Canadians?

**Hon. Jonathan Wilkinson (Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we are, of course, doing the right thing. That means working to address the supply constraints that have evolved since the Russian invasion of Ukraine.

Canada has committed to increasing its production of oil and gas by 300,000 barrels by the end of the year. We are working in partnership with our friends in the United States, Brazil and a number of other countries to stabilize global energy prices and to ensure that we are actually addressing affordability on a go-forward basis.

**PUBLIC SAFETY**

**Hon. Candice Bergen (Leader of the Opposition, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, under the Liberals, murders are at a 30-year high. We are seeing shootings and deaths increase. This weekend in Toronto is another sad example. However, we should not be surprised. The same minister who is busy misleading Canadians on the Emergencies Act is the one in charge of public safety.

The Liberals implementing gun bans while at the same time letting violent criminals into our communities is illogical and dangerous. Why will the soft-on-crime Liberals not do something to protect our streets and start by making sure that gangsters and drug dealers stay behind bars?

**Hon. Marco Mendicino (Minister of Public Safety, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, if the member had actually read Bill C-21, she would see that we are taking on organized crime head-on by raising maximum sentences for illegal gun smugglers. She would see that we are addressing the alarming concerns around handgun violence by introducing a national handgun freeze. She would see that we are also addressing the alarming trend around the connection between intimate partner violence and guns by the introduction of red flag protocols.

The only thing the Conservatives can offer is making AR-15 assault-style rifles legal again. They should come to this chamber with more ideas.

\* \* \*

**GOVERNMENT POLICIES**

**Hon. Candice Bergen (Leader of the Opposition, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, under the Liberals, those who commit a crime with a gun get to do their time at home. How is that protecting communities?

However, everything the Liberals touch is a disaster, whether it is the soft-on-crime and often misunderstood public safety minister, the heritage minister, who is taking away Canadians' online freedoms, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, who invites her delegates to a party with the Russians, or a finance minister trying to spend her way out of inflation. It is all a disaster.

Is it not true that Canadians are much worse off today than they were seven years ago and that it is all because of terrible Liberal policies?

● (1425)

**Hon. Mark Holland (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as we near the end of this session, I understand that the party opposite is continuing to try to obstruct and cast aspersions in a number of different places.

The reality is that over the last seven years, we have seen our economy grow. We have seen the investments that have been made across the board to help lift Canadians up. We have seen a record number of Canadians be lifted out of poverty, and we are way ahead of our poverty-reduction targets.

This government continues to be focused on delivering results for Canadians. I understand that the opposition is searching for attack lines. As they troll from subject to subject, we stay focused on getting things done for Canadians.

[Translation]

**Mr. Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, we are still waiting for those results. Let me summarize the Liberal response to the cost of living.

Last week, the Minister of Finance announced with great fanfare that she would do nothing. Everything is more expensive because of the cost of gas. The Minister of Environment and Climate Change is happy.

Canadians are camping out in front of passport offices. The minister failed to anticipate that Canadians would want to travel after two years of a pandemic.

The list is never-ending. The time has come to end the spiralling incompetence of the Liberals.

Who will have the courage to get up and bring the Prime Minister back in line?

**Hon. Randy Boissonnault (Minister of Tourism and Associate Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, let us be clear on the issue of affordability for Canadians.

On this side of the House, the government created the Canada child benefit, but the Conservatives voted against it. We delivered support for the tourism sector, but the Conservatives voted against it. We were here to support seniors, workers and single mothers, but the Conservatives voted against it.

The economy is growing and we are here for Canadians, but the Conservatives are just here to get sound bites for Twitter.

\* \* \*

### PASSPORTS

**Mr. Alain Therrien (La Prairie, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the federal passport fiasco is becoming dangerous. It has gotten to the point where the police have to intervene in lineups. The police are doing more than just anger management, though; they are also answering questions meant for federal employees.

Enough is enough. A crisis cannot be managed from 8 a.m. to 4 p.m., Monday to Friday. Why are these offices still not open seven days a week with extended hours?

This is a crisis. When will this government wake up?

[English]

**Ms. Ya'ara Saks (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Families, Children and Social Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as we are all aware, after two years of travel restrictions Canadians are travelling again and there is increased demand and volume for

### Oral Questions

passports. That is why the focus of the minister and officials has been to make sure that Canadian do receive their passports. It is why we are triaging lines at every Service Canada location in urban and metropolitan areas. It is why we have increased our staff by over 600 to serve Canadians. It is also why we have added additional resources to our NP lines and other call-in lines to ensure that we reach Canadians and that they get the documents they need.

[Translation]

**Mr. Alain Therrien (La Prairie, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, because the government is not doing its job at the passport office, members of Parliament are being inundated with calls for help from citizens.

On Friday, all MPs' offices received an email notifying them that the federal government was cutting services to elected officials who help their constituents obtain passports. Imagine that. The government is not doing anything to help people, and now it is preventing us from helping them instead.

In the end, we learned this morning that this email was a mistake. This is amateur hour. The minister's incompetence is reaching new lows.

When will they stop ad libbing and keep the offices open in the evenings and on weekends until the crisis is finally resolved?

[English]

**Ms. Ya'ara Saks (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Families, Children and Social Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member and all colleagues of the House who are advocating for constituents with urgent travel needs.

Employees at Service Canada have worked tirelessly throughout this pandemic to serve Canadians, and they have been performing their services overtime and every weekend. As a matter of fact, on the June 24 and July 1 long weekends, employees will be working to make sure that Canadians receive their documents. In addition to that, with regard to the NP line, an additional 50 resources have been added, with another 40 being trained, to make sure that we can address the increased demand and volume to assist constituents.

We are here to serve Canadians together in the House.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### FINANCE

**Mr. Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, that is not reassuring.

Life is getting more and more expensive. Families are on the verge of losing their homes, and children are going to school hungry. The crisis is hitting hard, and people are paying the price.

*Oral Questions*

The Liberals' response is a \$7 tax credit. They could not be more out of touch. It is a slap in the face to workers, seniors and children. People need help, and the NDP has proposed solutions.

Will the Liberals double the GST tax credit and increase the child benefit to help families that are struggling right now?

• (1430)

**Hon. Randy Boissonnault (Minister of Tourism and Associate Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, what the NDP is putting forward is insincere and rings hollow.

Just look at the Canada child benefit. In my city, Edmonton, a single mother with two children will receive \$13,660. That is not \$7, it is over \$13,000.

In Edmonton, a mother and father will get \$10,000 from our child care program. That is not \$7, it is \$10,000.

The NDP needs to get its facts straight and not tell tall tales in the House.

[*English*]

**Mr. Daniel Blaikie (Elmwood—Transcona, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the Liberals keep talking about things they were doing or should have been doing before inflation struck. The fact is that Canadians are worried about losing their homes and are worried about feeding their families, and the Liberal plan is another seven dollars on the GST rebate. That is not a plan. That is a talking point for a government that is more concerned about inflation as a public relations problem than it is about an economic problem. A real plan would provide some debt relief, double the GST rebate and increase the Canada child benefit.

When is the Deputy Prime Minister going to kindly announce that plan?

**Hon. Randy Boissonnault (Minister of Tourism and Associate Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is disappointing that the NDP continues to push this cynical and disingenuous narrative that somehow Canadians are only getting seven dollars more in affordability supports. It knows very well that in my own city of Edmonton, child care benefits are up to \$10,000 this year. As to the Canada child benefit, in Vancouver, a mother with two children gets \$13,666. That is a lot more than seven dollars. The NDP needs to stop playing for political points and tell the whole story.

**Mr. Dan Albas (Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the finance minister must be wearing industrial-grade noise-cancelling earphones to avoid hearing the calls from economists to cut her government's over-the-top spending. She knows that it is only adding gas to the inflationary fire. The Prime Minister has said that anything that has a hint of fiscal restraint is austerity. He axed Bill Morneau for wanting to get post-COVID spending under control.

Is she worried that if she presents anything to the Prime Minister that remotely resembles a cut, she might suffer the same fate as her predecessor, who went from Finance Minister Morneau to finance minister no more?

**Hon. Randy Boissonnault (Minister of Tourism and Associate Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, let us take a look at the facts. The Conservatives ran on a platform to spend \$168 billion. I

am glad they did not get elected. That would have been irresponsible.

Let us look at the economy. Let us look at the fact that we have a GDP that grew 5.6% in Q1. This fall, S&P and Moody's again affirmed our AAA credit rating, and 3.5 million jobs have been recovered since the worst part of the pandemic, which is ahead of the United States. Also, we have the lowest unemployment rate, at 5.1%, since 1976.

The economy is doing well. The Conservatives do not like it, but we sure do.

**Mr. Dan Albas (Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, they keep trying to change the channel, but these speNDP-Liberals do not, will not or cannot understand that their obsession with spending is fuelling inflation and hurting Canadians. Doug Porter, chief economist at BMO, said, "Fiscal policy has every bit as much a role to play in dampening inflation as does monetary policy...and fiscal policy should definitely not get a pass in the inflation fight."

The Conservatives have been saying to cut discretionary spending and give Canadians a break at the pumps. Those are good starting points. The question is, when will the Minister of Finance stop fuelling inflation and instead start fighting it?

**Hon. Randy Boissonnault (Minister of Tourism and Associate Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I invite members of the opposition and that member in particular to vote with us the next time we have a piece of legislation in the House that is designed to improve the lives of Canadians and make their lives more affordable. The Conservatives have voted against every single measure we put on the floor of the House to make life more affordable, including Bill C-2, the Canada child benefit and making sure that OAS payments are indexed.

They are all talk, no action. On this side, we are focused on affordability for Canadians.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the number one issue on every Canadian's mind is inflation.

This Liberal government is responsible for rising inflation. Conservatives are not alone in saying so. Yesterday, Scotiabank's chief economist, Jean-François Perrault, said that "high levels of fiscal spending will necessitate an unnecessarily large crowding out of private spending".

In other words, the government does not know how to manage things, and that is driving inflation up.

Will this government do the responsible thing, the right thing in an inflationary context, and control spending?

*Oral Questions*

• (1435)

**Hon. Randy Boissonnault (Minister of Tourism and Associate Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member of the House voted for the Conservatives' plan to run a \$168-billion deficit in their campaign platform.

On this side of the House, we made a point of indexing the Canada child benefit to inflation and cutting income tax for the middle class not once, but twice. We increased old age security and included a tax cut in Bill C-8.

The Conservatives voted against Canadians. We are voting for Canadians.

\* \* \*

**PASSPORTS**

**Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, all of our constituency offices are getting calls all day long from desperate Canadians about the passport problem, and I am sure this is true in all 338 ridings.

Once again this weekend, a nurse had to take time off work instead of treating patients. She had to stand in line today to get her passport. In Laval, police officers had to be sent out to calm the unrest among the people in line. I am proud to be Canadian, but when I see this, it tells me that my country is suffering. Canada is a G7 nation, not a third world country.

Why did the government drag its heels and create this passport crisis?

*[English]*

**Ms. Ya'ara Saks (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Families, Children and Social Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as the member is aware, as travel restrictions are being lifted, Canadians are beginning to travel again.

The department did plan for it. As of September of last year, over 600 new employees were added to Passport Canada services. In addition to that, every Service Canada office is receiving applications at this time. Every passport counter in this country is open to serve Canadians. Of the people who have their applications processed in person, over 96% are receiving their passports within 10 days. That is better than the international standards out there. We will continue to do everything we can to make sure Canadians receive their documents.

*[Translation]*

**Mrs. Dominique Vien (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, people have to bring a tent and camp out on the sidewalk overnight just to get a passport. This is happening in Canada, a G7 country. That department is in chaos. Passport Canada is processing 75,000 applications per week, down from more than 90,000 before COVID.

Employees need to be allowed back to work in person, so the business hours can be extended at all offices. Can the minister put away the talking points and give us some real answers?

*[English]*

**Ms. Ya'ara Saks (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Families, Children and Social Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the hon. member that our public servants have been working weekdays, overtime and weekends since travel restrictions have been lifted to ensure that Canadians receive their passports.

Over 360,000 passports have been issued since April of this year. Just last week, nearly 48,000 passports were issued to Canadians. We are continuing to make sure that service lines are triaged and that we are reaching seniors and people with disabilities, unique employment needs and humanitarian and compassionate issues that require emergency documents.

\* \* \*

*[Translation]***THE ECONOMY**

**Mrs. Dominique Vien (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the cost of groceries increased by almost 10% in April. It was the fifth month in a row that food prices had increased by more than 5%. The cost of gas was more than \$2 per litre. In the greater Quebec City area, house prices have increased by 21% over the past year.

With wage increases averaging about 3%, people are struggling to get by. Can the Minister of Finance offer Canadians some real answers?

**Hon. Randy Boissonnault (Minister of Tourism and Associate Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the member opposite is asking questions about affordability when her party has done nothing and has no plan to make life affordable for Canadians. In addition, her party obstructs the government every time we try to do something to make life more affordable for Canadians.

On this side of the House, we created the Canada child benefit and indexed it to inflation. We increased old age security. We also ensured that child care payments are indexed. We are focusing on affordability. On the other side, there is no plan.

\* \* \*

**PASSPORTS**

**Ms. Louise Chabot (Thérèse-De Blainville, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, people camped out in front of Service Canada offices all weekend to get their passports. They braved the wind and rain and stayed outside all weekend in the hopes of getting service. The worst part is that they were camped out in front of empty offices that closed for the weekend on Friday at 4 o'clock.

This weekend, people saw with their own eyes that no federal public servants were at work to help them. Does the minister realize how insulting that is?

*Oral Questions*

• (1440)

[English]

**Ms. Ya'ara Saks (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Families, Children and Social Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, Service Canada and passport centres throughout the country have been open overtime during the weekdays and on weekends. There are long lines, but Service Canada members are going into those lines and triaging emergency situations, and we are also encouraging those who do not have immediate travel to plan for their travel documents.

Nevertheless, as a matter of fact, today our minister is in a processing centre in Mississauga to see how we could increase efficiencies, manage workloads and address the increased demand and volume.

[Translation]

**Ms. Louise Chabot (Thérèse-De Blainville, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, this week is Quebec's national holiday. Next week is July 1. That is two weeks in a row of statutory holidays that mark the beginning of summer every year. That means more people will be travelling and will need their passports.

In the midst of a crisis, what is the minister planning to do to deal with the spike in demand? Above all else, is she at least planning to keep the offices open on weekends?

[English]

**Ms. Ya'ara Saks (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Families, Children and Social Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member's question gives me the opportunity to let Canadians know that on the June 24 weekend and the July 1 weekend, passport centres will be open to serve Canadians. Public servants are working hard, working overtime and on weekends to make sure that Canadians can travel this summer. We know they want to be out and about.

I want to thank our public servants who are working so tirelessly during this significant increase in demand. We owe them a debt of gratitude.

[Translation]

**Ms. Louise Chabot (Thérèse-De Blainville, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, this government is incapable of planning and it is incapable of learning from its mistakes.

This is not the first time Service Canada has been in hot water. Its employees were unable to reassure worried citizens at the beginning of the pandemic. They were unable to help victims of CERB fraud last year. They were unable to process EI claims this winter. Now, they are unable to process passport applications.

For two years, nothing has been working, and yet nothing has changed. Does the minister understand that she is the one responsible for this?

[English]

**Ms. Ya'ara Saks (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Families, Children and Social Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we owe tremendous gratitude to our public servants in this country, who, throughout the pandemic, had Canadians' backs. They were

able to distribute CERB quickly when it was needed. They were able to address the EI concerns of Canadians when they were laid off during the pandemic, and public servants worked night and day with new technologies and new methods to make sure that we reached Canadians when they needed it most.

Since September 2021, we have hired over 600 new employees, and we are hiring 600 more. Every passport counter in this office is open, and Service Canada offices are open to service Canadians.

\* \* \*

**THE ECONOMY**

**Ms. Michelle Ferreri (Peterborough—Kawartha, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, children and seniors are going hungry and people cannot go to work because they do not have enough money to put gas in their vehicle. Any MP who spends time in their riding or reads any of their emails knows how dire the cost-of-living crisis is, yet inflation continues to rise under the current Liberal government. Are the Liberals just not listening to Canadians, or do they just not care?

**Hon. Randy Boissonnault (Minister of Tourism and Associate Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, our government and I empathize with Canadians on the rising price of inflation, which is caused by Russian's illegal war in Ukraine, supply chain snarls and the zero-COVID policy in China.

However, let us look at the facts. I hope my colleagues will help me keep the other side accountable when we pass the—

**The Speaker:** I know everybody wants to hear the answer, so I will let the minister start from the top. I am sure everybody will be quiet so they can hear it all.

**Hon. Randy Boissonnault:** Mr. Speaker, we empathize with Canadians on the rising costs of gas and groceries. That is why we have an affordability plan.

However, let us look at the record. When this side cut taxes on the middle class and raised them on the wealthiest two times, how did the Conservatives vote? They voted against. What did they do when we had the Canada child benefit? They voted against. What did they do when we put money in for teachers? The Conservatives voted against. What did they do when we increased the money for seniors? The Conservatives voted against.

We vote for; they vote against. We are here for affordability.

• (1445)

**Mr. Ted Falk (Provencher, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, too many Canadians are unable to afford basic essentials like gas and groceries, and the Liberal government keeps passing the buck. The Liberals refuse to admit that it is their own policies that are creating higher prices and exacerbating the situation.

Will the government finally do the right thing, suspend the GST on fuels and help lower the cost of groceries for Canadian families?

**Hon. Randy Boissonnault (Minister of Tourism and Associate Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my hon. colleague's perspective on the matter, but let us actually take a look at the economic fundamentals of this country.

Our GDP grew 6% in Q1, making us the second-fastest-growing economy in the G7 and on track to be the fastest-growing economy in the G7. We have a AAA credit rating in place. We have recovered 115% of three million jobs lost, which is a faster recovery than our colleagues in the United States have achieved, and we have a trade surplus of over \$6 billion.

The Conservatives do not like it that the economy is doing well. Canadians do, and that is why we will focus on affordability.

\* \* \*

### HEALTH

**Mr. Stephen Ellis (Cumberland—Colchester, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, recent studies suggest that one in five Canadians does not have access to primary care. In Nova Scotia, there are 95,000 people without primary care. The president of the Canadian Medical Association has stated that what is clearly coming is the collapse of the current health care system.

The Prime Minister continues to talk about 7,500 health care providers. None have materialized. When is the government of inaction going to give Canadians the health care system they so deserve?

**Mr. Adam van Koevorden (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health and to the Minister of Sport, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague for his collaboration on the health committee.

Our government recognizes the importance of high-quality primary care and we also acknowledge that many Canadians are still struggling to access the care they need in a timely manner.

Going forward, as outlined in budget 2022, our government will remain focused on advancing the priorities of Canadians in health, including accessing the readily available, high-quality primary care services we all deserve.

I appreciate the question and look forward to continuing to work on this with my colleague.

\* \* \*

### AIRLINE INDUSTRY

**Mr. Taylor Bachrach (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, airport delays continue to cause stress for so many travellers. There are not enough airport workers, and the existing ones are overstretched and underpaid. Instead of simply paying airport workers fairly, the current government is offering a bonus for workers who do not take vacation or sick time this summer. Seriously, in the midst of a pandemic, the minister is incentivizing workers to come to work sick.

If he wants to get travellers moving again, he needs to scrap this program immediately and start paying workers fairly. Will he?

### Oral Questions

**Hon. Omar Alghabra (Minister of Transport, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I want to stress how urgent the situation is and that our government is working toward easing the delays at our airports. We have added more than 900 CATSA workers over the last few weeks. We have increased the number of CBSA agents. We have adjusted many of our measures, in collaboration with airports and airlines, to ease airport delays. We are working with workers, who have been working very hard over the last weeks, to address this issue. There is a lot of work to be done, but we are committed to it.

\* \* \*

### FOREIGN AFFAIRS

**Ms. Heather McPherson (Edmonton Strathcona, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the current government has a serious problem with transparency and accountability.

I have asked in the House and through access to information for a full and comprehensive list of the sanctions that have been imposed, when they were imposed and what assets have been seized. It has refused to provide any meaningful information. I need this information for my constituents and for Canadians who are horrified by the illegal invasion of Ukraine, so I will ask again. Will the minister today guarantee that she will provide a detailed description of who has been sanctioned, when, and the assets that have been seized?

**Hon. Robert Oliphant (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member raises a very important issue. With respect to Canada's unprecedented sanctioning of Russia, it started when Russia invaded Crimea illegally. It has continued. Those sanctions have been strengthened at an unprecedented level as Russia illegally invaded Ukraine again.

We continue to sanction a banking system, Mr. Putin and his inner circle, members of the Russian security council and countless numbers of industries and individuals in Russia. We will continue to do that until we draw them down to the point of no return.

\* \* \*

● (1450)

[Translation]

### SPORT

**Ms. Patricia Lattanzio (Saint-Léonard—Saint-Michel, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, an investment in recreational and sports infrastructure is an investment in the health and well-being of our constituents.

Could the minister update us on what he is doing to give Quebecers access to safe, sustainable facilities that promote recreational and sports activities in our communities?

*Oral Questions*

**Hon. Dominic LeBlanc (Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Infrastructure and Communities, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, on Friday, we announced over \$29 million in joint funding with Quebec for five sports and recreation projects in the Nord-du-Québec region.

Five indigenous communities in Nord-du-Québec will soon have access to high-quality, modern, accessible facilities where residents can come together and enjoy their favourite activities. We are always happy to invest in these types of projects across Canada.

\* \* \*

[English]

**HEALTH**

**Mr. Blake Richards (Banff—Airdrie, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, a couple in my riding recently returned from a trip to Greece. When they tried to register for the ArriveCAN app, they were sent the wrong verification code eight times. When they tried to contact the CBSA to fix the issue, the CBSA told them it did not offer support in relation to re-entering Canada.

I hear stories like this from my constituents all the time. The ArriveCAN app is increasingly unnecessary and is hopelessly broken, so when will the government commit to ending the chaos at our borders and our airports?

**Hon. Marco Mendicino (Minister of Public Safety, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as my colleague knows, the ArriveCAN app technology has helped to facilitate the measures we have taken at the border to protect the health and safety of Canadians throughout the pandemic. We continue to improve that technology by streamlining our processes and by making sure that Canadians have the smoothest experience at the border.

I am pleased to report to my colleague and all members in this chamber that compliance with the ArriveCAN app is over 95% at the border. That is a signal that we have made progress. I am happy to work with my colleague on the individual case that was brought to his attention in his riding.

\* \* \*

**PASSPORTS**

**Ms. Melissa Lantsman (Thornhill, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, it is another week and there is more chaos in our airports. Even if one wanted to go anywhere, getting a passport is turning into a Canadian-made nightmare. The minister is claiming there is a surge in applications, but that is just not true. Over the past 10 weeks, the surge the government is talking about has been only half of what it was before COVID.

If no one was laid off and no one at Passport Canada is working from home, will the minister responsible for the chaos tell us why anyone is still waiting for a passport they applied for in March?

**Ms. Ya'ara Saks (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Families, Children and Social Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as we have discussed, there has been an increased surge in the demand for passports with the ease of travel restrictions. In preparation for that, the minister and officials arranged for 600 new employees to be hired in September 2021, with an additional 600 be-

ing hired at this time. In addition to that, all Service Canada employees are back at work. Whether they are teleworking or in an office, they are at work. To disparage that is really questionable.

I really want to thank our public servants for everything that they have been doing for Canadians and continuing to work during this time.

**Ms. Melissa Lantsman (Thornhill, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, perhaps the parliamentary secretary can tell us what she thinks the word “surge” actually means. Passport Canada is at 48,000 passports this week. She just said that. They used to do more than 90,000 before COVID.

I have a few simple questions: How many passports are in the queue? Can she explain why she is telling Canadians about a magical surge that is not happening? When can she give the House a straight answer so that Canadians do not have to line up at 3 a.m. for a basic government service?

**Ms. Ya'ara Saks (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Families, Children and Social Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as the member well knows, during the pandemic many Canadians did not renew their passports and many Canadians did not bother to check what the updated times on their passports would be. Nevertheless, the minister has been working closely with officials. As a matter of fact, she is at a processing centre in Mississauga today to see how we can increase capacity and efficiency.

May I mention that the 48,000 from this week is a 10% increase from last week, so that week over week we are working with Service Canada and passport teams to increase efficiencies.

● (1455)

**Mrs. Laila Goodridge (Fort McMurray—Cold Lake, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, Canadians are being told to go in person to a passport office if they have to travel within 45 days. Tia took time off work and made a five-hour drive to get to Service Canada's passport office in Edmonton. She lined up at 4:30 in the morning with proof of imminent travel, but was triaged out of the line because she was not deemed urgent enough. In total, after 10 hours of driving, a hotel bill and time off work, she had no passport.

Folks living in my riding and in rural areas across Canada cannot just whip into a passport office on a whim. When will the minister fix this passport chaos?



**Ms. Ya'ara Saks (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Families, Children and Social Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, Service Canada and Passport Canada employees are working closely in teams to ensure that measures are taken to serve Canadians who ask for passport services. Those who are going to Passport Canada and service centres within 45 days of travel are encouraged to put in their applications in person and are assured that their passports will be processed efficiently. The member knows, as we have worked with her and many other members in the House, that those who have imminent travel do have the ability to work closely with the minister to ensure that their documents are received on time.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

#### OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

**Mr. Mario Beaulieu (La Pointe-de-l'Île, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, on Friday, the head of FrancoFolies de Montréal tried to justify the anglicization of his organization's workplace by saying that this promotes diversity and inclusion. That is absurd, but it is a shift we see all the time at the federal level. The official languages commissioner described this as backsliding. He explains that, on the contrary, the official languages and diversity are complementary, in that they are both ways of being more inclusive.

Does the minister agree that it is backsliding to claim that French can be set aside to be more inclusive?

**Hon. Ginette Petitpas Taylor (Minister of Official Languages and Minister responsible for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for the question.

Again, let us be very clear: we have the same goals, but our visions for achieving those goals may differ slightly.

We recognize that French is in decline in North America, including in Canada. That is why we are moving forward with an ambitious bill to do our part to protect our beautiful language, French. I hope that the opposition members will work with us—

**The Speaker:** Order. I must interrupt. It is very hard to hear the response from here, so I can only imagine how difficult it is to hear it in the back corner.

I will ask the minister to start over. I am sure that the hon. member for La Pointe-de-l'Île wants to hear the response.

**Hon. Ginette Petitpas Taylor:** Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question. As I have said many times, we have the same goal.

We want to do everything we can to protect and promote the beautiful French language all across Canada, including here. We recognize that French is in decline in North America, including in Canada. That is why we are moving forward with an ambitious bill. We want to do our part to protect our beautiful language, French, across the country.

I hope the opposition members will work with us to ensure that we can move forward with Bill C-13 as quickly as possible.

**Mr. Mario Beaulieu (La Pointe-de-l'Île, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, we need only look to the people at the top to see how French is pre-

#### Oral Questions

sented as a barrier to diversity. The Prime Minister himself appointed a Governor General who does not speak French, and his government has gone to court to try to force New Brunswick to accept a Lieutenant Governor who does not speak French. He is the first to drop the French language in the name of diversity, as though French could not also be diverse.

Does the minister support this shift to considering all forms of diversity to be more important than the French language?

**Hon. Ginette Petitpas Taylor (Minister of Official Languages and Minister responsible for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, let us be clear. We are the first government to recognize that French is declining in Canada, including here.

I once again call on the opposition members, especially the Bloc Québécois, to work closely with us to get this bill passed as quickly as possible. If we are going to do everything we can to protect and promote the French language, we must work together to ensure that this ambitious bill is passed sooner rather than later.

\* \* \*

[English]

#### HEALTH

**Mr. John Barlow (Foothills, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, thanks to the Liberals, Canada will be the first jurisdiction in the world to put warning labels on ground beef and pork. Imposing these warning labels means a single ingredient, wholesome protein, that most Canadian families rely on will be unaffordable. How nonsensical is this? They are putting on a warning label despite the fact that once this food is cooked, it does not exceed the Liberals' self-imposed limit on saturated fats.

How many doctors raised concerns with Health Canada that too many Canadians were eating raw beef and pork that warranted these ridiculous and unwarranted warning labels that are punishing Canadian farmers and consumers?

● (1500)

**Mr. Adam van Koevorden (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health and to the Minister of Sport, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, unlike my colleague opposite, we are concerned about the rising rates of chronic diseases in Canada. With last week being Men's Health Week, we talked in the House about how a disproportionately high number of men are dying from chronic diseases. I think we can all agree that more information at the grocery store is a good thing. Two in five adults currently report having at least one of the 10 most common chronic diseases, and that is unacceptable. These labels are widely recognized by health organizations in the scientific community as an effective tool to help counteract the rising rates of diet-related chronic illness.

On this side of the House, we agree that more information is always a good thing.

*Oral Questions*

**Mr. Martin Shields (Bow River, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, many of my constituents are aghast and angry that Health Canada chose to attack healthy, nutritious protein- and iron-rich food products such as ground beef and pork with a warning label. An added labelling cost to the industry will be passed down to consumers, but Health Canada does not seem to care about increased costs. Health Canada should be concerned with keeping Canadians healthy, not adding to their grocery bills.

Will the minister ensure that Health Canada drops this damaging, expensive, unnecessary, ideologically driven warning label?

**Mr. Adam van Koevorden (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health and to the Minister of Sport, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House, we will always prioritize Canadians' health based on scientific evidence. These labels are widely recognized to be a good tool to support Canadians as they make good decisions at the grocery store.

Let me be clear. Canadians will still produce and purchase ground meat. However, they now have a choice to make and an informed decision to limit their saturated fat consumption. Our government is committed to protecting the health of Canadians, and to continuing our work in the food industry to further reduce sodium and fats in the foods Canadians purchase.

\* \* \*

**REGIONAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

**Mr. Bob Zimmer (Prince George—Peace River—Northern Rockies, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I was in Inuvik, Northwest Territories, last week where two litres of orange juice is \$21.20. A box of Kraft Dinner is \$3.09, ground beef is almost \$20 a kilogram, a two-pack of ketchup is \$24, regular fuel is \$2.60 a litre, and residents' gas bills are over \$1,000 a month.

When will the government wake up and see that its high inflation and high taxation is making living in the north almost impossible?

**Hon. Dan Vandal (Minister of Northern Affairs, Minister responsible for Prairies Economic Development Canada and Minister responsible for the Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, all Canadians, regardless of where they live, should have access to affordable and nutritious food. That is why, in budget 2021, we expanded nutrition north with \$170 million in funding, in collaboration with indigenous partners to address food insecurity in the north. To offset the financial burden caused by COVID, we also announced \$25 million in support for nutrition north.

We realize there is a lot of work that we have to do, but we feel we are going in the right direction.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**JUSTICE**

**Ms. Emmanuela Lambropoulos (Saint-Laurent, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, since the Supreme Court decisions on the use of extreme intoxication as a defence, I have noticed that many people around me, especially women and girls, are worried. They are seeing a number of contradictory messages on social media.

Can the Minister of Justice reassure Canadians about the use of extreme intoxication as a defence?

**Hon. David Lametti (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would first like to thank my colleague from Saint-Laurent for her question and for her dedication to this issue.

I want to clarify one very important point: Being intoxicated is not a defence for criminal acts such as sexual assault. That was the law before the Supreme Court decisions and it is still the law today.

Bill C-28 amends the Criminal Code so that in the rare case of extreme intoxication, someone in a state of negligent self-induced extreme intoxication can be criminally responsible.

We will continue to build a justice system that is more effective, fairer, and worthy of victims' trust.

\* \* \*

**SPORT**

**Mr. Richard Martel (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, Hockey Canada got \$14 million in federal funding during the pandemic. In 2018, the Minister of Sport at the time said that organizations were required to disclose allegations of abuse and harassment or they would lose their federal funding. Such behaviours should never be kept quiet.

Will the minister be taking Hockey Canada's funding back?

● (1505)

**Hon. Pascale St-Onge (Minister of Sport and Minister responsible for the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, let me begin by saying that, as a woman and a former athlete, I was horrified and disgusted by what I read in the media about allegations against Hockey Canada players.

A financial audit of Hockey Canada's expenses and the use of public funds is under way. Regardless of the amount Hockey Canada received, we will not tolerate funds being used for purposes other than those set out in the contribution agreement between Sport Canada and Hockey Canada. If the agreement was violated, we will take appropriate measures.

[English]

**Mr. John Nater (Perth—Wellington, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, Canadians have been shaken by reports of Hockey Canada's involvement in alleged sexual assaults and cover-ups.

*Oral Questions*

Hockey Canada is an organization that received \$8.3 million from the federal government last year and paid no income tax, despite having a surplus of \$13.2 million. What action has the government taken to ensure sports organizations receiving federal funds, grants and contributions are taking real action to prevent sexual assaults, harassment and cover-ups?

**Hon. Pascale St-Onge (Minister of Sport and Minister responsible for the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I want to start by saying that I was absolutely horrified and disgusted when I read the stories in the newspapers.

As a woman and an ex-athlete, I want Hockey Canada to answer all legitimate questions around its actions. A financial audit is currently under way to shed light on Hockey Canada's funding and use of public money. We will not tolerate any amount of money being spent on anything other than what was agreed upon in the contribution agreement between Sport Canada and Hockey Canada. If the agreement has not been respected, we will then take the appropriate actions.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**PUBLIC SAFETY**

**Mr. Richard Martel (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, there was a landslide last week in La Baie, a community in my riding. One home was destroyed. Fortunately, there were no fatalities. We remain on alert and could face additional landslides at any time. Eighty families have been evacuated so far. The situation is critical, and residents need to feel supported.

Will the minister be there for those residents and is he prepared to co-operate if the Quebec government requests his assistance?

[English]

**Hon. Bill Blair (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Emergency Preparedness, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my friend from Chicoutimi—Le Fjord for his question and the conversation we had about making sure that the Government of Canada is there to serve the people affected by the landslides in Saguenay. I want to assure him and this House that our officials are engaged with our provincial counterparts. As the situation evolves, we stand ready to provide federal assistance when it is required by the people of Saguenay and the people of Quebec.

\* \* \*

**TOURISM INDUSTRY**

**Mr. Brendan Hanley (Yukon, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, today marks another step in easing restrictions at the border, including dropping the vaccine mandate for outbound and domestic flights. This is certainly welcome news for the tourism industry, both in the Yukon, Canada's greatest tourism destination, and around the country, as we see the tourism sector begin to recover after two years of struggle. Tourists are on the move once more.

Can the Minister of Tourism and Associate Minister of Finance tell this House how our government is supporting the tourism sector?

**Hon. Randy Boissonnault (Minister of Tourism and Associate Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my hon. colleague from Yukon for his exceptional work on the file.

Unlike the side opposite in this House, our government has supported the tourism sector right from the beginning. We invested \$23 billion to make sure the tourism sector could come roaring back after the pandemic. The Conservatives opposed us at every single step. We are sitting down with stakeholders and people across the sector—

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

**The Speaker:** I happen to be sitting next to someone who has a very loud voice, and I am sure he does not want me to identify him. I am going to ask him to keep it down so we can hear the answer, and so that I can hear the answer as well.

The hon. minister.

**Hon. Randy Boissonnault:** Mr. Speaker, I want to again thank my hon. colleague from Yukon for his exceptional work on the file.

Unlike the other side of this House, our government has supported the tourism sector through the pandemic, with \$23 billion in investments so that the sector could come roaring back. The Conservatives opposed us every step of the way. We are now meeting with stakeholders across the country to build a federal tourism growth strategy. We are going to make sure that the tourism sector comes roaring back and that we welcome the world to Canada. The Conservatives do not like it, but we do and so does the tourism sector.

\* \* \*

● (1510)

**THE ENVIRONMENT**

**Ms. Laurel Collins (Victoria, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, Canadians are worried about plastic pollution. They want progress on banning single-use items to keep our coastlines clear and to protect human health. The Liberals broke their promise to ban single-use items by 2021, and now the proposed ban would cover less than 1% of plastics. It does not even include items like coffee cups, lids, cigarette butts and other harmful plastics. Plastic pollution is threatening our oceans, our wildlife and our health.

Will the minister start showing some environmental leadership and expand the ban on single-use plastics?

*Government Orders*

**Ms. Julie Dabrusin (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Natural Resources and to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we promised Canadians we would deliver a ban on single-use plastics, and today that is exactly what we have done. By the end of the year, we will not be able to manufacture or import these harmful plastics. After that, businesses will begin offering the sustainable solutions Canadians want. We are taking a historic step forward, and with these new regulations we are reducing plastic pollution and keeping our communities, and the places we love, clean for now and for future generations.

**Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP):** Mr. Speaker, the latest IPCC report advanced the clock on “too late”. To have any hope of holding to 1.5°C or even 2°C, global emissions must peak before 2025 and drop rapidly from there to roughly half by 2030. Net zero by 2050 will not make any difference without deep cuts before 2025. We are 30 months from too late. When we get back here in September, we will have 28 months, yet the government continues to approve fossil fuel expansion.

Who would care, in this place, to explain this madness?

**Ms. Julie Dabrusin (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Natural Resources and to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we tabled an emissions reductions plan that is ambitious and achievable. It goes sector by sector to create a path for Canadians to reach our 2030 climate projections. It is a detailed plan that goes through each economic sector, and it has been supported by environmental groups right across our country. We are working very hard and take this issue very seriously. We will continue to do what is needed to reach our emissions projections.

**The Speaker:** I am afraid that is all the time we have for today.

\* \* \*

**PRESENCE IN GALLERY**

**The Speaker:** I wish to draw the attention of members to the presence in the gallery of the Honourable John Hogan, Minister of Justice and Public Safety and Attorney General for the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear!

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

[*Translation*]

**ONLINE STREAMING ACT**

The House resumed from June 17 consideration of Bill C-11, An Act to amend the Broadcasting Act and to make related and consequential amendments to other Acts, as reported (with amendments) from the committee, and of the motions in Group No. 1.

**The Speaker:** It being 3:12 p.m., pursuant to order made on Thursday, November 25, 2021, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded divisions on the motions at the report stage of Bill C-11.

[*English*]

Call in the members.

*And the bells having rung:*

**The Speaker:** The question is on Motion No. 1.

[*Translation*]

A vote on this motion also applies to Motion No. 3.

● (1525)

[*English*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 1, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 158*)

**YEAS**

## Members

Aboultatif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barlow	Barrett
Benzen	Bergen
Berthold	Bezan
Block	Bragdon
Brassard	Calkins
Caputo	Carrie
Chambers	Chong
Cooper	Dalton
Dancho	Davidson
Deltell	d'Entremont
Doherty	Dowdall
Dreeshen	Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Ellis	Epp
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Falk (Provencher)
Fast	Ferreri
Findlay	Gallant
Généreux	Genuis
Gladu	Godin
Goodridge	Gourde
Gray	Hallan
Hoback	Jeneroux
Kelly	Kitchen
Kmiec	Kram
Kramp-Neuman	Kurek
Kusie	Lake
Lantsman	Lawrence
Lehoux	Lewis (Essex)
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert
Lloyd	Lobb
MacKenzie	Maguire
Martel	Mazier
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLean
Melillo	Moore
Morantz	Morrison
Motz	Muys
Nater	O'Toole
Patzner	Paul-Hus
Perkins	Poillievre
Rayes	Redekopp
Reid	Rempel Garner
Richards	Rood
Ruff	Scheer
Schmale	Seeback
Shields	Shiple
Small	Soroka
Steinley	Stewart
Strahl	Stubbs
Tochor	Tolmie
Uppal	Van Popta
Vecchio	Vidal
Vien	Viersen
Vis	Vuong

Wagantall  
Waugh  
Williams  
Zimmer— 117

Warkentin  
Webber  
Williamson

## NAYS

### Members

Aldag  
Ali  
Anandasangaree  
Arseneault  
Ashton  
Bachrach  
Bains  
Barron  
Battiste  
Beech  
Bennett  
Bibeau  
Blaikie  
Blanchet  
Blaney  
Boissonnault  
Bradford  
Brunelle-Duceppe  
Carr  
Chabot  
Chahal  
Champoux  
Chen  
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)  
Cormier  
Dabrusin  
DeBellefeuille  
Desilets  
Dhaliwal  
Diab  
Drouin  
Duclos  
Duncan (Etobicoke North)  
Ehsassi  
Erskine-Smith  
Fillmore  
Fonseca  
Fortin  
Fraser  
Fry  
Garneau  
Garrison  
Gazan  
Gill  
Green  
Hajdu  
Hardie  
Holland  
Hughes  
Hutchings  
Idlout  
Jaczek  
Jones  
Julian  
Kelloway  
Khera  
Kusmierczyk  
Lalonde  
Lametti  
Lapointe  
Lattanzio  
LeBlanc  
Lemire  
Long  
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)

Alghabra  
Anand  
Angus  
Arya  
Atwin  
Badawey  
Baker  
Barsalou-Duval  
Beaulieu  
Bendayan  
Bérubé  
Bittle  
Blair  
Blanchette-Joncas  
Blois  
Boulerice  
Brière  
Cannings  
Casey  
Chagger  
Champagne  
Chatel  
Chiang  
Collins (Victoria)  
Coteau  
Damoff  
Desbiens  
Desjarlais  
Dhillon  
Dong  
Dubourg  
Duguid  
Dzerowicz  
El-Khoury  
Fergus  
Fisher  
Fortier  
Fragiskatos  
Freeland  
Gaheer  
Garon  
Gaudreau  
Gerretsen  
Gould  
Guilbeault  
Hanley  
Hepfner  
Housefather  
Hussen  
Iacono  
Ien  
Johns  
Jowhari  
Kayabaga  
Khalid  
Koutrakis  
Kwan  
Lambropoulos  
Lamoureux  
Larouche  
Lauzon  
Lebouthillier  
Lightbound  
Longfield  
MacAulay (Cardigan)

## Government Orders

MacDonald (Malpeque)  
MacKinnon (Gatineau)  
Martinez Ferrada  
Mathysen  
May (Saanic—Gulf Islands)  
McGuinty  
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)  
McPherson  
Mencicino  
Michaud  
Morrice  
Murray  
Ng  
Normandin  
Oliphant  
Pauzé  
Petitpas Taylor  
Powlowski  
Robillard  
Romanado  
Sajjan  
Samson  
Savard-Tremblay  
Schiefke  
Sgro  
Sheehan  
Sidhu (Brampton South)  
Sinclair-Desgagné  
Ste-Marie  
Sudds  
Thériault  
Thompson  
Trudel  
Valdez  
van Koeverden  
Vandenbeld  
Villemure  
Weiler  
Yip  
Zuberi— 209

MacGregor  
Maloney  
Masse  
May (Cambridge)  
McDonald (Avalon)  
McKay  
McLeod  
Mendès  
Miao  
Miller  
Morrissey  
Naqvi  
Noormohamed  
O'Connell  
O'Regan  
Perron  
Plamondon  
Qualtrough  
Rogers  
Sahota  
Saks  
Sarai  
Scarpaleggia  
Serré  
Shanahan  
Sidhu (Brampton East)  
Simard  
Singh  
St-Onge  
Tassi  
Therrien  
Trudeau  
Turnbull  
Van Bynen  
Vandal  
Vignola  
Virani  
Wilkinson  
Zarrillo

## PAIRED

Nil

**The Speaker:** I declare Motion No. 1 defeated. I therefore declare Motion No. 3 defeated as well.

The question is on Motion No. 2. Shall I dispense?

**Some hon. members:** No.

[*Chair read text of motion to House*]

● (1540)

(The House divided on Motion No. 2, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(*Division No. 159*)

## YEAS

### Members

Abouttaif  
Albas  
Alghabra  
Allison  
Anandasangaree  
Arnold  
Arya  
Atwin  
Badawey  
Baker  
Barlow

Aitchison  
Aldag  
Ali  
Anand  
Angus  
Arseneault  
Ashton  
Bachrach  
Bains  
Baldinelli  
Barrett

*Government Orders*

Barron	Barsalou-Duval	Lalonde	Lambropoulos
Battiste	Beaulieu	Lametti	Lamoureux
Beech	Bendayan	Lantsman	Lapointe
Bennett	Benzen	Larouche	Lattanzio
Bergen	Berthold	Lauzon	Lawrence
Bérubé	Bezan	LeBlanc	Lebouthillier
Bibeau	Bittle	Lehoux	Lemire
Blaikie	Blair	Lewis (Essex)	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Blaney	Block	Liepert	Lightbound
Blois	Boissonnault	Lloyd	Lobb
Boulerice	Bradford	Long	Longfield
Bragdon	Brassard	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	MacAulay (Cardigan)
Brière	Brunelle-Duceppe	MacDonald (Malpeque)	MacGregor
Calkins	Caputo	MacKenzie	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Carr	Carrie	Maguire	Maloney
Casey	Chabot	Martel	Martinez Ferrada
Chagger	Chahal	Masse	Mathysen
Chambers	Champagne	May (Cambridge)	May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
Champoux	Chatel	Mazier	McCauley (Edmonton West)
Chen	Chiang	McDonald (Avalon)	McGuinty
Chong	Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	McKay	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Collins (Victoria)	Cooper	McLean	McLeod
Cormier	Coteau	McPherson	Melillo
Dabrusin	Dalton	Mendès	Mendicino
Damoff	Dancho	Miao	Michaud
Davidson	DeBellefeuille	Miller	Moore
Deltell	d'Entremont	Morantz	Morrice
Desbiens	Desilets	Morrison	Morrissey
Desjarlais	Dhaliwal	Motz	Murray
Dhillon	Diab	Muys	Naqvi
Doherty	Dong	Nater	Ng
Dowdall	Dreeshen	Noormohamed	Normandin
Drouin	Dubourg	O'Connell	Oliphant
Duclos	Duguid	O'Regan	O'Toole
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Patzer	Paul-Hus
Dzerowicz	Ehsassi	Pauzé	Perkins
El-Khoury	Ellis	Perron	Petitpas Taylor
Epp	Erskine-Smith	Plamondon	Poilievre
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Falk (Provencher)	Powlowski	Qualtrough
Fast	Fergus	Rayes	Redekopp
Ferreri	Fillmore	Reid	Rempel Garner
Findlay	Fisher	Richards	Robillard
Fonseca	Fortier	Rogers	Romanado
Fortin	Fragiskatos	Rood	Ruff
Fraser	Freeland	Sahota	Sajjan
Fry	Gaheer	Saks	Samson
Gallant	Garneau	Sarai	Savard-Tremblay
Garon	Garrison	Scarpaleggia	Scheer
Gaudreau	Gazan	Schiefke	Schmale
Généreux	Genuis	Seeback	Serré
Gerretsen	Gill	Sgro	Shanahan
Gladu	Godin	Sheehan	Shields
Goodridge	Gould	Shiple	Sidhu (Brampton East)
Gourde	Gray	Sidhu (Brampton South)	Simard
Green	Guilbeault	Sinclair-Desgagné	Singh
Hajdu	Hallan	Small	Soroka
Hanley	Hardie	Steinley	Ste-Marie
Hepfner	Hoback	Stewart	St-Onge
Holland	Housefather	Strahl	Stubbs
Hughes	Hussen	Sudds	Tassi
Hutchings	Iacono	Taylor Roy	Thériault
Idlout	Ien	Therrien	Thompson
Jaczek	Jeneroux	Tochor	Tolmie
Johns	Joly	Trudeau	Trudel
Jones	Jowhari	Turnbull	Uppal
Julian	Kayabaga	Valdez	Van Bynen
Kelloway	Kelly	van Koeverden	Van Popta
Khalid	Khera	Vandal	Vandenbeld
Kitchen	Kmiec	Vecchio	Vidal
Koutrakis	Kram	Vien	Viersen
Kramp-Neuman	Kurek	Vignola	Villemure
Kusie	Kusmierczyk	Virani	Vis
Kwan	Lake	Vuong	Wagantall

*Government Orders*

Warkentin  
Webber  
Wilkinson  
Williamson  
Zahid  
Zimmer

Waugh  
Weiler  
Williams  
Yip  
Zarrillo  
Zuberi— 326

## NAYS

Nil

## PAIRED

Nil

**The Speaker:** I declare Motion No. 2 carried.

**Hon. Bill Blair (for the Minister of Canadian Heritage)** moved that Bill C-11, An Act to amend the Broadcasting Act and to make related and consequential amendments to other Acts, as amended, be concurred in at report stage with a further amendment.

