



HOUSE OF COMMONS  
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES  
CANADA

# House of Commons Debates

---

VOLUME 148 • NUMBER 351 • 1st SESSION • 42nd PARLIAMENT

---

OFFICIAL REPORT  
(HANSARD)

**Wednesday, November 7, 2018**

—

**Speaker: The Honourable Geoff Regan**

## **CONTENTS**

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

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, November 7, 2018

The House met at 2 p.m.

---

*Prayer*

---

• (1405)

[*English*]

**The Speaker:** It being Wednesday, we will now have the singing of *O Canada*, led by the hon. member for North Island—Powell River.

[*Members sang the national anthem*]

---

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*English*]

### NHL RETIREMENT

**Hon. Hunter Tootoo (Nunavut, Ind.):** Mr. Speaker,

[*Member spoke in Inuktitut*]

[*English*]

I want to recognize a great Canadian, and, full disclosure, he is my cousin.

Jordin Tootoo learned to play hockey in our home community of Rankin Inlet. He played four seasons with the Brandon Wheat Kings before joining the Nashville Predators in 2003, becoming the first Inuk to play in the NHL. After 13 seasons, Jordin has announced his retirement from professional hockey.

Jordin has faced struggles in his life. He lost his older brother to suicide. He conquered an alcohol addiction that threatened to end his playing career. He has turned those experiences into opportunities to promote mental wellness and suicide prevention. He has always given back to Inuit and indigenous communities and now will have more time to focus on his work with indigenous youth.

Jordin is an inspiration to all indigenous people, and indeed, to all Canadians. He has shown us that one can find success in life, even in the face of tough challenges, and how to help others find their way.

Jordin's Inuk name, Kudluk, means “thunder” in Inuktitut. Long may he roar.

### 2018 WORLD UNDER-17 HOCKEY CHALLENGE

**Ms. Karen Ludwig (New Brunswick Southwest, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to talk about an amazing event happening right now in my area of New Brunswick, the 2018 World Under-17 Hockey Challenge. This tournament brings together young people from around the world and across Canada to play their favourite sport: hockey. This is great for tourism, raising the profile of our area and offering opportunities to watch potential future NHL players.

My riding of New Brunswick Southwest was proud to host three of the pre-games: Canada versus the United States, in St. Stephen; Canada versus Russia, in Fredericton Junction; and Sweden versus the Czech Republic, in Blacks Harbour. I am thrilled to report that team Canada was victorious.

I congratulate all the teams for their tremendous efforts; the organizers, volunteers and sponsors; and especially, the teams representing Canada. I encourage all my colleagues in this House to watch the teams representing Canada in the upcoming games this week. Go team Canada.

\* \* \*

### BEAR CLAN PATROL

**Mrs. Cathy McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, last Thursday evening, I walked with a Bear Clan Patrol in Winnipeg. It was heart-wrenching. The team of volunteers patrols the north end, providing support for the most vulnerable. In just a few hours, we encountered a sexual assault victim, domestic abuse, and drug abuse, but also heartwarming expressions of appreciation.

The Bear Clan Patrol was relaunched after the death of Tina Fontaine. It now has 1,400 volunteers and is helping 40 other communities set up teams.

The current government promised that while the inquiry into missing and murdered women and girls was proceeding, it would not pause on important action. Last year, a small investment from the indigenous services department quickly ran out. The money went to sharp gloves, flashlights and a very modest office space. However, instead of committing funding, the department has left the group out in the cold. The department officials say that they are busy consulting this year, so there is no money for a team with a proven track record.

*Statements by Members*

I call on the minister to stand with the Bear Clan Patrol. Will the Liberals support the most vulnerable on the front lines?

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**REMEMBRANCE DAY**

**Mr. Jean Rioux (Saint-Jean, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we owe our freedom and the values we cherish to the sacrifices of women and men who fought courageously to defend our ideals. Bravely, they vanquished the enemy. Vimy, Passchendaele, Canada's Hundred Days: these were the victories that earned us the respect of our allies.

Let us keep their legacy alive because their dedication is the reason we now enjoy peace and freedom.

As we celebrate the 100th anniversary of the armistice this year, we honour all those who have served and are serving. On November 11, we will remember what they did to ensure peace for Canadians.

We must honour and carry on their mission every day by seeking peaceful solutions to all our conflicts.

\* \* \*

[English]

**DIWALI**

**Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, Diwali, or the festival of lights, is one of the highlights of the year. It represents hope and renewal. It is a time for traditions to be shared with family, friends and community. During this very special time, the spirit of Diwali provides us with a chance to increase our understanding of one another. We share a country where race, religion, colour and language are not barriers but reasons for all of us to celebrate our diversity.

Canadians of South Asian origin have made phenomenal contributions to Canada from coast to coast to coast, and Diwali is only one of the gifts they share with us all. In New Westminster and in Burnaby, we are particularly aware of their enormous contributions to the community.

Jagmeet Singh, our national NDP leader, and the entire NDP caucus wish all Canadians celebrating Diwali happiness, prosperity, good health and peace.

*Diwali mubarak.* Happy Diwali to all Canadians and all those celebrating Diwali around the world.

\* \* \*

• (1410)

[Translation]

**BERNARD LANDRY**

**Mr. Luc Thériault (Montcalm, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, Quebec is in mourning today. The Bloc Québécois extends sincere condolences to Bernard Landry's loved ones, to his wife, Chantal, and his three children, Julie, Philippe and Pascale.

Bernard Landry was premier of Quebec, an architect of modern Quebec, a great patriot and, most importantly, a staunch advocate for independence. He worked his entire life out of love for all

Quebeckers. He was a pillar of our nation's economic development, a true statesman who showed vision, dignity and accountability in our nation's highest positions.

Mr. Landry transformed Quebec's relationship with first nations and the Inuit. He was so proud of the Paix des Braves. He was a kind man and accessible leader who generously shared his time and his keen intellect and was a model of dedication and commitment to the cause.

Thank you, Mr. Landry.

\* \* \*

[English]

**REMEMBRANCE DAY**

**Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Carleton, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, what is special about attending remembrance ceremonies in a small town is that the populations are small enough that the fallen can actually have their names fit on the cenotaph itself, and local family members can walk up and lay a wreath in the name of one of those people whose name is carved on that stone. Vernon, Ontario, is such a village. Harvey Linton is such a man, and his brother, Oswald, who fell over seven decades ago in service to Canada, is such a hero.

I say this to remind the House that while we always rightly break into great powerful orations about the importance of our heroes, we have to remember that they were also real people with brothers and sisters, with senses of humour, with creature comforts. They are an awful lot like all of us and all the people that we represent. Let us remember them as individuals, as people and as family members. They are as the people we know from the places we go.

Lest we forget.

\* \* \*

**REMEMBRANCE DAY**

**Mr. T.J. Harvey (Tobique—Mactaquac, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to rise in the House today to recognize our veterans. Royalton, New Brunswick, may be a small community in the western part of the province of New Brunswick, but Royalton lays claim to having one of the largest number of people per capita to have enlisted in the Second World War, with 26 men and one woman who signed up to serve.

As they do every year, families in this community and all other Canadian communities plan to remember those brave men and women on Remembrance Day. Veterans' Week is a time for everyone to come together and salute all Canadians who have served in uniform, including those mentioned from the community of Royalton and all those who participated in these hard-fought battles. We honour all men and all women who had a role in defending our freedom. We also honour the families of fallen soldiers who have sacrificed so much. We thank them for their service and for making Canada the country we see today that allows us to remain proud and free.

This Veterans' Week, Canada remembers. Please have a moment of silence and thank a veteran.

*Statements by Members***REMEMBRANCE DAY**

**Mr. Bob Bratina (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, Remembrance Day this year falls in the dark shadow of the recent attack on Jewish Americans at the Tree of Life synagogue in Pittsburgh. Hateful impulses arise mostly from ignorance and the failure to understand, for instance, how Jews fought side by side with their fellow Canadians and Americans to ensure our freedom.

In my city of Hamilton, some of the leading Jewish citizens were veterans, people like businessmen and philanthropists Irving Zucker and Norm Levitt, and prominent lawyer David Goldberg, who flew Spitfires against Germany and earned the Distinguished Flying Cross. Others came from more humble backgrounds, such as Al Garshowitz. He was chosen to join the famous Dambusters and was killed in the crash of his Lancaster bomber during a raid. In 1944, Kurt Loeb and Sam Resnick joined our Scottish regiment, the Argylls, and were in Berlin for the victory celebrations. Kurt's family had fled Germany in 1937, and the young soldier wrote home after the victory, the letter written on Hitler's personal stationery.

On Remembrance Day, all who wore the uniform deserve everyone's respect.

\* \* \*

●(1415)

[Translation]

**REMEMBRANCE DAY**

**Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise in the House as a former soldier to honour my fellow servicemen and servicewomen for the contributions and sacrifices they have made over the years to allow us the freedom we enjoy today, and to honour current members of the Canadian Armed Forces who continue to protect our rights.

This year is the 100th anniversary of the end of the First World War. I wanted to do something special to mark this occasion, so I organized a commemoration under the theme "Charlesbourg remembers". On November 10, the Saint-Charles-Borromée parish, which is proudly celebrating its 325th anniversary this year, will be hosting a ceremony followed by a commemorative march that will end at the cemetery. There will be a reading of the poem *In Flanders Fields* by John McCrae, followed by a reading of the names of soldiers from Charlesbourg who gave their lives for our freedom during the First and Second World Wars.

Let us never forget all those we have to thank for our way of life today, and let us wear a poppy with pride in memory of the fallen.

\* \* \*

**JEWISH REFUGEES**

**Mr. David de Burgh Graham (Laurentides—Labelle, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, today, the Prime Minister will apologize on behalf of all Canadians for what happened to the passengers of the MS *St. Louis* in 1939, when 907 refugees, most of them Jewish, knocked at our door after being turned away by Cuba and the United States. Our response was famously recorded in the book by Irving Abella, *None is Too Many*. No one wanted to help them and this unfortunately helped validate the racism and anti-Semitism of that era. Following their unexpected return to European soil, more than one quarter of

those refugees lost their lives in Nazi concentration camps. They died for two reasons: they were Jewish and they were turned away. The survivors and families of several survivors are here today for this historic moment. I sincerely hope that this lesson stays with us for a long, long time.

\* \* \*

[English]

**OCEANS PROTECTION PLAN**

**Mr. Sean Casey (Charlottetown, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today on the second anniversary of our government's historic \$1.5-billion oceans protection plan.

Since 2016, the plan has made clear and measurable progress to keep our oceans clean, safe and healthy.

[Translation]

We have taken bold action to protect our whales. We have invested millions of dollars to ensure that the courageous men and women of the Coast Guard have the tools they need to keep Canadians safe at sea.

[English]

We brought the regulations around shipping and marine safety into the 21st century, and we have invested millions more in environmental protections and cutting-edge research to ensure our actions are backed by sound science.

These achievements in no way signify an end to our government's commitment to protecting Canadian waters, Canadian marine wildlife and the Canadian livelihoods that depend on both.

We owe it to our children and to our grandchildren to ensure that they experience the wonders of our oceans first-hand and not through the history books.

\* \* \*

**VETERANS AFFAIRS**

**Mr. James Bezan (Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, during Veterans Week, we owe our veterans and the men and women who serve in the Canadian Armed Forces our deepest respect and gratitude for the sacrifices they make to defend our freedoms.

Unfortunately, the Liberal government should be ashamed of itself. Instead of helping our veterans, they make multi-million dollar secret payments to convicted terrorists, like Omar Khadr. Now, the Liberals claim they were forced to give Khadr millions of Canadian taxpayer dollars because the courts made them do it. However, we know that the Liberals were never ordered by the court to make al Qaeda terrorist Omar Khadr a multi-millionaire.

*Statements by Members*

The Liberals chose to give him that money. That stands in stark contrast to the treatment they are giving our veterans. The Liberals did not leap at the chance to help our vets after realizing they were being shortchanged on their benefits for years. In fact, it will take another two more years for our veterans to be compensated.

How can the Liberals justify this deplorable behaviour? A convicted terrorist gets a \$10.5-million cheque from the Liberals, and our veterans who sacrificed for Canada are told they are “asking for more than we are able to give.” That is shameful.

\* \* \*

**DIWALI AND BANDI CHHOR DIVAS**

**Mr. Raj Saini (Kitchener Centre, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, today Hindu, Sikh, Buddhist and Jain communities across Canada will be celebrating Diwali and Bandi Chhor Divas.

In celebration of Diwali, houses will be illuminated with diyas in every corner, colourful rangoli artwork decorations will be the vibrant centrepieces of each household, and family and friends will be getting together to share a festive meal.

Delicious food and an abundance of Indian sweets will be a big part of these celebrations, so I urge all Canadians to take part in Diwali and Bandi Chhor Divas celebrations in their community and to not miss this opportunity.

Just like the diyas brightening up homes, I wish everyone an illuminating year filled with peace, happiness and prosperity. I wish a happy Diwali and Bandi Chhor Divas to all those celebrating in Kitchener Centre and across Canada.

\* \* \*

● (1420)

**POVERTY**

**Ms. Tracey Ramsey (Essex, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the effects of poverty and social exclusion on women continue to impact Canada's economic and social development and progress. In my region of Windsor Essex, 18.3% of people live in poverty.

Among these devastating statistics, poverty is even worse for women and children. In my riding, 24% of children and 42% of female-led lone parent families live in poverty. This is three times higher than the general population, as a single mother is almost four times as likely as a two-parent family to live in poverty.

Why do women in Canada suffer, considering we are the eighth wealthiest country in the world? Women spend more time doing unpaid work, and are more likely to sacrifice career opportunities and hold part-time or temporary lower-paying jobs, often with no benefits or security, because of their family commitments and a lack of affordable child care.

Working women in Canada earn only 87¢ for every dollar earned by men. New Democrats will always fight for Canada without poverty when no one is left behind and where every Canadian can live in dignity and respect, including all women.

[Translation]

**BERNARD LANDRY**

**Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, Quebec has lost a great patriot. Former premier Bernard Landry passed away yesterday, leaving behind a great legacy, including the development agreement with the Cree nation known as the “Paix des Braves”.

Mr. Landry was deeply committed to Quebec's independence, culture and economy. From his economic policy statement, *Bâtir le Québec*, in the 1970s to the digital era in the 2000s, he always believed that the government should intervene in the economy.

Let us talk about his achievements. As finance minister, he balanced the budget and was a strong supporter of free trade in 1988. That took a lot of courage because his views put him at odds with his usual allies from the trade-union left. However, he supported free trade for the good of Quebec. As he often said, “country before party”.

I knew him when I was a journalist and he never refused an interview. Once he told me, as a family man, and I quote, “Politics is hard on families so when I am with my kids, I am with them 100%.” I try to follow that advice as much as possible.

He never had it easy. He was defeated twice before getting elected and ran in three leadership races before becoming leader, but this activist never stopped. Even at the very end of his life, he was trying to persuade people, as we saw recently.

The great Quebec patriot has died. Goodbye, Premier Landry.

\* \* \*

[English]

**INUIT DAY**

**Ms. Yvonne Jones (Labrador, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be an Inuit member of Parliament and along with the member of Parliament for Nunavut and all colleagues in the House, we are excited today to mark the 12th annual Inuit Day and celebrations of Inuit around the world.

On this day, Inuit governments, organizations and communities alike, both on a national and international level, celebrate the rich culture and vibrant history of Inuit in the world. I want to acknowledge the fundamental role the Inuit play in Canada and our government support of Inuit-led policies, programs and developments. We recognize that traditional knowledge is a strong pillar that informs decision-making across the north.

I am proud of the respectful way in which our government continues to partner with Inuit, creating strong communities, informing Canadians of the important contributions that Inuit make, and the proud culture they share with all Canadians.

Let us please celebrate Inuit today.

## ORAL QUESTIONS

[Translation]

### PRIVACY

**Hon. Andrew Scheer (Leader of the Opposition, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, Canadians are shocked that the government secretly started collecting their personal financial information without their consent. The government never disclosed these practices to Canadians, who found out about them in the media. That, more than anything, shows how much faith the Prime Minister has in this policy.

The only thing Canadians want to hear from the Prime Minister is that he is cancelling the project.

When will he do that?

**Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, obviously as a government we take Canadians' privacy very seriously, as does Statistics Canada.

Statistics Canada contacted the Privacy Commissioner about this pilot project. We all understand the importance of having reliable data for Canadians. That is why we trust Statistics Canada to collect the necessary data while working with the Privacy Commissioner to ensure that the privacy of Canadians is always protected.

• (1425)

[English]

**Hon. Andrew Scheer (Leader of the Opposition, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, they are only doing this because they got caught. Stats Canada was not consulting with the Privacy Commissioner for the 15 years that they were raiding Canadians' private financial data. That is what Canadians are concerned about. The Prime Minister is not protecting their rights, he is violating them. Will he do the right thing and stop this practice?

**Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, in 2015, we campaigned on a promise to restore the long form census. The arguments the Conservative Party made in the years up to the cancellation of the long form census are exactly the same arguments they are making today about Statistics Canada, trumped up arguments about protection of privacy, when they know, and indeed all Canadians should know, that Statistics Canada works with the Privacy Commissioner, and respects and protects the privacy of Canadians. We will continue to ensure that the privacy of Canadians is always protected.

**Hon. Andrew Scheer (Leader of the Opposition, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, what the Prime Minister fails to understand is that these are not arguments put forward by the Conservative Party, these are the concerns of Canadians who do not want their financial information raided by the current government.

Here is what the BC Freedom of Information and Privacy Association had to say, "It is untenable to give absolute trust and authority to a government agency in today's technological landscape."

We are not talking about a census, we are talking about the government getting line-by-line financial data. Does the Prime Minister believe that is okay?

**Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, allow me to speak directly to Canadians to reassure them

### Oral Questions

that we are protecting the privacy of their data. We are working with the Privacy Commissioner, whose job it is to ensure that the privacy of Canadians is always protected. We understand the need for reliable data, unlike the members opposite, but we also always put at the forefront the protection of Canadians' privacy. That is why this data that Statistics Canada collects is anonymized, is subject to stringent controls. Indeed, this is the pilot project it is working on now, which has not even rolled out yet.

\* \* \*

### CARBON PRICING

**Hon. Andrew Scheer (Leader of the Opposition, CPC):** Actually, Mr. Speaker, what they put at the forefront is money intended to settle lawsuits because of data breaches.

When it comes to the carbon tax, there are reports that the current government intends to charge HST and GST on top of the carbon tax. Can the Prime Minister confirm today, yes or no, if HST and GST will be applied to the carbon tax?

**Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, what we have seen over the past weeks is the Conservatives continue to try and find new angles to muddy the waters on a basic fact. We are choosing to put a price on pollution because we think there is too much pollution and by putting a price on it there will be less of it. That is our plan. We are happy to defend our plan.

What is interesting is the Conservatives refuse to put forward their plan or they simply have no intention of putting forward a plan to fight climate change. What Canadians want to know is this. Where is their plan?

**Hon. Andrew Scheer (Leader of the Opposition, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, only a Liberal would believe that a simple yes or no question could be muddying the waters.

The HST and GST will either be collected on the carbon tax or it will not. The Prime Minister can tell Canadians right now if he will be applying HST and GST on his carbon tax. Yes or no?

**Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we have been laying out the details of our approach on pricing pollution not just for the past few weeks that we have announced the details of it, but over the past—

**The Speaker:** Order. I am having trouble hearing the answer. It is important to hear the answer, because if members want me to look for things that are unparliamentary or out of order, I have to be able to hear, of course.

Most members in all parties are able to sit through question period and hear things they do not like without interrupting, and so I would ask the rest to join that majority.

### Oral Questions

The Right Hon. Prime Minister.

• (1430)

**Right Hon. Justin Trudeau:** Mr. Speaker, it is very simple. Climate change represents perhaps the greatest global threat we are facing as a species. We have a plan to address the impacts of climate change both by growing our economy and protecting our families and the environment.

