



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

44th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage

EVIDENCE

NUMBER 094

Thursday, October 26, 2023

Chair: The Honourable Hedy Fry



Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage

Thursday, October 26, 2023

• (0820)

[English]

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh (Saskatoon—Grasswood, CPC)): I call this meeting to order.

Welcome everyone to meeting number 94 of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage.

Today's meeting is taking place in a hybrid format pursuant to the Standing Orders. Members are attending in person in the room or remotely using the Zoom application. We have two currently, Ms. Dhillon and Mr. Coteau.

It's good to see you both here this morning.

I would like to take this opportunity to remind all participants of this meeting that screenshots or taking photos of your screen are not permitted. The proceedings will be made available via the House of Commons website.

As you know, although this room is equipped with a powerful audio system, feedback events can occur, and you all know to keep your phones away from the microphones as we go.

We'll open the meeting with committee business.

Ms. Thomas, I saw your hand up first.

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): A point of order.

Mr. Peter Julian: I would like, through you, to have the clerk confirm that we had CRTC scheduled to come today. There are very important questions that need to be asked of the CRTC, including around regulations and telecom companies. Canadians are being gouged. There's also the massive influx of disinformation from the Fox propaganda network and others. Those are all important questions.

Can you confirm that because of the Conservative filibuster we've had to cancel the CRTC appearance yet again? You will recall that a couple of years ago, we had to delay the CRTC for an hour—

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): I was surprised too, Mr. Julian. I expected to see Ms. Eatrises today, but I saw “committee business” and no mention of the CRTC chair.

We have a new clerk here today. Geneviève is not feeling well today and couldn't join us in person, but Jacques Maziade is with us

today. As for the request for Ms. Eatrises, she was scheduled to appear today, so....

You know, Mr. Julian, I don't know what happened. I do agree with you. When I did see the notice come out on committee business, I had thought that Ms. Eatrises would be here for at least one hour today. That has not happened for some reason, but I will give that to the chair, and we'll move forward.

That was a very good point of order, because I too was expecting to see the head of the CRTC here today, so thank you for that. Does that satisfy you?

Mr. Peter Julian: I may come back to this issue. Are we currently in camera?

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): We're in public.

Mr. Peter Julian: Okay. The committee notice says “in camera”.

If we're in public, I want to say that this is the second time because of Conservative filibusters that we've had to delay or cancel the CRTC appearance, and I find it very regrettable. The Conservative filibusters blocking—

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): I'm going to say to you, Mr. Julian, that this was out of our hands. It was on the schedule to have the CRTC chair with us today, and I have no reason why Ms. Eatrises did not show.

Mr. Peter Julian: You will recall the last time the CRTC came, the CRTC was waiting outside while a Conservative filibuster was debating having the CRTC before the committee. It was bizarre. It was some kind of bizarre, dysfunctional....

I think it's important to note that this is the second time the CRTC has been cancelled or delayed because of a Conservative filibuster.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): They didn't cancel because of one side filibustering. Today's business should have been Ms. Eatrises, and I have no reason why Ms. Eatrises wasn't on today's agenda. I asked the same question of our group yesterday.

To be honest with you, I have the same issue that you have, but it's not because of any filibusters going on. Today's committee business was scheduled for the head of the CRTC to be with us today, so I appreciate your point of order.

[Translation]

Mr. Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ): I have a point of order, as well, Mr. Chair.

[English]

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Mr. Champoux, do you want to speak on...?

[Translation]

Mr. Martin Champoux: Yes, absolutely.

I note that Mr. Julian is drawing a parallel between the filibustering done by our Conservative colleagues at our last meeting with the CRTC, but the situation was different at the time, Mr. Chair, because the witnesses—

Let me finish, please.

[English]

Mrs. Rachael Thomas (Lethbridge, CPC): Point of order.

[Translation]

Mr. Martin Champoux: Mr. Chair, I'm on my point of order. I will finish it if I can have my colleagues' attention.

Mr. Chair, I would like to know if we can ask the clerk to explain to us what happened in the order of invitation for today's meeting.

[English]

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: Mr. Chair, this is debate.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Okay, so—

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: This is ridiculous. This is debate.

[Translation]

Mr. Martin Champoux: No, it's a point of order. I want to know about—

Mr. Chair, if Ms. Thomas can show a modicum of respect—

[English]

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Here is the ruling I'm going to make right now. Hold on.

Mr. Champoux, finish your comments. Then I will go to Mrs. Thomas. I have Mr. Coteau and I have Ms. Gladu. We have a lineup here.

Go ahead.

[Translation]

Mr. Martin Champoux: Let me finish before deciding that it is not a point of order!

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I want to know if we can ask the clerk to explain to us what happened to cause the order of today's meeting to be changed. I would like a clarification from the clerk if he has the information. Since our regular clerk is participating virtually, she may have some clarifications for us on the change we experienced with Ms. Eatrides' failure to appear.

[English]

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): According to our new clerk, it has been rescheduled at the direction of the chair. The chair made the decision to move Ms. Eatrides to another date. I don't know the date. We haven't decided that. The chair has decided that.

[Translation]

Mr. Martin Champoux: Thank you.

[English]

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): If I continue on, I have to go to Mr. Coteau.

Mr. Michael Coteau (Don Valley East, Lib.): My hand is down now, Mr. Chair. Thank you.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Thank you.

On the point of order, I will go to Mrs. Thomas and then Ms. Gladu.

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: I believe Ms. Gladu had her hand up first.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Ms. Gladu, go ahead.

Ms. Marilyn Gladu (Sarnia—Lambton, CPC): Thank you, Chair.

What I would say is thank you for clarifying that it was rescheduled based on the chair who normally occupies the seat. It was my understanding that you didn't even know you were going to be chair until this morning. So I think for Mr. Julian to falsely accuse the Conservatives being responsible for this...that he should withdraw those comments.

Thank you.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Mr. Julian.

● (0825)

Mr. Peter Julian: I certainly will not. The record stands in terms of the delay around the CRTC a couple of years ago. It was unbelievable to me. My comments today—

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): But we're talking about this meeting.

Mr. Peter Julian: And my comments today are absolutely appropriate, given that for the last three days, when we should have been considering safe sports and recommendations to protect athletes and the public in safe sports, we have been consumed by a Conservative filibuster.

The Conservatives need to admit that. They need to come clean.

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: Point of order.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): On a point of order, Mrs. Thomas.

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: Thank you.

You know, Mr. Julian likes to sit at this table and try to belittle the members of the Conservative team. Most of his belittling is targeted at me. It's unfortunate that as a male colleague he finds it enjoyable to go after a younger female colleague.

Mr. Peter Julian: A point of order.

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: Right now he is doing exactly that, and it is inappropriate. It is not a point of order that he is making.

Ms. Lisa Hefner (Hamilton Mountain, Lib.): A point of order.

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: Rather, he is taking an opportunity to debate.

Ms. Lisa Hefner: I think this is also debate, which is what Madam Thomas was proposing in the first place.

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: Mr. Chair, I would ask that you bring the debate to a close—

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): I would like to.

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: —and that we resume with the business of this meeting.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Yes, if we could.

I have two points of order in front of me, but I do want to bring everyone together here and get going on business today, if we can.

Mr. Julian, you were first up for a point of order and then Ms. Hefner. Then I'd like to go with the speaking order that we have here and continue today.

Mr. Peter Julian: Mrs. Thomas knows full well that I have immense respect for her. I compliment her experience—

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: Point of order.

Mr. Peter Julian: —and the fact—

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: Point of order.

Mr. Peter Julian: —that she—

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: Point of order.

Mr. Peter Julian: —has been—

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: Point of order.

Mr. Peter Julian: —a committee chair.

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: Point of order.

Mr. Peter Julian: I deplore—

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: Point of order.

Mr. Peter Julian: —the tactics—

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: Point of order.

Mr. Peter Julian: —of the Conservatives—

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: Point of order.

Mr. Peter Julian: —and I will continue—

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: Point of order.

Mr. Peter Julian: —to deplore the tactics—

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: Point of order.

Mr. Peter Julian: —of the Conservatives—

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: Point of order.