[*Translation*]

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

[*English*]

**Mr. John Nater:** Mr. Speaker, we request a recorded division.

● (1550)

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

(*Division No. 160*)

## YEAS

## Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Ali	Anand
Anandasangaree	Angus
Arseneault	Arya
Ashton	Atwin
Bachrach	Badawey
Bains	Baker
Barron	Barsalou-Duval
Battiste	Beaulieu
Beech	Bendayan
Bennett	Bérubé
Bibeau	Bittle
Blaikie	Blair
Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas
Blaney	Blois
Boissonnault	Boulerice
Bradford	Brière
Brunelle-Duceppe	Cannings
Carr	Casey
Chabot	Chagger
Chahal	Champagne
Champoux	Chatel
Chen	Chiang
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	Collins (Victoria)
Cormier	Coteau
Dabrusin	Damoff
DeBellefeuille	Desbiens
Desilets	Desjarlais
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Diab	Dong
Drouin	Dubourg
Duclos	Duguid
Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Dzerowicz

Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith	Fergus
Fillmore	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fortin	Fragiskatos
Fraser	Fry
Gaheer	Garneau
Garon	Garrison
Gaudreau	Gazan
Gerretsen	Gill
Gould	Green
Guilbeault	Hajdu
Hanley	Hardie
Hepfner	Holland
Housefather	Hughes
Hussen	Hutchings
Iacono	Idlout
Ien	Jaczek
Johns	Joly
Jones	Jowhari
Julian	Kayabaga
Kelloway	Khalid
Khera	Koutrakis
Kusmierczyk	Kwan
Lalonde	Lambropoulos
Lametti	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Larouche
Lattanzio	Lauzon
LeBlanc	Lebouthillier
Lemire	Lightbound
Long	Longfield
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacDonald (Malpeque)	MacGregor
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maloney
Martinez Ferrada	Masse
Mathysen	May (Cambridge)
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	McDonald (Avalon)
McGuinty	McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod
McPherson	Mendès
Mendicino	Miao
Michaud	Miller
Morrissey	Murray
Naqvi	Ng
Noormohamed	Normandin
O'Connell	Oliphant
O'Regan	Pauzé
Perron	Petitpas Taylor
Plamondon	Powlowski
Qualtrough	Robillard
Rogers	Romanado
Sahota	Sajjan
Saks	Samson
Sarai	Savard-Tremblay
Scarpaleggia	Schiefke
Serré	Sgro
Shanahan	Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton East)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simard	Sinclair-Desgagné
Singh	Ste-Marie
St-Onge	Sudds
Tassi	Taylor Roy
Thériault	Therrien
Thompson	Trudeau
Trudel	Turnbull
Valdez	Van Bynen
van Koeverden	Vandal
Vandenbeld	Vignola
Villemure	Virani
Weiler	Wilkinson
Yip	Zahid
Zarrillo	Zuberi— 210

*Routine Proceedings*

## NAYS

## Members

Abouttaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barlow	Barrett
Benzen	Bergen
Berthold	Bezan
Block	Bragdon
Brassard	Calkins
Caputo	Carrie
Chambers	Chong
Cooper	Dalton
Dancho	Davidson
Deltell	d'Entremont
Doherty	Dowdall
Dreeshen	Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Ellis	Epp
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Falk (Provencher)
Fast	Ferri
Findlay	Gallant
Généreux	Genuis
Gladu	Godin
Goodridge	Gourde
Gray	Hallan
Hoback	Jeneroux
Kelly	Kitchen
Kmiec	Kram
Kramp-Neuman	Kurek
Kusie	Lake
Lantsman	Lawrence
Lehoux	Lewis (Essex)
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert
Lloyd	Lobb
MacKenzie	Maguire
Martel	Mazier
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLean
Melillo	Moore
Morantz	Morrice
Morrison	Motz
Muys	Nater
O'Toole	Patzer
Paul-Hus	Perkins
Poilievre	Rayes
Redekopp	Reid
Rempel Garner	Richards
Rood	Ruff
Scheer	Schmale
Seeback	Shields
Shiple	Small
Soroka	Steinley
Stewart	Strahl
Stubbs	Tochor
Tolmie	Uppal
Van Popta	Vecchio
Vidal	Vien
Viersen	Vis
Vuong	Wagantall
Warkentin	Waugh
Webber	Williams
Williamson	Zimmer—118

## PAIRED

Nil

**The Speaker:** I declare the motion carried. When shall the bill be read a third time? Later today?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

## HOUSE OF COMMONS

**The Speaker:** I have the honour to lay upon the table the House of Commons' "Report to Canadians 2022".

\* \* \*

## 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 14 petitions. These returns will be tabled in an electronic format.

\* \* \*

● (1555)

## COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

## NATURAL RESOURCES

**Mr. John Aldag (Cloverdale—Langley City, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the fifth report of the Standing Committee on Natural Resources, entitled "A Study of Methane Reduction Plans: Emissions Reduction Fund On-shore Program Review".

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

[Translation]

## PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

**Mr. John Williamson (New Brunswick Southwest, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the following four reports of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts. First, I present the 16th report, entitled "Enforcement of COVID-19 Quarantine and Testing Orders".

[English]

I also present the 17th report, entitled "Regional Relief and Recovery Fund", and the 18th report, entitled "Natural Health Products".

[Translation]

Finally, I present the 19th report, entitled "Health and Safety of Agricultural Temporary Foreign Workers in Canada During the COVID-19 Pandemic".

[English]

## PUBLIC SAFETY AND NATIONAL SECURITY

**Hon. Jim Carr (Winnipeg South Centre, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the sixth report of the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security, in relation to the motion adopted on Thursday, February 10, 2022, entitled "Rise of Ideologically Motivated Violent Extremism in Canada".



[Translation]

TRANSPORT, INFRASTRUCTURE AND COMMUNITIES

**Mr. Peter Schiefke (Vaudreuil—Soulanges, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the sixth report of the Standing Committee on Transport, Infrastructure and Communities, entitled “Targeted Infrastructure Investments to Influence Social, Economic and Environmental Outcomes”.

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

\* \* \*

[English]

### CRIMINAL CODE

**Hon. Hedy Fry (Vancouver Centre, Lib.)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-295, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (neglect of vulnerable adults).

She said: Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce my private member's bill, an act to amend the Criminal Code regarding neglect of vulnerable adults, and I want to thank the member for Alfred-Pellan for seconding the bill.

The COVID-19 pandemic exposed clear evidence of abuse of seniors in care facilities across the country. With the lack of appropriate care and protection, as well as negligence and failure to follow accepted protocols, this situation resulted in appallingly high rates of COVID transmission in many long-term care facilities and led to increased mortality rates.

This bill aims to prevent a recurrence of those tragic outcomes by creating an offence for owners and managers of adult care facilities who fail to provide due care in accordance with accepted protocols and who are negligent in their duty to provide the necessities for a good quality of life. It would also allow courts to make an order prohibiting the owners and managers of such facilities from being in charge of or in a position of trust or authority toward vulnerable adults and to consider, as an aggravating factor for the purpose of sentencing, the fact that an organization failed to perform the legal duty that it owed to a vulnerable adult.

As Mahatma Gandhi said, “The true measure of any society can be found in how it treats its most vulnerable members.”

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

\* \* \*

● (1600)

### RESPECTING FAMILIES OF MURDERED AND BRUTALIZED PERSONS ACT

**Mr. James Bezan (Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman, CPC):** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-296, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (increasing parole ineligibility).

He said: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for Lakeland for seconding this private member's bill. This is the third Parliament that I have introduced this legislation in, and I hope to see it make it through all stages this time. I have been lucky to get it to committee and through committee in the past.

### Routine Proceedings

This bill, called the respecting families of murdered and brutalized persons act, would amend the Criminal Code and empower our courts so that they would have the judicial discretion to increase parole ineligibility when sentencing those criminals, the most depraved individuals in our society, who commit three crimes on one victim: kidnapping, sexual assault and murder. Those individuals, the Clifford Olsons and Paul Bernardos of the world, never, ever receive parole, but they use parole, and Clifford Olson was a perfect case of this, to revictimize and traumatize the families by going into gruesome details of how they murdered children. We want to save those families from having to live through that. This bill aims to limit victims' families from having to go through these unnecessary and traumatic Parole Board hearings and hearing more about how their children and loved ones were killed.

When I thought of this bill back in 2013, it was because of cases that came out at that time. We can all remember Tori Stafford and Noelle Paquette, and how they were brutally killed. Unfortunately, they were innocent bystanders who were captured, sexually assaulted and murdered by the perpetrators. These perpetrators are psychopaths who will never see the light of day, and that is why we need to bring forward legislation to give the courts the ability to extend parole ineligibility. This bill is not about mandatory minimums.

I also want to thank Senator Pierre-Hugues Boisvenu. Senator Boisvenu is going to sponsor a similar bill in the Senate, and he has always championed this cause. Last week was the 20th anniversary of a similar grotesque murder that happened to his own daughter.

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

\* \* \*

### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

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

That, notwithstanding any Standing Order or usual practice of the House, following Oral Questions on Tuesday, June 21, 2022, a member from each recognized party, a member from the Green Party, as well as the Leader of the Official Opposition, may make a brief statement.

**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 will please say nay.

I declare the motion carried.

*Routine Proceedings***PETITIONS**

## STATUE OF EMILY MURPHY

**Hon. Michael Chong (Wellington—Halton Hills, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I present a petition signed by 26 constituents in my riding of Wellington—Halton Hills. My presentation of this petition is no reflection of my support or opposition to the petition, but it simply reflects the ancient duty of members of the House to present petitions on behalf of constituents. The petitioners call on Parliament to take action with respect to a statue on Parliament Hill.

## AIR TRANSPORTATION

**Mr. Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, today I am presenting a petition on behalf of constituents in Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon who are calling on the Government of Canada in good faith to negotiate a new air transport agreement with the Government of India to allow for direct flights from Abbotsford, Toronto or Vancouver directly to the Amritsar region of the Punjab. My constituents believe we need to get direct flights in order to improve travel times and support all the people-to-people ties we have between these two regions.

- (1605)

## CLIMATE CHANGE

**Mr. Alistair MacGregor (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present a petition where the signatories call upon the Prime Minister and the Government of Canada to enact just transition legislation.

They want this legislation to produce a plan that reduces emissions by at least 60% below 2005 levels by 2030. They want it to create new public economic institutions that expand public ownership of services and utilities across the economy to implement the transition. They want it to create good, green jobs and drive inclusive workforce development. They want it to protect and strengthen human rights and worker rights, and respect indigenous rights, sovereignty and knowledge. Finally, they want it to pay for the transition by increasing taxes on the wealthiest and corporations, and financing through a public national bank.

## FALUN GONG

**Mr. James Bezan (Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to present a petition on behalf of 535 Canadians who are petitioning the House of Commons to remind us that we passed the Justice for Victims of Corrupt Foreign Officials Act, the Sergei Magnitsky Law, which I sponsored in 2018 in this chamber. It has been 21 years since Falun Gong practitioners started to get targeted by the Communist regime in Beijing, and unfortunately they have been subjected to organ harvesting. Through that organ harvesting enterprise, an illegal activity that is taking place in mainland China, we know that people have gotten rich off this through persecuting Falun Gong practitioners and selling their organs on the black market.

The petitioners are calling upon the Government of Canada to sanction the perpetrators by using the Sergei Magnitsky Law and other measures to ensure that they cannot come to Canada and that their assets are frozen. There are 14 individuals in the petition and the petitioners want them to be named and shamed, so I will do that now quickly: Jiang Zemin, Luo Gan, Liu Jing, Zhou Yongkang, Bo Xilai, Li Lanqing, Wu Guanzheng, Li Dongsheng, Qiang Wei,

Huang Jiefu, Zheng Shusen, Wang Lijun, Zhang Chaoying, and Jia Chunwang.

## RACIAL PROFILING

**Mr. Matthew Green (Hamilton Centre, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to present three petitions.

The first, e-petition 3668, initiated by Joel DeBellefeuille and supported by Canadians from across the country, addresses the critically important need to end racial profiling. Racial profiling is a degrading and racist practice affecting too many people in Canada, and even the Supreme Court has acknowledged that systemic racial profiling by police occurs as a day-to-day reality for Black and indigenous Canadians.

This petition calls upon the Minister of Public Safety to enact legislation that would prohibit racial profiling by police and make federal funding to law enforcement agencies dependent on those agencies having policies and procedures in place to end racial profiling.

- (1610)

## CLIMATE CHANGE

**Mr. Matthew Green (Hamilton Centre, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, my second petition calls on the government to take immediate and concrete action to address the climate emergency in Canada.

Since the Liberal government declared a climate emergency in 2019, we have endured heat domes and record heat waves in B.C., drought across the Prairies, flooding throughout the country, and massive storms in Ontario and Quebec that have left thousands of people without power for days on end.

It is clear that we must act immediately to address the effects of catastrophic climate change.

This petition calls for a broad spectrum of action, including reducing emissions levels by at least 60% of 2005 levels.

## FOREIGN ENLISTMENT

**Mr. Matthew Green (Hamilton Centre, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, finally, I would like to present e-petition 3810, initiated by David Mivasair from my riding of Hamilton Centre, which seeks to bring attention to the recruiting of Canadian citizens to serve in the armed forces of foreign countries, with a particular concern for the potential foreign recruitment being undertaken by the Israeli consulate in Toronto.

As members may be aware, the Foreign Enlistment Act states:

Any person who, within Canada, recruits or otherwise induces any person or body of persons to enlist or to accept any commission or engagement in the armed forces of [a] foreign state or other armed forces operating in that state is guilty of an offence.

*Routine Proceedings*

This petition has had the support of more than 1,200 people, and a similar e-petition in the previous Parliament received close to 8,000 signatures. We were unable to table it due to the dissolution of Parliament.

This petition calls on the Minister of Justice to undertake a thorough investigation of those who have recruited or facilitated recruitment for the Israel Defense Forces, and, if warranted, lay charges against those involved in recruitment and encouraging recruitment in the IDF.

## REPATRIATION OF CANADIAN CITIZENS IN SYRIA

**Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP):** Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to rise today to present this petition on behalf of 534 Canadians who express their outrage that 26 Canadian citizens, including 14 children, have been abandoned by our government in conditions that can only be described as “hell on Earth” in detention facilities in northeast Syria. They have been denied consular services. They have had no assistance from government. They have not been charged with any crimes, nor have they been convicted. Again, they are 14 children, eight women and four men who are currently held in northeast Syria.

Attempts to ask the government to repatriate them have fallen on deaf ears. The Canadian government has shown the ability to repatriate citizens from Syria, as was the case of the child called Amira, who was repatriated last year.

The undersigned 534 Canadians seek the Government of Canada's assistance to immediately begin the process to repatriate the 26 Canadian citizens, 14 children, eight women and four men, charged with nothing and convicted of nothing, who are in jail in northeast Syria. It is a matter of life and death.

## WON ALEXANDER CUMYOW

**Ms. Jean Yip (Scarborough—Agincourt, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I put forward this petition on behalf of Canadians who signed in support of selecting Won Alexander Cumyow as the next face of the \$5 bill.

Mr. Won was the first Chinese Canadian to be born in present-day Canada. Despite being a trained lawyer, he was denied the opportunity to write the bar and practise law, because he was ethnically Chinese. A root cause of anti-Asian racism in Canada is a lack of understanding and appreciation for the contributions of Asian Canadians throughout our country's history.

The petitioners are calling upon the Minister of Finance to select Won Alexander Cumyow as the face of the redesigned \$5 bill.

## SINGLE-USE PLASTICS

**Ms. Laurel Collins (Victoria, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I have two petitions to present.

First, I rise to present a petition on behalf of over 700 Canadians who are concerned about plastic pollution from balloons. This is particularly timely, given the government's announcement today on its limited single-use plastics ban.

The petitioners note that balloons are a major source of plastic pollution and marine debris. They are capable of travelling vast distances and persist in the environment for many years.

The petitioners note that more public education is needed to raise awareness about the harms of balloons and the fact that alternatives to plastic balloons for celebrations are widely available. They are calling on the government to ban the release of latex, mylar, nylon, rubber, helium and other party balloons and sky lanterns into the environment and to consider adding balloons to the list of harmful single-use plastics to be banned.

## CORPORATE SOCIAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY

**Ms. Laurel Collins (Victoria, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the second petition I am presenting is on behalf of Canadians concerned that Canadian companies are contributing to human rights abuses and environmental damage around the world. The petitioners note that indigenous people, women and marginalized groups are disproportionately affected. They call on the House to adopt human rights and environmental due diligence legislation that would require Canadian companies to prevent human rights abuses and environmental damage throughout their global operations and supply chains.

## RURAL AND SUBURBAN MAIL CARRIERS

**Ms. Lisa Marie Barron (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I stand today to present a petition on behalf of Canadian rural and suburban mail carriers. Eleven thousand rural and suburban mail carriers employed by Canada Post are required to use their own vehicles to deliver mail. As the cost of fuel continues to increase, the rates covered, as set by the Canada Revenue Agency, are not coinciding. As a result, workers are increasingly forced to use their own wages just to do their jobs.

This petition calls upon the federal government to temporarily increase the per-kilometre allowance rates by a minimum of 15% until gas prices see a drop below \$1.75 per litre, so that these workers are not forced to pay out of their own pockets to do their jobs.

I thank Fiona Gunn and her fellow rural and suburban mail carriers, as well as the 4,729 signatories, for their work to draw attention to this important issue.

*Routine Proceedings*

• (1615)

CLIMATE CHANGE

**Mr. Mike Morrice (Kitchener Centre, GP):** Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to rise this afternoon to present a petition on behalf of petitioners joining others across the country who are recognizing that we are in the midst of a climate emergency. The petitioners call on the government to enact just transition legislation that includes a number of items, such as the following: ensuring that we have reduced emissions at least 60% below 2005 levels by 2030; ending subsidies to fossil fuels; creating good, green jobs; expanding the social safety net with new income supports; decarbonizing public housing; providing accessible and affordable public transit across the country; and ensuring we can pay for this important transition by increasing taxes on the wealthiest corporations across the country.

HUMAN ORGAN TRAFFICKING

**Mr. Arnold Viersen (Peace River—Westlock, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I want to present a petition today. Petitioners from across the country, and in this case particularly from Scarborough, are calling on the government to enact legislation that would prevent Canadians from going abroad and participating in the illegal organ harvesting that happens around the world.

The petitioners are calling on the quick passage of two bills: Bill C-350 and Bill S-240. Those bills are exactly the same, but one is in the Senate and one is in this place.

The petitioners are calling for it to be made a crime for Canadians to go abroad or for them to be inadmissible to Canada if they have been participating in the illegal organ harvesting that is happening. This particularly has been raised by members of the Falun Gong community here in Canada, and I want to thank them for their advocacy in this area.

\* \* \*

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 539, 541, 542, 545 to 548, 550, 553, 557 and 559.

[Text]

Question No. 539—**Mr. Kelly McCauley:**

With regard to the contract initially awarded by Shared Services Canada to BMC Software Incorporated (BMC) worth approximately \$32.4 million for IT service management: (a) why did the contract increase in value to over \$50 million in February 2020; (b) which departments and agencies have migrated all of their IT service management to the BMC software; (c) of the departments that have not yet migrated their IT service management to the BMC software, what percentage of migration has been completed and what is the projected date as to when the migration will be complete; (d) what is the government's estimated total cost to complete the migration; and (e) will it be mandatory for departments and agencies to use the BMC software, and, if not, what alternatives will be made available?

**Mr. Anthony Housefather (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Services and Procurement, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, SSC invests in technology that supports a whole-of-government or “enterprise” approach by enabling organizations to shift toward the use of common information technology systems. SSC's contract with BMC reflects this approach to IT transformation, in that it provides for a modern information technology service management, or

ITSM, tool available for use across the Government of Canada, the GC.

The enterprise tool enables SSC, as the GC's IT infrastructure service provider, to collaborate effectively and efficiently with departments by providing a single self-service entry point for customer and end-user access to SSC services. The tool enables SSC to receive and respond to requests for services and to address IT incidents that affect those services. For the benefit of both SSC and departments, the tool standardizes ITSM processes; automates key tasks; enhances the flow of shared, real-time information; and improves analytics and reporting capabilities.

The decision to adopt the new ITSM tool is department-specific. It is not mandatory for departments and agencies to migrate to the new enterprise ITSM tool.

In regard to part (a), the contract value was increased by an additional \$20 million on February 21, 2020, to reflect anticipated expenditures. This additional value has been consumed over time, and included expenditures to support early planning and deployment of the ITSM tool by several departments. The amendment to the contract value was published on the proactive disclosure database at the following link: <https://search.open.canada.ca/en/ct/id/ssc-spc,C-2019-2020-Q2-00552>

As contract amendments are issued, they will appear through updates to the proactive disclosure database.

In regard to part (b), SSC is not implementing an overall project to migrate all departments to the enterprise tool procured from BMC Software Inc. That being said, the following departments have completed the work to migrate to the enterprise ITSM tool procured by SSC from BMC Software Inc.: Justice Canada, Transport Canada, Canadian Heritage, Indigenous Services Canada and Prairies Economic Development Canada.

In regard to part (c), as of May 16, 2022, the following departments are in the process of implementing the new enterprise ITSM tool or upgrading their existing BMC ITSM software: Shared Services Canada; Employment and Social Development Canada; Global Affairs Canada; Canada Revenue Agency; Canada Border Services Agency; Royal Canadian Mounted Police West; Innovation, Science and Economic Development; Statistics Canada; and Public Safety.

As SSC is not implementing an overall project to migrate all departments to the enterprise tool procured from BMC Software Inc., it is not possible to calculate the percentage of migrations that have occurred or remain, nor is possible to forecast a date by which migrations would be complete. The decision to adopt the enterprise ITSM tool lies with each department.

Regarding SSC's own migration to the enterprise tool from SSC's main legacy ITSM tool, the migration of users is at 40% and the configuration of the tool is at 70%. SSC's migration is estimated to be completed by March 2023.

*Routine Proceedings*

In regard to part (d), the cost to the GC will depend on the eventual extent of adoption of the tool by departments. SSC is not implementing an overall project to migrate all departments to the tool, so there is no estimated total cost for such a project. The decision to adopt the tool lies with each department, and each migration will give rise to some costs for SSC and for the department electing to migrate.

In regard to part (e), the decision to adopt the new ITSM tool, and in what form, is department-specific. While the enterprise ITSM tool provides numerous benefits, including greater efficiencies and improvements to service delivery, it is not mandatory for departments and agencies to migrate to the enterprise tool. However, if a department proposes to adopt another tool, there is a requirement to gain approval from the Government of Canada enterprise architecture review board, or GC EARB. There are multiple ITSM tools across the Government of Canada that departments have invested in over the years to meet their requirements.

**Question No. 541—Mr. Kyle Seeback:**

With regard to the government's use of single-use plastics: (a) does the government know how many single-use plastics it purchases, and, if so, what is the total amount of single-use plastics purchases made since January 1, 2020, broken down by (i) department, (ii) agency (iii) other government entity; and (b) what are the details of each purchase, including the (i) date, (ii) amount, (iii) description of goods, including the volume, (iv) vendor?

**Hon. Greg Fergus (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and to the President of the Treasury Board), Lib.:** Mr. Speaker, while the Government of Canada does not track single-use plastic purchases, it is reducing plastic waste by reducing the unnecessary use of single-use plastics, including straws, utensils, bags and bottles in government operations. They are, however, sometimes necessary for accessibility, health, safety or security reasons.

The government is also committed to the reuse and recycling of plastic in its operations, buying more products made from recycled plastics and reducing packaging waste by prioritizing reusable or recyclable packaging. The government will track and report its waste diversion starting in fiscal year 2022-23, including progress towards diverting at least 75% by weight of plastic waste from landfills by 2030.

**Question No. 542—Mrs. Cathay Wagantall:**

With regard to Veterans Affairs Canada's (VAC) online Benefits Navigator: (a) on what date was it established; (b) due to what circumstances was it established; (c) from the date of its creation to May 3, 2022, on what dates was it taken offline, and why; (d) on the date of its last modification, April 27, 2022, what changes were made to it and why; (e) since its creation to May 3, 2022, (i) what features or questions have been added to the questionnaire, (ii) what features or questions have been removed from the questionnaire, and why; (f) in what ways has VAC promoted its existence to veterans; (g) how many individual veterans have (i) applied for, (ii) received, VAC benefits by way of the Benefits Navigator since its creation; and (h) is or was it ever a standard component of VAC's intake process for benefit applicants, and, if not, what are VAC's plans to integrate it as a mandatory first point of entry for all applicants?

**Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Minister of Veterans Affairs and Associate Minister of National Defence, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, with regard to (a), the benefits navigator was established in 2014.

With regard to (b), the benefits navigator was created as a result of Veterans Affairs Canada's, VAC's, ongoing efforts to improve veteran access to information about VAC's benefits and services. The tool provides veterans, Royal Canadian Mounted Police, still serving Canadian Armed Forces members, spouses and survivors

with information about the VAC benefits and services that they may qualify for, given their specific situation.

With regard to (c), the benefits navigator would be inaccessible through My VAC Account any time that the system was offline. This includes instances of My VAC Account being offline for maintenance, upgrades or the addition of new features. My VAC Account outages are regularly scheduled, with one maintenance outage each month and one system outage every six weeks. While unscheduled outages do occur, they are infrequent.

With regard to (d), VAC regularly enhances My VAC Account to improve its service to veterans, Canadian Armed Forces and Royal Canadian Mounted Police members, and their families. In April 2022, as part of VAC's regular schedule of enhancements, updates were made to the benefits navigator to correct broken web page links on various results pages. Updates to the wording of various sections of the navigator were made to replace the word "Eligibility" with "Qualify" to ensure VAC's messages to its clientele are consistent across products.

With regard to (e)(i), since the questionnaire's inception in 2014, VAC's programs and services have evolved, with many programs and services being introduced, retired, or changed. These updates have been reflected in the benefits navigator. As an example, in 2019, significant changes were made to the content of the navigator to reflect the program changes brought forward with the implementation of the pension for life. The features offered by the benefits navigator have remained consistent since its inception.

With regard to (e)(ii), once a program, benefit or service is no longer offered at VAC, the information is removed from the benefits navigator. For instance, with the implementation of the pension for life, any VAC programs that were retired were removed from the benefits navigator. The features offered by the benefits navigator have remained consistent since its inception.

With regard to (f), VAC has used a number of methods to engage the veteran population in using the benefits navigator. This includes, but is not limited to, promoting it at outreach events, through social media posts, using notifications through My VAC Account and embedding hyperlinks to the tool within VAC's electronic guided application forms such as VAC2501.

With regard to (g), the benefits navigator was created to provide reference information only. It does not provide eligibility decisions, nor does it track whether a veteran who accesses the benefits navigator follows through with an application for a specific program.

*Routine Proceedings*

With regard to (h), as noted, the benefits navigator was created for the purpose of quickly informing veterans of which VAC programs they should consider applying for, based on their situation. As an information tool, the navigator does not collect sufficient information to make a full decision on eligibility; it has never been used as a standard component for the intake process for benefits applications, and currently there are no plans to do so.

**Question No. 545—Mr. Dave Epp:**

With regard to the Windsor-Detroit Bridge Authority (WDBA) and the design failure related to the Hydro One Conduit Project: (a) does the WDBA accept the independent engineering and geotechnical evidence that the failure was a design-related one, and, if not, why; (b) did the WDBA refuse the industry standard of accessing the professional performance insurance they were required to have, and, if so, why; (c) was the WDBA's contract provided to Amico to correct the design failure awarded through a sole source process, and, if so, why was a competitive bid process not used; (d) did the WDBA or CIMA+ amend the specifications for the remedial work to eliminate the long runs if the failures were due to construction practice and not a design error, and, if so, why was such a decision made; and (e) were the original failures caused by a construction practice involving pumping pressure, and, if so, what is the WDBA's explanation for why the remedial work, which used the same pumping pressures, did not fail in the same manner as the original design?

**Ms. Jennifer O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Infrastructure and Communities, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, with regard to the Windsor-Detroit Bridge Authority, or WDBA, and the Hydro One conduit project, this question is related to a dispute that has not yet been resolved and is scheduled for mediation in May 2022. It is also subject to ongoing contractual confidentiality obligations.

The WDBA is not able to prepare a response to this question without violating the confidentiality requirements. Doing so could also potentially impact the economic interests of Canada.

**Question No. 546—Mr. Dave Epp:**

With regard to the Windsor-Detroit Bridge Authority (WDBA) and the Hydro One Conduit Project: (a) did the WDBA consider Farhad Ganji to be in a conflict of interest by managing the CIMA+ review of the WDBA Hydro One Conduit Project as a WDBA employee and former CIMA+ employee; (b) who made the determination to have Farhad Ganji be a lead in the review; (c) to whom did Farhad Ganji report, and to whom did that person report to at WDBA for the WDBA Hydro One Conduit Project; (d) what is the position of the WDBA regarding the independent engineering findings of Kinectrics, Geotherm and Brierly that the Schedule 40 pipe was the wrong pipe to be specified for this project; (e) if the WDBA disagrees with the findings, what evidence is the disagreement based on; and (f) what differences are there between the original work specifications and the second specifications to address the need to conform to the required specifications of Hydro One?

**Ms. Jennifer O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Infrastructure and Communities, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, with regard to the Windsor-Detroit Bridge Authority, or WDBA, and the Hydro One conduit project, this question is related to a dispute that has not yet been resolved and is scheduled for mediation in May 2022. It is also subject to ongoing contractual confidentiality obligations.

The WDBA is not able to prepare a response to this question without violating the confidentiality requirements. Doing so could also potentially impact the economic interests of Canada.

**Question No. 547—Mr. Dave Epp:**

With regard to the Windsor-Detroit Bridge Authority (WDBA) and the Hydro One Conduit Project: (a) did WDBA sole source a contract with AMICO for the WDBA Hydro One Conduit Project with an entirely different design criteria that involved the conduit fill specifications changing from 200 metres to 70 metres, and, if so, why; (b) how many days in April of 2022 was the project at a standstill, and

why did the standstill occur; (c) what were the total costs incurred by the WDBA associated with the delay, including an itemized breakdown of the costs; (d) did WDBA procure their own independent engineering review of the project in addition to the Kinectric, Geotherm and Brierly reports, and, if not, why; (e) if the answer to (d) is affirmative, what are the details, including the findings of the review; (f) did the WDBA seek recourse against CIMA+ related to the project failures and, if not, why; (g) if the answer to (f) is affirmative, what are the details of the recourse; (h) for the failures on the WDBA Hydro One Conduit Project, what were the terms; and (i) what are the details of all changes in executive leadership at the WDBA that have occurred since January 1, 2022, including any change in either personnel or in the leadership structure?

**Ms. Jennifer O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Infrastructure and Communities, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, with regard to the Windsor-Detroit Bridge Authority, or WDBA, and the Hydro One conduit project, this question is related to a dispute that has not yet been resolved and is scheduled for mediation in May 2022. It is also subject to ongoing contractual confidentiality obligations.

The WDBA is not able to prepare a response to this question without violating the confidentiality requirements. Doing so could also potentially impact the economic interests of Canada.

**Question No. 548—Mr. Dave Epp:**

With regard to the Windsor-Detroit Bridge Authority (WDBA) and the Hydro One Conduit Project: (a) on what date did the current WDBA CEO, Bryce Phillips, become aware of the Kinectrics report on the Hydro One Conduit Project; (b) what was the project's injection failure; (c) did WDBA grant CIMA+ full authority over the role of designer and of contract administrator on the WDBA Hydro One Conduit Project, and, if so, (i) who made that decision, (ii) why was that decision made; (d) did the WDBA grant CIMA+ the permission to participate in the discussions with the insurer on the WDBA Hydro One Conduit Project, and, if so, (i) who made that decision, (ii) why was that decision made; (e) if the answer to (d) is affirmative, how does the WDBA address concerns that such discussions could jeopardize the availability of insurer proceeds; and (f) was CIMA+ allowed to compromise on the scope of the insurance on the WDBA Hydro One Conduit Project, and, if so, why?

**Ms. Jennifer O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Infrastructure and Communities, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, with regard to Windsor-Detroit Bridge Authority, or WDBA, and the Hydro One conduit project, this question is related to a dispute that has not yet been resolved and is scheduled for mediation in May 2022. It is also subject to ongoing contractual confidentiality obligations.

The WDBA is not able to prepare a response to this question without violating the confidentiality requirements. Doing so could also potentially impact the economic interests of Canada.

**Question No. 550—Ms. Melissa Lantsman:**

With regard to the current processing delays of immigration applications: (a) what is the average processing time of a permanent residence application; (b) what is the average time between a candidate's initial application and the receipt of an interview for the purpose of obtaining permanent residency; and (c) how many applicants have had to undergo two or more medical exams due to the expiration of the 12 month period for a valid medical exam for the purpose of receiving permanent residency?

*Routine Proceedings*

**Mrs. Marie-France Lalonde (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, with regard to (a) and (b), Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada, IRCC, understands the importance of the decisions on visa applications. IRCC recognizes that timely decisions are essential. Every case is assessed based on the information provided by the applicant and in accordance with Canada's immigration laws.

The time it takes to process an application varies according to a number of factors, such as the type of application being submitted, how well and how quickly applicants respond to requests from IRCC to provide biometrics, if applicable, and additional information, including medical examinations; how easily IRCC can verify the information provided; the complexity of an application; and resources within the integrated processing network. Processing times are regularly updated on the IRCC website at <https://www.canada.ca/en/immigration-refugees-citizenship/services/application/check-processing-times.html>.

With regard to (c), approximately 48,900 applicants, or 11%, who were admitted as permanent residents between April 1, 2021, and March 31, 2022, had two or more immigration medical examinations associated to their permanent resident application. The results of an initial medical examination may have expired for a variety of reasons, which include, but are not limited to, public health measures, travel restrictions and office closures related to COVID, pending receipt of other information on a file such as background or security results from partners or supplementary information required from a client.

Question No. 553—**Mr. Fraser Tolmie:**

With regard to the current processing delays of immigration applications: (a) what are the current standards for processing times of applications for the Federal Skilled Worker Program; (b) what is the government's target date for when service standards will return to normal; (c) what are the current standards for processing times for applications for Canadian Experience Class permanent residency; (d) what is the government's target date for when service standards will return to normal; (e) how much did the government pay out in overtime to employees working on permanent residence applications between March 1, 2022, and May 4, 2022; and (f) how many employees are or were working at Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada on permanent residence files as of (i) January 1, 2016, (ii) January 1, 2020, (iii) May 4, 2022?

**Mrs. Marie-France Lalonde (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, with regard to (a), the current service standard for applications received electronically in the federal skilled worker, or FSW, program is six months.

With regard to (b), processing times for applications received in the FSW program have increased beyond the established service standard over the past couple of years, as applicants in this category are typically located overseas, and were therefore affected by pandemic-related service disruptions and travel restrictions.

As a strategy to begin reducing the portion of the inventory represented by FSW applications, IRCC implemented a pause in new invitations through express entry under this category in January 2021. Canadian experience class, or CEC, applications have been on pause since September 2021. The pause for FSW remains in effect until July 2022.

This pause, combined with a gradual increase in processing once travel restrictions are eased, has allowed IRCC to begin significantly reducing the existing inventory. Following these strategies, IRCC anticipates clients will again be invited to apply to the program beginning in July 2022. The majority of these new applicants could then expect to be processed within the established service standard of six months.

With regard to (c), the current service standard for applications received electronically in the Canadian experience class, CEC, is six months.

With regard to (d), the vast majority of applicants in the Canadian experience class, CEC, have had their applications processed within the service standard of six months for applications received electronically. To maximize admissions from Canada in 2021 and to keep inventories aligned with the levels plan, a large round of CEC invitations through express entry was initiated. This service standard has generally been maintained, because most applicants were already located in Canada and therefore less affected by pandemic-related service disruptions and travel restrictions.

IRCC put in place a pause in new invitations through express entry under this category in September 2021. The pause for CEC remains in effect until July 2022. This strategy was implemented to begin reducing the existing federal high-skilled inventory.

IRCC anticipates clients will again be invited to apply to the program beginning in July 2022. The majority of these new applicants could then expect to be processed within the established service standard of six months.

With regard to (e), IRCC undertook an extensive search in order to determine the amount of information that would fall within the scope of this question and the amount of time that would be required to prepare a comprehensive response. The information requested is not systematically tracked in a centralized database. IRCC accordingly concluded that producing and validating a comprehensive response to this question would require a manual collection of information that is not possible in the time allotted and could lead to the disclosure of incomplete and misleading information. However, IRCC will continue to explore how and if this information could be captured and reported on accurately in the future.

*Routine Proceedings*

With regard to (f), IRCC undertook an extensive search in order to determine the amount of information that would fall within the scope of this question and the amount of time that would be required to prepare a comprehensive response. The information requested is not systematically tracked in a centralized database, and more often than not, IRCC's employees work on many lines of business and not just one. IRCC accordingly concluded that producing and validating a comprehensive response to this question would require a manual collection of information that is not possible in the time allotted and could lead to the disclosure of incomplete and misleading information. IRCC will, however, continue to explore how and if this information could be captured and reported on accurately in the future.

Question No. 557—**Ms. Lianne Rood:**

With regard to expenditures on legal costs by the Windsor-Detroit Bridge Authority (WDBA) in relation to the Hydro One Conduit Project, including those concerning any contract related to the project: (a) what is the total amount spent on legal costs; and (b) what are the details of each case or legal action, including the (i) name of the case, (ii) parties involved, (iii) total expenditures to date, (iv) description or summary of legal action, (v) status of the case, (vi) outcome, including the amount awarded or paid out, if applicable?

**Ms. Jennifer O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Infrastructure and Communities, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, with regard to the Windsor-Detroit Bridge Authority, or WDBA, and the Hydro One conduit project, this question is related to a dispute that has not yet been resolved and is scheduled for mediation in May 2022. It is also subject to ongoing contractual confidentiality obligations.

WDBA is not able to prepare a response to this question without violating the confidentiality requirements. Doing so could also potentially impact the economic interests of Canada.

Question No. 559—**Mr. Alex Ruff:**

With regard to the government's evacuation of Afghans during the fall of Kabul in August 2021 and the testimony at the Special Committee on Afghanistan on May 2, 2022, by Global Affairs Canada (GAC) officials that GAC is the lead department for international consular situations and similar evacuation emergencies as established under Canadian law, and that they always do lessons learned exercises in these situations: (a) were these lessons learned exercises interdepartmental with GAC, as well as the Department of Citizenship and Immigration, and the Department of National Defence, and, if not, why not; (b) on what dates were the lessons learned exercises conducted; (c) when were the associated reports (i) produced, (ii) published; and (d) how can the (i) public, (ii) parliamentarians, view the reports?

**Hon. Robert Oliphant (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, with regard to (a), Global Affairs Canada participated, along with other implicated government departments, in a whole-of-government review of the Afghanistan emergency response. This exercise was led by Privy Council Office from October 2021. Global Affairs Canada conducted a complementary internal after-action review, or lessons learned exercise, for activities falling within the department's mandate.

With regard to (b), internal lessons learned began to be captured as early as October 2021. Once finalized, the findings will be shared with Global Affairs Canada's senior management. The intent of this process is to improve existing emergency management processes and procedures for future responses.

With regard to (c), recommendations will be shared with relevant stakeholders within Global Affairs Canada in due course.

[English]

**QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS**

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, if the government's response to Questions Nos. 540, 543, 544, 549, 551, 552, 554 to 556, 558 and 560 could be made orders for return, these returns would be tabled immediately.

**The Speaker:** Is that agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

[Text]

Question No. 540—**Mr. Kyle Seeback:**

With regard to all flights taken by the government's fleet of Challenger and Airbus aircraft since the federal carbon tax came into effect on March 1, 2018, including those with and without passengers, broken down by aircraft and year: (a) how many legs has each aircraft flown; (b) what was the total number of kilometers flown; (c) how much fuel was purchased for each aircraft; and (d) what is the actual or estimated amount of carbon tax paid by the government on the fuel purchased for the flights?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 543—**Mr. Greg McLean:**

With regard to the 2 Billion Trees program, since the 2019 Speech from the Throne on December 5, 2019: (a) how much has been spent (i) administering the program, (ii) promoting the program, (iii) planting trees; (b) what is the breakdown of (a)(i) by item and type of expenditure; (c) what is the breakdown by location where trees were actually planted as of May 3, 2022; (d) what are the details of all contracts over \$5,000 related to the program, including, for each contract, (i) the date, (ii) the amount, (iii) the description of the goods or services, (iv) the duration of the contract, if applicable, (v) the vendor, (vi) the file number, (vii) whether the contract was sole-sourced or awarded through a competitive bid process?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 544—**Mr. Alexandre Boulerice:**

With regard to the government's commitment to provide up to \$100 million more to the provinces and territories through the Safe Return to Class Fund, as well as \$10 million to First Nations for on-reserve schools to improve school ventilation, broken down by province and territory, as of November 2021: how much did each province and territory (i) request, (ii) receive, (iii) spend?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 549—**Mr. Rob Moore:**

With regard to wharfs and port facilities owned or administered by Transport Canada: (a) what are the details of each facility, including the (i) location, (ii) available services, (iii) yearly marine traffic levels for each of the last five years, (iv) condition of the facilities, (v) repairs or upgrades required in the next five years to maintain functionality, (vi) federal funding commitment to the facility for each of the next five years for (A) operations, (B) repairs or upgrades; and (b) for each facility, has Transport Canada entered into an agreement as of May 4, 2022, to transfer the administration or ownership of the facility, and, if so, what are the details of the agreement, including the (i) date the agreement was signed, (ii) entity the administration or ownership is being transferred to, (iii) summary of the terms of the agreement, (iv) amount being paid to Transport Canada by the recipient, (v) location?

(Return tabled)



*Privilege***Question No. 551—Ms. Melissa Lantsman:**

With regard to the Canada Border Services Agency (CBSA), Public Safety Canada and current delays faced by travelers at the Canadian border: (a) what are the CBSA's current standards for border screening wait times; (b) what is the CBSA's target date to ensure all screenings are completed within normal or minimal wait times; (c) how many CBSA officers were working at points of entry as of (i) January 1, 2016, (ii) January 1, 2020, (iii) May 4, 2022; (d) how many employees at Public Safety Canada working at the CBSA are (i) working from home, (ii) on unpaid leave due to their vaccine status, as of May 4, 2022; and (e) what is the breakdown of each part of (c) by (i) type of point of entry (land crossing, airport, postal facility, etc.), (ii) specific point of entry?

(Return tabled)

**Question No. 552—Ms. Melissa Lantsman:**

With regard to the Canadian Air Transport Security Authority (CATSA) and current delays faced by travelers at Canadian airports: (a) what are the CATSA's current standards for security screening wait times; (b) what is CATSA's plan to reduce the long lines seen at airport security screenings before the summer travel season; (c) does CATSA have any specific targets for reducing passenger wait times, and, if so, what are the targets and by what date will each target be met; (d) how many employees are employed at CATSA performing airport security screenings as of (i) January 1, 2016, (ii) January 1, 2020, (iii) May 4, 2022; (e) how many employees at CATSA are (i) working from home, (ii) on unpaid leave due to their vaccine status, as of May 4, 2022; and (f) what is the breakdown of each part of (d) by airport?

(Return tabled)

**Question No. 554—Mr. Alex Ruff:**

With regard to the First-Time Home Buyer Incentive (FTHBI), announced by the government in 2019 and from September 30, 2019, to date: (a) how many applicants have applied for a mortgage through the FTHBI, broken down by (i) year, (ii) province or territory; (b) of the applicants in (a), how many applicants have been approved and accepted mortgages through the FTHBI, broken down by province or territory; (c) what is the total value of incentives (shared equity mortgages) under the program that have been issued, in dollars, broken down by year from 2019 to date; (d) for those applicants who have been issued mortgages through the FTHBI, what is the mean value of the mortgage loan; (e) what is the total aggregate amount of money lent to homebuyers through the FTHBI to date; (f) how many applicants have applied for a mortgage through the FTHBI, broken down by year in the federal electoral district of Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound; (g) how many applicants in the federal electoral district of Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound who have applied for a mortgage through the FTHBI have been approved, broken down by year; and (h) what is the total aggregate amount of money lent to homebuyers in the federal electoral district of Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound through the FTHBI to date?

(Return tabled)

**Question No. 555—Mr. Alex Ruff:**

With regard to the 35% tariff imposed on farm fertilizer sourced and purchased from the Russian Federation prior to March 2, 2022: (a) to date, how many orders of product has this new tariff applied to; (b) how many individual farms have been impacted by the 35% fertilizer tariff, broken down by province; (c) did the government consult with farmers when developing sanctions on agricultural products sourced from the Russian Federation; (d) can non-Russian flagged ships carrying Russian sourced fertilizer dock at Canadian ports to unload; and (e) is the government considering exempting fertilizer from sanctions given global food security concerns as a result of the ongoing war in Ukraine?

(Return tabled)

**Question No. 556—Mr. Eric Duncan:**

With regard to the Commemorative Partnership Program, broken down between the two project programs (the Community Engagement and the Community War Memorial Program): (a) what specific amounts have been budgeted or allocated to operate the program, broken down by fiscal year dating back to January 1, 2016; (b) what is actual amount spent on the program; (c) how many applications were (i) made, (ii) approved, (iii) declined, broken down by year; (d) what was the average amount spent per approved project, broken down by year; and (e) what is the breakdown of projects by province and by year since 2016?

(Return tabled)

**Question No. 558—Mr. Ryan Williams:**

With regard to housing on Canadian Armed Forces (CAF) bases: (a) what are the current numbers on the waiting list for military housing, broken down by CAF base; (b) for each base in (a), what is the breakdown of the waiting list by (i) priority 1, (ii) priority 2 (iii) priority 3; and (c) since January 1, 2016, what is the total number of new military housing units built on CAF bases, broken down by (i) year, (ii) base, (iii) type of housing?

(Return tabled)

**Question No. 560—Mr. Gerald Soroka:**

With regard to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police's (RCMP) efforts to crack down on fraud and information contained by the Canadian Anti-Fraud Centre: (a) how many individuals did the (i) RCMP, (ii) other law enforcement agencies, charge with fraud in each of the last five years; (b) what is the breakdown of (a) by the amount of fraud (under \$25,000, over \$100,000, etc.); and (c) does the RCMP exempt any Canadians from being charged under Canada's anti-fraud laws, and, if so, is the Prime Minister included in those who are exempt?

(Return tabled)

[English]

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux:** Mr. Speaker, I would ask that all questions be allowed to stand.

**The Speaker:** Is that agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

\* \* \*

**PRIVILEGE****GOVERNMENT RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS**

**Ms. Heather McPherson (Edmonton Strathcona, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. I am rising pursuant to Standing Order 48 to bring to your attention what I believe to be a breach of my privilege. Standing Order 48(2) requires written notice to be given to the Speaker to outline a member's intention to raise a question of privilege. An electronic letter was provided to the Speaker's office at the earliest opportunity, that being at 3:03 this afternoon.

Canadians are united in their support of Ukraine and want to know that the government is doing everything that it can to ensure that Ukraine has the support that it needs and to stop the Russians' illegal war and the genocide that is being perpetrated in Ukraine. Canadians want to know if the measures that the government has announced regarding sanctions are having the delivered or desired effect, or in fact any effect at all, on stifling the Russian economy and preventing any Canadian contributions, even in the most inadvertent and incidental way, to the unlawful war in Ukraine.

Our allies who have enacted sanctions have been and are transparent. There are some countries that will officially announce when a yacht or a luxury apartment has been seized, as well as the monetary value of that item or asset. Other European allies have already publicized similar asset seizures, with over \$2 billion seized by EU countries between late February and early April this year.

### *Government Orders*

I have repeatedly asked the government, both verbally during question period and in writing Order Paper questions to the Minister of Foreign Affairs and her parliamentary secretary, about the number of sanctions imposed and the value of the assets or property seized from the listed Russian oligarchs and their named relatives, and whether these measures have resulted in the halting of assets that could be used to purchase material or resources to harm Ukraine and Ukrainians. Canadians, of course, would very much like to know if the measures that the government is enacting and undertaking are actually working.

While I understand that Speaker's rulings have stated that the Speaker is not responsible for the quality of the answer, the Speaker does have an obligation to ensure that question period meets the standards set out by Bosc and Gagnon. For example, *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, Bosc and Gagnon, outlines a number of principles by which question period is governed. For example, it reads:

While there may be other purposes and ambitions involved in Question Period, its primary purpose must be the seeking of information from the government and calling the government to account for its actions.

If the primary purpose of question period is to seek information and call the government to account, how is it possible that the government provides incomplete or misleading answers?

Further, while Speakers have traditionally been reluctant to adjudicate on the quality of answers, it is nonetheless well within the Speaker's responsibility to ensure that the rules are followed and that the answers are provided. In this context, I will draw your attention to my specific case, namely the response, which indicates that the government would not answer, simply because it did not immediately have that information.

Mr. Speaker, this is not an example of an insufficient answer. It is an example of the government's abdication of its responsibility to provide an answer at all. In that context, I think it is appropriate for you to review this matter. Thus far, the Canadian government refuses to share even these basic, yet vital, details. Without this information, it feels very much like the government is hiding something. This raises concerns for me that perhaps the government has yet to take any meaningful, concrete actions, that it is just naming the names and not carrying out the enforcement.

The answers that have thus far been proffered to me in response to my numerous questions have been vague, incomplete or completely without any information at all. For example, the government responded to one of my Order Paper questions by writing that because it is unable or cannot provide complete information, it will provide none. I would argue that this response constitutes improper use by the government of the process of written questions, and it infringes on the member of Parliament's rights to hold accountable the ministry.

In chapter 7 of her November 20, 2004 report entitled "Process for Responding to Parliamentary Order Paper Questions", the then auditor general wrote this:

The right to seek information from the Ministry of the day and the right to hold that Ministry accountable are recognized as two of the fundamental principles of parliamentary government.

Written questions are one of the tools that Canadians, via their elected representatives, can use to force the government to be accountable.

I hope you will consider this matter seriously and recognize that it involves a prima facie breach of my privileges as a member of Parliament. None of the information that I have requested has been found in the government's responses.

● (1620)

#### SPEAKER'S RULING

**The Speaker:** I would like to thank the hon. member for having raised this matter.

It is true that the right to seek information and to hold government to account are at the basis of our parliamentary system. The member seems unsatisfied with the type of information and level of details obtained in response to questions raised in the House and through written questions placed on the Order Paper.

I will quote the *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, third edition, pages 529 and 530:

There are no provisions in the rules for the Speaker to review government responses to questions. Nonetheless, on several occasions, Members have raised questions of privilege in the House regarding the accuracy of information contained in responses to written questions; in none of these cases was the matter found to be a prima facie breach of privilege. The Speaker has ruled that it is not the role of the Chair to determine whether or not the contents of documents tabled in the House are accurate nor to "assess the likelihood of an Hon. Member knowing whether the facts contained in a document are correct".