The Conservatives have no plan and will try all sorts of different ways to distract from the fact they have no plan. We will fight climate change.

\* \* \*

### VETERANS AFFAIRS

**Mr. Guy Caron (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I remember the previous Conservative government that for five years was unable to give a yes or no answer. The current Liberal government, though, is disappointing one community after another, and this time it is veterans.

The government has let a total of \$1,037 million promised for the pension programs of our veterans to simply lapse.

Yesterday, the House unanimously approved the motion by my esteemed colleague for Courtenay—Alberni to reallocate the entirety of the funds to veterans programs, but the Liberals are refusing to do just that.

Is the Prime Minister ready to implement the motion of the NDP and finally spend the entirety of the budget promised to our veterans?

**Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, our government is, and continues to be, committed to supporting and honouring Canada's veterans and their families. Unlike the previous government, we ensure that the necessary funding is made available to veterans when and where they need it. That is why we were happy to support the NDP's motion yesterday.

What the Conservatives did in office was to cut services for veterans, including service offices, to create a fake balanced budget for the election.

In three years, we have increased financial supports by over \$10 billion, putting more money in veterans' pockets and increasing mental health supports, and we are delivering on the promises we made to veterans and their families.

\* \* \*

### THE ENVIRONMENT

**Mr. Guy Caron (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, those are fine words, but we want to see them backed by actions.

[Translation]

Today, more than 400 prominent figures co-signed the Quebec pact for a green transition. Civil society is pledging to take meaningful action to combat climate warming. An emergency debate on the alarming IPCC report was recently held in the House. In spite of all this, the Liberal government continues to believe that words outweigh action.

Will the Prime Minister listen to Quebecers' pleas and finally implement concrete policies for fighting climate change?

[English]

**Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I will get to climate change in a second, but I cannot let that lie, because we have been taking concrete action in standing up for our veterans, whether it is \$10 billion for veterans programs and services, whether it is raising financial supports for veterans and their caregivers, whether it is investing in the continuum of mental health services or expanding a range of services available to the families of medically released veterans, or reopening the nine shuttered offices. We have done nothing but act for our veterans.

[Translation]

We are also taking concrete action on fighting climate change, thanks to a plan that puts a price on pollution and that will show the world that Canada is a leader in addressing climate change while creating good jobs and economic growth.

\* \* \*

[English]

### INTERNATIONAL TRADE

**Ms. Tracey Ramsey (Essex, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister does not even seem to care about signing away Canadian jobs by signing onto the USMCA. The government has failed to ensure that aluminum and steel tariffs are lifted, risking the loss of at least 6,000 jobs, the jobs of people who are here on Parliament Hill today.

Aluminum workers from Kitimat to Saguenay are desperately trying to defend their jobs, families and communities. Why will the Liberals not listen to the workers' call and tell the U.S. administration that Canada will not ratify the USMCA until Trump drops his illegal tariffs?

**Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I disagree with the member's first statement, in that we know that the USMCA is creating and securing good jobs for Canadians right across this country.

However, if she does not believe me, allow me to read a quote from the NDP member for Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie. To the Canadian negotiators, he said "I just want to congratulate everybody in this room for the fantastic job that you did." Then he said that the USMCA is "the best deal possible and protect workers all around this country".

We agree with the member for Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie.



*Oral Questions*

•(1435)

**Mr. Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, is anyone surprised that the Liberals do not want to talk about workers who are losing their jobs. Dairy farmers are not happy. Medication prices are going to explode. Steel and aluminum workers cannot believe the government signed a deal that will continue to put their jobs at risk.

Aluminum workers from Unifor are here today on the Hill to ask the Prime Minister not to sign the USMCA until tariffs are off the table.

What is the Prime Minister going to tell those workers right here, right now?

**Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Once again, Mr. Speaker, we see a situation in which the NDP says one thing in the House, but another behind closed doors.

[*Translation*]

The member for Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie called the USMCA the best deal possible. He acknowledged that it is going to protect workers across the country. We know that we are always going to protect workers. That is what we told steel and aluminum workers, and that is what we told dairy sector workers. That is what we are telling everyone across the country, and we are going to do what we say.

[*English*]

**The Speaker:** I am afraid I have to remind the hon. member for New Westminster—Burnaby and some others near him not to interrupt when someone else has the floor. I would appreciate his agreement with that.

The hon. member for Richmond—Arthabaska.

\* \* \*

[*Translation*]

**PRIVACY**

**Mr. Alain Rayes (Richmond—Arthabaska, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, for the past two weeks, the Prime Minister has been stubbornly defending access to the personal and confidential data of 500,000 Canadians without their consent.

The situation is so disturbing that the Privacy Commissioner has launched an investigation. A petition was started just six days ago calling on the government to put a stop to this, and 19,000 people have signed it already.

Will the Prime Minister finally listen to Canadians and put an immediate stop to this serious invasion of people's privacy?

**Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we take the protection of Canadians' privacy seriously, as does Statistics Canada.

Statistics Canada has been in contact with the Privacy Commissioner about this pilot project, which has not yet been launched. We will keep working to ensure that protecting privacy remains a priority for Statistics Canada and our government.

I do want to point out that the Conservatives are using the same arguments for this issue as they did to justify getting rid of the long form census. Canadians were disappointed in that decision and—

**The Speaker:** Order. The hon. member for Richmond—Arthabaska.

**Mr. Alain Rayes (Richmond—Arthabaska, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister sounds like a broken record, but here is what Canadians really think.

Aline is wondering what the government is up to and whether it knows the meaning of personal and confidential. Marcel thinks it is sad the way we are being led the by Prime Minister's government. Catherine says that it is totally unacceptable and she is against this approach. She thinks this is very risky and intrusive.

We get hundreds and hundreds of messages like that.

For the umpteenth time in two weeks, I ask: will the Prime Minister end this unacceptable situation immediately?

**Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, allow me to reassure those Canadians directly.

Contrary to what the Conservatives are telling them to scare them, we will always protect Canadians' privacy. We are working with the Privacy Commissioner to ensure that all this data remains anonymous, that it is subject to stringent controls, and that there is no risk of this information being shared. Canadians can rest assured that this government will always protect their privacy.

[*English*]

**Hon. Peter Kent (Thornhill, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister needs to wake up and understand that Canadians reject the government's support of Statistics Canada's harvest of deeply personal financial data without asking for permission. Canadians realize that Europeans this year have new privacy laws that prohibit this sort of privacy exposure without the specific consent of clients.

Why will the Prime Minister not accept that Canadians own all of their personal information, financial or otherwise, and that they should decide whether that data is shared or not?

**Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, if the member remembers well, in the years leading up to the 2015 election we heard Conservatives making these arguments left, right and centre about the need to protect Canadians from the intrusiveness of Statistics Canada. Canadians rejected that approach of the Conservatives.

There were celebrations across the country when the very first thing we did was to restore the long-form census at Statistics Canada, so that decisions could be based on evidence and data and not ideology.

We will always protect Canadians' privacy and do it—

•(1440)

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola.

*Oral Questions*

**Mr. Dan Albas (Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I really hope the Prime Minister would tell that to the 27 million Canadians whose information a credit bureau was compelled to provide to Statistics Canada without any consent from them, contrary to what he said. The Liberals do not seem to understand that the personal information of Canadians does not belong to the government. They believe they have the right to know what everyone is doing with their finances all the time.

On this side of the House, we believe that access to that kind of information requires consent. No consent, no data. Why is the Prime Minister still refusing to listen to Canadians who want this program cancelled?

**Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, once again, these are the same arguments they made about Statistics Canada's compelling people to fill out the long-form census. In the 2015 election, Canadians spoke loudly and clearly, rejecting the Conservative vision of policies based on ideology rather than evidence and data.

We will not engage in the kind of fearmongering they are trying to use around Canadians and their data, because we can state unequivocally to Canadians that we continue to protect their data. We continue to understand how important it is to work with the Privacy Commissioner to ensure that happens.

**Hon. Lisa Raitt (Milton, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has just clearly said that it is their number one priority to protect Canadians' data. Perhaps he would like to explain to us today why Canada Post allowed a breach of the private data and credit card numbers of 4,400 cannabis purchasers in Ontario. That was just hacked within the government that he says protects Canadians' privacy. Would he like to explain to us exactly how that happened?

**Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, like I said, our government takes very seriously the protection of Canadians' information from unauthorized access, use, disclosure, modification, transmittal or disposal. Security measures are in place and compliance is ensured through routine inspection of sites and systems where sensitive information and assets are processed or stored.

On the issue that came up between the Ontario Cannabis Store and Canada Post, it was flagged, was fixed and Canadians can be sure that will not happen moving forward.

**Hon. Lisa Raitt (Milton, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, that pre-written apology the Prime Minister just gave in response will be cold comfort to any Canadian whose private financial data could be hacked in the future. The government cannot protect the privacy of data.

When the Prime Minister indicates that the long-form census is the reason Canadians are in favour of the removal of their data from their banks, the reality is that there is a big difference. In the long-form census they voluntarily gave their information, whereas Stats Can is ripping it out of their bank accounts. Will the Prime Minister stop this action?

**Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, once again, we see how short the Conservatives' memories are. The issue they had was that the long-form census was mandatory, not voluntary. That is why they eliminated the long-

form census and why we campaigned on a promise to respect Statistics Canada, to ensure that we protected Canadians' privacy every step of the way, while also ensuring that data would be the foundation of evidence-based policy, working in a way that would protect Canadians and deliver to them the services they need, as opposed to what the Conservatives wanted to do, eliminate the long-form census and Statistics Canada.

\* \* \*

**POVERTY**

**Ms. Rachel Blaney (North Island—Powell River, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the federal government has chosen its method for measuring poverty. With that calculation, poverty among seniors on paper moves from 14.2% down to 4.9%. With the cost of medication, housing and medical supplies, this calculation has not made life one cent more affordable for them. The government's poverty reduction plan is a document with no action. Now, thousands of seniors living in poverty may be excluded from the very definition. Why is the government trying to manipulate numbers to hide the actual poverty rate in Canada?

**Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, on the contrary, our focus in the national poverty reduction strategy is actually about clarifying the data and really being able to go after the problem that is facing so many Canadians.

Thanks to investments in programs like the Canada child benefit, the national housing strategy, enhanced seniors benefits and the Canada workers benefit, we are on track to lift 650,000 Canadians out of poverty, however it is defined. With Canada's first national poverty reduction strategy and our poverty reduction act, we have a plan to ensure that every Canadian has a real and fair chance to succeed.

● (1445)

[Translation]

**Ms. Brigitte Sansoucy (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the Liberals' proposed poverty reduction bill was the perfect opportunity to create a universal daycare system; create a universal pharmacare and dental program; create housing for everyone right now; improve income support programs; and ensure that EI is accessible to everyone. Unfortunately, the bill will not stop anyone who is poor now from still being poor in 2020.

When will the Liberals implement these measures to truly reduce poverty?

**Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we are growing the middle class by helping those who are working hard to join it.

*Oral Questions*

With programs like the Canada child benefit, the national housing strategy, enhanced seniors benefits, and the Canada workers benefit, we are on track to lift 650,000 Canadians out of poverty.

With Canada's first poverty reduction strategy and our poverty reduction act, we have a plan to ensure that every Canadian has a real and fair chance to succeed.

There is still a lot to be done, but we are on the right track.

\* \* \*

[English]

**CARBON PRICING**

**Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Carleton, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, when the Prime Minister told Canadians that he would take \$10 in carbon taxes from them for every \$9 in rebates he returned and make them somehow better off, they were understandably suspicious. Now they are learning that this original \$10 in upfront taxes might not include the HST on the tax. That is a tax on the taxes. The finance minister refused to confirm whether that was the case.

Yes or no, will the HST apply on the carbon tax?

**Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, again, we see the lengths to which the Conservatives will go to try and distract from the fact that they do not have a plan to fight climate change.

On this side of the House and indeed Canadians across the country recognize that climate change is the greatest global threat facing us all. We need a concrete plan to act against climate change. We have done exactly that by putting a price on pollution, by moving forward on investments and innovation and creating the clean economy, while at the same time supporting Canadian families through this transition to a cleaner economy.

That is our plan. What is theirs?

**Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Carleton, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the Liberals do not have an environment plan. They have a plan to raise taxes. They already said that they are going to collect more in tax revenue than they are going to give back in rebates. However, now we are learning that this upfront tax might actually be taxed again through the HST, a tax on a tax. None of their documents reveal whether in fact that is true. None of their ministers have admitted the truth on the question.

The Prime Minister can tell us now. Will the HST apply on the carbon tax, yes or no?

**Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as has been pointed out, we are the first generation to see the solution to this problem of climate change and the last generation to actually be able to act on it.

On this side of the House, we have put forward a concrete plan that puts a price on pollution. There is too much pollution and if we put a price on it, we will reduce the amount of pollution. It is something that Canadians understand. At the same time, we will be supporting them to be able to succeed through this transition to a cleaner economy.

That is our plan. The Conservatives have no plan. They will not talk about that.

**Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Carleton, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is the first person to raise taxes and the last person to tell the truth about it. Let us give him another opportunity to do so.

He admits that he is going to collect more in taxes than he gives back in rebates. Now we are hearing that the Liberals might actually charge HST on the tax, a tax on the tax.

Yes or no, will the HST apply on the carbon tax?

**Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives are circling around the issue of whether or not there is a crisis that we have to deal with. For 10 years, the previous Conservative government, of which that member was a key member, refused to actually take any action on fighting climate change.

We know the time to act is now, and that is exactly what we are doing. We are putting a price on pollution while we are helping families through this transition toward a cleaner economy. That is our plan. The Conservatives have none.

• (1450)

**Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Carleton, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, circling around? Well, he is actually circling around the taxpayer. He reaches into one pocket and then he circles around the other side to reach into the other pocket.

The Liberals are going to raise taxes on gas, groceries, home heating and other essentials Canadians require to survive. However, now we are hearing they might actually charge the HST on the tax itself. Imagine that, a tax on the tax.

If he cannot admit, will he deny that he is going to put a tax on this tax?

**Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, again, the Conservatives would prefer to play rhetorical games to try to distract from the fact that they do not think climate change is a real crisis to our country or our communities, this despite the wildfires, the floods, the droughts and the hurricanes on our neighbours to the south. These are challenges that we all know are real and they are playing rhetorical games to try to distract from the fact that they have no plan to fight climate change.

**Ms. Linda Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, speaking about being serious about addressing climate change, the Liberals promised to remove perverse fossil fuel subsidies. They claimed their carbon tax would drive the shift to cleaner energy sources and promised to shut down coal power, yet they propose to subsidize coal by virtually exempting it from the carbon tax. This will delay coal plant retirements, disincentive any shift to renewables, even cleaner gas, and allow harmful pollutants impacting health.

Why is the government undermining the efforts by provinces like Alberta that have shown leadership in earlier shut down of coal power?

*Oral Questions*

**Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, our plan to fight climate change includes phasing out coal power plants by 2030. We know that is an essential part of it. I want to highlight again the fact that we are able to move forward to reach our targets partially because Alberta has chosen to put an absolute cap on its oil sands emissions.

We are moving forward with a comprehensive responsible plan to fight climate change while we create jobs and grow the economy. Of course, the NDP does not think we are going far enough. The Conservatives cannot believe we are actually doing something, because they do not think we should do anything to fight climate change. We are doing the things that Canadians expect, growing the economy and protecting the environment.

\* \* \*

**NATURAL RESOURCES**

**Mr. Nathan Cullen (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I have quick question for the pipeline-owning Prime Minister. How is that sale going on the \$4.5 billion gem of an oil pipeline he picked up? What, no buyers? Is that why he is rushing the sale, to sell off an asset that Canadians spent \$500 million in 2018 to build? Well, it is good the government is offering 5% to local first nations.

Two critical questions remain. Given what just happened to Rona workers, will the Prime Minister guarantee that not a single worker will lose their job at Ridley Terminals? Will he also promise that no foreign government will be allowed to buy this strategic asset?

**Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, our approach on growing the economy and protecting the environment together is something Canadians understand right across the country. As we move forward with a concrete plan to fight climate change, while making sure we are investing in the kinds of infrastructures and opportunities to get our resources to new markets other than the United States, we are doing what Canadians expect. We will continue to focus on both growing the economy and protecting Canadians' future generations in our environmental protections, but also with good jobs for the long term.

\* \* \*

**FISHERIES AND OCEANS**

**Mr. Nick Whalen (St. John's East, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, you will not be surprised to know that, like your constituents, Canadians in St. John's East depend on the health and safety of our oceans. Oceans are at the core of who we are as Newfoundlanders. Canadians across the country are so proud that our government is investing in the health of our oceans with the \$1.5 billion oceans protection plan. Today is a big day.

On the two-year anniversary of the oceans protection plan, could the Prime Minister share some of the accomplishments that have been made possible by this \$1.5 billion investment?

**Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for St. John's East for his hard work to protect coastal communities like his own. Today, we are proud to celebrate the two-year anniversary of the oceans protection plan, which includes over \$138 million for Newfoundland and Labrador. We are establishing 24/7 capacity in the Coast Guard's three regional

operation centres, in Victoria, Montreal and St. John's, to ensure our waterways and Canadians remain safe.

We will continue to invest, protect and support Canadians living in coastal communities from coast to coast to coast.

\* \* \*

● (1455)

[Translation]

**VETERANS AFFAIRS**

**Mr. Richard Martel (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the government is going to save a lot of money at our veterans' expense with their new pension plan.

Mr. Bruyca, a very respected veteran who was humiliated by the government, was right when he said that veterans will end up with less money in their pockets despite the government's claims that the plan is going to cost billions and that services have increased.

When will the Prime Minister tell them the truth?

**Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the well-being and financial security of Canadian veterans are our main priority.

We are providing \$10 billion in new funding for our veterans, mainly to keep our promise to provide a pension for life option. Since more veterans will be opting for the maximum non-taxable amount of \$1,150 a month for life instead of a single lump sum payment, the cost will be spread over a longer period. We continue to make investments in order to better support our veterans.

[English]

**Mrs. Cathay Wagantall (Yorkton—Melville, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I believe the last time the Prime Minister spoke directly to a veteran was when he told him that they were asking for more than he could give.

The Liberals have been claiming that they have been spending more money on veterans, and we know that is not true. In fact, the Prime Minister is cutting \$500 million worth of benefits from our veterans.

Canadian veterans, like Sean Bruyca, have been calling the Liberal pension scheme a shell game ever since they discovered the details. Worse yet, to shut him up, the Liberals are taking this veteran to court for simply exposing the truth. Why?

**Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we will take no lessons on how we treat our veterans from the Conservative government that nickel-and-dimed them every step of the way, while wrapping themselves in the flag and at the same time shutting down the very service centres that served our veterans in their times of need.

*Oral Questions*

Since 2016, we have invested \$10 billion for veterans programs and services. We have raised financial supports for veterans and caregivers. We have supported a continuum of mental health services. We have expanded the range of services available to the families of medically-released veterans. We have increased, by \$42.8 million, the service—

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for Barrie—Innisfil.

**Mr. John Brassard (Barrie—Innisfil, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, in 2015, the Prime Minister stood in Belleville with veterans as a backdrop, including some from his own caucus wearing their medals, and said, “We will [immediately] reinstate lifelong pensions.” Veterans understood that to mean the type of pension that existed before the new veterans charter. We now know the Prime Minister deceived veterans and their families. The Liberal pension for life scheme moves away from the one veteran, one standard model and takes a half a billion dollars away from veterans and their families.

Why did the Prime Minister make a promise he knew he could not keep?

**Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, on the contrary, we are keeping our promises to veterans, which is something the Conservatives never did.

Our investments into veterans is \$10 billion, new dollars, including delivering on our promise for a pension for life option. Because veterans are expected to take the \$1,150 monthly tax-free payment for the rest of their lives, rather than taking a lump sum upfront, of course the budgetary costs are spread out over a longer time.