Mr. Peter Julian: —that are not—

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: Point of order.

Mr. Peter Julian: —in the public interest.

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: Point of order.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Thank you.

Okay, Mrs. Thomas.

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: He cannot assume what “Mrs. Thomas knows full well.” It's an incredibly demeaning statement to start that way. I would ask that he would rein in his tongue and show me some respect as an equal.

Mr. Peter Julian: Mr. Chair, I was not the one who said I'm going to make this committee “hell”, which is what Mrs. Thomas said at the last meeting.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Okay. Let's move on.

Ms. Hefner, do you have anything else to add here, then?

Ms. Lisa Hefner: I would like to support Mr. Julian's comments. I think it's fair what he has said, given the conduct of other members of this committee.

Thank you.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Thank you.

We're going to go back now.

You wanted to speak, Mrs. Thomas. I did read the intro of this. You had your hand up. The clerk noticed that you were the first one to have your hand up.

You have the floor.

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Chair, I'll be moving a motion for consideration at this committee. I would like it to be considered immediately, given that we are currently in committee business.

The motion reads as follows:

This committee condemns the CBC for publishing a false headline based on disinformation from Hamas, a criminal terrorist organization, that incorrectly stated Israel was responsible for the explosion at al-Alhi hospital in Gaza that resulted in the deaths of innocent civilians, and given that,

The Prime Minister, the Minister of National Defence, the Canadian Forces Intelligence Command, the United States, the United Kingdom and France have all concluded this claim is false,

The committee calls on the CBC to apologize to the Jewish community and all Canadians for spreading this dangerous disinformation and to publicly correct the record and to report this finding to the House of Commons.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Thank you, Mrs. Thomas.

Has anyone—

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: Mr. Chair, I do have further comments to make. However, for the benefit of the committee, I am happy to allow the motion to be distributed first. Then we can continue with discussion.

I would like it noted, however, that I am not ceding the floor. I do have further comments to make.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): That's fine, but we do need copies for everybody.

It's the will of the committee to suspend for a couple of moments to get copies distributed to everyone here. We'll take a three-minute or four-minute suspension.

• (0825) _____ (Pause) _____

• (0835)

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): We're back, and we are ready to resume.

[*Translation*]

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

[*English*]

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Go ahead on a point of order, Mr. Champoux.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Martin Champoux: I want to understand what Ms. Thomas just did. She had the floor.

I have a point of clarification. Were we debating the motion that was on the table at the last meeting, or did we start a whole new conversation today? If we have started a whole new conversation today, I would like you to confirm the order of speakers—there must be a list of speakers.

I would like to know in what capacity Ms. Thomas had the floor at that time. Was it an extension, a continuation of our last meeting, or was it a new round? Are we still discussing the same amendment as at the end of Tuesday's meeting?

[*English*]

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Mr. Champoux, she asked prior to speaking to this....

Last time it wasn't adjourned; it was suspended. I was here for that meeting on Tuesday. It was the chair, actually, who thought we were going to resume on my subamendment. That was her interpretation. My interpretation is a little bit different, because I thought we adjourned and started over. Actually, that's why I thought committee business today was going to be on the CRTC, but it wasn't because, as you saw in the notice, the committee business had nothing for today.

That's what I thought.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Martin Champoux: I will continue on my point of order, and I will try to ask my question clearly.

If I understand correctly, the CRTC person who was supposed to appear here will not appear, and the meeting on Tuesday was not

suspended, it was adjourned. If we are at this point, it is because there was a kind of error in the procedure.

Is that correct?

[*English*]

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): That's right.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Martin Champoux: Okay, thank you. That's very nice.

[*English*]

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Mr. Julian, go ahead.

Mr. Peter Julian: Mr. Chair, I have enormous respect for you, and you do remarkable work as a parliamentarian, but I can't agree with your interpretation of things. We were, as we have been over the last three meetings, engaged in the motion that was presented by Mrs. Thomas, and your subamendment was before this table. We don't start afresh. That would be a misinterpretation of the rules. With respect, I'll have to challenge your interpretation. I think where we are is, as you mentioned, your subamendment, which is a subamendment to my amendment.

I'm hoping we can get on with the safe sport study. I'm certainly willing to withdraw my amendment, and I hope Mrs. Thomas is willing to withdraw hers so we can get on to safe sports. I think there are some other ideas in terms of a study we could do, but I don't agree with this interpretation that somehow we're starting afresh but that Mrs. Thomas still has a continuation from the previous meeting.

With deep respect—because you do, I think, a remarkable job—I will have to challenge your ruling.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Go ahead, Mr. Melillo.

Mr. Eric Melillo (Kenora, CPC): I believe Mr. Julian had the floor on a point of order, and I do not believe he can move to challenge the chair on a point of order. That is my recollection of what just happened.

• (0840)

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): To be honest with you, Mr. Julian didn't have a point of order. I never heard him say, "point of order". After Mr. Champoux, he just had a few comments and took the floor by himself.

Thank you, Mr. Julian.

When we started, after I read the opening remarks, Mrs. Thomas had her hand up, and then we proceeded. I will admit that I did not assume, once we adjourned, that we were going to pick up on the subamendment from Tuesday.

Mrs. Thomas has the floor. She raised her hand first. I have Mrs. Thomas—

Mr. Taleeb Noormohamed (Vancouver Granville, Lib.): On a point of order, Mr. Chair, I believe Mr. Julian was challenging, and that should take us to a vote, if I'm not mistaken.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): I'm going to let the clerk explain the procedure going forward here.

Mr. Jacques Maziade (Committee Clerk): The challenge is on the decision of the chair.

Shall the decision of the chair be sustained?

If you say yes, it means we'll continue with Mrs. Thomas and her motion. If the committee says no, the decision is overturned and we're going back to square one.

Does everybody understand?

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Do you have any questions on this, Mr. Champoux?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Martin Champoux: What exactly are we coming back to, the subamendment or the agenda?

[*English*]

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: Mr. Chair, I have a point of order.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Mrs. Thomas, go ahead.

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: I'm sorry, Mr. Chair, but with all due respect, according to the Standing Orders and according to your chairmanship, I had the floor. The reason I was given the floor is that this is a whole new meeting. It's a business meeting, and I was the first one with my hand up and therefore acknowledged by the chair. I then moved a motion. It is not required to pick up this meeting where the last one left off, because the last meeting was not suspended. It was adjourned. I moved my motion. Mr. Julian doesn't like my motion, so he would like to take control of this meeting.

An hon. member: I have a point of order.

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: Mr. Chair, Peter Julian was on a point of order when he moved a motion to challenge you, which, I believe, if you confer with the clerk, is not permitted. I would like confirmation on that.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Thank you, Mrs. Thomas.

We have a couple of points of order here. Let me confer with the clerk for a second.

Mr. Coteau, you were first. Go ahead.

Mr. Michael Coteau: We know that points of order cannot be debated. Let's get to the vote, Mr. Chair.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): There was another point of order.

Mr. Julian, did you have your hand up? I could be wrong.

Mr. Peter Julian: I would ask Mrs. Thomas, through you, that she refer to all members respectfully. I realize she said she wanted to turn the committee into hell, but she still needs to be respectful of each member of this committee.

I would ask you to enforce that, please.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): We would like to suspend for two minutes. The clerk and I are going to confer, if you don't mind.

• (0840)

(Pause)

• (0855)

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): We're going to resume the meeting.

I am going to let the clerk read out the interpretation. We've spent some time going through the video of what was said, so I'm just going to let the clerk read out what it says.

Mr. Jacques Maziade : In the book, page 1062, states, "A member of a committee may move a motion at any time in the normal course of a meeting, provided that...the member has the floor to move the motion and is not doing so on a point of order."

The question is whether the chair will decide that it was a point of order.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): We went through the video from Mr. Champoux to Mr. Julian, and there was no point of order.

Mr. Peter Julian: A point of order.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Now there is a point of order. You can't even let me finish here, but go ahead.

Mr. Peter Julian: Let's not delay this any further. That is your interpretation.

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: A point of order.