This question is not a new one and the Speaker has indicated in the past that it is acceptable for the government, in response to written questions, to indicate that it cannot supply an answer. As such, in the Chair's opinion, this does not constitute a prima facie case of privilege, nor does it constitute a valid point of order.

It is my duty pursuant to Standing Order 38 to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Saanich—Gulf Islands, Climate Change; the hon. member for Cypress Hills—Grasslands, Agriculture and Agri-Food; the hon. member for Victoria, Climate Change.

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

● (1625)

[English]

#### ONLINE STREAMING ACT

**The Speaker:** Pursuant to an order made on May 2, the House will now proceed to the consideration of Bill C-11 at the third reading stage.

**Hon. Bill Blair (for the Minister of Canadian Heritage)** moved that Bill C-11, An Act to amend the Broadcasting Act and to make related and consequential amendments to other Acts, be read the third time and passed.

**Mr. Chris Bittle (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, today I rise to lead our consideration of third reading of Bill C-11, the online streaming act. This is not our first time dealing with this type of legislation. Bill C-11 is largely the same as the previous bill, which was adopted by the House on June 2021. The main difference between the two are changes in the approach to social media and the correction of drafting errors.

Our government reintroduced reforms to the Broadcasting Act in February of this year. Our goal with this legislation is to modernize the act so that it continues to serve Canadians in an increasingly digital age. Bill C-11 also delivers on our government's promise to update the act in support of Canadian content.

We Canadians are known for our rich and diverse culture. This is no accident. Rather, it is a consequence of bold action taken in the past. Our culture is the result of deliberate decisions Canadians have taken to support it, not the least of which is the Broadcasting Act, a crucial piece of cultural legislation.

The Broadcasting Act is not new. It was last amended in 1991, when I was still at Mary Ward elementary school in Niagara Falls. The years since have seen a rapid innovation in all sectors regulated by the act. The Internet has gone from a rarity to something that we hold in the palm of our hands. TV Guides have been thrown out in favour of on-demand streaming. Music has become ubiquitous, thanks to robust digital libraries. Films are now more available and instantly accessible, more than ever before. It is like having a Blockbuster store right in our own home. If we are talking about 1991 references, that is a good one to make.

In short, how we produce, access and think about content has changed dramatically. Our updates to the Broadcasting Act will continue to serve Canadians now and in the future as well as it has in the past.

I would like to highlight four main ways the online streaming act will serve Canadians.

First, Bill C-11 will ensure greater representation in our entertainment media for minority communities in Canada. Diversity is a cornerstone of Canadian identity but it is not a given. Representation matters. We must make sure that all Canadians can see themselves reflected in the stories they engage with.

Bill C-11 makes it possible for minority communities to be better seen and heard in our digital media. Some of these communities include francophones, indigenous peoples, minority language communities, LGBTQ+ persons and persons with disabilities. Canadian programming is telling those stories. It is up to us to make sure those voices are heard loud and clear, and that even more diverse voices can join them. *Kim's Convenience*, a show produced by CBC, follows a Korean family who runs a small business in Toronto, a distinctly Canadian experience. *Schitt's Creek*, another Canadian television program, leads with LGBTQ2S+ characters.

It is stories such as these that make us proud to be Canadian. They make us feel at home and they also make us feel seen and heard. We must not underestimate the power of seeing these kinds of stories on our screens. We must take action to make a welcoming space online for a diverse chorus of voices. This action includes

### Government Orders

taking steps regarding allocation of resources, which brings me to my second point.

The audiovisual interactive media sectors contributed over \$19 billion to Canada's GDP in 2020. It is an important segment of the Canadian economy, yet industry trends are worrisome. Current market trends anticipate a decrease in the production of Canadian television content by approximately half a billion dollars by 2025, compared to 2020. That is a 13% decrease and 13% fewer Canadian voices to be heard.

The year 2020 was not an optimal year either. That year, Canadian television production declined by \$320 million compared to 2018. These numbers are not figments of our imagination. They are facts. The industry is telling us that it needs our support and we should listen. Bill C-11 proposes interventions that can change the trajectory of these projections. If passed, the Department of Canadian Heritage projects that Canada's cultural production ecosystem could benefit by more than \$1 billion annually in mandated contributions. Greater financing means that additional funding would be available to Canadian productions, which would lead to more diversity in our broadcasting.

The risk is not purely economic. We are also risking the livelihood of tens of thousands of Canadians. Film, television and broadcasting production sectors represent 165,000 jobs. We need to protect the stability of those employment opportunities, especially as we come out of a pandemic.

● (1630)

The pandemic limited the revenue streams of Canadian artists and creators. Many had to reinvent how they share their gifts with the world. We all benefited from their resilience. We found solace in their music, we travelled through film and we experienced community through television. Creators are there when we need them, and Bill C-11 is our way to give back to them.

Creators told us they did not want to be subject to regulations in the online streaming act, and we listened. Their work will not be considered commercial, regardless of how much money they make. Our legislation would ensure that productions of digital-first creators do not face additional hurdles. Traditional broadcasters have long been subjected to certain requirements that bolster Canadian creators. We must ensure that new broadcasters, such as streaming platforms, offer our sectors the same backing. Bill C-11 would make that a reality.

*Government Orders*

My fourth point is to do with the support of artistic innovation. We wrote Bill C-11 to advance artistic innovation, not to hinder it. One of the ways we would be advancing innovation would be by changing our primary regulatory tool. As it stands, broadcasters must obtain broadcasting licences from the CRTC before they can operate in Canada. This is the bread and butter of current regulations. In this legislation, we have adopted a new approach: the condition-of-service model. Under our new model, broadcasters, both traditional and digital, could operate in Canada as long as they respect the conditions laid out by the CRTC.

The new conditions of service could be updated at any time. Previously, updates would only be made during the licensing renewal process, or every five to seven years. Our proposed model would give the CRTC the ability to seek contributions from broadcasters in support of Canadian storytellers, be they musicians, TV producers or filmmakers. All of these updates would ensure that regulations can evolve alongside the industry, rather than chasing to keep up.

I would like to change gears for a moment. I have laid out the four key things the online streaming act would do to improve cultural development and equity in Canada, but let us take some time to look at what the act would not do.

I will start with the most fundamental point. Bill C-11 would not regulate the Internet. I will say it again, because we hear it from the other side: Bill C-11 would not regulate the Internet. Traditional broadcasters have been regulated by the Broadcasting Act for decades. Television personalities were never regulated by the Broadcasting Act. This principle would not change under Bill C-11. The legislation would update our definition of “broadcasters” to include the platforms many of us get our content from.

The online streaming act would regulate foreign streaming companies, such as Netflix and Spotify, and domestic ones, such as Crave. Social media platforms that function as broadcasters, such as YouTube, could also fall under these regulations, but only the social media service itself would have responsibilities under Bill C-11. Content creators would not be subject to regulations. Platforms are in, and users are out.

Bill C-11 would not control what Canadians view online. On the contrary, it would pave the way for folks to view more Canadian content. With Bill C-11 we would be making it possible for Canadians to create more stories that resonate with their fellow Canadians. This fact goes back to my earlier point about the need for equal representation on our screens and in our earphones. We want to ensure that Canadians in the cultural industry face no closed doors when they tell their stories. The online streaming act would not limit the choices of Canadians, and this bill would create more choices for consumption, not less.

I want to assure every Canadian that, if this bill becomes law, their ability to choose what they watch and what they listen to would not change. We will always protect Canadians' freedom of expression.

The legislation would not overturn the Broadcasting Act. It would modernize the Broadcasting Act so that the good of that legislation continues to be experienced by future generations of Cana-

dians for years to come. History has shown us the importance of supporting broadcasting through legislation. Thanks to the Broadcasting Act and the work of parliamentarians who passed and amended it, we grew up consuming and loving Canadian content. This content has played a role in establishing our collective identity.

Our country is vast. Geographic separation can isolate us from province to province, territory to territory and region to region. Our shared experience of viewing and listening transcends the distance. It is one of the things that unites us. The actions and achievements of past parliamentarians made it possible to hear languages we did not speak, to see coasts of our country we had not seen and to listen to music unlike what we heard in our homes.

• (1635)

Our job is hold open even richer cultural experiences for coming generations of Canadians. Part of my identity as a Canadian is thanks to people who saw value in giving me those experiences. I would like to return the favour for future generations.

The COVID pandemic was a challenge for many of us. We watched local businesses struggle, community theatres close and film productions cease. Despite all of this disruption and chaos, many large streaming platforms had pandemic gains. Netflix is one example. The company gained 16 million new subscribers at the beginning of the pandemic. Fairness is paramount, and streaming services should hold no preference. As they solidify their place in our media landscape, they must be subject to wise and fair regulations. Bill C-11 could require online streaming platforms to contribute to the production of Canadian audio or audiovisual content. This bill could also require them to financially support the training of Canadian creators. This kind of financial support makes a big difference in the lives of many people.

Bill C-11 is before us today, thanks to the dedication of Canadians, public servants, industry professionals and parliamentarians. The Broadcasting Act guided the creation of great Canadian content for many years. We are grateful for the experiences it enabled us to share in the current era it helped us usher in, but we cannot let past decisions determine what tomorrow looks like. It is time for Canada to take greater control in today's digital era to fight for greater representation; to strengthen cultural growth and cultural sectors; to safeguard jobs and music, film and television production; and to evolve with the times and not fall behind them.

*Government Orders*

I am proud to stand behind legislation that will help Canada do that. I would like to commend the Minister of Canadian Heritage for his passionate defence of this legislation. His leadership has been critical in getting the bill to this point. I would also like to thank the Minister of Environment for the work he did on this legislation when he was the minister of Canadian heritage.

Now it is our turn to act. In passing this legislation, we will bring about a new era of Canadian content creation. We will ensure a promising future for our artists, our creators and our storytellers. We will shape what future generations think of when they picture what it means to be Canadian. Let us give them a future they can see themselves in.

With that, I invite my hon. colleagues to support this legislation.

**Mr. Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, there are two comments that stood out in that speech.

At one point, the member referenced that the bill would not control what people would say, but would only open the door for more Canadian content. In other words, that is the government, through this bill, controlling what people would see on the Internet, even if it is more Canadian content. The member might agree that seeing more Canadian content online is good, but again that is the algorithms taking away choice and determining what Canadians will actually see and be pointed to in their viewing activities on the Internet.

Second, I believe that during the committee hearings, Mr. Scott, the head of the CRTC, stated in reference to section 4.2 that this bill “allows the CRTC to prescribe by regulation user-uploaded content subject to very explicit criteria.” How does the member square what the CRTC is already saying about this bill with his words today here in the House?

• (1640)

**Mr. Chris Bittle:** Mr. Speaker, as for controlling what Canadians watch, the Broadcasting Act regulates television. I do not make the member watch Roughriders games, nor does the government or the CRTC make him do that. If he wants to watch the BC Lions, he is free to do that. If he wants to watch American football, he is free to do that.

With respect to algorithms, the law specifically prohibits the CRTC from regulating algorithms. With respect to what Mr. Scott said, what the member and Conservatives have left out is that Mr. Scott said the current legislation, as drafted, already allows the CRTC to regulate online platforms, but that Bill C-11 builds a wall around it. Platforms will have obligations; users will not. That is how it has been for the last 50 years under the CRTC for traditional broadcasters. It will continue to be the same for online streamers.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the parliamentary secretary for his speech. I am going to give him a break from questions about censorship and the CRTC's control over the Internet, if Bill C-11—

**The Deputy Speaker:** I must interrupt the member. It seems there was a problem with the interpretation, but it is working now.

The hon. member for Drummond can restart his question.

**Mr. Martin Champoux:** Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, I will give my colleague, the parliamentary secretary, a break. I will not talk about censorship. I will not talk about the enormous power that the CRTC will have over what Canadians and Quebeckers can and cannot watch online either. I think that we agree that the bill we are discussing contains no such horrors.

However, in the short time we had to discuss the amendments, there was something that troubled me, and that was the issue of the degree to which foreign companies will be required to use homegrown talent and creators.

We tried to submit a minor amendment that would have forced online companies to maximize their use of homegrown talent, creators and artists, but it was rejected. I would like to hear the reasoning behind this refusal to also make foreign companies maximize their use of Canadian and Quebec resources.

[*English*]

**Mr. Chris Bittle:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. member for his question and his collaboration during the debate and throughout committee work.

I know the Bloc, the Liberals and the NDP work very well together to ensure that we do hear diverse voices and that we do act to protect the French language, both within Quebec and outside of Quebec. That is what we are building on. In the Broadcasting Act, we are building on the others who have come before us in order to ensure that the voices and how Canada looks, how Canada sounds and how Canada communicates are reflected back at us.

I know we can quibble about amendments and I know the member was very passionate about that amendment, but I know we both stand behind the principle of this legislation, which is to ensure that strong voices in Canada, including strong francophone voices, are heard in our digital landscape as they have been heard under the Broadcasting Act with traditional broadcasters.

**Ms. Laurel Collins (Victoria, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, modernizing the Broadcasting Act is important, and levelling the field between Canadian broadcasters and web giants is essential. Even with these needed changes, Netflix, YouTube, Facebook and other web giants still do not pay their fair share on the profits they make here in Canada.

Why is the government delaying the implementation of a digital services tax? Why are they protecting the profits of the web giants and refusing to make them pay their fair share?

**Mr. Chris Bittle:** Mr. Speaker, I think we have to be careful, because there are web giants—and I know Netflix was mentioned in that group—that contribute heavily to Canadian production, employ many Canadians and provide many good union jobs as well. We should be careful when we are lumping everyone in to one particular group.

*Government Orders*

I agree that this legislation is about ensuring a level playing field. Our traditional broadcasters, although people will say what they will about the Bells and Rogers of the world, are Canadian companies. Large foreign companies should have to play by a similar set of rules. I do not know why the Conservatives are taking the side of huge foreign companies like Google or a Chinese company like TikTok over Canadian companies in Canada. It has been disappointing this entire time.

• (1645)

**Mr. Darrell Samson (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Veterans Affairs and Associate Minister of National Defence, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I really appreciated the member's speech. It gives Canadians a very good understanding of what the bill does and what it does not do. As a member of Parliament, my job is to be out there on the ground speaking with constituents and finding out how they feel. I am sure my colleague, in his constituency and in travelling as part of his job as the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage, is also travelling across the country and having those discussions.

What are the creators and artists on the ground saying this will do for them? Are they happy with this or not?

**Mr. Chris Bittle:** Mr. Speaker, I have had the opportunity to speak to creators large and small across the country. We had Gord Sinclair of The Tragically Hip before our committee. The member for Kingston and the Islands will not like me phrasing it this way, but a band from a small town in eastern Ontario that grew to be a huge success across the country benefited from previous legislation. He came to our committee to say he wants to see the next Tragically Hip and that Bill C-11 will do that.

We have been hearing that from artists across the board who have had significant success, and some who have not. The artistic community has been united in their support, from what I have heard on Bill C-11, and it is something I ask all members of this House to pass so that we can get that help to our artists.

**Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP):** Mr. Speaker, on this rare occasion, I actually had an amendment passed on Bill C-11, and it was with the aid and assistance of the hon. parliamentary secretary.

I wonder if he would like to expand on that experience of collaboration in the interest of community broadcasting and engagement of citizens through community non-profit activity, an aspect of Bill C-11 that has not been referenced much so far in this round.

**Mr. Chris Bittle:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. member for Saanich—Gulf Islands. Once again we find ourselves working together on a piece of legislation in a collaborative way. As we saw, amendments were accepted, I believe, from all parties in this House, including the Green Party and the Conservative Party, which stands opposed to this legislation.

I had the opportunity to meet with community broadcasters, which are a fundamental part of who we are. I would like to thank the hon. member for her amendment and for taking the time to stand up for those voices, because it is important for us to be local as we move out in the digital age. A lot of times we lose that local experience, which is so important in knowing what is going on in our communities in a basic way. In an era of disinformation, more

local sources provide us with better context and better information than the information we get from strangers on YouTube, so I want to thank her for helping to strengthen the Broadcasting Act in that way.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, my friend made reference to the industry as a whole, and it is a very important industry nationwide and in our communities, where literally hundreds of jobs are generated that support our arts. I wonder if the member could provide his thoughts in regard to the size of the industry and how much that means to Canada.

**Mr. Chris Bittle:** Mr. Speaker, this is a multi-billion-dollar industry. As I said in my speech, the industry employs 165,000 Canadians, and it is not just traditional broadcasters or traditional industries but digital creators too, and we do not want to separate them; they are all artists. Digital creators and traditional creators are all creating and benefiting our economy. It is important that we stand up and contribute and grow that number of 165,000 people employed in this industry, and Bill C-11 will help us along that way.

• (1650)

**Mr. Blake Richards (Banff—Airdrie, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, freedom of speech is a fundamental right in Canada. It is enshrined in our Charter of Rights and Freedoms in fact. Section 2 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms states:

Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms:

- (a) freedom of conscience and religion;
- (b) freedom of thought, belief, opinion and expression, including freedom of the press and other media of communication;
- (c) freedom of peaceful assembly; and
- (d) freedom of association.

These rights are what makes Canada a modern democracy. They are not trivial principles. They should not be up for debate. Interfering with fundamental rights is the sign of a dying democracy, yet the Liberals have shown, time and time again, that they are dead set on desecrating this right by regulating and censoring the social media content that Canadians are able to see online.

I just want to go back a little with the history. This bill was first introduced back in November 2020, as Bill C-10, and by February 2021, the Liberals had removed a clause from the bill exempting user-generated content, which extended the legislation to encompass everyday social media content created by Canadians. Before the bill could pass in the last parliamentary session through both Houses of Parliament, I raised a point of order and exposed the Liberals' reckless approach to implementing this bill. I submitted in my point of order that several of the amendments to Bill C-10 that were made in committee needed to be struck down because the government's committee government members had grossly exceeded their authority in more ways than one.

This point of order, which was upheld in its ruling, effectively defeated the chances of the bill being able to proceed before the Liberals called their early election back in 2021. Then, of course, to no one's surprise, when Parliament reconvened after that election, the bill was re-introduced as Bill C-11, which we have before us.

In order to ensure its passage, the Liberals decided to pass Motion No. 11 in the House, which has allowed them to push through the passage of this legislation by bypassing standard procedure. When that was not enough, the Liberals decided to pass several motions to shorten the committee's study and to limit witnesses, and then accused Conservatives of filibustering every time we opposed one of those anti-democratic motions.

Last week, the Liberals finally moved closure through Motion No. 16 to force the bill through committee clause-by-clause consideration with limited or, in many cases, no debate. On June 14, just last week, the Canadian heritage committee was forced to sit from 11 in the morning until 12:15 at night to complete clause-by-clause of 172 pages of amendments, over 100 of which were passed without allowing for so much as one second of debate.

I would say that bypassing debate and rushing through an unprecedented bill is an insult to Canadians, and it only allows the government to avoid accountability. Parliament has a democratic responsibility to thoroughly examine the implications of Internet regulation, and Canadians deserve to know the truth about this deeply flawed bill. The Liberals are stifling freedom of speech by curtailing parliamentary process.

Ironically, by limiting MPs' ability to speak, the Liberals are symbolizing the censorship contained within this bill. The government does not just want to regulate the Internet and hinder freedom of speech, it is also determined to interfere with parliamentarians' right to speak and debate the same legislation that is looking to interfere with people's rights and freedoms.

Back to the bill itself, under the auspices of amending the Broadcasting Act, the legislation contained in Bill C-11 infringes on the rights and freedoms of every single Canadian who uses social media. This bill would give bureaucrats at the CRTC sweeping powers to regulate online social media content based on famously irrational criteria. It would allow the CRTC to decide what content it considers to be Canadian enough, and then force social media companies to promote that content and bury the so-called un-Canadian content, so it would be nearly impossible to find. This would effectively result in censorship.

• (1655)

Moreover, analysts are saying that the bill could allow the CRTC to automatically subscribe Canadians to a certain list of Canadian YouTube channels, such as the CBC, without even asking their permission. It already mandates that cable providers do this in the subscriptions they offer to Canadians, so for the CRTC officials, I am sure doing so online would only be the next logical step in their mind.

Essentially, the government has decided that Canadians are not responsible enough to choose for themselves what they want to see on social media, so it is turning on the parental controls. This notion that Canadians need to be made to watch certain content that

### *Government Orders*

has been deemed as socially and culturally appropriate by the government and discouraged from watching other content is the result of an out-of-touch, paternalistic approach to governing what seems to stem from Liberal elitism.

As it stands now, Bill C-11 would determine what content is Canadian enough based on a famously flawed and outdated points system, which was developed in the 1980s, decades before the advent of social media. This black and white points system designed for legacy media, has resulted in a series of truly embarrassing rulings from the CRTC in recent years. For example, an Amazon Prime series focused entirely on the Toronto Maple Leafs was ruled to be not Canadian enough under this points system. The film adaptation of the famed Canadian novel *The Handmaid's Tale* was also deemed to be not Canadian enough, and *Deadpool*, the award-winning Marvel movie based on a Canadian character, filmed in Vancouver and co-written by a Canadian, was also deemed to be not Canadian enough under this system.

Maybe we should take some comfort in the fact that the minister responsible has promised to review and update these criteria for determining what is Canadian enough, but, then again, maybe not. Strangely enough, the minister boasted about a meeting with the German minister of culture to consult with her about how to update these criteria for determining what should be considered Canadian content. He decided it would be a good idea to get on a plane, fly across the Atlantic on the taxpayer dime, and talk with Europeans about the best way to approach Canadian legislation on what is Canadian content. Maybe the minister could have consulted with Canadians instead. They are the people he has actually been elected to serve. This is just an idea.

Of course, the minister has said that he will not reveal how he is planning to change the rules until after the bill passes through Parliament. By doing this, he is leaving both Canadians and parliamentarians completely in the dark about what his legislation is going to look like in practice. It begs this question: What content will the Liberal government deem to be Canadian enough on people's social media? Will it have to be made by Canadian citizens? In that event, what about permanent residents or people here on study or work permits? Will it have to be produced in Canada? What would that mean for Canadians living abroad who make social media content? Will it have to be only in an official Canadian language? What would that mean, then, for cultural groups in Canada who speak another language?

Perhaps, and I suspect this is the actual plan, the Liberal government will require that content producers subscribe to a certain set of values to be truly considered Canadian content. The Liberals already demand faith-based groups to adhere to the Liberal Party's stance on certain issues to meet the eligibility criteria for the Canada summer jobs program. Therefore, it would be fair to assume that they will likely do the same in determining what content would be considered Canadian on the Internet or on social media.

### *Government Orders*

The most alarming power given in this legislation is slipped into an unassuming clause buried in the text of the legislation that quietly allows the CRTC to create regulations “respecting such other matters as it deems necessary for the furtherance of its objects”. These 14 little words give the CRTC a blank cheque to act however it likes and arbitrarily create regulations whenever it feels it is necessary. CRTC bureaucrats are not elected officials, and they do not answer to Canadians. They should not be able to unilaterally create new regulations. It would be undoubtedly undemocratic to give them such broad, sweeping powers.

Under Bill C-11, the minister responsible assured Canadians that amateur content such as cooking videos or cat videos that people upload online would not be regulated under this proposed regulation, but officials at YouTube Canada were quick to respond to this comment by asserting that they had studied the legislation and the bill certainly would give the government the power to regulate amateur content.

• (1700)

I certainly know who I would believe with respect to that. That means that any content posted on any social media service could be subject to these arbitrary standards. One thing is clear. The Liberals are determined to censor our social media content, and that, by itself, is wrong.

On top of that, with the legislation being this broad, it is impossible to discern why something could be censored or the motivations behind it even. The Liberals are essentially saying to Canadians that they are going to censor what social media content we can access. They will not even tell us how they are going to censor it, but that it is okay and to just trust them on this one. I do not think so. I do not think most Canadians think so. We have seen far too many examples of the government trampling on charter rights to trust it.

We have seen how, under the Prime Minister, the government tested facial recognition technology on millions of travellers at Toronto Pearson International Airport without their knowledge or their consent. What happened to freedom?

We have seen how the government has been collecting cellphone data since the beginning of the pandemic without the consent of Canadians. What happened to freedom?

We have seen how, during a largely peaceful protest in downtown Ottawa, the government invoked the Emergencies Act to use unjustified and extraordinary powers against its own citizens. What happened to freedom?

We have seen how the government has discriminated against people based on their personal medical choices to bar them from air travel, despite a complete lack of scientific evidence. What happened to freedom?

In a recently revealed submission to the Department of Canadian Heritage, Twitter protested the recent proposals that would allow the government to block website access on the Canadian Internet saying that the measure would be similar to the kind of censorship found in places like China, North Korea and Iran. The submission goes on to say that the proposed measure “sacrifices freedom of ex-

pression to the creation of a government run system of surveillance of anyone who uses Twitter”. What happened to freedom?

The government is obviously not interested in respecting the rights or freedoms of people. The alternative to Bill C-11 is freedom. The only solution is to keep the government out of the equation.

Canada has long been home to many renowned actors, film makers, artists, performers and social media icons. It is belittling of the government to think that the only way Canadian art and culture can survive is through punitive legislation that forces people to watch it. The quality of Canadian content speaks for itself. The last thing it needs is to be propped up by a Liberal censorship regime.

Without government intervention, social media can continue to be a free market of ideas, content and information. Under this system, individual Canadians are left to decide for themselves what they want to see on social media. They will watch what they want to watch and ignore what they do not. Only under this self-regulating system can freedom truly exist.

Therefore, I move, seconded by the member for Mission—Mat-squi—Fraser Canyon:

That the motion be amended by deleting all the words after the word “That” and substituting the following:

“Bill C-11, An Act to amend the Broadcasting Act and to make related and consequential amendments to other Acts, be not now read a third time but that it be read a third time this day six months hence.”

**The Deputy Speaker:** The amendment is in order.

For questions and comments, we will go to the hon. parliamentary secretary to the government House leader.

• (1705)

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, talk about seeing something that is just not there. I think conspiracy theory 101 is the lesson from the other side here. What Bill C-11 is all about is fairly straightforward. It is the modernization of the Broadcasting Act. It is as simple as that. Maybe the Conservatives get a gold star nowadays if they mention the word “freedom” in their speeches. I do not know where the member is getting the information from.

If the member wants to be consistent with what he said, does that mean the Conservative Party of Canada's new approach to the CRTC is to get rid of it? Are they saying the CRTC regulations should not be applied to other media streams? Is that what the Conservative Party's position is today?

**Mr. Blake Richards:** Mr. Speaker, the member suggested I am seeing things that are not there. I think he is actually right. There are some things I am seeing that are not there.



*Government Orders*

What I am seeing that is not there is the idea of freedom from the government, the idea of respecting people's rights, the idea that we can actually let Canadians choose for themselves what they want to see on the Internet, what they want to see on their social media and what they do not, and the idea that we can actually enable Canadian content producers to produce the great content they produce without the need for the government to prop them up with censorship.

Those are the things I am seeing that are not there. Those are the things the government is doing, and those things should not be there.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Yves Perron (Berthier—Maskinongé, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, this again feels like a bad movie where the Conservative Party members are opposing just for the sake of opposing.

I will ask my colleague a two-part question. I hope his answer will show me that they are not opposing for the sake of opposing, in this case.

He spoke about local Canadian content and how to determine whether content is local. He seemed to be criticizing the implementation of a point system. He gave the example of a movie that talked about Toronto but was filmed in the United States. From what I understood, he seemed to be saying that it would be acceptable to consider that movie Canadian content. I am sorry, but if the royalties and all the actors were paid in the U.S. and all that money is going to stay in the U.S., then I do not think that qualifies as local content, just like an Australian movie that talks about Quebec would not be considered local content either.

I have two questions. First, if we do not have a point system, a mathematical formula or some fairly logical way of assessing whether content is local, how are we going to determine that? What does my colleague propose?

Second, is he really opposed to showcasing Canadian content and giving jobs to people here, whether in Quebec or Canada?

[*English*]

**Mr. Blake Richards:** Mr. Speaker, I think the member was referencing an example I used of a film about the hockey team the Toronto Maple Leafs. I do not know what his objection is to a Canadian hockey team being in a film. Maybe if it was the Montreal Canadiens he would be more open to it. I do not know.

He also mentions the idea of several other examples I used, and I used the example of *Deadpool*. It was filmed in Canada and co-written by a Canadian. It is about a Canadian character. What does he see as not being Canadian there? That certainly sounds pretty Canadian to me, so there are obviously some flaws in the way the system works, and the government is proposing to take that system and apply it to our social media as well. There are clearly problems, so why would we want to impose a system that is already flawed onto further content? It does not make any sense to me.

**Mr. Dave Epp (Chatham-Kent—Leamington, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my hon. colleague from Banff—Airdrie for his opinion of the direction the government has given to the CRTC to implement Bill C-11. What does he think of the direction? I have not seen it.

**Mr. Blake Richards:** Mr. Speaker, I think that question gets at the heart of one of the challenges with the bill. I mentioned during my speech the fact that there essentially is a lot of room for interpretation, and a lot of grey area, in terms of how this would all be implemented. I think leaving Canadians in the dark in such a way, when we are talking about essentially censoring what kind of content they can see without even knowing how it would be censored and in what ways, makes for greater concerns than the fact that things are going to be censored to begin with. I think that really gets to the heart of one of the big problems with the bill, and I appreciate the member raising that and giving me a chance to highlight that one more time.

• (1710)

**Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP):** Mr. Speaker, it is the hon. member's reference to the TV and movie filming of *Deadpool* in Vancouver that made me think to rise and ask this question of him.

That is, of course, important programming and an important industry for the Vancouver area, but I want to ask him if he is aware of the fact that most of that kind of production value in Canada pays Canadian actors what is called "at scale". They are not paid anything like what the U.S. actors who come in and get dropped in to the community are paid, and a lot of the working crew comes in from the U.S. It does not employ Canadians. That is a lot of what I hope Bill C-11 may change in the future. I hope for a chance to really create a level playing ground, so that when Canada is used as the backdrop for films, even around a Canadian story, Canadians are not treated as second-class citizens.

**Mr. Blake Richards:** Mr. Speaker, the member raises her concern about the different pay she claims for actors from Canada or from the States or whatever it might be.

What we are talking about here is a very broad and very sweeping bill. If she really feels that there is a need to address that specific concern, I would suggest to her that this is certainly the wrong way to go about approaching it. We could say that maybe using a sledgehammer to kill a fly would probably, in that case, be a good way of putting it. What we are talking about here is something that would limit people's freedom of expression and limit people's freedom to view the content they wish to view, or to not view the content they wish to view. That is a pretty broad, sweeping piece of legislation.

If she is looking to address the concerns she has, I would suggest looking at legislation that would far more narrowly address those concerns and not limit people's freedoms: people's freedom of speech and their ability to choose the content they wish to see. That, to me, we can never accept in any circumstances.

**Mr. Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, when the government put forward the first iteration of the bill in the last Parliament, I received a number of communications from constituents who were concerned about amending the Broadcasting Act. The major issue they had with it were the channels they were forced to pay for when they bought a TV cable package.

*Government Orders*

Does my colleague believe that the Government of Canada is applying a similar type of approach to the Internet that so many Canadians disagree with, when it comes to all of the channels they are forced to pay for just to get basic television in their homes?

**Mr. Blake Richards:** Mr. Speaker, I think this a good question and a good point that the member raises. I know that this is something I hear frequently from many people. I have experienced that myself. We just want to be able to have a couple of extra channels that maybe will allow us to see a few more hockey games or something, and we are forced to buy a whole package of things that we do not even really want to be able to do that.

I have heard that many times from many people, and I think it really does come to the heart of the problem here, which is that we are taking what really is a flawed system that has been set up for legacy media and television: those kinds of things. It is already flawed, and we are going to take that and apply that to social media content and to other content on the Internet. It was already flawed for what it was doing.

It was designed back in the 1980s, so 40 years ago, and we are applying that to something new that was not even invented at that point in time. As I think I said, it was already flawed. It seems to me like that is a really big mistake.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I want to start my speech with an aside once again. I am definitely making a habit of starting my speeches with an aside. I want to do this and I think everyone will be fine with it, because last Friday was graduates' day. In Quebec, we celebrated students graduating from high school, CEGEP, vocational school and other schools. We applauded their efforts and their determination at an important step in their studies. I therefore wanted to take a few moments to commend graduates in the riding of Drummond. I am thinking in particular of Elsa Darveau and Ève Turgeon, two young ladies that I adore. Back home, I want to applaud my stepson Christophe and his girlfriend Sophia who are also headed to CEGEP. I want to commend and congratulate everyone graduating in Quebec and Canada, and all those taking this big step in their studies.

I hope that this will be the last time we rise to speak to Bill C-11. I am optimistic that it will be. We worked on Bill C-10, we worked on Bill C-11. It is time to pass this bill that our cultural and broadcasting industries have awaited for such a long time.

I must say that we put a lot of hours into Bill C-10 after it was introduced in 2020. The spotlight was on us, as members of Parliament, and we were being congratulated and patted on the back by our colleagues and others, but there is a whole team working behind the scenes. I want to acknowledge my support team, which did extraordinary work during our study of Bill C-10 last year and during our study of Bill C-11 now before us.

I especially want to thank my assistant Mélissa, who did an amazing job planning more than 60 meetings with stakeholders from all across the industry and who worked non-stop to prepare for the committees. She did an amazing job. I thank my friend Éric, who contributed his thoughts and experience, our research friends, Michael and Vincent, and the whip's team, Paul, Marie-Christine and Charles.

I want to say a special thank you to my colleague from Beauport—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île d'Orléans—Charlevoix, who is here in the House today. Last year, she held meetings on Bill C-10, and she put in a lot of effort. It was a bill that she cared a lot about. I imagine she is pleased today to see that Bill C-11 will be passed. She was a singer in a former life. Actually, that is not true. She will always be a singer. In fact, the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans has the opportunity to benefit from her talents at just about every meeting. I think this bill was particularly close to her heart because she has made a living from singing and she knows how important the Broadcasting Act is to the entire cultural industry. I therefore thank my colleague for her wonderful help.

I feel like I am giving a thank-you speech at an awards ceremony, but I think it is important. I hope others will follow suit.

I also want to say a big thank you to the interpreters, the committee staff, and the clerks' office staff, who do an absolutely incredible job, always behind the scenes. Without them, I do not think we would be able to get anything done. I want to sincerely thank them as well.

With that, I want to focus on a number of very important things that were added to Bill C-10, which I spoke about earlier. My pet analogy is that Bill C-10, as introduced on November 3, 2020, was like a blank paint-by-number. The numbers were there, but they were in need of paint to fill in the structure and content of a bill that was lacking on both fronts.

Earlier, the parliamentary secretary talked about Bill C-10 and Bill C-11 as though they were essentially one and the same. He is not completely wrong about that, but he should have said that it was actually the final version of Bill C-10 as amended and the version of Bill C-11 as introduced that were virtually the same. That is an important distinction because a lot of work was done on Bill C-10. Specifically, a lot of work was done to take out significant sections of the Broadcasting Act, for example, paragraph 3(1) (a) on the Canadian ownership and control of broadcasting entities. Last year, the Bloc Québécois proposed an amendment to Bill C-10 to replace it with the following: “the Canadian broadcasting system shall be effectively owned and controlled by Canadians, and foreign broadcasting undertakings may also provide programming to Canadians”.

● (1715)

The wording has changed a bit in Bill C-11. Without getting into it too much, we would have preferred the wording from Bill C-10, but this is still an important amendment.

*Government Orders*

We often say that the Bloc Québécois put the protection of French back into the broadcasting bill. That is true, and it is in Bill C-11 because we managed to add it to Bill C-10. Here is what the new subparagraph 3(1)(i.1) says: “reflect and support Canada's linguistic duality by placing significant importance on the creation, production and broadcasting of original French language programs, including those from French linguistic minority communities”.

There is an important nuance here that I think is worth bearing in mind and repeating. The bill talks about “original French language programs”, not programs in French. If we had stuck with “programs in French”, as the bill seemed to suggest before we amended this clause, then content dubbed in French would have been given equal weight regardless of the original language. What we were calling for, and it was entirely legitimate for us to do so, was original French content, meaning broadcasting companies would be required to produce original content in the language of Molière, Vigneault, Leclerc, Lévesque and myself.

I am talking a lot about Bill C-10 because we added a few things to it, some of which also made their way into Bill C-11, so they have been discussed again.

One of them was the issue of discoverability, which really got people talking. It has become quite hackneyed and used to spread appalling misinformation. I talked about discoverability in the House last week, and I think it is pretty straightforward as a concept. It aims to ensure that local content is promoted, easy to find and available on any broadcasting platform.

I cannot imagine anyone thinking to themselves that, yes, we produce great content but that we need to make sure that no one can find it, so as not to completely confuse the algorithms of the big foreign companies, which will stop liking us.

I was elected by Quebec voters, who want me to protect their interests. I was not elected by multinational corporations that are based abroad and who report virtually no revenue, pay virtually no taxes and contribute virtually nothing to our broadcasting system and our cultural industry in Canada.

I therefore have no problem imposing discoverability requirements on these businesses, because I find that it makes sense. I find it contemptible that this requirement has caused so much outrage and been used as justification by those who claim that this broadcasting bill essentially amounts to censorship.

Another very interesting addition made to last year's bill is the sunset clause. This emerged from the realization that the Broadcasting Act has not been updated, revised or amended for more than 30 years, and that if nothing were done, it would more than likely be quite some time before a new act were adopted or amendments made to the new Broadcasting Act.

Why would we not require a re-evaluation at specified times to make the necessary amendments and adjustments? That is one of the fine additions included in Bill C-10, and then in Bill C-11, and it will require the House to review the Broadcasting Act every five years. If some things are not being done properly today, we will not have to wait 30 years to correct them.

• (1720)

Bill C-11 has had quite a strange trajectory. We can agree that the process was a little messed up. In other words, it was short-circuited or neglected. I apologize; perhaps I could have used a better term.

It did not help that the Conservatives decided they were going to oppose the bill in any way they could, by filibustering during some very important meetings, even though the study process had already been planned out when the committee received the bill. In response, the government opted for a closure motion, which made it tough to talk about amendments and advocate for amendments.

This meant that the committee was not able to have the types of discussions it would normally have when amendments to bills are proposed. I think that the discussion can open members' minds. I wanted to hear my colleagues make arguments, even the ones I find far-fetched. In committee, we are meant to discuss, listen to what others say and keep an open mind. This is how we can amend Bill C-11 as effectively as possible.

A few Bloc Québécois amendments were rejected. I think the main reason they were rejected is that we did not have the opportunity to explain them. There was no room for debate, particularly on the control we want to have over online companies, or rather the control we refuse to have over them.

It is unbelievable. When we tried to force American, Chinese and international companies, foreign companies, to hire Canadian and Quebec human resources, creative resources and talent as much as possible, I was told that it is impossible because the companies are already investing a lot of money. I was told that we cannot force them to hire locals because that would be too upsetting. That is what I was told. These companies and the web giants say that they are already contributing a lot and that it would be inconvenient if they were forced to use Canadian resources as much as possible. To that I say, they are always nibbling away at the advertising pie and taking the revenues for themselves.

I really want members to understand this. People in this flourishing industry are on the verge of switching careers. They no longer have an income, and media outlets are closing up shop, yet web giants tell us they do not want us to impose those kinds of constraints. Our doormat of a Canadian government lies down and has no problem letting them walk all over it.

*Government Orders*

I sincerely hope the government will take a somewhat firmer stance, especially when it comes to orders the CRTC can give. The CRTC does actually require good faith negotiations between the companies that create programs and those that distribute or broadcast them, and obviously that includes online platforms in our current system. That means the CRTC would need the tools to impose fair negotiation rules should good faith negotiations not happen. That idea was turned down too.

I was told it would not work, that the government could not give the CRTC tools to respond should negotiations not take place in good faith. That means big corporations will be able to walk all over our little-guy production companies and carry on exploiting our Quebec and Canadian content creators for profit.

• (1725)

Who might need these negotiations to be protected? Small programming businesses might need that, although many of them have grown. Consider APTN, for example. APTN's wonderful model is being emulated around the world. New Zealanders were inspired by what APTN has done in Canada and created a similar channel. CPAC is another example. I think everyone here is quite familiar with CPAC. We can also think of The Weather Network. These are all businesses that need this protection, but they are not getting it because we think that if we are too strict with online businesses, they will be angry. Do we really think they will go away because they are angry? They make billions of dollars.

Here is another thing that really frustrated me. We hear about balancing the market, making the market fair to ensure that our traditional broadcasting companies are not penalized in relation to online companies. In that regard, I am quite happy that the part II fees, which imposed significant and onerous financial conditions on licensed broadcasters, have been dropped. I think dropping these fees should really help them, or at least give them a little breathing room. However, the CRTC still cannot issue orders.

Let us talk about one of the amendments that I thought did not make much sense:

The [CRTC] may, in furtherance of its objects, make orders imposing conditions on the carrying on of broadcasting undertakings that the Commission considers appropriate for the implementation of the broadcasting policy set out in subsection 3(1), including conditions respecting...any change in the ownership or control of a broadcasting undertaking that is required to be carried on under a licence.

I said that the idea of a licence should be removed because we want that to apply to online undertakings. However, that was rejected. People did not want that to apply to online undertakings. It is as though they were still scared of the big online company monster. It is as though they were afraid of stepping on the toes of the giant.

We are afraid to step on the toes of the giant, but that giant is crushing us and we are saying nothing about it. We think it is amusing because we can watch our movies and our shows. We do not even realize that our creators are starving.

Bill C-11 will pass. The result of the vote will be close, but it will pass. I hope that the fears of those who have profusely expressed them will be allayed when they eventually realize that the “censorship” and “control” of what they envisioned are fabrications. These arguments are pure fearmongering and really have no merit. All the rambling that took place over the past few months

and the Conservatives' systematic filibustering when Bill C-11 was being studied in committee has only resulted in the postponement of important studies, such as that of bill C-18.

More than 450 news businesses have closed their doors. This is a crisis. Because so much time has been wasted for unfounded ideological reasons, a slew of media outlets, including small regional media, are on the brink of closure, and I find that outrageous. I think that these people should show their frustration by pounding a table and making sure their MPs hear them. It is absurd that Bill C-18 cannot be studied sooner and that we must wait until the fall to discuss this urgent matter.

• (1730)

[*English*]

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate many of the comments that my colleague across the way made, but I take a different approach. He made reference to Bill C-10 and the amendment process. I think it clearly demonstrated the interest of the government, when modernizing the legislation, to get it right. We saw a number of amendments that, in fact, ultimately changed the form of Bill C-11, and I think that is good for the industry as a whole and for future Canadian content.

The member made reference to the word “freedom”, and I think there is a fear factor out there, as some are trying to say that this is a limit on an individual's freedoms. Could he provide his thoughts with regard to the issue of the Conservative Party in essence saying that this is an attack on individual freedoms?

• (1735)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Martin Champoux:** Madam Speaker, I have never bought into those kinds of theories of infringement on individual freedoms and freedom of expression. People have raised concerns, and I think those who have raised them have gotten answers. Done and done. On the other hand, people who have absolutely no interest in this, who are not open to any kind of regulation, will reject any argument that is presented, no matter what it is.

There are several other examples of this throughout history. I am fairly certain that in the western United States in the nineteenth century, a time of complete lawlessness, the people running the show and getting their way certainly did not expect any legislation to be forced on them.

Regulation is required in certain situations. In this case, we are trying to do it right, and we have taken a long time to do it. I do not believe that we will end up with something perfect, but it will be much better than the current lack of legislation.

*Government Orders*

**Ms. Lisa Marie Barron (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, NDP):** Madam Speaker, for many years, companies like Netflix and Disney+ have not paid their fair share to fund our Canadian cultural content. Does the member think the Liberal government should have acted earlier in its mandate to prevent all the job losses in our cultural sector that this delay has caused?

**Mr. Martin Champoux:** Madam Speaker, I congratulate my colleague from Nanaimo—Ladysmith on the quality of her French. That was perfect.

I could take 20 minutes to answer that question. Of course the government should have imposed tax rules on online businesses much earlier. Even now, I do not think adequate measures have been brought in, far from it.

When it comes to contributing to the broadcasting system, to the cultural industry and to content, some companies are making an effort and trying to do something, but it is still not nearly enough. I do not want to point fingers at every single company, because there are some that are trying to produce things here.

However, several aspects still need to be fixed or brought in. Rules and a legal framework are needed. Once the framework is in place, it will be much easier for these businesses to generate original Quebec and Canadian content that meets both our expectations and the financial needs of the community.

**Mr. Yves Perron (Berthier—Maskinongé, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I thank my very distinguished and much appreciated colleague from Drummond for his colourful speech in which he found a way to talk about giants that are crushing us, exploitation, advertising pie, rambling and a messed up process.

He also talked about paint-by-number, which is what we might think of when we look at the magnificent shirt he is wearing today and which proves that, when it comes to freedom of expression, there is always a way around things, even the very restrictive dress code in the House.

Essentially, I would like him to reassure us and our Conservative colleagues about freedom of expression.

**Mr. Martin Champoux:** Madam Speaker, I really do not feel like answering the question. I would much rather react to my colleague's comments.

Freedom of expression is a topic that we could debate for many hours. I would say that, when it comes to broadcasting legislation, there also needs to be parameters that in some way guide what we can and cannot say.

In fact, this is something that we already do in everyday life. There is a rather universal concept that is generally understood by all, in Quebec and across Canada that one person's freedom ends where another's begins.

There is nothing in this bill that infringes on freedom of expression. I am not sure if that answers the question from my colleague from Berthier—Maskinongé, but, since I am saving the two or three insults I have for him for later in private, I will stop there.

• (1740)

[*English*]

**Mr. Gerald Soroka (Yellowhead, CPC):** Madam Speaker, the member says freedoms are potentially always there. My concern is the fact that there are algorithms now that the CRTC is going to be using for whether or not the freedom of presentation of user content or generated content could potentially be censored. Other countries have tried something like this, and there is 80% to 85% censorship. That should never have been censored, because there is an algorithm that is determining whether or not something is censored.

Is the member concerned at all that by using an algorithm, there will be censorship?

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Martin Champoux:** Madam Speaker, that is the source of all the disinformation. There is absolutely no interference in the coding of algorithms. There is even a clause that states that the CRTC cannot require the use of algorithms.

In short, the purpose is to create performance objectives. How will that be accomplished? It will be up to the businesses to explain that to the CRTC. The CRTC will then give them the green light, provided that it is shown the results. No one will tell these businesses to change their algorithms to include Canadian content or other content, or that such content will be prohibited based on algorithms. That is simply not true. That concept simply does not exist.

**Mrs. Caroline Desbiens (Beauport—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île d'Orléans—Charlevoix, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I simply want to again applaud the expertise of the member for Drummond, who worked so hard and so thoroughly. I also applaud the brilliant idea of reviewing this law every five years.

Could my colleague tell us what he thinks the future holds for Bill C-11 and what amendments he predicts will be made in five years?

**Mr. Martin Champoux:** Madam Speaker, that is a very good question. We do need to give ourselves the latitude to review the legislation and change things that are not working. Things are moving so quickly with the arrival of these web giants. The digital universe is evolving so quickly that we can barely keep up.

I think we will have to keep an eye on this and monitor the evolving technologies and content consumption patterns. We do not consume content the same way that we did five years ago, and that will probably change again in another five years.

A provision requiring that the House review the Broadcasting Act every five years will allow us to keep up and make it so that we do not end up with a completely outdated law in need of a total overhaul 30 years from now.

**Mr. Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP):** Madam Speaker, before I begin, I am seeking the unanimous consent of the House to share my time with my colleague from Edmonton Strathcona, who, I should point out, does exceptional work.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** All those opposed to the hon. member moving the motion will please say nay.

*Government Orders*

I hear none. The House has heard the terms of the motion. All those opposed to the motion will please say nay.

Since no one is opposed, the motion is deemed adopted.

The hon. member for Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie.

**Mr. Alexandre Boulerice:** Madam Speaker, I am going to digress a little, but it is relevant.

Caroline Rivera has been on my team from the very beginning, for the past 11 years. I am sure that Carolina, who is of Colombian heritage, would join me in congratulating the leftist winner in yesterday's presidential election in Colombia. I congratulate Colombia's new president, Gustavo Petro, and vice-president, Francia Marquez, Colombia's first Black woman vice-president.

This momentous and historic event reminded me of a quote from another Latin American politician who inspired not only his own country but also an entire continent. He said:

*[Member spoke in Spanish]*

*[Translation]*

"Let us work together as progressives, as left-leaning men and women, to build a fairer and better society." Those were some of Chilean president Salvador Allende's last words in 1973 from his presidential palace.

That is all I have to share about yesterday's current events and history from down south. I now want to talk about the history that we are making right here, in the House. I am very pleased to speak on behalf of the people of Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, of Montreal and of Quebec in support of this essential and long-overdue bill. The funding ecosystem was outdated and obsolete, and the act had not been thoroughly reviewed in the past 30 years. We ended up with a broken and completely unbalanced system in which creators and our artistic industry, our artists, artisans and technicians, were penalized while others were passing go and saving \$200. They were not collecting the money, but they did not have to spend it.

My point is that funding for a whole lot of our television, film and music creations flowed in large part through the Canada Media Fund, which was funded by cable companies back when they had the market to themselves. We said they were the ones with the pipeline and the container, so they would have to pay to put content in the pipeline. That is why the cable companies of this world—Videotron, Shaw, Rogers and Bell nowadays—had to contribute to a fund to support the production of Quebec and Canadian cultural content. It worked pretty well for several years, I must say. It is absolutely crucial to making sure our stories are told and our culture is shared here at home and around the world.

