

MA Master's Research Paper

Do *Morality Policy* Debates Involve Morality? A Framing Analysis of Medical Assistance in
Dying and Cannabis Legalization in Canadian Public Policymaking

Tavawn Graham

215404312

Dr. Ian Roberge

A Master's Research Paper submitted
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Public Policy, Administration and Law

York University

Toronto, Ontario, Canada

April 10, 2026

Abstract

Since its emergence in the 20th century, a variety of definitions and distinctions were made by scholars to define *morality policy*. This study examines these conceptions and offers a definition that more accurately reflects the multidimensional nature of policies. As a contribution to the literature, this study further investigates *morality policy* with an application to Canadian public policymaking. A discourse analysis of Canadian parliamentary debates on cannabis legalization and Medical Assistance in Dying revealed how morality policies are framed within the Canadian public policy environment. The findings show the framing strategies used by policy actors within these debates and the frequency of each frame used. We discovered that moral frames were used by policy actors ~20% of the time on these subjects, well below the frequency of non-moral frames used (i.e., instrumental and procedural frames). Furthermore, this study reveals a novel finding: when the judiciary influences the introduction of a *morality policy* issue onto the government agenda, non-supporting policy actors adjust their framing strategies within debates. Ultimately, the findings reveal the significance of framing in *morality policy* and identifies areas for future research within Canada and comparatively between Canada and the United States of America.

Keywords: morality policy, framing, parliamentary debates, discourse analysis, medical assistance in dying, cannabis

Acknowledgements

I would like to extend my sincere thanks to my supervisor, Dr. Ian Roberge, for his guidance and encouragement throughout my research and writing of this paper. I would also like to thank my girlfriend, Angela, for believing in me since day one, and for supporting me every step of the way. Lastly, I would like to thank my two lovely parents, Mr. and Mrs. Graham, as well as the rest of my family for making this dream of mine a reality.

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Introduction	1
Literature Review	6
Conceptualizing Morality Policy	6
Introducing Morality Policy and Highlighting Trends.....	9
Morality Framing.....	12
Religion and Morality Policy.....	18
Outcomes and Patterns of Morality Policy.....	25
Summary of Existing Contributions and Purpose of this Study	28
Methodology and Data Collection	30
Results	34
Case Study 1: Bill C-14, Medical Assistance in Dying.....	34
Case Study 2: Bill C-45, <i>the Cannabis Act</i>	43
Discussion	53
Conclusion	60
References	66
Appendix 1: Frames Used by Members of Parliament during Bill C-14 House of Commons Debates	77
Appendix 2: Frames Used by Members of Parliament and Invited Guests During Bill C-14 Committee Meetings	82
Appendix 3: Frames Used by Members of Parliament during Bill C-45 House of Commons Debates	90
Appendix 4: Frames Used by Members of Parliament and Invited Guests During Bill C-45 Committee Meetings	99

Introduction

As people progress through life, it is natural to reflect on how past choices shape present realities. People may find the way they viewed the world yesterday contrary to how they view the world today. This exemplifies the fact that human life is a continuous process of growth and experience. What someone considers to be right from wrong is likely connected to how they view the world, and how they situate themselves within that worldview. For some folks, this *moral compass* may come from religion, while for others, it may come from a secular-based framework of morality, among other possibilities. The principles people carry from these systems of beliefs are often illuminated through their daily activities, such as how they interact with others, where they choose to spend their time and resources, which political party they may support, and policies they advocate for or against. Looking beyond the individual level, widely held beliefs among a population is often indicative of existing public policies within a state. For example, it is likely to find anti-abortion policies in jurisdictions with a large population of religious believers (Cocca 2002; Kreitzer 2015). People who hold the majority belief within a state are likely to welcome these policies, while a smaller contingent of non-supporters are likely to reject it. This dynamic can give rise to political conflict within a state as those holding minority beliefs may advocate for policy change. In turn, policy makers may find themselves pulled into public debates on whose values should be sanctioned by the government (Haider-Markel and Meier 1996).

Scholars attest that these types of debates are unique to policies involving disagreements over what is fundamentally right and wrong (Euchner 2019). These policies are commonly referred to as morality policies. However, whether these policies are a distinct policy type continues to be contested. What differentiates these types of policies from “non-morality” policies is the manner in which public division unfolds on an issue. For non-morality policies, competing economic interests tend to divide the public. On the other hand, disagreements over citizens’ values and religious beliefs tend to drive division in *morality policy* debates (Wendell and Tatalovich 2021). For these reasons, it is unlikely for morality policies to find its way onto a government agenda based on socioeconomic variables (e.g., the wealth of the state). Instead, people’s values, opinions, public salience, and political considerations of decision-makers drives these policies onto government agendas (Patton 2007). Since its emergence in the 20th century, a variety of definitions and distinctions were made to define *morality policy*. A few examples include: *morality policy* raises questions that spark debates over first principles, resulting in uncompromising clashes of values (Mooney and Lee 1995); *morality policy* is neither tactical nor strategic; rather, it involves authoritative statements about what a polity holds to be fundamentally right and wrong (Mooney 2000); *morality policy* is usually simpler to understand than other policies, because it involves basic values that are typically of greater importance to the public than most other policies (Camobreco and Barnello 2008); and *morality policy* seeks to use the power of government to impose one set of fundamental values over other competing values (Slocum-Schaffer 2018). As corroborated in Euchner (2019), a commonality among these definitions is that value conflicts over fundamental principles

and disputes between what is right and wrong are characteristic to this policy type. Yet, a clear-cut definition has yet to be established.

This study offers a definition of *morality policy* that is not only consistent with these commonalities, but more accurately reflects the multidimensional nature of policies. It investigates the role of framing in *morality policy* debates, including how policy actors strategically use different frames when participating in such conversations and debates. Contemporary scholars are leaning towards a modern understanding that *morality policy* is best understood as *morality framing* where people can strategically frame an issue through a moral or non-moral lens depending on the circumstances (Crawford and Weible 2024). For policy makers, specifically politicians, this distinction can be dependent on which political party currently forms government, and whether an issue on the government agenda is pushing for policy change or the maintenance of the status quo. Inspired by my interests in religion and its involvement in government, this study seeks to identify *if* and *when* policy actors in Canada favour religious-based and/or secular-based moral frames within debates on *morality policy* issues, and if it is effective.

I seek to evaluate how existing theories and discoveries on *morality policy* apply to the Canadian public policy environment. This includes *framing theory*, which helps to describe how policy actors present moral issues to the public to influence their understanding (Burlone 2020). I am interested in evaluating which frame(s) is effective and why? How are discourse and arguments put together within these frames and how do they shape policymaking? I argue that in the Canadian public policy environment, policy actors use moral framing that aligns with the values of their supporters on *morality policy* issues,

while also aiming to gain broader public support through alternative framing strategies (i.e., instrumental and procedural framing). This dual approach may help policy actors to win over support from Canadians with differing fundamental views.

My research question is: How are morality policies framed within a Canadian policy environment? I seek to investigate: a) Which policy actors have a voice within *morality policy* debates? b) How are they presenting their arguments? c) How are they responding to each other? and d) What types of stories emerge within those debates? This study investigates debates surrounding the legalization of cannabis (Bill C-45) and Medical Assistance in Dying (MAiD) (Bill C-14) during Justin Trudeau's Liberal government between 2015-2018. Although cannabis legalization was a one and done subject in Canadian Parliament through Bill C-45, further adaptations to MAiD were made (through Bill C-7) and are currently ongoing. Based on the results in this study, I make a statement on the impact of framing on *morality policy* within the Canadian public policy environment.

This topic is worth investigating to study the significance of *morality policy* within the Canadian public policy environment, an area that remains understudied in the literature. Addressing this gap is important since it is accepted that *morality policy* issues often generate heightened public engagement in politics, and in turn, influence public policymaking (Patton 2007). This study would reveal if this finding is applicable to Canada; and if it is not, it would raise questions such as: why do *morality policy* issues not draw more attention from Canadians? Although this is a policy paper, I am aware of the political implications in this study, especially considering that cannabis legalization was an election promise from the federal Liberal Party. This study will reveal if and when Canadian policy

actors opt to use moral frames, on what issues, and if the frame used depends on which political party makes up the current government or the opposition. Comparing how policies are framed across two different policy fields will also reveal if any similarities and/or differences in approach exist among policy actors to garner public support. Such findings would answer questions like: which stakeholders do policy actors target for support/non-support for MAiD? How do their strategies change or stay the same to garner public support/non-support for cannabis legalization?

In the next section of this paper, the literature review presents a comprehensive layout of what we currently know about *morality policy*, and justifies the merit for future contributions through this study. The section following outlines the methodology used for data collection in this paper to study *morality policy* through framing, including the justification for our chosen approach. This section outlines how the data was collected and examined for both case studies (i.e., Bill C-14 and Bill C-45). Next, the results section reveals the key findings from this study that focus on the framing strategies used by policy actors during these *morality policy* debates, as well as the frequency of each frame used. Then, the discussion section further analyzes these findings and makes connections to previous findings in the literature. This section also identifies truly original findings in this study and highlights notable comparisons between the frames used during debates on MAiD versus debates on cannabis legalization. Lastly, this paper ends with a conclusion section that highlights the key takeaways from this study – contributing to our understanding of *morality policy* – and identifies future research considerations.

Literature Review

The literature review first explores the history behind the conceptualization of *morality policy* as a policy type, including approaches to defining *morality policy* today. The review then identifies the different types of morality policies, characteristics of morality policies, and themes around public participation on *morality policy* issues. Next, the review examines the concept of *morality framing* and highlights strategies behind framing issues through a moral lens (and without a moral lens). Lastly, the review explores the influence of religion on *morality policy* at both an individual and political level, followed by a section highlighting patterns around political decision-making and influence on morality policies.

As this study will investigate *morality policy* within a Canadian context, it will highlight Canadian pieces throughout the literature review. The purpose of this is to understand the historical landscape of *morality policy* issues, advocacy, and political-decision making within Canada, and will serve as a reference point to compare findings from this study. Lastly, while acknowledging that principles from various religions (e.g., Hinduism, Islam, Judaism, etc.) can offer insights that are relevant to this study, the religious aspects covered in the literature review are largely focused on Christianity.

Conceptualizing Morality Policy

Prior to the emergence of *morality policy*, four distinct policy types existed as frameworks for policy studies. These policy types were conceptualized by Theodore Lowi in the late-1960s and include: 1) Distributive policies – in which an entire population benefits from and contributes to services (e.g., highway construction); 2) Regulatory policies – in

which the actions of a subject or entity is limited (e.g., zoning laws); 3) Redistributive policies – in which resources from a sub-group within a population is transferred to another (e.g., progressive income tax); and 4) Constituent policies – which establish government entities to address public policy issues (e.g., the Canadian Food Inspection Agency) (Lowi 1964; Hollander and Patapan 2017; Motta 2021). However, policies driven by deeply held citizen moral and religious values are distinct from these four policy types due to a lower dependence on socioeconomic characteristics as key determinants of such policies (Morgan 1980; Meier 1994; Gibson 2004; Wendell and Tatalovich 2021). Numerous scholars explored this uniqueness over the past few decades and deemed *morality policy* to be a distinct policy type (Motta 2021). For example, Mooney (2000) stated that morality policies are based on authoritative statements reflecting what a polity ascribes as being fundamentally right and wrong.

Amidst efforts to conceptualize *morality policy*, some scholars presented arguments favouring Lowi's conceptualization of regulatory policies and redistributive policies as congruent with moral policy issues (Tatalovich and Daynes 1988; Meier 1999; Camobreco and Barnello 2008; Euchner 2019). Nonetheless, a broadly accepted characteristic of *morality policy* is that it involves value conflicts of citizen or religious groups competing in the political process, which are determinants not inherently captured under redistributive or regulatory policies (Meier 1992; Euchner 2019). Such factors are fundamental to the conceptualization of *morality policy* as a distinct policy type. However, another argument found in the literature presents a grey area to consider. Morality policies, as with most other policies, can be multidimensional in terms of how they are constructed

(Engeli and Varone 2011). For example, abortion and gambling can be perceived as health and economic policies respectively, in addition to them being morality policies. This argument can spark a debate around morality policies being no different from regulatory or redistributive policies.

A more recent development by social scientists called Moral Foundations Theory (MFT) supports arguments that *morality policy* is inherently distinct from other types (Wendell and Tatalovich 2021). The theory is based on five foundations of morality, with each comprising a positive or negative connotation (i.e., care or harm, fairness or cheating, loyalty or betrayal, authority or subversion, and sanctity or degradation) (Wendell and Tatalovich 2021, 2023). Researchers can apply MFT to conduct discourse analysis on written statements or publications to detect and quantify the usage of moral language (Wendell and Tatalovich 2021). The logic behind this theory is that a higher usage of moral language would uncover the moral foundations behind the policy issue at hand. For example, Wendell and Tatalovich (2021) utilized MFT to quantify the moral language used in Voter Guides that accompanied referenda in the United States of America (USA) on various topical policy issues, including the death penalty, same-sex marriage, and recreational marijuana. Their results revealed detectable patterns of moral rhetoric within the statements, implying that the issues are heavily rooted in moral values (Wendell and Tatalovich 2021).

According to Vossen et al. (2022), there are currently two approaches to conceptualizing *morality policy*. The first being the positivist approach, where *morality policy* is deemed inherently moralistic (Vossen et al. 2022). This approach seeks to label

morality policy as a distinct policy type. The second is the constructivist approach, which focuses on how an issue is framed (Vossen et al. 2022). This approach is backed by arguments attesting that policies are multidimensional. A positivist approach looks to clearly identify the subject (e.g., abortion, gambling, same-sex marriage), which is a problem since morality policies are a moving target. Because of that, we use a constructivist approach to define *morality policy* as strategies used by policy actors to address subjects framed through a moral lens where there is conflict over what is considered morally right and wrong. Later in this section, I elaborate further on the constructivist approach under Morality Framing.

Introducing Morality Policy and Highlighting Trends

Morality policy prompts intense debates on what is naturally right and wrong, grounded in first principles which are fundamental truths or assumptions (Mooney and Schuldt 2008; Euchner 2019). Today, in the 21st century, where diversity in thought, opinion, values, and expressions is magnified and far-reaching like never before (e.g., through platforms like social media), morality policies continue to bring about uncompromising clashes of values in society (Mooney and Lee 1995). These clashes oftentimes result in the interests or values of one sub-group within a population being recognized to the detriment of another. An example of this is the inverse correlation between abortion pro-choice votes and the percentage of Roman Catholics and Protestant fundamentalist Christians in American states (Mooney and Lee 1995; Roh and Berry 2008; Kreitzer et al. 2019). For this reason, Mooney and Lee (1995) assert that morality policies seek to regulate social norms or to evoke strong moral responses from citizens. There are

five characteristic features to describe *morality policy*: 1) a basic conflict of moral values exists on at least one side of the issue; 2) issue is highly salient to the public; 3) issue is technically simple (i.e., easy for citizens to comprehend); 4) issue elicits high public participation; and 5) a lack of compromise exists between both sides of the issue (Meier and McFarlane 1993; Mooney and Schuldt 2008; Roh and Berry 2008; Studlar 2008).

Furthermore, *morality policy* can be organized into four distinct subfields: 1) issues of ‘life or death’ (including abortion, euthanasia, and capital punishment); 2) issues of sexual behaviour (including same-sex marriage, prostitution, and pornography); 3) issues related to addictive behaviour (including gambling and drug use); and 4) issues of decisions over the relationship between individual freedoms and collective values (including religious education and gun control) (Knill 2013).

In his book titled “The Politics of Sin: Drugs, Alcohol and Public Policy, Kenneth J. Meier divided *morality policy* further into two types (Meier 1994). Meier classified the first type as *two-sided morality policies* where competing citizen perspectives and values exist (e.g., abortion and gambling); and the second type as *one-sided morality policies* or the “politics of sin”, where there is one dominating belief among a population that sinful behaviour is bad (e.g., murder) (Meier 1994; Tatalovich and Wendell 2018). *Morality policy* evokes much public participation due to its high salience, low technicality, and debate over first principles (or values) either held or rejected among citizens (Gormley 1986; Mooney and Schuldt 2008; Euchner 2019). High public participation coincides with heightened attention to *morality policy* issues among activists, the general electorate, and political decision-makers. For example, a 1989 survey led by the Canadian Abortion Rights Action

League (CARAL) revealed that 62 percent of Canadians disagreed with the Brian Mulroney Progressive Conservative government's intent to recriminalize abortion through the *Criminal Code* of Canada (Tatalovich 1997). According to a national poll, the number of opposing Canadians increased to 66 percent in December 1991 (Tatalovich 1997). The increased majority opposition to abortion criminalization, citizen participation in national surveys, and government attention to abortion (which is viewed as the quintessential *morality policy* issue (Motta 2021)) are indicative of its salience. Moreover, a government's responsiveness to implement or abandon a *morality policy* is dependent on the type (as defined in (Meier 1994)) under consideration. Later in this section, I elaborate further on this topic under Outcomes and Patterns of Morality Policy.

If high public participation is indicative of issue salience, does this mean that the public views non-morality issues as less important? If this claim is true, it would suggest that issues surrounding economic prosperity, health care, and housing come as afterthoughts to issues like abortion, euthanasia, and same-sex marriage. Mooney and Schuldt (2008) examined this conundrum and found no evidence to conclude that *morality policy* is more salient to the public than non-morality policy. According to the study, citizens of Illinois, USA, were presented with both *morality policy* issues (e.g., same-sex marriage, capital punishment (death penalty), and gambling) and non-morality policy issues (e.g., homeland security, national health insurance) and asked to share how important/salient each issue is to them through public opinion surveys (Mooney and Schuldt 2008). The results were incongruent with the arguments of *morality policy* scholars who assert that issue salience is a distinct trait of *morality policy* (Mooney and Schuldt

2008). A majority of respondents shared that policies regarding homeland security and civil liberties are more important than same-sex marriage policy, capital punishment policy, and casino gambling policy (Mooney and Schuldt 2008). A takeaway from this study is that salience is found in the eye of the beholder and morality policies, although salient due to its focus on citizen values, do not account for all salient issues facing humanity.

Morality Framing

Contemporary research on *morality policy* considers framing as central to whether a policy is perceived as a *morality policy* type (Mucciaroni 2011; Euchner et al. 2013; Ferraiolo 2013; Kreitzer 2015; Kreitzer et al. 2019). This argument is consistent with the notion that all policies are multidimensional, that is, capable of being perceived to address different types of issues (e.g., morality, economics, or health) (Meier 1999; Roh and Berry 2008; Engeli and Varone 2011). As mentioned earlier in this section, the constructivist approach to studying *morality policy* focuses on how a moral issue is framed (Vossen et al. 2022). In other words, scholars studying *morality policy* through this lens focus on what a policy currently appears to address, as opposed to directly accepting it as inherently moralistic (Vossen et al. 2022).

Mucciaroni (2011) investigated the concept of framing by analyzing different framing strategies employed by opponents to gay rights. One could reasonably presume that gay rights' opponents would largely adhere to framing the issue as a moral one, based on early notions that policies on citizen or religious values are intrinsically moral-based. However, the findings revealed the opposite to be true. According to the findings, in American states

with a large population of fundamentalist Protestants and Catholic Christians (e.g., Texas, Tennessee, Utah), the use of moral/religious frames to oppose same-sex marriage ranked 5th highest among all frames used, which included procedural frames (i.e., how decisions surrounding same-sex marriage should be made within the US federation), and instrumental frames (i.e., highlighting the perceived negative consequences for society if same-sex marriage is permitted) (Mucciaroni 2011). Arguably, the high use of these frames by opponents may have been a strategic measure to avoid appearing as bigoted. Lastly, the findings also found that in debates on same-sex marriage, members of the US Congress and Senate also used more non-moral frames to oppose same-sex marriage (Mucciaroni 2011).

Therefore, a reasonable argument exists regarding *morality policy* being more accurately defined as *morality framing*. Since morality policies (such as same-sex marriage in the example above) are permitted via the policy-making process, the manner in which the issues are framed by activists and decision-makers is crucial for its successful adoption (Haider-Markel and Meier 1996; Mucciaroni 2011; Euchner et al. 2013). Using same-sex marriage as an example, if advocates apply a human rights frame to promote the issue, it could apply greater pressure on decision-makers to also use that frame when deciding (Camobreco and Barnello 2008). In this scenario, decision-makers in government could risk harming their political reputation within a polity if they fail to act, as it could imply that they view gay couples as less than human.

In Canada, the federal Liberal Party stood as a crucial ally of social movements on abortion and same-sex marriage (Mucciaroni and Scala 2019). Through the adoption of the

Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedom (Charter) in 1982 – which was shepherded under a former Liberal government – and significant human rights jurisprudence (e.g., *R v. Morgentaler*, 1988), the Liberal Party framed abortion and same-sex marriage as individual rights consistent with “Canadian values” or “Charter Values” (Mucciaroni and Scala 2019). This framing yielded positive results for women and Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer or Questioning, and 2-Spirit (LGBTQ2S+) communities, as both abortion and same-sex marriage were made legal in Canada with the help of Liberal representatives in Parliament (Mucciaroni and Scala 2019). In contrast, a lesser extent of equality exists in the USA for women and members of the LGBTQ2S+ community. This is largely due to the prolonged period of conservative influence in the political domain since the late 1970s, which stymied abortion and gay rights’ advocates (Mucciaroni and Scala 2019). Since 2011, abortion restrictions within the USA states have increased significantly (Mucciaroni and Scala 2019), and with the overturn of *Roe v Wade* by the USA Supreme Court in 2022, legislatures have more power to ban abortions. Furthermore, LGBTQ2S+ rights in the USA are not at par with LGBTQ2S+ rights in Canada due to conservative influence (Mucciaroni and Scala 2019). The influence of political parties directly impacts the permissiveness of morality policies within a population, and it is largely dependent on their choice of framing (Patton 2007; Budde et al. 2018).