We immediately increased financial support for veterans, increased mental health support, and are delivering on our promise to veterans.

**Mr. John Brassard (Barrie—Innisfil, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, as he stood in Belleville with his hand over his heart, the Prime Minister clearly had his other hand behind his back with his fingers crossed. Veterans and their families do not like being lied to or deceived.

Will the Prime Minister admit that the Liberal pension for life scheme means no new money and in fact means less money for veterans and their families? While he is at it, why does he not apologize to veterans for lying to them?

**The Speaker:** I encourage members to be careful and judicious in the choice of their words.

**Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, when the Conservatives were in government, they tried to balance their budgets on the backs of veterans by cutting their services, by nickel-and-diming them and disrespecting them at every step of the way. I will take no lessons on how to treat our veterans with respect from those guys.

• (1500)

**The Speaker:** Order, please. The hon. member for Durham will come to order.

The hon. member for Drummond.

[*Translation*]

**EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE**

**Mr. François Choquette (Drummond, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, our employment insurance system is unfair to sick people.

Cynthia Lafontaine is a young mom who lives in my riding, Drummond. She was diagnosed with spinal cord cancer. She was able to collect benefits for 15 weeks, and after that, she did not have a penny to her name. By failing to take action, the government has put Cynthia and many other people in this awful situation. People do not recover from cancer in 15 weeks.

Would the Prime Minister show some empathy and give Canadians better sickness benefits?

**Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we have made solid commitments to improve the employment insurance system so that it meets the needs of Canadian families.

We created the new family caregiver benefit, we made the rules for EI sickness benefits more flexible, and we simplified the application process so Canadians can get their benefits more easily.

The Conservatives did not understand what a huge impact some illnesses can have on Canadian families, but we are working steadily to improve the employment insurance system.

\* \* \*

[*English*]

**PUBLIC SERVICES AND PROCUREMENT**

**Ms. Jenny Kwan (Vancouver East, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Public Services keeps saying fixing the Phoenix fiasco is her number one priority. My constituent went on maternity leave and thanks to Phoenix, her T-4 slip says she was paid four times more than what she actually received. Canada Revenue Agency will not put a hold on her file and as a result, she received a \$14,000 tax bill and was forced to pay taxes on income that she never earned. She filed a complaint more than seven months ago and was told no action has been taken.

How can the Prime Minister think that this is acceptable?

**Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we do not think this is acceptable. Canada's public servants deserve to be paid accurately and on time for their important work. Our government remains focused on stabilizing the Phoenix pay system and resolving these unacceptable issues, which continue to be our number one priority. We have increased the capacity by 1,500 people at the pay centre. The backlog is down 100,000 cases since January 2015. We did not create this Phoenix problem, but we are going to fix it.

*Oral Questions*

[Translation]

**VETERANS AFFAIRS**

**Hon. Steven Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister likes to boast and spout his litanies, but if a francophone veteran needs medical assistance, watch out. That will take a while. Who said that? It was the veterans ombudsman.

That should come as no surprise, since the Prime Minister said that veterans were asking for too much. Even women veterans have to wait forever.

When will the Prime Minister stop treating francophone veterans like second-class citizens?

**Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we continue to defend access to services in both official languages, and it would be unacceptable if francophones were not receiving adequate services in a timely manner. If there is a problem, we will make sure that it gets fixed.

I want point out, however, that since 2016, we have invested \$10 million in veterans programs and services. We have increased financial supports for veterans and their caregivers. We have supported a continuum of mental health services. We also reopened all the veteran service offices that were closed by the member and his government.

\* \* \*

[English]

**INTERNATIONAL TRADE**

**Mr. Dean Allison (Niagara West, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, after meeting with over 150 businesses throughout Canada, the negative effect of the imposed steel and aluminum tariffs by the U.S. has become very evident. Companies are downsizing. Some are closing. Employees are being laid off and losing their jobs, thanks to the Liberals signing a bad deal. It is unfathomable that the Liberals would sign a deal with the U.S. without having these tariffs removed.

Why would the Prime Minister sign a deal with the United States with steel and aluminum tariffs still in place?

**Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, once again, I want to begin by thanking all Canadians of different parties for working together so diligently to demonstrate a united front as we negotiated the new NAFTA. This was something that across the partisan divide was so important that we did together and we can all take credit for the security that we have in continued access to the U.S. markets.

However, as I told the steel and aluminum workers on the floor of their plant, this government has their back. We always will.

● (1505)

[Translation]

**Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, that is not readily apparent.

When we were negotiating directly with the Americans, tariffs of 25% on steel and 10% on aluminum were in place. This issue directly affects 30,000 jobs in Quebec.

The Prime Minister should have used the negotiations as an opportunity to make sure the tariffs were lifted, but he did not. The tariffs have been in effect for five months now. It has been almost a month since the agreement was signed, and the tariffs are still there.

Why did the Prime Minister fail in his duty? Why did he not demand that the Americans remove the tariffs completely before signing this agreement?

**Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as I told steel and aluminum workers when I visited their plants, our government will protect them. Canada's countermeasures will remain in place until the unfair steel and aluminum tariffs are lifted.

Throughout the negotiations, our goal was always to create conditions that will help grow the middle class and provide more opportunities to Canadians.

We will keep working until the tariffs are eliminated. That is what Canadians expect, and that is exactly what we are going to do.

\* \* \*

[English]

**INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS**

**Mr. Don Rusnak (Thunder Bay—Rainy River, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, just last month, my colleague's private member's bill, Bill C-326, which focuses on drinking water guidelines in Canada, moved to the Senate for first reading. As members will know, decades of neglect have left drinking water systems on first nations reserves in Canada in an unacceptable state. This is why our government is committed to ending long-term drinking water advisories on all public systems on reserve by March 2021.

Can the Prime Minister please update this House as to the actions being taken to ensure reliable access to clean drinking water on reserves?

**Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the member for Thunder Bay—Rainy River for his hard work and for his advocacy on this important issue.

I am pleased to share that as of today, 74 long-term drinking water advisories have been lifted, some of which have been in place for over a decade. We are making significant investments in improving water systems, in water operator training and to ensure at-risk systems do not become long-term issues. We remain firmly on track to our commitment to lifting all long-term drinking water advisories on public systems on reserve by March 2021.

\* \* \*

**ETHICS**

**Hon. Erin O'Toole (Durham, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the Privy Council revealed that 73 people were aware of Liberal cabinet secrets related to the delay of the Davie Shipbuilding contract. We know that several Liberal ministers and several Liberal MPs have real or perceived conflicts in that shipbuilding deal. This is in a government that has already seen several ministers and the Prime Minister found in ethical breaches.

Will the Prime Minister be completely transparent, release the names of the 73 people who knew or at least the names of the Liberal MPs on that list of 73?

**Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as the member well knows, it is improper to comment on this issue under the *sub judice* rule as the matter is before the court. This rule is a part of the law relating to contempt of court and also a convention recognized by this House. Members of Parliament are expected to refrain from discussing ongoing legal proceedings before the court. We respect this rule, as well as the law and rules that govern legal proceedings, including the handling of evidence, which will be dealt with before the court in due course on this case.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

#### TELECOMMUNICATIONS

**Mr. Robert Aubin (Trois-Rivières, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, when Rogers Communications proposed building a tower on Notre-Dame Street West in Trois-Rivières, people were immediately opposed to it.

Nevertheless, the company could still decide to go forward with this despite the public outcry and the municipality's opposition. A wide range of solutions were proposed, but the consultation provided for under the act may prove to be just a necessary inconvenience for the company.

How is it that, in 2018, the Prime Minister is allowing a telecommunications company to go ahead with something like this, despite opposition from the municipality and residents?

**Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we understand how important access to data and high-speed Internet across the country is for economic growth and to enable Canadians to fully participate in the labour market and job creation in the future. However, we expect all private companies responsible for providing these services to do so in a manner that is respectful to residents.

We will follow up on this issue.

\* \* \*

• (1510)

#### INTERNATIONAL TRADE

**Mr. Fayçal El-Khoury (Laval—Les Îles, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we know that small and medium-sized businesses contribute to our economy by exporting their products.

During the NAFTA negotiations, we consulted with and listened to SMEs. One thing they asked us to do was to reduce red tape at the border to help Canadian companies boost their exports.

Can the Prime Minister inform the House of the new measures in the new agreement that will directly help companies with that?

**Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for Laval—Les Îles for his support for the SMEs in his riding.

The new agreement with the United States and Mexico contains a new chapter on customs administration and trade facilitation, as well

as a new chapter on SMEs. The new regulations will reduce red tape at the border and boost trade.

This agreement will be good for Canadian companies and workers, including those in Laval.

\* \* \*

[English]

#### JUSTICE

**Hon. Andrew Scheer (Leader of the Opposition, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, for weeks the Prime Minister claimed that there was absolutely nothing he could do about Tori Stafford's killer being placed in a healing lodge. He actually instructed his entire caucus to vote against a Conservative motion that spelled out the exact steps that he could take. Now that he has finally acted on this, will he do the right thing and apologize to the Stafford family for politicizing this issue, and will he apologize—

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

**The Speaker:** Order. Order. The hon. Leader of the Opposition has a few more seconds.

**Hon. Andrew Scheer:** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister actually went to great lengths to demonize anyone who had a problem with this, resorting to nasty name-calling and divisive language. Will he do the right thing and apologize?

**Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, our hearts go out to the family of Tori Stafford for the lost angel.

The Minister of Public Safety asked the Commissioner of the Correctional Service to review the transfer decision in question and their policies on offender transfers. Following that review, he has provided direction to improve transfer policies on medium-security women offenders to facilities without a directly controlled perimeter. These changes will help ensure guilty parties are held accountable, while fostering rehabilitation so we can have fewer repeat offenders, fewer victims and, ultimately, safer communities.

\* \* \*

#### THE ENVIRONMENT

**Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP):** Mr. Speaker, apropos that last exchange, it is a shame Maclean's magazine did not have a hypocrite of the year award for parliamentarians.

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

**The Speaker:** Order. Order. There are reasons why we have rules on unparliamentary language, because it leads to disorder of that sort, so I would ask the hon. member for Saanich—Gulf Islands to withdraw the offending word.

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

**The Speaker:** We have to be able to hear the member. Order. Order.

**Ms. Elizabeth May:** Mr. Speaker, I apologize unreservedly, and to the hon. Leader of the Opposition as well.

I would like to proceed to my question, if that is allowed.

*Routine Proceedings*

When the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change report came out, it said that we had nothing that would block us from protecting life on earth by achieving 1.5° Celsius. The only missing ingredient is political will. My question to the Prime Minister is this. Can Canada show that political will and go to COP24 committing that Canada will follow the pathway set out by the IPCC?

**Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague for her long-time advocacy toward environmental causes in Canada. We are the first generation to feel the impacts of climate change and the last generation to be able to stop it. We are working hard to meet our 2030 targets, and we know there will be more work to do after that. We are leading the Powering Past Coal Alliance with the United Kingdom. We have been a leader at COP since 2015. We will continue to play a leadership role in tackling climate change internationally.

• (1515)

[Translation]

**The Speaker:** There have been discussions among representatives of all parties in the House, and I understand that there is consent for hon. members to rise now and observe a moment of silence in honour of Bernard Landry, the 28th premier of Quebec.

[A moment of silence observed]

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[Translation]

### VETERANS OMBUDSMAN

**Mr. Stéphane Lauzon (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Veterans Affairs and Associate Minister of National Defence, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 32(2), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the Veterans Ombudsman's Annual Report 2017-18.

\* \* \*

[English]

### GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's responses to 16 petitions.

\* \* \*

### APOLOGY TO JEWISH REFUGEES

**Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, on May 15, 1939, more than 900 German Jews boarded an ocean liner called the *St. Louis*. The passengers had been stripped of their possessions, chased out of their homes, forced out of their schools and banned from their professions by their own government. Their synagogues had been burned, their stores raided, their clothing scarred with yellow stars. They had been forced to add "Israel" or "Sarah" to the names they had known their whole lives.

Women and men who had once contributed so much to their country had been labelled aliens, traitors and enemies and were treated as such: persecuted, robbed, jailed and killed because of who they were. Nazi Germany had denied them their citizenship and their fundamental rights, yet when the *St. Louis* set sail from Hamburg that fateful Monday, the more than 900 stateless passengers on board considered themselves lucky, lucky because they each carried on board an entrance visa to Cuba, a rare chance to escape the tyranny of the Nazi regime under Adolf Hitler.

By the time the ship docked in Havana harbour, things would take a turn for the worse. The Cuban government refused to recognize their entrance visas, and only a few passengers were allowed to disembark. Even after men, women and children threatened mass suicide, entry was denied.

So continued their long and tragic quest for safety. They would request asylum from Argentina, Uruguay, Paraguay and Panama. Each said no. On June 2, the MS *St. Louis* was forced to leave Havana, with no guarantee that they would be welcomed elsewhere.

After the Americans denied their appeals, they sought refuge in Canada, but the Liberal government of Mackenzie King was unmoved by the plight of these refugees. Despite the desperate plea of the Canadian Jewish community, despite the repeated calls by the government's two Jewish caucus members, despite the many letters from concerned Canadians of different faiths, the government chose to turn its back on these innocent victims of Hitler's regime.

At the time, Canada was home to just 11 million people, of whom only 160,000 were Jews.

• (1520)

[Translation]

Yet even that proved to be too many for many Canadians, including Frederick Charles Blair, who then headed the government's immigration branch. In a letter dated September 1938, the minister wrote:

Pressure by Jewish people to get into Canada has never been greater than it is now, and I am glad to be able to add that, after 35 years of experience here, it has never been so carefully controlled.

[English]

Not a single Jewish refugee was to set foot, let alone settle, on Canadian soil.

The MS *St. Louis* and its passengers had no choice but to return to Europe, where the United Kingdom, Belgium, France and Holland agreed to take in the refugees. When the Nazis conquered Belgium, France and Holland, many of them would be murdered in the gruesome camps and gas chambers of the Third Reich.

The story of the *St. Louis* and its passengers is no isolated incident. The Government of Canada was indifferent to the suffering of Jews long before the *St. Louis* ever set sail for Halifax, and sadly, long after it had returned to Europe.

[Translation]

In the wake of the Great Depression, Canadian lawmakers had begun to tighten restrictions on immigration, adopting policies that were both economically and ethnically selective.



*Routine Proceedings*

To the government of the day, Jews were among the least desirable immigrants; their presence on our soil had to be limited. The government imposed strict quotas and an ever-growing list of requirements designed to deter Jewish immigration.

As the Nazis escalated their attacks on the Jews of Europe, the number of visa applications surged. Canadian relatives, embassy officials, immigration officers, political leaders—all were flooded with calls for help.

Wealthy businessmen promising job creation; aging parents vowing to take up farming; pregnant women begging for clemency; doctors, lawyers, academics, engineers, scientists imploring officials and the government to let them serve our country. They offered everything they owned, promising to comply with Canada's every request.

[English]

These refugees would have made this country stronger and its people proud, but the government went to great lengths to ensure that their appeals went nowhere, that their cries for help were left unanswered, for Canada deemed them unworthy of a home and undeserving of our help.

By 1938, the world was wrestling with a growing refugee crisis. When leaders of all nations convened in Evian to discuss the future of Jews in Europe, no country stepped forward to drastically increase its quotas. Jews were viewed as a threat to be avoided rather than as the victims of a humanitarian crisis.

When Canadian lawmakers returned from Evian, they used their powers to further tighten the rules around Jewish immigration, legitimizing the anti-Semitic sentiment taking hold at home and abroad. Bitter resentment toward Jews was enshrined in our policies, the same policies immigration officials would later use to justify their callous response to the *St. Louis* and its passengers.

Of all the allied countries, Canada would admit the fewest number of Jews between 1933 and 1945, far fewer than the United Kingdom and significantly fewer, per capita, than the United States. Of those it let in, as many as 7,000 were labelled prisoners of war and unjustly imprisoned alongside Nazis. As far as Jews were concerned, none was too many.

In the years leading up to the war, Hitler tested the world's resolve. He noted carefully as country after country proved itself indifferent to the plight of Jewish refugees. He watched as we refused them visas, ignored their letters and denied them entry. With every decree, he challenged the political courage of our leaders and the empathy of those who elected them. With every pogrom, he tested the bounds of our humanity and the limits of our solidarity. Adolf Hitler's test is one the Canadian government failed miserably.

● (1525)

This week marks the 80th anniversary of Kristallnacht, a sombre turning point in Hitler's racial policy and the beginning of the Holocaust. Kristallnacht happened on the heels of that Evian Conference, where the world cemented its indifference and antipathy towards Jews. There is little doubt that our silence permitted the Nazis to come up with their own final solution for the so-called Jewish problem.

[Translation]

When Canada joined the war against Germany—when we were fighting for democracy abroad—we were failing Hitler's victims at home. What we were willing to do abroad, we were unwilling to do at home.

The plight of the *St. Louis* did not lead to a significant change in policy, nor did alarming reports from across Europe or the gruesome details of a coordinated effort to eliminate Jews. When the allies caught wind of the concentration camps, they did not bomb the rail lines that led to Auschwitz, nor did they take concrete action to rescue the remnants of Europe's Jewish community.

When the war ended, Canada and the allied powers discovered the full horrors of the Holocaust. We joined the world in condemning in the strongest terms the death camps of Hitler and the despicable cruelty of his actions. And yet, even the industrial mass murder of more than six million Jews did not force a swift change in our immigration policy.

● (1530)

[English]

It would take another three years for Canada to open its doors and take in Jewish refugees at the same rate we took in non-Jewish German nationals at the end of the war. It would take new leadership, a new world order and the creation of the State of Israel, a homeland for the Jewish people, for Canada to amend its laws and begin to dismantle the policies that had legitimized and propagated anti-Semitism.

Adolf Hitler alone did not seal the fate of the *St. Louis* passengers or the Jews of Europe. To harbour such hatred and indifference towards the refugees was to share in the moral responsibility for their deaths. While decades have passed since we turned our backs on Jewish refugees, time has by no means absolved Canada of its guilt or lessened the weight of our shame.

Today I rise in the House of Commons to issue a long overdue apology to the Jewish refugees Canada turned away. We apologize to the 907 German Jews aboard the MS *St. Louis*, as well as their families. We also apologize to others who paid the price of our inaction, whom we doomed to the ultimate horror of the death camps. We used our laws to mask our anti-Semitism, our antipathy, our resentment. We are sorry for the callousness of Canada's response, and we are sorry for not apologizing sooner.

We apologize to the mothers and fathers whose children we did not save, and to the daughters and sons whose parents we did not help. We apologize to the imprisoned Jewish refugees who were forced to relive their trauma next to their tormentors.

*Routine Proceedings*

To the scientists, artists, engineers, lawyers, businessmen, nurses, doctors, mathematicians, pharmacists, poets and students, to every Jew who sought safe haven in Canada, who stood in line for hours and wrote countless letters, we refused to help them when we could have. We contributed to sealing the cruel fates of far too many at places like Auschwitz, Treblinka and Belzec. We failed them and for that we are sorry.

Finally, we apologize to the members of Canada's Jewish community whose voices were ignored, whose calls went unanswered. We were quick to forget the ways in which they had helped build this country since its inception, quick to forget that they were our friends and neighbours, that they had educated our youth, cared for our sick and clothed our poor. Instead, we let anti-Semitism take hold in our communities and become our official policy. We did not hesitate to circumvent their participation, limit their opportunities and discredit their talent. They were meant to feel like strangers in their own homes, aliens in their own land. We denied them the respect that every Canadian, every human being, regardless of origin, regardless of faith is owed by their government and by their fellow citizens.

When Canada turned its back on the Jews of Europe, we turned our back on Jewish Canadians as well. It was unacceptable then and it is unacceptable now. The country failed them, and for that we are sorry.

• (1535)

[*Translation*]

The story of the *St. Louis* and the ill-treatment of Jews before, during and after the Second World War should fill us with shame. Shame because these actions run counter to the promise of our country. That is not the Canada we know today—a Canada far more generous, accepting and compassionate than it once was. A place where citizenship is first defined by principles and ideals, not by race nor by faith.