Mr. Peter Julian: The reference that the clerk just gave is not about the issue that was raised by Mr. Champoux and me, which is that we had a subamendment on the floor that the chair of the committee had foreseen and that continues, as it has for the last three meetings. This has been the normal committee practice, so that motion was on the floor.

Yes, Mrs. Thomas still had the floor, there's no doubt, but that was on your subamendment. That is what I'm challenging in terms of interpretation, so—

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): That's fine. The challenge, though, Mr. Julian, is that if you had said "point of order", then it would have come back to me and you would not have had the floor. It would have gone back to the original motion that Mrs. Thomas made when we came in here. That's why we went through the video, to see in fact whether you said "point of order" after Mr. Champoux, which you didn't. You never said "point of order".

Mr. Peter Julian: I did. I did, and I have again.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): You did say "point of order"?

Mr. Peter Julian: I did, and then you recognized me—

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): That changes everything. I'm sorry. That will change everything. Then it's up to me to decide under this where we go next.

Mr. Peter Julian: I'm challenging your ruling, with respect, as I think you've been very good as the chair.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): No, that's fine. That's why we went through the video.

Now you're telling me you said "a point of order".

Mr. Peter Julian: I'm saying that I am challenging your decision. I think the committee should decide whether or not they uphold your ruling.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Mrs. Thomas, you had a—

Mr. Coteau, I see your hand is still up. Do you want to speak to this?

Mr. Michael Coteau: No. I'm sorry. Thank you.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): No, that's fine.

Mrs. Thomas, go ahead.

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

There are a couple of problems here. If I may have your attention.... I'll just wait.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Mr. Julian, you—

We're going to come back here, Ms. Gladu. Just let me say one thing.

Because Mr. Julian said that he said "a point of order", you can't, as the clerk said, move a motion on a point of order, and the motion was that you were challenging the chair. You can't do that.

Ms. Marilyn Gladu: It's a dilatory motion.

Mr. Kevin Waugh: Yes, and you can't do that under the book, as the clerk just read, so I'm going to go back, if you don't mind.

Mrs. Thomas had the floor, and I'm going to try to bring everyone together, if I can.

Do you have a point of order?

• (0900)

Mr. Peter Julian: On a point of order, you've had both Mr. Champoux and me raise concerns with your ruling, which we are challenging.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): I've heard the concerns.

Mr. Peter Julian: Yes. As you know, the practice in this committee—and the chair has been very good about this, I think—is that every time a ruling is challenged—it often comes from the Conservatives—the chair moves immediately to asking, "Shall the decision of the chair be sustained?" That's a very simple procedure. It's something that has been practised in our committee for as long as I've been on this committee.

I'm simply challenging your interpretation—with respect, because I believe you do a very good job—so the committee can make that decision as to whether or not they believe that your interpretation is the right one.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Mr. Champoux, go ahead.
[Translation]

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

I just want to make a comment.

I want to make sure that it's well understood by the committee, and by the public, that we are having this discussion because there was a mistake in the procedure regarding the notice of meeting for this meeting. There was also some confusion in understanding the agenda for today's meeting.

I want to make sure that we don't replace one mistake with another, and that's why I want us to follow the Standing Orders clearly. I want the decision to be made beyond any opinion, any partisanship, in the current debate, that the decision not be another procedural error, but a fair decision. That is actually why I want to know the facts concerning what we are about to do. I don't want us to make a mistake twice, after all.

The impression I had at the beginning of today's meeting was that, in the absence of the CRTC representatives, we had suspended the previous meeting. But that is not the case. I thought Ms. Thomas still had the floor on the subamendment that we were debating at the last meeting, which doesn't seem to be the case.

So there is confusion right now, and I want us to fix it. I want to get this right. A new motion has been moved. In my opinion, this motion was proposed while we were debating another motion, which is not in order.

I want to hear from the clerk. Before we proceed to any votes, Mr. Chair, I want things to be clear for everyone. I repeat, an injustice, or a mistake, cannot be corrected with another mistake.

Thank you.

[English]

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Thank you, Mr. Champoux.

I would ask Mr. Noormohamed to wait.

I'm going to get the interpretation from the clerk. We have been in a brief discussion here.

Jacques, if you don't mind, could you say it in French?

Mr. Champoux has asked the question. We've looked at the green book and we have a decision.

[Translation]

The Clerk: I will explain how I see the chair's ruling in the context of the start of the meeting.

He called the meeting to order, explained the rules of procedure for virtual attendance, and then we got to committee business. Before we resumed debate on the motion that the committee discussed last time, Ms. Thomas asked to speak, the chair recognized her, and then she moved her motion.

Until the committee resumes debate on the motion from the last meeting, we can use the floor for another discussion. That is my understanding of the chair's ruling, given the timeline of events. As the chair explained, the debate on the motion was adjourned at the last meeting. So the committee was not required to resume debate on this motion. It could debate something else.

That is how I interpret the current situation.

[*English*]

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Mr. Champoux, you have the ruling.

Yes, go ahead very quickly.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Martin Champoux: I understand, but the fact that the chair of the CRTC is not appearing this morning has added to the confusion. That is why we are in a special situation and why we are a bit caught off guard, if I may use that expression, Mr. Chair. We all assumed that the absence of the chair of the CRTC meant that we were continuing the debate on the subamendment.

Instead of being suspended, the last meeting was adjourned and we're back to square one; I understand that. I would still like to point out that this confusion is the result of a mistake and poor communication.

I hope that doesn't happen again.

• (0905)

[*English*]

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): That was well documented.

Ms. Gladu, you're on the list first, and then it's Mr. Noormohamed.

Ms. Marilyn Gladu: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I appreciate the clerk's explanation of how we got here.

Mrs. Thomas had the floor. Then there was a point of order by Mr. Champoux, but you can't interrupt somebody who has the floor with a point of order. Then there was a point of order by Mr. Julian. Again, you can't interrupt Rachael Thomas, who had the floor. Then, on a point of order, Mr. Julian tried to challenge the chair, which is a dilatory motion. I don't believe you can make a motion on a point of order. That's where we are.

I think you're correct. What we need to do is return to the person who had the floor, which was Mrs. Thomas.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Thank you, Ms. Gladu.

Mr. Noormohamed, you've had your hand up for a little while now, so the floor is yours for a second.

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

With the greatest of respect, this has nothing to do with points of order. Decisions by the chair, everyone says, are not debatable, but, according to the book, they can be appealed to the committee. To appeal a decision of the chair, a member must inform the committee of his or her intent to do so, which Mr. Julian did. There is an

expectation, then, that the chair will call that to a vote in order to determine whether or not the chair's ruling will be upheld.

This has nothing to do with points of order. While Ms. Gladu's timeline may or may not be accurate, it's not relevant to the point Mr. Julian just made. That is the reality we have to operate in, right now. In fact, there was a request to challenge the ruling of the chair that has nothing to do with points of order. It doesn't matter. He made the request.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): We've heard from the clerk. I'm going to proceed.

Mrs. Thomas, you have—

Mr. Peter Julian: I have a point of order.

Mr. Chair, I challenged your ruling. With respect, you now have to go to the committee.

Mr. Kevin Waugh: No, I don't.

Mr. Peter Julian: You absolutely do.

Mr. Kevin Waugh: We just checked the green book.

Mr. Peter Julian: No, Mr. Chair.

With respect, when the chair is challenged, it has been the practice in this committee.... The chair of the committee, with all due respect to her, has allowed those challenges on points of order, which come primarily from Conservatives. This has been a practice ingrained in our committee and our committee practices.

With respect, I disagree with your interpretation, and I would like you to submit that to the committee. That is your responsibility as chair.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Mr. Julian, I'm going to override you here. The decision was.... We're going to go back. We—

Mr. Peter Julian: I have a point of order.

Mr. Chair, you cannot override a challenge to the chair. You simply have to ensure that the question—

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): You can't introduce a challenge on a point of order.

Mr. Peter Julian: Yes, you can, and this has been our practice throughout this time. I believe, Mr. Chair, that you yourself in the position of vice-chair have challenged on a point of order a chair's decision. This is something that has been our practice in committee.

I am challenging your ruling. Respectfully, I will ask again. Will you ask the committee whether or not they sustain your ruling?