Framing can also be used strategically by decision-makers to overcome a deadlock on a *morality policy* issue - stemming from values contention among a polity - by remodelling a moral frame (Mooney and Lee 1995; Engeli and Varone 2011). This process is labelled in the literature as de-moralization (Engeli and Varone 2011; Kreitzer 2015). The de-

moralization of an issue shifts it from being considered a *morality policy* issue, that is highly salient and of low complexity, to a redistributive policy (as characterized by Lowi), framed as non-salient and highly complex (Lowi 1964; Engeli and Varone 2011; Kreitzer 2015; Hollander and Patapan 2017; Motta 2021). This shift in framing may limit public advocacy and political attention on the issue since it becomes viewed as unimportant to the general public. This can be advantageous for decision-makers because it spares them from making a decision on a contentious public issue, eliminating the risk of public scrutiny advanced by the group(s) whose values would not have been represented (Patton 2007). Advantages of this approach are validated by common patterns identified by William T. Gormley Jr's study of regulatory politics in the late 20th century (Gormley 1986). Gormley (1986) identified that when a policy is low in salience and high in complexity (e.g., insurance regulation, banking regulation, or hospital rate regulation), decisions are mostly made by the private sector with hardly any citizen engagement. In such cases, a government relies on the advice of subject matter experts to solve important issues best understood by those experts. On the other hand, when a policy is high in salience and low in complexity (e.g., abortion, sale of pornography, or gun control), politicians are at the center of the decision-making process due to pressures imposed by high citizen engagement on such issues (Gormley 1986). This latter pattern is reflective of the observed realities surrounding the policymaking process on *morality policy* issues, as evidenced in more contemporary literature (Heichel et al. 2013; Johns 2015; Kreitzer et al. 2019).

There are a range of issues commonly viewed from an economic value perspective that also consist of morality traits (Bassoli et al. 2021). Such issues are conceptualized as

latent morality policies and examples include gambling, drug use, and gun control (Bassoli et al. 2021; Wendell and Tatalovich 2021). According to scholars, latent morality policies contain both instrumental qualities as well as moral qualities; they are not driven by citizen value conflicts, but they *can be* based on how the issue is framed (Knill 2013; Bassoli et al. 2021; Wendell and Tatalovich 2021). For example, the former Justin Trudeau Liberal government of Canada employed a moral frame on gun control policy in 2021. During an address to the public, the former Prime Minister promised to ban firearms that his government labelled as “assault-style firearms” (ASF) (Schwartz 2024). In his address, Trudeau proclaimed: “These weapons were designed for one purpose and one purpose only: to kill the largest number of people in the shortest amount of time” (Schwartz 2024). Trudeau’s choice of words brought about a rise in citizen value conflicts that were largely dormant in the gun control policy space in Canada. Licensed gun owners responded negatively to this frame as their values and means of living were threatened by the Liberal government’s plan to also ban certain shotguns and hunting rifles (Schwartz 2024). On the other hand, the Liberal government's framing was consistent with the opinions of Canadians concerned over the rising rate of gun and gang violence and mass shootings in North America (Schwartz 2024).

While the Liberal government labelled guns as solely weapons of murder, the Conservative Party of Canada responded with a counter moral claim of their own. They declared that licensed gun owners are now being the ones “hunted” (or wrongfully oppressed) by the government (Schwartz 2024). In contrast, previous gun control policy reforms in Canada were framed from an instrumental public safety perspective. In

response to the 1989 École Polytechnique shooting in Montréal, Québec, the former Kim Campbell Progressive Conservative government of Canada passed legislation in 1991 to tighten gun control laws. A few years later, the former Jean Chrétien Liberal government of Canada further regulated firearms through the creation of the *Firearms Act*, extending the registration of firearms to include long guns (i.e., rifles and shotguns) in addition to handguns (Schwartz 2024). The evolution of gun control policymaking in Canada displays how the choice of framing can either de-moralize or moralize an issue. In sum, Canadian gun control policy has lately been subjected to moral framing at the political level, evoking its latent moral traits.

Gambling policy is another latent *morality policy* type and Ferraiolo (2013) analyzed the framing of this policy in the USA from state legislative records (i.e., speeches and debates) in North Carolina, Oklahoma, Tennessee, and Texas. Many speeches contained rational-instrumental arguments in addition to moral frames when expressing opposition to gambling policy (Ferraiolo 2013). For example, individuals expressed in their speeches that lotteries are not fiscally sound, offer low odds of winning, and should not be promoted by government (Ferraiolo 2013). These frames are void of moral reasonings and lean more towards economics. Moreover, opponents to gambling rarely labelled gambling as a sin and instead chose to focus on the negative impacts of gambling on the overall well-being of families and communities (Ferraiolo 2013). Despite this, Ferraiolo (2013) asserted that gambling opponents were not hesitant to evoke moral framing as a vehicle for their arguments, contrary to what Gary Mucciaroni observed in his aforementioned study on gay rights (Mucciaroni 2011). Why would decision-makers be more inclined to leverage a moral

frame for one contentious issue over another? Why would opponents to gay marriage and gambling in Texas and Tennessee be more inclined to utilize moral framing to repel gambling, but less so for gay marriage? Is it because marriage is highly revered in society and considered a human right? With this thinking, it may be politically unfavourable for a government to deem something so sacred as immoral for consenting adults.

These questions provide a basis for arguments in contemporary literature that *morality policy* is simply the strategic use of *morality framing* by political actors in policy debates (Knill 2013; Kreitzer et al. 2019; Wendell and Tatalovich 2021; Vossen et al. 2022; Crawford and Weible 2024). Although Wendell and Tatalovich (2021) refute this argument through the use of MFT, previous studies in Canada and the USA tell a different story. A story in which citizens and decision-makers can be unpredictable regarding their choice of framing on prominent *sin* issues.

Religion and Morality Policy

Morality policies are often centered around issues that are key elements of religious doctrines (Heichel et al. 2013). These include issues of ‘life and death’ (e.g., abortion and euthanasia), regulation of sexuality (e.g., sexual orientation and prostitution), and issues around addictive behaviour (e.g., gambling or alcohol use) (Heichel et al. 2013). Since *morality policy* is centered on issues of what is right and wrong, religious influence is an underlying component in debates and decision-making. For example, it is likely that a politician with a religious affiliation would favour policies that are in line with their religious beliefs (Haider-Markel 1999). The influence of religion on *morality policy* is based on the

concept of *sin*, which are actions deemed as immoral in religious teaching. Using the Bible as an example, Christians may view abortions as murder (a biblical sin) based on their interpretations of biblical scriptures, which may result in their opposition to permissive abortion policies within a state (Tatalovich 1997). It is helpful for policy advocates to be aware of the religious affiliations of a state's population and its political decision-makers, in order to develop a strategy for lobbying their interests.

Fink (2008) highlights the major influence of religion on *morality policy* through the actions of the Catholic Church and Christian Democratic parties in Europe. As the largest branch of Christianity, the Catholic Church has historically carried a major influence in decision-making across the world (Schmitt et al. 2013). Assisted Reproduction Technology is a *morality policy* issue involving the cultivation of human embryos to support fertilization for women (Fink 2008). Debates over morality center around the contention that an embryo is equivalent to a human being (Fink 2008). Numerous embryo research laws have been passed to set ethical guidelines around the use of embryos for research (Fink 2008). The Catholic Church has a clear, global stance on such laws based on the notion that a human being must be respected and treated as a person, beginning from the moment of conception (Fink 2008). In Europe, the influence of the Catholic Church has been carried out through Christian Democratic parties, which have adopted strict embryo research laws due to their religious moral beliefs (Fink 2008). Therefore, it is reasonable to presume that populations with large numbers of Catholic Church affiliates are likely to advocate for strict, conservative policies on moral issues, based on their reverence for God and

intolerance of sin. In sum, Fink (2008) displays a clear example of the impact of religion on *morality policy* (Engeli and Varone 2011).

Referring back to the discussion on *morality framing*, we know that *morality policy* issues can be de-moralized (Engeli and Varone 2011; Kreitzer 2015). In a similar manner, the level of religious influence on a *morality policy* issue can diminish over time (Knill et al. 2020). According to Knill et al. (2020), during the early stages of the policy process, when the definition of a moral issue is still in flux, religious influence is most significant. However, religious influence starts to diminish once the issue reaches the political agenda for decision-making in later stages (Knill et al. 2020). This implies that religion is viewed as a structural model for deciding what is acceptable human behaviour. As discussed in Knill et al. (2020), religion provides a straightforward guideline to living, which deciphers right from wrong, and helps individuals in deciding where to position themselves in value-related conflicts, such as policies surrounding individual autonomy over life and death. Why then does religious influence diminish throughout the policymaking process? It comes down to citizen values. In the Western world, as an example, church attendance has been waning throughout the 21st century (Fink 2008), and we're witnessing greater diversity in thought and values (Wendell and Tatalovich 2021). Therefore, utilizing religious framing on morality policies may not bode well for Western world political decision-makers in the latter stages of policymaking. At such stages, religious influence would be unimpactful in determining the regulatory strictness or permissiveness of a moral policy issue (Knill et al. 2020).

The effects of religious influence on limiting the permissiveness of morality policies are dependent on two characteristics: 1) the religious policy position on a particular moral

issue (i.e., the issue-specific restrictiveness of religious doctrines), and 2) the size and mobilization capacity of religious organizations (Knill et al. 2020). This correlation is evident in previous studies, which revealed that populations with a large and resourceful representation of Christian religious groups influence the passing of more restrictive morality policies, such as restricted abortion (Cocca 2002; Roh and Berry 2008; Schiffino et al. 2009; Schmitt et al. 2013; Budde et al. 2018). Ultimately, the success of religious framing is dependent on the size of the population with matching religious affiliation (Knill et al. 2020).

There has been an emergence of research on *morality policy* debates in Europe over the past two decades. Studies have revealed different dynamics in political party systems with and without the existence of a religious party (Studlar et al. 2013; Euchner 2019). Morality policies are more likely to be politicized when one party is strongly Christian-based (Studlar et al. 2013). In such cases, politicization is a matter of political strategy given the value tension between the two parties, which is likely representative of a similar division among the electorate. This point is highlighted further in Euchner (2019), that in countries with a strong religious-secular party cleavage, *morality policy* receives higher political attention. However, this attention is largely to the disadvantage of religious parties, because religious voter bases have diminished in many countries over recent decades, making it disadvantageous for religious parties to raise moral issues onto the government agenda (Euchner 2019). When a religious party is in government, secular opposition parties can place the government in very difficult situations to defend their religious positions on moral issues.

Due to secularization, religious parties try to avoid the introduction of moral issues onto the government agenda, but oftentimes to no prevail. Knill et al., (2020) highlights reasons why religious opposition is difficult. The first reason is based on developments in other countries towards more permissive policies (Knill et al. 2020). Such advancements may strengthen the position of domestic reform advocates to seek greater political attention on *morality policy* issues within their state (Knill et al. 2020). Moreover, the second reason is that reform advocates may effectively challenge dominant religious framing on morality policies, based on success garnered through increased political attention (Knill et al. 2020). Such trends create an environment for more permissive policy adoptions to take place. However, religious parties have adapted their approach for opposing permissive morality policies. Instead of framing their arguments based on divine religious instruction, religious parties have increasingly applied ‘unsecular’ framing due to the surge of secularization within states (Budde et al. 2018). For example, on the subject of homosexuality, religious parties increased their use of framing based on general social principles, such as family protection and values, opposed to religious framing to repel permissiveness (Engeli et al. 2013; Studlar and Burns 2015). Even with this change in approach, religious parties continue to defend their skepticism towards individual autonomy on moral issues (Budde et al. 2018). This suggests that their choice of framing is solely a means of strategy for political benefit, and their core citizen supporters may still feel that their religious affiliations are represented politically.

The political party system dynamic can be further explained by what scholars describe as a *two-world system* among countries. There is a *religious world*, in which a

major political party in a country is closely affiliated with the influences of the Christian Church and undergoes significant conflict with an opposing secular party (Engeli et al. 2013; Studlar et al. 2013; Studlar and Burns 2015). Oftentimes, such religious parties are Christian Democratic or Conservative with a confessional orientation (Engeli et al. 2013; Studlar and Burns 2015). In the *religious world*, it is unlikely that permissive morality policies would be passed when a Christian Democratic party forms government (Engeli et al. 2013). However, once there is a change in government with sufficient secular party representation, permissive policies are likely to pass, and quickly (Engeli et al. 2013; Studlar and Burns 2015). For example, Engeli et al. (2013) found that the politicization of *morality policy* issues and the change from a Christian Democratic government to a secular government played a huge role in the passing of permissive morality policies on euthanasia and same-sex marriage in the Netherlands. Countries considered part of the *religious world* include Belgium, the Netherlands, Spain, Switzerland, and the USA (Studlar and Burns 2015; Studlar et al. 2018).

Contrarily, there is a *secular world* in which conflict doesn't exist between a religious and secular party (Engeli et al. 2013). In such worlds, party systems are made up of solely secular parties whose compositions are not central to understanding *morality policy* decisions (Engeli et al. 2013). In a secular party system, it is common to see a conservative party voting for permissive policies, which appears to be nearly impossible in the *religious world* (Studlar et al. 2013; Adam et al. 2020). Furthermore, *morality policy* issues are both depoliticized and void of party competition in the *secular world*, with policy change occurring via free votes in a parliament and via judicial decisions (Engeli et al. 2013;

Studlar et al. 2013; Adam et al. 2020). Denmark and the United Kingdom are two examples of countries belonging to the *secular world* (Engeli et al. 2013). Both countries are without religious-secular party conflict nor party competition centered around *morality policy* issues (Engeli et al. 2013). In 1971, Denmark passed a permissive regulation on abortion under a right-wing government, following advocacy for abortion rights by women's organizations and individual left-wing Members of Parliament; and Denmark followed up with an even greater permissive regulation under a left-wing government in 1973 (Engeli et al. 2013). The study by Engeli et al. (2013) revealed a stark difference in permissive outcomes for the *religious world*, which exemplifies that secular party systems have little impact on the passing of permissive morality policies. Additional countries considered a part of the *secular world* include Australia, Finland, France, Greece, and Canada (Studlar and Burns 2015; Studlar et al. 2018).

Lastly, although the likelihood of passing permissive morality policies is improbable when a Christian Democratic (or “Confessional” Conservative) party dominates government, the passing of restrictive policies is not any more probable (Adam et al. 2020). Whether government representation of Christian Democrats is high or low, the probability of passing restrictive morality policies is unaffected (Adam et al. 2020). For example, Adam et al. (2020) found that the adoption of restrictive *morality policy* reforms in *religious world* governments having strong Christian Democratic representation were quite similar to occurrences in *secular world* governments between 1960-2010. This finding is consistent with outcomes resulting from the aforementioned shift in framing strategies used by Christian Democratic parties due to rising secularization.

Outcomes and Patterns of Morality Policy

Morality policy is unique due to the debates it inspires over first principles, and the high salience and low technicality surrounding issues. For these reasons, morality policies are expected to yield a greater degree of democratic responsiveness from political decision-makers (Patton 2007). The high public attention associated with morality policies makes it difficult for political decision-makers to avoid public scrutiny over decisions (Patton 2007); unlike the case with non-morality policies, such as taxation policy, in which subject matter is more challenging for the general population to engage in and understand. To mitigate chances of public disdain, politicians seek to respond to moral issues in ways that are consistent with public opinion (Meier 1994; Mooney and Lee 1995; Patton 2007) and adopt policies respectively. This political dilemma is heightened when controversy exists within public opinion over a *morality policy* issue (Mooney and Lee 1995; Engeli and Varone 2011).

As mentioned earlier in this section, Meier (1994) labelled two types of morality policies, and both directly impact a government's responsiveness to either adopt or abandon a *morality policy*. The first type is *one-sided morality policies* (e.g., murder and illicit drug use), which Meier called the "politics of sin" based on the interpretation that "everyone is opposed to sin" and it should be deterred and punished (Meier 1994; Tatalovich and Wendell 2018). Based on Meier's logic, there should be a general consensus of public opinion on these one-sided moral issues, making it easy for political decision-makers to adopt or abandon policies based on citizen values. Furthermore, Mooney (2000) explains that policy decisions on moral issues with a consensus of public opinion are

influenced almost exclusively by the ideals of politicians. However, decision-making isn't as easy for politicians when public opinion is contentious. In these instances, morality policies are driven by mass public opinion and requires politicians to validate one set of citizen values over another (Mooney and Lee 2000). This second type, *two-sided morality policies* (e.g., abortion and gay rights), involves the "redistribution of values" due to contrasting perspectives on these moral issues (Meier 1994; Tatalovich and Wendell 2018). Scholars believe that politicians will sometimes try to avoid making decisions on *two-sided morality policies* out of fear of dissatisfaction from citizens whose values are not represented (Engeli and Varone 2011). If politicians (particularly the governing party) choose to make a decision, they may unwillingly place themselves in the middle of the values conflict and may increase electoral competition with opposing political parties (Haider-Markel and Meier 1996).

In these instances, a possible solution for decision-makers would be to have all parties reach a common ground on the objectives and instruments surrounding a *morality policy*. For example, on recreational drug use, decision makers can consult with supporters and opponents on regulations to be put in place (e.g., how old does one need to be to purchase and consume recreational drugs? What are the qualifications needed for a business to sell recreational drugs? How can we best prioritize safety in public spaces and near schools and daycares?) However, it is unlikely that any policy decision would put an end to advocacy since values contention would still persist. The Advocacy Coalition Framework is a theory that explains how advocacy coalitions, commonly comprising actors from various governmental and private organizations, seek to influence policy change over

time (Jenkins-Smith and Sabatier 1994). According to Jenkins-Smith and Sabatier (1994), coalition members take coordinated action to influence government decision-making, seeking to better align government priorities with their objectives and beliefs.

Another influencing factor behind political decision-making on *morality policy* issues is the political party itself (Patton 2007). In the context of the USA, Republicans tend to support more restrictive or conservative morality policies and oppose more permissive or liberal morality policies (Patton 2007). For example, on the topics of same-sex marriage and abortion, Republicans are likely to prioritize criminalizing or regulating access based on ideological beliefs – oftentimes stemming from religious values (Patton 2007; Studlar and Burns 2015; Studlar et al. 2018). Since Donald Trump began his second term as President of the USA in 2025 – representing the Republican Party – he has enacted a series of restrictive policies towards the rights of the LGBTQ2S+ community. For example, he declared that there are only two recognized sexes in the country – male and female – and that the concept of gender identity (i.e., an individual’s preferred gender that is inconsistent with their biological sex classification) is not included (Trump 2025). Contrarily, Democrats in the USA are likely to support more permissive or liberal policies and oppose more restrictive or conservative policies (Patton 2007), seeking to leverage the strong polarization of citizen values within the country to pressure Republicans towards more permissive reforms.

Summary of Existing Contributions and Purpose of this Study

In conclusion, the existing literature contributes significantly to our understanding of *morality policy*. Scholars debated the legitimacy of *morality policy* as a distinct policy type. Some view *morality policy* as distinct from Lowi's classification of policy types, comprising issues that are inherently moral-based. On the other hand, others view *morality policy* as issues with the potential to be framed using a moral lens, but not intrinsically moral based. Generally speaking, morality policies address issues that are topical and easy to understand by the general public, rooted in conflicts over what is right and wrong. Notable examples in literature include abortion, the death penalty, gay rights, gambling, euthanasia, and Assisted Reproduction Therapy. Consistent with the perspective that morality policies are a moving target, scholars such as Gary Mucciaroni and Kathleen Ferraiolo asserted that *morality policy* would be better characterized as *morality framing*. This perspective views framing as a strategic tactic used by decision-makers for political gain, and highlights that issues can either be moralized or de-moralized through framing.

Furthermore, the influence of religion on *morality policy* is also explored through the literature. Religious influence at an individual politician- and political party-level, and the magnitude of Christian representation within a state, is directly correlated with a lack of (or resistance) to permissiveness on *morality policy* issues. Recent studies by Engeli, Studlar, and others explored the landscape of *morality policy* in Europe and identified the *two-world system*. There is a *religious world* in which *morality policy* is politicized and captures high public attention. Due to tensions between a religious-influenced party and a secular party, political competition is high in these countries and leads to greater permissiveness on

morality policy over time, especially when a secular government is formed. The *secular world* is characterized by the depoliticization of *morality policy*, with less time spent on the government agenda.

Lastly, the literature revealed which factors are conducive to higher democratic responsiveness of political actors to moral issues. When public opinion reaches consensus on a moral issue, it is smooth sailing for politicians. In these instances, politicians tend to make decisions on moral issues based on their own ideologies. On the other hand, contentious moral issues present difficult situations for politicians. In these instances, politicians may opt to delay decisions as long as they can to avoid political conflict and reputational risk. However, public pressure may leave politicians with no choice but to respond, leading decision-makers to attempt to satisfy public opinion as best as they can.

As mentioned, the objective of this research paper is to expand upon the existing literature on *morality policy* with an application to Canadian public policy making. Specifically, this paper seeks to answer the following question: How are morality policies framed within a Canadian public policy environment? This study investigates: a) which policy actors have a voice within *morality policy* debates? b) how are they presenting their arguments? c) how are they responding to each other? and d) what types of stories emerge within those debates? The study focuses on debates surrounding the legalization of cannabis (former Bill C-45) and Medical Assistance in Dying (MAiD) (former Bill C-14) during Justin Trudeau's Liberal government's between 2015-2018. I hypothesize that Canadian public policy makers will use moral framing to retain support from their

advocates, but will also use alternative framing strategies to gather support from the broader public.