This change in attitudes, this shift in policy was no accident. It was the work of Canadian men and women who dedicated their lives to making this country more equal and more just. Men and women who were children of the Holocaust, Jewish refugees or descendants of the oppressed.

[*English*]

These Jewish women and men took part in social struggles for fairness, justice and human rights. At home, they furthered the great Canadian causes that shaped this country, causes that benefited all Canadians. Abroad, they fought for democracy and the rule of law, for equality and liberty. The scope of their impact should not only be recognized, but celebrated. They were scientists and activists, ministers and singers, physicists and philanthropists. They were and continue to be proudly Jewish and proudly Canadian. They helped open up Canada's eyes and ears to the plight of the most vulnerable. They taught us *tikkun olam*, which is our responsibility to heal the world.

[*Translation*]

When Canada chose to turn its back on refugees more than 70 years ago, not only did the government fail to help the most vulnerable, it harmed all of us. Jewish Canadians have made

immense contributions to our country, as do all the immigrants who have chosen and continue to choose Canada.

[*English*]

As we stand here today, we are reminded of not only how far we have come, but also of how far we still have to go. During this Holocaust Education Week, it is all the more impossible to ignore the challenges and injustices still facing Jews in this country.

According to the most recent figures, 17% of all hate crimes in Canada target Jewish people, a far higher figure per capita than for any other group. Holocaust deniers still exist. Anti-Semitism is still far too present. Jewish institutions and neighbourhoods are still being vandalized with swastikas. Jewish students still feel unwelcome and uncomfortable in some of our college and university campuses because of BDS-related intimidation. Out of the entire community of nations, it is Israel whose right to exist is most widely and wrongly questioned.

Discrimination and violence against Jewish people in Canada and around the world continues at an alarming rate. Less than two weeks ago, not too far from here, a gunman opened fire on worshippers at the Tree of Life synagogue in Pittsburgh, killing 11 people and wounding six others. Among those wounded were four police officers who had arrived at the scene to defend the congregants. These worshippers were gathered in peace to practise their faith. They were murdered in their sanctuary on Shabbat because they were Jews.

This was a heinous anti-Semitic act of violence motivated by hate, designed to inflict pain and stoke fear in the Jewish community. Canadians were horrified by this vicious attack on the Jewish community and its values. Across Canada, people organized vigils in honour of the victims. They stood in solidarity with their Jewish brothers and sisters and echoed a sentiment shared from coast to coast, that anti-Semitism and all forms of xenophobia have no place in this country or anywhere in this world. Canada and Canadians will continue to stand with the Jewish community and call out the hatred that incited such despicable acts.

These tragic events ultimately attest to the work we still have to do together, work that begins with education, our most powerful tool against the ignorance and cruelty that fuelled the Holocaust, because, sadly, these evils did not end with the Second World War. Canada and all Canadians must stand up against xenophobic and anti-Semitic attitudes that still exist in our communities, in our schools, and in our places of work. We must guard our communities and institutions against the kinds of evils that took hold in the hearts of so many, more than 70 years ago, evils that did not end with the war.

*Routine Proceedings*

Following the recent horrific attack in Pittsburgh, Jewish Canadians are understandably feeling vulnerable. We know that here in Canada we are not immune to hate and hate crimes grounded in anti-Semitism. Our government and members of Parliament are working with the Jewish community to better protect their communities against the threat of anti-Semitism. Places of worship are sacred and should be sanctuaries for all faith communities. There have been clear calls to do more through the security infrastructure program to protect synagogues and other places that are at risk of hate-motivated crimes, and I pledge to all now that we will do more.

● (1540)

As we stand here today, we must commit ourselves not just to remember, but to act on this tragic history so our children and grandchildren flourish in a world in which they are never questioned or attacked because of their identity. Sadly, this is not yet that world.

Too many people of all faiths from all countries face persecution. Their lives are threatened simply because of how they pray, what they wear or what last name they bear. They are forced to flee their homes and embark upon perilous journeys in search of safety and a future. This is the world we all live in and this is therefore our collective responsibility.

It is my sincere hope that by issuing this long overdue apology, we can shine a light on this painful chapter of our history and ensure that its lessons are never forgotten. What we can hardly imagine, the passengers of the *MS St. Louis*, the victims of the Holocaust, and their descendants will never forget.

While no words will ever erase their pain, it is our sincere hope that this apology will help them heal, that it will bring them some peace, that it will cement Canada's unwavering commitment to stand with the Jewish community here and around the world in the fight against anti-Semitism, as the Jewish community in Canada and around the world is always among the first to stand against intolerance and hate in any form.

More than 70 years ago, Canada turned its back on them. But, today, Canadians pledged, now and forever, never again.

● (1545)

**Hon. Andrew Scheer (Leader of the Opposition, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my fellow members for today's solemn proceedings, humbled and honoured by the presence of some of those who were wronged by the terrible and fateful decision of the Canadian government, almost 80 years ago, to turn away the passengers of the *MS St. Louis* when they sought a safe harbour from Hitler's Germany.

It is a sign of a healthy society to be able to look at history clearly and see both the light and the dark, to celebrate our achievements, but to also mourn our failings. There is no shame, as a country, in acknowledging shameful acts in our past. The real shame would be in forgetting them and not learning from them.

[Translation]

While it is true that apologies cannot change the past, occasions such as this, marked by remembrance, reflection and regret, can help guide our future.

[English]

The unique horror of the Holocaust, in which more than a quarter of the passengers of the *MS St. Louis* perished, produced the rallying cry "Never again". That is not a passive hope; it is a call to action. It commands us to remember how, within the lifetime of some in this room, a civilized modern society succumbed to a primitive fear and turned its vaunted industrial prowess against its Jewish citizens and its neighbours.

"Never again" requires us to measure our actions today, not against the worst atrocities of that time but against the gradual process of dehumanization that preceded it and made the Holocaust possible. That insidious process of dehumanization was not confined to Germany or even to Europe. It was the same process that motivated Canadians, right up to the highest levels of government, to deny the *MS St. Louis* a safe harbour and to drive its desperate passengers back across the Atlantic into the gathering storm of war.

[Translation]

The men who turned away the *MS St. Louis* likely could not have foreseen the magnitude of the genocide that was on the horizon in Europe.

[English]

However, the new discriminatory laws and increasing acts of terror against Jewish citizens and the relentless and obsessive anti-Semitism of the Nazi government, which forced the passengers of the *MS St. Louis* to seek shelter across the Atlantic, leaves Canada with no excuses, not just in hindsight but at the time, for ignoring the dire threat they faced.

Historian Irving Abella has noted the bitter irony that:

To the condemned Jews of Auschwitz, Canada had a unique meaning. It was the name given to the camp barracks where the gold, jewellery and clothing taken from inmates were stored. It represented life, luxury and salvation. It was also isolated and unreachable, as was Canada in the 1930s and 40s.

To the passengers of the *MS St. Louis*, however, Canada was not geographically isolated or unreachable. They were there, just off the coast of Nova Scotia, searching for safety. It was not our lands, but it was the minds at the time that were isolated. It was hearts that were unreachable.

[Translation]

We apologize for closing our hearts and minds and our shores to the more than 900 Jewish passengers of the *MS St. Louis*.

● (1550)

[English]

Their plight has been called "The Voyage of the Damned", and Canada was responsible for turning them away.

*Routine Proceedings*

Canada was not alone in doing so. Cuba and the United States also turned the *St. Louis* away before it approached Canada. However, their callousness in no way excuses our own. There is no diminishment of individual guilt in such a shared failure. The Canadian government was responsible to the full extent of its own cold, deliberate and official inhumanity.

It is comforting to think that today we have learned the lesson of the MS *St. Louis*, but this apology should not make us comfortable. On the contrary, it should grab us and shake us. It should be an alarm that jolts us out of our daily routines and demands that we look at our world today through the lens of that experience.

True, Canada is not the same country it was in 1939. We have welcomed more people from more parts of the world than the government of that day could have possibly imagined, including 40,000 European Jews in the years immediately after World War II. Our peaceful pluralism today leaves no room for discrimination, and both the overt and subtle anti-Semitism that prevailed in that era no longer have any place in our laws and customs.

However, that does not mean that anti-Semitism and other virulent forms of intolerance no longer exist here. Anti-Semitism is not a relic of the 1930s. It was not eradicated with the defeat of the Nazis. It is, unfortunately and sadly, very much alive today.

[*Translation*]

In Canada, anti-Semitism accounts for the vast majority of religiously motivated hate crimes and the number of such crimes has gone up in the past few years.

[*English*]

On social media, in parades and public demonstrations, even on our own university campuses, we have seen a disturbing resurgence and even normalization of anti-Semitic rhetoric. We know from painful experience that where anti-Semitism is tolerated, anti-Jewish violence follows. This was brought home again, aching, in a murderous attack at Pittsburgh's Tree of Life synagogue only days ago.

We see it also overseas where anti-Semitic rhetoric, blood libels and conspiracies are still used by repressive regimes to distract from their own failures and to direct the frustrations of their people outward against the Jewish people and the Jewish State of Israel, whose citizens, as a result, live under constant threat.

[*Translation*]

In 2011, under our Conservative government, these events were commemorated by the unveiling of a memorial monument at the Canadian Museum of Immigration at Pier 21, in Halifax.

[*English*]

Designed by Daniel Libeskind, who also designed the National Holocaust Monument just a few blocks from the House, the Wheel of Conscience is a polished, stainless steel wheel, incorporating four connecting moving gears labelled anti-Semitism, xenophobia, racism and hatred. As one gear turns, it drives the others, showing their inextricable relationship.

Anti-Semitism has always been the first recourse of demagogues and the favourite fuel of tyrants. It takes many forms, from crude

caricatures reminiscent of Nazi propaganda to the more sophisticated new anti-Semitism that singles out Israel among all the countries in the Middle East for disproportionate condemnation. It is why synagogues, Jewish schools and Jewish community centres in Europe, and indeed around the world, are once again forced to employ armed guards and to discourage their members from wearing identifying clothing or symbols.

As we witness this rise of anti-Semitism and other forms of intolerance and discrimination, we cannot again stand by impassively. We cannot again watch and fail to act, as ancient prejudice mutates into new violence.

Barely four months before Mr. King's government decided not to offer the MS *St. Louis* refuge, a member of the House tabled a petition bearing more than 127,000 signatures, protesting against Jewish immigration to Canada.

Even in 1939, many Canadians knew that the seemingly rational arguments masked an irrational fear. They knew the right answer to the moral question posed by the plight of the MS *St. Louis*. Some, like historian George Wrong, spoke out bravely, petitioning the government on behalf of the passengers, but many more lacked the courage to give voice to their consciences.

• (1555)

[*Translation*]

We are here today because Canada was judged for its actions at that critical time and was found at fault. Every generation is tested. Every generation has to answer some hard questions and resist intolerance.

[*English*]

How will we respond when we face that test? What will we do to protect those fleeing genuine threats of violent persecution today? How far will we go to defend the religious freedom of our fellow citizens here at home?

This past Saturday, Canadians filled synagogues across our country as part of the #ShowUpForShabbat campaign. Jewish or not, all were welcomed by a community whose home in Canada predates Confederation by more than a century. It was a heartfelt show of support, demonstrating to our Jewish friends and neighbours that we will stand by them when they feel most vulnerable.

It was also a tangible expression of our oft-stated commitment to freedom and the rule of law. However, if that commitment is real, if the apology today is not just empty words, we must show the same willingness to stand, not just against violence but against hatred, intolerance and all violations of fundamental human rights.

With the lesson of history fresh in our minds, we have no excuse to failing to give voice to our convictions and making our conscience, and not expediency, our compass.

*Routine Proceedings*

Canada should have been guided by that spirit in 1939. Canada should have offered sanctuary to the passengers of the MS *St. Louis*. For our failure to do so then, we stand with the government today in its apology. Never again must none be too many.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Guy Caron (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, on June 7, 1939, Canada said no to Jewish refugees. Today, Canada is apologizing and expressing its regrets.

Let me begin by acknowledging all the survivors who are here with us.

[*English*]

Shalom, you are welcome in the House and your presence carries a world of meaning considering our past actions. Your presence here today is important, as Canada apologizes to the Jewish community for saying no to a number of their fellow Jews who were fleeing horrible persecution in Europe to find peace here on the eve of the Second World War.

The story of the MS *St. Louis* is part of a very long series of unfortunate events that shaped anti-Semitism around the world in the 1930s, and which still resonates today. What happened to the passengers of the MS *St. Louis* is a stain on Canadian history.

[*Translation*]

The MS *St. Louis* left the Port of Hamburg, Germany, on May 13, 1939. It carried 937 people, nearly all of them of Jewish, who were fleeing the growing violence and anti-Semitism in Europe and in Nazi Germany, where Adolf Hitler had already been in power for six years.

On June 2, the ship was forced to leave Havana, where just a few passengers had managed to disembark. The ship then sailed along the coast of South and North America in the hope that authorities would welcome the 907 remaining passengers.

In spite of the pleas from Captain Gustav Schröder, American organizations and celebrities, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt turned away the refugees. The ship continued northward, hoping for a favourable response from Canadian authorities.

On June 7, when the ship was just two days at sea from Halifax Harbour, 41 prominent Torontonians called on Prime Minister Mackenzie King to grant asylum to the *St. Louis* refugees. An answer came from justice minister Ernest Lapointe and from Frederick Charles Blair, the Canadian government official responsible for immigration.

Mr. Blair stated that the refugees did not qualify under Canada's immigration laws at the time, which he himself had created. He said, "No country could open its doors wide enough to take in the hundreds of thousands of Jewish people who want to leave Europe: the line must be drawn somewhere."

Sadly, in light of current events, these words still resonate today. After being turned away by Cuban, American and Canadian authorities, the 907 refugees aboard the *St. Louis* were forced to reverse course and travel back across the ocean to the war that was

brewing in Europe with eyes filled with dashed hopes, fear in their hearts, and only a suitcase to their name.

● (1600)

[*English*]

The passengers of the MS *St. Louis* were dispersed through Belgium, France, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom, but many of them were caught by the Nazis and sent to die in concentration camps. Two hundred and fifty-four of them did not survive, 254, all murdered, along with six million of their fellow Jews, victims of the Shoah. They were 254 people who had boarded the MS *St. Louis* in the hope of fleeing death and who could have been saved had Canada said yes.

Canada abandoned innocent people who then became victims of Hitler and his hate. The passengers of the MS *St. Louis* were fleeing anti-Semitism, unaware that anti-Semitism had crossed the ocean before them.

Anti-Semitism continues to claim lives today. On October 27, 11 people were shot and killed by a gunman in the Tree of Life synagogue in Pittsburgh. Eleven people died and six people were injured because of their faith. It is the most serious anti-Semitic attack in North American history.

Among the victims was a 97-year-old woman who had survived the horrors of the Holocaust, taken down by a killer fired up by the same vile hatred, a man who claimed that he wanted to "kill all the Jews".

Let us salute the incredible sense of duty of the Allegheny General Hospital personnel who treated the killer's injuries. Three of the doctors and nurses who treated him were themselves Jewish and through their acts showed the depth of humanist values found in the Jewish community. They honoured the principle that whoever saves a life saves an entire universe.

[*Translation*]

In 2016, police reported 1,409 hate crimes in Canada. That is not counting all the crimes that are not reported and whose victims suffer in silence. Of the hate crimes reported in 2016, 460 were motivated by the victims' religion, with half of those targeting the Jewish community, signalling that anti-Semitism is not a thing of the past. This past year alone, 14 synagogues in Canada received threats calling for the extermination of the Jewish community.

Verbal and physical violence, vandalism and harassment in public and online are still part of everyday life for Jews in this country. That is unacceptable.

[*English*]

From the MS *St. Louis* to the massacre in Pittsburgh, anti-Semitism continues to show its face. In fact, what we are unfortunately seeing today are past demons feeding into the fear of the other. Extremism is on the rise, and so are homophobia, misogyny, xenophobia, Islamophobia and anti-Semitism. Intolerance has no place here, yesterday, today or tomorrow.

*Routine Proceedings*

[Translation]

The survivors who are with us today remind us how important it is for all countries to welcome those who take huge risks to seek asylum, who take huge risks to live in peace, who take huge risks to create a better future for their children.

Even now, the refugee situation is at the root of an abundant flow of blood and ink. Every day, thousands of women, men and children attempt to flee violence, war, famine, drought and climate change in the hope of building a better life somewhere else, somewhere safer.

Considering the tensions that arose here and elsewhere when Canada welcomed Syrian refugees, I hope that today's national apology will give pause to those who still have a hostile, anti-immigrant mindset.

[English]

While today Canada officially regrets having refused entry to Jewish refugees on board the MS *St. Louis* and during most of the Second World War, we are reaffirming today our commitment to denounce anti-immigrant discourse, systemic racism and hate-based violence against people, regardless of their identity.

We need to be focused, in particular, on confronting online hate. As the recent horrifying events in Pittsburgh demonstrate, vicious anti-Semitic rhetoric online can and does lead to shocking acts of violence, including murder.

If the doors of Canada were closed to Jewish refugees on board the MS *St. Louis* in 1939 and during most of the Second World War, we must commit to never make the same mistake again.

These children, women and men are only asking that we open our doors to them so that they may unpack their suitcases here, so that they can continue their lives here, so that in safety and security, they can grow and accomplish their hopes and dreams, all the while contributing to Canadian society.

Because of anti-Semitism, we denied asylum to the passengers of the MS *St. Louis*. On behalf of my party, I wish to add my voice to the official apology made here today.

On June 7, 1939, Canada said no to Jewish refugees. Today Canada is apologizing and expresses its regret. The future must not follow in the path of past errors. We must all work collectively to fight against anti-Semitism in all its forms, wherever it takes place.

The NDP stands shoulder to shoulder with Canada's Jewish community against anti-Semitism, here in Canada and around the world. No community should face this hatred alone. Together, let us build a better story.

● (1605)

[Translation]

**The Speaker:** Does the hon. member for La Pointe-de-l'Île have the unanimous consent of the House to add a few words?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for La Pointe-de-l'Île.

**Mr. Mario Beaulieu (La Pointe-de-l'Île, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I am humbled to rise today to speak on behalf of the Bloc Québécois in response to Canada's apology to passengers of the MS *St. Louis*.

In 1939, in the early days of the Second World War, when Germany was fully under Nazi rule, Canada refused to welcome 907 Jewish refugees coming from Hamburg. These 907 people were fleeing ever-worsening persecution in their country.

Six months earlier, they had lived through the Night of Broken Glass, during which Adolf Hitler's troops burned down hundreds of synagogues and thousands of Jewish-owned businesses, killed 91 people and arrested 30,000 others, sending them to what would later become concentration camps.

On board the ship that was to save their lives, these 907 people first landed in Cuba. Cuba refused to help them. The ship then set course for Florida. The United States denied them asylum. As a last resort, the 907 passengers tried their luck in Halifax. Canada denied them asylum. In fact, Canada did not just say no. When asked how many Jewish refugees Canada would be willing to take, the federal government, through its then immigration minister, responded, "None is too many". These 907 Jews were therefore sent back to Europe to face certain death. Just a few months later, two-thirds of the passengers were living under Nazi occupation, and 254 of them were killed in the death camps.

Today we honour their memory and that of all those passengers. We commend the Canadian government's decision to apologize for the role it played in their lives, in their deaths, and in the lives of their loved ones.

This is one of the worst imaginable examples of lack of compassion and humanity. It is anti-Semitism. That is a loaded word, but unfortunately it is the word that best describes what happened.

The value of hundreds of people's lives was denied for no other reason than their religious beliefs. Canada was not immune to religiously motivated hatred of the other—and neither was Quebec immune to anti-Semitism, much to our regret. Anti-Semitism also found fertile ground in Quebec, which was struggling under the heavy yoke of the church at the time.