• (0910)

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): I was conferring with the clerk for a second.

I know that we've had a lot of suspensions. I'm just going to suspend for two minutes to get the official.... We've gone through the green book, but thank you, Mr. Julian. Just give me two minutes to collect our thoughts here.

• (0910) _____ (Pause) _____

• (0920)

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): We will now resume.

We have a couple of decisions to make here, as we're going around in circles. Thank you, everyone, this morning. I really appreciate this.

The green book on page 1059, under "Decisions of the Chair and Appeals", states the following:

One of the primary responsibilities of a committee Chair is to determine the procedural admissibility of matters raised in committee and whether the committee business is conducted in accordance with proper procedure.

This is what we've been talking about.

The Chair makes such decisions on his or her own initiative or following a point of order raised by a Member.

Decisions by the Chair are not debatable. They can, however, be appealed to the committee. To appeal a decision by a Chair, a member must inform the committee of his or her intent immediately after the decision is announced. The Chair then asks the committee the following question: "Shall the decision of the Chair be sustained?"

Then, as we were just discussing, this is what it states on page 1062:

the motion is not a substantive motion or a subsidiary motion where such a motion is already being debated (a committee is required to deal with such motions one at a time);

the member has the floor to move the motion and is not doing so on a point of order

Mr. Peter Julian: A point of order, Mr. Chair.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Mr. Julian.

Mr. Peter Julian: What you've just read out confirms what I have been saying, which is that—

• (0925)

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Well, there's an interpretation.

Mr. Peter Julian: No. I'll come to practice in a moment.

Immediately after the decision of the chair, Mr. Champoux raised a point of order. You declared your decision. Immediately after that decision, I challenged the decision of the chair.

As you say...and you just read it out. You just read it out. It's exactly what I was saying—

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): I also read out page 1062.

Mr. Peter Julian: It's immediately after, and then you go immediately to the committee to ask whether the decision of the chair should be sustained. That has been our practice.

You'll recall, Mr. Chair, that at our last meeting the Conservatives did it a number of times on points of order. This has been a practice of our committee since the beginning. It is confirmed by the green book.

I ask again. I am challenging your ruling for a number of, I think, very valid reasons, and I would ask that you ask the committee whether or not your decision will be sustained.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Mrs. Thomas.

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: There's a motion on the floor that I moved with regard to the CBC spreading dangerous disinformation pertaining to Hamas and Israel.

Mr. Taleeb Noormohamed: A point of order, Mr. Chair.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): On a point of order, Mr. Noormohamed.

Mr. Taleeb Noormohamed: The question with respect to the ruling of the chair is not one that can be debated. There should be a decision put to the committee. The committee has the will to sustain the chair's ruling or not.

I don't know why we are afraid of doing that, given that we did it three times at the last meeting alone. We could perhaps dispense with this, get it over with and then go back to whatever we need to do.

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: A point of order.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): On a point of order, Mrs. Thomas.

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: The motion on the floor was brought forward by me. The motion is to call on the CBC—

Mr. Peter Julian: A point of order, Mr. Chair.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Mr. Julian.

Mr. Peter Julian: It's not in order. That is what I am challenging. It's up to the committee to decide whether or not the sudden change procedurally is in order.

I would simply ask you—

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: A point of order.

Mr. Peter Julian: —to do as we have done so many times before and simply ask whether the decision of the chair should be sustained.

It is a fundamental right of committee members to challenge you in a respectful way with no debate. The committee will decide whether or not they sustain your ruling. I disagree with it, but there's no debate on this. You simply have to put it to the floor: Shall the decision of the chair be sustained?

Please do so.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Okay.

We're going around in circles. We all love circles on a Thursday, but I will let it go, the decision.

Go ahead with the vote.

(Ruling of the chair overturned: nays 6; yeas 4)

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): My decision is overturned.

Go ahead, Ms. Gladu.

Ms. Marilyn Gladu: I move that we return to talking about the subamendment. That's where we left off in the previous meeting.

I'm very disappointed, because I think it's clear that the CBC, even after a week and a half, hasn't retracted their story. We saw the Prime Minister and the Minister of Foreign Affairs.... All of this disinformation out there suggests Israel bombed the hospital, when in fact the information came from Hamas. I can't believe the committee doesn't want to talk about that and get the CBC to retract their story,

That said, we were talking previously about a similar issue with the CBC. In light of The Canadian Press having to retract three false statements about our Conservative leader this morning, I think this is a timely topic.

We were talking about the subamendment made to Mr. Julian's amendment.

What I will say is this: I think it's important to make sure we have Catherine Tait come to committee for two hours specifically to talk about the issue that was in the same motion today—the false story and the directive about how journalists should not refer to Hamas as terrorists, even though it's legal. We should somehow make sure we distinguish between that and what we're going to talk about with Ms. Tait when she's already scheduled to come, which is her mandate. I have a number of questions to ask about her mandate, because there have been numerous articles that have done a statistical analysis and come to the conclusion that the CBC is left-leaning. In many cases, they are not reporting to Canadians accurately. That is not freedom of the press. It is a very dangerous trend.

In my discussion, I would support very much Mr. Waugh's previous subamendment saying Catherine Tait...“for two hours”.

Thank you.

• (0930)

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Thank you, Ms. Gladu.

Just to inform everyone around the table, the chair, who isn't here today, had a speaking list, but I have a new speaking list in front of me, because we adjourned the last meeting.

We adjourned the meeting, so we start a new speaking list, if you don't mind, Mr. Noormohamed.... That's what I've done. I have Mrs. Thomas, Mr. Melillo, Mr. Julian, Mr. Noormohamed, Mr. Coteau and Ms. Hepfner. If you don't mind, Mr. Coteau had his hand up before you.

Mrs. Thomas, the floor is yours.

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Perhaps it would be best to start here.

I would like to point out a procedural thing. While I respect my colleague Ms. Gladu and her bringing forward my motion for discussion, I believe, if you look at the green book, that's not permitted. Because the motion is mine, I am the only one who can move it, unless, of course, someone has officially subbed in for me, at which point that individual can move it.

In order to bring us back under the procedure described in the green book, I will move my motion for discussion at this point in time.

Mr. Peter Julian: A point of order, Mr. Chair.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Go ahead, Mr. Julian.

Mr. Peter Julian: We made a decision at this committee, and we are back on your subamendment. That is something the committee decided, based on what has been committee practice since as long as I have been on the Canadian heritage committee.

It is out of order and inappropriate for any member of this committee to try to move three different motions through the course of this meeting. This is simply not appropriate procedurally.

Given that we have made the decision—it is back on your subamendment, as Ms. Gladu said, very appropriately—I would ask you to ensure that all members are speaking to your subamendment. That is what is before us on the table. That's what Conservatives moved and that's what we've been debating for the last three meetings.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Thank you, Mr. Julian. I agree.

We're debating, Mrs. Thomas, if you don't mind me saying, the subamendment put forth—

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: How does this subamendment exist?

Mr. Kevin Waugh: Because we're back here.

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: The motion is on the floor. You can't debate the subamendment without me moving the motion.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): No. I was defeated on a challenge, six to four, that we would go back to committee business and resume debate on the subamendment from Tuesday.

I have a speaking list here. You just happen to be first up now. Ms. Gladu did sneak in. Maybe she shouldn't have, but I let her. Then we're with you, then Mr. Melillo, and then Mr. Julian, if you don't mind.

We're talking about the subamendment from Tuesday, if you don't mind, about my subamendment to Mr. Julian's.

Is everything clear as mud here?

Mr. Julian and then Mrs. Thomas.

Mr. Peter Julian: I think it might be useful, Mr. Chair, for the clerk to read your subamendment on the record. Some folks around the table might need a refresher on what is actually before us.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): I have it right here in front of me. I'll read it out for those who weren't around.

Mr. Melillo, I know you weren't here.