We reached a tipping point when the system stopped working and became unfair and inequitable. That was when new online broadcasters hit the scene. Now they are the ones pocketing mega profits by streaming tonnes of content live and online. I am talking about companies such as Netflix, Disney+ and YouTube that did not exist 30 years ago of course. They were not planned for. We found ourselves in a situation where cable companies, which had fewer and fewer subscribers and therefore less and less revenue, were the only ones paying into the media fund, so the fund was

shrinking. Meanwhile, all the new digital broadcasters that were growing so fast did not have to pay a penny.

• (1745)

It was hurting our producers, our creators, because a large part of that money was not being invested or spent. That meant that some productions were shelved.

The other important point to remember is that we are also dealing with web giants that do not pay their taxes. They do not contribute at all to the general coffers, to our collective wealth, to help pay for our public services. Some will say that that is a whole other debate. Yes, it is a debate about the taxation of web giants, but it is also relevant here because web giants are also not paying their share in this situation. That is extremely important.

An estimated \$3 billion is invested in an artistic, television, film and musical production. By requiring these digital broadcasters, these web giants, to pay their share, Bill C-11 will add more than \$1 billion to this industry. We are restoring the balance, injecting money from the web giants who have, unfortunately, been benefiting for years from not paying. We need this bill to restore the balance and to support our creators in a much more effective and visible way.

There is a lot that could be done with this money. It would mean more productions, more content, more jobs. This is about our identity and about jobs in the cultural sector. It will translate into more sets, technicians, artisans, directors, screenwriters and writers. It is absolutely essential and important.

I believe that this will help us ensure that those in the music industry, who are currently paid peanuts by streaming services such as Spotify, will potentially earn more thanks to the rules that will be established. Members will recall the very frank statement by singer Pierre Lapointe at a ADISQ gala. He spoke about the amount of money he earned, a few hundred dollars, for hundreds of thousands of views or streams of one of his songs. We are obviously well aware that this system could not continue. It did not make sense and it had to be fixed. That is what we are doing, albeit a little too late. This should have been done sooner for many of our creators, but it is not too late to do the right thing. We could not continue with the existing situation.

Bill C-11 is important. The NDP was also successful in getting amendments passed that improved the government's original bill. We are very proud of that. I had a request from people in Montreal who asked us to clarify and better define the mandate of Radio-Canada International, which has unfortunately suffered cuts over the years. At the very least, they want to save what is left, so that our news is broadcast around the world in several languages.

Speaking of languages, one of the first amendments we passed to improve and amend the broadcasting bill had to do with all indigenous or first nations productions. They will receive more support, more money to share their stories, their realities and their experiences in their communities, in French and English, but also in indigenous languages, if they so desire. We strengthened those measures and have done the same for other groups of citizens, such as racialized people and people with disabilities. These were priorities for the NDP. We put forward these amendments and we succeeded in getting them passed.

Another issue is more support for community television and community radio, which are really very important in many regions and many parts of the country. I think it is important to flip the curve that put community television and radio at a disadvantage. This injects a little more money and support.

Yet another issue is enhanced protection for local jobs in Quebec and Canada, greater protection for our creators' intellectual property, more protection for freedom of expression and, to enforce all that, more powers enabling the CRTC to oversee it all for the good of society as a whole.

• (1750)

[*English*]

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, we often hear, during the discussions, whether it is today or in second reading, about the industry as a whole. I am thinking in terms of the creators and the artists, but there is also a great deal of background work that is involved. From managing the stage to maintaining the programs, there is a litany of other opportunities and jobs.

I am wondering if the member could provide his thoughts in regard to the industry, as a whole, which goes far beyond just the creators and the artists.

• (1755)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Alexandre Boulerice:** Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for his comments and his very pertinent question.

When we talk about cultural content, of course we think of the artists we see on stage, the actors and actresses in a TV series or film. They are the stars, the ones who go to galas and win awards. That is all fine, and we congratulate them.

However, my colleague is quite right to point out that there is a whole industry behind the scenes, including stage technicians, people who look after the sound and lighting, and people who provide the food. There is the whole administrative side, including the accountants who work for the cultural industry, for example. There are dozens of quite different jobs, and these employees do not appear on screen. They are not the ones we see, but they are there and are driving the industry forward. Their jobs enable them to bring home an income to support their families, pay the rent and buy groceries. I think Bill C-11 is good news for all those people.

**Mr. Yves Perron (Berthier—Maskinongé, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I would like my colleague to further clarify the very im-

### *Government Orders*

portant concept of discoverability. How can we establish processes to force platforms to make local content more visible? How does this not threaten freedom of expression, despite the criticisms we have heard, which I think are highly exaggerated?

**Mr. Alexandre Boulerice:** Madam Speaker, when it comes to Bill C-11, it feels like Halloween. Some members tried to scare people. They disguised themselves and it was just awful.

My colleague is absolutely right. The concept of discoverability is very important. We see that with the new digital broadcasters. There are algorithms that more or less decide what we see on the page when we open the app or the site. YouTube is perhaps the best example of that.

If the song, video or show is not available or easily found by the person who uses Netflix or Disney+, this Quebec or francophone culture will not be consumed. Rules are needed, and it will be important for the CRTC to be clear in its directives to ensure that Quebec and Canadian works are visible and relatively easy to find when the person goes to the digital broadcaster's site. If not, if those works end up 158th on the list, no one will ever see them and that will not advance Quebec or Canadian culture.

**Mr. Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ):** Madam Speaker, my colleague from Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie talked about Halloween and the fright nights we went through in committee.

In his opinion, if the committee had had the usual length of time afforded to the study of a bill, if everyone had participated in good faith and if committee members could have pursued debates on amendments proposed by the NDP, the Liberals, the Conservatives, the Bloc and even the Green Party, could the committee have improved the bill we will be voting on this week?

**Mr. Alexandre Boulerice:** Madam Speaker, much of the work was also done during the study of the old Bill C-10, so we need to look not only at the study of Bill C-11, but at all the debates on the Broadcasting Act.

People in the cultural community, especially those in Quebec, told us there was an urgent need to act and warned against missing this opportunity. That is why it was so important for us to press the government to move forward and pass this bill. Too much time has been wasted already.

[*English*]

**Ms. Heather McPherson (Edmonton Strathcona, NDP):** Madam Speaker, it is my privilege to stand in this place and speak to Bill C-11.

I have to begin by saying that I was one of the members of the heritage committee in the last Parliament when Bill C-10 came forward. I greatly appreciated working with my colleague from the NDP, the heritage critic in the last Parliament, and I thank him for his intervention today. I learn so much every time he speaks. He is such a very clear communicator. I greatly appreciate the contributions that he has made to this debate this evening.

*Government Orders*

I also want to recognize some of my friends in this place right now who were on that committee, with whom I very much enjoyed working. Unfortunately, I will not say that was the same for all members of our committee, but I will get into some of that detail in a little while.

To start with, I want to talk about just how vital this Bill C-11 legislation is. It is so important that we take the opportunity to level the playing field between the web giants, these big multinational corporations, and the artistic community in Canada. I am talking about the artists and the venues that support those artists, which are then in turn supported because we have a strong artistic community. The theatres, newspapers and radio stations, all of these things that get support when we level the playing field are so important. I am going to go through some of the organizations in my riding and say a little about them later on.

I want to just highlight a couple of things we have heard about over and over again from the Conservative Party. That is that Bill C-11 applies to user-generated content. They know that is not true. They know that except for very specific examples, that is not the way this bill has been set up. We know that this bill provides opportunities for indigenous people. It provides opportunities for programming for Canadians to hear and be exposed to indigenous language programming. It supports minority communities.

Many people do not know this about Edmonton Strathcona, but there is a huge and very vibrant francophone community in my riding. It is a part of why I have spent so many hours, not very successfully, I will say, trying to learn French so that I can speak French in this place and recognize the vital role that francophones play in our community in Edmonton Strathcona.

These are the things that we are pushing for with Bill C-11. When I sit at committee I hear, of course, that the Liberals brought this bill forward and they support the legislation. The NDP strongly supports this legislation as well, and the Bloc Québécois supports the legislation. The Green Party, which I think one of my colleagues mentioned, under—

• (1800)

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** I have to interrupt the hon. member.

The hon. Minister of Justice and Attorney General.

\* \* \*

**BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE**

**Hon. David Lametti (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I request that the ordinary hour of daily adjournment of the next sitting be 12 o'clock midnight, pursuant to order made Monday, May 2.

[*Translation*]

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** Pursuant to order made on Monday, May 2, the minister's request to extend the said sitting is deemed adopted.

I invite the hon. member for Edmonton Strathcona to continue her speech.

[*English*]

**ONLINE STREAMING ACT**

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-11, An Act to amend the Broadcasting Act and to make related and consequential amendments to other Acts, be read the third time and passed, and of the amendment.

**Ms. Heather McPherson (Edmonton Strathcona, NDP):** Madam Speaker, I look at the House, and I look at all of those who are supporting the legislation and know how important it is that we bring forward this long overdue legislation. Then, I see the Conservative Party not supporting it, and I question that. I wonder why that is the case.

Part of me thinks that it is because right now they are without a leader and they are, in fact, blocking everything that happens in the House. They have been filibustering our foreign affairs committee for over a month, and they are blocking us from being able to do the jobs we want to do in this place. Maybe that is part of it, but then I think about when the Conservatives were coming to the committee when we were looking at Bill C-10, and I will make a bit of a joke that I made then.

The member for Lethbridge yelled “freedom” so many times that I swear she seemed a bit like she was imitating *Braveheart*, except I would say in *Braveheart* they only yelled it once, so perhaps she could be a little more succinct. Also, when we were in committee, we saw a literal turning door of the “front-benchers” of the Conservative Party coming to our committee wanting to talk about Bill C-10. This would be good and important, if we had ever seen any of those members come to our committee to talk about COVID supports for artists.

If I had ever seen the member for Carleton come to my committee to talk to our group about how we need to support artists in his community, that would be one thing. If I had ever seen the member for Calgary Nose Hill come to the heritage committee to talk about truth and reconciliation and the acknowledgement of September 30 as the Day for Truth and Reconciliation, that would be another thing. We never saw any of that. We just saw them then, so I am asking myself why this is the case.

I actually talked to one of my Conservative colleagues who said that every time they sent out an email on Bill C-10, they raised about \$2,000. I have to think that this looks a lot like a fundraising campaign. This does not look a lot like good policy to me. This looks a lot like there is an option there to make some money, and of course that is hard for me to understand and hard for me to accept, because Edmonton Strathcona is the heart of the artistic community, as well.



We have a strong francophone community, but we also have an incredible artistic community, so I do not want members of that community to suffer and I do not want members of that community to not have the opportunity to benefit from taxes being raised or from funds going into the cultural community. For example, when Bill C-11 is put in place, over a billion dollars will go back into our cultural community in Canada. That is not taxes. I want to make it really clear that this is something the web giants would pay. It is not something the government would pay. Multinational corporations would be paying into our artistic sector.

What I think about is how much money Netflix has, how much money YouTube has and how much money all of these multinational corporations make, and why I would not want them to pay their fair share to support organizations like the Blues Festival in Edmonton Strathcona, the Edmonton Folk Music Festival, the Edmonton Fringe Theatre Festival, the Edmonton Heritage Festival, the SkirtsAfire Festival, theatre groups like the Alberta Musical Theatre Company, Concrete Theatre, where my good friend Miekio Ouchi used to work, Firefly Theatre and Circus, Fringe Theatre and Grindstone Comedy Theatre. I can tell members they had the most incredible Pride event there just a couple of weeks ago, and anyone in Edmonton Strathcona during Pride needs to go the Grindstone.

We have the Northern Light Theatre, we have Theatre Yes, we have Blues on Whyte, the Northern Alberta Jubilee Auditorium, the Metro Cinema and the Myer Horowitz Theatre. Outside of my riding is the Starlite Room, but I still visit it quite regularly. The Starlite Room had one of my very favourite concerts: I got to listen to Propagandi, a Canadian band, play there. Just a couple of weeks ago on my 50th birthday, I got to see Corb Lund sing, and I will tell members he is someone they should not miss. They should certainly be trying to support the Timms Centre, the Old Strathcona Performing Arts Centre, Varscona Theatre, Walterdale Theatre and the Yardbird Suite.

● (1805)

Francophone organizations in my community include the Chorale Chantamis, the Chorale Saint-Jean and the Flying Canoë Volant, where, as I have probably told everyone in the House, one can race a canoe down a ski hill, dressed up as a beaver. Also, there is L'Association Franco-Albertaine de L'UniThéâtre, the Fête-franco-albertaine and the FrancoMusik Alberta Association. There are alternative media that this would support, including the CJSR radio network of the University of Alberta, The Gateway and Le Franco.

All of these organizations are really important and integral to my community, and every one of these organizations could benefit from this fund. They could benefit from the money that would come in from multinational corporations.

I am never going to stand in this place as the member of Parliament for Edmonton Strathcona to fight for the rights of big corporations over the rights of artists, over the rights of community groups and over the rights of the small organizations that make Edmonton Strathcona so incredibly special.

**Hon. Kerry-Lynne Findlay:** Madam Speaker, on a point of order, my understanding is that the government has said that there would be extended hours tomorrow and that can only be done when there is consultation with leadership of the other parties. There has

### *Government Orders*

been no consultation with the Conservative Party, so for that reason those extended hours should not be granted.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux:** Madam Speaker, on the same point of order, because the Speaker has made a ruling on this in the past, if the government indicates through a minister that we are looking at extending hours, the assumption is that the consultation has taken place and there is another party that supports the initiative.

● (1810)

[*Translation*]

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** The hon. member for Berthier—Maskinongé on a point of order.

**Mr. Yves Perron:** Madam Speaker, I rise on the same point of order.

The Bloc Québécois would like to point out that we also do not know who agreed to this and that we were not even consulted. Regardless of what has been said in the past, there are several political parties in the House, and it would have been respectful to consult our House leader on whether our party agrees.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** I thank hon. members for their interventions. As the Chair has previously pointed out, the motion adopted on May 2 simply states that a minister must have the agreement of another House leader. It does not require that the parties to the agreement communicate to the House. Therefore, there has already been consultation with at least one party, leading to today's motion.

Resuming questions and comments, the hon. parliamentary secretary to the government House leader.

[*English*]

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I appreciate many of the comments that my colleague has brought forward. One of the things that is really important for us to recognize is that over the years we have seen significant change. In the early 1990s, when the Internet really started to take off, we started to see more streaming really beginning. It was not really until the late 1990s. The Broadcasting Act has not been amended in any significant way since then. I wonder if the member could provide her thoughts on why it is so critically important, just recognizing technological changes, for this act to be modernized.

**Ms. Heather McPherson:** Madam Speaker, my colleague is absolutely right: The world has changed. A Broadcasting Act that was brought forward in the 1990s would clearly not be sufficient for what artists in this community are facing today. In fact, I am just going to quote, if I could, from a constituent in my riding. She is, in fact, Juno prize-winning singer and musician Maria Dunn. She wrote to me with her support for Bill C-11, and said that “online broadcasters must have the obligations to invest in and showcase Canadian creations.” This is from a Juno-winning artist whom I have the great privilege of representing in this place, so we can all say that what was appropriate in the 1990s cannot be considered appropriate now in 2022.

*Government Orders*

**Mr. Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon, CPC):** Madam Speaker, earlier in our debate today, the government of Canada outlined that its intent was not to regulate the programs and content that Canadians were viewing online, but simply to open the door to more Canadian content. In other words, it was skirting the question. Mr. Scott, the chair of the CRTC, said during the proceedings that this bill, Bill C-11, would allow the CRTC to prescribe regulation to user-uploaded content.

Does the NDP support more oversight over what Canadians want to view, especially as it relates to the arts and culture sector?

**Ms. Heather McPherson:** Madam Speaker, the reality is that what people see online is already being regulated. It is being regulated by multinational corporations that are not paying their fair share. They decide what people get to see. They already do that, and they do not contribute. To say that there is somehow going to be some strange oversight that is going to go too far is really misleading, and is really disappointing to hear.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I want to congratulate my colleague from Edmonton Strathcona for her speech. As she mentioned earlier, I had the pleasure and privilege of working with her on Bill C-10 last year.

I almost rose earlier on a point of order. I believe there is a standing order that states that we cannot lie and we cannot spread misinformation. I believe I heard my colleague say that she was 50 years old. Enough is enough. We are being taken for fools. This colleague is not 50. If she is 50, then I am 85.

That said, I recall that we worked very hard to advance Bill C-10 last year despite the obstacles we faced. I would like to know whether my colleague has had the chance to take a look at what is in Bill C-11, and if she found that there were things missing that we had added to Bill C-10.

Are there amendments that she would have wanted to make to Bill C-11 this year, even with the good work done on Bill C-10?

• (1815)

[*English*]

**Ms. Heather McPherson:** Madam Speaker, I would just say that it was very kind of my colleague to comment on my age and me not looking that age. Perhaps I will take this opportunity to wish my father a very happy Father's Day and to thank him for his genes.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** Resuming debate, the hon. parliamentary secretary to the government House leader.

I cannot imagine that he can beat that comment.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, you are quite right. It is quite the comment to follow.

I look at Bill C-11 from a totally different perspective from the official opposition: from how they see the bill and interpret the legislation. Understanding that things change through time is really important here. It seems to be something the Conservative Party has not necessarily realized yet.

I raise this in the form of a question. When we talk about how things change over time and the need to modernize the legislation, I figured it would have been fairly easy to argue why Bill C-11 was so important to Canada. We need this legislation. I want to talk about why it is so important that we have this legislation shortly.

Suffice to say, when I was first elected in the eighties at the Manitoba legislature, we did not have very much when it came to Internet services. In fact, those were the days when we actually had to use the telephone line: We would hear the dial up, the long buzz and then one would know they were on the Internet by a certain sound that came through the computer speakers. It took a while to see that take place.

A few years later, as we started to get into the nineties, things became a whole lot more advanced with the Internet—

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** There is a point of order by the hon. member for Fort McMurray—Cold Lake.

**Mrs. Laila Goodridge:** Madam Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of the chamber the lack of quorum in this place. I understand a motion was passed on this, but it is really sad that we are discussing such an important piece of legislation and there is no quorum.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** The hon. member is aware that there are members participating virtually as well, but I will take a minute to double-check quorum and will get back to the hon. member.

*And the count having been taken:*

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** Between members in the House and those virtually, there is quorum.

Resuming debate, the hon. parliamentary secretary to the government House leader.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux:** Madam Speaker, it is interesting to be interrupted with a quorum call. Many people working throughout the day often go to the MP lobby to get something to eat. I suspect we will find that on all sides of the House. It does not mean there is a lack of interest in what is taking place. The lobby is just through the door.

I want to pick up on the point that things have changed. Back in the nineties, the Internet started to speed up in a very significant way. There was nothing called Netflix when I was first elected. When we look at the speed that is required to have the type of streaming we have today, it was not even being imagined by most people back then. That was the time we last saw the modernization of Canada's Broadcasting Act.

*Government Orders*

Most Canadians understand and appreciate why it is important to have the CRTC, for example. Based on some of the arguments put forward by the Conservatives today, I am beginning to think they would get rid of the CRTC if they were put in government. That is just based on some of the comments they have put on the record. However, if we reflect on the important role that the CRTC has played in Canadian society, it is really—

• (1820)

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** There is another point of order by the hon. member for Fort McMurray—Cold Lake.

**Mrs. Laila Goodridge:** Madam Speaker, I call quorum.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** I will check on quorum one more time.

*And the count having been taken:*

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** There are more than enough members for quorum at the moment.

I will return to the hon. parliamentary secretary to the government House leader.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux:** Madam Speaker, the games continue to be played. At the end of the day, I can assure everyone that there is a keen interest in this, at least on behalf of three political entities in the chamber. Members of the Liberal Party, the Bloc, the NDP and the Green Party recognize the true value of the passage of Bill C-11. It is only members of the Conservative Party of Canada who seem to want to bury their heads in the sand, not realizing that as time passes, technology changes. The advancement of the Internet has dictated the need for us to bring forward legislation of this nature.

We are bringing forward this legislation to ensure there is a level playing field. Unlike the Conservative Party of Canada, we care about an industry that provides billions of dollars to our economy and provides opportunities to creators, actors and so many other people from coast to coast to coast. It is only the Conservative Party of Canada that does not realize the true value of Bill C-11. Instead, what we get a sense of with the new Conservative Party is a hard right turn.

If we look at the member for Carleton and some of the things he has been talking about—

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** We have a point of order by the hon. member for Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon.

**Mr. Brad Vis:** Madam Speaker, I have risen on this point of order on more than one occasion already in response to the member for Winnipeg North. Categorizing the Conservative Party as a hard-right political party is not parliamentary language and insinuates that my party is hateful. I kindly ask that the member take back that comment and continue his debate in good faith.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** That is more a point of debate. However, I would ask parliamentarians who participate in debate to be mindful of how they categorize individuals. Generally, for parties, it is a bit different, but we still want to make sure we do not walk that fine line.

The hon. parliamentary secretary to the government House leader.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux:** Madam Speaker, to be a bit more sensitive to the member opposite, we have this hard reform element within the Conservative Party. Many of them are Reformers, and that is pretty far to the right. We saw that today. If we listen to and read some of the things the member for Banff—Airdrie put on the record today, it is almost as if the Conservatives get a gold star in the back room if they mention the word “freedom”. If they say the word “freedom”, it is a good thing.

It is interesting that just before question period got—

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

• (1825)

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** There have been a lot of individuals thinking out loud or wanting to participate while the hon. parliamentary secretary has the floor. I want to remind those members that there will be a 10-minute question and comment period, so if they could hold off until then, that would be greatly appreciated.

The hon. parliamentary secretary.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux:** Madam Speaker, the point is that we are getting a mentality that is overcoming the Conservative element of the party today, something which—

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** We have a point of order from the hon. member for Prince George—Peace River—Northern Rockies.

**Mr. Bob Zimmer:** Madam Speaker, my point of order is about using phraseology in this place that is parliamentary. Only a Liberal would find the word “freedom” offensive. It is unreal.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** Again, that is a point of debate. I would ask members to make sure their points of order are actual points of order, because this takes away time from the hon. member for Fort McMurray—Cold Lake and other speakers.

The hon. parliamentary secretary has 14 minutes. Then there will be 10 minutes of questions and comments.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux:** Madam Speaker, I believe I should get a bonus two minutes because of the number of interruptions I have had.

The member made reference to the word “freedom”. At the end of the day, the Liberal Party of Canada does not need any lesson from the Conservatives with regard to individual rights and freedoms. After all, we are the party that brought in the Charter of Rights. We are a party of the charter. We understand what freedoms are all about.

As for the Conservatives, on the other hand, I would again remind them to look at some of the things their colleagues put on the record today with regard to Bill C-11, as if it is some sort of an assault on the freedoms of Canadians. The parliamentary secretary, in introducing it and speaking to it earlier today as the first speaker from the Liberal side, emphasized a couple of points about what the bill is not. It does not regulate the Internet. The bill—

*Government Orders*

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** We have another point of order from the member for Fort McMurray—Cold Lake.

**Mrs. Laila Goodridge:** Madam Speaker, I would like you to check online again, as I believe we continue to have an issue when it comes to quorum, and also confirm whether someone having their camera on but not being visible in the shot actually constitutes quorum. I believe that has already been ruled on.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** I thank the member. It is an issue for all parliamentarians. It is something they do on a regular basis. They may turn their camera off for a bit and then turn it back on. When I am looking at the screen here, I just see that they are on. I would have to double-check to make sure if their cameras are on or off.

*And the count having been taken:*

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** Right now we have quorum just in the House.

The hon. member for Elmwood—Transcona is rising on a point of order.

**Mr. Daniel Blaikie:** Madam Speaker, I am wondering if the Conservative members are looking beyond their own benches when they call quorum or if they are looking at the House as a whole.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** When we call quorum, we look at the House as a whole.

The hon. parliamentary secretary to the government House leader.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux:** Madam Speaker, I was emphasizing what the parliamentary secretary for heritage indicated at the beginning of his comments, which is that Bill C-11 would not regulate the Internet, nor would it control what Canadians will see. It would not put any limitations on the individual freedoms of Canadians.

On the other hand, shortly after the member made those statements in representing the government, we had one of the freedom fighters within the Conservative Party stand up and talk about the peaceful demonstrations in Ottawa, the heavy arm of the government, other off-topic areas and why people should be concerned about freedom being taken away. I do not know how many times he used the word “freedom”. I could not help but think about the member for Carleton, or the member's statement earlier today when he talked about freedom oil.

The Conservatives are really starting to focus in on that word. I do not know why, because when we talk about Bill C-11, nothing could be further from the truth. They know that, yet they continue to do what they can to prevent this legislation from passing. We saw that at second reading. We saw that at the committee stage. There is no will from the Conservative Party to see this legislation pass, and if not for time allocation and if not for the support of most of the parties in the House, we would not be able to get it passed.

I want members of the Conservative Party to realize what would happen if this bill does not pass. We all have artists, creators and other people in our communities who directly or indirectly work in this industry, which is so critically important. We heard some of the job numbers. We are talking about thousands of people across this

country in every region who, in one way or another, either directly or indirectly understand the importance of Canadian content. They understand the importance of levelling the playing field.

How can we say to the mainstream media, for example, whether it is CTV or CBC, that they have to comply with CRTC rules but we should not apply similar rules to streaming services? Only the Conservative Party would argue that the status quo is good enough and we do not need a change, even when it has been clearly demonstrated that our industry in Canada is hurting. The industry itself is asking for the types of changes the Government of Canada is proposing, yet the Conservatives are not listening, I would argue, to what their constituents are saying.

There is a leadership vacuum taking place within the Conservative Party, and there is no doubt about that. Maybe that is one of the reasons they find themselves on the wrong side of Bill C-11. However, I would remind my Conservatives friends that they should reflect on the importance of those jobs and Canadian content.

We have a lot to be very proud of. I remember that many years ago, we had *The Beachcombers*. It was set in an area of B.C. that I learned about when I was relatively young because of that particular program. However, I do not believe that program would have existed if not for the Government of Canada having programs in place to ensure Canadian content.

● (1830)

We have seen some incredible productions with Canadian content. We have heard reference to *Schitt's Creek*. It is an interesting program. I did not even hear about it until I heard about the Emmy Awards it won. Then I started talking about it and all of my colleagues seemed to have heard about the program. It can be streamed online from Netflix. It is an excellent program. Another is *Corner Gas*, a show set on the Prairies. My colleagues from across the way should have an appreciation for the importance of that particular program.

We have seen some amazing talent over the years. Some of my favourites would be individuals like Anne Murray and Celine Dion. There are some incredible talents. If we take a look at the important role that CRTC has played in ensuring and fostering Canadian content, we should all have a better appreciation of the important role that government, whether it is through the CRTC or in other ways, could play to support that critical industry.

I have talked a great deal about a program called Folklorama in the province of Manitoba. For me, Folklorama embodies a great deal of what one would classify as amateur talent that will ultimately travel the world and get onto screens and radio programs. It is a great feeder. When I think of Folklorama, and it is coming up in the month of August, it is a significant production. It is roughly 50 pavilions of all different ethnic groups. It is often said people can travel the world by coming to Winnipeg in the first couple of weeks of August and visiting the different pavilions.

What people would find is some incredible talent, whether it is singing, acting or dancing. As I have pointed out, it is not only about those who are on the stage. There are also the production teams. We have made mention of the creators. We have talked about those who provide the lighting, the sound and the transportation, the bringing to and from. We have talked about the rentals as a direct result and even the sense of just feeling good knowing that a particular production is taking place in the community. These are all direct benefits. This is one of the reasons why the government needs to be involved.

When we think of Bill C-11, it is not just what we might see on Netflix or CBC, or hear on a radio program. It filters its way down. Many of the people I talk about when I think of things such as Folklorama will graduate to become professional actors or actresses and be engaged in our artistic world.

The member for Edmonton Strathcona made reference to the numerous musical and theatrical activities in the city of Edmonton in the province of Alberta. I could talk about the very same things in the province of Manitoba. I suspect we could go from coast to coast to coast, and we would find some amazing organizations, the vast majority of which are non-profit, that are a part of their communities in very real and tangible ways.

• (1835)

Many of those organizations will ultimately be provided opportunities because of regulations and because of organizations like the CRTC, because we recognize just how important it is to have Canadian content. It is about levelling the field. When I talk about the Internet, from yesterday to today, we need to recognize, very clearly, that through the Internet there are large worldwide organizations. The most obvious one that people make reference to is Netflix, but there are others that are out there, whether it is Crave, Pure Flix or other organizations, that are looking and sourcing revenue and opportunities in Canada but are not contributing their fair share.

That is what Bill C-11 is really about. Not only does it continue to recognize the importance of the industry to Canada and how critically important it is that we continue as we have over the last number of years in certain areas, but also how important it is that we level that playing field so that those who are streaming online will also contribute in an equal and more fair fashion.

By doing this, we will be able to reverse the trend. We have heard that the trend has not necessarily been positive. That is in good part because of online streaming. There are things we can do to reverse it, and by doing that we are creating opportunities, in particular, I would emphasize, for young people, for people who want to get into our arts community in a very real and tangible way.

I would hope that members of the Conservative Party would recognize the true value in supporting our young people and supporting the industry as a whole, reverse their position and agree to support and vote in favour of Bill C-11.

• (1840)

**Mr. Frank Caputo (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo, CPC):** Madam Speaker, it is always a pleasure to rise on behalf of the people of Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo.

### Government Orders

My colleague mentioned that shows like *The Beachcombers* and, if I understood his argument correctly, shows like *Corner Gas* may not be possible in the future if not for a bill like Bill C-11. Can he point the House to precisely where in the bill it empowers shows like *Corner Gas* and *The Beachcombers* to live on, given his argument?

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux:** Madam Speaker, the legislation enables the CRTC and the government to ensure that those who are streaming are contributing to the development of the industry here in Canada. It is not necessarily to say that those programs would never have stood a chance, but let us recognize that having things such as the CRTC greatly enhances the opportunity for artists all over our country to have future prospects and encourages more Canadian content to support minorities. Whether it is in our multicultural communities or indigenous communities, it provides for Canadians to tell our stories more than we could without the legislation. That is something that I suspect the member who posed the question could not deny.

**Mr. Brad Vis:** Madam Speaker, I am just rising on the earlier point of order related to the agreement to extend the hours. Both the Conservative Party and the Bloc have confirmed that they did not agree—

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** I am sorry. I am not going to allow that because I have already ruled on it.

[*Translation*]

The hon. member for Berthier—Maskinongé.

**Mr. Yves Perron (Berthier—Maskinongé, BQ):** Madam Speaker, if I wanted to tease my colleague from Winnipeg North, I would ask him what he thinks it means when colleagues leave the chamber while he is talking or when a bunch of points of order are raised, but I would not want him to take that the wrong way. I really like him, especially when he asks me questions that allow me to elaborate on our plan for independence.

I believe my colleague is a father too and someone was extending father's day wishes earlier. I want to take this opportunity to wish a happy father's day to my father, Gérard, who is 87 and worked hard his whole life.

I would like my hon. colleague to tell us about the importance of discoverability. Why is it important to showcase content that was produced by people in Canada?

• (1845)

[*English*]

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux:** Madam Speaker, the member is correct. I am a father and a grandfather, and I am very proud of my children and grandchildren. I know my father would be with me at least in spirit. It is important for us to recognize the important role that fathers play in society, along with mothers too obviously.

*Government Orders*

I really believe that the modernization of the Canadian Broadcasting Act provides hope for future generations of artists and creators and, as I always try to emphasize, the industry as a whole, because it is healthy. I know the province of Quebec has been absolutely incredible. Many would argue that it is one of the leaders of the country in terms of the artists who have come from the province of Quebec. There is truly amazing talent there, but it is also scattered throughout the country.

That is why we find so many members supportive of the legislation. It is long overdue. We need this modernization because the sooner we can modernize the act, the healthier and better it will be for the industry as a whole.

**Ms. Laila Goodridge (Fort McMurray—Cold Lake, CPC):** Madam Speaker, I want to thank my hon. colleague for his speech despite my point of order. It had nothing to do with the content of his speech. It was more about the process in the chamber.

My question is specifically around how the bill was sped through committee with the amendments. I sat late into the night last week as we were voting on amendment after amendment with no discussion and not even reading which amendment we were voting on. Does the member believe that is an appropriate way to govern business and discuss the legislation before us?

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux:** Madam Speaker, if the member wanted to get a really good answer, she should probably talk to her House leader. At the end of the day, I suspect that if there was a higher sense of co-operation and less filibustering, all members would have loved to see more opportunity to feel comfortable in knowing that the legislation would pass out of the committee stage in a timely fashion so that we could ultimately see the legislation pass before the summer break.

I suspect that had there been some sort of an accommodation for that and maybe a little less filibustering we quite possibly would have been able to have more dialogue on some of the amendments. It was a time issue as not only the government but members of the Bloc and NDP recognized that we needed to get the bill out of committee so that it could come back with the idea of hopefully passing it before the House rises later this week.

**Ms. Laurel Collins (Victoria, NDP):** Madam Speaker, web giants are going to be using every possible loophole to circumvent our tax rolls and circumvent the requirement to fund Canadian cultural content. Therefore, the government has a responsibility to ensure the bill does not contain any loopholes. In the interest of transparency, is the government going to make public the instructions to the CRTC to ensure the web giants fulfill their obligations of making Canadian content discoverable and disclosing their financial information to contribute to the development of our cultural content?

When does the government plan to send and disclose these instructions?

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux:** Madam Speaker, I would encourage the member to talk to the minister of heritage, who is looking at how we can ensure we protect our culture and our arts industry. That is one of the reasons why he was very quick to bring forward this legislation. That is one of the reasons why the government is so insistent, with the support of the NDP, in getting this legislation through. I am confident that we are taking a step in the right direction. No

doubt, as time goes on, we will have to ensure that the field is, in fact, being levelled.

• (1850)

**Mr. Frank Caputo (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo, CPC):** Madam Speaker, in response to a question from my hon. colleague, the hon. parliamentary secretary essentially laid the blame with the Conservative House leader for the amendments at committee being rammed through. The last time I checked, it was the Liberals and their coalition partners who have a majority there, so who is he to place the blame on the Conservatives for those amendments being rammed through in an otherwise clearly undemocratic fashion?

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux:** Madam Speaker, I have sat on both sides of the House, in opposition and in government. I know how often the Conservative Party has been a destructive force on the floor of the House of Commons. We have seen that amplified over the last number of months.

Even though I was not at committee, I can imagine just how disruptive they would have been, just based on some of the dialogue and some of the discussion that we have already heard in debate. We need to realize the Conservative Party of Canada does not like this legislation, so they are doing whatever they can to prevent its passage, unfortunately.

**Mr. Clifford Small:** Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Both the Conservative Party and the Bloc have confirmed that they did not agree to—

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** I am sorry. I am not going there on that point of order. I have already ruled on that, not just with you now, but also with the hon. member for Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon.

I ruled on this earlier. You are trying to challenge the Chair, and that is not acceptable.

[*Translation*]

We only have time for a brief question. The hon. member for Beauport—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île d'Orléans—Charlevoix.

**Mrs. Caroline Desbiens (Beauport—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île d'Orléans—Charlevoix, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I will try to be brief. I congratulate my colleague on his speech and for talking to us about people like Céline Dion and Anne Murray, who we are all very familiar with.

Some artists are represented by organizations or agencies in the business. Other creative artists, authors and composers represent themselves, as I do. I have 80 to 85 songs written and released and I have never allowed them to be distributed on social media for the simple reason that I was concerned that someone would take them and that I would not earn anything from them, because they are my property.

What does my colleague think of these creators who are not really represented but who have just as much right to the revenues from their royalties?

*Government Orders*

[English]

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux:** Madam Speaker, I learned that the member has a beautiful voice. Maybe at some opportunity I will get to hear it. I often find that songs sung in French sound a lot sweeter than it is when sung in English. I cite *Happy Birthday* as a good example. I look forward to maybe hearing her songs, and I applaud her having a strong character to ensure that her work is not stolen.

**Mr. Gerald Soroka:** Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Both the Conservative Party and the Bloc have confirmed that they did not agree to—

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** Again, we are broaching the same subject matter that has already been dealt with before the House. I would caution the Conservative members from raising a point of order on a matter that has already been raised, which means that the hon. members are actually challenging the Chair. Is that what your intent is, to challenge the Chair?

**Mr. Gerald Soroka:** Madam Speaker, no.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Madam Speaker, I just walked into the proceeding, and I wanted to ask to see whether the Bloc—

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** I am not going to entertain those anymore.

Resuming debate, the hon. member for Fort McMurray—Cold Lake has the floor.

**Mrs. Laila Goodridge (Fort McMurray—Cold Lake, CPC):** Madam Speaker, I will be splitting my time with the member for Perth—Wellington.

As members have heard through our debates over the last few weeks, Bill C-11 will set the stage for the federal government to have unfettered control in regulating what Canadians see on the Internet.

This expansion of the regulatory authority of the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission, better known as the CRTC, to all audiovisual content on the Internet is a radical and sweeping move that really raises concerns around accountability, government overreach and the protection of individual rights and freedoms in this country.

I want to be clear: Bill C-11 is a bill that would give the CRTC the power to control what Canadians find and post on the Internet. It is a fundamental change in the way we do broadcasting in Canada or what is considered broadcasting. The very idea that the government intends to introduce licencing of the Internet in the same way that radio and television are licenced in Canada ultimately means that creators must obtain speech by permission from the government.

From the very beginning, Conservatives have been opposing the ideological agenda of this inflexible and regressive legislation. We have now and always will stand up for our arts and culture sectors, and now especially it is important for us to make sure that we are standing up for our digital-first creators, who are facing a lot of uncertainty about their livelihoods.

Many of these witnesses were not able to be heard from in committee because of an arbitrary timeline that was set by the government.

This is not just targeting so-called digital giants such as legacy news media, Google or Facebook. In 2022, anyone with a cell phone can be a creator and have an audience on the World Wide Web.

While the heritage minister has misleadingly claimed that Bill C-11 is about creators and about making more Canadian content available, and that it would actually even the playing field, what we have discovered in committee is that this is not true. If Canadians want to watch our world-class Canadian content, there is absolutely nothing stopping them, so there is no need for specific content to be spoon fed to us. If passed, Bill C-11 would not create an even playing field for our Canadian content creators. Instead, it would allow a government body to close off certain creators for the benefit of a select few, essentially hand-picking winners and losers. That is something that, on this side of the House, we disagree with.

In its current form, Bill C-11 does not protect individual online content creators. Instead, it burdens them with an abundance of draconian rules and regulations that they are ill-equipped and underfinanced to engage with. The regulations are through the roof.

While the NDP-Liberal government claims that there is now an exemption for user-generated content, this bill gives the CRTC the power to regulate any content that generates revenue, directly or indirectly. That means that non-commercial, user-generated content, like picking up a cell phone and creating a video, could create indirect revenue, which would then fall under the purview of the CRTC.

Artists, independent content creators and experts alike have all been raising alarm bells about the impact of these changes. I think it is really important to read some of the testimony that we heard at the heritage committee, such as what we heard from Oorbee Roy. She said:

Not only does this bill not help me. It also hurts me and actively undermines my needs as an artist. There's no language in the bill to tell me otherwise.

Frankly, I don't qualify. I'm just not the right fit...

I literally have never gotten a seat at the table—except now, as a digital creator, I'm getting a seat at the table. Representation matters.... Please don't suppress my voice.

I read this into the record because I think it is very important to make sure we understand that this digital space is still fairly new, so trying to over-regulate it, which is exactly what Bill C-11 does, could have long-lasting impacts.

It is important to highlight the fact that it expands the role of the CRTC to allow it to impose new regulations on platforms such as TikTok, Facebook and YouTube, and whatever new platform has not even been created yet. These changes do not have to be passed through Parliament. These regulations will impact all Canadians who use online content, but there is no power for us, as parliamentarians, to make decisions on this. It leaves questions as to what is going on.

*Government Orders*

• (1855)

I think the best way to continue to showcase the amazing contributions of Canadian creators is to safeguard the protection of their freedom of expression. We have to enshrine the right of a Canadian to express their opinions, create content and speak freely so our rich Canadian culture is accessible to all. Frankly, without this in place, I have no trouble finding Canadian content on the World Wide Web, and I think that is something that is really important. We have an amazing set of artists who get out there.

One of the big pieces, after spending many hours in the heritage committee listening to amendments being debated, is that we failed to see any movement from the government on having a real conversation. We were voting on amendment after amendment, not even reading those amendments into the record. There was no idea of what we were debating most of the time, other than for those of us who had our package in front of us. Anyone who was following at home were completely out of luck. They did not even know what we were discussing. That is not the transparency that Canadians request from their parliamentarians. This is not the level of debate we should be having in the House.

I understand that members opposite will say that, “Oh, this is because the Conservatives were filibustering.” We were raising valid concerns that had been brought to our attention. There are tons of witnesses who want to present on this very important topic who have been silenced by the government, the NDP-Liberal coalition. There are people who want to make this the best possible legislation that it can be.

Quite frankly, I do not believe that we are at the best. I think that it is incumbent on each and every one of us parliamentarians to send the bill back to committee because, ultimately, we can do better, and we must do better. Just because something is difficult, just because we have an arbitrary timeline because the government really wants to get it passed by the summer, does not necessarily mean that is what we should do.

The Liberals dragged their feet on the previous iteration of the bill and let it die on the Order Paper when they called an unnecessary election last fall. The fact is that somehow this is now a priority for them, and they are trying to ram it through Parliament, rather than have a serious conversation and inviting digital-first creators to have some dialogue to make sure these changes we are making are actually going to benefit the sector and benefit Canadians. Ultimately, is it going to be something we will be proud of?

I am quite concerned that what we are doing is actually changing what Canadians will see online without any debate, completely behind closed doors, and it has been very clear from the expert testimony that the bill would allow the CRTC to regulate user-generated content. That is why, through a series of vital amendments, the Conservatives tried, we really did try to work with members opposite, to fix the bill.

I get it that the members opposite like to say, “The big bad Conservatives don't support artists, and they don't support creators.” That is not true. As someone who grew up dancing, singing and in a band, I understand that there are a lot of needs of artists. I understand very clearly that this is something that is so important, but we have to do it right. We have to do the right thing for the right rea-

sons, otherwise it is not right, and this is not being done for the right reasons at the right time in the right space.

I would urge all members to simply take the bill back to committee to allow us to have some meaningful conversation and debate on these amendments. At a very minimum, could we read the amendments into the record, so all members and everyone who was listening at home could at least know what we are discussing prior to us doing it? Also, there were errors when it came to translation. They were fixing the fact that the translation in the original bill was incorrect. That is how rushed the bill was. Not even the translation was accurate. That is just another example as to why we need to slow this down and send the bill back to committee to ensure that we have an opportunity to provide Canadians, especially those who create user-generated content, with the best possible bill.

• (1900)

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, does the member not realize that the Conservative Party, for hours and hours, whether in second reading or in committee, went out of its way to try to kill the bill? The Conservatives do not like the legislation, so they brought in a huge number of amendments to the legislation as a way to, again, prevent the legislation from passing. Then this particular member stands up and effectively said, “We just want to make a few amendments to it, and then we'll pass it. We can make it a better piece of legislation.”

It seems to me that the member is maybe not even consistent with some of the remarks from some of her colleagues today. The amendment is to kill the bill. The Conservative Party does not support this bill.

I would ask the member this: Does she support the CRTC?

• (1905)

**Mrs. Laila Goodridge:** Madam Speaker, it is awfully condescending of the member opposite. Despite the fact that there are many members in this chamber on his side, he constantly asks questions. He monopolizes the floor in here on so many occasions. For whatever reason, there are a number of members in here who are not allowed to speak. They are not allowed to ask questions, and so here we are. We are debating. We are trying to have a conversation here, and the member is concerned about trivial antics and trying to point fingers. I am here to try to make sure that Canadians have the best possible legislation, and that is exactly what Conservatives are going to fight for: the best possible legislation.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** Before I go to questions and comments, I want to remind members having conversations, especially on this side, because it is so close to the mike of the hon. member who was speaking, that it is not kind to go back and forth while someone has the floor.

Questions and comments, the hon. member for Drummond.



*Government Orders*

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for her speech. I agree with her on one point, and that is that we did not have enough time. We should have had more time to debate the amendments. However, when there is a gag order, there obviously comes a time when the amendments are no longer being read. That is true.

This was raised many times by my colleague during the clause-by-clause study in committee. There are many things that should have been discussed. I assume that my colleague was present during clause-by-clause consideration because she is familiar with the bill and our concerns about it.

I would like to hear her talk about the very important amendment that we proposed regarding paragraph 3(1)(f). It is one of the amendments, one of the clauses in the bill, that I think is among the most significant. I would like to ask her about the amendment that we passed with respect to paragraph 3(1)(f) specifically, and hear what impact she thinks it will have on digital companies compared to traditional broadcasting companies.

**Mrs. Laila Goodridge:** Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question. I think that 142 amendments were proposed for this bill. There may have been even more than that.

I do not remember the details of every single amendment, but I think it would have been worthwhile to debate them. However, we were simply told which amendment number would be voted on, starting at 9 p.m. That was not okay.

That is not how things should be done, and I want everyone to support the idea of sending this bill back to committee.

[*English*]

**Ms. Laurel Collins (Victoria, NDP):** Madam Speaker, I have in front of me quotes from the Alliance of Canadian Cinema, Television and Radio Artists; from the Canadian Independent Music Association; from the Society of Composers, Authors and Music Publishers of Canada; and from many more. They are calling for this bill to pass. I am curious about why the Conservatives are using misleading statements about freedom of expression to protect the profits of the web giants at the expense of Canadian cultural workers.

**Mrs. Laila Goodridge:** Madam Speaker, yes, there are many stakeholders who are in favour of seeing this bill pass, but there are at least as many, if not more, who are very concerned about the speed at which this piece of legislation is going through, the secrecy and the lack of accountability.

Honestly, we were debating amendments with no content until after midnight. Not even a phrase could be said about why we were voting on things. As I said earlier, there were amendments because the translations were wrong and there were amendments because the legislation was not drafted correctly to begin with, yet there was no context given as to what these amendments were. Therefore, it is incumbent upon us to make sure we have the best legislation and to send this bill back to committee.

**Mr. John Nater (Perth—Wellington, CPC):** Madam Speaker, it is always a pleasure to rise in the House and debate legislation. It is unfortunate that we have to do it under the guillotine of a guillo-

tine motion whereby all stages were time limited and Canadians did not have the opportunity to fully engage on this piece of legislation.

I would remind the House that this is the first major update to the Broadcasting Act in over 30 years, and the government saw fit to ram this through committee, report stage and now third reading with limited debate. However, the Senate—the unelected, unaccountable branch of government—can take all the time it wants. It is allowed to have witnesses and it is allowed to hear from Canadians, but here in this House, the people's House, the elected branch of Parliament, we are being forced to deal with this.

The practical effect of this piece of closure upon closure upon closure is that key stakeholders never had the chance to appear before committee. I would remind the House as well that many of the limited number of witnesses we did have expressed significant concerns. I am sure the government would be interested to know that over a third—39.3%, to be exact—of the witnesses who appeared had significant concerns with this piece of legislation. In fact, 31% thought it should be defeated altogether because of its poor drafting.

There was not unanimity. There was barely a plurality who saw this bill as a perfect piece of legislation in its actual form. Canadians did not have a chance. Let us hear from some of the groups that did not have a chance to appear before the committee.

The Aboriginal Peoples Television Network contacted the committee and wished to appear, but could not appear. Ethnic Channels Group did not have an opportunity to appear. The Community Radio Fund of Canada, the Ontario Association of Broadcasters, the Canadian National Institute for the Blind and the Radio-Canada International Action Committee all contacted our committee to appear and share their views on this piece of legislation. They could not do that because of the actions of the government in ramming it through committee and through this House.

The practical result is that when it came to clause-by-clause study, every single clause, every single amendment was forced to be put at 9:00 p.m., without debate, without amendment, without even reading the amendment into the record. Canadians watching at home—and there were Canadians watching at home who were concerned about this piece of legislation—had no clue what parliamentarians were voting on. What is more, we only received these amendments that same day, with no time to consult key stakeholders in the industry or key creators who may have had concerns or viewpoints on potential amendments. We could not contact them. We could not talk to them. We did not have the opportunity to have that conversation, and instead every single clause, every single amendment was put without debate, without amendment, without even being read into the record.

That is not how committee ought to function. That is not how deliberative democracy ought to function.

### Government Orders

I want to be clear. We had several key amendments that we felt would improve this piece of legislation. I want to talk about one that actually succeeded, despite the best efforts of the Liberal government. Every Liberal voted against this amendment, but thankfully the opposition stood firm and eliminated part II licence fees. For far too long, the government has been charging part II licence fees for domestic Canadian broadcasters. It is a tax. It is solely a tax levied on Canadian broadcasters. It is not levied on foreign streaming giants, only on Canadian broadcasters.

The government keeps talking about levelling the playing field, but their idea of levelling is just adding more regulatory burden on everyone rather than truly having a positive impact on domestic broadcasters. Thanks to the Conservative leadership on this issue, we eliminated part II licence fees, saving Canadian broadcasters over \$100 million in tax, money that simply goes into the government coffers. It does not go to CRTC. It does not go to programming. It does not go to promoting Canadian culture. It does not go towards promoting Canadian content. It is just more money that goes into the government coffers.

• (1910)

There were other amendments that we proposed that would have improved this piece of legislation. I would say the most important were related to section 4.2, user-generated content. I note that the Green Party had similar amendments that would have either taken out or significantly modified section 4.2 to ensure once and for all that user-generated content was not captured.