It is vital that we acknowledge that today. It is vital that we remember that we were not always on the right side of history, that we too can choose the wrong path. It is vital that we keep alive the memory of those who were condemned to death by our blindness in 1939. That is the best way to ensure that we remain vigilant against intolerance.

In closing, I would like to speak directly to our fellow citizens of the Jewish faith.

Less than two weeks after the terrible anti-Semitic crime in Pittsburgh, I want to assure them that they can count on the support of our party and on the solidarity of Quebecers. Quebec will remain united against even the smallest expressions of hatred. We will stand shoulder to shoulder. This is how we will ensure that tragedies like the one that befell the passengers of the MS *St. Louis* will never happen here again.

•(1610)

[English]

**The Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent for the hon. member for Saanich—Gulf Islands to add a few words?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

[Translation]

**Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP):** Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to rise to respond to these sad and touching speeches.

I sincerely thank the Prime Minister for his leadership in issuing this formal apology. That is very important. It is too late to take action, but it is never too late to apologize. I would also like to thank the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques and the member for La Pointe-de-l'Île.

[English]

The facts have been canvassed well, eloquently and movingly by all my colleagues. The reality of these facts has been summed up so well. However, I must take a moment to thank the historians who make sure we know of the sins of our past. Unbearable and unspeakable cruelty, blindness and callousness, we all wear the stains of this crime. I do not know if we would know about it without the historians Irving Abella and his co-author Harold Troper. I thank them for writing *None is too many*. How hard that work must have been. Mark Twain once said that history is written with the ink of pure prejudice. However, one sits down to expose prejudice when history is truth-telling. It leaves us knowing as a fact that our country had the worst record of any country that was refugee-receiving in that period. It is hard to recognize ourselves as Canada in this story, just as it is hard to recognize ourselves as Canada from ripping indigenous children from their families and putting them in residential schools, and ignoring the plights of people over the generations.

Because so much has been said, and so movingly, I want to focus on one aspect of this tragedy. It is not a coincidence, I am sure, that the Government of Canada chose today for this apology, congruent as it is with the 80th anniversary of Kristallnacht. Tonight, at Kehillat Beth Israel synagogue, tomorrow at the Congregation Emanu-El in Victoria, people will gather to commemorate Kristallnacht, the first real manifestation of the evil of Nazi Germany in targeting Jewish synagogues, businesses and homes and smashing the glass everywhere throughout Nazi Germany.

It was only six months later that those 907 German Jews boarded the *St. Louis* to get away. Six months after Kristallnacht is when the *St. Louis* left port. How were we so blind and insensitive? However, we were, and we know that was only 80 years ago. We have all said never again, we abhor anti-Semitism, just as we abhor racism in any form.

Then we come up against Pittsburgh and the Tree of Life synagogue. I think we have come full circle in a pattern of hatred and human intolerance that is not yet eradicated, because the Tree of Life synagogue outside Pittsburgh was not only targeted by that crazed gunman because he hated Jews, it was because he hated Jews who helped refugees. That synagogue, Tree of Life, had a very active chapter of the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society that was helping raise money to resettle refugees now, in 2018. That is why that gunman

### Routine Proceedings

posted notices ahead of time of the Shabbat for refugees, held by synagogues like Tree of Life.

The Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society has existed for decades. Its current CEO, Mark Hatfield, had this to say, “We assist refugees today not because they are Jewish, but because we are Jewish.”

•(1615)

The Torah requires us to intervene, to stop these things that are being done by our government in our name. That light exists in the synagogues, where the moral code of the Jewish people says that we take on a mitzvah, we take on a good work out of religious duty, and we do that work. That is the light that can guide us and we must, as politicians, never turn a blind eye to any among us who would seek electoral advantage by opening the door a crack to white supremacists, neo-Nazis or any of those who would raise up again, and hatred and fear advances their cause.

We in this time see other so-called leaders and, as my friend from the NDP said, there is a movement of intolerance on the rise. We see it globally in Brazil. We see it in the United States. We see that some people gave that gunman in Pittsburgh the idea that he had licence. Therefore, when we say “never again”, we mean it not about history but about our present.

We stand with the people of the Tree of Life synagogue in Pittsburgh as we stand with the 907 Jewish German citizens who we turned away, to our eternal shame. We wish we could turn back the hands of time and be in Halifax harbour on a million little boats and say “Jump, join us. We love you”. Now, we can only stand here and say that we are so very sorry.

[Translation]

**The Speaker:** I would like to thank the right hon. Prime Minister, the hon. Leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques, the hon. member for La Pointe-de-l'Île and the hon. member for Saanich—Gulf Islands for the eloquent and moving remarks they made today about the terrible tragedy of the *MS St. Louis*.

•(1620)

[English]

How embarrassing it is that Canada turned them away and, for me, that they were turned away at the gates of my city of Halifax, and how important it is that we remember.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

## COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

### PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

**Hon. Larry Bagnell (Yukon, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 74th report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs.

*Routine Proceedings*

The committee advises that, pursuant to Standing Order 91.1(2), the Subcommittee on Private Members' Business met to consider the order for the second reading of private member's bills originating in the Senate, and recommends that the items listed herein, which it has determined should not be designated non-votable, be considered by the House.

**The Speaker:** Pursuant to Standing Order 91.1(2), the report is deemed adopted.

CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

**Hon. Michelle Rempel (Calgary Nose Hill, CPC):** Motion for concurrence

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker, I move that the 18th report of the Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration presented on Wednesday, March 29 be concurred in.

In this place, as noted, we just talked a lot about never again and our duty in terms of never again. The report that I am attempting to concur in, should it please the House, has some very concrete recommendations to fulfill the obligation of never again here today.

Obviously, as the Leader of the Opposition said, it is very heartening to hear all people in this House support the apology to those who were on the ill-fated journey of the MS *St. Louis* but a lot of the words in the speech that the Prime Minister made are directly congruent with the report that I am attempting to concur in.

While it is important for us to apologize and recognize the sins of our past, never again also means ensuring that we are not allowing those sins to reoccur in real time. When we have incidents of genocide, if we say never again, it means that we have to ensure that those incidents of genocide are stopped.

Today, the report that I am speaking to relates to the ongoing Yazidi genocide. The Yazidi people are an ethnic and religious minority in northern Iraq. In the summer of 2014, ISIS invaded their villages, killed a large majority of the male population and rounded up tens of thousands of their women and forced them into sexual slavery.

Two years later, the United Nations issued a report after their initial review of what was going on in Sinjar and came up with several challenges for the international community to respond to in order to ensure that the genocide is stopped and that justice is brought to people who have experienced genocide.

The conversation around what to do with Yazidi genocide survivors has brought a lot of ire and difficult conversations in this House over the last three years. It has forced us and challenged us to have a conversation about the adequacy of the UN selection process for internally displaced persons. It has forced us to have a conversation about whether Canada should be relying solely on the United Nations to select refugees when they were not being referred to Canada for resettlement. It has also forced difficult conversations in the 2015 election process and difficult conversations today.

The report that I have in front of my colleagues makes some recommendations that I believe, if concurred in by this House of

Commons, will bring our country a lot further to fulfilling its promise of never again.

While the Prime Minister was making his speech, I noted a few of his words. He talked about how immigration policy around the time of the Second World War imposed strict quotas on victims of genocide, the Jewish people, how there was a list of requirements to deter Jewish resettlement and how the government at that time was inundated with calls for assistance but failed to act.

I would note that one of the key recommendations of this report is that Canada not turn a blind eye to the additional resettlement or reunification of Yazidi genocide victims with those who have arrived in Canada. The government's response to resettling Yazidi victims required it to essentially set up a new program, which is something that had not been done before in Canada. It meant we needed to work faster than the speed of the United Nations and look at internally displaced persons. Survivors who are here in Canada recount their stories to many of us.

• (1625)

They talk about the selection process and being vetted and then about talking to selection agents, who say, "Don't worry, just go to Canada. You can bring your family later." One of the key recommendations of this report is that the government prioritize the family reunification of these genocide survivors, because that is a key part of their healing and of the world doing its part to stop this genocide. That is why I feel this report should be concurred in today.

I will later read a specific case that relates to the three quotes from the Prime Minister that I just read.

To date, the government has placed strict quotas on Yazidi genocide survivors. There has been no movement to allow greater numbers through the privately sponsored refugee program, as many in the communities who are trying to help these survivors have asked for. There is a very strict set of requirements that I believe is deterring people from being able to resettle, in that many of these genocide survivors did not list family members in their initial applications because they thought they were dead but later discovered they were alive. Now the government is saying it is too bad because these people were not listed.

A lot of bureaucracy is happening rather than our asking the question of how to do this right and how we can change this. If the bureaucracy says this is just the way the rules are, maybe we need to change the rules. That is why I thought this report was a good first step in coming up with a bipartisan consensus on how we can change some of the rules in Canada to prioritize genocide survivors, and certainly in terms of family reunification.



*Routine Proceedings*

I will relate two specific cases. One of my constituents is a Yazidi refugee. She was one of the Yazidi refugees who came to Canada as part of the initiative that began in 2017. She is an ex sex slave of ISIS who survived captivity for two years after her town was invaded. In January 2017, she was interviewed by the UNHCR. In that interview, she, her sister, her mother and four daughters were all accepted as refugees. She requested bringing her brother as well. She said they advised her that her brother was in process and would follow her to Canada in two months. She states they guaranteed this to her, as she did not want to leave her only male relative behind. This is important, because much of the male Yazidi community was executed during the first round of genocide and male reunification has become increasingly more urgent for the women who survived and are here in Canada today.

She arrived in Canada with her female family members in February 2017. That month, she stated that her brother was interviewed by the UNHCR and advised that he did not have a case as he had not been taken captive by ISIS. My constituent is confused and concerned about the misinformation provided by the UNHCR, as it seems to have changed its mind about her brother. She has now been in Canada for over a year. Her brother has still not joined her and it is not clear what recourse she has since the one-year window of opportunity provision cannot be used for siblings.

In Yazidi culture, the role of male support is important. My constituent's husband and other male family members were killed by ISIS. She and her female family members are now alone in Canada. They feel they require his support—not to mention they are concerned about his well-being as a Yazidi in Iraq. He is currently in an Iraqi refugee camp.

Now I will go back to the Prime Minister's words about the government at the time being inundated with calls for assistance and about government impediments to this type of migration.

On June 18, 2018, my office sent this information to the immigration department. We received a reply on June 21, 2018, from an Olga Radchenko, director of parliamentary affairs, that they would investigate our questions. We provided this information on June 22, 2018. We then sent this person a follow-up email on September 18, 2018, inquiring about the status of the investigation. We have yet to receive a response and have not seen any movement on this file.

• (1630)

I do not know if the minister thinks this is an example of the files of Yazidis being expedited for family reunification, as outlined in the recommendations in this report, but I would not characterize a five-month delay in a simple response to a member of Parliament's office as acceptable.

These women are struggling to overcome their trauma, as well as the difficulties of having moved to a new country. The reason I initiated this study was to ensure that we responded to their unique needs as a new cohort of people who have come to Canada without a large diaspora of them here already. I cannot imagine being one of these women who are here and do not know what to do. They are struggling to overcome some basic trauma, never mind trying to figure out they can call a member of Parliament's office to have an inquiry made into their case. This should be a lot easier, and that is

what this cross-party report is recommending. Indeed, the recommendations in the report were supported by the government members of the immigration committee.

There are other similar cases. Sara is a single mom with five kids, three of whom are permanently disabled because of attacks by ISIS fighters. She and her five kids were kidnapped by ISIS, but were able to remain together because they were so young. The kids were given drugs and beaten daily for over a year by terrorists. When they finally managed to escape to a refugee camp, it had little to no medical supplies and no one who could treat her children. A few months passed, and her brother showed up at the camp with his family. Sara was so relieved to have someone to rely on.

After a month, Canadian officials came to the camp, taking down the names of Yazidis who could come to Canada. Sara was on the list with her kids, but her brother was not. She pleaded with officials, saying that she could not survive with her brother's help, that if he were not with her, she did not want to go to Canada. The Canadian official responded that her brother would arrive shortly after she did in Canada. That is what she testified. Sara has been living in Winnipeg for over a year and is still waiting for her brother, who is in a refugee camp that is about to be shut down for lack of funding and supplies. Sara said she would never have come by herself, but had been told that he would follow shortly afterwards. She said she could not survive here by herself, but that at least back home, she had someone to help her.

These are the types of stories that one will hear when talking to the scant few hundred genocide survivors who have been resettled in Canada. It is sheer panic and desperation on their part that they are able to have here the remaining people who survived this genocide. We have to appreciate that this is a small, insular community whose religious and ethnic traditions are passed down through oral history. We have to appreciate the panic and the urgency these people feel to try to reunify with their family members. I cannot fathom being a genocide survivor whose home has been destroyed at the hands of ISIS, who comes from a place where there are mass graves and where it is not safe to return, and where there has been no movement by the international community to bring justice to the perpetrators of this genocide. I cannot imagine being in that headspace and then saying, "I want to leave Canada because the Canadian government will not move fast enough to reunify my family members."

This raises an awkward question that many of us do not want to talk about here, but one that is worth discussing. According to the United Nations, 65 million people in the world are on the move right now. The context for migration has greatly changed in the last several years. We are seeing a lot of people moving across borders for various reasons, and we need to have a conversation in Canada about whom we prioritize and in what situation. That is a difficult, uncomfortable conversation, but it is one that is absolutely critical to have if we are to have an immigration policy that helps the world's most vulnerable.

*Routine Proceedings*

It is very difficult for me to understand why the members of this community are waiting years and years to be reunified with their families who are under severe threat of death, yet someone can cross the border at Roxham Road and enter the asylum claim process, after already having reached a safe country as defined by the current government.

● (1635)

We will disagree on this point. There are people in this place who will disagree with me that this is an issue. However, I would say that we cannot turn a blind eye to this, especially going back to the remarks the Prime Minister just made about this never happening again.

In its refugee resettlement programs, Canada needs to prioritize the victims of the four atrocity crimes. If the United Nations cannot figure out how to do that, then we need to both force the United Nations to reform and also change our own processes, because if we cannot reunite these people with their family members, we are doing something wrong.

The reason I support this report is that it calls for these exact changes. It calls for expedited processes to reunite these family members. It calls for a lifting of caps on privately sponsored refugees so that family reunification can happen.

There are many things the government needs to do, which I hope all members in this place would support. I have been calling on the government to do this for the last several years.

We have called on the government to treat the declaration of genocide as an immediate call to action in which a whole-of-government approach is required, including humanitarian aid, military intervention and resettlement. This included acting upon the June 2016 United Nations recommendation to accelerate the asylum claims of Yazidi victims of genocide.

We have been calling for a review of the selection process used by the United Nations to identify refugees for the government-sponsored refugee stream, and have encouraged changes if necessary.

We asked for the removal of the mission cap under the privately sponsored refugee program for Iraq in order to fully harness the generosity of Canadian private sponsors.

We called for a review of the processing times in Canada of the asylum claims of victims of genocide in both the government-sponsored and privately sponsored refugee stream, to make process improvements.

We also called for specific targets for the numbers of victims of genocide within our refugee sponsorship programs and putting in place mechanisms to measure whether or not we are meeting these targets, and thus our efficacy.

We asked the government to examine and implement innovative ways of identifying victims of genocide, as many of these people can experience difficulties being identified as part of the UN selection process.

We requested that the Government of Iraq and the United Nations, if necessary, monitor and report on the progress, if any,

being made regarding the return of ethnic and religious minorities to their places of origin in northern Iraq.

We asked the government to ensure that support is provided for the investigators mandated through the UN Security Council resolution 2379 to support domestic efforts to hold ISIS accountable for war crimes, crimes against humanity and genocide.

We asked the government to support family reunification for resettled Yazidis in Canada by indefinitely extending the one-year window of opportunity for them to include immediate family members who have been found to be alive, to define family members in the same way as those claiming asylum through exemptions from the safe third country agreement, and to expedite the processing of these applications to take no longer than 30 days.

We have asked for so many concrete things for the government to do. I know there are good people on the other side of the aisle who want to see this happen. That is why I was heartened to see this report tabled. However, we have yet to see the government act on these things.

I do not want to have to be standing here, or my successor, many years down the road, after we have made all of these recommendations and have to apologize to Sara, or to the women in my riding, and say, "Look, we didn't get it right. We didn't change our processes. We didn't do everything that we could to stop the genocide and to bring things to justice."

I understand the need to apologize. However, there are so many groups around the world who understand that genocide is something the world should not respond to after it occurs. We have to prevent it. We have to stop it. I feel very strongly that if the House concurs with this report and agrees with the finding of the immigration committee that this will be one more signal to the government that it needs to act to ensure that this never happens again.

● (1640)

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I truly believe that all members of this House recognize the horrors of ISIS and would love to see it completely disappear off the face of the earth. For the victims of ISIS, the social, psychological and physical impacts are difficult to really comprehend. If we look at these victims of ISIS, and particularly the Yazidi women, who were taken as sex slaves and had unimaginable things done to them, what we have seen is a caring government here in Canada, which has gone above and beyond in trying to ensure that we get numbers coming into Canada. It is interesting that we are having this discussion after today's apology to our Jewish community.

I want to let the people who are following today's debate know that the government is working diligently with different stakeholders, including provinces, to ensure that we are making the changes necessary to alleviate some of the concerns and pain the Yazidis are going through, in particular the women of the community.

*Routine Proceedings*

**Hon. Michelle Rempel:** Madam Speaker, it is great for the member to stand here and say those things. It is not enough to say things. We have to follow that with action. I should not have to wait for five months, as a member of Parliament, to figure out where the application for reunification is for a genocide survivor. Can the member imagine if she had not called me? She would have no hope.

These recommendations were made in this report months ago. These people do not have months. Given what they have lived through, they also certainly do not have the capacity to be revictimized over and over again because the government has failed to act.

I am going to push back on my colleague. If he truly believes what he said, he will use his government appointment to push for action from his colleagues in cabinet to make sure that the recommendations in this report are acted upon, that we do not see these types of delays, and that we see justice for these survivors.

**Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP):** Madam Speaker, the word “genocide” is a very powerful word. It is so powerful that we can only use it in very specific circumstances, lest we cheapen its value. When we look at what ISIS tried to do to the Yazidi people, with the horrific trauma, the torture, the killing, and the mass rapes, it meets the test of genocide. When something meets the test of genocide, it says to the international community that its obligations become heightened because of it.

I am very thankful that we are having this discussion on this 79th anniversary of Canada rejecting the Jewish refugees on that ship who begged for support. How does my hon. colleague respond to this notion that the government is good, the government cares and the government is trying, and therefore, the government should be thanked for the inaction we have seen on the horrific crisis facing the Yazidi community?

We need to stand up. Clearly, we need to move more quickly. We need to use whatever resources are necessary for reunification for a community that has done no wrong and has suffered some of the gravest crimes imaginable.

What does my colleague think this Parliament needs to do to follow through on that word “genocide” and prevent it so that it will never happen again?

• (1645)

**Hon. Michelle Rempel:** Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague for his passion. I would like to also thank his caucus colleague, the member for Vancouver East, for working on this file with us. On days when I feel that we have to beat our heads on a brick wall to get action on this, it is really heartening to have support across the aisle. If there is one thing we should be getting right in this place, it is understanding that we do not want to have to apologize again.

It is better for us to prevent this, to stop it, and to bring these people to justice. The fact that we are standing here on this day and have yet to figure out how to bring in people who have borne arms for a terrorist, genocidal death cult is wrong. We need to fix it.

We need to figure out how to reunify these family members and get them back to their homes. That is what “never again” means. It means bringing justice and ensuring that those who want genocide

are brought to justice to the highest possible degree. Parliament needs to understand that, act on it and force the government to act. This report is part of that process.