It reads as follows:

Given that,

Hamas has been a declared terrorist organization by the Government of Canada since 2002, and

The horrific Hamas terrorist attack against Israel left thousands of innocent people dead and injured, and

—the third point now changes—

That both the European Union and U.S. lawmakers have raised concerns about false and misleading content about the Israel-Hamas conflict being spread, and The CBC receives \$1.4 billion in public funding and that Meta and Google and other media platforms receive over \$1 billion in indirect subsidies annually through taxpayer dollars, and that this committee has a mandate to review Government expenditures,

The Committee:

g) That the committee invite Rachel Curran, head of public policy, Meta Canada to come before the committee and summon the President of the CBC, Catherine Tait to appear for 2 hours by herself within seven days of the motion being adopted,

h) invite the CBC Director of Journalistic Standards, George Achi and the CBC ombudsman Jack Nagler, to appear separately for a minimum of an hour and a half each, to address the CBC's position on Journalistic Standards and Practices.

This is the subamendment that we are currently going to debate.

● (0935)

Mr. Taleeb Noormohamed: A point of order.

Mr. Peter Julian: A point of order.

Mr. Kevin Waugh: We've got a choir here.

Go ahead, Mr. Noormohamed.

Mr. Taleeb Noormohamed: With respect to process, based on the overturning of the ruling of the chair, I would go back to page 1062 of the green book just so that we are all clear in terms of the speaking list specifically.

The book notes, "If either the debate or the meeting is adjourned without the committee taking a decision," which is what happened, "the committee may resume the debate at any time afterwards at another meeting."

My question for the clerk—this is not to be obstreperous or obstructionist; I'm just trying to understand—is this: If that is where we were, should we not be going back to the original speaking list?

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): If you wish, I can start with Mrs. Thomas, who's up right now.

Mr. Taleeb Noormohamed: No, no. I mean the original speaking list for the last meeting. That's what I am asking about.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Yes. I have it right in front of me.

Mr. Taleeb Noormohamed: I'm not saying that's.... I'm just curious process-wise if that's what we should be doing. I don't know.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Well, here's the adjourned or suspended; we were adjourned, so we started a new list. That would be my interpretation.

Mr. Taleeb Noormohamed: Fine. I was just curious. I was asking a process question, that's all.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Mr. Julian.

Mr. Peter Julian: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair, for reading out the motion.

I do not have a record of your subamendment saying, "Meta and Google and other...platforms".

Meta and Google receive over \$1 billion, just those two companies. I don't recall "and other...platforms". That exponentially increases the massive government indirect subsidies that go to these

companies. I don't have a record of those three words appearing. That Meta and Google receive over \$1 billion in indirect subsidies is absolutely appropriate, and that was in my amendment.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): The clerk is going to explain the difference to you. We just had your amendment and my subamendment.

Mr. Peter Julian: Ah, okay.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Is that clear?

Mr. Peter Julian: Yes.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Mrs. Thomas, the floor is yours.

We're speaking to the subamendment, if you don't mind my saying, from Tuesday.

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: The amendment, which has now been amended and then subamended, that is before this committee has to do with the CBC. Mr. Julian then added "Meta and Google".

The intent of the subamendment being discussed would be that Ms. Tait, the head of the CBC, would be brought forward to this committee, and she would be given opportunity to answer for decisions she has made.

Further to that, there would be a desire to hear from Mr. Achi, who is responsible for journalistic standards and who instructed those at the CBC not to use the word "terrorist" when referring to Hamas, which is a terrorist organization.

Further to that, there is also a desire to hear from Mr. Nagler, who is also a part of the leadership team at the CBC. He serves as the ombudsman.

Of course, these three combined would hopefully be able to offer this committee some answers as to why they're making the decisions they are making.

What I find alarming is that the CBC is spreading dangerous disinformation, promoted by Hamas, and they put it out there as if it's fact. Just a week ago, they said that the Gaza hospital was bombed by Israel and that hundreds were dead. In fact, we now have intelligence from Canada's national defence and intelligence command, and we also have verification from the United States, France and the United Kingdom, saying that is false. Yet, the CBC has not offered an apology for their spreading of dangerous disinformation, dangerous disinformation that actually feeds into anti-Semitic beliefs and behaviour in this country.

When taxpayers are putting \$1.4 billion toward a machine that is spreading disinformation, that's wrong.

● (0940)

Ms. Lisa Hepfner: On a point of order, I'm wondering if there—

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): There is a point of order from Ms. Hepfner.

Ms. Lisa Hepfner: I'm not sure that this is accurate, based on the CBC coverage that I've seen. I'm wondering if the member opposite can provide the articles that she's concerned about.

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: That's not a point of order. This is a point of debate.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): That is debate

Go ahead, Mrs. Thomas.

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: What we see at this committee is the cover-up coalition, which is a combination of the NDP member, Mr. Julian, and the Liberal members, and they are wanting to shut down debate.

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

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Mr. Noormohamed, on a point of order.

Mr. Taleeb Noormohamed: Mrs. Thomas is now calling out specific members of this committee for their work by name, which is not only entirely inappropriate, it's inaccurate. It's also entirely unprofessional.

Perhaps, Mr. Chair, you might ask her to not do that.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Continue, Mrs. Thomas, if you don't mind, on the subamendment put forward by Kevin Waugh.

Mr. Peter Julian: I have a point of order.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Go ahead, Mr. Julian, on a point of order.

Mr. Peter Julian: I would ask you to caution all members about being respectful.

You'll recall, Mr. Chair, that the Speaker actually ruled on this, that the name-calling in the House of Commons is inappropriate. It's inappropriate at committee as well.

The Speaker has already ruled on this. I would ask, through you, that all members treat each other with respect.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): I agree.

Can we all get along for a little while and deal with the subamendment, if you don't mind?

Mrs. Thomas, you started, and we have a speaking list here. The floor is yours.

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: Mr. Chair, before I resume my comments, I would comment on that point of order first.

I referred to Mr. Julian as "Mr. Julian". At the last meeting, I accidentally used his first name. I said, "Peter Julian", at which point he took great offence and raised it. I offered an apology and he forgave me, which I'm thankful for. Today, I'm calling him "Mr. Julian", which was his request and which I believe is respectful to do. He's now saying I'm calling him names, so I'm curious: If he doesn't want me to call him "Peter Julian", and he doesn't want me to call him "Mr. Julian", what would he like me to call him?

Mr. Peter Julian: I have a point of order.

The Speaker's reference, and I know Mrs. Thomas is well aware of this, was to the use of derogatory names towards political parties, whether it's the NDP or any other party.

She's quite right to point out she apologized for her remarks in the last meeting. I have definitely forgiven her and I appreciate that she has been referring to me by my family name.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Well, I have, too, Mr. Julian, if you don't mind me saying. I'm also at fault. I've been calling people by their first names, so I was taken aback last week.

Mr. Peter Julian: Mr. Chair, you know what the committee practice is, and you also know what the Speaker's ruling was. The Speaker's ruling was not to use derogatory terms connected to any caucus. That is why I'm asking you to ensure there are no derogatory names, directed either personally, which is not the case here, or towards a party caucus.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Thanks, Mr. Julian.

I went back to Hansard several times last week. We call each other by our first names. I'm just bringing this forward. It is a point I'm making. Now—

Mr. Peter Julian: This is something that has already been resolved. Mrs. Thomas has already apologized and I've forgiven her. That is not the issue here, and I would like you to stay on point, please.

The question is whether you can use derogatory comments about any party caucus. That is what I'm asking you to enforce. As the Speaker ruled in the House, this is something that should be maintained in committee.

• (0945)

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Okay.

Mrs. Thomas, go ahead.

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: I wonder whether the honourable member, then, could help me understand: What was the derogatory term that was used?

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Go ahead, Mr. Julian.

Mr. Peter Julian: Mrs. Thomas is well aware.

The Speaker ruled on the use of derogatory terms towards any party caucus, including the NDP, during question period. I'm sure she can make her point without being derogatory. I would ask you simply to enforce that rule.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Thank you.

Go ahead, Mrs. Thomas, with the subamendment, if you don't mind.

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: Before I was interrupted, I was making the exact point my colleague is proving true, which is to say that the Liberals and the NDP have joined forces to try to bring this debate to an end, because they very much want to defend the CBC. They very much want to defend the spreading of disinformation and the dangerous conduct the CBC has engaged in by propagating a message put out there by Hamas. The CBC put that message out there as if it were fact.