Unfortunately, in each case the government voted down each of those meaningful amendments. Liberals even voted down eliminating two words that would have at least taken out indirect revenue. Anyone who spends time talking to digital first creators, talking to those who use digital platforms to promote their content knows that when we are saying “indirect revenue”, it captures a whole swath of the Internet. That is the concern Canadians have had from day one.

I know this has been mentioned before, but this is an important observation from Canada's most successful YouTube channel. Morghan Fortier said:

Bill C-11 is not an ill-intentioned piece of legislation, but it is a bad piece of legislation. It has been written by those who don't understand the industry they're attempting to regulate, and because of that, they've made it incredibly broad.

She went on:

Worst of all, proposed section 4.2 hands sweeping power to the CRTC to regulate the Internet use of everyday Canadians and small businesses like mine that are not even associated with broadcasters.

That is the reality. Conservatives stood up for those creators to try to narrow the exception to the exception that is found in section 4.2, but of course the government members voted against the idea.

Conservatives also stood up for Canadians to try to bring in a definition of “discoverability”. We want to ensure that Canadians can find their favourite Canadian content online. We want to ensure that when Canadians log on to one of the platforms, they can find Canadian content. What we do not want to see is one piece of Canadian content being promoted over another piece of content, with the CRTC deciding which Canadian content is most Canadian or which piece of content should be promoted over another piece of content.

We introduced measures that would have ensured that algorithms were kept out, that Canadians were not going to be subjected one way or the other to promotion of content, but of course our efforts, which included the definition of discoverabilities and included protections for Canadians, were also voted down.

We also suggested that there should be an updated or a clear definition of “Canadian content” to ensure that Canadian stories are told, that Canadian actors, Canadian technicians, Canadian directors and producers are encapsulated into a broad definition of Canadian content so that those films and television shows filmed right here in Canada and those actors who have striven all their lives could find success here in Canada.

Here is what John Lewis, international vice-president of the International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees, said about Canadian content:

Under the current system, *The Handmaid's Tale* doesn't qualify as Canadian. It's based on a novel by Canadian author Margaret Atwood, who served as a consulting producer. It features Canada-centred plot lines, was filmed in Canada—employing hundreds of Canadians—and garnered 75 Emmy nominations. Canadians were recognized internationally for their skill in art direction, production design, hairstyling, makeup artistry, costume design, visual effects and editing.

But *The Handmaid's Tale* is not Canadian content.

We tried to have the government commit to updating the Canadian content rules prior to going ahead with Bill C-11, but of course it did not happen, and we are still waiting for the minister's policy directive to the CRTC. Bill C-11 provides very broad powers to the CRTC, but much of that will be filled in by the policy directive that the Minister of Canadian Heritage will send to the CRTC.

Canadians deserve to know how the minister wishes to see the CRTC implement those measures, but we have not seen that policy directive. The minister will in fact not disclose it until after royal assent, so Canadians and parliamentarians here in this place and in the other place are forced to vote on Bill C-11 before seeing how it will be implemented.

• (1915)

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, it is somewhat disingenuous when a member of an opposition party tries to give a false impression to that degree. They do not support Bill C-11, and that is the bottom line.

The members can talk about amendments and so forth. I understand what has taken place at committee. The member knows full well, as I do, the games that we witnessed from the Conservative Party with respect to Bill C-11. It was filibuster after filibuster. They did not want it to get out of the chamber. Their intent was to kill Bill C-11.

Will the member be straightforward and tell Canadians why the Conservative Party of Canada does not support the modernization of the Broadcasting Act? They had the opportunity to demonstrate their support; all they want to do is filibuster. That is the bottom line.

● (1920)

**Mr. John Nater:** Madam Speaker, if we want to talk about the king of filibusters, it is the member for Winnipeg North.

Let us be very clear. In the last election platform, the Conservative Party committed to updating the Broadcasting Act and ensuring that foreign web giants paid their fair share in Canada, but we also made the commitment that we would do so by respecting digital-first creators and by ensuring that Canadian content was able to find success not only here in Canada but around the world. What Bill C-11 does is put up walls around Canada that will prevent our great creators from finding success worldwide.

Let me be very clear. It was only on May 24 that the bill first came before the Canadian heritage committee. Then the government went forward and used closure upon closure upon closure to force this through committee rather than allowing parliamentarians to do our jobs, analyze the bill, hear from witnesses and make amendments to the piece of legislation.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I commend my colleague from Perth—Wellington. It is usually a great pleasure for me to work with him on the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage. We do not always agree and sometimes have our differences, but that happens even in the best of families.

I want to remind the House that when we started studying Bill C-11 in committee, we agreed to do so as quickly as possible, at the request of the cultural industry and broadcasters. However, it was the Conservative Party, through my colleague from Perth—Wellington, who asked the other committee members to set aside 20 hours to hear from witnesses. We agreed on that. This was a suggestion from the Conservative Party and my colleague from Perth—Wellington.

My question is the following. Why did my colleague later decide that 20 hours was not enough? We already had all of the requests to appear for the witnesses and organizations. What happened at that point to make my colleague change his mind and decide that the 20 hours he had requested were no longer enough?

**Mr. John Nater:** Madam Speaker, the 20 hours we proposed represent the minimum amount of time for hearing from witnesses in committee. While witnesses were appearing, we heard from cultural groups, organizations and broadcasters who had concerns about this bill and who wanted to go before the committee to be heard and provide information in that regard. The Conservatives had 20 witnesses who wanted to appear, but were unable to do so. Some Canadians wanted to testify and did not have that opportunity.

[*English*]

**Mr. Richard Cannings (South Okanagan—West Kootenay, NDP):** Madam Speaker, for once I have to agree with the member for Winnipeg North. The Conservatives just do not seem to want

### *Government Orders*

the bill to pass in any shape or form. They voted against Bill C-10, an old version of the bill. They asked the government not to reintroduce it. They have not gotten any wins for workers during the whole pandemic.

Why are they siding with web giants like Netflix who do not pay their fair share, instead of supporting arts and culture workers, who have suffered so much in the last couple of years, and passing this bill?

**Mr. John Nater:** Madam Speaker, I am standing up for cultural workers. I am standing up for those digital-first creators who have found success through online means, who have found success here in Canada and around the world because they have used new technologies. We strongly believe in updating the Broadcasting Act to bring it into the 21st century, but we should not and ought not do that at the expense of those who have found success globally thanks to new technologies.

**Mr. Mike Morrice (Kitchener Centre, GP):** Madam Speaker, it is an honour to rise tonight to speak to Bill C-11, an act to amend the Broadcasting Act. Bill C-11 seeks to modernize the existing Broadcasting Act for the first time since 1991, primarily to bring online streaming services like Netflix and YouTube within its domain.

I will be sharing my time with the member for Saanich—Gulf Islands.

In my view, it has been a long time. Bill C-11 is certainly needed. We need to modernize the Broadcasting Act. I also feel it is well-intentioned legislation on behalf of the government party, and it has good items in it, a few of which I will mention. One, of course, is the requirement for streaming services like Netflix to invest more in Canadian productions. Second is that it legitimizes the role of community broadcasting, including non-profit and campus radio stations, acknowledging that community broadcasters, through collaboration with local organizations and community members, are in a unique position to provide varied programming to meet the needs of their communities.

That being said, Bill C-11 also has significant issues. The first is that, throughout the bill, we see vague language and some contradictions, and at times it is fairly poorly written. I will give one example. In the section I will be talking about next, there is a definition of “social media service” without that term being defined earlier in the bill. As we heard from others, it skips over a really critical opportunity to update and clarify the definition of what Canadian content is.

*Government Orders*

Most important of all, despite claims that only platforms would be regulated, there are very clear provisions in the bill that would allow for user-generated content to be regulated, and the chair of the CRTC confirmed as much when he was in front of the heritage committee. One of those provisions is any time user-generated content generates either direct or indirect revenue. What does that mean? I think of a local musician who might be soliciting financial contributions on a YouTube livestream, for example, and whether that musician might fall under the regulations that are permitted under this act.

I want to be really clear. There are some who have said that this bill censors what Canadians would be allowed to watch. That is simply not true. That is not in this legislation. That said, both at committee and in the wider conversation across the country on this bill, non-partisan experts and those affected by the legislation have shared their concerns, and I would like to share a few of those this evening.

One group is the YouTube content creators themselves, Canadians like Morghan Fortier. Morghan said this: “Bill C-11 is not an ill-intentioned piece of legislation, but it is a bad piece of legislation. It’s been written by those who don’t understand the industry they’re attempting to regulate”. Many others are on the record with concerns similar to Morghan’s, other YouTube content creators across the country.

Then, of course, there are also subject matter experts like Michael Geist, who sounded the alarm. He has written often on the topic and spoke at committee. I hesitate to even bring up Mr. Geist given how often he has already been referenced in this debate over the last number of weeks, but I will quote one snippet that is important for this House to hear again, which is that Bill C-11 needs “extensive review and further reform to get it right.”

Finally, political analyst Erica Ifill shared her many concerns in a recent *Hill Times* article. She put it succinctly, “the new broadcasting bill still does not address core problems of the digital experience.”

• (1925)

For my part, I brought two amendments to the committee. One would have removed every part of proposed section 4.2 of the bill that allowed for user-generated content to be regulated at all. There are various provisions here that would open up that opportunity. Why not close those to be really clear that platforms are in and users are out?

The second was more precise but less ambitious, which was to remove just those users who generate indirect revenue. Can we not at least agree on that? This is a group of users the bill was likely not intended for, so let us take that out. Again, parliamentarians from all parties have previously said that they believe in this premise of platforms in and users out. Therefore, I was disappointed that both of these amendments were defeated at committee.

I would also like to briefly note my disappointment in the process. It was not the best moment. We saw the animosity between committee members, between opposing parties in this chamber, and that resulted in the majority of votes on amendments last Tuesday night having to take place without any debate at all. In my time

here I have seen better moments. I think back to December when members came together to unanimously move forward on banning conversion therapy, for example. There have been incredible moments in this place of parliamentarians working together, but in my view, this was one of our less strong moments.

To summarize, in my view, when assessing legislation, I find myself thinking about my neighbours in Kitchener and our community, and I ask myself, “Does the bill do more harm than good?” I get it that rarely I will get to vote on legislation that fully addresses the interests of my community, so I will always support legislation that has a net-positive impact. However, my concern with Bill C-11 is that it could do more harm than good. This is the reason I did not support it earlier this afternoon, and I am not likely to support it at third reading tomorrow. I appreciate the good intentions. I appreciate that there are good elements in the bill. I certainly wish we had more time to debate it, and even to see more negotiation among parliamentarians to see amendments tabled and moved forward with.

Assuming the bill will soon be moving to the Senate, I hope senators will take the opportunity to improve the bill.

• (1930)

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, at the beginning of his speech, the member made reference to the fact that we have not modernized the legislation for many years. However, when we take a look overall, I believe we would get a consensus from the stakeholders that the bill is in fact a step forward for an important industry, let alone artists, creators and all those involved—

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès):** The hon. member for Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke.

**Mrs. Cheryl Gallant:** Madam Speaker, I do not believe we have quorum.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès):** There are no quorum calls after 6:30 p.m. There is a judgment.

**Mrs. Cheryl Gallant:** We do not have quorum, but we also are without the Constitutional requirement of quorum. In other words, for those in the NDP House leadership, we want them to confirm that they did not agree to the government’s unconstitutional extension of hours—

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès):** The hon. member is out of order, and I would ask the hon. member to stop.

**Ms. Elizabeth May:** Madam Speaker, I have a point of order.

**Mrs. Cheryl Gallant:** Madam Speaker, you cannot give a point of order when I am still doing my point of order—

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès):** The hon. member does not have the floor.

*Government Orders*

The hon. member for Saanich—Gulf Islands.

**Ms. Elizabeth May:** Madam Speaker, I am sorry, but the hon. member for Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, and I was paying close attention, was not given the floor at any time by the Speaker. No one who has not been given the floor by the Speaker is allowed to speak. Once the Speaker stands, everyone is to sit down.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès):** I did mention the hon. member and I gave her the floor, but as soon as I saw where it was going, I got up again. There is no reason for a point of order. Those items have been debated more than once and the Speaker has ruled.

The Speaker has made a ruling, and it can be found in the Debates of May 2, 2022, at pages 4577 and 4578. I would invite the member to read the ruling of the Speaker to find that this matter has already been settled.

The hon. parliamentary secretary to the government House leader.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux:** Madam Speaker, the point I was getting to is that the member, I am sure, is aware of the importance of modernizing the act, and that the vast majority of the stakeholders see the proposed legislation as a step forward. The broader community, being Canadian artists, creators and workers in the industry, see it as positive legislation. I wonder if the member can reflect on that aspect.

● (1935)

**Mr. Mike Morrice:** Madam Speaker, I want to make clear to the parliamentary secretary that I do agree with him.

As I said in my speech, it has been quite some time since the Broadcasting Act was first passed. There is an important need to modernize the Act, and I am glad the governing party prioritized that. I also believe it is important to get it right. While there are many stakeholders, as he has mentioned, who are supportive, there are also many others, some of whom I mentioned, such as Canadian YouTube content creators, who are quite concerned.

I go back again. Yes, it is a difficult decision not to support this legislation, but the analysis I am doing is weighing harm versus good. My concern here is that, with this legislation as currently written, given some of the vague language and allowing for user-generated content to be regulated as it does, it is open to the possibility of more harm than good.

**Mr. John Nater (Perth—Wellington, CPC):** Madam Speaker, it is one of those rare occasions, and perhaps not so rare, when the blues and the Greens are on the same page on something, and it is on section 4.2.

The member mentioned in his comments the ambitious versus less ambitious amendment. I want to talk about the less ambitious amendment that would take out indirect revenue and the impact that would have on at least ensuring that those who are paid by the platforms would be captured, but those who have indirect revenue through licensing deals or through sponsorships would not be captured. I wonder if he could expand on that and how that would have been a small change that would have had a big impact on digital-first creators and how they do their work.

**Mr. Mike Morrice:** Madam Speaker, I think it is important to offer multiple options, and it was my intention to say, “Here is a concern I identified.” I had the chance to speak to it, and I offered a few ways the committee could consider addressing it. I know other parliamentarians did as well.

In my view, at least taking out user-generated content with indirect revenue would have been a reasonable amendment. It is also my view that, had we had less of the rhetoric in this place and more of a collaborative engagement among parliamentarians across party lines, there would have been an opportunity to say, “This is a reasonable one. We can agree on this piece. We will put aside our differences over here.” My sense, with this particular legislation at this time of year, is that it did not allow for some of those improvements. I believe all of us should be reflecting on the reasons why those reasonable improvements did not see the light of day.

**Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP):** Madam Speaker, I want to begin by acknowledging that we are here on traditional unceded Algonquin territory and say *meegwetch*.

[*Translation*]

It is a great honour to speak to Bill C-11 this evening. As everyone knows, this bill would amend and modernize the Broadcasting Act, something that has not been done in 30 years, even though we have seen enormous changes in the various delivery platforms. The biggest changes have to do with online streaming rather than television and radio broadcasting. There have been changes for our actors, creators and musicians and with respect to the issue of Canadian, Quebec and indigenous culture.

First of all, this bill is not perfect. I have problems with certain aspects of it, but I have decided to support it anyway, and I will explain why. I thank my colleague from Kitchener Centre, another Green MP. We made different decisions, but we agree on the problems and the reasons why he will be voting no and I will be voting yes.

● (1940)

[*English*]

It is a complicated bill. I want to start with a few things, just to clarify what it is not. Moments ago, a very talented new member of Parliament, the hon. member for Fort McMurray—Cold Lake, spoke about wishing that we could put in a more concrete, entrenched form that freedom of expression and freedom of speech are respected in this land and that every Canadian knows they have a right to those things.

I would say, with all respect to that member, we have that. We have the right of free speech in the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. Beyond that, the act that this bill amends but does not cancel, repeal or wipe out the words of, the Broadcasting Act, has for the past 30 years entrenched the right of Canadians to freedom of expression. Nothing in this modernization in Bill C-11 would change, in any way, our right to freedom of expression. This bill does not censor anything. It does not change what we can see and what we cannot see, or what we can hear and what we cannot hear. It attempts to achieve greater protections for many different varieties of Canadians against the powers of the new digital world.

### *Government Orders*

I am going to focus a little time on some specific examples. Before I talk about the good the bill does, let me say where I hope we will observe closely how the bill works, and be more than prepared to take it up again within the next year or two. I would suspect we would, if we have the problems that we fear we may have with the failure to make sure that Canadians who in the government's intentions are not supposed to be caught by this bill, are not, and if we have problems differentiating the impact of the bill on those people from the impact on the large digital platforms, whether it is Netflix, Crave or HBO. We are not intending to capture users who place their content on YouTube.

One of the differentiations that I found quite useful, and that I actually heard from Professor Michael Geist, was that there is a difference between a platform, a place where we can put things, that is "curated" versus one that is not curated. That is the word he used. I wish the government had used that kind of language in Bill C-11, because I think it would clarify things a great deal.

In other words, instead of concentrating on who does what on a platform, we should differentiate between the systems and differentiate between the platforms. If we were to say there was this area where there was a conscious effort to promote certain content, it would be a curated place. This is versus one where everybody could put stuff up: It is not being curated to meet a certain purpose. If it is being curated to meet a certain purpose or to create different profit, that would have been a better differentiation than we have in Bill C-11. What we have in Bill C-11 has left us divided.

I do not disagree one bit with my colleague for Kitchener Centre that this bill should be much better and clearer on the question of platform versus user. Platforms will be in and users will be out: I believe that is the government's intent, but the drafting does not make that sufficiently clear. I think we will have to go back to it and improve on and clarify this.

I remain concerned that the CRTC has a lot of clout and power in this. I hope we see that the CRTC is guided by the best information from people who are skeptical about this bill to make sure its use does not do anything but improve the situation for Canadians, both those who enjoy the products of creators and those who create. I hate to use the word "consumption" as if people consume culture, and I will not use it. People who enjoy culture, who are edified by culture and who feel ennobled by culture, those of us who are essentially the audience, need to benefit from this act just as the creators do.

Regarding the discussion around platforms versus users, I do not think the government has it right yet, so why am I going to vote for this bill?

When I look at the creative community, there is no question about this as it is empirically documented. The rise of the digital broadcaster has reduced the economic status of Canadian musicians and Canadian creators versus those in the U.S. Just to give members one example from the world of music, a traditional broadcaster generally sent 49¢ out of every dollar from Canadian music to the U.S. That sounds like a lot. Then, we see that the digital broadcaster sends 64¢ out of every dollar to the U.S. From 49¢ to 64¢ is a big difference to someone who is living on those earnings. In fact, I do not know how Canadian musicians can live on their earnings. In

the past year, in 2021, on average Canadian musicians writing their own material earned \$67 total in royalties from digital streaming platforms. This is not acceptable. It is not acceptable that people who are writing their own music in Canada have their income reduced just by virtue of what medium they use to share that material.

We need to have a Broadcasting Act that promotes Canadian creators within Canada and overseas, and we hope this bill will improve things. Certainly, the Canadian Media Producers Association, the Coalition for the Diversity of Cultural Expressions, the Society of Composers, Authors and Music Publishers of Canada, SOCAN, and the Alliance of Canadian Cinema, Television and Radio Artists, ACTRA, are saying that for their own survival as artists we need desperately to redress that imbalance. When it goes onto a digital platform, Canadian artists are paid less. They are valued less, and will turn from that career because they cannot make ends meet. As the rise of digital access to creativity overtakes the traditional, the situation will only get worse, and that is the trend line we see with the digital media and the online sharing of everything from music to film, video and TV.

There is a huge creative class in Canada. As a matter of fact, just to give some context for it, the membership of the Society of Composers, Authors and Music Publishers is 175,000 people. By the way, SOCAN does not just promote these brilliant creative people, but it actually runs the system that collects the royalties and distributes them fairly, so when we go outside of that system we are seeing the funds to pay musicians the royalties they deserve slip through their fingers without capturing it. That is why SOCAN is so strongly in favour of Bill C-11.

The same is true of how people feel across the spectrum of other artistic endeavours. We have heard a lot in this place about films like *The Handmaid's Tale*. It is hard to say one loves *The Handmaid's Tale* when, as a feminist, one would wonder how Margaret Atwood could see the future coming before we did. I dread the day I go to shop with my debit card and it is taken from me. It is not sufficiently Canadian content when the leads, the producers, the people holding the cameras and the people yelling "cut" are not Canadian. That is what Bill C-11 hopes to repair.

• (1945)

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, when I listen to the member speak, I think about the Canadian industry. It seems to me that the Canadian industry will be further ahead with the passage of Bill C-11 than if it is not passed. I wonder if the member could give a clear indication whether she appreciates that or she disagrees with that.

*Government Orders*

**Ms. Elizabeth May:** Madam Speaker, I hope I was clear in my speech that this is the reason I am voting for Bill C-11. It is important and urgent that we pass Bill C-11 now.

We saw the last Parliament's attempt to pass Bill C-10. It is not the fault of any of us in the opposition that we had an unnecessary election, which caused Bill C-10 to die on the Order Paper, but Canadian performers and creators have been waiting a very long time to see a modernization that takes into account the way their income is undermined by online streaming. We need to do this urgently, and if it turns out that, as many have warned us, there are mistakes made in other parts of the bill, I hope we will go back and fix that later.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I am pleased to learn that my colleague plans to support the bill. I admit that I was concerned about the Green Party members, especially when I heard the member for Kitchener Centre take the Conservative position on the issue of digital content creators, on the exemption and on clause 4.2 in particular.

I wondered whether my colleague shared that position and whether she also believed that this clause gave her cause for concern respecting freedom of expression and freedom of creation by these new artists, who are carving out more and more space in our landscape and from whom we will benefit a lot in the years to come, I am sure.

My other question has to do with the Canadian content she was talking about. She brought up *The Handmaid's Tale*, saying that Bill C-11 would correct the fact that a production like that was not considered Canadian content.

I want to understand something. Does my colleague think that this content will become Canadian content or, on the contrary, does she think that the rules have to be tightened so that anything produced with stories from here are also produced by artists and talent from here?

● (1950)

**Ms. Elizabeth May:** Madam Speaker, I will do my best to provide a good answer to both questions from my colleague from Drummond.

First, I am absolutely comfortable with the position taken by my colleague from Kitchener Centre. In the Green Party, we are Green MPs, yes, but we have our own ideas and we do not have to vote with one voice. As members of Parliament, we have our own positions, depending on our ridings.

Second, I think my colleague from Drummond is right. It is vital that we have cultural products from here, made by Canadians and Quebecers from here. If I remember my colleague's speech correctly, he, like his Bloc Québécois colleagues, clearly supports our creators, directors and film and television creators, and he believes that Quebec culture is more threatened by the development of online broadcasting and must be protected.

[*English*]

**Mrs. Tracy Gray (Kelowna—Lake Country, CPC):** Madam Speaker, I want to ask the hon. member about the CRTC. We know

that Bill C-11 would give sweeping new powers to the CRTC. We have heard that the government is not willing to disclose the policy directive for the CRTC. Is it not concerning to the member that we would give the CRTC these new powers without actually knowing what its mandate is going to be and what the policy directive will be?

**Ms. Elizabeth May:** Madam Speaker, I have a lot of concerns about the CRTC. I used to appear as an administrative lawyer in front of the CRTC, a gazillion years ago, on things like the Bell Canada review of revenue requirements when we were breaking up Ma Bell. I was a lawyer with the Public Interest Advocacy Centre and was before the CRTC quite a lot.

That policy directive should be public. One of the things the CRTC did in recent years, which I find very concerning, was deciding that Russia Today was appropriate content and available to be packaged on cable channels. That never should have happened.

We need to keep the pressure up to say that we need to see, from the government, the directive to the CRTC, and we need more transparency from the CRTC.

**Mrs. Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC):** Madam Speaker, I will be splitting my time with the member for Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo.

Bill C-11 is yet another attempt by the Liberals to regulate what Canadians can say and see on the Internet by granting unprecedented powers to the CRTC with, importantly, no clear guidelines or limits on how that power would be used.

The minister has made many claims about Bill C-11. He says that it would protect Canadian identity and culture, that it would help promote diversity and marginalized groups in Canada, and that it would tell Canada's story to the world. These objectives are commendable, but the big problem is that Bill C-11 would actually accomplish none of them. Instead, it would threaten the viability of Canadian digital content creators, stifle innovation and grant unprecedented new powers to the CRTC to dictate what Canadians can read, what they can listen to, and what they can say and see on the Internet.

### *Government Orders*

Like its predecessor, Bill C-10, Bill C-11 is not about promoting Canadian content. It is really about censoring views and ideas that the Liberal government does not like, all under the auspices of strengthening Canadian culture. The bill's so-called discoverability provisions would essentially push content in front of Canadians, if that content is considered Canadian enough, whether people want to see it or not. If it fails to pass the government's definition of "Canadian", it would be pushed down in the queue where it cannot be found. The CRTC would essentially decide which content creators succeed, what content Canadians see and what content Canadians do not see. The minister has recently declared that he alone would develop rules on what content is defined as Canadian. That is a pretty shocking revelation, that he considers himself the single arbiter of national identity.

This is especially disconcerting since the NDP-Liberal government is also currently developing an online harms bill, which has been so shrouded in secrecy that only recently an access to information request uncovered thousands of pages of negative comments by stakeholders. Critics warned that the original Liberal government plan would amount to censorship. I understand that a new proposal is now being put forward, given all the criticism. It would apparently place the onus on digital platforms to deal with harmful content. Based on the Liberals' track record, no one should believe that this proposal would pose less of a threat to individual liberties than their other ideas. I am not sure how they would tackle real online harms, such as non-consensual or child sexual abuse material, which is often not enforced through platforms right now.

On Bill C-11, thousands of Canadian artists, content creators and policy experts have voiced extreme opposition. They point out that pushing content to viewers who are not interested in it would actually harm Canadian creators, because the algorithms will penalize content that viewers do not interact with.

Justin Tomchuk, a Canadian producer who operates two very successful YouTube channels, noted, "Our channels have highlighted Canadian products for the world to see and purchase. Unfortunately, Bill C-11 would make that more difficult and potentially destroy our visibility internationally."

Dr. Irene Berkowitz, a senior policy fellow at the Toronto Metropolitan University's Audience Lab, also testified at committee, and Matt Hatfield said that it's "very risky for a small country like Canada to encourage this kind of model of prioritizing our own content. The benefits are pretty meagre if we make it work for our local content. The risk, if a larger country like France were to do the same thing, is enormous to us."

Morghan Fortier, co-owner and CEO of Skyship Entertainment, creator of Canada's most-watched YouTube channel, said:

Bill C-11 is...a bad piece of legislation. It's been written by those who don't understand the industry they're attempting to regulate, and because of that, they've made it incredibly broad. It mistakes platforms like YouTube, TikTok and Facebook for broadcasters like the CBC, Netflix and Amazon Prime. It doesn't understand how those platforms operate, and it ignores the fundamental importance of global discoverability.

Those same points echo around the Canadian arts scene. Scott Benzie, the managing director of Digital First Canada, which advocates for digital content creators, said, "Most concerning about C-11 is that there is still room in the bill for the government to

force platforms to put 'approved' Canadian content ahead of independent Canadian content and artificially manipulate the algorithms. Even in the best-case scenario this bill only has downsides for digital-first creators, while the traditional media industry gets their funding doubled."

The reality is that traditional broadcasters like the CBC would receive more funding under Bill C-11, while independent innovators driving Canadian digital leadership will be left behind. Not only will Bill C-11 not promote Canadian digital content or strengthen Canadian culture, but its discoverability provisions will stifle innovation and impose severe restrictions on what content Canadians can access.

During committee hearings, the campaigns director of advocacy group OpenMedia, Matt Hatfield, said, "Manipulating our search results and feeds to feature content that the government prefers instead of other content is gross paternalism that doesn't belong in a democratic society."

● (1955)

There really is no better definition of "censorship" than what the Liberal government is trying to do in Bill C-11. Censorship is at its very core. The Liberals even used censorship to cut off debate and ram through an unprecedented 150 amendments to the bill with no discussion or explanation. Over the last two weeks, the Liberals have effectively censored their own censorship bill.

Canadians will remember the fiasco of Bill C-10, which the Liberals introduced last year. Under Bill C-10, people's everyday expressions, which could include pictures, audio and video, would have been magically turned into broadcasting programs when transmitted by third parties like social media firms over the Internet, unless the CRTC or a cabinet policy directive said otherwise. Almost any individual-generated content would become subject to regulation. That is why Internet law expert Michael Geist called Bill C-10 an unconscionable attack on the online free expression of Canadians. As the Liberals stifled debate and used tactics like closure on Bill C-10, Conservatives did propose amendments to protect individual users and smaller players in the market by exempting streaming services and social media users with lower revenues, but the Liberals rejected that common-sense compromise.



*Government Orders*

Now the minister claims that this new bill, Bill C-11, addresses the concerns about Bill C-10 and that Canadians can be assured that regulating user-generated content on the Internet is now off the table, but that is just not true. In fact, when asked at committee hearings about whether Bill C-11 includes the potential for regulating user content, the CRTC chair, Ian Scott, acknowledged, “As constructed, there is a provision that would allow us to do it as required”.

The Liberals have tried to pull the wool over everyone's eyes with Bill C-11 by apparently reintroducing some original safeguards, while at the same time introducing a new provision that effectively negates the safeguards. I think we all agree with the goal of updating Canada's Broadcasting Act and bringing it in line with the realities of the 21st century. Conservatives have said repeatedly that we support creating a level playing field between large foreign streaming services and Canadian broadcasters, but Conservatives believe we can achieve that reform while also protecting individual rights and without turning the CRTC into an all-powerful censure board with almost no limits to its regulatory authority.

Should Canadians entrust the Prime Minister and the government with the power to regulate what Canadians say and see? Let us look at their track record. There have been many examples of this particular Prime Minister cracking down on those with whom he disagrees, from former senior ministers who defended the principle of judicial independence, like the Hon. Jody Wilson-Raybould, to denigrating and demeaning fellow Canadians who want their freedom back and to end federal mandates, and helping perpetuate misinformation and fake news about them, their motives and their actions. The Prime Minister has actually called Canadians who disagree with him un-Canadian. Therefore, is it any wonder that Canadians would be skeptical about his plans for the cabinet appointments who will define Canadian content for regulation?

This penchant for using the unbridled power of the state against the individual Canadians is embodied in Bill C-11 and in coming legislation the Liberals will claim is necessary. However, stakeholder groups that have been involved in consultations so far have called the Liberals' proposals dangerous, with the possibility of expanding the powers of regulators over time and significantly impacting the free expression and privacy rights of Canadians.

My constituents are clear about their views on the Liberal government's heavy-handed attempts to regulate and control what Canadians are allowed to say and see on the Internet. They have told me they do not agree with the Liberal government's censorship measures. No government agency responsible for broadcasting in a free and democratic society should have the kinds of powers and unchecked discretion as are proposed in Bill C-11. Canadians have fought and died to defend rights to freedom of thought and expression. In a society that cherishes these values, Bill C-11 would leave the door open for real abuses of power against the free expression rights of Canadians.

My Conservative colleagues and I will remain steadfast in working to stop the NDP-Liberal government from taking away the free expression and individual rights of Canadians. In its present form, we oppose Bill C-11, given the potential for it to establish a regime of censorship, control and regulation while not achieving the outcomes its proponents purport.

• (2000)

**Mr. Peter Fragiskatos (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Revenue, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I appreciate the speech from the member opposite, although I cannot help but disagree. Someone else who would disagree is the Society of Composers, Authors and Music Publishers of Canada. This is what they said about Bill C-11:

Canadian creators need support to continue to develop Canadian music in the world of streaming, and Canada must be a place for emerging music creators, where songwriters and composers can create, grow and thrive.... The tabling of the Online Streaming Act on February 2, 2022, is an important first step to make it easier for Canadian audiences to find and engage with Canadian creators, giving our music a place in the world of streaming.

This is a respected organization that is completely behind the aims of Bill C-11. What does the member think about this stakeholder's comments?

**Mrs. Shannon Stubbs:** Madam Speaker, here is what Nettwerk Music Group from Vancouver, B.C. says. It is a full-service artist development and music intellectual property brand builder from over 37 years:

We believe that Bill C-11 represents a fundamental misunderstanding of our industry and how musical artists are discovered and fanbases are built in today's streaming landscape. The emergence, variety, and growth of online platforms and services and the expanding means and methods to share, stream, view, download, or buy our artists' music has been revolutionary in allowing us to grow the profiles of our Canadian artists on the world stage. Bill C-11 [has] the potential for significant negative impacts on the businesses of Canadian music companies and Canadian artists focused on building a global audience. Any regulation of our artists' work, whether distributed by us directly to online services or licensed for use by fans and consumers for inclusion in user-generated content on social media services, is unacceptable. Bill C-11 proposes outdated solutions in search of a problem.

That is why Conservatives think it should go back to committee.

• (2005)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. René Villemure (Trois-Rivières, BQ):** Madam Speaker, the Conservative members have talked a lot about freedom of expression and censorship. At this point in the debate, I would like my colleague to tell me exactly what she thinks freedom of expression is and what she thinks censorship is.

*Government Orders**[English]*

**Mrs. Shannon Stubbs:** Madam Speaker, the issue with Bill C-11 is that MPs here are prepared to vote on legislation that grants unprecedented and sweeping powers to a powerful regulatory body without knowing the details, the impacts and the scope. The minister himself has even said that there is going to be some sort of policy directive provided to the regulatory body that we do not know about right now, that MPs have no details about whatsoever.

In the context of this debate, in Bill C-11, I think that it is dangerous and irresponsible of members of Parliament to support pushing through legislation in that context, in that reality. I think that given the learned, expert and diverse cautions about the negative impacts of this bill on the free expression of all Canadians, that is the core principle that members of Parliament must defend. That is why we must oppose Bill C-11.

**Mr. Richard Cannings (South Okanagan—West Kootenay, NDP):** Madam Speaker, since the beginning of the pandemic, one of the hardest-hit sectors was the arts and cultural sector: 25% of arts and culture workers in Canada lost their jobs in the pandemic. At the same time, Netflix's profits increased by 22% in 2020, and it is not paying its fair share. The big web giants pay hardly any taxes in Canada, whereas other broadcasters do.

I am just wondering why the Conservatives are so against supporting the arts and cultural sector. This program would raise a billion dollars for that sector to do work in Canada, yet Conservatives do not seem to want the big web giants to pay their fair share.

**Mrs. Shannon Stubbs:** Madam Speaker, in fact, we have said repeatedly that we think that big foreign streamers should be on an even playing field with smaller Canadian broadcasters. What is very bizarre, I find, about this debate is that the member has raised a legitimate challenge, one I think that we are all aware of and that probably merits debate. However, its remedy is not in Bill C-11. He is talking about a taxation issue.

Other members have talked about pay rates or about competitiveness issues against other jurisdictions on all kinds of different arts and cultural productions. Those are all issues that we should be talking about. Perhaps there are public policy or legislative solutions to those issues, but what is very confusing about this is that Bill C-11 does not deal with any of that.

Bill C-11 gives unprecedented powers to a regulatory body to negatively impact the free expression rights of all Canadians in all online streaming media, and that is why Conservatives oppose this bill.

**Mr. Frank Caputo (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo, CPC):** Madam Speaker, it is always a pleasure to rise on behalf of the people of Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo.

Before I begin, I want to take care of a couple of things. First, there were three people in my riding who were tragically killed over the weekend, including a four-week-old infant. Last I heard, there was a young person as well who remained in critical condition after this tragic motor vehicle accident. I want to assure the family and loved ones who suffered through this that they are in my thoughts and prayers. I just want to take a moment of silence, given the passing of these three people.

On a bit of a happier note, I want to wish my dad a happy Father's Day. I did get to see him yesterday.

The last thing, I promise, before getting into Bill C-11, is that I have two friends getting married this weekend, and I want to give a shout-out on the House of Commons floor to Lucky Sharma and Aimée Marshall on their upcoming wedding. I wish them a life of happiness.

Now let us get on to why we are all here, Bill C-11, and why we are all here sitting late, with Motion No. 11.

I remember when the Liberals, as a third-place party, in 2015, touted themselves as the party of transparency. We were told, "Sunny ways, my friends, sunny ways," and that they would not use omnibus bills. Those are for undemocratic groups like the Conservatives to use. They would not shut down debate. No, that would not ever happen.

Then we had the NDP, the party of the underdog, fighting for each and every person, being the voice for people who did not have a voice themselves, the voice for the voiceless, the party fighting vigorously for democracy above all else, supporting things like Motion No. 11, not only to curtail debate, and I cannot count how many times that has happened recently and in respect to this bill directly, but also to shut down debate.

That, to me, does not sound like either is a party of transparency. I may have expected this from the Liberals. I frankly did not expect it from the NDP. Let us face it, if the Conservatives had done this when we had a majority, it would have been called high-handed. Instead, the rhetoric is, "We just want to get this done." This is coming from a party that took months to recall Parliament after an unnecessary pandemic election.

Wait, Madam Speaker, there is more. We have over 100 amendments that were moved in committee without any sort of scrutiny. To me, that is undemocratic.

If I could sum up one of the issues I have with this bill, it comes down to a question that I asked the hon. parliamentary secretary. I asked him about TV shows that he had referenced and his saying, if I understood his argument correctly, that we may not have these TV shows if it were not for Canadian content. I challenged him in a question, asking, "Where in Bill C-11 do we preserve the existence of these television shows?"

Somewhat predictably, he did not point to anything in particular. He said that it depends on the content of the shows. That is the interesting part. Here is the problem: this is the classic "the Liberal government knows best". It is for the government to decide what the appropriate content is.

People ask, “Well, what is the problem with this?” This is the government essentially preferring some media over others, but not only is it preferring some media over others; it goes beyond that, because we do not know exactly how the government is going to go about preferring some media over others. We really do have a compound problem there.

One, why are we preferring? It is ostensibly for the reasons that have been outlined by the government, but then we have this vacuum in which we ask ourselves, well, how are we going to go about that? Rather than flesh that out and rather than spend the time at committee to do this, the government rammed through over 100 amendments. To me, that does not sound like a government that is bent on getting this right, as we have heard so often, because this needs to happen on an act that has not been updated since 1991.

Make no mistake: I am not advocating for the status quo, but I am opposing what we have seen here.

● (2010)

Frequently from the government we have heard, “Why do Conservatives not just get on board with the changing times?” That completely misses the point. The Conservatives are prepared to get on board with the changing times. Just because we are not prepared to get on board with it being done in this way does not mean we do not recognize the necessity for change.

Rather, we have a bill that has been rammed through. If this bill was truly good for the country, why is the government trying to get it done so quickly? It is obviously a near copy of the deeply flawed Bill C-10, which had a number of concerns raised by experts.

I do not deny that we live in an increasingly digital world. We need laws and policies that reflect the world we live in today. I am in my 40s, yet I find myself increasingly telling my family members and my mother that I need a text message rather than a phone call, because we are going back and forth constantly, living in a busy world that is increasingly dependent on electronics.

I am sure I am not the only one who feels as though, while we used to fall asleep reading a book 20 or 30 years ago, we probably now fall asleep doing different things and watching different things.

All that is to say that yes, the law needs to be updated. The question then becomes how Parliament appropriately intervenes, and just because Conservatives are opposed to the intervention itself, the unique intervention that has been put forward, does not mean that an intervention is unnecessary.

Canada's Conservatives support creating a level playing field between large foreign streaming services and content creators, but what we have here would be giving the power to the CRTC to regulate the Internet. In my view, that is not the appropriate way to go about this. This, to me, is an exhortation for more government involvement and more power in what we do. It feels like it never ends when we see the government slowly but surely encroaching into what people will watch, but it is not even clear as to how the government would do that, and that is a really substantial concern.

This bill, in my view, targets user-generated content. That has been discussed at length, and I will not go into it much more. Despite the government's assurances, companies like YouTube still

### *Government Orders*

identify areas of the bill that would identify user-generated content. Despite the exemption for user-generated content, this legislation would allow the CRTC to regulate any content that generates revenue, directly or indirectly. That is rather broad.

When we are talking about indirect generation of revenue, where does that line end? Does it end at one person removed, one job removed or one dollar removed? How do we actually judge that? These are unanswered questions that would have been wonderful to answer at committee, and there were many witnesses who would have been prepared to answer these questions.

According to the CRTC chairperson, Mr. Scott, the CRTC issues approximately 250 decisions annually. For an administrative board, that is relatively small. That is fewer than five per week, so I ask myself how we can expect the CRTC to have this capacity. Again, this is consistent with what I am saying. We are just going to grow the CRTC even bigger. That is the answer. That is the response to this. It is to make more government with more policies with more workers, which is going to cost more taxes for ultimately questionable ends.

I am only four pages into a 10-page outline. I have a lot more to say, but I know my time is coming to an end. As much as others here might like to hear it, I know we are under time constraints, so I will answer any questions from my colleagues with that.

● (2015)

**Mr. Maninder Sidhu (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I was intently listening to the member opposite on his speech, and he mentioned the approach we are taking. We are listening to stakeholders and content creators, and I would like to share a quote with him from the Society of Composers, Authors and Music Publishers of Canada. I would say they know better than most of us here about content creation. Their CEO said this:

Canadian creators need support to continue to develop Canadian music in the world of streaming, and Canada must be a place for emerging music creators, where songwriters and composers can create, grow and thrive.

Their news release went on:

The tabling of the Online Streaming Act on February 2, 2022, is an important first step to make it easier for Canadian audiences to find and engage with Canadian creators, giving our music a place in the world of streaming.

I would like to ask the member opposite what he thinks about this quote from content creators themselves.

**Mr. Frank Caputo:** Madam Speaker, the member's question was actually just posed to my hon. colleague. I am not sure if my colleague heard, but my hon. colleague from Lakeland just answered this very question.

*Government Orders*

If we are going to get into a battle of duelling experts, then we can certainly do that because Professor Michael Geist, a professor of law, somebody whose life revolves around this, has been highly critical of the bill. I am mindful of the fact that reasonable people can disagree on these points. We are never going to have uniformity in what people think, but for instance Professor Geist said:

The Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage heard from a total of 48 witnesses as individuals or representing organizations during its study of Bill C-11 (excluding the CRTC and government officials). Of those 48, at least 16 either raised concerns about the regulation of user content in the bill or disputed government claims about its effect.

I could go on, but I will wrap up on this. There is certainly not academic unanimity as to the consequence of Bill C-11.

● (2020)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. René Villemure (Trois-Rivières, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague from British Columbia. His riding is magnificent.

I would really like to hear his thoughts on something. I picked up on some major distrust of the CRTC. In my opinion, the CRTC is a relic of the 20th century, but I would like my colleague to expand on why he does not trust it.

Why is he so suspicious of the CRTC?

[*English*]

**Mr. Frank Caputo:** Madam Speaker, I do not distrust the institution so much as I distrust the government. Let us go through it here. The budget will balance itself. We will have modest deficits, I believe \$10 billion. The budget will be balanced, set in stone, by 2020. Law enforcement asked for the Emergencies Act. There is also going to eat caviar with Russians when they have recently invaded Ukraine, and blaming people for travelling as to the reason why we have lineups at the borders and long lines and long waits for passports. There is hybrid Parliament, for instance, another one meant to address COVID. The list goes on and on.

I actually had a paragraph about trust built right in, so I thank my colleague for asking that question because really that is what it comes down to. The government is saying, “Just trust us to get this right”, but we do not have all the details. It is not a matter of trust in the CRTC. It is a matter of lack of trust in the government.

**Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP):** Madam Speaker, the issue of trust is something we could apply back to the Conservative official opposition, because we had Conservatives pretending that somehow the bill made Canada into North Korea. We had Conservatives pretending that somehow this meant that the government would be following people on cell-phones. It is all in Hansard and it is all in testimony that we have seen.

Conservatives repeatedly blocked witnesses from testifying and refused to have us consider clause-by-clause on the bill to actually improve the bill, which is where most of the witnesses were. Conservatives refused to acknowledge that the vast majority of witnesses who came forward were in favour of the bill with improvements.

The NDP went to work and we got more amendments in than any other party. We worked to improve the bill, which I will be

talking about in just a moment. I would ask my colleague, whom I respect a lot, how Canadians can trust Conservatives when they have been so misleading and disinforming about the bill.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès):** The hon. member for Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo, please answer in 10 seconds or less.

**Mr. Frank Caputo:** Madam Speaker, Conservatives have not been misinforming about the bill. Conservatives want the best bill possible, and we will not apologize for fighting for that.

**Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP):** Madam Speaker, as a rebuttal to my friend from the Conservative caucus, if Conservatives had wanted the best bill possible, they would not have filibustered in committee for weeks. They would not have blocked witnesses from testifying. They would not have blocked amendments to improve the bill, and they would not have been trying to obstruct at every stage of the bill. When Conservatives say they want the best bill possible and basically engage in systematic vandalism of the bill for weeks and weeks, it undermines their own credibility. There is no doubt of that.

However, that is enough on the Conservatives, at least for a moment, though I will come back a little later on in the 20 minutes accorded to me on Bill C-11 to talk about how the Conservatives basically tried to destroy a bill that would help many Canadians. That is really the essence of Bill C-11 and why this bill was important to bring forward.

Over the course of the last three years, we have seen the collapse of Canadian productions, an average decrease of 12.4% per year. That is a lot of lost jobs. What we saw in digital media was that royalties paid to Canadian creators were three times lower than those for traditional media usage. What that means is that not only are Canadians losing their jobs, but they are being paid far lower than what they should be paid. In 2020, we know that one in four people working in the cultural sector lost their jobs. At the same time, the web giants' revenues, in this case Netflix, increased by over 22% in the same year. What we have seen over the course of that time is musician's revenues falling by 79%, a reduction in production and the loss of jobs as well.

A special guest has just arrived in the House. I am not supposed to comment on who arrives in the House, but I am very happy to see our special guest with the member for Burnaby South. If the Speaker wants to rule me out of order, it is perfectly appropriate to do so. I am just thrilled to see her here in the House, I think for the first time.

We have a series of calamities that have struck our cultural producers and employees, the creative minds that bring culture to Canadians, over the last few years. We needed to ensure in Bill C-11 that we put in a place a level playing field. We know that the web giants' revenues and profits have skyrocketed over the course of the last few years. At the same time, as I mentioned, we have seen a reduction in income from virtually every sector within the cultural sphere. Our artists, creators, musicians and writers are a real benefit to Canada, and we need to make sure we have a level playing field so that they get the jobs and have the future that we all want to see. This is really important.

The context of Bill C-11 is the massive profits of the web giants, which really do not contribute anywhere near their fair share to the production of Canadian content to make sure we have in place that vital and dynamic Canadian cultural sphere. On the one hand, there are massive profits; on the other hand, there are shrinking incomes and a shrinking number of jobs in the sector. The intent of Bill C-11 was to put in place a level playing field and ensure that the web giants actually paid their fair share and made their contribution so that we can have more jobs and more vibrant cultural industries and Canadian creative talent can be set loose.

As we know, the Minister of Canadian Heritage, who also believes in having a level playing field, went before committee to testify on what it would mean just financially. The numbers talk and make a big difference. I will talk about what he said in his testimony, when he was finally able to testify. It is important to note that the Conservatives, who said they wanted to question him on the bill, also refused to let him in the room so they could question him on the bill. How do we square that circle? This is where the issue of Conservatives undermining Canadians' trust in them is so apparent. They were saying they have to question the minister and then refused to let him into the room so they could question the minister. It was the same way they treated the chair of the CRTC. They wanted to question him on the bill, but refused to let him into the room to answer questions about the bill.

● (2025)

How do we square that circle with Conservatives who have been running amok ever since they basically torpedoed their former leader? They have broken into factions that are fighting each other. That they would not allow the CRTC chair to come in and be questioned, that they would not allow the Minister of Canadian Heritage to come in and be questioned on Bill C-11, does not make any sense at all to any reasonable Canadian.

Our job is to question, to get answers, to push and to prod. The Conservatives just wanted to talk to themselves, make big grandiose speeches and pontificate, but they did not want us to ask the questions that demanded the answers that Canadians needed to see around Bill C-11. However, we finally managed to get the minister into the room, no thanks to Conservatives who were disruptive, vandalizing and trying every possible way to disrupt the proceedings.

The Minister of Canadian Heritage came in and gave us the figure to the question we were asking: What is the estimated net benefit to the Canadian cultural sector, the net transfer from the web giants who have made these massive profits over the last few years to

### *Government Orders*

Canadian cultural industries, in terms of employment, higher incomes and making sure that there is prosperity in Canada? The figure is \$1 billion, which is how much Bill C-11 would transfer from the web giants, which largely take it out of the country. There is some production that is done in Canada, but not nearly as much as there would be with a level playing field.

Instead of that money leaving the country, it would stay here in Canada and create Canadian jobs. It would create jobs in my riding of New Westminster—Burnaby and our leader's riding of Burnaby South, which is Hollywood north, as members know. It is really the heart and soul of the Canadian production sector. This will mean more jobs for Canadians in our ridings and in ridings right across the country.

It means a future for our young people, even the young people who are here on their first visit to the House of Commons, to actually get engaged as future film editors, as film producers or in a whole myriad of other cultural sectors. It really would guarantee the future. If we think of \$1 billion a year over the next 20 years, then we are talking about \$20 billion for those children who were born this year. In 20 years when they are out in the job market, there will be jobs for them. This is the kind of investment that pays off over the next couple of decades and that, of course, is also vitally important.