**Mr. Marwan Tabbara (Kitchener South—Hespeler, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I understand the urgency. We have seen far too often acts of genocide, whether in Rwanda, in northern Iraq or even in Burma. It is unfortunate that countries and states are acting after the fact. It is unfortunate that this still happens.

The member said to follow with action. I want to remind her of her government's actions. The genocide happened in the summer of 2014. Her government did not take action on it. It brought in a total of two Yazidis. We have brought 1,200 Yazidis to the safe haven of Canada. Also, she talked about family reunification. The Conservatives had a backlog of 167,000 under family reunification, and we have brought that backlog down to 24,000. I want to remind the member of her government's policies.

**Hon. Michelle Rempel:** Madam Speaker, in 2014, after the genocide, then immigration minister Chris Alexander ordered an audit of the referred refugees from the UNHCR to see if genocide survivors were there. The Liberal Party then politicized this in its campaign, and on Friday, October 9, 2015, the Prime Minister was asked this question: “I wanted to start by asking you about the Conservatives' policy of prioritizing ethnic and religious minorities when bringing in refugees. Is that something that would continue if the Liberals were elected?” He responded, “Absolutely not.”

The reality is that the Conservative Party, and I am going to give credit to the NDP as well, had to stand here and force the government to do what was right. It took two votes to get the Liberals to recognize the genocide, and it took me standing here day after day asking when we were bringing these women here.

What my colleague just said was perhaps one of the most shameful things that could happen on a day when we are trying to say never again. He was saying, “We didn't act, but let's spin it”, when he should have said, “It is my responsibility as a member to stand with you and ensure that it never again happens.”

I am proud to stand here and say that people on this side of the aisle are going to put that type of disgustingness aside and force the government to do what is right.

• (1650)

**Mr. Larry Maguire (Brandon—Souris, CPC):** Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to be here to congratulate my colleague on her speech in regard to the report that is here for concurrence. Her role as shadow cabinet minister on citizenship and immigration has had a great deal to do with getting the Yazidi people here in the numbers we have. They would not be here today without her.

It was a pleasure to stand with her in Winnipeg last summer and meet the Yazidi people, who know that it was her forcefulness and her continuing involvement in making sure that she kept the Yazidi needs in the forefront of the immigration program that actually brought the 1,250 here to Canada.

I wonder if she could help us understand more about the reallocation of resources to maybe keep some of the people back in and resettle them back into their home areas as well.

*Routine Proceedings*

**Hon. Michelle Rempel:** Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for all the work he has done in Manitoba in his role as deputy shadow minister on this issue. In this situation, it is not about taking credit, unlike what my colleague just tried to do. This is about doing what is right. We should not try to take credit for just doing what is simply right. If anything, the credit goes to those women, those survivors, who, after trauma, have gone across the world, stood up and raised their stories and demanded justice in light of what has been such a difficult personal trial. All credit goes to them and all responsibility for doing what is right falls on us.

[Translation]

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** It is my duty pursuant to Standing Order 38 to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Regina—Lewvan, International Trade; and the hon. member for Vancouver East, Natural Resources.

[English]

I wish to also inform the House that because of ministerial statements, government orders will be extended by 62 minutes.

Resuming debate, the hon. parliamentary secretary to the government House leader.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I have been following this debate now for a number of years, and I think it is fair to say that we recognize the strength of the Yazidi women in being able to withstand what they have over the last period of time. However, it is also important to recognize that we have an incredible civil service within the Department of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship. We also have a government that was not forced to do anything by the opposition on this particular issue.

I believe the record is very clear that from day one, this government has taken the issue very seriously. We have been proactive in working with the many stakeholders to ensure that we got Yazidi women, in particular, to Canada as refugees. There have been approximately 1,000.

Having said that, seconded by the member for Yukon, I move:

That the debate on this issue be adjourned.

[Translation]

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

\* \* \*

## PETITIONS

### MINIMUM WAGE

**Ms. Marjolaine Boutin-Sweet (Hochelaga, NDP):** Madam Speaker, I have two petitions today.

I am very pleased to table a petition signed by many residents of my riding of Hochelaga.

The petitioners note that Canadian families are working harder than ever, but they are still struggling to keep their heads above

water. They point out that in 1996, the Liberal government scrapped the federal minimum wage for industries under the legislative authority of the federal Parliament, that nothing has been done to increase wages since then, and that a federal minimum wage would help combat growing income inequality and improve wage standards for workers across the country. The petitioners therefore call on the government to bring back the federal minimum wage and to gradually raise it to \$15 an hour.

• (1655)

### PAY EQUITY

**Ms. Marjolaine Boutin-Sweet (Hochelaga, NDP):** Madam Speaker, in the second petition, the petitioners wish to bring to the attention of the Canadian government that women in Canada earn only 77¢ for every dollar a man makes, that the World Economic Forum ranks Canada 80th out of 145 countries when it comes to pay equity, that our families and our economy are also being undermined because women earn less than men, and that many parliamentary committee reports have recommended the adoption of proactive measures on pay equity.

The petitioners are therefore calling on the Canadian government to bring forward proactive pay equity legislation within six months and remove all other barriers to economic equality for women.

### TAX HAVENS

**Mr. François Choquette (Drummond, NDP):** Madam Speaker, I also have two petitions to present.

The first has to do with tax havens. Given that the Liberal government supported the NDP motion calling on it to take concrete action to combat tax havens, given that the Government of Canada recently signed two new tax information exchange agreements with notorious tax havens, Grenada and Antigua and Barbuda, given that the use of tax havens results in massive revenue losses for the public treasury, the petitioners are calling on the Government of Canada to cancel its agreements with tax havens, beginning with the ones it just signed with Grenada and Antigua and Barbuda, in order to reduce social inequality in this country.

### SENIORS

**Mr. François Choquette (Drummond, NDP):** Madam Speaker, the second petition also has to do with social inequality.

Canadians want a national seniors strategy given the inequalities in this country that affect seniors in particular. The petitioners are calling on the Government of Canada to adopt a national seniors strategy in order to meet their needs in terms of health, housing and financial security and to improve their quality of life.

### RAIL TRANSPORTATION

**Mr. Robert Aubin (Trois-Rivières, NDP):** Madam Speaker, like a train that regularly arrives at the station 10 to 13 times a day, so too are my constituents coming to my office every week with one, two, three or ten sheets of petitions calling for a high-frequency train to Trois-Rivières for many reasons.

*Government Orders***MOTIONS FOR PAPERS**

First, the train would result in unparalleled economic development in the regions. Next, it would make good on the government's fine speeches which, for the time being, are nothing but empty words. It would also help reduce greenhouse gases while contributing to economic development—the two would work hand in hand.

Therefore, I am pleased to present another part of this petition in the hope that there will be good news in the next budget for the people of the Mauricie and all Canadians in the Quebec-Windsor corridor and not just another election promise.

\* \* \*

[English]

**QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS**

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, if the government's responses to questions Nos. 1928 to 1930 could be made orders for returns, these returns would be tabled immediately.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** Is that agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

[Text]

Question No. 1928—**Mr. Richard Martel:**

With regard to the G7 Summit in Charlevoix in June 2018: (a) which regional, municipal, or local governments have submitted bills, invoices, or other requests for reimbursement to the Canadian government for costs incurred as a result of the Summit; (b) for each government in (a), what are the details including the (i) amount requested, (ii) amount reimbursed, (iii) description of request (for example, reimbursement of policing costs); and (c) for any requests which have been rejected or unfulfilled by the Canadian government, what were the reasons they were rejected or unfulfilled?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1929—**Mr. Glen Motz:**

With regard to instructions, memorandums, or orders provided by the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness or the Department of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness to Correctional Services Canada, since November 4, 2015, related to incarceration or prison population levels: what are the details of each, including (i) date, (ii) sender, (iii) recipient, (iv) title, (v) summary of contents, (vi) file number?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1930—**Mr. Chris Warkentin:**

With regard to the government decisions related to Canada Goose Holdings Inc.: (a) does a conflict of interest screen exist for Gerald Butts that covers any government decisions concerning Canada Goose Holdings Inc., and, if so, when was it established; and (b) what is the complete list of decisions or discussions from which Gerald Butts has recused himself, since November 4, 2015?

(Return tabled)

[English]

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux:** Madam Speaker, I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** Is that agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I ask that all notices of motions for the production of papers be allowed to stand.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** Is that agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

● (1700)

[Translation]

**CANADA-ISRAEL FREE TRADE AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT**

The House resumed from October 29 consideration of the motion that Bill C-85, An Act to amend the Canada-Israel Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act and to make related amendments to other Acts, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

**Mr. Darrell Samson (Sackville—Preston—Chezzetcook, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I am pleased to be sharing my time with the member for Essex.

[English]

I am very proud to speak to Bill C-85. However, before I go into the bill itself, it is quite interesting to see the work our government has done in the last year. This is fourth trade deal on the table. That is very impressive, without a doubt, keeping in mind that 60% of our GDP is from trade deals, so no trade deals, no economy. That is pretty well how I would describe it. Therefore, they are extremely important.

The good thing about this as well is that small, medium and large Canadian companies are able to compete in the world, which is extremely important. There is nothing to fear, because we are among the best in the world and we can produce the best as well.

I would also like to share with members of the House, all 338 members, that in my opinion, it would be a good strategy, which I will focus on in the next few months, to meet with all business associations in our communities. For example, I have one in Sackville, one in Fall River, one in the Eastern Passage area and one in the Eastern Shore, the Porters Lake-Lake Echo area.

It is time to have some really strong conversations about the opportunities that have been created in the last year with these trade deals. People have to understand that these trade deals touch many sectors. As I go through my speech, they will hear about the 100% cut in tariffs. These are great opportunities. My question for all members is this. Are they communicating with our business communities? Are they aware of these changes? Are they aware of the potential opportunities? That is what is important.

*Government Orders*

I will talk about CIFTA, the Canada-Israel trade deal. This is not something new that has just come about. Last year, we agreed to amend and enhance this agreement. It had been 20 years. How much has this agreement brought to us? Over the last 20 years, we have seen two-way trade triple. It is now up to \$1.7 billion, which is an enormous amount of money for two countries directly trading.

This trade deal, Bill C-85, has four amended chapters and seven new chapters. The amendments, as everyone will see, are very important to improving the trade deal, as well as the new chapters. Once again, our government is influencing major changes to enhance many areas of trade.

Let me start with dispute resolution and dispute settlement. As we know, that was crucial element in the USMCA deal and we were not going to sign any deal without it. That is how important it is. Not only is it in this trade deal, but in many chapters. This will make it that much stronger because there will be analysis and discussions on specific chapters and, therefore, over time, both countries will see the strengths and weaknesses and will be able to work through those processes.

This trade deal would provide more access to products, not just good products but all types of products. There will be almost 100% tariff reduction on fish, seafood and agriculture, which are major sectors in our economy.

• (1705)

We see improvement in the structure of the agreement. On the rules of origin, also very important, we were able to bring some relaxed focus to it, recognizing the global value chain and streamlining for tariff treatment. Again, it ensures the necessary conditions will be in place for greater success.

In the new chapters, we see the e-commerce, which is the online purchasing. Again, no tariff will be applied in any way, shape or form. It will also protect our intellectual properties, again because as Canadians, we have many areas where we have been number one. We have the best products and the best inventions. Therefore, we were able to ensure there would be relief on the copyright end.

Other measures we see in these new chapters are around food safety and environmental protection, which are extremely important, as well as labour standards. We have removed technical barriers to trade. These are very important points.

I want to touch on two areas in the added features where Canada has lead once again. The first is applying a gender lens to the trade deal. It is extremely important that we are able to apply that lens to ensure that both genders are able to contribute directly to the economy and these trade issues. We have shown how we can ensure greater success in the economy with direct contributions. It will benefit all Canadians, not just a certain group of Canadians. It is wide open in that sense.

The second area where we have really made some improvement is in the small and medium-sized businesses. As we know, small and medium-sized businesses in Canada are the backbone of our economy. We must ensure that they are successful and that we give them the tools to ensure that success. That is exactly what we have with this deal.

Let us look at how this deal will affect my province of Nova Scotia. We can look at the CETA deal, for example. Ninety-six per cent of tariffs on fish and seafood are eliminated. In manufacturing, tires had a tariff of 4.5%, and that is gone. It is now zero percent. Machinery and equipment had tariffs of up to 8%. That is gone. Agriculture and agri-food, such as blueberries, had tariffs of up to 9.6% and now have zero tariffs. Maple syrup, which we are extremely well known for in Canada, now has zero tariffs.

These trade deals are extremely important. Our government has been a leader from day one. We are continuing on that. We have signed the CPTPP, with access to over 500 million people. Through both the CETA and the CPTPP, we now have access to a billion people. Again, in the CPTPP we are seeing major benefits to financial services, food, seafood, agriculture and variety of sectors.

Let me finish with a quote. A mining industry representative said, “We can’t afford to be outside of this trading bloc...It would put us at a huge disadvantage.”

It is obvious that this government is focused on the middle class and the economy. We know that 60% of our GDP is based on trade deals and these trade deals will continue to allow middle-class Canadians to prosper.

• (1710)

**Ms. Tracey Ramsey (Essex, NDP):** Madam Speaker, the new CIFTA includes a commitment to encourage the use of voluntary corporate social responsibility standards. I want to ask the member why this is voluntary in CIFTA.

**Mr. Darrell Samson:** Madam Speaker, it is because their business community has good citizens. Both countries have agreed to work with the business community so its members can be good citizens in protecting the economy, the environment and our communities. Those are major things, and it is a step in working together to ensure we will get to where we need to go.

We do not have to write it in black and white all the time. We, as two countries, can agree to work together to share the innovative principles that can be used to make those things we want to accomplish happen.

*Government Orders*

**Mr. Harold Albrecht (Kitchener—Conestoga, CPC):** Madam Speaker, certainly, on this side of the House we are all in favour of trade. We have shown that many times throughout our time in government, and before. However, one of the comments my colleague made was about the support for small and medium-sized businesses. We certainly have shown our support for SMEs on this side. I would like to ask my colleague this: If they are so supportive of small business, why last summer did they take the approach of attacking small business and creating obstacles for small business to be able to succeed? Then finally, the Liberals reduced the small business tax after pressure from Canadians, small businesses and this side of the House. If they are so supportive of small business, why did it take all that pressure and why are they being so hard on small business owners?

**Mr. Darrell Samson:** Madam Speaker, as I said at the beginning of my speech, these trade deals are extremely important for the business community. This will allow it opportunities to continue to grow and prosper. That is extremely important. My job and his job and the job of the 338 MPs is to work closely with our business community to make that happen.

Let me just remind my colleague across the floor that it is this government that has lowered the small business tax from 11% to 10.5% to 10% and in April it is going down to 9%, which will be among the lowest in the world.

[Translation]

**Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie (Joliette, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my esteemed colleague for his speech, which once again was dynamic and passionate.

I would like to ask him if, to his knowledge, with respect to the agreement between Canada and Israel, the bill distinguishes between the territory of Israel and the territories occupied since 1967, as called for by the UN Security Council.

**Mr. Darrell Samson:** Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question. I saw nothing to that effect in the agreement. Perhaps my colleague found something.

Let us remember that this agreement is the fourth in the space of a year, and, as members, it is our job to communicate. We frequently make changes to policies to improve the lives of middle-class Canadians, but people on the ground are not always kept in the loop. It is our job to keep them informed.

Next week, we will be back in our constituencies. It will be a good opportunity to communicate directly or indirectly with small and medium-sized businesses. For example, if they are not aware of certain budget cuts, that will be the time to tell them about it. There might also be opportunities, so I will be in touch with them to find out what they want. I will be readily available to help them as their representative.

•(1715)

[English]

**Ms. Tracey Ramsey (Essex, NDP):** Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise to speak to Bill C-85, an act to amend the Canada-Israel Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act and to make related amendments to other acts.

There are many elements to any trade deal that can make them extremely complex, and they can be massive documents. However, today I want to focus on gender, labour and the important human rights obligations that this deal can address.

The original Canada-Israel FTA was negotiated in 1993, and has been expanded three times over the last 25 years. The last revision or modernization of this agreement was negotiated by the previous Conservative government and is now being brought into force legislatively by the Liberals, much like the original NAFTA deal and the recent CETA and CPTPP agreements.

New Democrats are supportive of the fact that this deal has a number of positive issues. One of them is that it would create more favourable conditions for exporters through important non-tariff commitments. On the trade committee we hear about non-tariff barriers far more than we hear about tariffs, as Canada is largely becoming tariff-free with the globe. It really is non-tariff barriers that we need to address to ensure that trade is flowing.

It would establish mechanisms whereby both nations can co-operate to resolve unjustified non-tariff barriers. It has provisions related to the protection and enforcement of intellectual property rights. It would create potential new and improved market access for Canada, particularly in the areas of agriculture, agri-food, fish and seafood products. There are changes to the rules of origin that reflect many aspects of Canada's current approach, including recognizing the presence of global value chains and the integrated nature of North American production, as well as streamlining the provisions for obtaining preferential tariff treatment.

The environment chapter is another first for Israel and would ensure environmental protections are maintained with recourse to a chapter-specific dispute resolution practice.

There is a chapter on small and medium-sized enterprises that would improve transparency and commit both parties to co-operate with a view to removing barriers and improving access for SMEs to engage in trade. It is widely understood that we need greater supports for our domestic exporters to take advantage of this. Certainly, again at the trade committee, we hear consistently that SMEs are not able to trade in the same way that large players are.

For every FTA that we are signing, our exports are decreasing with the country that we are signing. I point to the recent signing of CETA. A year on from the signing of CETA, our exports have decreased. Therefore, there are major fundamental issues that need to be addressed with the types of trade agreements that we are creating and signing onto, if they are not actually creating opportunities for Canadian businesses.

*Government Orders*

The modernized CIFTA would provide new and improved market access for virtually 100%, up from 90%, of current exports of agricultural, agri-food, fish and seafood products. In the agriculture and agri-food sector, 92% of Canadian exports would enter Israel duty-free, in unlimited quantities, under the modernized CIFTA, which is up from a current level of 83%. The agreement offers the potential for deeper, broader and more prosperous commercial relationships between our two countries. Because of these provisions, New Democrats will support this bill at second reading, but will make constructive suggestions to include crucial human rights elements, and we hope that the Liberals and Conservatives will accept our amendments at committee.

I want to talk about social issues. We are pleased with the new language and the representation of more social aspects of the deal, such as the environment, small business, corporate social responsibility, labour and gender. However, we cannot understand why, with such a progressive trade agenda for the current government, that it would not have these provisions within the text of the agreement and fully enforceable.

I want to talk a bit about corporate social responsibility. The article references again voluntary OECD guidelines for multinational enterprises that are a broad application to this agreement. This is a good first step. However, with respect to this clause, the New Democrats would prefer to see a corporate social responsibility chapter that has some enforceability and some teeth to it. When corporate social responsibility is only voluntary, how can the government plan to hold corporations to account? Those who violate human rights make a bigger profit when there is no one there to ensure that they are not violating rights. Therefore, we have to ask ourselves why this provision is only voluntary.

As I mentioned, this was the Conservative-negotiated deal, but the Liberals were truly concerned with the provisions. They could have negotiated much stronger language, as was done in the European Union-Israel trade agreement, which states:

Relations between the Parties, as well as all the provisions of the Agreement itself, shall be based on respect for human rights and democratic principles, which guides their internal and international policy and constitutes an essential element of this Agreement.

I have to ask why the government did not bother to include a similar general line, at the very least, on human rights provisions in this agreement.

• (1720)

I want to talk a bit about the gender chapter. The NDP would like to emphasize, as we have in other trade agreements, that the provisions around gender and equality cannot be just limited to one chapter, especially when it is unenforceable.

As in the international trade committee, where I am vice-chair, and in committee meetings regarding other trade deals, OXFAM Canada came and presented. It called the mainstreaming of gender rights throughout the entirety of this FTA the path that we need to be on, not only relegating to one small chapter.