The members within the Liberal and NDP caucus at this committee have determined they do not wish to have this conversation. They do not wish to have the CBC held to account, which is shameful. Canadians deserve better. They deserve accurate news coverage.

Mr. Peter Julian: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): There's a point of order.

Before we go on, we have a hard stop at 10:15. I just heard this from the clerk.

Go ahead, Mr. Julian.

Mr. Peter Julian: I would certainly disagree with Mrs. Thomas that we should be turning the committee into hell, which is what her comment was last time.

Could you please confirm, Mr. Chair, that the president of the CBC is coming before this committee next week? I think that is very germane to this discussion in the subamendment. The president of the CBC is already confirmed, as Ms. Gladu was kind enough to confirm. Next week, she will be coming to committee,

Could you confirm that, please?

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Thank you, Mr. Julian.

You know the subamendment is for two hours, which is why we're discussing it. You know as well as everyone around here that, as of Tuesday, she has been logged in for next Thursday for one hour. The subamendment is a little different, as you know, Mr. Julian. We're asking her for two hours. That's why we're on this subamendment, with Mrs. Thomas having the floor right now.

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Again, my honourable NDP colleague proves my point that the Liberals and the NDP at this committee are in fact trying to prevent the CBC from having to come forward, as these three members—

Mr. Peter Julian: A point of order.

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: —Mr. Nagler, Mr. Achi and Ms. Tait—

Mr. Peter Julian: Mr. Chair, a point of order.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Mr. Julian.

Mr. Peter Julian: Could you please confirm yet again, Mr. Chair, that the president of CBC is coming next week?

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Yes, she is coming. Catherine Tait is coming next Thursday for one hour. That is confirmed. But we're dealing with the subamendment, if you don't mind, Mr. Julian.

Things have moved with Ms. Tait, as you know. I was surprised, actually, that the chair last Tuesday said it's open warfare on Ms. Tait. We can also talk about other things. We wanted to talk specifically about the CBC, which the chair interpreted...it's now wide open.

Ms. Gladu.

Ms. Marilyn Gladu: On a point of order, Chair, Mr. Julian brought forward that the Speaker had provided rules to try to improve the decorum. One thing that was in those guidelines that he brought forward was that we shouldn't be chronically interrupting.

The number of points of order that we're seeing from Mr. Julian while my colleague Mrs. Thomas is trying to speak does look like excessive interruption.

Thank you.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Thanks, Ms. Gladu.

Again, Catherine Tait will be here on behalf of the CBC next Thursday for one hour.

Mr. Taleeb Noormohamed: A point of order, Mr. Chair.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Yes, Mr. Noormohamed.

Mr. Taleeb Noormohamed: I want to clarify two things.

One is that the chair did not use the term “open warfare” last meeting.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): No, she didn't. That's right. I would agree with that. It's open discussion.

• (0950)

Mr. Taleeb Noormohamed: I think it's important not to mischaracterize that.

Number two, could you clarify for this committee that members can ask witnesses the questions they want to ask?

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): That was the interpretation of the chair last Tuesday.

Mr. Taleeb Noormohamed: Thank you.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Mrs. Thomas.

Mr. Michael Coteau: A point of order, Mr. Chair.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Mr. Coteau, go ahead.

Mr. Michael Coteau: I know that this meeting has been very challenging, but I would like to ask you as the chair to ensure that if members are repeating themselves, you hold them accountable. We don't have a lot of time and we have an important study that speaks to issues that this entire committee was committed to. That was the health and well-being of our athletes here in Canada.

I do believe that the issues MP Thomas is bringing up around CBC and accountability are issues that MPs should be able to ask the CEO of CBC. I will vote in favour of asking CBC to come to the committee so that MP Thomas can ask those questions, but the constant repeating of the same point doesn't really allow us to do our work.

The bottom line, at the end of the day, is that we finish this report. It speaks to many examples of athletes being exploited here in Canada. We have a duty as MPs to make sure that this report is put forward, voted on and reported back to the House.

Thank you so much, Mr. Chair.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Thank you, Mr. Coteau.

Go ahead, Mrs. Thomas, with your points on the subamendment, please.

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: It's interesting to me that the members opposite are prescribing what this committee has a responsibility to do.

While I don't disagree, I would also raise the fact that this committee has the responsibility to hold the CBC to account with regard to telling the truth. The CBC is under the parameters of Heritage Canada. This committee is the heritage committee. Therefore, as members of this committee, we have the responsibility to hold the CBC, the public broadcaster within this country, to account. If the CBC is reporting false information, dangerous disinformation, that is causing significant harm, then the CBC has the responsibility to answer for that decision and to answer for the impact this decision has had on Canadians, in particular on the Jewish community.

Let me be very clear: For the Liberal members and the NDP member of this committee to try to block for Ms. Tait and to try to block—

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

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): On a point of order, Mr. Noormohamed.

Mr. Taleeb Noormohamed: I would ask you to clarify what I think, mathematically, is the umpteenth time, that Catherine Tait from the CBC is coming and that members can ask her whatever their hearts desire. Please do that so that Mrs. Thomas can disabuse herself of this notion that somehow that's not what people want.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Okay.

Go ahead, Mrs. Thomas.

On a point of order, Mr. Julian.

Mr. Peter Julian: Mr. Chair, you'll recall that I was a member around this table during the Harper regime and—

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): What does that have to do with what we're discussing here?

Mr. Peter Julian: I'm coming back to that.

Numerous times when I was speaking, the Conservatives would point to the issue of relevance. Of course, relevance and repetition are the two elements around any filibuster, so I would question both the relevance and the repetition here.

When we are talking about the subamendment, it is important to stick to the subamendment, and it is also important to ensure that there isn't repetition.

We know that Ms. Tait is coming next week, so that kind of drive-by comment is simply inappropriate. It's not relevant.

The question that you raised, Mr. Chair, is a very valid one: Should she be coming for two hours? I think that's worthy of debate and let's have that debate.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): That is debate.

Mrs. Thomas, go ahead.

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: To the committee, through you, Mr. Chair, I'm seeing the members of the Liberal Party and the NDP member consistently interrupting me and finding fault with the fact that I'm talking about Ms. Tait, the head of the CBC, coming to this committee. That is the very core of the subamendment that we're talking about.

On the one hand, I am being berated by my colleagues at this table for talking about Ms. Tait coming to this committee and how that's so important, and then I'm also being berated, on this other side, for needing to stick to the subamendment. So here I am stuck in this interesting place, which brings me to the conclusion.

This is just a nonsensical way for the Liberal and NDP members of this committee to try to stop the discussion, to try to stop my comments, because they do not want the truth to be told. They do not want the truth exposed. They do not want to acknowledge that the CBC is spreading disinformation that is dangerous in nature.

The CBC published an article with this title, "Hundreds killed in Israeli airstrike on Gaza City hospital, Palestinian Health Ministry in Gaza says". Let's be clear. The Palestinian health ministry is run by Hamas, so for the CBC to release an article with intel that they received from Hamas is absolutely inappropriate.

It was found, and has been confirmed by the Prime Minister of Canada, the Minister of National Defence, the Canadian Forces intelligence command, the United States of America, the United Kingdom and France that this is a false narrative the CBC has been spreading. It is in fact dangerous disinformation that feeds into anti-Semitism in this country. It is wrong, and this committee has the responsibility to hold the CBC leadership to account.

For the members of this committee to try to backstop the leader of that organization is absolutely horrendous. It's despicable. This is the spreading of dangerous disinformation that has had a massive impact on people in Canada.

We're talking about a public broadcaster that is paid to the tune of \$1.4 billion from the Canadian taxpayer. Surely this committee can do its job, and surely the members of the Liberal caucus and the member of the NDP caucus who are trying to disrupt at this committee could perhaps have the decency—

Mr. Peter Julian: I have a point of order.

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: —to have the conversation and allow Ms. Tait to come forward for two hours, along with her leadership team, to answer the questions that need to be answered.

Mr. Julian is interrupting me again on a point of order.

● (0955)

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Yes, he is.