What happened to the bill in committee? What did the NDP do? What was our approach? As members know, our leader, the member for Burnaby South, said that we are here to do work and to improve the lives of Canadians, and that is what the confidence and supply agreement is all about. It is pushing for dental care, which we have never had in this country and which so many Canadian families desperately need. It is pushing for affordable housing at a time of massive crises in affordable housing, after decades of Liberal and Conservative governments doing absolutely nothing about affordable housing. Finally, we have the kinds of investments that will actually make a difference in Canadians' lives.

As well, we have talked about and pushed for Canadian pharmacare to be adopted next year. Under the confidence and supply agreement, this is a vital component. Members will recall that just 15 months ago the Liberals and Conservatives combined in that cruel coalition to vote down the Canada pharmacare act that would have 10 million Canadian families actually get the medication that their doctors prescribed. The Liberals and Conservatives got together and said, "We're going to say no to pharmacare." However, under the confidence and supply agreement, with the member for Burnaby South and the NDP caucus, we now have an obligation by the Liberal government to adopt the Canada pharmacare act next year.

On a just transition, we have seen the impacts of climate change. We know what that will mean for young people who, in 20 years, will become adults. If we do not put in place a just transition, if we do not fight back against climate change, it will have a profound impact on their lives.

*Government Orders*

These are all the things that are in the confidence and supply agreement. These are the things that we pushed for, because we believe in working hard to make Canadians' lives better.

How does that philosophy translate to Bill C-11?

● (2030)

We went to committee with the idea of improving Bill C-11. The vast majority of witnesses who came forward said this is a good bill and is a needed bill, but there are areas of improvement.

The NDP is the effective opposition and no one doubts that. We are the ones who get things done. We are the worker bees of Parliament. We are not like the Conservatives. If we were like the Conservatives, we would be going around in circles and pontificating. What we do is get things done. I understand some of the Conservatives are sensitive to that, but that is okay. They can watch and learn from us so they can be more effective in their roles.

As an effective opposition, we came forward with five areas where we wanted to improve the bill. Madam Speaker, as your eyes indicate, you are interested in hearing more, so let me tell you about those five areas.

First, we know that in broadcasting there are barriers for marginalized Canadians. What we sought, fought for, pushed for and succeeded in doing was changing Bill C-11 so that it now reflects that broadcasters have an obligation to open doors and make sure there is a place for Black and racialized Canadians and their stories. For indigenous people, indigenous cultures and indigenous languages, that is now also an obligation. We are opening those doors to Canadians who have not been heard from. When we look at those accomplishments, they are major improvements to the bill.

As to Canadians with disabilities, members know full well that Canadians with disabilities are the most marginalized Canadians. Half of the people who have to go to food banks to put food on the table are Canadians with disabilities. They are half of those who are homeless in this country, and there is a growing number of homeless. That is why we pushed so hard for affordable housing investments on the scale that is needed to ensure that Canadians have a roof over their heads at night. Half of those people have disabilities.

For Canadians with disabilities to tell their stories, broadcasters and online companies will now need to open that place up. These Canadians have been marginalized for so long, and it is a major achievement in improving Bill C-11. It is a major improvement that we will see in the coming years. That \$1 billion in investments can now go to Black and racialized Canadians, indigenous people, indigenous voices, indigenous culture and indigenous languages. Canadians with disabilities will be able to tell their stories and make their own productions. That was a major component of the amendments the NDP brought forward.

The second is community broadcasting. We are seeing a disturbing growth of hate. We have seen this with more racism, misogyny, anti-Semitism, Islamophobia, homophobia and transphobia. All of these toxic forms of hate are being amplified often by social media sources and algorithms that remain in a black box unbeknownst to us and not transparent at all. These companies are not accountable.

We are seeing more and more of that hate and division. We have seen that in the United States with the Republicans. We saw this in Canada with the so-called "freedom convoy". I appreciate many Conservative MPs and feel their work is important, but some Conservative MPs, to my immense chagrin and sadness, embraced the so-called "freedom convoy", even though we saw symbols of hate manifest throughout, such as Nazi flags, flags of vile and violent slavery and slogans that were Islamophobic and anti-Semitic. The convoy wanted to overthrow the government. That was their announced aim. These are things that should not be embraced by any elected official. We should all push back against hate.

However, as we are seeing, part of the antidote to that hate is more enhanced community broadcasting. The second group of amendments that the NDP brought forward and succeeded in passing were amendments that enhance our community broadcasting capabilities, including our radio, TV and online broadcasting, so that people in communities can talk to each other and communities can talk among themselves to build solidarity and build an antidote to the hate and division we are seeing manifest in so many quarters.

● (2035)

This is a fundamentally important series of amendments as well. What they do is turn things back on the community, where we love our neighbours and work with our neighbours, unlike the fear and intolerance we are seeing now with the American Republicans and their wacky campaigns of hate, which unfortunately and disturbingly we see sometimes here in Canada as well. We should never forget that we have seen the most despicable, racist, Islamophobic, anti-Semitic violence in this country, and we need to constantly stand against that. The second series of amendments is the antidote to that hate by putting the emphasis on community broadcasting, which has been eroded so much over the past couple of decades.

The third and fourth series of amendments touched on the issue of ensuring freedom of expression at all times and making sure that was in the bill, and ensuring at the same time that there is enhanced accountability for the CRTC, because we believe that is important. Those amendments go together in a very real sense. Freedom of expression, as reinforced, will be the direction to the CRTC, as freedom of expression is paramount. At the same time, the CRTC has an obligation, with more accountability mechanisms as well. Those are the third and fourth components of what the NDP brought forward.

The fifth is ensuring Canadian jobs and ensuring the protection and promotion of Canadian intellectual property. We need to make sure that Canadian cultural creators, the creators we are all very impressed with, whether they are musicians, actors, actresses or filmmakers, remain in every sphere of the cultural industries we have. We must have in place provisions to ensure Canadian employment and the protection of Canadian intellectual property. That was the fifth and last series of amendments we brought forward to make sure this bill was stronger.

*Government Orders*

We supported the principle of the bill; there is no doubt about that, but we believed in enhancing it. That is why we worked hard to build those amendments in the five categories I mentioned to ensure that we had the best possible Bill C-11.

I will come back for a moment to talk a bit about how the Conservatives handled this whole process, because it saddens me.

Our responsibility in the House of Commons is to come forward and, yes, at times oppose legislation. There is no doubt. I remember speaking in the House for 14 hours in a filibuster to block the mean-spirited, ugly, destructive Harper budget of 2012. I stood in the House for 14 hours to stop that budget because of what it would do to destroy the environment and really the livelihoods of people. There was this transfer of wealth to the banks and the very wealthy. All of the provisions of these Harper budgets provided for overseas tax havens that today, as members well know, amount to \$25 billion a year of tax money that could be supporting families, seniors, students and people with disabilities and ensuring affordable housing, all of those elements. Yes, we could say the Liberal government had not done much until the confidence and supply agreement and that now things are going to start moving, which is great, but the Harper government was deplorable in all of these areas. There was no accountability at all.

For Bill C-11, if the Conservatives had chosen to say they were going to block the transfer to a level playing field, they could have. Instead, they were very destructive and very unhelpful, filibustering, blocking witnesses and doing everything that I think most Canadians would say parliamentarians should not be doing when their work is to scrutinize and make sure that legislation is better when it comes out of the House than when it came in.

I am pleased to say that the NDP did do that. I am pleased to say that we stuck to our principle of improving the bill. At third reading, it is undoubtedly much improved from second reading for all the reasons I just mentioned. We are proud of that work. As an effective opposition, our job is to block legislation when it is bad, but when it is good and when Canadians agree, we must make sure legislation is better coming out than when it was coming in.

• (2040)

**Mrs. Cheryl Gallant:** Madam Speaker, can the NDP House leader confirm that he agreed with the government to extend hours without the constitutional requirement of—

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès):** I remind the member that this has been dealt with. As the Chair has previously pointed out, the motion adopted on May 2 simply states that a minister must have the agreement of another House leader. It does not require that the parties to the agreement communicate it to the House. In making the request, the minister implicitly acknowledged that there is an agreement. There is a long-standing principle that we take a member at their word. There is therefore no reason to doubt the existence of an agreement at this time.

Is there a question for the hon. member?

The hon. member for New Westminster—Burnaby has a point of order.

• (2045)

**Mr. Peter Julian:** Madam Speaker, I am pleased to answer the question. Of course, we want to sit here until midnight and work. We are here—

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès):** I ruled that there is no answering the question.

The hon. member for Mississauga—Malton.

**Mr. Iqwinder Gaheer (Mississauga—Malton, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I welcome my colleague's support for this bill. It explicitly excludes all user-created content on social media platforms and streaming services. These exclusions mean that experiences for users creating, posting and interacting with other user-generated content will not be impacted whatsoever.

I would like to ask my hon. colleague what he thinks of the Conservatives, who have been misleading Canadians regarding this bill.

**Mr. Peter Julian:** Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question. I am going to fully answer the previous question, though, for the minute that I am given, because I think it is important. Why—

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès):** I am going to interrupt the hon. member. I did rule on this. There is no need to answer any question, because it has been ruled on by the Speaker.

I would like the hon. member to please answer the question from the hon. member for Mississauga—Malton.

**Mr. Peter Julian:** Madam Speaker, yes, we wanted to sit until midnight. Yes, I approved it.

On the other question on the importance of how—

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès):** The hon. member for Calgary Centre has a point of order.

**Mr. Greg McLean:** Madam Speaker, when my colleague asked a question, you ruled her out of order and then there was no follow-up question. Now you have ruled the member opposite out of order for responding in the manner he did, yet he is still answering the question.

I suggest, if you are treating the two sides equally, that he should stand down and we should get to the next question, please.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès):** The hon. member for Calgary Centre has a point. I ruled that there would be no answer to the question. The object of this is to debate the bill. The hon. member for Mississauga—Malton has asked a specific question on the bill and I would like the hon. member to perhaps withdraw the answer.

**Mr. Peter Julian:** Madam Speaker, I will withdraw it and answer the second question, which of course is a good one.

*Government Orders*

The Conservatives have been wild in their disinformation on this issue, and unbelievably so. I thought at first it was because members had not read the bill. Then I realized something. We were giving answers in the House about these things and the minister, of course, was responding, and members of the committee who had read the bill were responding. I realized then that this was not about reading the bill or understanding the bill. It was really about talking to a very narrow base that they want to misinform.

I imagine they were fundraising off of it. I imagine that is why they were being so wildly and deliberately inaccurate. However, I find it sad in a parliamentary context. As members of Parliament, we have a responsibility to get the information and deliver to Canadians information that is accurate. The Conservatives have failed now for months to do that in some areas, particularly most egregiously around Bill C-11, where the disinformation is so unbelievably bad that—

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès):** Questions and comments, the hon. member for Calgary Centre.

**Mr. Greg McLean (Calgary Centre, CPC):** Madam Speaker, I sometimes like listening to the member when he gives a speech. I thank him for his speech here, but it was really about criticizing Her Majesty's loyal opposition for its role in trying to point out what might be deficiencies in this bill. Some of those deficiencies are fairly obvious.

I can tell the member that I have received more requests from constituents of mine, who have read the bill, regarding what is wrong with it, including on things like exceptions, exemptions, exemptions to exceptions and all kinds of language. There is nothing here that lets people really understand how things will be ruled on going forward.

As opposed to trying to blame Her Majesty's official opposition and saying to look at the bill itself, can we hear what the member has to say about what is good about this bill? So far, he has given us nothing that is good about this bill.

**Mr. Peter Julian:** Madam Speaker, that is wild disinformation again. I spoke for 20 minutes, and 17 and a half of those minutes were on the bill itself and the NDP amendments. That is wild disinformation. The Conservatives cannot even calculate with a stopwatch, when 17 and a half minutes are given to what is good in the bill and the amendments that the NDP brought forward. I even talked about confidence and supply.

Yes, I took a couple minutes to talk about what was deplorable conduct from the Conservatives, and there is simply no way to excuse it. What the Conservatives did in blocking witnesses from answering questions and blocking people from getting information was simply deplorable. That does not even make sense. I cannot understand why the Conservatives acted the way they did.

There are many good things in the bill, which is why almost all of my speech, which did last 20 minutes, was on both the importance of the bill and the importance of the significant NDP amendments that have improved this bill.

• (2050)

**Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP):** Madam Speaker, I do think we made improvements to the bill. Even one

Green Party amendment managed to get in. It was quite a nice change from Bill C-12, the climate accountability act, on which all of my amendments were killed by the NDP-Liberal deal.

I really regret asking this, but I have not had a chance in this session and we are about to rise for the summer, so I will ask my hon. friend, since he has pointed to the confidence and supply agreement, why the NDP decided that dental care was enough and that proportional representation or significant climate improvements would not be included.

**Mr. Peter Julian:** Madam Speaker, I would disagree with the premise of the question. I talked about dental care, but I also talked about affordable housing. The affordable housing crisis is something that is right across this country, including in the riding of my colleague, for whom I have a lot of respect.

This took unprecedented investments, and for the first time we have those unprecedented investments. After 50 years, since the former Liberal government actually ditched the national housing program, we will actually see tens of thousands of units of affordable housing—not market housing, but affordable housing based on income—being built across the country.

The just transition act is an absolutely mandatory part of the confidence and supply agreement as well. This is absolutely necessary, as I know the member knows, through the climate crisis that we are seeing. Last year, of course, both with the heat dome and the atmospheric rivers, we saw first-hand the impact of the climate crisis that is striking so close. We need that immediately.

The Canada pharmacare act is again another piece of significant legislation that has to be adopted next year. There are 27 other components. It is all published online, and we can of course direct people there who want to learn more. It is all online, all of the elements of the accord and all of the important things that will come to Canadians and to our planet as a result.

**Ms. Laurel Collins (Victoria, NDP):** Madam Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from New Westminster—Burnaby for all of his work on this file.

In front of me here, I have quotes from the Canadian Media Producers Association, from the Coalition for the Diversity of Cultural Expressions, from the Society of Composers, Authors and Music Publishers of Canada and many others who support this bill and want it to move forward and understand how much it will help cultural workers.

We have misleading statements from the Conservative Party, which is using misleading statements about freedom of expression to protect the profits of web giants. I am curious if the member can speak to just how unfortunate it is that they are prioritizing the profits of web giants over support for cultural workers.



*Government Orders*

**Mr. Peter Julian:** Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the member for Victoria for her incredible advocacy and strong push for the environment and for the future of our planet. Coming from British Columbia, I really appreciate and have great respect for her environmental work. It is at such a critical time, when we have seen climate change striking first-hand, particularly in British Columbia as the epicentre.

The member for Victoria has really made an enormous contribution to move this country in a direction we need to go in order to actually and actively combat the climate crisis. I know there is a ton of work still to do, but I wanted to express appreciation for everything that she has done so far, and I know she will continue to keep pushing.

We have had incredible, systematic disinformation from the Conservatives. The vast majority of witnesses who appeared before the committee were in favour of Bill C-11, but they often talked about improvements to the bill. The Conservatives and the NDP took a different tack. The Conservatives' reaction was, "We are just going to shut everything down. We are trying to block everything." The NDP, as the effective opposition, said, "No, we have to improve this bill."

The vast majority of witnesses support it. The quotes that the member from Victoria just made are absolutely accurate. We sought to make the bill better, and we succeeded in those five areas I mentioned during my speech, particularly in terms of breaking down the barriers for marginalized Canadians, Black and racialized Canadians, indigenous—

• (2055)

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès):** Questions and comments, the hon. member for Drummond.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague from New Westminster—Burnaby for his speech. I had the pleasure of working with him when the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage studied Bill C-11.

He said earlier that he spent only about three minutes criticizing the Conservatives' obstructionist tactics and 17 minutes saying nice things about Bill C-11. I congratulate him on having the self-restraint to spend only three minutes talking about the obstructionist tactics.

I would like his opinion on what I see as a crucial part of Bill C-11, the government's kid-glove treatment of web giants. We would like to see the government really stand up to these digital giants that exploit us and rake in huge profits at Canadians' expense, and especially at the expense of Canada's and Quebec's cultural industry.

I would like to hear my colleague's thoughts on that. Does the government's position inspire confidence? Does he believe in the future of our industries, knowing that the government is too spineless to stand up to the web giants?

**Mr. Peter Julian:** Madam Speaker, I also want to thank my colleague from Drummond for his work on the committee. We were able to improve the bill, which is an important part of our work.

Another important part of our work as members of Parliament is to pressure the government.

Has the government stood up to the web giants? No, not really. Some of what my colleague said is very true and relevant.

However, we have work to do. The improved version of Bill C-11 is a first step in that direction, but we need to continue our work—

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès):** Order. We also need to resume debate.

The hon. member for Brandon—Souris.

[*English*]

**Mr. Larry Maguire (Brandon—Souris, CPC):** Madam Speaker, it is my first opportunity to speak to Bill C-11 and outline my significant concerns with what the Liberal government is proposing.

I will be sharing my time tonight with my fantastic colleague, the member representing South Shore—St. Margarets.

Let us make no mistake that what is contained within the legislation is extraordinary new powers for the government, through the auspices of the CRTC, to regulate wide swaths of what Canadians can create and watch on the Internet. Moreover, I have never received a letter, email or phone call from a constituent or a content creator in Canada asking the CRTC to regulate the Internet.

A couple of months ago, I had the opportunity to listen to a presentation on this bill, and one commentator said, "The road to hell is paved with good intentions." I was taken aback for a moment. I had to fully understand why he made that reference, but it got to the crux of the matter, which is that no matter how noble the government's intended goals may be, this legislation will be an absolute quagmire. It gives the CRTC immense powers. It will give it the power to regulate what Canadians listen to and watch on the Internet, which has never been done before. This bill would also leave the door wide open for the CRTC to even regulate content creators sometime down the road.

Millions of Canadians are rightly alarmed about the Liberal government's intentions. Bill C-11 would give the CRTC the power to regulate the Internet, and we know the government will introduce a bill in the future to determine what people can say on the Internet. A representative from YouTube who appeared at committee said, "Our concern is that Bill C-11 gives the government control over every aspect of Canadians' experience on YouTube. It does not include effective guardrails on either the powers given to the CRTC or the content to which those powers apply."

*Government Orders*

Before I go any further, let us just step back and contemplate the size of the CRTC bureaucracy that will need to be established to undertake what Bill C-11 is trying to achieve. The sheer magnitude of the daily content being created for audiovisual services is hard to wrap one's head around. Across online platforms such as YouTube, podcast apps, websites and everything in between, thousands of hours of content are created in Canada every day. Unlike traditional broadcasters the CRTC regulates, new apps and websites are constantly being created and released to the public. Online platforms have cut out the middleman and dramatically reduced overhead costs, which in previous generations made it difficult for content creators to find an audience. As content creators have discovered, they now have the entire world with which to share their product.

Not only have we seen an extraordinary rise in content creators, but we have also seen several new online companies and platforms emerge. I, for one, welcome this innovation and entrepreneurial spirit, all done without needing tax dollars or regulations. With this in mind, for the CRTC to keep up with all the new platforms in order to regulate them would be impossible. I can imagine it now: hundreds of new CRTC employees scouring the Internet for hours and hours as they look for new platforms they intend to regulate.

Not only is it foolhardy to think the CRTC could ever figure out a way to manage this workload, but it would also be an incredible waste of taxpayers' dollars, and for what? What are the Liberals trying to accomplish other than to create a mountain of red tape? That question gets to the core of why this legislation is short-sighted and could have disastrous consequences. What happens if the CRTC says it cannot do the job? Does it then come back to the government and ask for legislative powers to demand online platforms apply for authorization before Canadians can access their content? Not only would that be a colossal headache for companies, but many would just walk away from the Canadian market.

• (2100)

Here is another big question: How can the CRTC even impose its jurisdiction on companies that operate outside Canada? Unlike TV channels or radio waves, there is no limit to the number of websites or online platforms. A company might have its headquarters in Europe, its servers in Asia and its IT developers in the United States. While the CRTC might carry a big stick at home, there is no reasonable way for it to enforce its regulations on companies that do not have a single employee in Canada. These are the questions we must be asking.

It is simply impossible to regulate the Internet, as Bill C-11 would inevitably do. As I see this legislation, there will be very limited benefit for the vast majority of Canadians who create content, the Canadians who watch that content and the companies that publish that content. The real issue is, what problem is the government trying to solve? No one, particularly the Minister of Canadian Heritage, has ever provided a solid reason for this Goliath of a bill. The ingenuity and creativity of content creators such as musicians, artists, pundits, bloggers, gamers and everyone in between have been thriving, all without needing the CRTC to regulate the platforms on which they publish.

Never before in the history of our country has there been more Canadian content being created and watched than there is today.

For those who want to learn about cooking, follow their favourite folk band, watch a tutorial on how to plant a vegetable garden or listen to people debate politics, all one must do is search for it. Many of those Canadians are generating content or deriving income from their own hard work. Many of them now generate revenue and have even made a full-time job out of it.

According to a 2019 university report, there are an estimated 160,000 Canadian content creators on YouTube alone, including 40,000 who have enough of an audience to monetize their channels. I can only surmise that number has grown since then, and more Canadians have unplugged their cable boxes and now turn to the Internet and online content for their entertainment and news. The reason I am bringing this up is the fact that, through Bill C-11, the Liberals are giving the CRTC the power to regulate the platforms their content is uploaded on.

Internet expert Michael Geist, who has been following this legislation, said, "for all the talk that user generated content is out, the truth is that everything from podcasts to TikTok videos fit neatly into the new exception that gives the CRTC the power to regulate such content as a 'program'."

This is important because Bill C-11 would give the CRTC the power to write its own regulations. It would be able to determine what is considered the program, which will then fall under its purview. Due to the vague nature of the bill, no one knows what could possibly be deemed a program.

Mr. Geist also wrote about how this bill is created, stating:

[It] is a legislative pretzel, where the government twists itself around trying to regulate certain content. In particular, it says the CRTC can create regulations that treat content uploaded to social media services as programs by considering three factors:

[First,] whether the program that is uploaded to a social media service directly or indirectly generates revenue;

[Second,] if the program has been broadcast by a broadcast undertaking that is either licensed or registered with the CRTC;

[Third,] if the program has been assigned a unique identifier under an international standards system.

The Liberals can get up to say that user-generated content is exempt, but they cannot say that with any great confidence. As a parliamentarian, I am not comfortable with giving so much power to a body that is not directly accountable to Canadians. If Bill C-11 simply wanted to regulate Netflix, Disney+, Amazon Prime and the other large streaming services, we would be having a completely different conversation. I implore my Liberal colleagues to shelve this bill and go back to the drawing board. There are too many questions and too many concerns for it to proceed.

*Government Orders*

In closing, I want to stress how unrealistic and impractical it is to regulate the Internet. The consequences of this poorly drafted legislation would likely be to weaken consumer choice and hurt the potential of Canadian creators. I, for one, cannot and will not vote in favour of a bill that would grant the CRTC so much power. Canadians are rightly very concerned that this is overreach by the current Liberal government.

• (2105)

**Mr. Iqwinder Gaheer (Mississauga—Malton, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, the Conservatives used every tactic in the tool box to delay and block Bill C-11. At committee, all the members agreed to study the bill for 20 hours of witness testimony. However, the Conservatives did not allow that because they filibustered for seven hours. They went as far as to filibuster their own study at one point.

Why will the colleague and his colleagues not support Canada artists and creators?

**Mr. Larry Maguire:** Madam Speaker, obviously it was in my speech. With the greatest number of creators we have ever had in Canadian history today, there is no way the CRTC is going to be able to manage trying to keep track of everyone through the mechanisms that it will have to put in place to monitor every one of those thousands that are coming into blogs and Internet services every day in Canada.

Our job as the opposition is to try to bring forward good ideas. The government was exempt of that, so we have tried to hold their feet to the fire as a good opposition would. We have heard from thousands, more like millions, of Canadians who have said that the bill is inadequate.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Mario Simard (Jonquière, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I quite like my friend from Brandon—Souris, who serves with me on the Standing Committee on Natural Resources.

He said at the end of his speech earlier that we should not try to regulate the Internet. However, regulating the Internet is not the purpose of the bill. I am sure my colleague is well aware that if Quebec wants its culture to flourish in a sea of anglophones, it needs support. That is what the bill seeks to do: offer support to Quebec culture to enable it to compete with American commercial culture.

That is how the bill should be regarded. The objective is not to regulate the Internet or to limit freedom of expression, but rather to ensure that all forms of expression find their place on the Internet, especially French-language expression.

[*English*]

**Mr. Larry Maguire:** Madam Speaker, this is not about culture. We all have the opportunity to express that anywhere in Canada. The bill is about regulating programming, and the government has given the CRTC the power to determine what a program is and then regulate it. I would be very worried about it if I were from Quebec. I am from Manitoba, another bilingual province. We have to be very concerned about the government interfering in the lives of creators who are putting this content out there every day. Some of them are making a very good living at it.

• (2110)

**Mr. Richard Cannings (South Okanagan—West Kootenay, NDP):** Madam Speaker, it was clear after listening to the member's speech that the Conservatives simply do not want the bill in any shape or form. The member basically said it was impossible, yet Canadian arts and culture workers have been clambering for us to pass the bill because they know how beneficial it will be for them. They have struggled over the past two years, and they need this support.

We have the web giants such as Netflix and YouTube, which are making record profits yet pay no taxes in Canada. This is what the bill is about. I am wondering about the Conservatives saying that we should spend more time at it, yet they filibustered at committee and stopped witnesses from appearing. They delayed getting their amendments in. What is their game plan?

**Mr. Larry Maguire:** Madam Speaker, I want to—

**An hon. member:** Oh, oh!

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès):** Order. There is a member who is trying to answer a question.

The hon. member for Perth—Wellington has a point of order.

**Mr. John Nater:** Madam Speaker, I did call out just to correct the member about the Conservatives' strong position on this matter, and its strong principles—

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès):** The question is that we do not like disorder in the chamber, especially when another member is trying to answer a question.

The hon. member for Brandon—Souris.

**Mr. Larry Maguire:** Madam Speaker, I would have gladly given my time up to my colleague from Perth—Wellington to answer that question because he is absolutely right. What we are talking about here is the creation and the creators on the Internet, not the traditional types of media that we have had in Canada. This is the Internet sites that we are dealing with and the types of creation that are on there are growing and expanding. I do not know where the member gets his information, but there are more creators on the Internet today than we have every had before.

**Mr. Rick Perkins (South Shore—St. Margarets, CPC):** Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise today on behalf of my riding, South Shore—St. Margarets, to speak on Bill C-11, an act to amend the Broadcasting Act, the first amendments in 31 years, I believe.

I was disheartened to see how swiftly the government moved to shut down debate on this important bill. The irony is not lost on me, or probably on the House, that the government moved to stifle debate on a bill designed to control what people can see or say on the Internet. The irony continues because the heritage minister recently stated that he does not expect the Senate to rush the bill through in the other place. This raises the question as to why the government was so eager to have the bill moved through the House of Commons committee.

### *Government Orders*

My colleague for Perth—Wellington noted that the minister does not expect the Senate to rubber-stamp it, but for some reason he expects the House and our 338 duly elected members of Parliament to rubber-stamp the bill. The Liberals voted closure on the second reading of the bill, a bill that would let the government prioritize what is most important for us to see on the Internet, and a bill that would put new entrepreneurs under the thumb of government regulation. This is what the witnesses who generate content on the Internet say. This is what, in committee, the head of the CRTC said. Now, I know other members may have their own opinion, but I think it was the expert, the head of the CRTC, who said that the bill would give it the power to regulate the Internet.

The Liberals did not take what they were hearing and did not like what they were hearing in committee. What did they do? They had the House of Commons put closure on the public hearings and the clause-by-clause phase under the anti-democratic Motion No. 16, which stopped what the committee was doing on the bill and forced clause-by-clause without debate. It even stopped the committee members who moved those motions from reading their motions.

Numerous times during clause-by-clause, I asked the chair, when Motion No. 16 was stated, where in that motion it said, when it talked about debate, whether or not a member could actually read their motion so people watching could find out. The Chair went further to say that he was interpreting Motion No. 16 to mean that members could not even read the motion in the debate, which was quite shocking, because the member for Vancouver Centre who chairs the heritage committee, in 2015 on another piece of legislation, said:

We need to discuss why the government does not listen at committee stage to anything anyone says. It does not accept any amendments from anyone at all, and then it complains that the opposition refuses to allow public consultation. Everyone has accepted that public consultation should occur. Public consultations went on before [it] was set up.... We are absolutely not opposed, but we think we should listen to experts and to people who tell the minister what the government should be doing with the bill, but nobody listens in this government.

That was from the member for Vancouver Centre, who chaired this committee, so it is incredible that the Liberals continued to follow a different path during these discussions. Conservatives have raised the concerns of Canadians time and time again, but sadly the Liberals are too focused on ramming through this legislation. The NDP, of course, were reading from talking points that someone in their coalition had provided them.

The member for New Westminster—Burnaby and the NDP House leader is fond of quoting Tommy Douglas, and I will read for him something that Tommy Douglas said: “The greatest way to defend democracy is to make it work.” Before the member joined the government, he used to understand that the House rules are made to ensure that opposition could do its duty in making democracy work by scrutinizing legislation. In hearing from a variety of witnesses on that legislation, and on proposing and discussing amendments to that legislation, since the member for New Westminster—Burnaby joined the Liberal government, he now thinks the opposition's role is to rubber-stamp legislation, as he clearly did during clause-by-clause.

● (2115)

The member for New Westminster—Burnaby said, in 2015:

There was concern over a wide variety of community impacts as well. We have a government that brought forward a badly flawed bill last year and forced it through. Initial debates reflected very poorly on the government, so it hid the bill for a year and is now bringing it forward with closure, trying to ram it through the House with no due parliamentary consideration.

He was often a critic of tactics of closure before, but he seems to enjoy using closure now that he is part of the government.

Conservatives would have updated the Broadcasting Act while also respecting digital-first creators and those Canadians who want to excel here at home and around the world with the freedom to create and earn a living without government regulation.

Bill C-11 contains disturbing open-ended online censorship regulatory power for the government. The legislation would allow the CRTC to regulate any content that generates revenue directly or indirectly in proposed paragraph 4.2(2)(a). That means virtually all content would still be regulated, including that of independent content creators earning a living on social media platforms such as YouTube, TikTok and Spotify.

What does “indirectly” mean? Everything posted on the Internet has some sort of identifier and code to it, and it is on a page. Everything and everyone in the House is on a page. Opposite that, everything posted on social media has advertising beside it, so everything posted on the Internet indirectly generates revenue. That is why the CRTC chair says it can regulate all user-generated content.

When Canadians do an Internet search or look at videos on YouTube or TikTok, the Liberal government, in this bill, would require that those platforms prioritize Canadian content to the top of the list of what people see. The CRTC would pick the winners and losers of what Canadians can see. It would determine whether the cat video one wants to see has sufficient Canadian content. Is the cat Canadian? Is the videographer Canadian? Was it filmed in Canada? That is how the CRTC would impact what one can see on the Internet.

It is horse feathers that this bill would not give the government the power to regulate all user-generated content, as the minister claims. The Liberal government rules will drive what one sees on the first page, and not what is most popular. Most people do not go past the first page. This bill forces platforms to develop algorithms to choose what cat video comes first on search pages. This is why this bill is so dangerous, but the NDP-Liberal government thinks if it moves we should regulate it: “Hi, we are here from Ottawa and we are here to intrude on people's lives.”

*Government Orders*

Liberals say to trust them, yet they refuse to release the directive that is required to give to the CRTC. That is the trust they ask of us. They say that it is not their intention and not to worry. If they want that trust, then they should make the CRTC directive public now, before the bill passes. What is the government hiding?

The minister has tried to claim that user-generated digital content and YouTube creators, TikTok creators and Canadians who have been able to burst onto the scene not just in this country but internationally, are free from having that content regulated. The government says it has no interest in looking at that. If that were true, the government should have made it clear by voting for our amendments in committee. It refused to pass amendments that would remove the government's and the CRTC's ability to regulate user-generated content indirectly. To me, that says it all. By refusing to do that, by defeating the amendments that would prevent the government from regulating indirect revenue and user-generated content when supposedly the government was open to amendments in committee, it admits the bill has that power.

The NDP-Liberal government only wants to see its ideas on the Internet, and no one else's. The bill is another dagger, in my view, to our democracy. I would urge all members to please vote against this at third reading.

● (2120)

**Mr. Peter Fragiskatos (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Revenue, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, in thinking back to Progressive Conservative governments of the past, they very much championed the idea that television corporations or radio corporations, for example, would have an obligation to support Canadian content. The world has changed very much since the last time the Broadcasting Act was updated in 1991. Streaming services play a fundamental role and are even more important than radio and television in terms of story creation.

Why not ask those streaming services to support the creation of Canadian content? That is my question to the member. That is the fundamental aim of this bill.

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** Madam Speaker, the ability of Canadian artists to develop their programs, music or content has not been hindered by not being regulated. The other day, the member for Kingston and the Islands spoke at length about one quote from The Tragically Hip saying how it could not have burst onto the scene without the use of this bill. It managed to burst onto the scene without this, and so did Justin Bieber, Shawn Mendes, Alessia Cara, the Weeknd and Carly Rae Jepsen. They were all discovered on the Internet without the help of the CRTC or the Liberal government.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from South Shore—St. Margarets for his speech. I had the pleasure of sitting with him during the clause-by-clause consideration of Bill C-11, and we had a lot of fun. It was probably the most entertaining part of the study, I must say.

Having said that, in his speech, he talked about how the legislation would allow the CRTC to regulate content such as user-generated content, which I think is an unfounded statement. I am wondering how many opinions he would have needed to hear to convince him that there is no infringement on freedom of expression or

on user-generated content. Clearly, I am talking about opinions that were contrary to the few that were presented by the witnesses invited by the Conservatives. I would like to hear what my colleague has to say about this. I know he did not attend all the committee meetings, but I think he has a pretty good idea of our work.

● (2125)

[*English*]

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** Madam Speaker, I also enjoyed our time sitting next to each other during the long hours into the evening on clause-by-clause. We had a lot of fun joking back and forth. That is part of the fun we can have sometimes in this place, regardless of the party.

In answer to the member's question, I do not think there is an actual number, but there were dozens more witnesses we were trying to hear from. I do not think the committee ever settled that 20 hours would be the limit. In fact, committees often change the number of witnesses once they are into the committee and say they should hear from more people. We thought we should perhaps hear from a few more witnesses to get a more balanced approach so we could have more discussion about the amendments that were being proposed in clause-by-clause.

**Ms. Laurel Collins (Victoria, NDP):** Madam Speaker, it is pretty rich to hear the Conservatives quoting Tommy Douglas, especially when it comes to time allocation: Under the Harper government, the Conservatives used time allocation over 100 times. I encourage my Conservative colleague to reflect on the words of Tommy Douglas when he said, "The greatest way to defend democracy is to make it work." What we have seen from the Conservative caucus is obstructionist tactics, delays, repeated points of order and attempts to slow down legislation, not to try and make democracy work.

I encourage my colleagues to think about that.

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** Madam Speaker, I thank the member for the quote. The NDP used to remember what it was like to be in opposition, but now it seems to speak for government. The tools that the opposition has for democratic discourse are limited relative to members of the NDP-Liberal government trying to ram things through. We had to use every tool in our arsenal, which is limited in—

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès):** Resuming debate, the hon. member for Calgary Skyview.

**Mr. George Chahal (Calgary Skyview, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the member for Brampton Centre.

I am pleased to rise today to share my support for Bill C-11, the online streaming act. The overarching goal of the act is to ensure that online streamers contribute in an equitable but flexible way to the creation of Canadian content, just as our broadcasting system has done for decades. I want to talk about why this bill is fundamentally important when it comes to our music sector.

### *Government Orders*

Online streaming services such as Spotify and Apple Music have dramatically changed how we listen to music. Today, most Canadians use YouTube as their primary music streaming service; however, these online streamers are not subject to the same rules as traditional broadcasting services such as over-the-air television, cable and radio. Right now, our system is not supporting Canadian musicians and creators the way it should.

The music sector is important to Canadian society. It includes a wide array of artists, including songwriters, composers, performers and arrangers. Agents, producers, record labels and many others also support their work. The music production and sound recording industry accounts for over \$625 million to Canada's GDP and almost 10,000 jobs. Through their music and lyrics, Canada's musicians help create relationships and memories, initiate important social discussions and forge a collective national identity and values. Music allows us to share our country, our culture and our ideas throughout the world.

For decades, Canadian broadcasters have given us incredible Canadian content on our televisions and radios. This is by no accident. We choose to be different from the cultural juggernaut of the United States. We care about our cultural sovereignty. We believe our diversity should be celebrated. Our culture is who we are as Canadians. It is our past, our present and our future. It is how we tell our stories to each other.

As a condition of their licences, radio broadcasters have had to invest in our culture and our artists. It is why we have all the great Canadian content we love. Whenever we hear Charlotte Cardin, Coeur de Pirate, Joni Mitchell, Drake, Justin Bieber, Shawn Mendes, Great Big Sea, the Arkells and The PropheC from Calgary Skyview, it makes us proud to be Canadian.

Since the early 2000s, the music industry has navigated a landscape that has been proudly changed by new distribution models offered by online platforms. We have also seen the music industry evolve from selling music on physical media to digital sales and downloads and, most recently, the increasing popularity of online streaming. Online streaming has had positive impacts for Canadian consumers and certain artists.

Online broadcasters make music readily accessible to Canadians wherever they have an Internet connection available. They can access a variety of music and playlists tailored to their pace and interests. Streaming has also allowed a number of artists to be discovered and has bolstered their careers in other countries. Ruth B. is just one notable example of a Canadian artist who has achieved great international success after being discovered online.

• (2130)

However, the upheaval caused by digital platforms has also had significant consequences for our broadcasters and musical artists. Currently, online platforms have no regulatory requirements to support Canadian music. As more and more Canadians listen to online platforms and the revenues of traditional broadcasters drop, so too does the funding and support for Canadian musical artists. We need to fix this now.

We have heard, loud and clear, from Canadian music producers that passing Bill C-11 is critical to the industry. I want to share a

quote from SOCAN, the Society of Composers, Authors and Music Publishers of Canada:

Canadian creators need support to continue to develop Canadian music in the world of streaming, and Canada must be a place for emerging music creators, where songwriters and composers can create, grow and thrive.

It continues:

The tabling of the Online Streaming Act on February 2, 2022, is an important first step to make it easier for Canadian audiences to find and engage with Canadian creators, giving our music a place in the world of streaming.

The chair of the board of the Canadian Independent Music Association told us that:

The most tangible way to get our artists heard in Canada and around the world is to ensure that we have awesome Canadian artists, supported by strong Canadian owned independent music companies that can compete in the global music market.... I welcome all initiatives that help make our companies stronger and our artists thrive.

That is why we are here. On this side of the House, we want to see our artists thrive. Bill C-11 seeks to update our broadcasting framework so that online platforms would be required to support Canadian music and artists, just as traditional broadcasters currently do. Bill C-11 would ensure that our musical artists would continue to contribute to Canadian culture and be able to make a living from their music. This bill is a part of our wider commitment to supporting artists in Canada and strengthening our arts and culture sector.

In conclusion, this bill realizes the importance of investing in Canadian music. Bill C-11 creates a competitive and sustainable broadcasting system while supporting music. The modernized and fair regulatory framework that it proposes would support Canadian artists and broadcasters.

I ask the hon. members of the House to support this bill. We owe it to the next generation of Canadian music talent.

\* \* \*

• (2135)

[*Translation*]

## CRIMINAL CODE

BILL C-21—NOTICE OF TIME ALLOCATION MOTION

**Hon. David Lametti (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, an agreement could not be reached under the provisions of Standing Orders 78(1) or 78(2) with respect to the second reading stage of Bill C-21, an act to amend certain acts and to make certain consequential amendments regarding firearms.

*Government Orders*

Under the provisions of Standing Order 78(3), I give notice that a minister of the Crown will propose at the next sitting a motion to allot a specific number of days or hours for the consideration and disposal of proceedings at the said stage.

\* \* \*

[*English*]

**ONLINE STREAMING ACT**

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-11, An Act to amend the Broadcasting Act and to make related and consequential amendments to other Acts, be read the third time and passed, and of the amendment.

**Mr. Greg McLean (Calgary Centre, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague talked about the cultural juggernaut of the United States and how this bill is meant to forestall that cultural juggernaut.

However, over the last several months, we have been in the House debating bills that pertain to issues that primarily arise in the United States. In as much as we are culturally juggernauted by the United States, we seem to be responding to it in the House. I am hoping that the member does not have a bill in front of the House that he is supporting that would actually lead to more of that or bring in more U.S. culture and politics. Could he address that?

It is not his party's practice to keep these issues out of Canadian politics.

**Mr. George Chahal (Calgary Skyview, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, what this bill does is it makes sure that we become a juggernaut when it comes to supporting Canadian music, artists and talent. I can tell members that my constituents and many great artists need and want the opportunities to flourish and to be able to become those great artists, many of the great artists that I mentioned a few minutes ago in my speech.

This bill also makes sure that we can support those Canadian artists and content, as well as support Black, indigenous and racialized communities across Canada.

• (2140)

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Marie-Hélène Gaudreau (Laurentides—Labelle, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I will be brief. We are among friends, it is late and we are chatting. The government just gave notice of a time allocation motion. I must say that this in no way comes as a surprise.

I would like to know what is going on with the official opposition. We are trying to regulate and protect content, not control it. I do not understand.

Why does my colleague think the official opposition is so opposed to Bill C-11?

[*English*]

**Mr. George Chahal:** Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that we see constant delays by the official opposition in bringing forward important legislation that supports Canadians from coast to coast to coast. This bill does that. It supports Canadian content and artists, to the contrary of what the opposition is saying. It is unfortunate the Conservatives do not want to support an important bill to help mod-

ernize, from the 1990s, the Canadian Broadcasting Act. This bill brings opportunities for Canadian content and for better funding and support for Canadian artists to thrive from coast to coast to coast in both official languages, and it supports Black, indigenous and racialized communities as well.

**Ms. Laurel Collins (Victoria, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, this bill is a step in the right direction, but web giants like Netflix, Facebook and YouTube still do not pay their fair share. What is needed is a digital services tax, a tax that would require these web giants to pay their fair share on the profits they are earning here in Canada. I wonder if the member would commit to pushing his party to ensure that web giants pay their fair share.

**Mr. George Chahal:** Mr. Speaker, this bill is extremely important because it mandates that many of those companies the member mentioned contribute to the system to support Canadian content. I am in support of that. I am supportive of the Canada Media Fund being well funded to support Canadian content, and all broadcasters should contribute to that. I look forward to working across the aisle with my colleagues to see how we can improve that and how we can make sure that all broadcasters contribute to that so that local artists and contributors to Canadian content can thrive and survive in this highly competitive industry.

**Mr. Ron McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, over the years, I have had many conversations with content originators, mainly musicians, who have complained that in the current online environment it is almost impossible to make a living, and it is suffocating the Canadian music industry. I wonder if the member could tell us more about how this bill will help them to survive and thrive.

**Mr. George Chahal:** Mr. Speaker, it is so important to make sure that Canadians who are working hard to bring forward music, and artists, have the opportunity to do so. I can tell the member about, in my riding of Calgary Skyview, a number of artists, such as The PropheC, who from a young age has been creating music and is now an international success. He is from a racialized community. Jarnail Aielonn is somebody who supports working hard by day, but in the evening he is producing great music and content around the world. It will help people like that across the country who currently do not have the opportunity to flourish and provide great content and great music for all of us to enjoy.

**Mr. Shafqat Ali (Brampton Centre, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for Calgary Skyview for sharing his time with me.

I respectfully acknowledge the Anishinabe people as I join the debate from the national capital region located on the unceded traditional territory of the Algonquin nation.

It is an honour to rise in the House today to speak in support of Bill C-11, the online streaming act. This bill represents an important milestone in supporting Canadian culture, both today and into the future. Some critics of the bill have questioned the need to safeguard Canadian culture, and I would like to take the opportunity today to talk about some of the unique benefits provided by the Canadian broadcasting system.

### *Government Orders*

While online broadcasters are an important element of the Canadian system in this day and age, some genres like sports remain the mainstay of traditional broadcasters. With this legislation, the sports programs that Canadians currently enjoy would remain available in the future as technologies evolve and business models change.

Canada has a rich history of athletic excellence, and Canadian broadcasters have been there to capture these moments and share them with our fellow Canadians. In the earliest days of radio, Foster Hewitt would welcome fans to hockey broadcasts on Saturday nights with his iconic sign-on: “Hello, Canada, and hockey fans in the United States and Newfoundland.”

Broadcasting helped inspire a love of one of our national sports for generations of Canadians. Broadcasters have covered innumerable Stanley Cups, the historic summit series between Canada and the U.S.S.R. at the height of the Cold War, and both our men's and women's national teams winning gold medals on home soil in the 2010 Winter Olympics, hosted by Vancouver. Moments like these bring Canadians of all backgrounds together. They are fun, entertaining and dramatic. Such experiences strengthen the cultural fabric and sense of sovereignty of our country.

It is not just hockey that broadcasters showcase for Canadians. Through the small screen, Canadians have seen numerous remarkable athletic achievements. Television and radio have chronicled the Toronto Blue Jays, first in 1992 then again in 1993, and the Toronto Raptors in 2019, becoming the first champions from outside the United States in professional baseball and basketball respectively.

We watched as Mike Weir became both the first Canadian and the first left-handed golfer to win the Masters in 2003. Similarly, Georges St-Pierre won two UFC welterweight championships, cementing his reputation as a renowned athlete and possibly the best MMA fighter ever. Traditional broadcasters, through a range of offerings like basic cable and pay-per-view television, have allowed us to follow these careers and share in these exciting moments.

We saw Donovan Bailey go down in history as the fastest man in the world when he won Olympic gold in 1996. We marvelled when Bianca Andreescu captured the first tennis singles major in Canadian history by winning the 2019 U.S. Open.

• (2145)

The country was captivated by one of the most inspiring athletic achievements in history when Terry Fox ran 5,300 kilometres across Canada in 143 days to raise money for cancer research during the Marathon of Hope.

Sports and athletic achievements are without a doubt an important part of Canadian culture. Canadian athletes set records and break ground. They reflect the diversity of our country, and we can celebrate their athletic accomplishments in real time, in part because these sports programs are made available through our broadcasting system.

Cross-country skier and biathlete Brian McKeever has a career total of 17 medals and is now Canada's most decorated winter Paralympic athlete, an honour previously held by the late Lana Spree-

man. The Paralympic Games raise the profile of accessible sports with coverage by CBC and by other broadcasters. In the recent winter 2022 Paralympic Games, Canada ranked third as a country, bringing home 25 medals.

As a particular point of pride, Canada is a leader in women's sports and making strides toward gender equity in the field. For instance, when Christine Sinclair scored her 185th international goal, she broke the scoring record for both men's and women's international soccer. Quinn became the first transgender, non-binary athlete to earn a medal when the Canadian women's soccer team won gold at the 2020 Tokyo Olympics.

Moments like these inspire Canadians and create a shared sense of national pride and unity. Canadian broadcasters have played a key role in sharing these events with Canadians. That is why Bill C-11—

• (2150)

**The Deputy Speaker:** Order. We have a point of order from the hon. member for Perth—Wellington.

**Mr. John Nater:** Mr. Speaker, I want to give the member for Brampton Centre a couple of seconds to sit down and maybe collect his thoughts, because he might be reading the wrong speech from the department. It does not seem to be relevant to Bill C-11. I enjoy the walk down sports history lane, but I do not see the relevance to Bill C-11. Perhaps the department gave him the wrong speech.

**The Deputy Speaker:** I thank the member for the interruption. It is not a point of order.

I will recognize the hon. member for Brampton Centre.

**Mr. Shafqat Ali:** Mr. Speaker, sports and broadcasting have a strong relation. They go together, and that is the history I am talking about. Bill C-11 is important because broadcasters are directly related with this and sports history is really important to tell to Canadians.

Just as a level playing field is vital for sports, it is equally important in broadcasting. Requiring online broadcasters to contribute to the broadcasting system in an equitable manner will help ensure that significant sports moments continue to be broadcast to all Canadians.

In conclusion, without a doubt our culture includes sports teams and leagues, big and small, that we follow as aspiring players ourselves. Whether fair-weather fans or steadfast fans, we are fans across the country.

Bill C-11 is important for many reasons. I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak today on how modernizing the legislation would level the playing field between traditional and online broadcasters so that both can compete in a fair manner that is sporting after all.



*Government Orders*

• (2155)

**Mr. John Nater (Perth—Wellington, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the member opposite for his sports analogies. I am not sure how they are relevant to Bill C-11, since sports are actually not entirely captured in Bill C-11, since Canadian broadcasters use sporting commentary to fulfill their CanCon requirements, but since he is on sports, I wonder if he would join me in condemning Hockey Canada for failing to disclose, four years ago, a sexual assault that occurred in London, Ontario.

Will he join me in condemning Hockey Canada for covering that up for the last four years?

**Mr. Shafqat Ali:** Mr. Speaker, absolutely, yes, I would.

This bill explicitly excludes all user-created content on social media platforms and streaming services. These exclusions mean that the experience for users creating, hosting and interacting with other user-generated content will not be impacted whatsoever, while the treatment of commercial content such as TV shows and all songs across all platforms will still be standardized.

This bill tells the CRTC to work with platforms to ensure a certain amount of Canadian content is showcased on platforms in both official languages as well as indigenous languages. Clause 12 of the online streaming act explicitly states that any regulation that CRTC imposes on platforms through the Broadcasting Act cannot infringe on Canadians' freedom of expression on social media.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, Bill C-11 contains many extremely important points that we have not discussed much because all kinds of events happened that prevented us from really debating issues that I feel are very important.