Gender equality does not only concern issues of women entrepreneurs and business owners. Labour rights must also address injustices to women, like pay inequity, child labour and poor working conditions.

The NDP believes that for an agreement to be truly progressive when it comes to gender rights, it must address the systemic inequalities for all women.

We also believe that both gender analysis and gender impact assessment must be applied to all trade agreements and we would like to see this in the updated CIFTA. Every trade agreement that we sign should build on the previous gender provisions that we have achieved in other deals.

I want to talk a bit about labour. We are pleased to see that there is a labour chapter, which is a first for Israel in a free trade agreement. This would help to ensure that high labour standards are maintained, with recourse to labour-specific, enforceable, binding dispute settlement mechanisms where non-compliance can lead to monetary penalties.

The Canadian Labour Congress has also made it clear that in order to equally raise labour standards and all standards in an FTA, the labour chapter must include the International Labour Organization's eight core conventions and adhere to its decent work agenda. It also must include the creation of an independent labour secretariat to oversee a dispute settlement process when there are violations of labour rights.

The NDP also agrees with the CLC that the Government of Canada must look at due diligence for Canadian companies and funding agencies and create a framework for transnational bargaining to allow unions to represent workers in multiple countries.

Any FTA should be guided by the principle that no one should be disadvantaged. Working people cannot continue to be an afterthought in trade agreements.

Too often people talk about free trade and state that "a rising tide lifts all boats" and that simply trading with another country, they will emulate higher respect for workers, women and human rights. However, we know that is simply not the case.

When we talk about human rights there are concerns with this FTA due to the fact that there are no human rights provisions and protections and recognition of the rights of Palestinians living in occupied territories. Human rights must be a part of our relationship with Israel, rights that Canadians expect us to uphold throughout the globe. Bill C-85 does not ensure that CIFTA complies with international law. The government must respect Canada's commitment to a peaceful and just settlement of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.



*Government Orders*

Last week I travelled with the Minister of Foreign Affairs and on the trip to Israel and to Palestine, she repeatedly talked about the importance of Canada's commitment to a two-state solution. This trade agreement is an opportunity to address this issue in a meaningful way by including language that mirrors the Israel-EU agreement.

The agreement appears to cover products made in Israeli settlements and occupied territories. Neither Canada nor the United Nations recognize these settlements as part of Israel. These settlements are illegal and clearly violate the fourth Geneva Convention, which prohibits the settlement of territories acquired by war and the movement of indigenous people in those territories, among other things.

There is virtual global unanimity that the territories seized and occupied since 1967 by Israel, the West Bank, Golan Heights, Gaza and East Jerusalem are not part of Israel but form the basis of a sovereign Palestinian state. Those territories are a fraction of the land awarded to the Palestinian people by the United Nations partition of 1967.

As I said, New Democrats have worked for decades for a peaceful resolution in Israel and Palestine and we will continue to fight for fairness and justice for all, including within this agreement.

As I said at the beginning of my speech, there is much within this modernized agreement that is positive and that we agree with. We will work at committee to ensure respect of human rights is included in the newly updated CIFTA.

Trading with Canada is a privilege not just because of our incredible resources and products, but because of our global reputation. Fair trade can be a tool, among many others, that we use to positively contribute to the world around us. Together with our global partners, we can build a better future.

• (1725)

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is not very often, when debating trade, that New Democrats indicate, or at least imply, they are going to vote in favour of legislation. I am glad to hear, if that is the case, that the NDP have recognized the importance of world trade. That is fairly significant and I want to applaud my colleague across the way. My understanding was that back in the early 1990s, they voted against the Canada-Israel Free Trade Agreement.

That said, could my friend enlighten members on whether we can anticipate the NDP having a different take on some of the other trade agreements? The member seems to be of the opinion that all of these trade deals were done and sealed and now we are bringing in the legislation. A lot of the changes were made not that long ago, in the last year, including this agreement. The agreement was not signed off on by any stretch of the imagination.

Could the member enlighten us on what we can expect from the NDP on the trade file in the future?

**Ms. Tracey Ramsey:** Mr. Speaker, I do not think I need to enlighten the member. We supported the Canada-Ukraine deal in this Parliament and another, technical trade bill, so I would invite the

member to look at the record of what the NDP has been doing in Parliament in regard to trade.

I will say, though, that details matter in agreements and I am so proud of New Democrats and the way we look at trade agreements in their entirety. We take the time to ensure that we understand what is in them and the impact they will have on Canadians. There are a lot of questions that Canadians should be asking about the types of trade agreements being signed and whether they are bringing opportunities to us. It is unfortunate that the Liberals, much like the Conservatives, are not in favour of having an accounting of where we are at with trade agreements from years past. It is something critical that we do to ensure that we are trading responsibly.

I would encourage the member to speak to members at the trade committee and support the amendments that New Democrats will be bringing forward that will reflect transparency, as well as human rights, which are critical in this particular agreement.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie (Joliette, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague for that very good speech on the Canada-Israel Free Trade Agreement.

Towards the end of her speech, she noted that the agreement makes no distinction between the territory of the State of Israel and the territories that have been occupied since 1967, which is contrary to the UN recommendation and this country's position. According to the Global Affairs Canada website, Canada does not recognize permanent Israeli control over territories occupied in 1967.

If that error is not corrected in this agreement, what will her party's position be for the final vote?

[*English*]

**Ms. Tracey Ramsey:** Mr. Speaker, what the member stated is true. This is Canada's position because we are a party to UN Security Council resolution 2334 that we signed in 2016, which includes two very important statements. The first is that we reaffirm "that the establishment by Israel of settlements in the Palestinian territory occupied since 1967, including East Jerusalem, has no legal validity and constitutes a flagrant violation under international law and a major obstacle to the achievement of the two-State solution and a just, lasting and comprehensive peace". It also calls on states to bear in mind the first paragraph of the resolution, calling on them "to distinguish, in their relevant dealings, between the territory of the State of Israel and the territories occupied since 1967".

One amendment New Democrats will be proposing is something that we saw in the EU-Israel agreement, namely, recognition of the distinction made in this Security Council resolution, as well as human rights provisions that can and should be included in this agreement.

• (1730)

**Mr. Kelly McCauley (Edmonton West, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing my time with my colleague, the member for Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier. I rise today to speak to Bill C-85, the free trade agreement with Israel.

*Government Orders*

We heard some remarkable speeches today in the House from the Prime Minister, the opposition leader, the leaders of the NDP, and from the Bloc and the Green Party in apology for Canada's turning away of the MS *St. Louis*.

Remarkably, right after the speeches, we heard my colleague, the member for Calgary Nose Hill, give an impassioned speech in support of concurrence with the committee report on the resettlement of Yazidi women and children in Canada. I really hope that people took notice of that. It is about the same issue, namely, people who are facing genocide in a foreign land and that we are not doing our part to help. I hope the government will listen to the comments by my colleague, the member for Calgary Nose Hill, so that Canadians do not have to sit here a generation from now to hear another apology for turning our backs on these people.

Before I get back to Bill C-85, I want to express, as I am sure everyone in the House does, my sorrow about the horror of the murders at the Tree of Life Synagogue a short time ago, an act of violent anti-Semitism and a reminder that this hatred still exists in our world today.

On a per capita basis in Canada, anti-Semitism is unfortunately still the most prevalent hate crime reported. The main synagogue in my riding of Edmonton West, Beth Israel, is a place of worship for a lot of friends of mine. I often visit for events, and I was there this Saturday for the drop-in for Shabbat. One thing I noticed as I approached was a police car across the street providing security and security at the door.

We do not see that security at any other place of worship in Canada, not at the Catholic church I attend, nor the Baptist church that one of my sons goes to for sporting events, nor at other places of worship, such as the mosque that several of my friends attend. It is only at the synagogue. It is disgraceful and very unfortunate in this day and age that this is still required in Canada, the United States, and other parts of the world.

What does this say about our society in Canada in this day and age that a synagogue still requires security? What does it say when a lunatic spouting violent anti-Semitic remarks goes out and kills 11 worshippers in a synagogue? It says that anti-Semitism, unfortunately, is still alive and well and strong.

I belong to an organization called Christians United for Israel. We have about 90,000 members in Canada. There are about 3 million members in the U.S. Why do I belong to it? Well, it is because the scourge of anti-Semitism still flourishes.

Today's debate is on trade with Israel, and I cannot discuss trade with Israel without noting the burgeoning anti-Semitic movement in Canada called BDS, the boycott, divestment, sanctions movement, which works to boycott, divest from and sanction Israel. I will call the BDS movement what I believe it is, an anti-Semitic movement.

BDS supporters, hand over heart, will claim they are not anti-Jewish, that they are just anti-Israel. I think we need to call a spade a spade. BDS supporters claim its intent is to move Palestinian-Israeli negotiations forward. Fine and dandy, but it is funny that they are oddly silent about Turkey and Iraq bombing Kurdistan. They are oddly silent about Turkish products from illegally occupied Northern

Cyprus. They are oddly silent in response to calls to sanction Morocco for its seizure of Western Sahara.

I have to ask, where is the outrage of the BDS supporters about Russia's illegal invasion and occupation of parts of Ukraine? It is funny, I do not see them marching at universities over the tenfold increase in Russian imports into Canada over the last 10 years. Where is their outrage about the Saudi war in Yemen? I do not see them protesting up and down the St. Lawrence as tanker after tanker of Saudi crude sails in. However, I am sure we will see these same people screaming about the injustice of having an Israeli soda stream device for sale in a local store.

The leftists complain that Trump promotes violence with his rhetoric. I believe that BDS and its proponents do the same thing: they promote anti-Israeli and anti-Jewish messaging. To those who say they are not anti-Semitic, just anti-Israel, I say, if it walks like a duck and quacks like a duck, it is a duck.

● (1735)

Why should we support this updated agreement with Israel? Well, Israel is the freest and most democratic nation in the Middle East. It is the only Liberal democracy in that part of the world, and reflects many of the values and beliefs that Canadians hold dear, including respect for democracy, the rule of law, tolerance of a multi-racial and multi-religious society, and tolerance of gender and sexual expression rights.

Israel is called a start-up nation for a reason. It is probably the most innovative nation in the entire world. It ranks first in the world for its attitude toward entrepreneurial risk and for the growth of innovative companies, and it is second, only after the U.S., for venture capital availability. It ranks 20th out of 140 countries listed in the latest competitiveness report for the freeness of economy. Canada can only gain by partnering and having stronger economic ties with such a country.

The fastest growth rates in Israel, averaging 8% annually, are to be found in its high-tech sectors, and 80% of its high-tech products are exported. However, despite all of this, despite its investment in R and D, despite 5.5% of its GDP going for national defence, I would like to point out to my colleagues across the way that the country of Israel still manages to have a budgetary surplus year after year.

As I mentioned, economically, Israel is a high-tech powerhouse, and we can only gain by strengthening our relationship with it. For Canadian companies, we can get improved access to its agriculture, agri-food and seafood exports. We can get improved border efficiencies, better regulatory transparency and reduced red tape. However, it is odd that the Liberals, who are so in love with regulatory red tape and never pass on a chance to further burden our economy with it, love Israel for the fact that it is going to reduce red tape.

*Government Orders*

The bill has several new chapters. The new chapter on electronic commerce would commit Canada and Israel to not introduce tariffs and other barriers to commerce. The chapter on intellectual property would affirm commitments between Canada and Israel under the World Trade Organization to ensure proper protection of IP rights. The technical barriers to trade chapter would ensure that technical regulation, conformity assessment procedures and other standards-related measures could not be used as unjustified barriers to trade. The trade and environment chapter would ensure that Canada and Israel pursue high levels of environmental protection while realizing the benefit of liberalized trade. There is a new chapter on trade and labour, which would ensure effective enforcement of labour laws. The chapter on trade facilitation would enhance border efficiencies, increase regulatory transparency and reduce red tape for Canadian businesses. If only the government were as committed to reducing red tape in Canada as it is to trade with Israel. However, both countries would also benefit from an updated dispute settlement agreement and better rules of origin labelling.

We have much to gain from our friends in Israel. As I mentioned, it is literally the only Liberal democracy in the Middle East. It is a world leader in technological innovation. We also see that it leads in pharmaceutical innovation.

Before a friend of mine unfortunately passed away from ALS, he was a test subject who had his body equipped with a robotic walker so he could enjoy the final year of his life being able to walk. These are all advancements made by the Israeli tech industry, which is something Canada can gain from very much.

I would like to end with a quote from the great Milton Friedman about trade, who said:

The most important single central fact about a free market is that no exchange takes place unless both parties benefit.

I believe the amendments to this trade agreement would benefit both Canada and Israel, as well as our allies.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate many of the comments by my colleague and friend across the way.

I want to pick up on the wonderful national apology, which was long overdue, that we heard today. I sensed, not only on the floor of the House but from all of those watching in the gallery, that all the speeches given were heartfelt.

I think it is an appropriate debate that we are having here this afternoon, as we discuss the very special relationship between Canada and Israel, and the importance, not only in tangible terms of having a trade deal like this between two great countries, but also, in good part, in terms of extending a hand of friendship. Yes, there are economic benefits, but there is also a friendship benefit with a trade agreement of this nature.

As well, there are some areas that we are putting a little more emphasis on, such as the issue of equality for women and dealing with some of the inequities that might be in the current agreement.

I wonder if I could get my friend's comments on the general thrust of my remarks.

● (1740)

**Mr. Kelly McCauley:** Mr. Speaker, for a change, I actually want to thank the member for Winnipeg North for the question. It nice to need the earpiece as well to hear his question instead of his yelling.

I tease him, but I agree with him. For Canada, it is not just a trade deal. We have very deep bonds. The newest rabbi for Beth Israel Synagogue in my riding replaces the wonderful Rabbi Daniel Friedman, who was one of the architects and the main driving force behind the Holocaust memorial in Ottawa. The new rabbi, Rabbi Claman, was born in Winnipeg, grew up in Ottawa and came here after 10 years in Jerusalem.

We have a lot of ties with a lot of families. The deputy governor of the Bank of Israel is a Canadian lady from McGill. One of the youngest members of the Israeli Knesset is a Canadian-born young lady from Montreal as well.

This goes a lot deeper than mere trade ties. It reflects our shared values, liberal democracy, freedom of religion and so many other things that go far deeper than just a simple trade deal.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie (Joliette, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, does my colleague believe that this agreement between Canada and Israel should apply only to the territory of the State of Israel or does he believe that it should also include the territories occupied since 1967? What is his party's position on that?

[*English*]

**Mr. Kelly McCauley:** Mr. Speaker, a year and a half ago I was in Israel in the summer. We met with members of the Israeli Knesset and one was from the Arab list coalition. It has a proportional representation program. The member from the Arab list said that he believed the biggest hope for peace, and please do not laugh at this, was President Trump. It was not because of what Trump was doing, but because the intent was to take the politics out of it and focus on prosperity and trade. That is what he believed would move the Palestinian people forward and to a peaceful resolution, not the politics but creating wealth. This trade agreement will help create wealth for everyone over there, not just the people in Israel but in other areas as well.

**Mr. Larry Maguire (Brandon—Souris, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I want to ask my colleague about a number of the new initiatives in the bill. This was a Conservative-initiated project that took place as a result of the bill we signed in 2014. Part of that bill was a memorandum of understanding to renegotiate it at this time. I am pleased to see that and a number of new chapters on labour, environment, trade, gender, small and medium enterprises. I wonder if he could elaborate on the importance of those.

*Government Orders*

**Mr. Kelly McCauley:** Mr. Speaker, it is quite funny. Earlier we heard a Liberal member say that this was the fourth trade agreement the Liberal government had signed. That overlooks the fact that the Israeli agreement had been in existence for 20 years, and this is an update. The U.S. trade agreement, which it almost dropped the ball on, is existing free trade. CETA was 99% done. The Liberals kind of took it over the edge, despite scoring a goal into an empty net and then claiming that they were the heroes of the game. It is the same with CPTPP, or whatever they want to add to the acronym. The Liberals try to claim success for things brought in under the previous Conservative government.

• (1745)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Joël Godin (Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague from Edmonton West for his excellent and relevant speech. It reiterated the position of our party, the party of free trade and the economy. I also want to thank him for sharing his time with me. I am proud to do so.

Today is a very special day. Earlier in the House, we spared a very special thought for those of the Jewish faith. We reflected about them, apologized, and acknowledged the fact that they, as a people, experienced one of the greatest human tragedies and are still standing. I have a lot of respect for the Jewish people.

Unfortunately, on October 27, a synagogue in Pittsburgh was attacked. That is unacceptable. It reminds me of the massacre at the mosque in Sainte-Foy, where people who were in the wrong place at the wrong time fell victim to barbaric acts. These types of attacks are unacceptable in a civilized society. The government needs to put measures in place to eliminate as much as possible these barbaric acts motivated by race and religion.

Today I will be speaking to Bill C-85, an act to amend the Canada-Israel Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act and to make related amendments to other acts. We, the Conservatives, are the party of the economy, as I said at the outset. We are very proud of the markets that we opened up and developed. We are consistent, and we not only talk the talk, we walk the walk. We are going to support this bill at second reading because it is important to create trade routes, and this is one of them.

As a long-standing trade partner to Israel, Canada has a duty to continue this business relationship. Israel is a major market for Canadian goods and services. The relationship between Canada and Israel is based on shared values and interests. Canada derives tangible benefits from this strong relationship.

First off, with regard to security, Israel is an island of stability amid the turbulence that engulfs the Middle East. The knowledge and experience that Israel and Canada share are ever more important. We all know that in our modern world, threats do not stop at national borders. The security agreement signed by Canada and Israel in 2008 under Mr. Harper's Conservative government has permanently established this collaboration, which is so beneficial for Canada.

Second, there is the economy. Since 1996, Canada and Israel have had a free trade agreement that has significantly boosted trade between the two countries.

Third, there is technology. Israel has the second-largest concentration of high-tech companies after Silicon Valley, in the United States. Israel is a model of innovation. I would add that when I had the privilege, as a parliamentarian, of visiting Israel and Palestine, I observed that the people who live there are determined, intelligent and highly skilled. Canadian start-ups should take a page from their book.

Israel has an impressive approach to supporting and encouraging start-ups. For example, universities are involved in developing start-ups, and there risk is part of the equation. We should be looking at allowing more risk when it comes to start-ups in Canada, because when a company becomes a world leader, even if it is just one in a hundred, that definitely gives us an advantage.

• (1750)

It is therefore in our best interest to come up with a model for start-ups that aligns with the Israeli model.

We are already linked through the Canada-Israel Industrial Research and Development Foundation, or CIIRDF. That foundation takes in proposals for R and D projects in all areas of technology that have no military or defence applications. There is however a special focus on projects in aerospace, agriculture and processed food, financial services, information and communications technologies, life sciences, oil and gas, and sustainable technologies. These relationships are beneficial for both our countries.

The Canada-Israel Free Trade Agreement, or CIFTA, was signed on July 31, 1996 and came into force on January 1 of the following year. It has therefore been in effect for more than 20 years. This bill seeks to expand the scope of the agreement and deliver on negotiations that were launched in 2010 and 2014. In July 2015 Canada and Israel concluded negotiations on reduced tariffs on all agricultural products, investment protection mechanisms, sanitary measures, intellectual property and non-tariff barriers.

The Government of Canada website on the Canada-Israel Free Trade Agreement states, under the heading “Modernization overview and chapters”:

In July 2015, Canada and Israel completed negotiations to update four chapters in the Agreement: Dispute Settlement, Goods Market Access, Institutional Provisions, and Rules of Origin. The Agreement was also expanded to include seven new chapters: E-Commerce, Intellectual Property, Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures, Technical Barriers to Trade, Trade and Environment, Trade and Labour, and Trade Facilitation.

That, to me, shows that three years were wasted updating an agreement that had been signed in 2015 under the Harper government. I might add that the protocol amending the Canada-Israel Free Trade Agreement was signed three years later in Montreal on May 28, 2018, but has yet to come into force. Until that happens, the 1997 free trade agreement continues to apply.