Go ahead, Mr. Julian.

Mr. Peter Julian: I disagree with the profound disinformation, and that is not relevant to the subamendment. The subamendment is the two hours versus the one hour, and I think that's a worthy debate.

I appreciated your offering it as a subamendment, Mr. Chair, but the comments are not relevant to the subamendment.

Ms. Tait is coming. She's coming before the committee. I would ask you to enforce that rule of relevance, so that the comments are on whether a two-hour as opposed to a one-hour time frame is appropriate.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Okay.

Go ahead, Mrs. Thomas.

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: Thank you.

To be clear, the subamendment is very specific about the reason Ms. Tait would be coming to this committee. It is not the addition of an hour to the already standing commitment. Rather, it is for an entirely new purpose she is being asked to come.

It also reads that there are two other individuals on her leadership team who would be required to come: Mr. Nagler and Mr. Achi.

Again, for the members opposite, along with the NDP member, to try to shut this down—

Mr. Peter Julian: I have a point of order.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Go ahead, Mr. Julian.

Mr. Peter Julian: I, again, question relevance. The reality is that my amendment very clearly refers to the other two individuals. We know Ms. Tait is coming next week. The accusations and comments are not relevant to the subamendment.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Mrs. Thomas, go ahead.

I think the confusion, if you don't mind me saying, is that we had booked in Catherine Tait before all the issues we have seen in the last two weeks out of the CBC newsreel. The subamendment we're dealing with concerns the reporting out of Gaza since the conflict started between Hamas and Israel.

Yes, we're dealing with a subamendment, but this is where we've crossed the line. We had Tait coming regardless, and now we've asked her to come for two hours. Things have developed, as you know, Mr. Julian. Things have developed over the last two weeks that were, "Really? Is this what's happening?"

That's why your amendment and my subamendment include the CBC. It was because of the issues that happened with the reporting of the public broadcaster.

Mrs. Thomas, if you don't mind, continue on the subamendment.

● (1000)

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I'll read the exact wording of the the subamendment:

That the committee invite Rachel Curran, head of public policy, Meta Canada to come before the committee and summon the President of the CBC, Catherine Tait to appear for 2 hours by herself within seven days of the motion being adopted,

invite the CBC Director of Journalistic Standards, George Achi and the CBC ombudsman Jack Nagler, to appear separately for a minimum of an hour and a half each, to address the CBC's position on Journalistic Standards and Practices.

One of those journalistic standards and practices is that they refused to call Hamas a terrorist organization. This is despite the fact that Hamas has been listed by Canada as a terrorist organization since 2002. That's more than 20 years.

For the CBC to make this decision is absolutely irresponsible. It is to peddle disinformation. It is to be on the side of Hamas, which is to be on the side of terrorists, which is to be against the Jewish population, which is wrong.

[*Translation*]

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

[*English*]

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Go ahead, Mr. Champoux.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Martin Champoux: Mr. Chair, Ms. Thomas' accusations and comments about the public broadcaster are extremely serious. I would encourage her, through you, Mr. Chair, to be careful in what she says because it can cause a lot of damage. This is a major blow to the credibility of the public broadcaster.

I think we've gone around the table a little bit. I invite you to question the repetition in Ms. Thomas' comments. Without that repetition, we would be resuming debate and listening to other speakers.

I would still urge my colleagues to be extremely careful in their choice of words, as words have consequences. We are talking about a public news outlet. This is a very serious attack on the credibility of a broadcaster based on opinions, not facts.

Thank you.

Mr. Peter Julian: I also have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

[*English*]

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Go ahead, Mr. Julian.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Peter Julian: I think you should give the floor to someone else. Ms. Thomas is not following the rules of the committee. The allegations she is making against journalists put their lives at risk and are extremely serious and inflammatory.

This week, she said that she wanted to make this committee a living hell. I find those comments absolutely disgraceful, and she should apologize to all journalists.

We may disagree on some points, but the allegations she has just made are appalling. They threaten journalists' lives.

[English]

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Thank you to both of you.

Thank you, Mr. Champoux, a former journalist, for your comments.

Mrs. Thomas, continue on, if you don't mind.

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: I wish the members of this committee cared enough about the lives of innocent Jewish individuals—

Mr. Taleeb Noormohamed: A point of order, Mr. Chair.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Mr. Noormohamed.

Mr. Taleeb Noormohamed: We have now sat through Mrs. Thomas saying that we are on the side of terrorists—all of us. We have sat through Mrs. Thomas saying that we don't care about the Jewish community.

I am very proud to represent the Jewish community in Vancouver and the institutions that are Jewish in my riding. I take great, great responsibility, and it means the world to me that they have chosen to have me as their member of Parliament.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Thank you.

Mr. Taleeb Noormohamed: What she is doing, if I may finish, Mr. Chair, is not only casting aspersions on the intentions of members of this committee. What she's also doing—perhaps wittingly, perhaps unwittingly, I don't know what she's thinking—is to foment a remarkable amount of discord in communities where we already have a lot of anxiety.

Ms. Marilyn Gladu: A point of order.

Mr. Taleeb Noormohamed: It is not helpful, Mr. Chair, and it's extremely dangerous.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): On a point of order, Ms. Gladu.

Ms. Marilyn Gladu: Chair, while respecting the point that we all need to get to a better place, I think that was debate.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Thank you.

We have a speaking list. Hopefully, we can get through most of it, if not all of it, before the hard stop at 10:15.

We have Mrs. Thomas continuing. Then we have Mr. Melillo, Mr. Julian, Mr. Coteau, Mr. Noormohamed and Ms. Hefner on the speaking list.

Go ahead, Mrs. Thomas.

• (1005)

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: The point is simple. The CBC itself said that to call Hamas terrorists was to take sides. If they're not going to call Hamas a terrorist organization, are they not left taking a side still?

[Translation]

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

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Go ahead, Mr. Champoux.

Mr. Martin Champoux: I would remind you that the allegations that Ms. Thomas is currently making are extremely serious.

As Mr. Julian pointed out earlier, there are journalists on the ground. To suggest that journalists at Radio-Canada, CBC or any media outlet are biased towards terrorists threatens their safety on the ground and undermines their integrity. These comments are serious and have far-reaching effects.

I am asking Ms. Thomas to retract her remarks, to withdraw them and to choose her words better because we are spreading serious misinformation that can seriously harm journalists who are doing their work on the ground.

[English]

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Thank you, Mr. Champoux.

Mrs. Thomas, continue, if you don't mind.

Mr. Peter Julian: On a point of order, Mr. Chair, you do need to ask Mrs. Thomas to retract what are serious allegations that put the lives of journalists, who are already in incredibly dangerous situations, in peril. These are not comments that can be excused. We can't turn the page. She has made unbelievably horrific allegations. She needs to retract. She needs to apologize.

I would suggest, Mr. Chair, that you have the power from this committee to go to someone else so that she cannot—

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Mrs. Thomas, would you apologize?

Mr. Peter Julian: I would ask for her to apologize to all the journalists she has just put in incredible danger.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Mrs. Thomas, you've been asked to apologize.

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: I have the article in front of me. I'd be happy to read it into the record in its entirety. I believe if I were to do so, it would show that the CBC did in fact take information—

Mr. Taleeb Noormohamed: A point of order, Mr. Chair.

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: —at their own admission—

Mr. Taleeb Noormohamed: A point of order.

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: —directly from Hamas, and put it out to the Canadian public—

Mr. Taleeb Noormohamed: A point of order.

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: —as if it were fact.

Mr. Taleeb Noormohamed: A point of order, Mr. Chair.

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: I do not retract my statement.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Okay.

Mr. Noormohamed.

Mr. Taleeb Noormohamed: Well, I think Mrs. Thomas has now spoken for herself. She's not retracting her statement, so she's not taking you up on the offer to apologize to the committee, or, more importantly, to journalists. This is now not only repetitive; this is inflammatory. The consequences of these types of comments...