Comparing how policies are framed across two different policy fields seeks to reveal if any similarities and/or differences in approach exist among policy actors to garner public support. Findings would answer questions like: which stakeholders do policy actors target for support/non-support of MAiD? How do their strategies change or stay the same to garner public support/non-support for cannabis legalization?

For this paper, we are interested in the framing, moralizing, and de-moralizing of policy issues in Canada. We know we could have approached this through a different angle, such as through the Advocacy Coalition Framework theory, which explores how advocacy groups can influence policymaking over time. We chose to study *morality policy* through framing because it considers the multidimensional nature of policies and provides a better, more effective explanation for our findings. As morality policies are strategies used by policy actors to address subjects framed through a moral lens where there is conflict over what is considered morally right and wrong, any study approach that does not focus on framing would be limiting.

Methodology and Data Collection

As explained in Chong and Druckman (2007), framing can be used by people to conceptualize an issue in a particular way, or to shift their thinking about an issue. This underscores the premise of *framing theory* that an issue can be viewed from a variety of perspectives, having implications for multiple values or considerations (Chong and

Druckman 2007). To study *morality policy* through framing, we leveraged the approach used by Gary Mucciaroni (Mucciaroni 2011) and Kathleen Ferraiolo (Ferraiolo 2013) to observe framing strategies of opponents to gay rights and state lotteries respectively. The approach entailed a discourse analysis of speeches made by legislative actors in American states, including North Carolina, Texas, and Tennessee. Both studies revealed that policy actors are flexible with their framing strategies on *morality policy* issues – a question we seek to examine further in this Canadian study. Due to its focus on framing, this approach is better suited to answering our research question than others which overlook the multidimensional nature of policies. Therefore, we are confident that our chosen approach provides an effective explanation of how Canadian policy actors engage with moral frames versus other types of frames during *morality policy* debates.

In this study, a discourse analysis on speeches made in Canadian Parliament (i.e., within the House of Commons and committee meetings) while debating MAiD legalization and cannabis legalization was completed. Qualitative data was gathered from Hansard reports on every debate, beginning from the introduction of each bill into the House of Commons (and subsequently into committee meetings) to Royal Assent.

Beginning with MAiD, we accessed Hansard reports in English to analyze the speeches delivered during these debates by searching “medical assistance in dying” on the search bar at <https://www.ourcommons.ca/PublicationSearch/en/>. We refined the search by selecting the appropriate Parliament and Session (42nd Parliament and 1st 2015.12.03 – 2019.09.11). Using these parameters, we accessed and analyzed speeches made in the House of Commons by clicking the “HANSARD” tab. A total of 21 reports were analyzed on

these debates from April 14-to-June 14, 2016. Afterwards, we accessed and analyzed speeches made in the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights by clicking the “COMMITTEE” tab. A total of seven reports were analyzed on these debates from May 2-17, 2016.

Next, for cannabis legalization, we accessed Hansard reports in English to analyze the speeches delivered during these debates by searching “cannabis” on the same search bar mentioned above. Again, we refined the search by selecting the appropriate Parliament and Session, which is the same as the one mentioned above. We accessed and analyzed speeches made in the House of Commons by clicking the “HANSARD” tab. A total of 55 reports were analyzed on these debates from April 13, 2017, to June 20, 2018. Then, we accessed and analyzed speeches made in the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights, Standing Committee on Health, and Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security by clicking the “COMMITTEE” tab. A total of thirteen reports were analyzed on these debates from May 11, 2017, to June 7, 2018.

Three different categories of frames referenced in Mucciaroni (2011) were coded for during the analysis of all debates – moral frames, instrumental frames (or rational-instrumental frames), and procedural frames. These frames, with the exception of procedural frames, were also coded for in Ferraiolo (2013). Each speech was coded at the sentence/paragraph level, with each statement having to meet the criteria for a frame: 1) Moral frames – statements made by policy actors through a moral lens, describing qualities such as *good versus bad/evil* and the responsibility of government to protect its citizens’ health and autonomy; 2) Instrumental frames – statements made by policy actors to

describe the causality (*cause and effect*) of policy proposals, specifically its intended or unintended consequences on Canadians; and 3) Procedural frames – statements made by policy actors to describe approaches to meet policy objectives. To enhance reliability, all statements were reviewed twice.

It can be argued that some frames coded in this study can cross into different categories. Where overlap exists, frames were categorized based on the dominant emphasis behind the speech. For example, some speeches made during debates on Bill C-45 highlight the causality of cannabis legalization on public health and safety goals; and the impact of proportional pricing-to-potency levels for cannabis sales on youth consumption. Although these frames overlap with both moral and instrumental frames, it was categorized under moral frames due to a dominant emphasis on harm reduction and the responsibility of government to protect its citizens.

We used Microsoft Excel to record and quantify the number of times a frame was used during debates. We created two sheets per subject – one for Bill C-14 and another for Bill C-45 – to organize the data by the frames used within the House of Commons from the frames used within parliamentary committee meetings. In each sheet, we listed all moral, instrumental, and procedural frames used by policy actors during debates in each setting. We recorded the total number of times each frame was used, how frequent each frame was used as a percentage of all frames within its category, the policy actor(s) who used each frame (i.e., which political party, organization, or individual), and whether each frame was used to indicate support for the Bill (+), opposition for the Bill (-), or to obstruct the government's approach to the Bill (/). Moreover, within each setting for both subjects, we

calculated the sum of frames used for each category and its frequency as a percentage of all frames used across the three categories. Lastly, within each category, for both subjects, we calculated the frequency of frames that were “+”, “-“, and “/”.

In the next section, the results are organized into two case studies. The first case study presents the framing strategies of policy actors during debates on Bill C-14, Medical Assistance in Dying. In a similar manner, the second case study presents the framing strategies used during debates on Bill C-45, *the Cannabis Act*. As MP representatives of the Green Party were such a small contingent during this Parliament and Session, their interventions were peripheral and not included. Also, although frames used by the Bloc Québécois are found in the results, their interventions were more targeted and less frequent compared to interventions from the Liberal, Conservative, and New Democratic parties.

Results

Case Study 1: Bill C-14, Medical Assistance in Dying

On February 6, 2015, in the *Carter v. Canada* case, the Supreme Court of Canada (SCC) ruled section 14 and paragraph 241 (b) of the *Criminal Code* unconstitutional, because it prohibited physicians from assisting in the consensual death of another person (Department of Justice Canada 2021). This ruling reversed an earlier precedent established by the SCC in the 1992 *Rodriguez v. British Columbia (Attorney General)* case where Sue Rodriguez was unsuccessful in her Charter challenge to remove the ban on assisted-dying (*Rodriguez v. British Columbia (Attorney General)* 1993). Following the decision in *Carter v.*

Canada, the SCC instructed Parliament to prepare an appropriate legislative response to reflect the new changes to the criminal law. Specifically, the federal government was directed to permit some form of physician-assisted dying (Department of Justice Canada 2021). The SCC advised there was a need for a “carefully designed system imposing stringent limits” to protect vulnerable people, and that these complex regulatory regimes be created by Parliament opposed to the Courts (Department of Justice Canada 2021).

Parliament passed Bill C-14, Medical Assistance in Dying (MAiD), on June 17, 2016, following a series of debates within the House of Commons and committee meetings. Within these conversations, policy actors used moral, instrumental, and procedural frames to either indicate support for the Bill (+), opposition for the Bill (-), or to obstruct the government’s approach to the Bill (/). Bill C-14 has the following eligibility requirements for individuals seeking access to MAiD: Individual must be 1) an adult (at least 18 years old) who is mentally competent (“capable”) to make health care decisions for themselves; 2) have a grievous and irremediable medical condition; 3) make a voluntary request for MAiD which does not result from external pressure; 4) give informed consent to receive MAiD; and, 5) be eligible for health services funded by a government (“Legislative Background: Medical Assistance in Dying (Bill C-14)” 2016).

Within the House of Commons (HOC) a total of 669 frames were used by Member’s of Parliament (MPs) when presenting their arguments and responding to each other. Of the 669, 20.8% (or 139) were moral frames compared to 28.3% (or 189) instrumental and 51% (or 341) procedural frames. In the committee meetings, a total of 364 frames were used by MPs and other policy actors, including representatives of professional organisations,

bureaucratic government staff, and lawyers. We found the frequency of moral frames to be nearly equivalent to the HOC total. However, a 14% decrease in instrumental frames and an 11% increase in procedural frames was also observed. Out of a total of 364 frames, 23.6% (86) were moral, 14.3% (52) were instrumental, and 62.1% (226) were procedural. Combining both settings, of all the moral frames used, 36.9% were “+”, 16.4% were “-“, and 46.7% were “/”. Of all the instrumental frames used, 63.5% were “+”, 16.2% were “-“, and 20.3% were “/”. Of all the procedural frames used, 26.1% were “+” and the remaining 73.9% were “/”. **Tables 1-3** below highlight the most essential frames (by category) used during the HOC and committee meeting debates. A complete list of all frames used by category can be found in the appendices.

Table 1: Bill C-14 - Essential Moral Frames Used During House of Commons and Committee Meeting Debates

Moral Frames (HOC: 20.8% of all Frames, N = 139); (Committee: 23.6% of all Frames, N = 86)			
	[HOC] Frequency of Frame as % of all Moral Frames (N)	[Committee] Frequency of Frame as % of all Moral Frames (N)	Policy Actors that Used the Frame
Ensuring patient autonomy and access to a peaceful death without prolonged suffering (+)	27.3 (38)	14.3 (13)	Liberal Party; Dying With Dignity Canada; End of Life Planning Canada; Alliance of People with Disabilities Who Are Supportive of Legal Assisted Dying Society
We must protect and respect the conscience rights of health care providers against compelled participation in killing (MAiD) (/)	18.7 (26)	17.6 (16)	Conservative Party; New Democratic Party; Evangelical Fellowship of Canada; Christian Legal Fellowship; Coalition for HealthCARE and Conscience; Canadian Council of Imams; Physicians' Alliance against Euthanasia
Dignity is expressed through the value of human life, even among suffering. Life is a gift from God and we should respect it / contend for life (-)	13.7 (19)	8.8 (8)	Conservative Party; Evangelical Fellowship of Canada; Canadian Council of Imams; Centre for Israel and Jewish Affairs
We must protect the most vulnerable members of society, including seniors and those who do not consent or who do not want this (/)	13.7 (19)	17.6 (16)	Conservative Party; Living with Dignity; Euthanasia Prevention Coalition; Euthanasia Prevention Coalition of British Columbia; Canadian Association for Community Living; Communication Disabilities Access Canada
Bill C-14 respects personal autonomy, protects the vulnerable, and affirms the inherent value in every human life (+)	10.8 (15)	N/A	Liberal Party

Table 2: Bill C-14 - Essential Instrumental Frames Used During House of Commons and Committee Meeting Debates

Instrumental Frames (HOC: 28.3% of all Frames, N = 189); (Committee: 14.3% of all Frames, N = 52)			
	[HOC] Frequency of Frame as % of all Instrumental Frames (N)	[Committee] Frequency of Frame as % of all Instrumental Frames (N)	Policy Actors that Used the Frame
It is incumbent upon parliamentarians to put in place a national framework around our medical assistance in dying to ensure that there are the appropriate and necessary safeguards in place, certainty for medical practitioners, and that there is access for patients who want to access medical assistance in dying (+)	23.3 (44)	12.8 (6)	Liberal Party; Canadian Medical Association; Canadian Nurses Protective Society; Barreau du Québec
Advancing a balanced legislative approach to respect patient autonomy and protect vulnerable persons and conscience rights (+)	17.5 (33)	4.3 (2)	Liberal Party
Warning that Bill C-14 is the thin edge of the wedge toward expanded assisted-suicide policies targeting children, the disabled, the chronically ill, the elderly, and non-productive Canadians / slippery slope (-)	17.5 (33)	12.8 (6)	Conservative Party; Living with Dignity; Euthanasia Prevention Coalition; Association for Reformed Political Action; Liberal Party (MP Robert-Falcon Ouellette)
Conscience protection should be added to preserve the existing system and prevent physicians from leaving the practice (/)	6.9 (13)	N/A	Conservative Party
Serious concerns about explicitly granting conscience rights to publicly funded institutions, especially when they may be the only option in a community; since institutions are not people, do not have Charter rights, and this doesn't meet what we're trying to accomplish (+)	N/A	4.3 (2)	Liberal Party

Table 3: Bill C-14 - Essential Procedural Frames Used During House of Commons and Committee Meeting Debates

Procedural Frames (HOC: 51.0% of all Frames, N = 341); (Committee: 62.1% of all Frames, N = 226)			
	[HOC] Frequency of Frame as % of all Procedural Frames (N)	[Committee] Frequency of Frame as % of all Procedural Frames (N)	Policy Actors that Used the Frame
Bill C-14 is flawed (doesn't adequately respond to Carter) and likely unconstitutional. Amendments should be adopted. Bill should not be rushed. Further safeguards will protect autonomy (/)	34.9 (119)	23.5 (53)	Conservative Party; New Democratic Party; Canadian Council of Criminal Defence Lawyers; Dying With Dignity Canada
No conscience protections in Bill C-14; responsibility shifted to provinces, colleges and regulating bodies; federal government has a duty to protect rights of physicians, allied health professionals, and health institutions (/)	21.4 (73)	10.6 (24)	Conservative Party; Coalition for HealthCARE and Conscience; Christian Legal Fellowship
This proposed legislation does not compel any health care practitioner to provide medical assistance in dying. Practitioners will have the right to choose as their conscience dictates (+)	9.7 (33)	4.0 (9)	Liberal Party; Conservative Party (following committee amendments to Bill C-14)
Encourage the government to amend this legislation to include a system of advance review (judicial oversight) by competent legal authority (/)	6.2 (21)	7.1 (16)	Conservative Party
A person must be competent at the time MAiD is provided (advance directives would not be permitted). Requests must be fully informed and free from coercion (+)	4.1 (14)	6.2 (14)	Liberal Party
The lack of advance directives in the legislation is too restrictive (/)	2.9 (10)	4.4 (10)	New Democratic Party
Amend legislation to clearly define "reasonably foreseeable" to reduce uncertainty and prevent vague application (/)	1.5 (5)	8.0 (18)	Conservative Party; Bloc Québécois; Canadian Civil Liberties Association; Barreau du Québec

The results reveal that the Liberal government used more instrumental and moral frames in the HOC to defend its policy objectives for MAiD. For example, a frequently used instrumental frame by the government was to argue that it is essential for Parliament to pass legislation on MAiD by the SCC's deadline to ensure a national framework would be in place to meet public need. This frame was also used by policy actors during committee meetings, including the Canadian Medical Association. Regarding moral frames, the government frequently used this type of framing to advocate for the protection of personal autonomy in MAiD legislation. The government claimed that through Bill C-14, individuals seeking a peaceful end to their suffering would have access to MAiD, if eligible. In committee meetings, multiple organizations also expressed their support for MAiD legalization using this frame, including Dying with Dignity Canada and End of Life Planning Canada.

The results also show that the main political opposition parties (Conservative and New Democratic parties) used the highest-frequency procedural frame in these debates. Both the Conservative and New Democratic parties argued that Bill C-14 was flawed (e.g., its vagueness around the definition that death must be "reasonably foreseeable"), did not meet the *Carter v. Canada* objectives, and risked being unconstitutional. During committee meetings, this frame was also used by the Canadian Council of Criminal Defence Lawyers and Dying With Dignity Canada.

Furthermore, we see in the results that a *slippery slope* argument was used at a high frequency in these debates to oppose Bill C-14. This instrumental frame was used prevalently by the Conservative Party within the HOC and committee meetings, as well as

by Living with Dignity, Euthanasia Prevention Coalition, and the Association for Reformed Political Action within committee meetings. Interestingly, this frame was also used by a Liberal MP, Robert-Falcon Ouellette, who's position on Bill C-14 was contrary to that of the Liberal Party. On May 2, 2016, Robert-Falcon Ouellette stated that, "From an indigenous perspective, I look at this bill and I cannot support it, because it leads to a place where I do not believe we are looking out for the interests of all people within our society. It is not allowing us to fully comprehend the needs of everyone who makes up Canadian societies, but really, it is taking us down a path that is very dangerous, and we do not know where it ends." Although Robert-Falcon Ouellette was a representative of the governing party, he brought a unique lens to these debates on how the objectives of his Party may not align with the needs of Indigenous Peoples in Canada; and these needs should be valued.

Moreover, the highest obstruction moral frame used in the HOC debates centered around conscience protections for physicians/health care workers and health institutions. In addition to the Conservative Party using this frame, we also observed that the Evangelical Fellowship of Canada, Christian Legal Fellowship, Coalition for HealthCARE and Conscience, Canadian Council of Imams, and Physicians' Alliance against Euthanasia used this frame in committee meetings. What's similar between these organizations is their Christian religious affiliation, excluding the Physicians' Alliance against Euthanasia which is secular based. Each organization is opposed to health care workers potentially being forced to offer MAiD to eligible patients and argued from a strong moral perspective.

It is also notable to highlight that both the Conservative Party and the New Democratic Party advocated for strengthened palliative care to be prioritized along with the

option for patients to choose MAiD. Although the palliative care arguments are not directly relevant to this framing study, it is a key issue impacting the lives of vulnerable seniors.

Lastly, **Table 4** contains a snapshot of the position statements of select organizations represented at the committee meetings, or the written submissions of policy actors presenting at these meetings when position statements could not be located. The statements further validate the findings in this study.

Table 4: Bill C-14 Position Statements / Committee Written Submissions

Organization	Position
Canadian Medical Association	"It [Bill C-14] meets our call for a very measured and cautionary approach, particularly with the initial legislation," says Dr. Jeff Blackmer, vice president of medical professionalism for the Canadian Medical Association.
College of Family Physicians	The College of Family Physicians expressed satisfaction with the federal government's "prudent" response [Bill C-14].
Evangelical Fellowship of Canada	The EFC opposes euthanasia and assisted suicide. However, as the federal government is going to allow these practices, we are urging them to put in place very strict limits and safeguards to protect conscience rights and the lives of vulnerable Canadians.
Christian Legal Fellowship	Parliament should affirm "suicide prevention" as an important public policy goal and "sanctity of life" as a fundamental societal principle. Parliament should implement stronger safeguards to protect the vulnerable.
Coalition for HealthCARE and Conscience	We are concerned that Bill C-14, as proposed, doesn't protect the conscience rights of health care workers and facilities with moral objections to helping take the lives of Canadians.
Canadian Council of Imams	We as a <i>[sic]</i> Muslims are side by side with our friends and faith leaders remain inalterably opposed to euthanasia and assisted suicide, the intentional killing of human beings, euphemistically being called "Medical Assistance in Dying," but which is more accurately, and tragically, nothing less than murder, as was recognized by the Criminal Code of Canada prior to the passing of Bill C-14 in June 2016.
Communication Disabilities Access Canada (CDAC)	CDAC is asking for stronger safeguards for people with communication disabilities. These safeguards must include a directive to medical practitioners to engage a communication professional to assess the patient and to provide any required accommodations and supports.

Centre for Israel and Jewish Affairs	C-14 should be amended to explicitly ensure that physicians, nurses and pharmacists who object to MAiD for reasons of conscience cannot be compelled to provide it, nor be subject to discriminatory employment practices in any area of federal jurisdiction.
Association for Reformed Political Action	Regardless of what Bill C-14 will look like when it receives Royal Assent, as long as it allows any humans to be killed at the hands of the state, it will be broadened, as others who wish to have assistance in dying will demand the same treatment. Any distinction between those who qualify for assisted suicide or euthanasia will be arbitrary and face the eventual potential of being struck down as discriminatory. It is crucial that Parliament upholds its duty to protect all human life.

***Position statements / Committee Written Submissions** were not found for the following policy actors: Canadian Nurses Protective Society, Barreau du Québec, Canadian Council of Criminal Defence Lawyers, Physicians Alliance Against Euthanasia, Living with Dignity, Euthanasia Prevention Control, Euthanasia Prevention Coalition of British Columbia, Canadian Association for Community Living, Dying With Dignity Canada, End of Life Planning Canada.

Case Study 2: Bill C-45, *the Cannabis Act*

In 2015, the Liberal Party of Canada confirmed its election promise that a Liberal government would legalize, regulate, and restrict access to marijuana (Noronha 2015). Following success in the 2015 federal election, the Liberal government tabled Bill C-45, the *Cannabis Act*, into the HOC in April 2017. The goal of the Act is to keep cannabis out of the hands of youth and to keep the profits out of the hands of criminals and organized crime (Health Canada 2018). Unlike MAiD, the direction to legalize marijuana came from the Liberal government themselves, and not the SCC. However, similar to the MAiD legislation, Parliament was working towards a deadline, which in this case was July 1, 2018 (although it was an arbitrary one – not directed by the Courts). To gather a framework for drafting the Bill, the Government of Canada launched the Task Force on Cannabis Legalization and Regulation (Health Canada 2018) which included extensive consultations with Canadians, provinces and territories, and Indigenous communities. Following the task force, MPs engaged in a series of debates on Bill C-45 that occurred within the HOC, followed by

committee meetings with experts and other stakeholders. Bill C-45 received Royal Assent on June 21, 2018.

