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# Article summary:

1. Bill C-18, the Online News Act, is set to be voted on in the House of Commons today. The legislative process for this bill has been criticized for cutting off debate at second reading and excluding potential witnesses.

2. Bill C-18 is the product of an intense lobbying campaign from some of Canada’s largest media companies and will require payments for links, indexing or otherwise directing traffic to news organizations.

3. The Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage had a limited number of hearings with few independent Canadian experts or independent media companies invited to appear.

# Article rating:

Appears moderately imbalanced: The article provides some useful information, but is missing several important points or pieces of evidence that would be required to present the discussed topics in a balanced and reliable way. You are encouraged to seek a more balanced perspective on the presented issues by exploring the provided research topics and looking at different information sources.

# Article analysis:

The article by Michael Geist provides an overview of the legislative review process for Bill C-18, the Online News Act, which is set to be voted on in the House of Commons today. The article paints a negative picture of the bill and its review process, criticizing it for cutting off debate at second reading and excluding potential witnesses as well as expanding eligibility into broadcasters such as the CBC and foreign news outlets such as the New York Times. It also claims that mandated payments for links are at the foundation of the bill and that more than 75% of revenues will go to broadcasters such as Bell, Rogers, and CBC.

The article appears to be biased in its reporting on Bill C-18, presenting only one side of the issue without exploring counterarguments or providing evidence for its claims. For example, while it criticizes the government’s decision to cut off debate at second reading and exclude potential witnesses from appearing before committee, it does not provide any evidence that these decisions were made in bad faith or with malicious intent. Additionally, while it claims that more than 75% of revenues will go to broadcasters such as Bell, Rogers, and CBC, it does not provide any evidence or sources to back up this claim. Furthermore, while it acknowledges that Facebook may block news sharing in response to this bill, it does not explore any possible risks associated with this decision or present both sides equally.

In conclusion, while this article provides an interesting overview of Bill C-18 and its review process, it appears to be biased in its reporting on this issue due to its lack of evidence for its claims and failure to explore counterarguments or present both sides equally.

# Topics for further research:

* Bill C-18 pros and cons
* Impact of Bill C-18 on news sharing
* Arguments for and against mandated payments for links
* Evidence for revenue distribution of Bill C-18
* Potential risks of Facebook blocking news sharing
* Debate on Bill C-18 in the House of Commons
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