Mr. Chair, I would ask you, as the chair of this committee today, to take very seriously what Mr. Champoux, Mr. Julian and I and others in this committee are saying and feeling. This is a very, very serious line of misinformation that Mrs. Thomas has chosen to peddle to get clips. This is not what this committee should be about. People's lives are literally hanging in the balance over every word people are saying, not just abroad but also in this country.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Thank you, Mr. Noormohamed.

Go ahead, Mrs. Thomas.

Mr. Peter Julian: Mr. Chair, I would ask that you give the next person on the list the ability to speak.

Could you rule on that, please?

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Mrs. Thomas, are you just about ready to wrap up? I do have Mr. Melillo and Mr. Julian next on the list.

Mr. Peter Julian: Chair, I'm not asking you....

She has not retracted. She has not apologized. She has made incendiary allegations against journalists. I would ask that you give the speaking role to the next person, and if you rule to the contrary, I'm prepared to move the appropriate challenge to your ruling.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Mrs. Thomas, you do have the floor. I wish you would wrap up.

Mr. Peter Julian: Mr. Chair, I would challenge your ruling on this. I believe that her allegations are—

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): All right. I'll call for the vote then.

Mr. Peter Julian: —unbelievably inappropriate and that her time speaking should be suspended. She has caused disorder in this committee.

• (1010)

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Mr. Julian, could you explain what you would you like to challenge again?

Mr. Peter Julian: She has provoked disorder by her incendiary comments about journalists. She has been repetitive and she has not been relevant to what is before us.

You've called her repeatedly on this. You've asked her to apologize. She has refused. There is order that must be maintained in the committee.

I would ask you to maintain it by simply passing to the next person on the list, who I believe is Mr. Melillo. That's the decision I'm asking you to take.

Ms. Lisa Hefner: Chair, it's 10:15, so I—

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): It's actually not. I have 10:11.

Sorry, but I have four minutes after all. That clock is fast.

Ms. Lisa Hefner: I move to suspend the meeting. Can I do that?

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): No, you can't. Just give me 30 seconds, if you don't mind.

Because we are limited to time, let me say this before we do in fact adjourn for the day. Next Tuesday, October 31—let me read this into the record, if you don't mind—we will hear from Jean-François Bélisle on his appointment as director of the National Gallery of Canada and continue reviewing the safe sport report, which is to be confirmed based on the outcome of the meetings to date.

I wanted to say that prior to the end of the meeting. It's up to the chair, when she comes back next week...but that was on our schedule for next Tuesday and I wanted everyone around the table to expect that.

Today we thought we were going to get the chair of the CRTC, and then we didn't get her for some reason. For Tuesday, we are expecting to hear from Jean-François for one hour in committee.

Mrs. Thomas, we're back to you. The time is running out.

Mr. Peter Julian: On a point of order, Mr. Chair, I did ask you for a ruling on this.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): You're challenging the chair.

Mr. Peter Julian: No, I've asked you for a ruling. You haven't given it yet.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): I'm asking Mrs. Thomas if she would apologize. That's what I asked.

If you would withdraw some of the remarks that you made to journalists, then we could proceed, if you don't mind.

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: I haven't made any comments to journalists, but I have referenced an article written by the CBC on October 17 entitled, "Hundreds killed in Israeli airstrike on Gaza City hospital, Palestinian Health Ministry in Gaza says". I talked about what is stated in that article.

[*Translation*]

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

[*English*]

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: It's an article written by the CBC. If this committee is uncomfortable with what the CBC has said, that's unfortunate. I won't retract a true statement based on an article the CBC wrote.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Go ahead, Mr. Champoux.

[*Translation*]

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

First of all, these are not the words of Ms. Thomas. She specifically associated CBC with Hamas, and she was not quoting the article when she said that earlier. She's come back with this article to justify their actions. It doesn't justify anything at all.

The point is, Mr. Chair, that Mr. Julian asked you to enforce a ruling, to take away Ms. Thomas' right to speak, and that's the ruling he asked you to rule on.

[*English*]

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): I'm being challenged, so I will bring it to a vote.

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: Mr. Chair, I have a point of order.

I would like you to read into the record what exactly the challenge is and what has gone on here, before we move to that vote. That's so we can have a full understanding.

Mr. Peter Julian: Mr. Chair, she violated the standards that committees are supposed to adhere to.

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: I have a point of order.

This is debate, right now. Mr. Chair, you have to go immediately to a vote.

Mr. Peter Julian: The member has refused to apologize for her comments and put people in a dangerous position. She has, as well,

repeated herself and not been relevant in speaking to the subamendment.

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: I have a point of order.

• (1015)

Mr. Kevin Waugh: Move on, everyone.

Mr. Peter Julian: On that basis, yes, I believe you have the right to bypass the speaker, so we'll speak to the next Conservative member.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Thank you, Mr. Julian.

I see the clock is at 10:15. Could I have someone adjourn?

Mr. Taleeb Noormohamed: I so move.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Kevin Waugh): Thank you, Mr. Noormohamed.

The meeting is adjourned.

Published under the authority of the Speaker of
the House of Commons

SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

The proceedings of the House of Commons and its committees are hereby made available to provide greater public access. The parliamentary privilege of the House of Commons to control the publication and broadcast of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its committees is nonetheless reserved. All copyrights therein are also reserved.

Reproduction of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its committees, in whole or in part and in any medium, is hereby permitted provided that the reproduction is accurate and is not presented as official. This permission does not extend to reproduction, distribution or use for commercial purpose of financial gain. Reproduction or use outside this permission or without authorization may be treated as copyright infringement in accordance with the Copyright Act. Authorization may be obtained on written application to the Office of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Reproduction in accordance with this permission does not constitute publication under the authority of the House of Commons. The absolute privilege that applies to the proceedings of the House of Commons does not extend to these permitted reproductions. Where a reproduction includes briefs to a committee of the House of Commons, authorization for reproduction may be required from the authors in accordance with the Copyright Act.

Nothing in this permission abrogates or derogates from the privileges, powers, immunities and rights of the House of Commons and its committees. For greater certainty, this permission does not affect the prohibition against impeaching or questioning the proceedings of the House of Commons in courts or otherwise. The House of Commons retains the right and privilege to find users in contempt of Parliament if a reproduction or use is not in accordance with this permission.

Also available on the House of Commons website at the following address: <https://www.ourcommons.ca>

Publié en conformité de l'autorité
du Président de la Chambre des communes

PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

Les délibérations de la Chambre des communes et de ses comités sont mises à la disposition du public pour mieux le renseigner. La Chambre conserve néanmoins son privilège parlementaire de contrôler la publication et la diffusion des délibérations et elle possède tous les droits d'auteur sur celles-ci.

Il est permis de reproduire les délibérations de la Chambre et de ses comités, en tout ou en partie, sur n'importe quel support, pourvu que la reproduction soit exacte et qu'elle ne soit pas présentée comme version officielle. Il n'est toutefois pas permis de reproduire, de distribuer ou d'utiliser les délibérations à des fins commerciales visant la réalisation d'un profit financier. Toute reproduction ou utilisation non permise ou non formellement autorisée peut être considérée comme une violation du droit d'auteur aux termes de la Loi sur le droit d'auteur. Une autorisation formelle peut être obtenue sur présentation d'une demande écrite au Bureau du Président de la Chambre des communes.

La reproduction conforme à la présente permission ne constitue pas une publication sous l'autorité de la Chambre. Le privilège absolu qui s'applique aux délibérations de la Chambre ne s'étend pas aux reproductions permises. Lorsqu'une reproduction comprend des mémoires présentés à un comité de la Chambre, il peut être nécessaire d'obtenir de leurs auteurs l'autorisation de les reproduire, conformément à la Loi sur le droit d'auteur.

La présente permission ne porte pas atteinte aux privilèges, pouvoirs, immunités et droits de la Chambre et de ses comités. Il est entendu que cette permission ne touche pas l'interdiction de contester ou de mettre en cause les délibérations de la Chambre devant les tribunaux ou autrement. La Chambre conserve le droit et le privilège de déclarer l'utilisateur coupable d'outrage au Parlement lorsque la reproduction ou l'utilisation n'est pas conforme à la présente permission.

Aussi disponible sur le site Web de la Chambre des communes à l'adresse suivante :
<https://www.noscommunes.ca>