Given that the runway from Bill C-45's introduction into the HOC to its Royal Assent was longer in comparison to Bill C-14, policy actors had more time and opportunity to deliberate. As a result, it is not surprising that the total frames used during Bill C-45 debates in the HOC is nearly 300-400 times more compared to Bill C-14 debates. Of a total of 1047 frames, 16.9% (or 177) were moral frames compared to 56.8% (or 595) instrumental and 26.3% (or 275) procedural frames. In the committee meetings, a total of 411 frames were used by MPs and other policy actors. Again, we found the frequency of moral frames to be nearly equivalent to the HOC total. However, unlike the case with Bill C-14, the frequency of instrumental and procedural frames were also nearly equivalent to the HOC total. Out of a total of 411 frames, 19.2% (79) were moral, 58.2% (239) were instrumental, and 22.6% (93) were procedural. Combining both settings, of all the moral frames used, 50.4% were "+", 40.2% were "- ", and 9.4% were "/". Of all the instrumental frames used, 62.0% were "+", 6.8% were "- ", and 31.2% were "/". Of all the procedural frames used, 62.8% were "+" and the remaining 37.2% were "/". **Tables 5-7** below highlight the most essential frames (by category) used during the HOC and committee meeting debates. A complete list of all frames used by category can be found in the appendices.

Table 5: Bill C-45 - Essential Moral Frames Used During House of Commons and Committee Meeting Debates

Moral Frames (HOC: 16.9% of all Frames, N = 177); (Committee: 19.2% of all Frames, N = 79)			
	[HOC] Frequency of Frame as % of all Moral Frames (N)	[Committee] Frequency of Frame as % of all Moral Frames (N)	Policy Actors that Used the Frame
It is about protecting the health of Canadians, and most importantly, the health of young people and children (+)	26.1 (49)	23.0 (20)	Liberal Party
Marijuana is bad and dangerous and must not be normalized; legalization sends the wrong message to young Canadians, and efforts should focus on prevention and supporting families (-)	18.1 (34)	N/A	Conservative Party
If the government legalizes this drug, people, youth, and families will suffer/be less safe. It would have a big impact on Canadians overall health and well-being (-)	8.0 (15)	N/A	Conservative Party
Marijuana is the perfect gateway to other harder, stronger, more chemical-based, and more addictive drugs (-)	6.9 (13)	3.4 (3)	Conservative Party
Our aim is to minimize the harms associated with cannabis use. (+)	5.9 (11)	12.6 (11)	Liberal Party
Canada, as a constitutional democracy, must uphold individual freedom and responsibility, allowing Canadians to make autonomous decisions about their bodily integrity without undue state interference or criminalization (+)	N/A	10.3 (9)	Liberal party

Table 6: Bill C-45 - Essential Instrumental Frames Used During House of Commons and Committee Meeting Debates

Instrumental Frames (HOC: 56.8% of all Frames, N = 595) (Committee: 58.2% of all Frames, N = 239)			
	[HOC] Frequency of Frame as % of all Instrumental Frames (N)	[Committee] Frequency of Frame as % of all Instrumental Frames (N)	Policy Actors that Used the Frame
Government is committed to legalizing, restricting, and strictly regulating cannabis to protect Canadians' health and safety, keep it from youth, and remove profits from criminals through a legal market (+)	26.2 (153)	6.7 (16)	Liberal Party
Bill does not reflect government objectives; it risks greater access for children, potential exploitation by crime, and fails to stop organized crime (/)	16.6 (97)	4.2 (10)	Conservative Party
Canada's current system of controlling cannabis through the criminal justice system (status quo) does not adequately protect the health and safety of Canadians, especially youth. It has allowed criminals and organized crime to profit, while failing to keep cannabis out of the hands of young Canadians (+)	14.7 (86)	5.5 (13)	Liberal Party; New Democratic Party
Warning of a slippery slope from marijuana legalization; Bill C-45 follows the Colorado model, which has caused problems in its jurisdictions (-)	4.8 (28)	0.8 (2)	Conservative Party
An immediate education program is needed to ensure youth understand that marijuana is not healthy, using evidence-informed messaging targeted to youth and young adults (+)	N/A	5.9 (14)	Liberal Party; Canadian Centre on Substance Use and Addiction; Canadian Paediatric Society; Canadian Medical Association

Table 7: Bill C-45 - Essential Procedural Frames Used During House of Commons and Committee Meeting Debates

Procedural Frames (HOC: 51.0% of all Frames, N = 341); (Committee: 58.2% of all Frames, N = 239)			
	[HOC] Frequency of Frame as % of all Procedural Frames (N)	[Committee] Frequency of Frame as % of all Procedural Frames (N)	Policy Actors that Used the Frame
Rushing legislation with wide-ranging national effects is short-sighted and ill-advised; the bill is flawed, lacks scientific evidence, and the government should reconsider its timelines (/)	17.8 (49)	17.6 (16)	New Democratic Party; Conservative Party; National Organization for the Reform of Marijuana Laws; Sensible BC; Métis National Council
Bill C-45 includes provisions to protect youth, including prohibiting selling or providing cannabis to anyone under 18, with penalties up to 14 years, and making it an offence to enlist youth in cannabis-related crimes (+)	12.0 (33)	14.3 (13)	Liberal Party
To support protecting youth, Bill C-45 makes it illegal to sell products appealing to youth and enacts comprehensive advertising restrictions to prevent promotions and other messaging that encourage uses (+)	7.3 (20)	26.4 (24)	Liberal Party
We need to have the means to match our ambitions. Government must invest more money into prevention. The last budget provided nothing for prevention, even though that is crucial (/)	6.5 (18)	N/A	New Democratic Party
To protect the vulnerable, mandate package health warnings for all cannabis products, including known and potential harmful effects of exposure, similar to cigarettes, including child proof packaging (+)	N/A	3.3 (3)	Canadian Paediatric Society; Ontario Public Health Association

Similar to the results for Bill C-14, we found that the Liberal government used more instrumental and moral frames in the HOC to defend its policy choices on cannabis legalization. Prominently, the government relied on very narrow messaging via instrumental framing to explain the overall goal behind Bill C-45 (i.e., legalizing, restricting, and strictly regulating cannabis to protect Canadians' health and safety, keep it from youth, and remove profits from criminals through a legal market) for a total of 153 times. From a moral perspective, the government frequently framed the objectives of the Bill as a means to protect the health and safety of Canadians (especially youth), personal autonomy, and harm reduction.

Furthermore, the results show that the Conservative Party opposed cannabis legalization, and frequently used moral framing to oppose it from a drug use perspective. For example, the Conservative Party used frames such as "marijuana is bad and dangerous" and it is the "perfect gateway" drug. On the other hand, the both the Liberal government and the New Democratic party supported cannabis legalization. Both parties were in agreement that the current cannabis prohibition process (the status quo) was ineffective at preventing youth from consuming marijuana. This instrumental frame was frequently used by both parties to justify their case for a strictly regulated legal cannabis regime.

Another area in which the results are similar to that of Bill C-14 is regarding the use of procedural frames. The results show that the main political opposition parties used the highest-frequency procedural frame. Both the Conservative Party and New Democratic Party argued that Bill C-45 is flawed and should not be rushed by the government. In

committee meetings, this procedural frame was also used by the National Organization for the Reform of Marijuana Laws, Sensible BC, and Métis National Council.

Moreover, the committee meetings yielded a wide array of frames from non-MP policy actors in attendance, largely from instrumental and procedural perspectives. For example, the Canadian Centre on Substance Use and Addiction, Canadian Paediatric Society, and Canadian Medical Association called for an immediate education program to inform youth on the impacts of cannabis use on their health (instrumental frame). Furthermore, the Canadian Paediatric Society and Ontario Public Health Association recommended that package health warnings be mandated for all cannabis products, as well as child proof packaging, to protect the vulnerable (procedural frame). Additional frames from non-MP policy actors are low in frequency and can be found in the appendix.

Similar to the discussions on palliative care during Bill C-14 debates, another topic came up consistently during debates on Bill C-45. The New Democratic Party, as well as the Conservative Party, argued for decriminalization to either be a complement to Bill C-45 (New Democratic Party's preference) or as an alternative approach to replace the Bill itself (Conservative Party's preference). Although decriminalization is not directly related to the framing purposes for this study, it is worth mentioning given its connection to drug law enforcement.

Lastly, **Table 8** contains a snapshot of the position statements of select organizations represented at the committee meetings, or the written submissions of policy

actors presenting at these meetings when position statements could not be located. The statements further validate the findings in this study.

Table 8: Bill C-45 Position Statements / Committee Written Submissions

Bill C-45 Position Statements / Committee Briefs	
Organization	Position
Criminal Lawyers' Association (CLA)	The CLA support the legalization of marijuana. There are, however, serious problems, including constitutional issues, with Bill C-45. Most of these problems however can be corrected with relatively minor amendments.
Canadian Centre on Substance Use and Addiction	The evidence on reducing the harms associated with cannabis use supports taking a public health approach, which enables health and social harms to be addressed through the following recommendations: • Delaying the initiation of cannabis use and reducing the frequency of cannabis use; • Reducing the quantity and potency of cannabis used; • Reducing higher-risk use, including among at-risk populations (e.g., pregnant women and those at risk of mental health issues), in higher-risk situations (e.g., while driving and in combination with other substances such as alcohol), and with higher-potency products; • Ensuring that regulated products meet strict quality control standards; • Increasing access to services and supports for those who engage in problematic or higher-risk use; and • Reducing involvement with the criminal justice system.
Canadian Drug Policy Coalition (CDPC)	CDPC supports the passing of Bill C-45 and the legal regulation of non-medical cannabis as a way to minimize the social and individual costs of prohibition, while ensuring that cannabis policy supports public health and human rights to the fullest extent possible. Legalizing and regulating cannabis will ensure that there is adequate oversight of the complete market of non-medical cannabis, including control overdose, quality, potency, marketing and access. CDPC supports a public health-based approach to regulation of cannabis, as espoused in the objectives of Bill C-45, as well as the recognition that regulatory mechanisms can protect vulnerable populations including youth.
Canadian Public Health Association (CPHA)	CPHA commends the federal government for this important step in developing a public health approach to addressing cannabis use in Canada. Bill C-45 also delineates areas of federal and provincial/territorial (FPT) authority. Further efforts should be undertaken to develop this legislation, and the associated regulations and guidelines to minimize inter-provincial variations in approaches. CPHA recognizes the complex inter-relationships of federal, provincial, municipal and Indigenous governance authorities that exist concerning the regulation and sale of alcohol and tobacco, as well as the precedents and constitutional authorities that support those regimes. We also realize that these authorities need to be respected in structuring cannabis-related legislation and supporting regulations. This initiative, however, is a rare

	opportunity to develop a control system that respects FPT and Indigenous governance rights while providing consistent pan-Canadian regulation.
Canadian Paediatric Society	Youth should not use cannabis recreationally because its many potentially harmful effects are serious. These effects are present in the entire population; however, the developing brain is especially sensitive to the negative consequences of cannabis use. Canadian youth are at significant risk for developing CUD and, possibly, for doubling their risk of having a psychotic illness. Driving under the influence of cannabis increases the risk for motor vehicle accidents. Where cannabis has been legalized in the USA, children are requiring emergent medical care at greater rates due to unintentional ingestion.
Canadian Medical Association (CMA)	The CMA has long-standing concerns about the health risks associated with consuming cannabis, especially by children and youth in its smoked form. Weighing societal trends against the health effects of cannabis, the CMA supports a broad legal-regulatory framework as part of a comprehensive and properly sequenced public health approach of harm reduction. Recommendations 1. The CMA recommends that the legalization age be amended to 21 years of age, to better protect the most vulnerable population, youth, from the developmental neurological harms associated with cannabis use. 2. The CMA recommends that a comprehensive cannabis public health strategy with a strong, effective health education component be implemented before, and no later than, the enactment of any legislation legalizing cannabis.
Cannabis Canada Association	Cannabis Canada welcomes the legislation tabled today by the Government of Canada to legalize, regulate, and restrict access to cannabis. This <i>[sic]</i> as an important step that catapults Canada to a world leadership position in a new and exciting industry sector. The Association looks forward to continuing to working closely with all levels of government throughout the process of legalization. The Association is in complete support of prohibiting advertising and promotion that is directed at children. "We hope to see better recognition of the fact that a certain level of product branding and advertising, that in no way appeals to children or youth, is necessary," clarified Ms Rivet. "Consumers need information about a new and complex product. This will also help to provide clarity in the marketplace about where and how to obtain legal and safe cannabis versus illegal cannabis, and help to more quickly drive out the black market."
Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police (CACP)	The CACP strongly advocates against in-home production and in-home possession, while strongly advocating for sustained education campaigns, clear packaging/labeling, sale prices that will discourage illicit sales on the "black market", and strict security clearance requirements that would safeguard against criminal organizations becoming licensed growers. The CACP also supports efforts to deter and reduce criminal activity by imposing serious criminal penalties for those breaking the law, especially those who import or export cannabis, or provide cannabis to Canada's youth.

Ontario Public Health Association	Specifically, our Task Group encourages the Ontario Government to adopt a public health approach to cannabis regulation to allow for more control over the risk factors associated with cannabis-related harms. We have been struck by the evidence from North America's long experience with the tobacco, alcohol and medical drug industries, as well as the recent developments related to medical and non-medical cannabis usage in the United States that clearly demonstrates that commercialization increases prevalence of use, which in turn generates significant risks and harms for health. Consequently, we urge you to consider the following evidence-informed recommendations: • Set a minimum age of 21 for cannabis purchase and consumption; • Adopt a government-owned and controlled store-front system with no co-location of alcohol or tobacco with the sale of cannabis; • Place restrictions on where cannabis can be consumed; and • Invest in prevention, public health education, research, enforcement, treatment and surveillance.
Centre for Addiction and Mental Health	Neither Bill C-45 nor the proposed regulations specify that cannabis advertising on television and radio and in newspapers and magazines will be prohibited. Licensed cannabis producers have indicated that they plan to advertise. We recommend that Bill C-45 be amended – or that regulations be adopted – to clarify that these forms of advertising and promotion will be prohibited.
Canadian Medical Cannabis Council (CMCC)	CMCC supports the need to restrict the advertising of cannabis to young people, but is strongly opposed to brand prohibition or plain-packaging. Brand prohibition or plain-packaging facilitates counterfeiting which in turn fuels the illicit market, limits information and restricts choice, and forces companies to compete strictly on price (rather than quality), which could lead to a flood of cheap, lower quality, lower cost products, and subsequently to higher usage rates yet lower tax revenue.
Barreau du Québec	In general, the bill is comprehensive, in that it outlines clear measures addressing the production, distribution and sale of cannabis that respect the shared jurisdiction of each level of government. We believe that the timeline proposed by the federal government is reasonable, but collaboration and coordination between the federal government, provincial and territorial governments and municipal governments is critical to its success. It is important to keep in mind that legalizing cannabis encompasses issues that involve all levels of government, and also their respective areas of jurisdiction. Therefore, we are calling on the government to give provinces that have expressed interest in drafting legislation on the distribution and retail sale of marijuana the time they need to do so, thereby respecting shared jurisdiction.
National Organization for the Reform of Marijuana Laws	We applaud Canada for showing federal legislators in the United States what can be accomplished with true leadership and dedication to sound public policy, ... America's leaders would be wise to learn from our neighbors, and similarly replace our archaic and failed marijuana prohibition laws with a regulatory scheme that is largely evidence-based and that reflects cannabis rapidly changing cultural status.

Anandia Labs	The passage of Bill C-45, the Cannabis Act, is expected by late summer 2018 and will give marijuana a sanctioned social currency that has eluded it to date. From Anandia's perspective, the new law will provide the leg-up needed to expand research in concert with the growth of a cannabis products industry that, according to cannabis investment platform ArcView Group, will reach \$23 billion in North America in just a few years.
Canadian Federation of Apartment Associations	The Canadian Federation of Apartment Associations announced its position earlier this week to ban people from smoking cannabis in their apartments once the drug is legalized later this year.
Portage	Portage recommends that marijuana not be legalized for people under the age of 21. We also endorse the recommendation of controlling the level of THC, the active ingredient in cannabis, for citizens 25 years of age or younger. If, as the Canadian Medical Association states, the brain continues developing until the age of 25, THC, consumed in the strong doses available today, is a substance that can increase mental health risks. Portage also firmly believes that the government must support the rehabilitation centres that provide assistance to addicts. The Parliamentary Budget Officer recently estimated that the sale of legal marijuana would generate between \$481 million and \$618 million in revenue. In this regard, Portage recommends that all of the taxes collected as the result of the legalization of marijuana be used to develop a national strategy for the prevention of drug addiction and, that a significant portion be made available to rehabilitation organizations.
Canadian Nurses Association (CNA)	CNA supports the passing of Bill C-45 and believes that legalization is an excellent option for addressing the harms of cannabis. Legalization can support the regulation of quality, dose and potency while minimizing social harms and the costs of prohibition. In addition, legalization can improve access to related research into potential harms or medical benefits.
Cannabis Culture	This is not legalization. It's Prohibition 2.0, and beneficiaries include licensed producers who have managed to effectively lobby – and even hire – Liberal marijuana task force members and government officials. Legalization should mean the end of criminalization – not continued prohibition. I support reasonable regulation of cannabis, but this legislation is not reasonable. It's prohibitive, punitive and will not achieve any of its stated goals. Once again, the Liberals have lied, and Canadians will pay the price.

*Position statements / Committee Written Submissions were not found for the following policy actors: Educators for Sensible Drug Policy, Drug Free Kids Canada, Sensible BC, Atlantic Convenience Stores Association, Tousaw Law Corporation, Métis National Council.

Discussion

The results give rise to five key observations in this study. First, framing matters in *morality policy* debates. We see in this study that framing is a key strategy used by policy

actors to support, oppose, or obstruct developing legislation on *morality policy* issues. In each case study, the sum of all frames used were well-distributed over the three framing categories, opposed to being limited to a single category. This is an indicator that policy actors are strategic in their approach when deliberating over *morality policy* issues.

Although there is a recognized moral component behind assisted-dying and cannabis consumption, the results reveal that policy actors are reticent to express their positioning on these issues based on their moral values only. By using instrumental and procedural frames, policy actors are able to reorient an issue to *appear* as a different, non-moral problem. For example, the results show that non-supporters of Bill C-14 advocated for the inclusion of conscience protections into the bill in order to protect health care providers against “compelled participation in killing” – a moral frame. However, non-supporters (specifically the Conservative Party) also argued their dissent from another angle. They argued that the inclusion of conscience protections is needed to prevent physicians from leaving their practice, which in turn would jeopardize Canadians’ access to critical health care altogether. The latter is an instrumental frame which reorients the issue as a matter of health care administration, which *appears* as less morally based. However, even this framing is rooted behind a moral positioning that physicians will refuse to perform duties that are contrary to their moral beliefs. The results are significant because they corroborate previous findings in the literature that policies are multidimensional, *morality policy* issues can be de-moralized, and framing is central to whether a policy is perceived as a *morality policy* type.

Second, the results reveal that moral frames are present in Canadian public policy environments, but they're not overpowering. What significantly jumps out in this study is that moral frames were used ~20% of the time in both cases. Although the subjects of both cases (i.e., assisted-dying and recreational drug use) are within subfields of *morality policy*, policy actors more often based their arguments using instrumental and procedural frames. This increases our understanding that morality policies are a moving target; they are strategies used by policy actors to address subjects framed through a moral lens where there is conflict over what is considered morally right and wrong. The lack of moral framing is probably opposite from what we would see in the USA. This opens the door to questions like: if moral frames are used less in Canada than in the USA, why is that? Is it that Canadian politicians avoid religion, why? Is it that Canadians don't want to have these conversations, why? And as Fink (2008) describes of the Western world, is it that there is a drop in religious practicing in Canada, why? As the USA is part of the *religious world*, assisted-dying and recreational drug use are likely to be more politicized due to religious-secular party competition at the federal level (Engeli et al. 2013; Studlar and Burns 2015; Studlar et al. 2018). Consistent with previous findings in the literature, the results confirm that this is not the case in Canada, a *secular world* country, where morality policies are depoliticized and void of religious-secular party competition (Engeli et al. 2013; Studlar 2008; Adam et al. 2020).

Third, it appears that the manner in which a *morality policy* issue is introduced onto the government agenda informs how non-supporters will use moral frames in debates. This finding offers a new contribution to the existing literature on *morality policy*. Although moral

frames were the least used in all debate settings – with the exception of Bill C-14 committee meetings in which instrumental frames were used slightly less – when policy actors did use moral frames, it was frequently used by the Liberal government in support of both bills. However, the results reveal a striking contrast between the frequency of moral frames used for opposition versus obstruction between both bills. For Bill C-14, moral frames were mostly used to obstruct the government’s approach to legalization, while for Bill C-45, moral frames were mostly used to oppose cannabis legalization altogether. A reasonable explanation for this is the difference in how these bills were introduced into the HOC. As Parliament was instructed by the SCC to create a legal framework for MAiD, it would be less effective for policy actors to argue for its opposition. Non-supporting actors were better off obstructing the government’s approach to creating a framework and presenting alternatives of their own. On the other hand, the judiciary was not involved in the introduction of Bill C-45. Thus, there was nothing legally binding Parliament to legalize cannabis. As cannabis legalization was an election platform promise of the government, there was a political advantage for the Conservative party (and other policy actors) to argue for its opposition instead of simply sufficing to obstruct the proposed approach within the bill.