For example, we have talked about the concept of discoverability at length, but the idea of the concept of discoverability has boosted francophone culture and enabled francophone artists to have great careers and develop an enviable audience, especially on the radio, in Quebec and probably eastern Canada as well.

I would like my colleague to say a few words about discoverability because this is an extremely important concept in the context of Bill C-11. It is important to the development of Quebec content and francophone content across Canada.

[*English*]

**Mr. Shafqat Ali:** Mr. Speaker, this bill updates CRTC guidelines that will increase the proportion of French language content to be supported through the Canada Media Fund and other streams. For example, clause 6 of the online streaming act specifies that all new requirements for platforms must work to support and enhance French and English minority language communities across the country.

With regard to minority languages in the North American media landscape, we are taking action to protect and promote francophone creators and storytellers. This is a part of the Government of Canada's larger commitment to ensure the vitality of French language and minority language communities.

**Mr. Richard Cannings (South Okanagan—West Kootenay, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, for years, one of the things that the NDP has

been calling for is a level playing field, a new Broadcasting Act that would stop the unfair competition that our broadcasters and our arts sector have been facing for years and years. The Liberals have been in power for six years or seven years now, and I am wondering if the hon. member can estimate how many jobs have been lost because we have not been forcing Netflix and the other web giants to pay their fair share to support Canadian work in the arts and cultural sector.

• (2200)

**Mr. Shafqat Ali:** Mr. Speaker, for decades Canadian broadcasters have given us incredible Canadian content through television and radio. That was not an accident. We have chosen to be different from the cultural juggernaut of the United States. We care about our cultural sovereignty. We believe our diversity should be celebrated. Our culture is who we are as Canadians.

I am sorry, but English is not my mother language, just to let the hon. member know.

It is our past, our present and our future. It is how we tell our stories to each other. As a condition of their licences, television and radio broadcasters have had to invest in our culture and our artists.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Marie-Hélène Gaudreau (Laurentides—Labelle, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing my time with my esteemed colleague from Trois-Rivières.

Since we are talking about culture, all of the Quebec TV series recently ended for the season, so I want to say hello to my mother-in-law, my father-in-law, my spouse and my two grown daughters, who are almost finished their school year. In a few days, we will be returning home to our riding.

All joking aside, we have raised a lot of issues since the start of this debate. This is the first time I will be speaking about this subject, and so I will put my colleagues back on the right track.

Quebec culture is at the heart of the Bloc Québécois's mission and mine as an MP, and broadcasting is certainly one of the most effective tools for getting the message out and helping to define our national identity. It goes without saying that the Bloc Québécois supports this reform. We even supported time allocation before the last election. Indeed, we agree with this legislation. Why? It is because the Broadcasting Act has not been updated since 1991. Generations are getting shorter as technology evolves in leaps and bounds. It is about time.

### *Government Orders*

In May 2021, in *La Presse*, Paul Journet wrote: “Our broadcasting and telecommunications laws were written in the VHS era”. My daughters associate VHS with that big box of memories I pull out so we can watch snippets of their mother’s teenage years. Now that is old.

The system has become outdated and unfair. Unlike our radio and television stations, today’s platforms, which are often run by foreign giants, have zero obligation to fund or broadcast Canadian cultural content. Our companies are at a disadvantage, and our artists are losing revenue. For example, in 2019, 52% of audiovisual content produced in Canada was not Quebec content. Let me say that again. In 2019, 52% of audiovisual content produced in Canada was not Quebec content. It was content made in Canada by foreign companies.

Furthermore, according to data from the Canadian Audio-Visual Certification Office, the number of Canadian productions decreased by 12% each year between January 2017 and 2020. I know several producers, and they can confirm this. It is alarming and it is high time we address it.

The 30 or so titles from Quebec on Disney+, Amazon Prime Video and Netflix make up 0.1% of their Canadian catalogue. Quebec film and television series producers and distributors, whose work I admire, are still finding it very difficult to sell their shows to these American streaming giants. Of course, there are very few shows made in Quebec. In September, there were none on Disney+. I invite my colleagues to go check; it is appalling. This has to change, because rich cultural expression is out there and people should be able to access it.

No more than five of Amazon Prime Video’s 1,400 titles are from Quebec. When I tell my daughters that, they say they understand why we watch more shows in English than in their mother tongue.

Netflix is the only platform to have increased its Quebec catalogue significantly. I have to say I appreciate that. The California-based company has more than quintupled its production in Quebec over the past two years, from five titles to almost 30.

Even though minority communities account for 14% of Canada’s francophone population, francophone television production in minority communities accounts for just 4% of the total.

● (2205)

When it comes to music, francophone music on digital platforms represents only 2.7% of the 10,000 most popular songs. Those numbers are hard to see.

The Society of Composers, Authors and Music Publishers of Canada, or SOCAN, recently reported to the Canadian Press that francophone artists in Canada receive only 2% of the digital royalties paid in the country. After recording an album, an artist would receive only a few cents, especially if it is on a platform like Spotify, so it really is a poor reflection of the consumption of Canadian content on digital platforms, never mind the impact it has on the economy.

This is where our minds are right now. We have been waiting for this bill for months, and we are making a major and constructive

contribution, especially thanks to my hon. colleague from Drummond who did so much to help improve it. We hoped to pass this bill before the election, when it was called Bill C-10. Now we have Bill C-11 before us, and it must pass.

I will repeat the main points. What is this bill all about? It concerns the protection and promotion of original French content. So far, so good.

Earlier, my esteemed colleague from Drummond spoke about discoverability, or discovering Canadian programming and original Canadian content, and especially having a fair share of original French-language content. The term “fair” is very important. There is also the showcasing aspect. When the content is good, it is showcased in programming in both official languages and also in indigenous languages.

There is also the mandatory contribution to the Canadian broadcasting system in the event that a business is unable to access Canadian resources for its programming. We spoke about control earlier, and I look forward to hearing the questions I will be asked. We need to have first-run French content to ensure the presence, or discoverability, of new broadcasts on platforms such as Netflix, Amazon and Disney+. There are older programs or old films that we like to watch these days, especially when we return to our ridings.

There is a sunset clause to ensure that there is a thorough review of the legislation every year. Why? Because technology changes so quickly. We have to leave some elbow room to review, compile and correct course in order to be sure, for once, that we are in tune with the times.

The Minister of Canadian Heritage promised us that the Bloc Québécois’s amendments would end up in the new version. They are indeed there. The wording of some of them is slightly different, but the important thing is the substance. Nothing can be left to chance in a bill where we want to be able to course correct in the event that changing one simple word has a major impact on the effect of the clause.

From day one, the Bloc, backed by Quebec’s entire cultural sector, was the party that worked the hardest on improving Bill C-10 and getting it passed. Unfortunately, it was dropped from the Order Paper. I have been a member since 2019, and I learned that we have to start over when that happens.

For my last minute, I would like to say that with each month lost, though whether because of our fatigue, the filibustering or some other reason, I think about the industry. That is \$70 million that is not going to our artists in Quebec and Canada.

It is time to do something about this, so I urge all my colleagues to vote in favour of this bill.

*Government Orders*

• (2210)

[English]

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the enthusiastic support for Bill C-11 and the member's comments in regard to the Minister of Canadian Heritage and being genuine in wanting to improve the legislation and look for amendments. The Bloc members have contributed a number of thoughts that ultimately influenced the legislation that we have today.

The member has recognized with enthusiasm the potential within the legislation, in particular for things like the French language, and that it has a very positive impact for young people who are looking at the arts performance area and at being in that whole industry. I am wondering if she could provide her thoughts in regard to the important message this sends to young people who see themselves getting into the arts programs.

[Translation]

**Ms. Marie-Hélène Gaudreau:** Mr. Speaker, the arts, such as music, theatre and languages, encourage us to explore. That is culture.

As I was saying earlier, more diversity and discoverability lead to more wealth, which will have a positive effect on the next generation of creators, those young creators who have struggled to get through the pandemic because they were isolated.

Hold on to your hats, everyone, because what we are doing now will help these young people become the artists of tomorrow.

**Mr. Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Laurentides—Labelle for her excellent speech and her kind words. I am flattered, touched, honoured and a touch embarrassed.

I thought that my colleague gave a fascinating answer to the member for Winnipeg North's question about culture just a few minutes ago. I know that her riding is home to many cultural organizations and artists and that it has a vibrant cultural life.

I would like to hear my colleague talk a bit about how greatly the cultural industry has suffered in recent years and about why a bill like Bill C-11 is so important to reviving our cultural industry.

**Ms. Marie-Hélène Gaudreau:** Mr. Speaker, my esteemed colleague from Drummond is right. Indeed, my riding of Laurentides—Labelle is culturally diverse, whether it be in terms of film or singer-songwriters.

Clearly, we need to talk about the idea of redistribution. Consuming culture is not only good for the soul, but it can also break isolation. It re-invigorates, and that has an effect on our future actions.

This bill is about giving artists their fair share, in a fair way. It is late, but I think everyone understands what I am saying. This is about giving back and inspiring the culture that is so abundant in our hearts.

**Mr. Greg McLean (Calgary Centre, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for her speech.

I heard her mention some figures. She mentioned something about \$70 billion a year for the arts sector in Quebec.

Where is that number coming from? Does that amount make sense for the Quebec economy?

• (2215)

**Ms. Marie-Hélène Gaudreau:** Mr. Speaker, the amount was \$70 million. That is what the heritage minister told us last year.

It is important to understand that this is an estimate, and the industry agrees. Obviously, it would be difficult to get an exact figure. However, when the amount is in the millions of dollars, that is just too much.

**Ms. Laurel Collins (Victoria, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for her speech. For many years now, our broadcasters and cultural workers have been suffering from unfair competition from the web giants.

That is why the NDP believes this bill is a good first step in creating a level playing field and making the web giants pay their fair share. The Liberal government has been delaying this reform for many years.

Can the member explain the repercussions of this delay on the loss of revenue and jobs in the cultural sector in Quebec and Canada?

**Ms. Marie-Hélène Gaudreau:** Mr. Speaker, I congratulate my colleague on her French. That is a form of discoverability and I am very proud of that. I am taking English classes to enrich my mind and broaden my cultural horizons, and my accent is improving.

The consequences are clear. We are trying to make up for the time lost since 1991. We want the act to be reviewed every five years to ensure that we do not fall as behind as we are now.

**Mr. René Villemure (Trois-Rivières, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the House for the opportunity to speak to Bill C-11. I am very proud of this bill and will explain why.

I want to take this opportunity to mention that my son started working on air in radio this morning. I wish him well with discoverability. I will also add that my daughter is a documentarian and recently produced a documentary on Montreal in the disco era. I have two children working in the arts, in French, which is why this topic is particularly important to me.

In addition, my riding of Trois-Rivières is a place where many artists converge. People are familiar with Fred Pellerin and, perhaps, the Lemay brothers. There are also people in studios producing soundtracks that are distributed all over the world, even in China. The Cogeco auditorium just recently hosted *Harmonium symphonique*, so it is safe to say that Trois-Rivières is awash in culture.

Speaking of culture, I want to address one criticism. In the past, a number of people—although there are fewer of them now—have asked me what the Bloc Québécois's role is in all of this. We defend the French language and francophone culture, which means that we protect and support artists.

### *Government Orders*

As soon as we saw Bill C-10, we could tell that protecting French was not a strong priority. English is appealing; it is everywhere on the web and in music. I have nothing against English. However, what bothers me is that English is becoming the singular way of thinking, which means that culture is disappearing.

Let me give you an example. Recently, I was with people from the OECD who were presenting a framework for analyzing artificial intelligence. Being a language specialist, I asked the woman which language the framework was designed in. She told me that everyone had met in Paris—people from Egypt, Brazil, Canada and everywhere. I asked her what language these people spoke while in Paris, and she said that they had been working in English. There is nothing wrong with that, but the very nature of the thought process is different.

That is what people mean when they talk about losing a culture and losing a way of thinking. That is why the discoverability we have all been talking about here is important. We have to be able to develop francophone content, and it has to be a priority for online companies. With Bill C-10, we had concerns about whether the CRTC, as a relic of the 20th century, would have the wherewithal to take action on this. We proposed amendments that addressed the situation and resolved those concerns. Our francophone artists will reap the rewards.

We also considered the impact of Bill C-10 on freedom of expression. My colleague from Drummond proposed amendments that were agreed to, amendments that can provide reassurance to artists and content creators.

Next came an unjustified hiatus because of the election. Perhaps it was not completely unjustified; after all, I was elected. People lost money because of the hiatus because it delayed the introduction of Bill C-11. My colleague from Drummond was undeterred. He kept working just as hard, single-handedly advancing the cause of content creators, because that is what the Bloc Québécois does: We do it all for Quebec.

We clarified the concept of decision. This may seem simple, but it is not. Decision is a word, and, as I often point out, a word is a construct of sound and meaning. We added meaning to the word decision.

We also insisted on maintaining Canadian ownership and Canadian control of the broadcasting system. We insisted and will continue to insist on the chair of the CRTC becoming proficient in French. This is not a preference, but a necessity. A culture cannot be understood if its language is not understood. Throughout the current process, the Bloc Québécois kept pressuring the government to do more for Quebec.

Sadly, the debate gave way to disgraceful comments. I am thinking in particular about the member for Lethbridge, who told Alberta media that some provisions of Bill C-10 targeted a very niche group of artists from Quebec, outdated artists stuck in the early 1990s because they failed to be competitive on the new platforms. She went on to say that these Quebec artists produce content that Canadians simply do not want.

One would be hard pressed to find greater contempt. Throughout the debate, I heard several colleagues, especially on the Conserva-

tive side admittedly, express their concerns about freedom of expression.

● (2220)

That is an important topic, so I took the time to ask three colleagues in the House how they would define freedom of expression. Interestingly, other than saying that freedom of expression is important and essential, no one was able to define the concept and what they understood by it. I was not convinced by the argument.

Invoking something does not make it real. Instead of wasting time with baseless arguments, the Bloc Québécois prefers to take action and protect content creators. Quebec culture is at the heart of the Bloc Québécois's mission. Broadcasting is one of the most effective tools for sharing this culture, which is our identity.

The Bloc Québécois is clearly in favour of modernizing the Broadcasting Act, which has not been updated in ages, not since 1991. Obviously, the evolution of technology has not been taken into account.

The Bloc Québécois also contributed significantly to the previous version of the bill, Bill C-10, by securing the following gains: the protection and promotion of original French-language programs; the discoverability of services, and I will not dwell on this, since it has already been discussed at length; the promotion of Canadian programming in both official languages and in indigenous languages; a mandatory contribution to Canada's broadcasting system; the requirement for first-run French-language content, in order to ensure there are new French-language shows on Netflix, for example; and a sunset clause that would provide for a comprehensive review of the act every five years.

When my colleagues ask about the purpose of the Bloc Québécois, I can say our purpose is to protect, promote and take care of francophone culture. The Minister of Canadian Heritage promised us that the Bloc Québécois amendments would be included in the new version of the reform, and indeed, we see significant evidence of them. We have to admit it. That said, the wording obviously differs. Some words are changed here and there, which can change the meaning a bit, but we have to admit that it is quite clear.

Quebec's and Canada's cultural sector has been impatiently waiting for this act to be updated. It has been waiting for decades. The first request from the cultural sector is simple: ensure that this bill is passed. That is what we are being asked to do. Earlier, there was mention of the \$70 million estimated by the then Minister of Canadian Heritage. It was an estimate, but a reliable one.

*Government Orders*

Since the beginning of time, it was said that everything that happened happened within the bounds of space and time. Nothing could exist outside space and time. Globalization and the Internet turned this idea upside down. In 2022, the virus has no borders, inflation has no borders and culture has no borders. It is time to pass Bill C-11 before time ravages our Quebec and Canadian cultures, turning them into a monolith.

• (2225)

[*English*]

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the member made reference to the issue of freedom. The Conservative Party seems to want to paint a picture of Bill C-11 as an offence or an attack on people's freedoms. When we take a look at the legislation, we will find that it does not in any way regulate the Internet, control what Canadians can see or try to tell Canadians what they have to watch.

Can my colleague provide his thoughts on the Conservatives arguing that Bill C-11 is an attack on freedom?

[*Translation*]

**Mr. René Villemure:** Mr. Speaker, freedom of expression is a truly fundamental subject. Freedom of expression is often discussed but seldom defined. I would like to add a philosophical dimension.

Freedom of expression is the possibility of saying something. It is not permission to say anything at all; it is the possibility of saying something. Bill C-11 fundamentally leaves a lot of space for everyone. I believe that Bill C-11 does not place significant restrictions on freedom of expression. I honestly believe that one would have to be a little malicious to think that it contains restrictions.

[*English*]

**Mrs. Tracy Gray (Kelowna—Lake Country, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the member could speak to the term “discoverability” and if he has any concerns with the vagueness of that in this particular piece of legislation, which does not have a clear definition. It is probably one of the most important ways that this legislation will be implemented and carried out, yet we do not even have a definition. I wonder if he could speak to that.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. René Villemure:** Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague for her very important question.

Discoverability is a potential. It is a possibility. It is a bit like planting seeds and watching the flowers grow afterwards. At the moment, I would not be able to say what colour the flower will be, and that is what will probably be governed by the regulations in due course. Nevertheless, what matters is that the possibility of being discovered is written into the law. It is the use that will determine this discoverability, but, for the moment, the important thing for us is that it is in the bill at this stage.

**Mr. Mike Morrice (Kitchener Centre, GP):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for Trois-Rivières for his speech.

I know he supports Bill C-11 and that discoverability of French-language content is important to him. That reminds me of my own experience watching *M'entends-tu?* on Netflix while I was working

on my French. I hope more people across the country will watch this amazing show.

My question for the member is about clause 4.2, which would make it possible to regulate user-generated content. This worries me, so I proposed an amendment to strike it, but my amendment was rejected.

Is he concerned about this clause too? Are Quebec's content creators concerned?

**Mr. René Villemure:** Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for the question. It is an important one that will give us the opportunity to clarify the situation.

The thing that surprises me a bit is that the question sounds a lot like the Conservative point of view, which is unusual, honestly. However, in this case, the proposed interpretation of clause 4.2 is simply false. That is not how it should be understood, on the contrary.

• (2230)

**Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, we are talking about \$1 billion that will be paid to cultural organizations. That will certainly make a big difference for our artists.

What difference does the member think that this billion dollars will make for artists from Quebec?

**Mr. René Villemure:** Mr. Speaker, we have been talking about discoverability for several minutes now. Discoverability refers to the potential to be discovered, found, used, watched, listened to and read, and it is very important to us. Discoverability leads to more revenue over time. Like all models, these models can, of course, be improved. However, I think that we have worked on it and polished it enough.

[*English*]

**Mr. Darrell Samson (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Veterans Affairs and Associate Minister of National Defence, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I just want to mention that I will be sharing my time with the member for Hamilton East—Stoney Creek.

This is a great opportunity to speak on behalf of Sackville—Preston—Chezzetcook and on behalf of Bill C-11, which is, of course, modernizing the Broadcasting Act for a digital age and continuing the tradition of supporting a diverse audience.

The current Broadcasting Act was passed in a much different era, way back in 1991. We have seen, of course, HDTV, now 4K television, high-speed Internet and the growth of online audiovisual broadcasting services increase over time. These technological changes have left the Broadcasting Act well behind. Video and audio computer coding standards like MPEG4 and MP3 did not even exist when the current act was envisioned. The only way to receive content in those days, of course, was through TV and radio. The purpose behind Bill C-11 is to bring the Broadcasting Act to the 21st century.

### *Government Orders*

We are living in an interactive, on-demand, multi-device digital age. Our system needs to adapt to a modern era and Bill C-11 does just that. The goal is to generate more funding for Canadian music and stories, and more employment opportunities in the creator sector. We want Canadian programs and songs to be discoverable, including an Internet-based platform that captures so many viewers and listeners today, especially a young audience.

Bill C-11 would do this not just for mainstream programming, but also for diverse and marginalized voices that have historically been under-represented in the broadcasting system and have had very limited content choices by, for and about them.

The underlining Canadian values of fairness, acceptance and respect have long been part of our broadcasting system. We know that Canadian audiences are diverse and that the broadcasting system needs to serve them all. It is the principle that has ensured, from the very beginning, that there must be broadcasting in both French and English. It is the same principle behind the extension of television broadcasting services first to underserved rural communities, then to remote communities and the north.

A place was made in the sixties for educational broadcasting. Indigenous television broadcasting began to develop by the end of that decade. Community broadcasting arrived in the seventies. Radio and television services in languages other than English and French have also been made available in the system, yet there remains a gap. Programs that reflect indigenous peoples and racialized and ethno-cultural communities remain few and far between, and creative employment opportunities are slim. Our broadcasting system must strive to continue serving audience needs and being inclusive of all Canadians.

With the growth of the web giants and their Internet streaming services offering hours of programming, we need to ensure that Canadian values of fairness, respect and inclusion remain important in the regulation of Canada's broadcasting system. This is why Bill C-11 underscores the need for diversity and inclusion. Bill C-11 makes changes to the Broadcasting Act to ensure that the broadcasting sector is more inclusive of all Canadians.

• (2235)

Bill C-11 strengthens an objective in the act to declare that the broadcasting system should:

serve the needs and interests of all Canadians — including Canadians from racialized communities and Canadians of diverse ethnocultural backgrounds, socio-economic statuses, abilities and disabilities, sexual orientations, gender identities and expressions...and reflect their circumstances and aspirations, including equal rights, the linguistic duality and multicultural and multiracial nature of Canadian society and the special place of indigenous peoples within that society...

This objective will help to enable access to the system by these communities and provide programming for them that speaks to their needs and interests.

Let us look at the big picture. We were all hopeful in the early days of the Internet that it would develop on its own: It would generate new opportunities, strengthen democracy and connect us to many others around the world. Much of that has happened, yet the Internet has also changed the way we enjoy content and learn about the news, creating a fundamental shift in the business model of

artists, creators, journalists and news outlets. It has also facilitated polarization, hate and fake news narratives that divide us. It has exposed people to harmful content and online experiences that would be unacceptable in the real world.

For many Canadians, COVID-19 has meant that we have dramatically shifted our personal and professional lives online. We must take action to address the problems now. It is time to make the Internet a fairer, more inclusive, safer and more competitive place in Canada.

In conclusion, until now online broadcasting services have not been obligated to contribute to the achievement of broadcasting objectives. Bill C-11 provides the CRTC with the ability and the means to better serve the needs of those who belong to official language minority communities, women, indigenous peoples, ethno-cultural minorities, racialized communities, the LGBTQ2 community and people with disabilities.

In this way, Bill C-11 continues the tradition of our broadcasting system of answering diverse audience needs and it helps to ensure that values, fairness, acceptance and inclusion will continue in the digital environment. This is a very important and long overdue change to the Broadcasting Act, and I urge all members of the House to support this important bill.

**Mr. Greg McLean (Calgary Centre, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I have some questions on some of the last points the member raised in his speech, which piqued my attention. He talked about the inclusiveness of the bill for allowing members of certain communities more access. Maybe this is where the disconnect is happening on the bill, because the whole thing about net neutrality is that all of those groups, especially my friends in the LGBTQ community, have been able to access what they want and find those groups of common interests because of net neutrality.

The bill changes net neutrality, so how is he suggesting that the bill would make things more inclusive as opposed to less inclusive?

• (2240)

**Mr. Darrell Samson:** Mr. Speaker, there is no regulation of control over what is being streamed. This will continue to happen, and the under-represented groups will continue to have access, but have more access because there will be more support for them in various ways throughout the bill.

**Mr. Richard Cannings (South Okanagan—West Kootenay, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the web giants like Netflix, YouTube and Facebook still do not pay their fair share of taxes in Canada. They still do not pay their fair share of funding for Canadian cultural content. The Liberal government has been dragging its feet. Liberals talk the talk about tax fairness, but they have not been walking the walk for the past six or seven years.

I am wondering if the hon. member can estimate how many jobs have been lost over those years because of that tax unfairness. How many dollars have been left behind because we have not been forcing the web giants to pay their fair share?

**Mr. Darrell Samson:** Mr. Speaker, our government has moved on many fronts to ensure that those who have more can help others, and I look at the increase of taxes to the 1% of Canadians as an example. This bill would be moving us toward there. We have not made all the steps we need to make, but I am 100% in agreement with him. I think we have to make sure those groups that are benefiting from our programming pay their fair share. This is the first step, and we will make the steps that are necessary to achieve the goal I believe he is asking for.

**Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have the opportunity to ask my colleague a simple question, because we had another point raised by the Conservatives that was not accurate, when it comes to the LGBTQ2S community.

We heard testimony at the Canadian heritage committee that OutTV was basically removed from, or not allowed to be on, a number of online streaming distributors. OutTV came to committee and said that with the way it works currently, it does not have access and is excluded. In Bill C-11, as the member has pointed out, there are no exclusions.

Does the member not feel this is appropriate? Given how these big web giants act and how they can exclude with impunity, does it not make sense to have a level playing field, so that there is access for all Canadians of all communities to these online streaming platforms and streaming distributors?

**Mr. Darrell Samson:** Mr. Speaker, there is no question that these different groups have been excluded in the past, and in Bill C-11 we are going to see the CRTC would be mandated to include them and to focus on those minorities. That is exactly what we shall do with this bill.

**Mr. Chad Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise this evening in support of Bill C-11.

For decades, Canadian broadcasters have given us incredible Canadian content on our televisions and radios. This is no accident. We choose to be different from the cultural juggernaut of the United States. We care about our cultural sovereignty. We believe our diversity should be celebrated. Our culture is who we are as Canadians. It is our past, our present and our future. It is how we tell our stories to each other.

As a condition of their licences, TV and radio broadcasters have had to invest in our culture and our artists, and that is why we have all the Canadian content we love. We can see *Schitt's Creek*, *Kim's Convenience* and *Corner Gas*, or hear Charlotte Cardin, Joni Mitchell, Drake, Justin Bieber, Shawn Mendes, Great Big Sea, and the list goes on, including the Arkells from my home town of Hamilton. If members are in Hamilton this Friday, they could catch the Arkells at Woodlands Park. I invite everyone in the House and anyone who is watching this evening to join us for that concert.

Here is the problem: Canadians are not using cable anymore. Now online streaming is everywhere. People can stream content

### Government Orders

through their phone, their car or their TV. We all enjoy this, but streaming platforms like Amazon Prime and YouTube broadcast to Canadians without the same requirements that helped build Canada's culture. They invest in our economy in other ways, but they do not have to produce content that reflects our Canadian stories and shared identity, until now.

That is why the government introduced Bill C-11, the online streaming act. This bill ensures that online streamers contribute in an equitable but flexible way to the creation of Canadian content. It ensures that Canadians could easily find that content on their platforms.

Based on the quality of debate we have heard from the official opposition today and over the past week, I think all members of this House could benefit from a refresher of what this bill does not do. This bill does not impose regulations on content everyday Canadians post on social media. This bill does not impose regulations on Canadian digital content creators, influencers or users. This bill does not censor content or mandate specific algorithms on streaming services or social media platforms. This bill does not limit Canadians' freedom of expression in any way, shape or form.

Bill C-11 also takes into account the reality that music is largely broadcast online, most notably on platforms like YouTube. In fact, a study conducted by Media Technology Monitor in 2020 found that about two-thirds of Canadian adults use YouTube to listen to music, which outpaces dedicated music services, such as Apple Music and Spotify. That is why this bill includes very important updates that would focus only on commercial content, such as music videos uploaded by labels on YouTube or livestreams of professional sports matches.

This bill explicitly excludes all user-generated content on social media platforms and streaming services. Proposed subsection 2(2.1) of Bill C-11 states:

A person who uses a social media service to upload programs for transmission over the Internet and reception by other users of the service—and who is not the provider of the service or the provider's affiliate, or the agent or mandatary of either of them—does not, by the fact of that use, carry on a broadcasting undertaking for the purposes of this Act.

In plain language, this means that users, even digital-first creators with millions of subscribers, are not broadcasters. They will never face any obligations under the bill. Any suggestions otherwise are simply untrue.

With this approach, the experience for users creating, posting and interacting with other user-generated content will not be impacted whatsoever, while still standardizing the treatment of commercial content such as TV shows and songs across all platforms.

*Government Orders*

Just to be clear, clause 12 of the online streaming act explicitly states that any regulations the CRTC imposes on platforms through the Broadcasting Act cannot infringe on Canadians' freedom of expression on social media. It states specifically:

For greater certainty, the Commission shall make orders under subsection 9.1(1) and regulations under subsection 10(1) in a manner that is consistent with the freedom of expression enjoyed by users of social media services that are provided by online undertakings.

In conclusion, now that we have been able to resolve these unfounded claims, and we have heard many of them today and many of them at committee, and I tuned in a couple of times to listen to them, let us go back to why we are here in the first place.

• (2245)

Just as they did with Bill C-10, the Conservatives have used every tactic in the tool box to delay and block Bill C-11. At committee, all members agreed to study the bill for 20 hours of witness testimony. However, the Conservatives did not allow the committee to get to clause-by-clause by filibustering for seven hours. They went as far as to filibuster their own study motion at one point. It is deeply disappointing we cannot move forward on our study of this important bill, especially since our arts and cultural community has been telling us how vital and urgent this legislation would be for them.

Marla Boltman, from Friends, said:

Requiring contributions from foreign tech giants that extract billions of dollars from our country will help sustain our industry while driving investment and innovation in the creation of Canadian content that continues to reflect our diversity of voices and who we are as Canadians. Foreign contributions will level the playing field between Canadian broadcasters and foreign platforms. Frankly, it sends a message to the world that Canada is open for business, but there are no more free rides. If you benefit from the system, you must contribute to it.

I could not agree more. On this side of the House, we have made our position clear. Bill C-11 is about fairness and good middle-class jobs in the cultural sector. It is about having the power to shape our culture and making sure everyone can see themselves in our culture. It is about being proud of who we are. It is about being proud of being Canadian, so let us keep moving on this important legislation.

• (2250)

**Mr. John Nater (Perth—Wellington, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I heard the member talk about levelling the playing field. Would he agree that one way to level the playing field would be to eliminate class 2 licence fees?

**Mr. Chad Collins:** Mr. Speaker, we heard consistently in the House and at committee about levelling the playing field. This is about trying to assist cultural organizations and disadvantaged groups, as the member prior to me referenced throughout his entire speech. It is about making investments in cultural organizations, arts organizations, musicians and individual artists who have struggled through the pandemic.

Almost every speech tonight referenced 1991 as where the legislation sits. The member and his former government had an opportunity for almost a decade to make changes to the legislation. It decided not to do that. We are doing that with Bill C-11 here tonight, and I would encourage all members of the House to support it.

**Ms. Laurel Collins (Victoria, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I asked this of a number of the member's colleagues, but I have not received a straight answer. This bill is clearly a step in the right direction, but web giants are still not paying their fair share. The Liberal government is delaying legislation on a digital services tax, which is something that would actually make companies such as YouTube, Facebook and Netflix pay their fair share on the profits they make here in Canada.

Will the member commit to pushing his party to implement a digital services tax?

**Mr. Chad Collins:** Mr. Speaker, I am always supportive of levelling the playing field. I was very specific in my speech to make the point of ensuring the tech giants, as the member referenced, pay their fair share. Bill C-11 goes a long way in establishing that. I think it was just last year some of those tech giants started to pay GST and HST for the subscribers who utilize their services, so we have come a long way over the last couple of years. We are going to continue to make progress on this issue, including introducing taxation, fees and levies over the next couple of years.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Marie-Hélène Gaudreau (Laurentides—Labelle, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I have a very simple question for my colleague.

What would he say to explain why this bill allows for regulations, when the word that is commonly used is "control"? How would he convince people who have reasonable doubts to vote in favour?

[*English*]

**Mr. Chad Collins:** Mr. Speaker, we know with all legislation that comes forward at any level of government nothing is perfect. We learn over time how legislation can be improved. The fact this dates back to 1991 illustrates there is lots of room for improvement. While this bill may not be perfect, to the member's point, our government will continue to find and seek out ways to improve the legislation that ensures we continue to level the playing field.

**Mr. Mike Morrice (Kitchener Centre, GP):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for Hamilton East—Stoney Creek for the tone of his speech. It elevates the quality of the discourse in this place.

He did mention some concerns with respect to user-generated content that I shared previously this evening. My question is specifically on proposed section 4.2. Given the points he made, does he not see it would be simpler to just remove the sections that create various exemptions with respect to indirect or direct revenue? Would that be one way to simplify the bill, or does he feel differently about that?



*Government Orders*

**Mr. Chad Collins:** Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the member's amendment. It is not something I support. I support the legislation as it has been put. I think we have a very comprehensive bill here that covers almost all the issues that witnesses brought to our attention at committee. We have incorporated those comments and stakeholder input into the bill, and I am satisfied with everything we have in time for a vote.

**Mr. Dean Allison (Niagara West, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the member for Peterborough—Kawartha.

Over the last two years of the NDP-Liberal government, we have seen a very uniquely ballooning government interfering in virtually all aspects of Canadians' lives. It has truly been a pattern of an expanding, intrusive and increasingly controlling and restrictive federal government, with its ill-advised discriminatory and vindictive vaccine mandates, damaging and traumatizing restrictions, demeaning and exclusionary QR codes, and of course the now infamous vaccine passports, which is probably one of the worst and most divisive public policy measures to ever be introduced in this country. It is why provinces only kept them in place for a few months before realizing the colossal mistake it was to divide, segregate and pit Canadians against one another based on health status. I am not sure how anyone ever thought segregating and discriminating against a group of Canadians would be good public policy.

However, in reality, this is simple. The Liberal government, with its NDP collaborators, has exploited the pandemic to drive its big, intrusive and overreaching government agenda. This also includes other areas of the lives of Canadians, with perhaps the upcoming digital ID, which has already been emphatically rejected by civil liberty groups, the Province of Saskatchewan and the former Ontario privacy commissioner.

The NDP-Liberal government is not just happy with the COVID intrusion. It is now expanding its surveillance of Canadians to the digital realm with respect to Canadians' Internet activities, including YouTube and social media accounts. No matter how the Liberals attempt to spin it, that is exactly what they are doing and they know it. It is similar to their political games and mistruths on the carbon tax, a tax that was supposed to be revenue-neutral but clearly is not, as confirmed by the Parliamentary Budget Officer. They are now trying to convince Canadians that Bill C-11 is not a censorship and surveillance bill, but nobody is buying it.

Just like Canadians and stakeholders rejected the precursor to Bill C-11, which was Bill C-10 in the previous Parliament, the same thing is happening again. Let us remind Canadians that true to form, the Liberals passed Bill C-10 in the last Parliament without allowing a full debate at the heritage committee. Many outstanding concerns from experts and parliamentarians over how this legislation would affect the rights and freedoms of Canadians when they are on the Internet went unaddressed because of the government's unwillingness to allow a full debate. In the new Parliament it is much the same. It does not seem like anyone supports Bill C-11, except the NDP-Liberal government, a government that seems relentlessly bent on restricting and controlling many aspects of Canadians' lives.

To be frank, I do not understand the government's obsession with wanting so much control over Canadians. Leave Canadians alone.

They know what they are doing and they just want their lives back. They want their lives free of constant government discipline, surveillance and control.

Let me remind Canadians of what the Liberals did during COVID. They tracked Canadian movements, including trips to the liquor store and the pharmacy. Canadians were closely tracked by this NDP-Liberal government via cellphones without people's knowledge during the COVID-19 pandemic. This information was made public by a report sent to the parliamentary ethics committee. The report revealed that the Public Health Agency of Canada was able to view detailed snapshots of people's behaviour, including visits to the grocery store, gatherings with family and friends, time spent at home and trips to other towns and provinces.

It is encouraging that my colleagues on the ethics committee expressed surprise at how much detail the report contained, even as all identifying information was stripped out. The phone locations allowed the Public Health Agency to get a picture of gatherings occurring in people's houses, such as over Labour Day weekend. The report included a graph recording hours spent away from home in each province between Christmas Day 2020 and the week of September 19, 2021. Government officials had access to detailed information about people's movements after scooping up data from 33 million mobile devices across Canada.

This is government surveillance of Canadians, plain and simple. There is no other way to put it, regardless of the what the NDP-Liberals attempt to spin it as. It is definitely unacceptable, but it is unsurprising that the NDP-Liberal government would engage in something like this. I am certain that Canadians do not want Ottawa tracking their movements. Experts like Ontario's former privacy commissioner Ann Cavoukian have questioned the government's claim. She said, per True North, "there has yet to be enough assurances that the data could not be reidentified to track individual Canadians."

In addition to not wanting to be surveilled and tracked, Canadians do not want Ottawa telling them what they should or should not be thinking or posting to their social media accounts or their YouTube channels. At this point, it is important to note that on this side of the House, we support a level playing field between foreign streaming services and Canadian broadcasters while protecting the individual rights and freedoms of Canadians.

• (2255)

Let us not forget that Canada is home to many world-class writers, actors, composers, musicians, artists and creators. Creators need rules that do not hold back their ability to be Canadian and a global success.

### *Government Orders*

While the government claims that there is now an exemption for user-generated content, Bill C-11 allows the CRTC to regulate any content that generates revenue, directly or indirectly. That means that virtually all content would be regulated, including independent content creators earning a living on social media platforms like YouTube and Spotify. As such, critics are publicly accusing the government of state-sponsored censorship. It is simple. This bill is an affront to freedom of expression. It allows the government to regulate what Canadian users can post online or how the said content will be promoted.

Michael Geist, the University of Ottawa's Internet and e-commerce law research chair, has been especially vocal on Bill C-11. He has said that the government has misled Canadians on the scope of the bill. The professor's concerns with Bill C-11 include its "virtually limitless jurisdictional, overbroad scope, and harmful discoverability provisions." He added, "Bill C-11 treats all audio-visual content as programs subject to potential regulation. With exceptions that could easily capture TikTok or YouTube videos, the bill is about far more than just large companies."

What is most concerning is that the CRTC's chairman, Ian Scott, who was appointed by the Prime Minister to the position in 2021, said that Bill C-11 needs to be open-ended so that the CRTC could have room to manoeuvre. That is a very worrying statement by the chairman of the CRTC. Let us remind the government that two former CRTC officials spoke out against the precursor of Bill C-11. They signed a petition labelling the bill an "authoritarian" move.

In addition, Kent Walker, Google's president of global affairs and chief legal officer, warned that the incoming Bill C-11, meant to censor the Internet, could drastically change how Canadians interact online. Walker said that while Google is open to new regulations, current proposals border on the extreme. He added, "The closer you get to that extreme, the more concern. Whether that's on bespoke content regulation, or local content requirements, or government mandates for link taxes and other sorts of things—any flavour of one of those could actually really be bad."

YouTube officials have also warned that if the Prime Minister's Internet censorship bill goes through, it could give the government unprecedented power over everyday content posted online. According to YouTube Canada's head of government affairs, Jeanette Patell, Bill C-11's wording is so broad that it places home videos within the purview of the CRTC. Patell also said that Bill C-11 "provides the CRTC the discretion to regulate user-generated content like a fan doing a cover song or someone making cooking videos in their kitchen or doing how-to-fix-a-bike videos." That simply means that any video could be subject to CRTC's surveillance, control and regulation.

Twitter has also joined the opposition to the NDP-Liberal government's online censorship efforts. A submission from Twitter compared the Liberals' online hate legislation to censorship regimes in authoritarian countries such as North Korea. This bears repeating. Twitter's opinion of the government's effort to censor the Internet is that it can be compared to the censorship regime in North Korea. That is an incredible statement and the government should take heed. I doubt that Twitter officials were being facetious when they made this statement.

Twitter's manager for public policy had this to say:

The proposal by the government of Canada to allow the Digital Safety Commissioner to block websites is drastic. People around the world have been blocked from accessing Twitter and other services in a similar manner as the one proposed by Canada by multiple authoritarian governments (China, North Korea, and Iran for example) under the false guise of "online safety," impeding peoples' rights to access information online.

That is a powerful statement. Once again, the government needs to really understand the damage it would be doing with this bill, perhaps unprecedented and permanent damage.

To add to the long list of critics of Bill C-11, we also have Timothy Denton. Mr. Denton is a former CRTC commissioner. Mr. Denton also likened the proposed Internet regulations by this government to authoritarian regimes. He said:

It is creepily totalitarian, something you might expect out of China or Russia... They are going to be unworkable and they are going to be, I think, unconstitutional in the old-fashioned sense of outside the powers of the federal government. I think they are almost certain to be taken down on Charter issues of freedom of speech. But they are really very unpleasant pieces of legislation.

To conclude my speech today, I would like to reiterate that Bill C-11 is another unacceptable attempt by the NDP-Liberal government to censor the Internet and, once again, restrict free speech. The restrictive, divisive and controlling NDP-Liberal government needs to finally realize that Canadians just want to be left alone.

● (2300)

It is time that the NDP-Liberals began paying attention to what Canadians want rather than pushing their partisan agenda of dividing, wedging and stigmatizing Canadians based on anything and everything they can conjure up.

● (2305)

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, a number of the Conservative speakers on this piece of legislation make me wonder whether or not they have actually purchased tinfoil hats. At the end of the day, I am not sure what part of the legislation the member opposite feels so offended by. Members of the Bloc and the New Democratic Party, and at least one member of the Green Party, support the legislation. It is not just the government or two political parties, and only the Conservative Party has these wild, crazy thoughts that it is an infringement on freedoms.

*Government Orders*

I am wondering if the member could provide his thoughts as to why the Conservative Party of Canada feels it is a fight against Canadian freedoms. In fact, we are the party that brought in the Charter of Rights. We understand the importance of freedom.

**Mr. Dean Allison:** Mr. Speaker, the great example is everything the Liberals have done in the past couple of years. They said they based things on science, but really it was based on political science. There was massive government overreach at every step. They would say one thing and do something different.

They would have experts, chambers of commerce and international organizations saying that what they were doing makes no sense, but they still kept misleading Canadians by saying they were just following the science. They have proven time and time again that they are not to be trusted when it comes to our freedoms in this country.

**Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I am saddened by the member's speech. I have had conversations with him in the past and always found him to be very level-headed. It is obvious that he has not read the bill. He does not understand the bill at all, which is fine, as members can stand in the House and speak even if they have not read the material.

However, what he does talk about is disturbing because it does apply, but it applies to the web giants. We have seen with the Facebook papers the indiscriminate collection and use of people's private data, and it is indiscriminate by the web giants. There is not a single Conservative who has risen in the House to say that is wrong, so I want to ask the member about that.

What he says about Bill C-11 is simply not true. It has no relationship to the bill, as I am sure he is aware. He is a very intelligent man. However, the indiscriminate collection of data is taking place, and it is taking place by private companies. As the Facebook papers have revealed, it is something we should be concerned about. Why is he not concerned about private corporations collecting that data and tracking Canadians? Why is he not concerned about that?

**Mr. Dean Allison:** Mr. Speaker, it has been great working with the hon. member over the years. We spent some time on the trade committee together.

I would point to the fact that I have not heard one speech on this side of the House that has not said we should level the playing field. We believe beyond a shadow of a doubt that big corporations should not just get away with whatever they feel like. We have not said that they should not have to pay their fair share. We firmly support that. That is an issue. We need to make sure we level the playing field. We have said that. We have said that before, and we will continue to say that as we move along.

**Mr. Eric Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I want to build a bit on the CRTC. We have heard a lot about the frustrations tonight. We have seen this time and time again with the Liberal government. Of course, the NDP is supporting them, and then a couple of years down the road when, for example, the CRTC has been given very vague definitions and broad powers to interpret a lot of these things as it sees fit, the government will say that it is not the government, it is the CRTC. The NDP and the Bloc will say they cannot believe that happened, as that is not what they intended.

Could the member speak to the vague definitions in this bill, as we can see this Trojan horse coming, and the CRTC intervening in a wide way? This is apparently not the intention of the bill, but Liberals have had more than enough opportunities to intervene and clarify, and it has refused to do so.

**Mr. Dean Allison:** Mr. Speaker, that is one of the challenges we have with a lot of the legislation we see in the House: the vagueness. It is so open-ended that definitions are not nailed down. This has happened with many pieces of legislation before, when we did not get definitions to define what something is. It created a lot of ambiguity.

At a point later in time, the Liberals could do exactly that. They could say it was not their fault and that it was not what they meant. This creates a lot of vagueness. We would like to see those things nailed down.

● (2310)

**Ms. Michelle Ferreri (Peterborough—Kawartha, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, as always, it is an honour to rise in the House of Commons to represent the constituents of Peterborough—Kawartha.

Today, I am speaking to one of the most important bills that will come before this Parliament: Bill C-11, also known as the online streaming act. Bill C-11 would impact anyone who uses the Internet. Bill C-11, or the online streaming act, is a significant piece of legislation. It is long and convoluted in how it is written, but in a nutshell it would mean that the CRTC would have significant governing powers over content creators and what is uploaded to the Internet.

For those who do not know, the CRTC is the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission. According to its website, it is an administrative tribunal that operates at arm's length from the federal government. This bill appears to make it even closer to the government, meaning more government overreach. As we have all experienced, more bureaucracy never equals more efficiency or equity.

In this speech, I am going to outline three key reasons why Canadians should be deeply disappointed and concerned with this bill. Number one is the lack of transparency. Number two is logistics and the fallout from not foreseeing the consequences of this poorly written bill. Number three is unnecessary urgency.

### *Government Orders*

If someone Google searches Bill C-11, they will read the following: “The online streaming act does not apply to individual Canadians, whether they are users, creators, digital influencers or workers.” Just for the record, in case people at home do not know, an online content creator could perhaps be a child who has uploaded their performance at their talent show, Justin Bieber, perhaps one's favourite cook, an athlete or a musician. All of these people are considered to be online content creators. This is the biggest area of mistrust and lack of transparency when we go back and read that “the online streaming act does not apply to individual Canadians, whether they are users, creators, digital influencers or workers.”

We have heard multiple times from the heritage minister that this bill would not target content creators, but rather the platforms, which means Facebook, TikTok, Netflix, etc. However, Ian Scott, the chair of the CRTC, the entity that would be responsible for doing the regulation on the government's behalf, says that user-generated content would be fair game. Who are we to believe?

That is fairly inconsistent information and, as such, Canadians are very skeptical of the “just trust us” approach. I do not know of any contract with any reputable organization where the customer is asked to sign now and learn the details later. This approach lacks transparency and, in the absence of information, we can expect people to fill it in with misinformation. The Liberal government continues to leave out information, which leads to mistrust. Why is the government asking Canadians to just trust it? What premise has it set to deserve such blind faith?

I want to move on to my second major concern: the logistics of this bill. As I have mentioned, there are very few clear details on how this bill would impact content creators and users. What I do know is that there are thousands of videos uploaded every day, and probably even millions. How will the government plan to manage this? What is the plan? I have seen time and again the government fail to plan and constantly react instead of prepare. We have the highest wait times at passport offices that we have ever seen, because the government was not prepared. How is it going to manage the volume of content creators fairly? I would like to know these details before we pass this bill.

Rules and guidelines are extremely important when generating content. I worked in both mainstream media and as an online content creator, and it is extremely important to have guidelines that equal the playing field, but this bill would not do that. Here is a quote from Dr. Irene Berkowitz. Irene said:

Bill C-11's wrong turn starts with the notion that CRTC has jurisdiction over the whole Internet for two reasons. The first is scale. Consider the math. On YouTube alone, 500 hours of content is uploaded per minute....

Second, new media is a feature, not a bug.... Bill C-11 gets it backwards. Instead of positioning new media as a model to engage audiences, it ensnares new media in the epic fail part of our old media: disregard for audiences.

● (2315)

Here is another quote. It is from Darcy Michael, a comedian and digital content creator:

Bill C-11 will directly affect my ability to earn an income.

He went on:

The sheer logistics of the CRTC trying to approve Canadian content for every video uploaded to social media is impossible. Across the country, there are thou-

sands of videos uploaded every day. There is simply no way to approve this. You are creating a logistical nightmare, with all due respect to the members, without properly understanding the industry that we're in.

He continued:

I don't want to be paying 30% to do something I don't benefit from as a digital creator. I think it's a second tax. I think that by the end of the day I'll be paying 80% tax on my income. That isn't fair.

To my third point, why the rush? This is a significant piece of legislation that needs a lot of attention and detail, so why would anyone who truly cares about democracy want this rushed? Bill C-11 would be the first major update to the Broadcasting Act in 31 years, and this government is ramming it through. Why?

Dozens of interested witnesses have yet to be heard by the heritage committee. The government has an obligation to listen to those who are directly impacted by the bill. By imposing an arbitrary deadline to return the bill to the House, the government is not allowing members to carefully consider each clause or amendment, and this will inevitably result in a flawed and incoherent Broadcasting Act, which comes back to the second point I made earlier: There is no way to work out the logistics in such a rushed approach.

I am somebody who likes things done quickly. I am always about speed and efficiency, but this is being rushed. I would ask Canadians if they would want someone regulating every book they read and every song they hear. Do they want censorship at that level? Bill C-11 would create winners and losers based on the CRTC's rule book, which is unknown at this time and will be decided on with zero transparency to Canadians.

Here are some powerful words from Oorbee Roy, a digital content creator, who said:

Not only does the bill not help me. It also hurts me and actively undermines my needs as an artist. There is no language in the bill to tell me otherwise.

Frankly, I don't qualify. I'm just not the right fit. That I'm not the right fit is a story I've been told my whole life. ... I'm too round. I'm a nerd. I'm too old. I'm female. I'm not feminine enough. I'm not the right demographic, but I've never been the right demographic. My voice has been suppressed far too many times.

That is a powerful quote from Oorbee Roy, a digital content creator.