Fourth, policy actors tend to rely on instrumental framing when shaping *morality policy* debates. Similar findings were revealed in the two aforementioned USA-based studies that observed the framing strategies used by policy actors within debates on gay rights and state lotteries (Mucciaroni 2011; Ferraiolo 2013). In this study, instrumental frames were used 60% of the time to argue support for both bills. This included

interventions from Liberal MPs who sought to influence parties to agree that Bill C-14 is needed to ensure a national framework is in place for patients to receive MAiD, alongside appropriate safeguards for medical practitioners; and why Bill C-45 is needed to legalize and strictly regulate cannabis to protect Canadians' health and safety, keep cannabis from youth, and remove profits from criminals through a legal market. These frames were also used by the New Democratic Party to argue support for Bill C-45 only, as well as non-MP policy actors to argue support for both bills. Moreover, the results reveal that when instrumental frames were not used to support a bill (which was the majority of the time), it was mostly used to obstruct it rather than to oppose it. Policy actors frequently argued that the government's approach would not produce the desired outcome(s), and could create further problems for Canadians to contend with. For example, for Bill C-14, it was argued by the Conservative Party that conscience protection should be added to the bill in order to preserve the existing healthcare system and prevent physicians from leaving their practice. This instrumental frame was used 13 times as an attempt to persuade the Liberal government (and all Canadians) that if conscience protection is not included in the bill, Canadians would have fewer doctors to provide them with medical care. Moreover, for Bill C-45, the Conservative Party argued that the bill does not reflect the government's agenda, because it risks providing children with greater access to cannabis, potential exploitation from criminal activity, and would fail to stop organized crime. This instrumental frame was used 97 times as an attempt to convince everyone that provisions in the bill, such as adults of legal age can grow up to four cannabis plants in their home for personal use, and youth

can be in possession of up to 5 grams of cannabis at any time, makes it easier for youth to have access to cannabis and potential criminal engagement.

Fifth, the results show that decision-makers tend to poke holes into arguments within *morality policy* debates, rather than to oppose arguments entirely via causality. Such an approach would make them appear to be more open to change, which is politically more favourable when public opinion is swaying in the opposite direction. This finding is supported by the literature, which suggests that decision-makers often seek to reach a common ground with other parties on *morality policy* issues to avoid values conflict and pressures from electoral competition. Within the context of this study, this is more clearly revealed for cannabis legalization, since the Liberal Party won a majority government mandate from the public in the 2015 federal election. Non-supporting oppositional parties, such as the Conservative Party, would've found their stance on cannabis legalizations as unpopular among the Canadian polity. This confirms that policy actors will use moral frames to retain support from their advocates, but will also use instrumental frames to gather support from the broader public. Not only did the Conservative Party and a subset of non-MP policy actors use moral frames to both oppose and obstruct Bill C-14 (~60% of all moral frames) and Bill C-45 (~50% of all moral frames), as the results show, these actors leveraged instrumental frames as well. The results not only confirm the hypothesis in this study, it also takes it a step further to clarify that in order to gather support from the broader population, policy actors cannot appear to be utterly dismissive in their non-support of current public policy objectives, as it could arguably do them a disservice (especially as an opposition party) when it comes to the next election. Therefore, it is strategic for policy

actors to engage in these types of *two-sided morality policy* debates with more obstructionist-type frames versus oppositional-type frames. This may reduce the likelihood that citizens view dissenting policy actors negatively; and for opposition parties in particular, it could enhance their popularity by helping the public recognize potential flaws in the governing party's intentions.

Lastly, when we compare across the two cases, three key takeaways stand out. First, procedural frames were most frequently used in debates on Bill C-14, while instrumental frames were most frequently used in debates for Bill C-45. For Bill C-14, the supporters of the Bill argued how the government's approach is aligned with the SCC's decision in *Carter v. Canada*, while non-supporters largely argued it failed to do so. It appears from these results that when policy objectives arise on the government agenda via judicial decisions (as was the case for Bill C-14), procedural frames significantly outweigh instrumental frames. Although this claim cannot be generalized, it seems likely that in situations where the judiciary calls on policy makers to correct unconstitutional matters, the strategic advantage to oppose policy objectives from a causality perspective deteriorates. If policy actors oppose the development of a legal framework, they risk being perceived as supporting the denial of individuals' rights – which is not a good look in the public eye. Therefore, a more reasonable alternative would be to critique the approach to developing the framework.

Second, supporters of both bills indicated strong favour for personal autonomy and harm reduction. This includes the governing Liberal Party; a party that continues to advocate for permissive morality policies, such as legal abortion and same-sex marriage –

as mentioned in the literature. These qualities were largely represented through moral frames in this study. However, we cannot generalize these results with broad statements to say that Canadians largely favour these qualities in morality policies, especially given the plurality of beliefs and religious affiliations within the country.

Third, we observed that a *slippery slope* argument was frequently used by opponents within both cases. This instrumental frame was largely used by the Conservative Party – especially within HOC debates – and non-MP policy actors also engaged with this framing. In a strategic way, these types of frames can instill doubt and fear in the public as to the perceived and/or real consequences behind policy implementation. In relation to this study, it is possible that this approach may already prove to be effective in the case of MAiD. This is because subsequent policy adaptations to MAiD occurred in 2021 (i.e., Bill C-7, which removed the requirement that a person’s natural death be reasonably foreseeable), and future adaptations continue to be debated (i.e., whether eligibility for MAiD should be extended to individuals whose sole underlying medical condition is mental illness). Therefore, it is possible that the *slippery slope* instrumental frame may have served as a primer for non-supporting policy actors to gradually shift some initial supporters of Bill C-14 towards opposition.

Conclusion

This study makes three key contributions to our knowledge of *morality policy* and increases our understanding of how morality policies are framed within the Canadian public policy environment. First, we learned that policy actors in Canada do use moral

frames within *morality policy* debates. However, this study revealed that they use alternate framing strategies more, such as instrumental and procedural frames. This finding is consistent with previous *morality policy* studies completed in the USA with a focus on framing. This finding also validates my argument that Canadian policy actors use moral framing that aligns with the values of their supporters on *morality policy* issues, while also aiming to gain broader public support through alternative framing strategies.

Second, the findings in this study also confirm that framing is significant for *morality policy*. For each subject, a variety of frames were used by policy actors across each of the three framing categories. These frames were used strategically to either support, oppose, or obstruct proposed policy objectives brought forth by the Liberal government on MAiD and cannabis legalization. The findings corroborate the claims by contemporary scholars in the literature that *morality policy* is the strategic use of *morality framing* in policy debates. My definition of *morality policy* also supports this claim, since *morality framing* is a part of the strategies used by policy actors to address subjects framed through a moral lens where there is conflict over what is considered morally right and wrong.

Third, this study revealed that framing strategies used by non-supporting policy actors are dependent on how a *morality policy* issue is introduced into Parliament. When a *morality policy* issue was introduced via direction from the judiciary (i.e., MAiD), non-supporting policy actors frequently chose to obstruct the government's approach within the bill rather than to oppose the bill itself. This is an original finding through this study, and the strategy likely served a political purpose for the Conservative Party to avoid appearing as anti-democratic. This finding indicates that the way a *morality policy* issue makes its way

onto the government agenda matters. It helps to justify why advocates for policy change on contentious *morality policy* issues might turn to the courts to seek recognition of individual rights, as seen with Kay Carter in the *Carter v. Canada* case. The findings reveal that the judiciary can be a catalyst for the adoption of permissive morality policies, influencing non-supporters to use more constructive, less oppositional framing strategies. This is a major contribution to the literature and opens the door for future research to explore if similar framing strategies are used by non-supporting policy actors in other like scenarios. It would be interesting to test this finding elsewhere in other jurisdictions, including in *religious-world* countries such as the USA.

As anticipated, the findings in this study answer questions like: Which stakeholders do policy actors target for support/non-support for MAiD? How do their strategies change or stay the same to garner public support/non-support for cannabis legalization? We observed that the strategies used by policy actors remained the same across both subjects, with the exception that non-supporters used more procedural frames within debates on MAiD, and more instrumental frames within debates on cannabis legalization. We observed that supporters for both bills advocated for the rights of Canadians who felt that their independence to make their own choices were being dismissed by the hands of the Canadian State. This population of Canadians were the target audience of supporting policy actors, most notably the Liberal government, and the use of moral framing was key to retain support from this population. Conversely, non-supporters for both bills advocated for the strong beliefs and opinions of Canadians who disagree in principle with the legalization of MAiD and cannabis. Based on the moral frames used by non-supporters,

their target audience comprised of Canadians whose religious affiliations reject permissiveness on these subjects, and Canadians who feared that permissiveness on these subjects would put Canadians at risk of imminent and prolonged danger. For example, this may include fears of vulnerable seniors becoming coerced to apply for MAiD, and fears that more youth will experience long-term negative cognitive health implications due to legal cannabis consumption.

Therefore, we observed that policy actors do use moral frames to align with the values of their supporters. In addition, we also observed that policy actors use instrumental and procedural frames to argue positions from an all-Canadian beneficiary perspective. In doing the latter, policy actors target support from Canadians who are stuck in the middle on *morality policy* issues, and may also sway support from Canadians holding values from the opposite side. Overall, these findings are consistent with my argument in this study.

For future research, it would be interesting to study the evolution of public opinion with the subsequent adaptations to MAiD, as well as the framing strategies used by policy actors within these debates. As the subsequent adaptations (through Bill C-7 and Bill C-62) took place at later Parliamentary sessions, it did not allow for a comparable analysis in this study. This is due to sources of variation that could've impacted our results, including changes in policy actors within Parliament and possible differences in public opinion over this time period. To further test my argument that policy actors use alternative framing strategies to gather support from the broader public, it would be useful to compare Canadians perceptions of MAiD in 2016 versus 2026.

Furthermore, future research could carry out a state-by-state comparison to study how *morality policy* is framed in Canada versus the USA. It would be interesting to study the similarities and differences in how policy actors between both countries approach these debates. As the findings in this study raised questions like – if moral frames are used less in Canada than in the USA, why is that? Is it that Canadian politicians avoid religion, why? Is it that Canadians don't want to have these conversations, why? Is it that there is a drop in religious practicing in Canada, why? – a cross-state comparative analysis could bring about answers that may deepen our understanding of the *religious-world vs secular-world* dynamic.

It would also be interesting for future research to examine how moral frames are used within other *morality policy* issues within Canada, such as education. Specifically, it would be interesting to see if personal autonomy and harm reduction are consistently used by policy actors to advocate for permissiveness on other *morality policy* issues. For example, in August 2023, the provincial government of Saskatchewan introduced its pronoun law to require schools to seek parent/guardian permission in order to change students' pronouns (Government of Saskatchewan 2023). The provincial government of Alberta enacted similar requirements in December 2024, instructing school authorities to notify parents when students request to be referred to by a new name or pronoun related to gender identity (Government of Alberta 2024). Furthermore, Alberta instructed its school boards to remove all educational materials that contain depictions of sexual acts in July 2025 (Government of Alberta 2025). All of these policies sparked contentious public

debates and future studies could explore if personal autonomy and harm reduction are relevant moral frames used within these conversations and debates.

Lastly, future research could examine the framing strategies used by policy actors within Canadian provincial legislatures and compare it to the results in this study at the national level. For context, this idea is sparked by the following: since the literature deems the USA as part of the *religious-world*, it can be expected that moral frames would be used frequently within *morality* policy debates in Congress. However, Mucciaroni (2011) and Ferraiolo (2013) revealed that differences can be found at the USA state level. In both studies, framing strategies used by policy actors in largely Christian populated states were similar to the results in this Canadian study; that is, strategies were not heavily swayed towards moral framing. It would be interesting to see if similar differences exist among policy actors at the Canadian provincial level versus federal level. Ultimately, we know now through this study that while moral framing is used in addressing *morality policy* issues in Canada, non-moral framing strategies tend to dominate this space.

References

- Adam, Christian, Christoph Knill, and Emma T. Budde. 2020. "How Morality Politics Determine Morality Policy Output – Partisan Effects on Morality Policy Change." *Journal of European Public Policy* 27 (7): 1015–33.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13501763.2019.1653954>.
- Bassoli, Matteo, Michele Marzulli, and Marco Pedroni. 2021. "Anti-Gambling Policies: Framing Morality Policy in Italy." *Journal of Public Policy* 41 (1): 137–60.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143814X19000345>.
- Budde, Emma, Stephan Heichel, Steffen Hurka, and Christoph Knill. 2018. "Partisan Effects in Morality Policy Making." *European Journal of Political Research* 57 (2): 427–49. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6765.12233>.
- Burlone, Nathalie. 2020. "Value-based Issues and Policy Change: Medical Assistance in Dying in Four Narratives." *Social Policy & Administration* 54 (7): 1096–109.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/spol.12587>.
- Camobreco, John F., and Michelle A. Barnello. 2008. "Democratic Responsiveness and Policy Shock: The Case of State Abortion Policy." *State Politics & Policy Quarterly* 8 (1): 48–65. <https://doi.org/10.1177/153244000800800104>.
- Chong, Dennis, and James N. Druckman. 2007. "Framing Theory." *Annual Review of Political Science* 10 (1): 103–26.
<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.polisci.10.072805.103054>.

Cocca, Carolyn E. 2002. "The Politics of Statutory Rape Laws: Adoption and Reinvention of Morality Policy in the States, 1971-1999." *Polity* 35 (1): 51–72.

<https://doi.org/10.1086/POLv35n1ms3235470>.

Crawford, Anna M., and Christopher M. Weible. 2024. "The Political Polarization over Abortion: An Analysis of Advocacy Coalition Belief Systems." *Policy Sciences* 57 (3): 599–620. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11077-024-09544-7>.

Department of Justice Canada. 2021. "Supreme Court of Canada Ruling." July 7.

[https://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/cj-jp/ad-am/scc-](https://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/cj-jp/ad-am/scc-csc.html#:~:text=On%20February%206%2C%202015%2C%20the,consensual%20death%20of%20another%20person)

[csc.html#:~:text=On%20February%206%2C%202015%2C%20the,consensual%20death%20of%20another%20person](https://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/cj-jp/ad-am/scc-csc.html#:~:text=On%20February%206%2C%202015%2C%20the,consensual%20death%20of%20another%20person).

Engeli, Isabelle, Christoffer Green-Pedersen, and Lars Thorup Larsen. 2013. "The Puzzle of Permissiveness: Understanding Policy Processes Concerning Morality Issues."

Journal of European Public Policy 20 (3): 335–52.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/13501763.2013.761500>.

Engeli, Isabelle, and Frédéric Varone. 2011. "Governing Morality Issues through Procedural Policies." *Swiss Political Science Review* 17 (3): 239–58.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1662-6370.2011.02025.x>.

Euchner, Eva-Maria. 2019. "Morality Policy." In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Politics*, by Eva-Maria Euchner. Oxford University Press.

<https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228637.013.641>.

Euchner, Eva-Maria, Stephan Heichel, Kerstin Nebel, and Andreas Raschzok. 2013. "From 'Morality' Policy to 'Normal' Policy: Framing of Drug Consumption and Gambling in Germany and the Netherlands and Their Regulatory Consequences." *Journal of European Public Policy* 20 (3): 372–89.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13501763.2013.761506>.

Ferraiolo, Kathleen. 2013. "Is State Gambling Policy 'Morality Policy'? Framing Debates Over State Lotteries." *Policy Studies Journal* 41 (2): 217–42.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/psj.12015>.

Fink, Simon. 2008. "Politics as Usual or Bringing Religion Back In?: The Influence of Parties, Institutions, Economic Interests, and Religion on Embryo Research Laws." *Comparative Political Studies* 41 (12): 1631–56.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0010414007309203>.

Gibson, M. Troy. 2004. "Culture Wars in State Education Policy: A Look at the Relative Treatment of Evolutionary Theory in State Science Standards*." *Social Science Quarterly* 85 (5): 1129–49. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0038-4941.2004.00267.x>.

Gormley, William T. 1986. "Regulatory Issue Networks in a Federal System." *Polity* 18 (4): 595–620. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3234884>.

Government of Alberta. 2024. "Supporting Alberta Students and Families." December 5.
<https://www.alberta.ca/supporting-alberta-students-and-families>.

Government of Alberta. 2025. "School Library Standards Engagement." September 5.

https://www.alberta.ca/school-library-standards-engagement#:~:text=The%20new%20standards%20include:%20*%20Removing%20school,with%20a%20revised%20version%20in%20September%202025.

Government of Saskatchewan. 2023. "Education Minister Announces New Parental Inclusion and Consent Policies." Saskatchewan, August 22.

<https://www.saskatchewan.ca/government/news-and-media/2023/august/22/education-minister-announces-new-parental-inclusion-and-consent-policies#:~:text=On%20August%2022%2C%202023%2C%20Education%20Minister%20Dustin,pronouns%20if%20the%20student%20is%20under%2016.>

Haider-Markel, Donald P. 1999. "Morality Policy and Individual-Level Political Behavior; The Case of Legislative Voting on Lesbian and Gay Issues." *Policy Studies Journal* 27 (4): 735–49. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1541-0072.1999.tb02000.x>.

Haider-Markel, Donald P., and Kenneth J. Meier. 1996. "The Politics of Gay and Lesbian Rights: Expanding the Scope of the Conflict." *The Journal of Politics* 58 (2): 332–49. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2960229>.

Health Canada. 2018. "Bill C-45, the Cannabis Act, Passed in Senate." June 20. <https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/news/2018/06/bill-c-45-the-cannabis-act-passed-in-senate.html>.

- Heichel, Stephan, Christoph Knill, and Sophie Schmitt. 2013. "Public Policy Meets Morality: Conceptual and Theoretical Challenges in the Analysis of Morality Policy Change." *Journal of European Public Policy* 20 (3): 318–34.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13501763.2013.761497>.
- Hollander, Robyn, and Haig Patapan. 2017. "Morality Policy and Federalism: Innovation, Diffusion and Limits." *Publius: The Journal of Federalism* 47 (1): 1–26.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/publius/pjw027>.
- Jenkins-Smith, Hank C., and Paul A. Sabatier. 1994. "Evaluating the Advocacy Coalition Framework." *Journal of Public Policy* 14 (2): 175–203.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143814X00007431>.
- Johns, Tracy L. 2015. "Managing a Policy Experiment: Adopting and Implementing Recreational Marijuana Policies in Colorado." *State and Local Government Review* 47 (3): 193–204. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0160323X15612149>.
- Knill, Christoph. 2013. "The Study of Morality Policy: Analytical Implications from a Public Policy Perspective." *Journal of European Public Policy* 20 (3): 309–17.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13501763.2013.761494>.
- Knill, Christoph, Xavier Fernández-i-Marín, Emma Budde, and Stephan Heichel. 2020. "Religious Tides: The Time-variant Effect of Religion on Morality Policies." *Regulation & Governance* 14 (2): 256–70. <https://doi.org/10.1111/rego.12203>.

- Kreitzer, Rebecca J. 2015. "Politics and Morality in State Abortion Policy." *State Politics & Policy Quarterly* 15 (1): 41–66. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1532440014561868>.
- Kreitzer, Rebecca J., Kellen A. Kane, and Christopher Z. Mooney. 2019. "The Evolution of Morality Policy Debate: Moralization and Demoralization." *The Forum* 17 (1): 3–24. <https://doi.org/10.1515/for-2019-0003>.
- "Legislative Background: Medical Assistance in Dying (Bill C-14)." 2016. Department of Justice Canada. <https://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/rp-pr/other-autre/ad-am/ad-am.pdf>.
- Lowi, Theodore J. 1964. "American Business, Public Policy, Case Studies, and Political Theory." *World Politics* 16: 687–91.
- Meier, Kenneth J. 1992. "State Policies on Funding of Abortions: A Pooled Time Series Analysis." *Social Science Quarterly* 73 (3): 690–98.
- Meier, Kenneth J. 1994. "The Politics of Sin." In *The Politics of Sin: Drugs, Alcohol and Public Policy*. Taylor and Francis.
- Meier, Kenneth J. 1999. "Drugs, Sex, Rock, and Roll: A Theory of Morality Politics." *Policy Studies Journal* 27 (4): 681–95. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1541-0072.1999.tb01996.x>.

- Meier, Kenneth J., and Deborah R. McFarlane. 1993. "The Politics of Funding Abortion: State Responses to the Political Environment." *American Politics Quarterly* 21 (1): 81–101. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1532673X9302100106>.
- Mooney, C. Z. 2000. "The Decline of Federalism and the Rise of Morality-Policy Conflict in the United States." *Publius: The Journal of Federalism* 30 (1): 171–88. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.pubjof.a030059>.
- Mooney, Christopher, and Mei-Hsien Lee. 2000. "The Influence of Values on Consensus and Contentious Morality Policy: U.S. Death Penalty Reform, 1956-82." *The Journal of Politics* 62 (1): 223–39. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-3816.00011>.
- Mooney, Christopher Z., and Mei-Hsien Lee. 1995. "Legislative Morality in the American States: The Case of Pre-Roe Abortion Regulation Reform." *American Journal of Political Science* 39 (3): 599. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2111646>.
- Mooney, Christopher Z., and Richard G. Schuldt. 2008. "Does Morality Policy Exist? Testing a Basic Assumption." *Policy Studies Journal* 36 (2): 199–218. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1541-0072.2008.00262.x>.
- Morgan, David R. 1980. "POLITICS AND MORALITY: THE EFFECT OF RELIGION ON REFERENDA VOTING." *Social Science Quarterly* 61 (1): 144–48.
- Motta, Michael J. 2021. "Diffusion and Typology: The Invention and Early Adoption of Medicinal Marijuana and Offshore Wind Policies." *Social Science Quarterly* 102 (1): 567–84. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ssqu.12893>.

- Mucciaroni, Gary. 2011. "Are Debates about 'Morality Policy' Really about Morality? Framing Opposition to Gay and Lesbian Rights." *Policy Studies Journal* 39 (2): 187–216. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1541-0072.2011.00404.x>.
- Mucciaroni, Gary, and Francesca Scala. 2019. "Morality Issues: Abortion and Gay Rights." In *The United States and Canada*, 1st ed., edited by Paul J. Quirk. Oxford University Press New York. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780190870829.003.0009>.
- Noronha, Charmaine. 2015. *Canada's Liberal Government Promises to Legalize Marijuana*. December 4. <https://apnews.com/general-news-42acc8d506af48429a8108bd4abb549d>.
- Patton, Dana. 2007. "The Supreme Court and Morality Policy Adoption in the American States: The Impact of Constitutional Context." *Political Research Quarterly* 60 (3): 468–88. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1065912907303844>.
- Rodriguez v. British Columbia (Attorney General), No. 23476 (Supreme Court of Canada September 30, 1993).
- Roh, Jongho, and Frances S. Berry. 2008. "Modeling the Outcomes of State Abortion Funding Referenda: Morality or Redistributive Policy, or Both?" *State Politics & Policy Quarterly* 8 (1): 66–87. <https://doi.org/10.1177/153244000800800105>.
- Schiffino, Nathalie, Celina Ramjoué, and Frédéric Varone. 2009. "Biomedical Policies in Belgium and Italy: From Regulatory Reluctance to Policy Changes." *West European Politics* 32 (3): 559–85. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01402380902779097>.

- Schmitt, Sophie, Eva-Maria Euchner, and Caroline Preidel. 2013. "Regulating Prostitution and Same-Sex Marriage in Italy and Spain: The Interplay of Political and Societal Veto Players in Two Catholic Societies." *Journal of European Public Policy* 20 (3): 425–41. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13501763.2013.761512>.
- Schwartz, Noah S. 2024. "Grandpa Joe's Hunting Rifle: Morality Policy Framing in Canadian Parliament." *Policy Sciences* 58 (1): 163–78. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11077-024-09554-5>.
- Slocum-Schaffer, Stephanie A. 2018. "Morality Policy." In *Federalism in America: An Encyclopedia*, vol. 1.
- Studlar, Donley T. 2008. "U.S. Tobacco Control: Public Health, Political Economy, or Morality Policy?" *Review of Policy Research* 25 (5): 393–410. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1541-1338.2008.00343.x>.
- Studlar, Donley T., and Gordon J. Burns. 2015. "Toward the Permissive Society? Morality Policy Agendas and Policy Directions in Western Democracies." *Policy Sciences* 48 (3): 273–91. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11077-015-9218-9>.
- Studlar, Donley T., Gordon J. Burns, and Alessandro Cagossi. 2018. "Morality Policy Processes in Advanced Industrial Democracies." *Policy Studies* 39 (5): 479–97. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01442872.2018.1481501>.
- Studlar, Donley T., Alessandro Cagossi, and Robert D. Duval. 2013. "Is Morality Policy Different? Institutional Explanations for Post-War Western Europe." *Journal of*

European Public Policy 20 (3): 353–71.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/13501763.2013.761503>.

Tatalovich, Raymond. 1997. “Public Opinion and Organized Interests Consensus Building or Mobilization of Bias?” In *The Politics of Abortion in the United States and Canada: A Comparative Study*. Routledge.

Tatalovich, Raymond, and Byron W. Daynes. 1988. “Conclusion: Social Regulatory Policymaking.” In *Social Regulatory Policy*.

Tatalovich, Raymond, and Dane G. Wendell. 2018. “Expanding the Scope and Content of Morality Policy Research: Lessons from Moral Foundations Theory.” *Policy Sciences* 51 (4): 565–79. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11077-018-9329-1>.

Trump, Donald J. 2025. *DEFENDING WOMEN FROM GENDER IDEOLOGY EXTREMISM AND RESTORING BIOLOGICAL TRUTH TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT*.
<https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/2025/01/defending-women-from-gender-ideology-extremism-and-restoring-biological-truth-to-the-federal-government/>.

Vossen, Job P. H., Gabriëlle L. De Pooter, and Petra Meier. 2022. “Conceptualizing Morality Policy: A Dyadic Morality Frame Analysis of a Gendered Legislative Debate on Abortion.” *Policy Sciences* 55 (1): 185–207. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11077-022-09449-3>.

Wendell, Dane G., and Raymond Tatalovich. 2021. "Classifying Public Policies with Moral Foundations Theory." *Policy Sciences* 54 (1): 155–82.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11077-020-09399-8>.

Wendell, Dane G., and Raymond Tatalovich. 2023. "Status Politics Is the Origin of Morality Policy." *Politics and the Life Sciences* 42 (2): 306–15.

<https://doi.org/10.1017/pls.2023.11>.

Appendix 1: Frames Used by Members of Parliament during Bill C-14 House of Commons Debates

Bill C-14 - House of Commons Debates		
Moral Frames (20.8% of all Frames, N = 139)		
	Frequency of Frame as % of all Moral Frames (N)	Policy Actors who Used the Frame
Ensuring patient autonomy and access to a peaceful death without prolonged suffering (+)	27.3 (38)	Liberal Party
We must protect and respect the conscience rights of health care providers against compelled participation in killing (MAiD) (/)	18.7 (26)	Conservative Party; New Democratic Party
Dignity is expressed through the value of human life, even among suffering. Life is a gift from God and we should respect it / contend for life (-)	13.7 (19)	Conservative Party
We must protect the most vulnerable members of society, including seniors and those who do not consent or who do not want this (/)	13.7 (19)	Conservative Party
Facilitating personal autonomy in dying while maintaining adequate safeguards for the vulnerable (+)	10.8 (15)	Liberal Party
Bill C-14 respects personal autonomy, protects the vulnerable, and affirms the inherent value in every human life (+)	10.8 (15)	Liberal Party
Assisted-dying is misaligned with efforts to build a happy, productive and better society (a society which contends for life) (-)	2.9 (4)	Conservative Party
We cannot simultaneously work to end depression and suicide while also creating legislation that would allow people to request assisted dying (-)	1.4 (2)	Conservative Party
We must have robust safeguards to prevent abuse and mitigate harms in the legalization of physician-assisted killing (/)	0.7 (1)	Conservative Party
Instrumental Frames (28.3% of all Frames, N = 189)		
	Frequency of Frame as % of all Instrumental Frames (N)	Policy Actors that Used the Frame

It is incumbent upon parliamentarians to put in place a national framework around our medical assistance in dying to ensure that there are the appropriate and necessary safeguards in place, certainty for medical practitioners, and that there is access for patients who want to access medical assistance in dying (+)	23.3 (44)	Liberal Party
Advancing a balanced legislative approach to respect patient autonomy and protect vulnerable persons and conscience rights (+)	17.5 (33)	Liberal Party
Warning that Bill C-14 is the thin edge of the wedge toward expanded assisted-suicide policies targeting children, the disabled, the chronically ill, the elderly, and non-productive Canadians / slippery slope (-)	17.5 (33)	Conservative Party; Liberal Party (MP Robert-Falcon Ouellette)
Adopting an approach that respects the Charter and the needs and values of Canadians (+)	6.9 (13)	Liberal Party
Conscience protection should be added to preserve the existing system and prevent physicians from leaving the practice (/)	6.9 (13)	Conservative Party
Ensuring Canadians have access to all end-of-life care options (+)	4.8 (9)	Liberal Party
Five-year review clause, and national reporting system, is another important safeguard. It would allow for future improvements and modifications, if need be. This included detailed reporting from provinces and territories (+)	4.8 (9)	Liberal Party
Balancing respect for health care providers' conscience rights with ensuring access to willing providers through collaboration with provinces and territories (+)	3.7 (7)	Liberal Party
I am afraid Bill C-14 is a short step to misfortune, and the path with proper safeguards would be a long one. We need to be tight and protective of the vulnerable, seniors, and youth (/)	3.7 (7)	Conservative Party
Doctors may face lawsuits/unemployment for failure to comply with a patient who wishes to die, if conscience protections are not in place (/)	2.1 (4)	Conservative Party
Government must ensure that the people who make use of this legislation are making a clear and informed choice and have all of the information they need to make an informed decision (/)	2.1 (4)	Conservative Party
Bill C-14 is silent on protections for health institutions. Physicians would be forced to provide MAiD or refer patients, which may go	1.6 (3)	Conservative Party

against their conscience. If we are to insist that those institutions now need to participate in physician-assisted dying, we may end up losing a lot of health care facilities in our country (/)		
Bill places burden on taxpayers to cover medical costs associated with MAiD (/)	1.1 (2)	Conservative Party
My concern is that there is always the risk of one person inadvertently terminating his or her life, which would be a huge loss. It is too great a risk that one innocent person might die. This could happen if we have advance directives (/)	1.1 (2)	Conservative Party
Bill C-14 respects Carter and complies with the Charter of Rights (+)	1.1 (2)	Liberal Party
A simple system of advance legal review by competent authority would eliminate doctor shopping and achieve the central objective: it would ensure that people who have not consented or do not meet the criteria are not killed, without any effective means to investigate that after the fact (/)	0.5 (1)	Conservative Party
If doctors' conscience is not protected in the legislation, some medical associations might challenge it, which will lead to variations from province to province. That will result in delays and the rise of health tourism (/)	0.5 (1)	Conservative Party
Proposing Bill C-14 allow for licensed individuals to assist in assisted suicide to protect doctors' conscience rights and keep the health care system focused on care (/)	0.5 (1)	Conservative Party
Bill C-14 would not normalize medically assisted dying as perhaps has occurred in Belgium and the Netherlands, the two most often cited examples of the slippery slope (+)	0.5 (1)	Liberal Party
Procedural Frames (51% of all Frames, N = 341)		
	Frequency of Frame as % of all Procedural Frames (N)	Policy Actors that Used the Frame
Bill C-14 is flawed (doesn't adequately respond to Carter) and likely unconstitutional. Amendments should be adopted. Bill should not be rushed. Further safeguards will protect autonomy (/)	34.9 (119)	Conservative Party

No conscience protections in Bill C-14; responsibility shifted to provinces, colleges and regulating bodies; federal government has a duty to protect rights of physicians, allied health professionals, and health institutions (/)	21.4 (73)	Conservative Party
This proposed legislation does not compel any health care practitioner to provide medical assistance in dying. Practitioners will have the right to choose as their conscience dictates (+)	9.7 (33)	Liberal Party; Conservative Party (following committee amendments to Bill C-14)
Encourage the government to amend this legislation to include a system of advance review (judicial oversight) by competent legal authority (/)	6.2 (21)	Conservative Party
A person must be competent at the time MAiD is provided (advance directives would not be permitted). Requests must be fully informed and free from coercion (+)	4.1 (14)	Liberal Party
Bill C-14 meets and answers the Supreme Court of Canada decision in Carter (+)	3.8 (13)	Liberal Party
Employed safeguards into the legislation to protect the vulnerable (+)	3.5 (12)	Liberal Party
The lack of advance directives in the legislation is too restrictive (/)	2.9 (10)	New Democratic Party
Committed to work going forward with provinces and territories to support access for medical assistance in dying, while simultaneously respecting the personal convictions of health care providers. (+)	2.3 (8)	Liberal Party
Amend legislation to clearly define “reasonably foreseeable” to reduce uncertainty and prevent vague application (/)	1.5 (5)	Conservative Party; Bloc Québécois
We must restrict access to medical assistance in dying to terminally ill individuals with strict safeguards and punitive measures against coercion (/)	1.2 (4)	Conservative Party
On reasonable foreseeability and diagnosis, we leave the determination up to medical practitioners. The requirement of reasonable foreseeability must be in conjunction with an irreversible state of decline or a trajectory toward death (+)	1.2 (4)	Liberal Party
Amend legislation to require a psychiatrist undertake an evaluation of the patient who is determined to have an underlying mental health challenge to determine capacity to consent on a decision that is ultimately irreversible (/)	0.9 (3)	Conservative Party

We must also respect the rights of people seeking this procedure by ensuring that those providers who have expressed a preparedness to help patients can do so without fear of criminal prosecution. Under Bill C-14, certain health care providers, such as physicians, pharmacists and authorized nurse practitioners who administer medical assistance in dying would be exempt from criminal prosecution (+)	0.9 (3)	Liberal Party
Bill C-14 is neither too restrictive nor too permissive. It strikes the correct balance, while simultaneously recognizing that with further study and mandatory review, the balance will continue to be recalibrated to reflect new evidence and evolving societal values respecting medical assistance in dying (+)	0.9 (3)	Liberal Party
Ensure a robust prior review of social vulnerabilities for every patient considering MAiD (/)	0.6 (2)	Conservative Party
I believe that not only should two doctors be required to sign off but that there should be a requirement for a psychological examination or independent oversight from a social worker to be done on patients before they can access assisted suicide or euthanasia (/)	0.6 (2)	Conservative Party
Physician-assisted dying must also be made available in places where there are very few doctors and very few medical services (/)	0.6 (2)	New Democratic Party
Bill C-14 does not sufficiently protect vulnerable persons, persons particularly with underlying mental health challenges (cognitively challenged) (/)	0.6 (2)	Conservative Party
Bill C-14 does not contain the safeguards we need to ensure that there are precautions in place so that someone who took someone's life without consent would be effectively prosecuted (/)	0.6 (2)	Conservative Party
It makes sense to limit medical assistance in dying to situations where death is reasonably foreseeable, where our physicians, nurse practitioners, and others, can draw on their existing ethical and practical knowledge, training, and expertise in addressing these challenging circumstances (+)	0.3 (1)	Liberal Party
We must remove the criterion of "reasonably foreseeable natural death". Patients wants to put an end to the irreversible process of a slow death (/)	0.3 (1)	New Democratic Party

Amend Bill C-14 to ensure that it does not provide a future opportunity for people who are mentally ill to be able to request MAiD (/)	0.3 (1)	Conservative Party
If we pass this legislation without conscience protection, presumably euthanasia and assisted suicide will enter the standard of care and then fit within that existing policy framework of the College of Physicians and Surgeons in Ontario (/)	0.3 (1)	Conservative Party
We may have been tasked by the court to address the constitutionality of the current laws, but we are tasked by Canadians to go beyond that. The law we put forward should not simply fall within a range of reasonable options. It should be the best possible law we are capable of drafting (+)	0.3 (1)	Liberal Party
We must address the issue, so let us address it in the most restrictive fashion we can so that it is an exception in our society when someone is able to have doctor-assisted suicide or euthanasia (/)	0.3 (1)	Conservative Party

Appendix 2: Frames Used by Members of Parliament and Invited Guests During Bill C-14 Committee Meetings

Bill C-14 – Committee Meetings		
Moral Frames (23.6% of all Frames, N = 86)		
	Frequency of Frame as % of all Moral Frames (N)	Policy Actors that Used the Frame
We must protect and respect the conscience rights of health care providers against compelled participation in killing (MAiD) (/)	17.6 (16)	Conservative Party; Evangelical Fellowship of Canada; Christian Legal Fellowship; Coalition for HealthCARE and Conscience; Canadian Council of Imams; Physicians' Alliance against Euthanasia
We must protect the most vulnerable members of society, including seniors and those who do not consent or who do not want this (/)	17.6 (16)	Conservative Party; Living with Dignity; Euthanasia Prevention Coalition; Euthanasia Prevention Coalition of British Columbia; Canadian Association for Community Living; Communication Disabilities Access Canada

Ensuring patient autonomy and access to a peaceful death without prolonged suffering (+)	14.3 (13)	Liberal Party; Dying With Dignity Canada; End of Life Planning Canada; Alliance of People with Disabilities Who Are Supportive of Legal Assisted Dying Society
By denying advance consent, the government closes the door to relief for those who would suffer terribly, and that option should remain available (/)	12.1 (11)	New Democratic Party; Dying With Dignity Canada; Canadian Association of Retired Persons
Dignity is expressed through the value of human life, even among suffering. Life is a gift from God and we should respect it /contend for life (-)	8.8 (8)	Conservative Party; Evangelical Fellowship of Canada; Canadian Council of Imams; Centre for Israel and Jewish Affairs
We must ensure safeguards protect Canadians from abuse and mitigate harms inherent in legalizing the killing of human beings (/)	3.3 (3)	Conservative Party
Assisted-dying is misaligned with efforts to build a happy, productive and better society (a society which contends for life) (-)	3.3 (3)	Conservative Party; Association for Reformed Political Action
Age requirement is discriminatory. A 16-year-old with a brain tumour will suffer as much as a 36-year-old (/)	3.3 (3)	New Democratic Party; Dying With Dignity Canada
Real people suffering in agony will have their charter rights limited every day until the government commissions the studies (i.e., access for mature minors and where mental illness is the sole underlying medical condition, and advance requests) and then reports back to Parliament. They deserve more than Bill C-14 provides (/)	3.3 (3)	New Democratic Party
Mandatory waiting periods (i.e., 15-17 days) may be arbitrary, cause suffering, and raise section 7 and cruel-and-unusual concerns (/)	3.3 (3)	New Democratic Party; Dying With Dignity Canada
Bill C-14 respects personal autonomy, protects the vulnerable, and affirms the inherent value in every human life (+)	2.2 (2)	Liberal Party
"Reasonably foreseeable" clause limits the good we can do with this legislation. Compassion should not be limited to those on the verge of death (/)	2.2 (2)	New Democratic Party
We must have robust safeguards to prevent abuse and mitigate harms in the legalization of physician-assisted killing (/)	1.1 (1)	Conservative Party
Allowing doctors to intentionally end the life of their patients are contrary to the goals of medicine and the good of our patients, especially the most vulnerable and those who cannot speak for themselves (-)	1.1 (1)	Conservative Party

Discriminating against whole groups of people based solely on their medical condition may very well be a charter discrimination, and a violation of their charter of rights (/)	1.1 (1)	Dying with Dignity Canada
Instrumental Frames (14.3% of all Frames, N = 52)		
	Frequency of Frame as % of all Instrumental Frames (N)	Policy Actors that Used the Frame
Balancing respect for health care providers' conscience rights with ensuring access to willing providers through collaboration with provinces and territories (+)	25.5 (12)	Liberal Party; Canadian Medical Association; College of Family Physicians of Canada
It is incumbent upon parliamentarians to put in place a national framework around our medical assistance in dying to ensure that there are the appropriate and necessary safeguards in place, to ensure certainty for medical practitioners, and to ensure that there is access for patients who want to access medical assistance in dying (+)	12.8 (6)	Liberal Party; Canadian Medical Association; Canadian Nurses Protective Society; Barreau du Québec
Warning that Bill C-14 is the thin edge of the wedge toward expanded assisted-suicide policies targeting children, the disabled, the chronically ill, the elderly, and non-productive Canadians / slippery slope (-)	12.8 (6)	Conservative Party; Living with Dignity; Euthanasia Prevention Coalition; Association for Reformed Political Action
Five-year review clause, and national reporting system, is another important safeguard. It would allow for future improvements and modifications, if need be. This included detailed reporting from provinces and territories (+)	10.6 (5)	Liberal Party; Canadian Medical Association; Barreau du Québec
Ensuring Canadians have access to all end-of-life care options (+)	6.4 (3)	Liberal Party; Dying With Dignity Canada; Canadian Association of Retired Persons
Government must ensure that the people who make use of this legislation are making a clear and informed choice and have all of the information they need to make an informed decision (/)	6.4 (3)	Conservative Party
Advancing a balanced legislative approach to respect patient autonomy and protect vulnerable persons and conscience rights (+)	4.3 (2)	Liberal Party

Serious concerns about explicitly granting conscience rights to publicly funded institutions, especially when they may be the only option in a community; since institutions are not people, do not have Charter rights, and this doesn't meet what we're trying to accomplish (+)	4.3 (2)	Liberal Party
Cautious about defining hastened death as health care because it would relinquish MAiD from federal jurisdiction and make it difficult to deny access (/)	4.3 (2)	Conservative Party
Adopting an approach that respects the Charter and the needs and values of Canadians (+)	2.1 (1)	Liberal Party
With the absence of decisions regarding advance directives, a two-tiered system may emerge where wealthy Canadians can access assisted dying abroad while those with modest means cannot (/)	2.1 (1)	New Democratic Party
Doctors may face lawsuits/unemployment for failure to comply with a patient who wishes to die, if conscience protections are not in place (/)	2.1 (1)	Conservative Party
MAiD should not be seen as a new normal medical response to suffering or even just as one option among and equal to others (/)	2.1 (1)	Conservative Party
Bill C-14 is silent on protections for health institutions. Physicians would be forced to provide MAiD or refer patients, which may go against their conscience. If we are to insist that those institutions now need to participate in physician-assisted dying, we may end up losing a lot of health care facilities in our country (/)	2.1 (1)	Conservative Party
Reasonable foreseeability of death is a standard that provides sufficient guidance to physicians and nurse practitioners by taking out a lot of the subjectivity that was left by the court's undefined concept of a grievous condition, while allowing those with the necessary medical knowledge and expertise to make the decisions based on the individual circumstances of each case (+)	2.1 (1)	Liberal Party
The requirement that the person's natural death be reasonably foreseeable provides a fair way to restrict eligibility without making assisted dying available to everyone; it also protects the vulnerable (+)	2.1 (1)	Liberal Party