*Government Orders*

I will wrap up my speech by saying that George Orwell warned us of the dangers of having the thought police, and I think that Bill C-11 is a potentially dangerous bill that needs a lot more attention before we can get it right. I urge everyone in this House to vote against it and take the time it needs to make sure we get it done right.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, when we are looking at Bill C-11, we hear a great deal of exaggeration coming from the Conservative Party, such as to try to give the impression that a child uploading a video from school would be impacted by Bill C-11. It is just wrong to try to imply that.

The member talked about a rush. However, this is not something that has just been in the oven for the last couple of weeks. We have seen this issue being dealt with now for two years in a very tangible way, not to mention the consultations that have taken place between the minister and the industry even before the legislation was presented.

If it was up to the Conservative Party of Canada, this bill would never see the light of day. That is apparent, and it is one of the reasons the Conservative Party does not have the support to prevent the bill from ultimately passing. Would the member not agree?

**Ms. Michelle Ferreri:** Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to engage with this member, who lives in the House of Commons.

I am a little surprised that the member does not care about all of the witnesses who have been on the record to say how this bill is going to impact them. Has he not listened to the witnesses? This is 100% how a content creator is created. Justin Bieber started his first video by uploading himself playing music. That is a fact.

• (2320)

**Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the comparison to George Orwell is so unbelievably wacky that I cannot even address that.

I would like to stick to the facts. The facts are that we had the equivalent of five weeks of hearings. The facts are that the vast majority of witnesses who came before committee were in favour of the bill and wanted some improvements. The NDP worked very hard to achieve those improvements, but the vast majority of witnesses supported the legislation because they have seen how the cultural sector has been eroded by the dominance of the web giants.

Fact: The Conservatives blocked additional witnesses by filibustering even some of the witnesses who came, such as the chair of the CRTC and the Minister of Canadian Heritage.

Fact: The Conservatives did not submit their amendments after all the other parties had submitted their amendments, leading to further delays.

Fact: The Conservatives did not want consideration at clause-by-clause.

Fact: The NDP pushed through important amendments that I mentioned earlier tonight that actually improved the bill to make Bill C-11 better than ever.

Final fact: This is important, and not a single Conservative addressed this. The fact is that right now there is indiscriminate collection of people's private data by the web giants. The Facebook papers revealed this, yet not a single Conservative has spoken to decry the indiscriminate collection of private data that is taking place right now by web giants.

How does the member respond to all of these facts?

**Ms. Michelle Ferreri:** Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that my colleague does not love one of the best authors of all time.

To his points, I actually agree 100% that we need to be harsh on people who are taking advantage of others. We put these amendments forward.

To his point about the witnesses, 40% of the witnesses did not agree with this bill. I would put it back to him and ask him if he thinks this bill is ready. Does he think this bill is ready for legislation when 40% of the witnesses have said it was not?

In my opinion, we have something significant that has not been touched in 31 years. The Liberals are ready to ram it through without more careful consideration. It is going to change how we consume and create everyday media. I would like to be a little more thorough than that.

**The Deputy Speaker:** This is just a reminder that we have now hit five hours of debate. All of the speeches from this point on are automatically 10 minutes with five minutes of questions and answers.

Resuming debate, the hon. member for Richmond Hill.

**Mr. Majid Jowhari (Richmond Hill, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is indeed an honour to stand in the House once again to represent my constituents of Richmond Hill. As I join you from the national capital region, I respectfully acknowledge that the land on which I am located today is the traditional ancestral unceded territory of the Algonquin Anishinabe people.

The government is committed to implementing its digital and cultural policy agenda, which would serve Canadian interests not only today, but also well into the future. It would support our cultural and artistic ecosystem, including our many talented creative sector workers. This is urgently needed.

Today, I am pleased to speak to important elements of the online streaming act. First, I will have the pleasure of talking about the Canadian independent producers and the important role that they play. Second, I want to talk about the importance of ensuring that Canadians can find and access Canadian stories and music.

Delaying Bill C-11 would do harm to our production industry. It would leave the creative ecosystem in a very uncertain and difficult place without support and predictable funding for Canadian programs. Ultimately, the online streaming act aims to foster an environment where Canadian music and stories can thrive and be discovered. The time to act is now, and there is a lot at stake.

### *Government Orders*

Turning an idea into a cultural product is no simple task. From coast to coast to coast, our creatives have undeniable talent and unparalleled work ethics. Canada's independent producers are an example of this.

A Canadian independent producer is a Canadian person or entity, usually a corporation, that creates an audiovisual media project that is not owned or controlled by a broadcaster or a distributor. In other words, independent producers make movies, TV shows and documentaries that are not subject to creative controls by a TV channel, network, streaming service or cable company. They are crucial to creative risk-taking, authentic storytelling and diverse representation in our audiovisual sector.

In film and television, independent productions cover a wide range of formats and genres, from art house films to popular animated kids shows and everything in between. To successfully realize a project, independent producers do many things. They invest in development, make pitches, secure financing, hire creative and technical teams, scout locations, and navigate complex trade, tax and labour arrangements to make projects happen. Not surprisingly, Canadian independent producers often work closely with Canadian musicians for scores and soundtracks.

There are over 600 independent production companies in Canada, most of them small and surviving project to project. In 2019-20, Canadian independent film and television accounted for \$2.9 billion in production volume and more than 81,000 jobs. Many of these independent production companies are undercapitalized and often face difficulty obtaining project financing. In Canada, once a finished project is in hand, all the rights for its creative elements are clear. The producers can then make money, but it is risky business with a lot of upfront costs.

While we may recognize some Canadian landmarks in the background of some American productions, these companies work with Canadian talent below the line: the “best boys”, “grips” and “gaffers” listed in movie credits. They work with our visual effects, post-production and virtual production studios, who are valuable without a doubt.

However, Canadian productions, and specifically independent Canadian productions, are important for ensuring that the cultural industry investments touch down and take root in the places where our stories come from. For example, just one season of *Heartland* spent over \$28 million on production, saw each dollar of federal tax incentive produce more than \$11 in GDP, and hired more than 1,400 vendors across Alberta.

Independent Canadian productions also tell untold stories and develop diverse programming. Diversity is one of Canadians' greatest strength. Without independent producers taking risks, we would never have films such as *Water in Hindi* or *Edge of the Knife* in the endangered Haida language.

• (2325)

Our stories and our creative talent are at the heart of the online streaming act. The legislation lists several important factors for the CRTC to consider in its definition of Canadian programs, such as, for example, collaboration between Canadian producers, Canadian ownership and exploitation of IP by Canadians. This would give

the commission the flexibility to require all types of broadcasting undertakings, including online streaming services, to financially contribute to the development of Canadian programs and talent. That is what Canada's important independent production sector needs to continue to thrive.

A strong independent production sector ensures Canadian stories are told by and for Canadians. However, it is not enough to encourage the production side alone. It is important that Canadians can find and access Canadian stories and music as well. As we see more of ourselves reflected in these popular media, it creates a sense of pride and a sense of unity, precisely when we need them during these difficult times.

The influx of streaming programs has meant access to endless content, but it can be difficult to find or even recognize Canadian programs. This is in part because online platforms are not required to showcase Canadian programs in the same way as the traditional broadcasters. Our independent productions, and especially Canadian music, deserve to be discovered and supported. However, in the current context, it is challenging for independent producers to remain visible in the marketplace.

Word-of-mouth marketing is no longer sufficient. Our musical tastes are increasingly dictated by algorithms. What we are asking for has proven successful in the past. Forty-one years ago, the federal government stepped in with requirements for CanCon to save our singers and musicians from being lost to the radio hits from the United States.

Without prominence, Canadian stories and songs will not be discovered, heard or remunerated. The intent behind showcasing Canadian stories and music is not to limit consumer choice, but to help raise the profile of Canadian artists. Regulation would not prevent Canadians from accessing programs from around the world. It would give us greater opportunity to discover local ones. The CRTC would work directly with platforms to determine how they can best showcase more Canadian content.

Discoverability is a tool to help audiences find Canadian works. It would ultimately be up to the commission, as the expert, independent regulator, to craft discoverability requirements that are appropriate for different types of online streaming services. The commission's scope is limited in the bill and would be further guided by the government's policy direction, as is common practice.

*Government Orders*

In closing, whether we are individual fans and consumers, career showrunners and artists, or industry players, the truth is that we are all invested in the vibrancy of Canadian stories and music. We need Canadian stories and songs to be available and accessible to Canadians. With the online streaming act, we will not just hope but plan for meaningful and sustainable change for our broadcasting and audiovisual sectors, and the production and distribution ecosystem that supports them.

This bill would provide Canadian creators and independent producers the opportunity to own, control and monetize their work, and gives Canadian stories and music a fighting chance to reach the Canadian audience that wants to hear or see them. I urge all members of the House to support the online streaming act. It is time for us to work together to ensure that our cultural sector remains strong, resilient, competitive and representative of our beautiful country.

• (2330)

**Mr. Richard Cannings (South Okanagan—West Kootenay, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, broadcasters in Canada for decades have been funding Canadian content in Canada and have been paying taxes, yet web giants like Netflix have been doing neither. What we need is a digital services tax. The Liberals have been kicking that down the road for years.

My question is simple. When will the government implement a digital services tax so that we can have a level playing field, at least in that regard, for our broadcasters?

**Mr. Majid Jowhari:** Mr. Speaker, I think it is less about implementing that tax right away and more about putting the proper elements and structure into place to be able to move in that direction. As my hon. colleague talked about, it is about making sure there is a level playing field. That is exactly what the intent of this bill is: making sure that not only do we put the proper pillars and drivers in place for that playing field, but also that we empower the CRTC to administer it.

All bills go through review. Hopefully, when the time comes to review this bill, we will be in a position to further evaluate the possibility of the tax that my colleague is talking about.

**Mr. Greg McLean (Calgary Centre, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I really appreciate my colleague's comments. It is the first time I have heard him speak in the House. I really appreciated the tenor he brought to this debate. Let me ask this question. He brought up the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission and its role in this legislation. Right now, that body has had less and less to do and it is becoming somewhat irrelevant. In this case, we are looking at actually changing net neutrality because so much is delivered over the net here.

I would ask the member to please tell me this, if he could. How many people does he think will be employed at the CRTC to make sure it can go through all this content? They will need to make sure it meets the standards that they will set, obviously under the auspices of the government. Does he foresee a time when the number of people working for the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission will exceed the number of artists actually providing input into the system?

• (2335)

**Mr. Majid Jowhari:** Mr. Speaker, I am glad the member was in the House when I was delivering the speech. I have been intervening in the House for a number of years.

It is not so much about how many people will be employed by the CRTC. It is the fact that the CRTC will be empowered and in a position to administer the bill, while collaboratively working with producers to ensure that Canadian content is not only developed but highlighted and properly compensated. It will not necessarily be all the content from social media and various platforms that will be subjected to that rule.

When we look at it, although the amount of content that is being tabled is a lot, the content producers are the ones who the CRTC will work with. They make up a much smaller number than the content creators. That will determine, as time goes on, how many people will be needed.

That was a hypothetical question, but I think it is a question that is worth taking note of.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, quickly, I am wondering if my colleague can provide his thoughts on the importance of passing the legislation to modernize the public broadcasting act. It has been many, many years, going back to the early nineties. Back then, the Internet was a pretty slow thing.

**Mr. Majid Jowhari:** Mr. Speaker, honestly, I got married in 1990. This bill was passed in 1991, a year after I got married. Today, when we celebrate, we take a video that we can post online and on WhatsApp.

The key thing is that it is time for us because the content developers are developing Canadian content at a much faster rate. That needs to be acknowledged and fairly compensated.

\* \* \*

[*Translation*]

**MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE**

**The Deputy Speaker:** I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate has passed the following bill, to which the concurrence of the House is desired: Bill S-7, An Act to amend the Customs Act and the Preclearance Act, 2016.

\* \* \*

[*English*]

**ONLINE STREAMING ACT**

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-11, An Act to amend the Broadcasting Act and to make related and consequential amendments to other Acts, be read the third time and passed, and of the amendment.

**Mr. Peter Fragiskatos (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Revenue, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it has been very interesting to take part in tonight's discussion and hear the different views expressed. I am happy to have what I believe will be the last word tonight on the matter, on Bill C-11.

### Government Orders

At the heart of it is culture and questions around culture. That is the way we make sense of ourselves and our place in the world as individuals and also as members of communities on a local level and on a national level as Canadians. In this, storytelling is particularly key. I would add storytelling by artists plays a special role as well. If there is such a thing as Canadian identity, and I believe there is, our artists have helped to shape it. They have played a fundamental role and continue to do so.

If we think about music, can we tell the Canadian story without looking at The Guess Who, for example, or The Tragically Hip? What about television? *Murdoch Mysteries* comes to mind, for example, and *North of 60*. We can name a number of other Canadian programs. My father would always talk about *The Beachcombers*, which I am not too familiar with, but it looks as though the Speaker is. If we think of film, there is *Bon Cop Bad Cop*. There are other good examples as well, but that one stands out for a number of members.

Talent explains why each of these became a success. The talent of the producers involved, the artists themselves, the musicians, the actors and all those around is at the top of the list for sure. Another factor that is key to their success is the fact we have a system in Canada that promotes Canadian culture and recognizes the importance of it.

As a condition of their licences, Canadian television and radio broadcasting companies have needed to ensure a space for Canadian content. In Canada, we have the CanCon rules, or the Canadian content rules, where 40% of radio content, for example, must include content of Canadians, and 55% of television content must be Canadian. Radio and television companies also need to pay into the Canada Media Fund.

We have had this system in place for decades. This has long been expected of radio and television companies. On top of that, there is also the fact they have had to pay into the Canada Media Fund. That is an important point to recognize as well.

Here is why Bill C-11 matters. What has been expected of Canadian radio and television organizations for decades would now be expected of streaming organizations such as Netflix, YouTube and Spotify, for example. We need to recognize this is 2022. The last time the Broadcasting Act was modernized was in 1991.

I was in Mrs. Bryne's grade 4 class sitting next to my friends Rob DeVries, Sarah Wuerth and Julie Hearn. Members will not know those names, but those I just mentioned, who were part of those classes, will know what that means exactly and how far back we go. That was grade 4. We have not updated our regulations since then, and we need to.

We need to recognize where we are in Canada's trajectory or how we have evolved as a society. Streaming organizations now play a fundamental role, even more important than radio and television, in terms of content creation. When we talk about our storytellers we look to YouTube, Netflix and Spotify. They play a very important role in that regard.

Recognizing this, the bill puts forward measures in an according fashion so we can keep up and continue to support our artists. The alternative, which I know is favoured by my friends in the opposi-

tion, is to allow the free market to reign and allow every individual Canadian artist to compete on their own merits, but to put them up against the mammoth that is the American entertainment industry.

I truly believe in this, and this should not even be a debate. In fact, if we go back to The Tragically Hip, which I mentioned before, its members themselves have made the argument that, were it not for CanCon rules, their success would not have been seen. This is because they would have been up against Pearl Jam and Nirvana. They would have been up against Radiohead, and we can name other examples, on their own, but they were given supports to be on the radio and be promoted in that way. I mentioned a few television series before. Those Canadian programs that are a signature of Canadian culture were supported by the CanCon rules.

● (2340)

For all those reasons, we have to look to our past and learn from it, but also modernize and keep up with the times. Bill C-11 does that by ensuring that streaming organizations do their fair share to ensure a level playing field, support Canadian artists and pay into the Canada media fund. These are not unreasonable expectations of organizations such as Netflix, YouTube and so on, which are doing so well. Obviously, if they are benefiting, they can do their part to support Canadian culture and cultural production in Canada.

**Ms. Laurel Collins (Victoria, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, one of the important aspects of this bill is ensuring that web giants pay their fair share and that money is there for our cultural workers and the Canadian broadcasters that have not been on a level playing field. Unfortunately, the big web giants still do not actually pay their fair share.

There is a need for a digital services tax. The Liberal government has been delaying implementing legislation on a digital services tax, and I am curious if the member would speak to his commitment to ensuring that the web giants truly pay their fair share.

● (2345)

**Mr. Peter Fragiskatos:** Mr. Speaker, every company has to pay their fair share. I look forward to engaging more with NDP members, as I think all members on this side of the aisle do, on that matter to get their thoughts. I know where they stand, but let us collaborate, let us listen and let us work toward a fair playing environment, if I can put it that way, in terms of the digital creators the member is so concerned about.

Here, we are talking about Bill C-11. It is a good bill. I know the NDP supports it, and I appreciate that.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Before we close, I just want to say that as Speaker, when I find out what people were doing in 1991, it starts to upset me just a bit. I think I am a little older than some of the folks who were speaking tonight.



It being 11:46 p.m., pursuant to order made on Monday, June 13, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the third reading stage of the bill now before the House.

The question is on the amendment.

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

The hon. member for Perth—Wellington.

**Mr. John Nater:** Mr. Speaker, I think you will find consent to adopt it on division.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The hon. member for Winnipeg North.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux:** Mr. Speaker, I suspect not. I request a recorded division.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Pursuant to order made on Thursday, November 25, 2021, the recorded division stands deferred until Tuesday, June 21, at the expiry of the time provided for Oral Questions.

The hon. parliamentary secretary to the government House leader has a point of order.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux:** Mr. Speaker, I suspect if you were to canvass the House, you would find unanimous consent to call it midnight so the House can adjourn.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Is it agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

---

## ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

[*English*]

### CLIMATE CHANGE

**Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP):** Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to pursue a question I put to the Prime Minister on April 6, which was two days after a quite devastating report from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. It was from working group III, in the sixth assessment report. What that report told me when I read it was that we have less time than I thought, because the timeline for action to avoid going above 1.5°C or even holding to below 2°C was shortened considerably.

I asked the Prime Minister, two days later, whether anyone had briefed him on this new documentation from the IPCC and whether he understood how rapidly the window on 1.5°C was closing. Unfortunately, in the Prime Minister's answer, he revealed that he had not been briefed, not possibly. The answer he gave was the usual response, that the government is doing a wonderful job. He said that we have put forward a very comprehensive plan and that we are committed to reducing emissions and will reduce them "by 40% from 2005 levels in the next eight years." That statement alone confirmed that no one had briefed him, or if they had he chose to reject

### *Adjournment Proceedings*

the advice, because saying that we have a "doable and concrete" plan is not the same thing as saying that it is adequate.

I am going to do something I probably should not attempt to do at midnight in this place, which is read from the "Summary for Policymakers", give a reference to the paragraph and page, and decipher some fairly impenetrable language so if the Prime Minister or his staff should happen to watch this late show, maybe they will understand that they are proposing a plan that does not preserve any hope of holding to 1.5°C.

Paragraph C.1, on page 22, working group III, sixth assessment report, from April 4, states, "Global GHG emissions are projected to peak between 2020 and at the latest before 2025 in global modelled pathways that limit warming to 1.5°C...and in those that limit warming to 2°C...and assume immediate action."

I have to explain that the way the IPCC writes is somewhat impenetrable. It is not projecting something that will happen. The sentence would make more sense if it was reversed. What the IPCC is saying is that all the models it has worked through, all the pathways it has found that hold to 1.5°C or 2°C require that "between 2020 and at the latest before 2025" we begin to see a total drop in emissions, so the word "peak" is to suggest that no later than "before 2025" total greenhouse gas emissions must begin to drop and the highest level they ever achieve must be before 2025.

This is seriously concerning, because going above 1.5°C or 2°C is not a political target. We cannot negotiate with the atmosphere. The physics and chemistry of the atmosphere tell us, from the best peer-review process of science in the history of the world, the IPCC, that we have to ensure that greenhouse gas levels begin to drop by then or the window on holding on to a livable world will close, and close forever. It does not reopen. I repeat: Going above 1.5°C or 2°C is not a political target. It is about whether global climate systems remain hospitable to our species. If we exceed those, our children may be condemned to an unlivable world.

• (2350)

**Mr. Terry Duguid (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend and colleague for Saanich—Gulf Islands for her remarks.

I agree with her that the recent IPCC report is a stark reminder of the impacts of climate change and the urgency for action. As climate impacts intensify, it is only becoming more obvious that moving to a clean, net-zero economy is critical to protecting the well-being of Canadians and communities, and securing Canada's economic prosperity.

At COP26, Canada announced it would take additional action to significantly reduce GHG emissions from the oil and gas sector by setting emissions caps. At COP26, Canada also joined over 100 countries in signing the global methane pledge to reduce global anthropogenic methane emissions by 30% by 2030.

*Adjournment Proceedings*

Canada will lead the way on oil and gas methane by going beyond our current target of 40% to 45% by 2025 to reduce emissions by 75% by 2030. As countries and businesses around the world move rapidly toward net-zero emissions, more ambition is needed today to ensure that Canada is not left behind and can secure a foothold in a low-carbon future.

In 2021, the Canadian Net-Zero Emissions Accountability Act became law. The act enshrines Canada's commitment to achieve net-zero emissions by 2050, establishes Canada's 2030 target as the first key milestone for this path, and ensures a transparent and accountable process in meeting our climate objectives.

The 2030 emissions reduction plan, or the ERP, was established on March 29 and is the first of many to come under the act. The ERP is about more than achieving incremental GHG emissions reductions to reach Canada's 2030 target. It is also about putting in place foundational measures to ensure that Canada's future is not only carbon neutral, but that it also makes energy alternatives more affordable and creates new, sustainable job opportunities for workers.

The ERP includes a suite of new mitigation measures and strategies. It builds on the foundation set by the pan-Canadian framework and the 2020 strengthened climate plan, and considers the best available science, indigenous knowledge and the advice of the net-zero advisory body. Achieving Canada's climate objectives will be a whole-of-economy and whole-of-society effort. Every economic sector has a role and responsibility to reduce emissions, but the pathway to achieving emissions reduction will look different for each.

The 2030 ERP takes into account this reality. It sets out guideposts for each sector to further reduce emissions, and highlights the measures and strategies towards an emissions reduction of 40% below 2005 levels. We are taking action in the electricity sector and will work with provinces and utilities to establish a pan-Canadian grid council to promote clean electricity infrastructure investments.

I see I am running short on time, but we are doing many more things, including investing in nature and natural climate solutions to deliver additional emissions reductions, and making significant new investments to support a sustainable future for Canadian farmers. As the hon. member knows, we will be instituting an emissions cap and taking further measures to reduce our emissions.

• (2355)

**Ms. Elizabeth May:** Mr. Speaker, I now have to ask the parliamentary secretary, who is an old friend, if he has read the IPCC report, because his answer reflects the usual complacency we hear. The government is doing things. There is no denying there are many programs, but the totality of those programs does not ensure that we can hold to 1.5°C or 2°C. In fact, they do the opposite. Net zero by 2050, by itself, is not science: It is a marketing slogan. What we have to look at is that last year, 619 people in British Columbia died in four days. There were wildfires across the province and floods in November. All that has happened to Canada right now at a 1.1°C global average temperature increase. We are on track for three times more. It is not survivable. Nothing matters if we do not get this right.

**Mr. Terry Duguid:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for her passion and advocacy, which I share.

I can assure the member that we will continue to work with other levels of government, indigenous peoples, experts, industry, stakeholders and interested Canadians to build on our collective action to drive further reductions and put Canada on that path to net zero.

\* \* \*

**MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE**

**The Deputy Speaker:** I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate has passed the following bill, in which the concurrence of the House is desired: Bill S-6, an act respecting regulatory modernization.

\* \* \*

**ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS**

AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

**Mr. Jeremy Patzer (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I would ask members to imagine a runner. He takes his place and is about to run the biggest race of his lifetime, but before the whistle blows, he leans down and ties his shoelaces together so that one shoe is securely fastened to the other shoe.

Then the runner deliberately turns around so that his back faces the finish line and sits down. Meanwhile, all his opponents stand at the ready. Their shoes are fastened properly and they face forward. These runners are prepared to race.

That is a good way for us to picture the different position the Prime Minister is putting Canada in when there is a looming global food shortage that we are not prepared for.

Other countries around the world are ready. They are not punishing producers and they have a plan to tackle the looming crisis. Agriculture is our superpower. It is this hidden economic driver that can not only solve world hunger but could also bring a great deal of prosperity to this nation. However, our producers cannot do this alone. They need the government to work alongside them, not against them, but the Prime Minister fails to recognize this. Not only that, but he has belittled and disrespected this industry by tying its hands behind its back and kicking it aside, all the while expecting it to solve our problems.

*Adjournment Proceedings*

It started with applying the carbon tax to on-farm fuels, followed by poor trade deals and then a threat of a 30% reduction in fertilizer usage. Now our producers are dealing with sky-high input costs and the new threat of front-of-pack labelling for single-ingredient ground beef. At the very least, all our producers are asking for from the government is clarity. Unlike everyone else, our farmers only get one shot at success every year, and they cannot go into this blindly.

In my question, I asked the minister for clarity around the retroactive tariff on Russian fertilizer purchased before March 2. In her answer, she refused to give specifics. Now we are here on June 20, and our farmers are still somewhat in the dark. Fertilizer prices have more than doubled over the winter, and when these are coupled with sky-high input costs, our producers simply cannot afford an extra tariff that was applied on a product purchased before the war even started.

Despite what the minister thinks, fertilizer is not some optional add-on; rather, it is a critical tool that is used to boost crop yields and maximize output. Farmers really have no choice but to use it in order to meet the global demand and to make a profit on the crops that they grow.

As we look at what is happening across the globe with the war in Ukraine, India placing a ban on the export of wheat and poor yields as a result of the drought in western Canada, it is safe to say that we are on the brink of a global food crisis. If we want to solve this problem with a made-in-Canada solution, the government should work to make inputs less expensive so we can increase crop yields. The minister can do this today by cancelling the tariff on Russian fertilizer.

Tonight I will ask again: Will the government do the right thing and remove the retroactive tariff on fertilizer purchased before March 2?

● (2400)

**Mr. Terry Duguid (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. member for Cypress Hills—Grasslands for raising this important question. I understand the decision to withdraw WTO benefits for Russia and Belarus was taken in the context of pre-existing challenges for the agricultural sector in Canada this spring season. However, I would like to remind the hon. member that the government adopted this trade measure as part of a broad and comprehensive set of sanctions in concert with like-minded global partners to ensure that countries that seriously threaten and breach the rules-based international order cannot benefit from it.

Russia's actions, facilitated by Belarus, blatantly violate international law and pose a dire threat to international peace and security. Canada will continue to hold the Russian regime accountable for its attack on the democracy and independence of Ukraine as we stand together with its people.

As members know, we announced on March 3 that Russia and Belarus's entitlement to WTO tariff treatment had been removed under the Customs Tariff, resulting in a 35% tariff right applicable to virtually all imports from these countries. However, the order al-

so ensured that goods that were already in transit to Canada on or before March 2 could still benefit from WTO tariff treatment.

I would also like to remind the hon. member that customs duties and taxes are paid by importers based on the time of importation of goods and not the date when they are purchased, so it is also important to understand that the 35% tariff for Russian fertilizer is not imposed on farmers, but is paid by importers. In this instance, some importers maintained their purchases from Russia, even after the measure was implemented, while others decided to make other sourcing arrangements. As a result, providing relief from the tariff to importers who maintained their purchases from Russia would be inequitable to those importers who changed their sourcing away from Russia, often incurring greater costs. It would also not translate into reduced costs for many farmers.

I can also confirm that in order to preserve the integrity of Canada's Ukraine response measures, the government will not be granting tariff relief for any Russian goods affected by the withdrawal of WTO tariff preferences, including fertilizers. Government officials have already communicated this information to industry stakeholders so that Canadian businesses can take steps to diversify their supply chains away from Russia in the near term.

Also, I would like to note that in recognition of the challenges facing the sector, Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada has amended its advance payments program with a federal loan program guarantee that provides agricultural producers with easy access to low-interest cash advances. Instead of receiving advances in two instalments, producers are now eligible to receive their full 2022 advance immediately when they apply.

**Mr. Jeremy Patzer:** Mr. Speaker, again, it is backwards hearing it from the parliamentary secretary when he thinks that just because it is paid by importers, somehow farmers are not going to have to pay for it. We all know the importers are going to pass that cost on to the farmer, but the farmer has no means of passing that cost on to anybody else. If the government truly wanted to support farmers, it would scrap the tariff for farmers.

Canada is also an outlier on this issue. The G7 countries do not have this kind of tariff because they truly know what it means to support farmers. Supporting farmers and going tough on Russia for its illegal occupation of Ukraine are not exclusive to each other.

I call on the minister once again. Let us harness our superpower and use it to address the looming global food crisis. After seven years of working against our farmers, the government has an opportunity to change course. Instead of working against them by making their lives more expensive, let us work alongside our producers. Standing up and saying they are working with the industry is not enough. Our farmers deserve actions and results.

*Adjournment Proceedings*

Once again, will the government do the right thing, support our farmers and drop the tariff on Russian fertilizer purchased before March 2?

• (2405)

**Mr. Terry Duguid:** Mr. Speaker, we understand that Canadian farmers are going through a difficult time due to the unprecedented supply chain disruptions resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic and the severe commodity disruptions arising from Russia's illegal invasion of Ukraine.

However, as I just explained, removing the tariff on fertilizer would not really help farmers as the tariff is not imposed on them, but rather on importers. That is why, in order to really support our farmers, Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada has amended its advance payments program so that farmers can have access to cash advances faster this year.

CLIMATE CHANGE

**Ms. Laurel Collins (Victoria, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I want to start by quickly acknowledging the work of an incredible organization in my riding.

[*Translation*]

I am very pleased to highlight the incredible work of the Société francophone de Victoria, which serves more than 5,000 people who speak French in Victoria. In addition to promoting, representing and protecting the French language and culture, this organization has created spaces that foster inclusion and celebrate expression. From June 21 to August 18, it will hold Rendez-vous Victoria, a community event with music activities and performances, all in French.

To support its objective of creating an inclusive francophone community space in the downtown area, the Société francophone de Victoria has applied for federal funding to help buy the building it currently occupies and make it more accessible. I am very grateful to this organization for its passion and dedication, and I am asking the government to support its work.

[*English*]

Now I will get to a critical issue.

Last week, we found out that internal documents from Environment and Climate Change Canada and Natural Resources Canada showed that the Liberal government's climate plan and targets are not feasible. Sadly, it is not surprising. Canada has never met a single climate target it set. Under the Liberals, Canada has the worst record in the G7, and Canada has the worst track record in the G20 when it comes to handing out public money to oil and gas companies.

It has now been three years since the Liberals declared a climate emergency, but they are still not taking action at the scale or speed required. Their claim that they could reduce oil and gas emissions while increasing oil and gas production never made any sense. It is clear that we will not meet our targets by relying on costly, unproven carbon capture technology, technology that those same internal documents called "high risk".

The Liberals' emissions reduction plan only aims to meet the low end of their target to reduce emissions by 40% to 45%, which is not adequate. It does not leave any room for error, yet they are relying on "high risk" carbon capture technology.

The IPCC is clear that the world urgently needs to move away from fossil fuels and make significant investments in renewable energy if we have any hope of securing a livable future. They have also warned against relying too heavily on carbon capture. They point out that it is one of the most costly and least effective options.

Renewable energy technology is ready and available, and over the past decade the costs have decreased significantly. The International Energy Agency reports that wind and solar are the cheapest sources of new electricity generation in history, and their cost continues to drop. If we are going to meet our climate targets and avoid the most catastrophic consequences of the climate crisis, Canada needs to dramatically boost investments in renewable energy.

These investments, along with strengthening grids and electrifying infrastructure, not only help us fight the climate crisis, but also create good, long-term jobs for Canadians. Instead of investing in renewables and in a just transition for workers, Canada continues to hand out billions in public financing to profitable oil and gas companies.

Will the government commit to ending all fossil fuel subsidies, stop funnelling billions of dollars to profitable oil and gas companies through a carbon capture tax credit and instead invest in real climate solutions?

• (2410)

**Mr. Terry Duguid (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member for the question. However, it is not the question I was expecting in these adjournment proceedings. The question I have before me is with regard to the report from the commissioner of the environment and sustainable development, so I am going to reflect on that and I think I will get at the member's question by talking about it.

We have made a lot of progress on climate action in this country. A good example of this is carbon pricing. In 2019, because of the pan-Canadian approach to pricing carbon pollution, we succeeded in having a carbon price in place throughout Canada for the first time. This was a critically important step toward reducing economy-wide emissions. We deliberately established the overall approach within a relatively short period of application, from 2018 to 2022, to allow us to learn lessons and improve the approach for the longer term.

As the commissioner identified, the initial experience illustrated the need to strengthen some aspects of the minimum national stringency standards, so in 2021 we published a new, strengthened set of criteria alongside a longer-term, more ambitious carbon pricing trajectory, rising by \$15 a year to \$170 per tonne by 2030. As the commissioner noted, these new criteria significantly improved the rules for carbon pricing, including for industrial emitters, and I am confident that provinces and territories will strengthen their systems for industrial emitters to ensure they do their part.

When we published the new criteria, we also committed to an additional review of carbon pricing by 2026. This will allow us to work with provinces and territories to address the remaining issues raised by the commissioner. The lesson here is that ambitious climate action is achievable and requires continuous improvement.

The commissioner also discussed the impact of carbon pricing on indigenous communities, and we have taken real action to address these impacts in the provinces where the federal fuel charge applies and where we return revenue directly, those currently being Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Ontario. The climate action incentive gives most households more back than they pay in the carbon price, and rural households receive an additional 10%. This addresses the impact on most indigenous households.

In 2021, we augmented this approach by tripling the amount of fuel charge proceeds going back to indigenous communities and we are co-developing solutions for returning these funds.

Finally, recognizing the need to go further, we have committed to gather more data so that we can make sure any remaining impacts are addressed.

In closing, I want to thank the commissioner for his work. Our government is taking ambitious action on climate. I am proud of our record as it is progressing and of the new actions we are undertaking, but there is always more room for improvement, I think the hon. member will agree, and the commissioner's work is vital for identifying where we can do more and do better.

**Ms. Laurel Collins:** Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the member for his answers, for being available to answer questions at this late

### *Adjournment Proceedings*

hour, past midnight, and for his reflections on this scathing report from the environment commissioner.

I also want to bring up what the environment commissioner is pointing to, which is that this government has been going from failure to failure. His own department called carbon capture “high risk” and said that with their plan, it was not feasible to meet emissions reduction targets in the oil and gas sector.

Experts have warned against relying on carbon capture to meet our climate targets, yet when big oil asks for yet another subsidy, billions of dollars of more public money, the government gave them the carbon capture tax credit. The government also bought a pipeline, approved Bay du Nord and plans to increase oil and gas production.

That is not a climate plan. Why are the Liberals listening to big oil instead of climate experts?

• (2415)

**Mr. Terry Duguid:** Mr. Speaker, just to reiterate, our government is committed to ensuring a just transition, including ensuring that Canada's workers have the skills necessary to take advantage of these opportunities by consulting on just transition legislation and by supporting sustainable jobs in every region of the country. Over the past two years, we have made historic investments in support of economic recovery, climate action, and skills and training that will create sustainable jobs.

We are making investments in carbon capture and storage. By way of comments from the IPCC, which the hon. member is fond of quoting, it will be an important part of the mix in getting to our 2030 targets and net zero by 2050 and sharing this technology with the world.

[*Translation*]

**The Deputy Speaker:** The motion that the House do now adjourn is deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, the House stands adjourned until later this day at 10 a.m. pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 12:16 a.m.)



# CONTENTS

Monday, June 20, 2022

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

### Canada Infrastructure Bank Act

Bill C-245. Second reading .....	6931
Mr. McDonald .....	6931
Mr. McCauley .....	6932
Mr. Garon .....	6933
Ms. Blaney .....	6935
Mr. Bachrach .....	6936
Mr. Morrice .....	6938
Ms. Ashton .....	6939
Division on motion deferred .....	6939

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

### Criminal Code

Bill C-21. Second reading .....	6940
Mr. Zimmer .....	6940
Ms. Damoff .....	6941
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands) .....	6941
Mr. Morrison .....	6942
Mr. Soroka .....	6942
Ms. Damoff .....	6943
Ms. Gaudreau .....	6944
Mr. Angus .....	6944
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands) .....	6944
Mr. Longfield .....	6944
Mr. Morrison .....	6946
Ms. Gaudreau .....	6946
Mr. McKay .....	6946
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands) .....	6946
Ms. Damoff .....	6946
Mr. Viersen .....	6948
Ms. Gaudreau .....	6948
Mr. Johns .....	6948
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands) .....	6948
Mr. Falk (Provencher) .....	6949
Ms. Damoff .....	6950
Ms. Gaudreau .....	6950
Ms. Blaney .....	6951
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands) .....	6951
Mr. Viersen .....	6951
Mr. Schiefke .....	6952
Ms. Michaud .....	6953
Ms. Kwan .....	6953
Mr. Virani .....	6953
Mr. Bezan .....	6955
Ms. Michaud .....	6955
Ms. Damoff .....	6955
Mr. Turnbull .....	6956
Mr. Lloyd .....	6957
Ms. Michaud .....	6957
Mr. Johns .....	6957

Mr. Morrice .....	6958
-------------------	------

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

### Freedom in Canada

Mr. Hardie .....	6958
------------------	------

### Community Events

Mr. Kitchen .....	6958
-------------------	------

### Bluedrop ISM

Ms. Thompson .....	6958
--------------------	------

### Marcel Jobin

Mr. Perron .....	6958
------------------	------

### Medal Awarded by MP for Bourassa

Mr. Dubourg .....	6959
-------------------	------

### Agriculture in Canada

Ms. Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk) .....	6959
-------------------------------------	------

### Sothymalar Paramsothy

Ms. Sgro .....	6959
----------------	------

### Dragons Abreast

Mr. Erskine-Smith .....	6959
-------------------------	------

### Bill C-291

Mr. Caputo .....	6960
------------------	------

### Turning the Tide Awards

Ms. Jones .....	6960
-----------------	------

### Arctic Sovereignty

Mr. Zimmer .....	6960
------------------	------

### Bill C-11

Mr. Steinley .....	6960
--------------------	------

### Sherbrooke Station Market

Mrs. Brière .....	6960
-------------------	------

### Alberta Billy

Ms. Blaney .....	6961
------------------	------

### Ann-Renée Desbiens

Mrs. Desbiens .....	6961
---------------------	------

### Energy Industry in Canada

Mr. Lloyd .....	6961
-----------------	------

### World Refugee Day

Ms. Kayabaga .....	6961
--------------------	------

## ORAL QUESTIONS

### The Economy

Ms. Bergen .....	6962
Mr. Boissonnault .....	6962

Ms. Bergen .....	6962	<b>Foreign Affairs</b>	
Mr. Wilkinson .....	6962	Ms. McPherson .....	6967
<b>Public Safety</b>		Mr. Oliphant .....	6967
Ms. Bergen .....	6962	<b>Sport</b>	
Mr. Mendicino .....	6962	Ms. Lattanzio .....	6967
<b>Government Policies</b>		Mr. LeBlanc .....	6968
Ms. Bergen .....	6962	<b>Health</b>	
Mr. Holland .....	6962	Mr. Richards .....	6968
Mr. Berthold .....	6963	Mr. Mendicino .....	6968
Mr. Boissonnault .....	6963	<b>Passports</b>	
<b>Passports</b>		Ms. Lantsman .....	6968
Mr. Therrien .....	6963	Ms. Saks .....	6968
Ms. Saks .....	6963	Ms. Lantsman .....	6968
Mr. Therrien .....	6963	Ms. Saks .....	6968
Ms. Saks .....	6963	Mrs. Goodridge .....	6968
<b>Finance</b>		Ms. Saks .....	6969
Mr. Boulerice .....	6963	<b>Official Languages</b>	
Mr. Boissonnault .....	6964	Mr. Beaulieu .....	6969
Mr. Blaikie .....	6964	Ms. Petitpas Taylor .....	6969
Mr. Boissonnault .....	6964	Mr. Beaulieu .....	6969
Mr. Albas .....	6964	Ms. Petitpas Taylor .....	6969
Mr. Boissonnault .....	6964	<b>Health</b>	
Mr. Albas .....	6964	Mr. Barlow .....	6969
Mr. Boissonnault .....	6964	Mr. van Koeverden .....	6969
Mr. Deltell .....	6964	Mr. Shields .....	6970
Mr. Boissonnault .....	6965	Mr. van Koeverden .....	6970
<b>Passports</b>		<b>Regional Economic Development</b>	
Mr. Deltell .....	6965	Mr. Zimmer .....	6970
Ms. Saks .....	6965	Mr. Vandal .....	6970
Mrs. Vien .....	6965	<b>Justice</b>	
Ms. Saks .....	6965	Ms. Lambropoulos .....	6970
<b>The Economy</b>		Mr. Lametti .....	6970
Mrs. Vien .....	6965	<b>Sport</b>	
Mr. Boissonnault .....	6965	Mr. Martel .....	6970
<b>Passports</b>		Mrs. St-Onge .....	6970
Ms. Chabot .....	6965	Mr. Nater .....	6970
Ms. Saks .....	6966	Mrs. St-Onge .....	6971
Ms. Chabot .....	6966	<b>Public Safety</b>	
Ms. Saks .....	6966	Mr. Martel .....	6971
Ms. Chabot .....	6966	Mr. Blair .....	6971
Ms. Saks .....	6966	<b>Tourism Industry</b>	
<b>The Economy</b>		Mr. Hanley .....	6971
Ms. Ferreri .....	6966	Mr. Boissonnault .....	6971
Mr. Boissonnault .....	6966	<b>The Environment</b>	
Mr. Falk (Provencher) .....	6966	Ms. Collins (Victoria) .....	6971
Mr. Boissonnault .....	6967	Ms. Dabrusin .....	6972
<b>Health</b>		Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands) .....	6972
Mr. Ellis .....	6967	Ms. Dabrusin .....	6972
Mr. van Koeverden .....	6967	<b>Presence in Gallery</b>	
<b>Airline Industry</b>		The Speaker .....	6972
Mr. Bachrach .....	6967		
Mr. Alghabra .....	6967		



## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

### Online Streaming Act

Bill C-11. Report stage .....	6972
Motion No. 1 negatived .....	6973
Motion No. 2 agreed to .....	6975
Mr. Blair (for the Minister of Canadian Heritage) .....	6975
Motion for concurrence .....	6975
Motion agreed to .....	6976

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### House of Commons

The Speaker .....	6976
-------------------	------

### Government Response to Petitions

Mr. Lamoureux .....	6976
---------------------	------

### Committees of the House

#### Natural Resources

Mr. Aldag .....	6976
-----------------	------

#### Public Accounts

Mr. Williamson .....	6976
----------------------	------

#### Public Safety and National Security

Mr. Carr .....	6976
----------------	------

#### Transport, Infrastructure and Communities

Mr. Schiefke .....	6977
--------------------	------

### Criminal Code

Ms. Fry .....	6977
Bill C-295. Introduction and first reading .....	6977
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed) .....	6977

### Respecting Families of Murdered and Brutalized Persons Act

Mr. Bezan .....	6977
Bill C-296. Introduction and first reading .....	6977
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed) .....	6977

### Business of the House

Mr. Lamoureux .....	6977
Motion .....	6977
Motion agreed to .....	6977

### Petitions

#### Statue of Emily Murphy

Mr. Chong .....	6978
-----------------	------

#### Air Transportation

Mr. Vis .....	6978
---------------	------

#### Climate Change

Mr. MacGregor .....	6978
---------------------	------

#### Falun Gong

Mr. Bezan .....	6978
-----------------	------

#### Racial Profiling

Mr. Green .....	6978
-----------------	------

### Climate Change

Mr. Green .....	6978
-----------------	------

### Foreign Enlistment

Mr. Green .....	6978
-----------------	------

### Repatriation of Canadian Citizens in Syria

Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands) .....	6979
--------------------------------------	------

### Won Alexander Cumyow

Ms. Yip .....	6979
---------------	------

### Single-Use Plastics

Ms. Collins (Victoria) .....	6979
------------------------------	------

### Corporate Social and Environmental Responsibility

Ms. Collins (Victoria) .....	6979
------------------------------	------

### Rural and Suburban Mail Carriers

Ms. Barron .....	6979
------------------	------

### Climate Change

Mr. Morrice .....	6980
-------------------	------

### Human Organ Trafficking

Mr. Viersen .....	6980
-------------------	------

### Questions on the Order Paper

Mr. Lamoureux .....	6980
---------------------	------

### Questions Passed as Orders for Returns

Mr. Lamoureux .....	6984
---------------------	------

### Privilege

#### Government Responses to Questions

Ms. McPherson .....	6985
---------------------	------

#### Speaker's Ruling

The Speaker .....	6986
-------------------	------

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

### Online Streaming Act

Mr. Blair (for the Minister of Canadian Heritage) .....	6986
Bill C-11. Third reading .....	6986
Mr. Bittle .....	6987
Mr. Vis .....	6989
Mr. Champoux .....	6989
Ms. Collins (Victoria) .....	6989
Mr. Samson .....	6990
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands) .....	6990
Mr. Lamoureux .....	6990
Mr. Richards .....	6990
Amendment .....	6992
Mr. Lamoureux .....	6992
Mr. Perron .....	6993
Mr. Epp .....	6993
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands) .....	6993
Mr. Vis .....	6993
Mr. Champoux .....	6994
Mr. Lamoureux .....	6996
Ms. Barron .....	6997
Mr. Perron .....	6997
Mr. Soroka .....	6997

Mrs. Desbiens .....	6997	Mr. Champoux .....	7029
Mr. Boulerice .....	6997	Ms. Collins (Victoria) .....	7029
Mr. Lamoureux .....	6999	Mr. Chahal .....	7029
Mr. Perron .....	6999		
Mr. Champoux .....	6999	<b>Criminal Code</b>	
Ms. McPherson .....	6999	<b>Bill C-21—Notice of Time Allocation Motion</b>	
<b>Business of the House</b>		Mr. Lametti .....	7030
Mr. Lametti .....	7000	<b>Online Streaming Act</b>	
<b>Online Streaming Act</b>		Bill C-11. Third reading .....	7031
Bill C-11. Third reading .....	7000	Mr. McLean .....	7031
Ms. McPherson .....	7000	Mr. Chahal .....	7031
Mr. Lamoureux .....	7001	Ms. Gaudreau .....	7031
Mr. Vis .....	7002	Ms. Collins (Victoria) .....	7031
Mr. Champoux .....	7002	Mr. McKinnon .....	7031
Mr. Lamoureux .....	7002	Mr. Ali .....	7031
Mr. Caputo .....	7005	Mr. Nater .....	7033
Mr. Perron .....	7005	Mr. Champoux .....	7033
Mrs. Goodridge .....	7006	Mr. Cannings .....	7033
Ms. Collins (Victoria) .....	7006	Ms. Gaudreau .....	7033
Mr. Caputo .....	7006	Mr. Lamoureux .....	7035
Mrs. Desbiens .....	7006	Mr. Champoux .....	7035
Mrs. Goodridge .....	7007	Mr. McLean .....	7035
Mr. Lamoureux .....	7008	Ms. Collins (Victoria) .....	7035
Mr. Champoux .....	7009	Mr. Villemure .....	7035
Ms. Collins (Victoria) .....	7009	Mr. Lamoureux .....	7037
Mr. Nater .....	7009	Mrs. Gray .....	7037
Mr. Lamoureux .....	7010	Mr. Morrice .....	7037
Mr. Champoux .....	7011	Mr. Julian .....	7037
Mr. Cannings .....	7011	Mr. Samson .....	7037
Mr. Morrice .....	7011	Mr. McLean .....	7038
Mr. Lamoureux .....	7012	Mr. Cannings .....	7038
Mr. Nater .....	7013	Mr. Julian .....	7039
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands) .....	7013	Mr. Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek) .....	7039
Mr. Lamoureux .....	7014	Mr. Nater .....	7040
Mr. Champoux .....	7015	Ms. Collins (Victoria) .....	7040
Mrs. Gray .....	7015	Ms. Gaudreau .....	7040
Mrs. Stubbs .....	7015	Mr. Morrice .....	7040
Mr. Fragiskatos .....	7017	Mr. Allison .....	7041
Mr. Villemure .....	7017	Mr. Lamoureux .....	7042
Mr. Cannings .....	7018	Mr. Julian .....	7043
Mr. Caputo .....	7018	Mr. Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry) .....	7043
Mr. Sidhu (Brampton East) .....	7019	Ms. Ferreri .....	7043
Mr. Villemure .....	7020	Mr. Lamoureux .....	7045
Mr. Julian .....	7020	Mr. Julian .....	7045
Mr. Julian .....	7020	Mr. Jowhari .....	7045
Mr. Gaheer .....	7023	Mr. Cannings .....	7047
Mr. McLean .....	7024	Mr. McLean .....	7047
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands) .....	7024	Mr. Lamoureux .....	7047
Ms. Collins (Victoria) .....	7024		
Mr. Champoux .....	7025	<b>Message from the Senate</b>	
Mr. Maguire .....	7025	The Deputy Speaker .....	7047
Mr. Gaheer .....	7027	<b>Online Streaming Act</b>	
Mr. Simard .....	7027	Bill C-11. Third reading .....	7047
Mr. Cannings .....	7027	Mr. Fragiskatos .....	7047
Mr. Perkins .....	7027	Ms. Collins (Victoria) .....	7048
Mr. Fragiskatos .....	7029	Division on amendment deferred .....	7049

**ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS**

**Climate Change**

Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)..... 7049

Mr. Duguid ..... 7049

**Message from the Senate**

The Deputy Speaker..... 7050

**Adjournment Proceedings**

**Agriculture and Agri-Food**

Mr. Patzer..... 7050

Mr. Duguid ..... 7051

**Climate Change**

Ms. Collins (Victoria) ..... 7052

Mr. Duguid ..... 7052

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>