Other approaches to eligibility that were proposed and suggested would be arbitrary. They are not viable options as they discriminate on the basis of a person's medical condition from the outset rather than allowing the medical practitioner to consider all of the person's circumstance (+)	2.1 (1)	Liberal Party
MAiD should not be available for any and all type of suffering, because it would greatly increase the risk to vulnerable people, contribute to the stigmatization of persons with disabilities, could undermine suicide prevention; and it could lead marginalized or lonely individuals to seek medical assistance to end their lives prematurely (+)	2.1 (1)	Liberal Party
Noting that many First Nations communities and the Canadian health care system are not fully prepared for Bill C-14 due to ongoing oppression, intergenerational effects of residential schools, and the need for cultural safety models (/)	2.1 (1)	New Democratic Party
Recommend that the ability to provide assistance in dying, including access to substances that cause death, be limited to specially trained and certified health care practitioners authorized by the Minister of Health and the Minister of Justice. This would ensure that vulnerable patients are protected from fatal errors (/)	2.1 (1)	Conservative Party
Procedural Frames (62.1% of all Frames, N = 226)		
	Frequency of Frame as % of all Procedural Frames (N)	Policy Actors that Used the Frame
Bill C-14 is flawed (doesn't adequately respond to Carter) and likely unconstitutional. Amendments should be adopted. Bill should not be rushed. Further safeguards (and advance consent) will protect autonomy (/)	23.5 (53)	Conservative Party; New Democratic Party; Canadian Council of Criminal Defence Lawyers; Dying With Dignity Canada
No conscience protections in Bill C-14; responsibility shifted to provinces, colleges and regulating bodies; federal government has a duty to protect rights of physicians, allied health professionals, and health institutions (/)	10.6 (24)	Conservative Party; Coalition for HealthCARE and Conscience; Christian Legal Fellowship

Amend legislation to clearly define “reasonably foreseeable” to reduce uncertainty and prevent vague application (/)	8.0 (18)	Conservative Party; Bloc Québécois; Canadian Civil Liberties Association; Barreau du Québec
Encourage the government to amend this legislation to include a system of advance review (judicial oversight) by competent legal authority (/)	7.1 (16)	Conservative Party
A person must be competent at the time MAiD is provided (advance directives would not be permitted). Requests must be fully informed and free from coercion (+)	6.2 (14)	Liberal Party
The lack of advance directives in the legislation is also too restrictive (/)	4.4 (10)	New Democratic Party
this proposed legislation does not compel any health care practitioner to provide medical assistance in dying. Practitioners will have the right to choose as their conscience dictates (+)	4.0 (9)	Liberal Party
Employed safeguards into the legislation to protect the vulnerable (+)	3.5 (8)	Liberal Party
Need to exempt health care providers from criminal prosecution when counselling patients for MAiD (/)	3.1 (7)	Conservative Party
Amend legislation to require a psychiatrist undertake an evaluation of the patient who is determined to have an underlying mental health challenge to determine capacity to consent on a decision that is ultimately irreversible (/)	2.7 (6)	Conservative Party
Need to exempt health care providers from criminal prosecution when acting in good faith, make mistakes facilitating MAiD (/)	2.7 (6)	Conservative Party
Ensure a robust prior review of social vulnerabilities for every patient considering MAiD (/)	1.8 (4)	Conservative Party
It makes sense to limit medical assistance in dying to situations where death is reasonably foreseeable, where our physicians, nurse practitioners, and others, can draw on their existing ethical and practical knowledge, training, and expertise in addressing these challenging circumstances (+)	1.8 (4)	Liberal Party
Bill C-14 meets and answers the Supreme Court of Canada decision in Carter (+)	1.8 (4)	Liberal Party
Bill C-14 is neither too restrictive nor too permissive. It strikes the correct balance, while simultaneously recognizing that with further	1.8 (4)	Liberal Party

study and mandatory review, the balance will continue to be recalibrated to reflect new evidence and evolving societal values respecting medical assistance in dying (+)		
In my opinion, it's a mistake to consider conscience rights part of criminal law. Those rights fall under medical ethics and provincial laws that also govern medical practice. The bill does not cover this, and I think that is a wise constitutional decision (+)	1.3 (3)	Liberal Party
We must include stronger safeguards for people with communication disabilities. These safeguards must include a directive to medical practitioners to engage a communication professional to assess the patient and to provide any required accommodations and supports (/)	1.3 (3)	Communication Disabilities Access Canada
Five-year review clause is too long; a shorter period of review should be established, specifying certain topics that must be reviewed (/)	1.3 (3)	New Democratic Party
I believe that not only should two doctors be required to sign off but that there should be a requirement for a psychological examination or independent oversight from a social worker to be done on patients before they can access assisted suicide or euthanasia (/)	0.9 (2)	Conservative Party
Amend Bill C-14 to ensure that it does not provide a future opportunity for people who are mentally ill to be able to request MAiD (/)	0.9 (2)	Conservative Party
We must also respect the rights of people seeking this procedure by ensuring that those providers who have expressed a preparedness to help patients can do so without fear of criminal prosecution. Under Bill C-14, certain health care providers, such as physicians, pharmacists and authorized nurse practitioners who administer medical assistance in dying would be exempt from criminal prosecution (+)	0.9 (2)	Liberal Party
The fact that the Supreme Court's decision in Carter does not squarely address mature minors or advance directives does not in our view diminish the government's or Parliament's obligations to respect charter rights or to guard against needless suffering (/)	0.9 (2)	New Democratic Party
We need to set very strict and restrictive parameters, including a punitive measure for those who would seek to pressure, force, or coerce anyone to assist someone in taking his or her life (/)	0.9 (2)	Conservative Party

The Minister of Justice and the Minister of Health must no later than 180 days after the day on which this Act receives royal assent, initiate one or more independent reviews of issues relating to requests made by mature minors for medical assistance in dying, to advance requests and to requests for mental illness as a sole underlying medical condition (+)	0.9 (2)	Liberal Party
In addition to these robust safeguards, the enactment of definitions for medical assistance in dying, as well as what constitutes a grievous and irremediable medical condition in federal legislation, is essential to the achievement of a consistent, pan-Canadian framework (+)	0.9 (2)	Liberal Party
These safeguards may not be sufficient to help protect all Canadians. These limits can be more stringent than those specified in Carter to ensure appropriate (/)	0.9 (2)	Conservative Party
Eligibility criteria must be more clearly defined to ensure appropriate access to MAiD and to protect vulnerable patients (/)	0.9 (2)	Conservative Party
Physicians and nurse practitioners who are going to be engaged in medically assisted dying must receive appropriate/required training, including cultural training for interactions with First Nations communities (+)	0.9 (2)	College of Family Physicians of Canada
Nurse practitioners should not be eligible to qualify for the exemption for medical assistance in dying. It needs to be somebody at the medical practitioner level. MAiD is a very serious assessment and should be taken with more care (/)	0.9 (2)	Conservative Party
We must place the onus on the medical or nurse practitioner performing the procedure to ensure that all criteria are met, making them responsible for killing someone who does not meet the criteria (/)	0.9 (2)	Conservative Party
I believe crafting the legislation to require two independent medical opinions is important. It would give us some parameters of reassurance to operate under (+)	0.4 (1)	College of Family Physicians of Canada
As it stands, the two-doctor standard for assessing consent and capacity, I would suggest, is insufficient, and I think I've been echoed in that concern by others (/)	0.4 (1)	Conservative Party

We do not believe it's within the scope of practice for pharmacists to make a judgment on capacity assessment of the validity of a patient's consent (/)	0.4 (1)	Conservative Party
Committed to work going forward with provinces and territories to support access for medical assistance in dying, while simultaneously respecting the personal convictions of health care providers (+)	0.4 (1)	Liberal Party
Independent recommendations on mature minors and mental illness should be required by statute. At the moment, the preamble to Bill C-14 makes only a non-binding pledge to explore these other situations, but these topics are too important to be left to such an uncertain process (/)	0.4 (1)	New Democratic Party
Bill C-14 as it is currently drafted, with the recommendation that the trifecta of age, mental illness, and capacity assessment, or advance directive, should be studied in an expedient manner and in a thorough manner in the coming days (+)	0.4 (1)	Liberal Party

Appendix 3: Frames Used by Members of Parliament during Bill C-45 House of Commons Debates

Bill C-45 - House of Commons Debates		
Moral Frames (16.9% of all Frames, N = 177)		
	Frequency of Frame as % of all Moral Frames (N)	Policy Actors that Used the Frame
It is about protecting the health of Canadians, and most importantly, the health of young people and children (+)	26.1 (49)	Liberal Party
Marijuana is bad and dangerous and must not be normalized; legalization sends the wrong message to young Canadians, and efforts should focus on prevention and supporting families (-)	18.1 (34)	Conservative Party
If the government legalizes this drug, people, youth, and families will suffer/be less safe. It would have a big impact on Canadians overall health and well-being (-)	8.0 (15)	Conservative Party
Marijuana is the perfect gateway to other harder, stronger, more chemical-based, and more addictive drugs (-)	6.9 (13)	Conservative Party

Marijuana is bad, and the government has a responsibility to protect citizens, especially children, by making access and distribution as difficult as possible; the bill falls far short and needs significant changes (/)	6.9 (13)	Conservative Party
Our aim is to minimize the harms associated with cannabis use. (+)	5.9 (11)	Liberal Party
The government is delivering on a regrettable, dangerous, and perhaps even deadly election promise. It is unacceptable for the Liberal government to make ours one of the few countries in the world to legalize marijuana consumption (-)	5.9 (11)	Conservative Party
It is important for young people to know that marijuana is not good for their health and that excessive use jeopardizes their future. It should not be legal (-)	5.3 (10)	Conservative Party
We want to make sure that when we are talking about 18-year-olds or above using cannabis, we understand that these individuals have reached the age of majority. They have the capacity to make choices. We are not encouraging the use of cannabis; we are saying that well-informed adults have the ability to make a decision on their own (+)	2.7 (5)	Liberal Party; New Democratic Party
Zero grams is the only safe amount for our children, not the four grams proposed by the government (/)	2.7 (5)	Conservative Party
Legalizing cannabis for adults in Canada and the possibility of having a few plants at home will not put children in harm's way. We want to give parents the responsibility of keeping these plants safe at home and educating their family and children, as any good, responsible parent should do (+)	1.6 (3)	Liberal Party
One child with an addiction is one too many. It affects the entire family. It can result in suicide (-)	1.1 (2)	Conservative Party
It is distressing that legalization encourages marijuana use, especially among youth, contradicting years of public health efforts to prevent them from starting (-)	1.1 (2)	Conservative Party
Let us invest in awareness-raising campaigns, persuade our youth to participate in sports, arts, and cultural activities, and get our young people involved elsewhere, rather than let them hang out in the streets. Let us educate them. We would have a solution and we would not need to legalize marijuana (/)	1.1 (2)	Conservative Party

Bill C-45 introduces a new toxic substance, putting girls and unborn children at greater risk, with high addiction rates among teenagers, especially single pregnant teens (-)	0.5 (1)	Conservative Party
Because young people are more susceptible to THC's negative effects on brain development, legalization should not permit possession by children as young as 12 (/)	0.5 (1)	Conservative Party
Instrumental Frames (56.8% of all Frames, N = 595)		
	Frequency of Frame as % of all Instrumental Frames (N)	Policy Actors that Used the Frame
Government is committed to legalizing, restricting, and strictly regulating cannabis to protect Canadians' health and safety, keep it from youth, and remove profits from criminals through a legal market (+)	26.2 (153)	Liberal Party
Bill does not reflect government objectives; it risks greater access for children, potential exploitation by crime, and fails to stop organized crime (/)	16.6 (97)	Conservative Party
Canada's current system of controlling cannabis through the criminal justice system (status quo) does not adequately protect the health and safety of Canadians, especially youth. It has allowed criminals and organized crime to profit, while failing to keep cannabis out of the hands of young Canadians (+)	14.7 (86)	Liberal Party; New Democratic Party
Right now it is easier for children to acquire marijuana than it is for them to acquire tobacco or alcohol, with our youth having some of the highest rates of cannabis use in the world (+)	6.0 (35)	Liberal Party
Warning of a slippery slope from marijuana legalization; Bill C-45 follows the Colorado model, which has caused problems in its jurisdictions (-)	4.8 (28)	Conservative Party
Legalizing marijuana will leave provinces and municipalities to address problems in public safety, health, and education; government must be clear about provincial responsibilities (/)	3.8 (22)	Conservative Party

Legal age for cannabis consumption should be raised to 25 to protect youth. Brain development is still ongoing between ages 18-21 (/)	1.9 (11)	Conservative Party
Our American counterparts have found an increase in impaired driving following the legalization of marijuana. There is little doubt that Canadians will see a similar increase of drug-impaired driving if marijuana is legalized (-)	1.7 (10)	Conservative Party
Concerns about Canada-U.S. border crossings if legalization occurs, as most U.S. border states have not legalized recreational marijuana; government must educate youth about lifetime bans for violations (/)	1.7 (10)	Conservative Party
Legalizing and regulating cannabis would put criminal gangs out of the cannabis business and deliver a massive financial blow by cutting off revenue that funds harder drugs, guns, and community violence (+)	1.5 (9)	Liberal Party
The war on drugs has been a complete failure; billions spent have ruined lives, tied up courts, and a new strategy is needed to redirect resources into better programs (+)	1.5 (9)	Liberal Party; New Democratic Party
Instead of legalization, cannabis should become a ticketing offence so that police can still confiscate that drug (/)	1.5 (9)	Conservative Party
For youth, Bill C-45 would also seek to avoid the negative lifelong consequences of possessing very small amounts of cannabis. Bill C-45 proposes that youth under 18 years of age would not be subject to criminal prosecution for possession of up to five grams of cannabis (+)	1.5 (9)	Liberal Party
In addition to protecting public health and safety, the government aims to avoid criminalizing Canadians for minor cannabis offences, which can have significant consequences (+)	1.5 (9)	Liberal Party
One of the big concerns with cannabis today is that people who are purchasing it have no idea what they are getting. Bill C-45 will ensure that the supply was safe, securely cleared and federally licensed (+)	1.5 (9)	Liberal Party
While we wait for legalization, the Liberal government is ignoring the tens of thousands of charges and criminal records handed out for simple possession, which disproportionately affect young and racialized Canadians. We want an interim measure of decriminalization (/)	1.5 (9)	New Democratic Party

Bill C-45 has the goal of preventing young people from accessing cannabis (+)	1.4 (8)	Liberal Party
If we look at it through the lens of raising taxes, it starts to make some sense. This bill is all about that (/)	1.4 (8)	Conservative Party
The benefits of removing the criminalization of cannabis is that judges and the justice system would have more time to deal with more serious offences, and police resources will be saved (+)	1.0 (6)	Liberal Party; New Democratic Party
Government's approach is improvised and trivializes the use of marijuana. Even though the bill has not yet been passed, the government's lazy approach trivializes young people's use of drugs, which is already having devastating effects. We want to achieve exactly the opposite effect (/)	1.0 (6)	Conservative Party
Government is trying to reduce cannabis use by youth, to restrict their ability to obtain the product, to provide them with better information on its health harms and risks, and to keep them out of the hands of the criminal justice system for possessing even small amounts of cannabis (+)	0.7 (4)	Liberal Party
This bill will have many more implications for the Government of Quebec than it will for the Government of Canada. It raises issues related to public health, safety, education, economic development, agriculture, and more. This file raises a lot of issues that do not fall within Ottawa's jurisdiction (/)	0.7 (4)	Bloc Québécois
There are dangers for young people who may come into contact with marijuana edibles. This is an issue that is not properly addressed in Bill C-45 (/)	0.7 (4)	Conservative Party
Research proves that marijuana can have dangerous effects on children's brain development and overall health, which can lead to an increase in cannabis-related hospitalizations, as seen in jurisdictions that have already legalized marijuana (-)	0.7 (4)	Conservative Party
To deter criminal activity and protect the health and safety of Canadians, our government is committed to ensuring that there is a safe and legal controlled supply of cannabis available for sale when the act comes into force (+)	0.7 (4)	Liberal Party

Bill C-45 includes the authority to make regulations that could require cannabis to be sold in child-resistant packaging to protect our youngest ones from accidentally consuming the product (+)	0.7 (4)	Liberal Party
To simply decriminalize right now, absent a comprehensive regulatory framework, will not achieve the objectives we are seeking to achieve with the legalization of cannabis. We need to have a regulatory framework in place (+)	0.5 (3)	Liberal Party
Marijuana kills brain cells that do not regenerate. Alcohol does not kill brain cells. There is a risk of permanent damage to mental health with marijuana (-)	0.5 (3)	Conservative Party
Alcohol is a legal and controlled substance and young people have access to it anyway. It is therefore not true to say that by legalizing marijuana, we are going to limit how much access young people have to drugs (/)	0.3 (2)	Conservative Party
No matter what Liberals say, children smoke pot with their parents. This is the way it works. To suggest that all of a sudden we should not worry because it will be a legal product that will solve that problem is very naïve (/)	0.3 (2)	Conservative Party
The cannabis act is replete with arbitrary cut-offs that do nothing to protect our children from the dangers of marijuana. In fact, we believe they expose them to greater risk (/)	0.3 (2)	Conservative Party
Government wants to line the pockets of their Liberal cronies at the expense of the health and safety of Canadians (/)	0.3 (2)	Conservative Party
Many Canadian business leaders are concerned that marijuana legalization could create workplace safety problems, exposing employers and employees to legal risks, more accidents, increased absenteeism, and lower productivity (-)	0.3 (2)	Conservative Party
Bill C-45 strikes the right balance by allowing industry to promote products in a controlled manner, protecting youth and public health while enabling adults to make informed decisions (+)	0.3 (2)	Liberal Party
We need measures like Bill C-45 to create a safe environment for Canada's youth so that this next generation of leaders can flourish (+)	0.2 (1)	Liberal Party
Decriminalizing cannabis would not meet government objectives; Bill C-45 establishes a complex regime for legalization and strict	0.2 (1)	Liberal Party

regulation, developed with input from Canadians and in collaboration with provinces, territories, and municipalities (+)		
Legalization would mean more injuries, more deaths, and more carnage on our roads (-)	0.2 (1)	Conservative Party
The new system will also help protect the health of adult Canadians by ensuring that the cannabis available on the legal market is produced in a controlled environment, correctly labelled, and free of any additives or dangerous chemical products (+)	0.2 (1)	Liberal Party
Government is investing in robust measures to make sure all Canadians, especially young people, are aware of the risks associated with cannabis use (+)	0.2 (1)	Liberal Party
If we are serious about Canadians' health and safety, this is not the route to take; cannabis will be in homes and accessible to children who never considered using it (-)	0.2 (1)	Conservative Party
Questioning why the government did not make marijuana an over-the-counter drug, which could have been safer by allowing purchase through pharmacies with pharmacist guidance (/)	0.2 (1)	Conservative Party
The proposed approach to youth cannabis possession does not encourage it but recognizes that a balanced strategy using multiple tools, not just the criminal justice system, better reduces youth consumption (+)	0.2 (1)	Liberal Party
Working with international experts, including the United Nations, to fulfill commitments, promote public health, and combat illicit drug trafficking (+)	0.2 (1)	Liberal Party
Three international treaties will be violated if the government goes ahead with the legalization of marijuana (/)	0.2 (1)	Conservative Party
Procedural Frames (26.3% of all Frames, N = 275)		
	Frequency of Frame as % of all Procedural Frames (N)	Policy Actors who Used the Frame

Rushing legislation with wide-ranging national effects is short-sighted and ill-advised; the bill is flawed, lacks scientific evidence, and the government should reconsider its timelines (/)	17.8 (49)	New Democratic Party; Conservative Party
Ensuring a public health and safety approach by using \$9.6 million from Budget 2017 and continuing a broad-based public education campaign on cannabis' detrimental impacts on brain development, addiction, impaired driving, and mental health (+)	16.0 (44)	Liberal Party
Under the proposed legislation, federal, provincial, and territorial governments share responsibility: federal government oversees production and sets industry-wide standards, while provinces and territories manage distribution and sales (+)	13.1 (36)	Liberal Party
Bill C-45 includes provisions to protect youth, including prohibiting selling or providing cannabis to anyone under 18, with penalties up to 14 years, and making it an offence to enlist youth in cannabis-related crimes (+)	12.0 (33)	Liberal Party
To support protecting youth, Bill C-45 makes it illegal to sell products appealing to youth and enacts comprehensive advertising restrictions to prevent promotions and other messaging that encourage uses (+)	7.3 (20)	Liberal Party
We need to have the means to match our ambitions. Government must invest more money into prevention. The last budget provided nothing for prevention, even though that is crucial (/)	6.5 (18)	New Democratic Party
Revenue from cannabis taxation should be directed to addiction treatment, mental health support, and education programs, not general revenues, recognizing the close link between mental health and addiction (+)	4.4 (12)	Liberal Party; New Democratic Party
Government is committed to working with provinces and territories to encourage the creation of non-criminal offences prohibiting youth possession, allowing police to seize cannabis without imposing criminal sanctions (+)	4.0 (11)	Liberal Party
Bill C-45 provides little clarity on the flexibility granted to provinces and municipalities for implementation and does not adequately address retraining costs for law enforcement under Criminal Code change (/)	2.5 (7)	Conservative Party

It is important to undo the past injustices of this incredibly outdated law and to suspend the criminal records of any Canadian affected by a possession charge and a record, once Bill C-45 is passed (+)	2.2 (6)	Liberal Party; New Democratic Party
The most serious shortcoming of the Liberal bill is that it moves straight to legalization rather than a step-by-step approach, starting with decriminalization; we risk being stuck with this decision that treats a health problem like a crime problem (/)	2.2 (6)	New Democratic Party
There is nothing in Bill C-45 that would provide the legal ability for young people under the age of 18 to access cannabis (+)	1.8 (5)	Liberal Party
There is no funding for teachers and front-line workers to conduct public awareness campaigns on cannabis' effects on health, behaviour, and legal aspects; youth may not realize that arrests could lead to a criminal record, and the information is unclear (/)	1.8 (5)	Conservative Party
The government's decision to move hastily on such an important piece of legislation is concerning (/)	1.5 (4)	Conservative Party
Bill C-45 addresses public safety but not public health, lacking research on cannabis effects; investment in research and prevention programs at the provincial level is needed (/)	1.5 (4)	New Democratic Party
Concerned about the legal age of cannabis and the potential effects on the health of Canadians; it is not unreasonable to want a full understanding of the health effects of cannabis use before it is legalized (/)	1.5 (4)	Conservative Party
Bill C-45 does not sufficiently educate youth on the dangers of driving high; if the government proceeds, it must prioritize public awareness campaigns to protect young people (/)	1.1 (3)	Conservative Party
Punishments in the bill, including indictable offences and prison sentences up to 14 years, seem excessive; questions remain whether the government is open to amendments (/)	1.1 (3)	New Democratic Party
Recognizing that some provinces and territories may not have systems set up and running upon royal assent, our government is proposing to facilitate access for Canadians to a regulated, quality controlled supply of cannabis through a secure mail system via existing licensed producers (+)	0.4 (1)	Liberal Party

On this road to legalization, the government must be very clear and must have the resources to make sure we have that public awareness and that public health approach (/)	0.4 (1)	New Democratic Party
A framework is needed for employers to lawfully manage workplace risks from cannabis use, including the option to test employees when safety standards may be violated (/)	0.4 (1)	Conservative Party
This bill makes no mention of mental health, even though this issue should have been included and studied (/)	0.4 (1)	Conservative Party
If the Liberals want to make it accessible, they should have the quality and the toxicity created in a controlled environment with health and safety behind it (/)	0.4 (1)	New Democratic Party

Appendix 4: Frames Used by Members of Parliament and Invited Guests During Bill C-45 Committee Meetings

Bill C-45 – Committee Meetings		
Moral Frames (19.2% of all Frames, N = 79)		
	Frequency of Frame as % of all Moral Frames (N)	Policy Actors who Used the Frame
It is about protecting the health of Canadians, and most importantly, the health of young people and children (+)	23.0 (20)	Liberal Party
Bill C-45 aims to minimize the harms associated with cannabis use (+)	12.6 (11)	Liberal Party
Canada, as a constitutional democracy, must uphold individual freedom and responsibility, allowing Canadians to make autonomous decisions about their bodily integrity without undue state interference or criminalization (+)	10.3 (9)	Liberal Party
It is important for young people to know that marijuana is not good for their health and that excessive use jeopardizes their future. It should not be legal (-)	6.9 (6)	Conservative Party
Adequately fund public education campaigns to reinforce that cannabis is not safe for children and youth by raising awareness of the harms associated with cannabis use and dependence (+)	5.7 (5)	Educators for Sensible Drug Policy

For individuals 18 and older, who have reached the age of majority, we recognize their capacity to make choices; we are not encouraging cannabis use, but affirming that well-informed adults can make their own decisions (+)	4.6 (4)	Liberal Party; New Democratic Party
Zero grams is the only safe amount for our children, not the four grams proposed by the government. There is no safe age for experimentation (/)	3.4 (3)	Conservative Party
Marijuana is the perfect gateway to other harder, stronger, more chemical-based, and more addictive drugs (-)	3.4 (3)	Conservative Party
Legalization age of 18-19 seems reasonable to minimizing the harms to youth, similar to that of the purchase of alcohol (+)	3.4 (3)	Liberal Party
Cannabis is potentially dangerous, especially for young people. It is bad. Addictive and harmful to developing adolescent brains (-)	2.3 (2)	Conservative Party
These harms are distinctly different from the harms of use of other substances, such as tobacco, alcohol, and opioids, but they're no less serious or consequential (-)	2.3 (2)	Conservative Party
If the government legalizes cannabis, people, youth, and families will suffer, and overall Canadian health and well-being will be negatively impacted (-)	2.3 (2)	Conservative Party
Adults who use this drug do not deserve the application of the criminal sanction, nor do children or minors who use this drug (+)	2.3 (2)	Professor Neil Boyd (Professor of Criminology, Simon Fraser University, As an Individual); Criminal Lawyers' Association
Passing Bill C-45 and legally regulating non-medical cannabis aims to minimize the social and individual costs of prohibition while supporting public health and human rights to the fullest extent possible (+)	2.3 (2)	Liberal Party
Pricing can be used to reduce youth cannabis use. Setting the price according to product potency, and in the case of cannabis by level of THC—can incentivize the use of lower-risk products (+)	2.3 (2)	Canadian Centre on Substance Use and Addiction
The simple fact is that criminalization of marijuana kills (+)	1.1 (1)	Mr. Michael Spratt (Criminal Lawyer, Abergel Goldstein and Partners, As an Individual)
We believe this is the path to minimizing infectious disease such as hepatitis C and HIV, reducing overdose and social stigma, and promoting public health and safety objectives (+)	1.1 (1)	Canadian Drug Policy Coalition

Encourage provincial and territorial governments to limit the sale of cannabis to government-controlled entities to ensure that the focus remains on harm reduction, not profit (+)	1.1 (1)	Canadian Public Health Association
Instrumental Frames (58.2% of all Frames, N = 239)		
	Frequency of Frame as % of all Instrumental Frames (N)	Policy Actors who Used the Frame
The federal government must exercise caution, establish public health objectives, be accountable, and focus on education about youth consumption, protecting Canadians, and reducing harm (+)	8.4 (20)	Liberal Party; New Democratic Party; Canadian Public Health Association; Canadian Drug Policy Coalition
Right now it is easier for children to acquire marijuana than it is for them to acquire tobacco or alcohol, with our youth having some of the highest rates of cannabis use in the world (+)	8.0 (19)	Liberal Party
Government is committed to legalizing, restricting, and strictly regulating cannabis to protect Canadians' health and safety, keep it from youth, and remove profits from criminals through a legal market (+)	6.7 (16)	Liberal Party
An immediate education program is needed to ensure youth understand that marijuana is not healthy, using evidence-informed messaging targeted to youth and young adults (+)	5.9 (14)	Liberal Party; Canadian Centre on Substance Use and Addiction; Canadian Paediatric Society; Canadian Medical Association
Canada's current system of controlling cannabis through the criminal justice system (status quo) does not adequately protect the health and safety of Canadians, especially youth. It has allowed criminals and organized crime to profit, while failing to keep cannabis out of the hands of young Canadians (+)	5.5 (13)	Liberal Party; New Democratic Party
Bill C-45 must include measures that will allow the legal industry to compete with the black market, notably in relation to price, branding, and advertising, within well-regulated parameters to help eliminate confusion in the marketplace about legitimate sources and to guide Canadians in their use of a new and complex product (+)	5.0 (12)	Liberal Party; New Democratic Party; Cannabis Canada Association

People currently using the black market may not transition to the licit system if taxes are too high or access is less convenient or affordable, making it difficult to shift them to the regulated market (/)	5.0 (12)	Conservative Party; Canadian Public Health Association; Canadian Drug Policy Coalition
Bill does not reflect government objectives; it risks greater access for children, potential exploitation by crime, and fails to stop organized crime (/)	4.2 (10)	Conservative Party
Bill C-45 has the goal of preventing young people from accessing cannabis (+)	3.8 (9)	Liberal Party
The benefits of removing the criminalization of cannabis is that judges and the justice system would have more time to deal with more serious offences, and police resources will be saved (+)	3.4 (8)	Liberal Party; New Democratic Party
Legal age for cannabis consumption should be raised to 21 or 25 to protect youth, with restrictions on quantities and potency for those under 25, as brain development continues and damage can be permanent (/)	2.9 (7)	Conservative Party
In addition to protecting public health and safety, the government aims to avoid criminalizing Canadians for minor cannabis offences, which can have significant consequences (+)	2.9 (7)	Liberal Party
Urges the Government of Canada to consider extending the July 2018 commencement date to allow police services time to obtain resources and proper training, critical for successful implementation of the proposed Cannabis Act (/)	2.5 (6)	Conservative Party; Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police
Government must allocate a portion of cannabis revenues to prevention, treatment, harm reduction, and education to ensure youth can make informed decisions about a substance detrimental to their health and well-being (+)	2.1 (5)	Liberal Party; Drug Free Kids Canada; Ontario Public Health Association
There are dangers for young people who may come into contact with marijuana edibles. This is an issue that is not properly addressed in Bill C-45 (/)	2.1 (5)	Conservative Party
To prevent lifestyle advertising and promotion to youth, the Act should include plain packaging, reducing appeal and enhancing the impact of health warnings (+)	2.1 (5)	Hon. Anne McLellan (Senior Advisor, Bennett Jones LLP, As an Individual); Dr. David Hammond (Professor, University of Waterloo, School of Public Health and Health Systems,

		As an Individual); Ontario Public Health Association
Expect an increase in impaired driving following the legalization of marijuana (-)	1.7 (4)	Conservative Party
For youth, Bill C-45 would also seek to avoid the negative lifelong consequences of possessing very small amounts of cannabis. Bill C-45 proposes that youth under 18 years of age would not be subject to criminal prosecution for possession of up to five grams of cannabis (+)	1.7 (4)	Liberal Party
Legalizing marijuana will leave provinces and municipalities to address problems in public safety, health, and education; government must be clear about provincial responsibilities (/)	1.7 (4)	Conservative Party
Canadians should be aware that cannabis remains illegal at the federal level in the United States, and we will ensure they understand this clearly (+)	1.3 (3)	Liberal Party
The government has been clear that strictly regulating cannabis within the legalized framework is of the utmost importance. As such, a ticketing scheme is put forward under the proposed legislation (+)	1.3 (3)	Liberal Party
A number of risk factors arise with personal cultivation, including exposure to youth; health and safety matters, such as mould and fire hazards; overproduction; and the potential for trafficking (/)	1.3 (3)	Canadian Public Health Association
The war on drugs has been a complete failure; billions spent have ruined lives, tied up courts, and a new strategy is needed to redirect resources into better programs (+)	0.8 (2)	Liberal Party; New Democratic Party
Instead of legalization, cannabis should become a ticketing offence so that police can still confiscate that drug (/)	0.8 (2)	Conservative Party
Warning of a slippery slope from marijuana legalization; Bill C-45 follows the Colorado model, which has caused problems in its jurisdictions (-)	0.8 (2)	Conservative Party
Bill C-45 continues to criminalize youth for possessing more than five grams of cannabis, an arbitrary and disproportionate amount, leading to arrests and incarceration for simple possession (-)	0.8 (2)	New Democratic Party

Setting a minimum age too high risks pushing young adults to the illegal market, endangering their safety with unregulated and potentially unsafe cannabis (+)	0.8 (2)	Ms. Jacqueline Bogden (Assistant Deputy Minister, Cannabis Legalization and Regulation Branch, Department of Health; Canadian Public Health Association)
One purpose of the bill is to move illicit black-market products into the regulated market, but leaving one-third of products, like edibles, on the black market undermines this goal as Canadians seek healthier consumption methods (/)	0.8 (2)	New Democratic Party
The whole experience of being involved in the criminal justice system can have a greater negative impact than what comes from the use of a small amount of cannabis (+)	0.8 (2)	Liberal Party
The government is having a public education campaign to promote awareness not only among youth but among all Canadians about the harms of cannabis use, etc., and that would be part of the targeting for youth not to have access to it (+)	0.8 (2)	Liberal Party
With regard to personal cultivation, we oppose it and believe it will be a catalyst for overproduction that will flood the illicit market and effectively undermine the pricing structure and supply offered by the regulated regime (/)	0.8 (2)	Conservative Party
Merge the Cannabis Act with the Access to Cannabis for Medical Purposes Regulations to avoid confusion, align Health Canada and law enforcement efforts, and limit organized crime by reducing licensed producers and distributors (/)	0.8 (2)	Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police; Ontario Provincial Police
Recommend that packaging requirements be stringent, in order to provide clear labelling to allow police to identify between legal and illegal cannabis, and to give users adequate information to make informed choices about their cannabis consumption (/)	0.8 (2)	Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police; Ontario Provincial Police
Education on the effects of marijuana use is critical to discourage youth consumption, and police should be involved in the education strategy (+)	0.8 (2)	Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police
A provincial ticketing mechanism will prevent youth from entering the criminal justice system when charged with cannabis-related offences (+)	0.8 (2)	Ontario Provincial Police

Marijuana is not as dangerous as alcohol, and regulatory approaches should be somewhat similar (+)	0.8 (2)	Sensible BC
Setting the minimum age at 25 will encourage the black market and youth access through adults over 25 (+)	0.8 (2)	Professor Neil Boyd (Professor of Criminology, Simon Fraser University, As an Individual)
Youth should not face criminal penalties; the Cannabis Act should be amended to use soft approaches like counselling and community service, reducing harm and stigma while still discouraging unlawful use (/)	0.8 (2)	Canadian Drug Policy Coalition
Federal government should adopt a public health approach to cannabis regulation to allow for more control over the risk factors associated with cannabis-related harms (/)	0.8 (2)	Centre for Addiction and Mental Health
We believe very strongly that the proposed age of 18 under Bill C-45 sends the wrong message to young Canadians—that it is safe for them to consume marijuana at that age (/)	0.4 (1)	Conservative Party
First and foremost, we want to get this right and are committed to implementing the necessary regulation regarding edibles (+)	0.4 (1)	Liberal Party
The criminalization of marijuana disproportionately impacts individuals who are young, marginalized, members of over-policed communities, or racialized (+)	0.4 (1)	Mr. Michael Spratt (Criminal Lawyer, Abergel Goldstein and Partners, As an Individual)
Responsible branding for adults aims to eliminate confusion between legal and illegal markets, distinguish reputable companies and high-quality products, and educate consumers about responsible consumption (+)	0.4 (1)	Canadian Medical Cannabis Council
Support a minimum age of 19, with a zero possession limit for youth below the minimum age. This would allow for ticketing for youth possession, consumption, and sharing of cannabis as a provincial offence, along with the authority to seize cannabis from young persons (/)	0.4 (1)	Ontario Provincial Police
In order to allow the public to make an informed choice about recreational cannabis use, it is essential to allocate funds to research in a wide variety of areas, especially in health, in sociology and, of course, in law (+)	0.4 (1)	Barreau du Québec

Using criminal law to enforce the Act's regulations puts young people at risk of criminal charges, which can have serious life impacts, even as we aim to discourage youth from experimenting with marijuana (/)	0.4 (1)	Ms. Anne London-Weinstein (Former Director, Criminal Lawyers' Association)
Government should immediately halt arrests and imprisonment for simple cannabis possession leading up to July 2018 legalization, focusing on constructive alternatives and avoiding criminal records, saving resources on policing and prosecution (/)	0.4 (1)	National Organization for the Reform of Marijuana Laws
Bill C-45 distinguishes between non-flowering and flowering plants; the Act should be amended to allow adults to grow up to 10 plants, with four in flower, providing flexibility for personal use without breaking the law (/)	0.4 (1)	Anandia Labs
More restrictive limits on growing in rented dwellings are needed to protect owners and neighbours, ideally with a federal ban, due to fire safety, humidity, building safety, and odour concerns (/)	0.4 (1)	Canadian Federation of Apartment Associations
Given that many cannabis users are young adults, the federal government should facilitate discussions with all levels of government to ensure a consistent minimum age, preventing cross-border variation and improving the effectiveness of age regulations in protecting youth (/)	0.4 (1)	Ontario Public Health Association
It won't be perfect, but the sooner we move to a legal framework, under which we can then start to work on the other pieces, will create clarity for Canadians, clarity for the health system, and clarity for our criminal justice folks (+)	0.4 (1)	Nova Scotia Department of Health and Wellness
A better approach is a legalization framework that includes prior illicit market participants, enhancing public health and safety through oversight, increasing tax revenues, benefiting from their knowledge, protecting them from criminal sanctions, and preventing the black market from thriving and undermining youth protection and the justice system (+).	0.4 (1)	Ms. Trina Fraser (Partner, Brazeau Seller LLP)
It is naive to think that increasing enforcement funding will eliminate the illicit cannabis industry; it may reduce it, but cannot make it disappear completely (/)	0.4 (1)	Ms. Trina Fraser (Partner, Brazeau Seller LLP)
Branding on cannabis retail packaging should be allowed to reduce criminal contraband production and distribution, and to educate legal	0.4 (1)	Atlantic Convenience Stores Association

consumers, helping them make informed choices and minimizing the impact of lowest price points (+)		
Restrictions on possession amounts and plant limits for personal non-commercial cannabis production undermine the goal of eliminating the black market; allowing self-sufficiency supports the transition away from illicit sources (/)	0.4 (1)	Tousaw Law Corporation
Procedural Frames (22.6% of all Frames, N = 93)		
	Frequency of Frame as % of all Procedural Frames (N)	Policy Actors who Used the Frame
To support protecting youth, Bill C-45 makes it illegal to sell products appealing to youth and enacts comprehensive advertising restrictions to prevent promotions and other messaging that encourage uses (+)	26.4 (24)	Liberal Party
Rushing legislation with wide-ranging national effects is short-sighted and ill-advised; the bill is flawed, and the government should reconsider its timelines (/)	17.6 (16)	New Democratic Party; Conservative Party; National Organization for the Reform of Marijuana Laws; Sensible BC; Métis National Council;
Bill C-45 includes provisions to protect youth, including prohibiting selling or providing cannabis to anyone under 18, with penalties up to 14 years, and making it an offence to enlist youth in cannabis-related crimes (+)	14.3 (13)	Liberal Party
Under the proposed legislation, federal, provincial, and territorial governments share responsibility: federal government oversees production and sets industry-wide standards, while provinces and territories manage distribution and sales (+)	7.7 (7)	Liberal Party
Ensuring a public health and safety approach by using \$9.6 million from Budget 2017 and continuing a broad-based public education campaign on cannabis' detrimental impacts on brain development, addiction, impaired driving, and mental health (+)	5.5 (5)	Liberal Party
Government is committed to working with provinces and territories to encourage the creation of non-criminal offences prohibiting youth	3.3 (3)	Liberal Party

possession, allowing police to seize cannabis without imposing criminal sanctions (+)		
There is nothing in Bill C-45 that would provide the legal ability for young people under the age of 18 to access cannabis (+)	3.3 (3)	Liberal Party
To protect the vulnerable, mandate package health warnings for all cannabis products, including known and potential harmful effects of exposure, similar to cigarettes, including child proof packaging (+)	3.3 (3)	Canadian Paediatric Society; Ontario Public Health Association
Bill C-45 contains no measures to address Canadians stigmatized by the war on drugs, including reconsideration of ongoing sentences and record suspensions for prior convictions (/)	3.3 (3)	Mr. Michael Spratt (Criminal Lawyer, Abergel Goldstein and Partners, As an Individual)
We need more money for education (/)	2.2 (2)	Canadian Medical Association; Drug Free Kids Canada
A public education and awareness campaign, in partnership with provinces, territories, municipal health authorities, and key partners, will inform Canadians—especially youth—about the health and safety risks of cannabis use (+)	2.2 (2)	Liberal Party
Recognizing that some provinces and territories may not have systems set up and running upon royal assent, our government is proposing to facilitate access for Canadians to a regulated, quality-controlled supply of cannabis through a secure mail system via existing licensed producers (+)	1.1 (1)	Liberal Party
A maximum 14-year sentence, hybridized by indictment, is completely unrealistic given what occurs in practice (/)	1.1 (1)	Mr. John Conroy (Barrister, As an Individual)
Advocate for a legal cannabis regime that allows pardons for past cannabis-related convictions and addresses prejudice from convictions, stays of proceedings, withdrawals, acquittals, and records in police databases, even without a finding of guilt (+)	1.1 (1)	National Organization for the Reform of Marijuana Laws
The federal government, as drafter of Bill C-45, must ensure provinces have sufficient financial and infrastructure resources to address the physical and psychological health impacts, legislating strict minimum standards across all jurisdictions rather than abdicating responsibility (/)	1.1 (1)	Portage
Advocate for a staged approach: start small, get it right from the beginning, and then move forward gradually (/)	1.1 (1)	Saskatchewan Ministry of Justice

Request that a legislative framework be established prior to legalization to give law enforcement clear guidance, funding, and training (/)	1.1 (1)	Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police
Preferable to avoid relying on criminal law and sanctions to enforce compliance with what should be largely regulatory legislation for a legal product (/)	1.1 (1)	Criminal Lawyers' Association
A significant problem exists in the ticketing provisions, where discretion over prosecution or issuing a ticket is left to police with few guidelines, creating vagueness that undermines the purpose of the provision and the use of criminal law (/)	1.1 (1)	Criminal Lawyers' Association
Maximum penalties for serious breaches should align with those of the Tobacco Act, reserving imprisonment for the most serious abuses and not exceeding tobacco or alcohol penalties (/)	1.1 (1)	National Organization for the Reform of Marijuana Laws
Youth possession of cannabis (over 5 grams) should not incur criminal penalties; the government should use a restorative justice approach, removing clause 8 and related subclauses to eliminate current and future repercussions for youth (/)	1.1 (1)	Canadian Nurses Association
A more nuanced approach to licensing is needed, excluding those with convictions involving youth, connections to organized crime, or offences with guns, violence, or controlled substances other than cannabis (+)	1.1 (1)	Ms. Trina Fraser (Partner, Brazeau Seller LLP)
Edibles must be legal; cannabis should be removed from the CDSA, allowing flexibility, but edibles must be permitted (/)	1.1 (1)	Cannabis Culture