*Government Orders*

The discussions concluded in 2015, and we are now nearing the end of 2018. That means we wasted three years. This government's sluggishness has cost us billions of dollars. The Conservative government is the one that negotiated the agreements, while the current Liberal government is just patting itself on the back and signing the agreements.

Let us not forget the Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership. This multilateral free trade agreement, which was signed on February 4, 2016, aims to integrate the economies of the Asia-Pacific region and the Americas. The negotiation of the Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership began in 2008 under the Harper government. In June 2012, Canada and Mexico joined the negotiations. On February 4, 2016, the Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership was signed. It must now be ratified by 12 countries, and that process is still under way. Once again, this shows how slowly things move under the Liberals.

Then there is the Canada-European Union Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement, or CETA. Who put that in place? Once again, it was the Harper government. It was the Conservative Party, the party that understands the economy and seeks to open new trade routes. I think that is a very legitimate thing to do since our neighbour to the south is unpredictable. Unfortunately, again this morning, I read that our Prime Minister announced that we are going to sign the agreement with the United States even though the tariffs on steel, softwood lumber and aluminum have not been lifted.

It is good to sign agreements, but we need to use our bargaining power. Unfortunately, when this government signs agreements, it uses our agreements and our objectives and simply continues the work we started. Things would not have gone the way they did with the USMCA if the Conservatives were in office.

• (1755)

[English]

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is interesting that the member across the way is trying to rewrite history. We can share some of the credit. A good example would be the Ukraine trade agreement. There was a lot of work done on both sides, by the Conservatives and this government, to ensure that the deal was actually signed off. The Prime Minister was in Ukraine to further advance that sign-off. To imply that the comprehensive and progressive trans-Pacific partnership agreement was complete is wrong, not to mention CETA, with Europe, which was virtually off track. Our most capable and able minister, who helped secure the agreement with the United States, was in Europe trying to get it back on track.

It is important to recognize that we have some of the best trade negotiators and civil servants in the world when it comes to this, and it should be highlighted on all sides of the House.

As the Liberals will want to take credit and the Conservatives will want to take credit, we should at the very least join hands and acknowledge our negotiators.

[Translation]

**Mr. Joël Godin:** Mr. Speaker, let's not get into a debate over who is the best. I just want to say that, as parliamentarians, we have to rise above partisanship and forge international ties so we can get free trade deals that benefit Canadians.

With respect to the latest agreement, the USMCA, Canada was the last one to get to the negotiating table. Negotiations took 13 months. Unfortunately, the negotiations did not eliminate all irritants. There are American taxes on aluminum, steel and softwood lumber. There are consumption taxes on products here.

As I have said in the House before, a business in my riding with headquarters in Canada does manufacturing in the United States. This Canadian company produces chewy granola bars in the United States and has to pay taxes to export its products to Canada. That is unacceptable.

I think we need to rise above partisanship to accelerate the process that gets us the best free trade agreements with several different countries.

**Mr. Robert Aubin (Trois-Rivières, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I listened carefully to my colleague's speech. In the first part of his speech, he tried to make a clear distinction between the Conservatives and the Liberals. I would group those two parties together and include the NDP, because when it comes to developing trade agreements that enable our business owners to export and grow, we all agree. Where we differ is that the NDP is wondering why we are not using these international treaties as leverage to advance human rights.

The proposed new treaty makes the adoption of corporate social responsibility standards voluntary. The Liberals and the Conservatives take the exact same approach. There are no protections for the people whose resources are being taken.

Have things changed under the new Conservative leadership, or do they still support the same approach taken by Mr. Harper and the previous Liberal government?

**Mr. Joël Godin:** Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Trois-Rivières for his interesting question.

Our job as parliamentarians is to improve bills. This evening, I allowed my colleague to share his thoughts on the bill introduced by the Liberals. We are currently at second reading of Bill C-85, and we are debating this bill because we want to make things better. I hope his message was heard.

• (1800)

**Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie (Joliette, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to speak to Bill C-85, which implements the new Canada-Israel Free Trade Agreement.

Earlier today, the House acknowledged the atrocities suffered by the victims of the Shoah, particularly the passengers of the MS *St. Louis*. Because of a heartless policy, indisputably motivated by anti-Semitism, Canada prevented these 907 passengers from finding refuge here at home. We all bear some responsibility for what awaited them when they returned to Europe.

*Government Orders*

Ironically, this afternoon we are discussing Bill C-85 to modernize the free trade agreement between Canada and Israel. In 1939, Jews did not have a country they could consider their own, where they could be confident they would be safe. Maybe that is what made them so vulnerable and almost wiped them from the face of the Earth, victims of the madness of some and the indifference of others. Today, almost 80 years later, they have a prosperous country and we are talking about modernizing a free trade agreement linking Canada and Israel. We have come a long way.

We note that Bill C-85 is not introducing free trade between Canada and Israel. It is updating an agreement that has existed since 1997, so for 22 years. Israel is one of the first countries in the world with which Canada reached a free trade agreement. In terms of trade, Quebec and Israel have a lot in common. Israel is a modern country, one of the most technologically advanced countries in the world, especially in communication and information, and so is Quebec. In any given year, between 40% and 45% of Canada's technology exports originate in Quebec. Also, Israel is a global leader in the electrification of transportation. Quebec is poised to become one. The only thing missing is a little boost from Ottawa.

In those two areas and in many others, there are numerous and logical linkages between Quebec and Israeli companies. That is why we will be supporting Bill C-85 at second reading.

That said, I want to point out an anomaly in the agreement as drafted that must be corrected. Although we are supposed to be debating a free trade agreement between Canada and Israel, that is not what the text states. In fact, this seems to be an agreement with Israel and the occupied territories. By ratifying the agreement as written, Canada would be in some way recognizing that the occupied territories actually belong to Israel. Such a position is in contradiction to Canada's foreign policy, international law and the will of the UN Security Council.

To properly understand this point, let us look at the history. In 1947, the United Nations adopted a partition plan in order to create two states in the territory of British Palestine: a Jewish state, which today is Israel, and an Arab state, which would become Palestine. Unfortunately, things were not so simple.

Arab countries rejected the partition plan, war broke out, and to the surprise of many, the Israeli army forced back the Arab forces throughout the territory. It was in this context of war that the State of Israel was created. When the warring parties agreed to the ceasefire in 1949, the international community accepted the ceasefire line as the Israeli border. Palestine, however, was not born. Egypt occupied Gaza while Jordan occupied East Jerusalem and the West Bank. There was no peace, however, this was just a ceasefire.

After years of tension, war broke out again in 1967, and Israel, after driving out the Arab armies, began occupying all the Palestinian territory.

• (1805)

Since 1967, the conflict has been frozen. The international community's position has not changed. The State of Israel's territory is what belonged to it in 1949. The rest of the territory it occupies does not really belong to the country. Any change should be the outcome of a bilateral agreement, not a bilateral agreement between

Canada and Israel such as the one we are discussing today, but an agreement between Israel and Palestinians.

Canada supports the international consensus. As the Global Affairs Canada website states:

Canada does not recognize Israel's unilateral annexation of East Jerusalem. ... Canada does not recognize permanent Israeli control over territories occupied in 1967.... Israeli settlements in the occupied territories... constitute a serious obstacle to achieving a comprehensive, just and lasting peace.

Canada's position is clear. It is in line with international law, which the Bloc Québécois fully supports.

That is why I mentioned an anomaly earlier. The free trade agreement appears to deviate from that stance. Article 1.7 specifies that Israeli territory is the territory where its customs laws are applied.

An occupied territory is a territory on which laws are imposed and enforced. This is the very meaning of an occupation.

The agreement as is includes the occupied territories, and in particular the settlements. It states that they are part of Israeli territory, which is at odds with Canada's foreign policy.

When the agreement was signed in May, the Minister of International Trade said the following to The Canadian Press: "In international trade law, the way a territory is defined is the physical territory where the customs laws apply."

However, this does not have to be the case. Europe chose to make its trade policy comply with its foreign policy. Article 83 of the Europe-Israel free trade agreement quite simply states that the agreement applies to the territory of the State of Israel.

There has been no movement in the Israeli conflict, and it is festering. As settlements continue to grow, it becomes increasingly difficult for Israel to put an end to the occupation, and it becomes increasingly difficult to achieve what everyone here in this House wants, which is for the two states to live in peace, side by side, within recognized borders.

The UN Security Council understood that well. It also understood that a provision like the one in the agreement does not promote peace. In resolution 2334, which was passed unanimously in December 2017, the Security Council called on all states to "distinguish, in their relevant dealings, between the territory of the State of Israel and the territories occupied since 1967".

Quebeckers are friends with Israel, but they are also friends with Palestinians. Above all, they care about peace. That is why, after passing Bill C-85 at second reading, we will ensure this anomaly is corrected.

[English]

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, in anticipation that this bill will ultimately be passing, it is encouraging to see the type of support for what I believe is a fantastic piece of legislation. There are some very progressive aspects to the bill.

*Government Orders*

We have seen a very positive trade agenda from day one with this government. We have highlighted Ukraine, the EU, the comprehensive TPP, and the new trade agreement with the United States and Mexico. The real beneficiary of all of this is Canada's middle class, and those aspiring to be a part of it, from getting into those markets.

We are the only country in the G7 that has these trade agreements with all the other G7 countries. It is a very powerful statement. It is encouraging to see what appears to be virtually unanimous support for the legislation.

I would ask my colleague across the way if he would provide his thoughts on how important it is that we get these trade relations with other countries around the world, because they will enhance opportunities for our businesses, creating great opportunities for job growth here in Canada.

• (1810)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie:** Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question and comments.

The Bloc Québécois does indeed recognize the importance of having fair trade deals for all parties. This puts me in mind of former Quebec premier Bernard Landry, who passed away yesterday. He was one of the first people to speak out and say that for Quebec, it is important to get involved in global trade. As he noted, half of what Quebec produces, roughly equivalent to half our economy, is due to our exports.

Quebec is a small, open economy. For us to have so much wealth and so many jobs—I am thinking of our technology shift and our high-tech and high value-added jobs—it is vital to have trade deals with other partners. Half of Quebec's wealth depends on it, so it is very important.

I would remind my colleague, however, that all too often, including in the last three major deals—the one with Europe, the new TPP and the new NAFTA with the U.S. and Mexico—major sectors of the Quebec economy were offered up as bargaining chips without adequate compensation from our point of view and that of Quebec. Obviously, I am talking about our farmers, our dairy producers and other supply managed producers. Breaches were opened in this sector, which is supposed to be protected. There is great inequity, which must be compensated.

However, I am very pleased to have moved a motion in the House that was unanimously adopted. It calls for full compensation for all supply managed producers before the new USMCA is ratified in the House. We will be following this very closely.

**Ms. Linda Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I listened to my colleague who is from Quebec, as am I. Indeed, Quebec is a nation that is dependent on international trade, as he said. I would like to hear his thoughts on the USMCA and dairy producers.

Two committees are going to be struck, specifically to ensure that dairy producers are adequately compensated and to hear from the sector as a whole. I would like to hear my colleague's thoughts on the two consultation panels that have been created.

**Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie:** Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Rivière-des-Mille-Îles for her question and her concern for our farmers.

Our farmers do not like being compensated. They tell me that they did not want to be sacrificed in the agreements, but that is what happened to them in the last three agreements. I am pleased to hear today that there are two consultation panels, but unfortunately I fear that the consultations will not end with full compensation for the sacrifices they made in the last three agreements. Nevertheless, it is a very good start. Let us hope that this leads to full compensation and that the House will never again sign trade agreement in which our dairy farmers and other supply managed farmers are sacrificed.

In my speech I announced that we would support this bill at second reading, but that we would propose an amendment to ensure that the land occupied since 1967 is excluded. I would have liked to know whether the Liberal Party members will accept our amendment.

• (1815)

[*English*]

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota):** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some hon. members:** Question.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota):** The question is on the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota):** All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota):** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota):** In my opinion the yeas have it.

*And five or more members having risen:*

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota):** Call in the members.

• (1855)

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

(*Division No. 933*)

YEAS

Members

Aboulttaif  
Albrecht  
Alleslev  
Amos  
Arnold

Albas  
Aldag  
Allison  
Anandasangaree  
Aubin

*Private Members' Business*

Ayoub	Badawey	Moore	Morneau
Bagnell	Bains	Morrissey	Motz
Barlow	Barsalou-Duval	Nantel	Nassif
Baylis	Beaulieu	Nater	Nault
Benzen	Berthold	Ng	Nicholson
Bezan	Bittle	Nuttall	Oliphant
Blaikie	Blair	Oliver	O'Toole
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)	Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)	Ouellette	Paul-Hus
Boissonnault	Bossio	Pauzé	Peschisolido
Boucher	Boudrias	Peterson	Petitpas Taylor
Boulerice	Boutin-Sweet	Philpott	Picard
Brassard	Bratina	Poilievre	Poissant
Breton	Brosseau	Quach	Qualtrough
Caesar-Chavannes	Calkins	Ramsey	Rankin
Cannings	Caron	Ratansi	Reid
Carr	Carrie	Rempel	Richards
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)	Casey (Charlottetown)	Rioux	Robillard
Chen	Chong	Rogers	Romanado
Choquette	Christopherson	Rudd	Ruimy
Clarke	Cooper	Rusnak	Sahota
Cullen	Cuzner	Saini	Sajjan
Dabrusin	Damoff	Samson	Sangha
Davies	DeCoursey	Sarai	Scarpaleggia
Deltell	Dhaliwal	Schiefke	Schmale
Dhillon	Diotte	Schulte	Serré
Doherty	Donnelly	Sgro	Shanahan
Drouin	Dubé	Sheehan	Shipley
Dubourg	Duclos	Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Duguid	Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Sikand	Simms
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)	Duvall	Sohi	Sorbara
Dzerowicz	Easter	Sorenson	Spengemann
Eglinski	Ehsassi	Stanton	Ste-Marie
El-Khoury	Ellis	Stetski	Strahl
Erskine-Smith	Eyking	Stubbs	Tan
Eyolfson	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Tassi	Thériault
Falk (Provencher)	Fergus	Tilson	Tootoo
Fillmore	Finley	Trost	Trudel
Finnigan	Fisher	Van Kesteren	Vandal
Fonseca	Fortier	Vandenbeld	Vecchio
Fragiskatos	Fraser (West Nova)	Viersen	Virani
Fraser (Central Nova)	Freeland	Wagantall	Warawa
Fry	Fuhr	Waugh	Webber
Gallant	Garrison	Weir	Whalen
Généreux	Gerretsen	Wilkinson	Wilson-Raybould
Gill	Gladu	Wong	Wrzesnewskij
Godin	Goldsmith-Jones	Yip	Young
Goodale	Gould	Zahid	Zimmer— 270
Gourde	Graham		
Grewal	Hajdu		
Hardcastle	Hardie		
Harvey	Hehr		
Hogg	Holland		
Hughes	Hussen		
Hutchings	Iacono		
Jeneroux	Johns		
Joly	Jones		
Jordan	Jowhari		
Julian	Kang		
Kelly	Kent		
Khera	Kitchen		
Kmiec	Kusie		
Kwan	Lake		
Lambropoulos	Lametti		
Lamoureux	Lapointe		
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)		
Laverdière	Lebouthillier		
Leitch	Leslie		
Liepert	Lightbound		
Lloyd	Lobb		
Long	Longfield		
Ludwig	Lukiwski		
MacGregor	MacKenzie		
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maguire		
Malcolmson	Maloney		
Martel	Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)		
Mathyssen	May (Saarnich—Gulf Islands)		
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McCrimmon		
McDonald	McGuinty		
McKay	McKenna		
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)		
McLeod (Northwest Territories)	Mendicino		
Mihychuk	Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)		
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)			
Monsef			

## NAYS

Members

Tabbara — 1

## PAIRED

Members

Cormier

Fortin — 2

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota):** I declare the motion carried. Accordingly, the bill stands referred to the Standing Committee on International Trade.

(Bill read the second time and referred to a committee)

**PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS**

[English]

**CRIMINAL CODE**

The House resumed from October 31 consideration of the motion that Bill C-375, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (presentence report), be read the third time and passed.



**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota):** The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at third reading stage of Bill C-375 under private members' business. The question is on the motion.

May I dispense?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

[*Chair read text of motion to House*]

● (1905)

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

(*Division No. 934*)

### YEAS

#### Members

Aldag	Amos
Anandasangaree	Arseneault
Arya	Ashton
Aubin	Ayoub
Badawey	Bagnell
Bains	Barsalou-Duval
Baylis	Beaulieu
Bittle	Blaikie
Blair	Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Boissonnault	Bossio
Boudrias	Boulerice
Boutin-Sweet	Bratina
Breton	Brosseau
Caesar-Chavannes	Cannings
Caron	Carr
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)	Casey (Charlottetown)
Chen	Choquette
Christopherson	Cullen
Cuzner	Dabrusin
Damoff	Davies
DeCoursey	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Donnelly
Drouin	Dubé
Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)	Duvall
Dzerowicz	Easter
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Ellis	Erskine-Smith
Eyking	Eyolfson
Fergus	Fillmore
Finnigan	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fragiskatos	Fraser (West Nova)
Fraser (Central Nova)	Freeland
Fry	Fuhr
Garrison	Gerretsen
Gill	Goldsmith-Jones
Goodale	Gould
Graham	Grewal
Hajdu	Harcastle
Hardie	Harvey
Hehr	Hogg
Holland	Hughes
Hussen	Hutchings
Iacono	Johns
Joly	Jones
Jordan	Jowhari
Julian	Kang
Khera	Kwan
Lambropoulos	Lametti
Lamoureux	Lapointe
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)	Laverdière
Lebouthillier	Leslie
Lighbound	Long
Longfield	Ludwig
MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)

Malcolmson	Maloney
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	
Mathysen	
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	McCrimmon
McDonald	McGuinity
McKay	McKenna
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino	Mihychuk
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)	
Monsef	
Moore	Morneau
Morrissey	Nantel
Nassif	Nault
Ng	Oliphant
Oliver	Ouellette
Pauzé	Peschisolido
Peterson	Petitpas Taylor
Philpott	Picard
Poissant	Quach
Qualtrough	Ramsey
Rankin	Ratansi
Rioux	Robillard
Rogers	Romanado
Rudd	Ruimy
Rusnak	Sahota
Saini	Sajjan
Samson	Sangha
Sarai	Scarpaleggia
Schiefke	Schulte
Serré	Sgro
Shanahan	Sheehan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sikand	Simms
Sohi	Sorbara
Spengemann	Ste-Marie
Stetski	Tabbara
Tan	Tassi
Thériault	Tootoo
Trudel	Vandal
Vandenbeld	Virani
Weir	Whalen
Wilkinson	Wilson-Raybould
Wrzesnewskyj	Yip
Young	Zahid— 198

### NAYS

#### Members

Aboultaif	Albas
Albrecht	Alleslev
Allison	Arnold
Barlow	Benzen
Berthold	Bezan
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)	Boucher
Brassard	Calkins
Carrie	Chong
Clarke	Cooper
Deltell	Diotte
Doherty	Eglski
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Falk (Provencher)
Finley	Gallant
Généreux	Gladu
Godin	Gourde
Jeneroux	Kelly
Kent	Kitchen
Kmiec	Kusie
Lake	Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Leitch	Liepert
Lloyd	Lobb
Lukiwski	MacKenzie
Maguire	Martel
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)	Motz
Nater	Nicholson
Nuttall	O'Toole
Paul-Hus	Poillievre
Reid	Rempel
Richards	Schmale
Shipley	Sorenson
Stanton	Strahl
Stubbs	Tilson
Trost	Van Kesteren
Vecchio	Viersen

*Private Members' Business*

Wagantall  
Waugh  
Wong

Warawa  
Webber  
Zimmer— 76

**PAIRED**

Members

Cornier

Fortin— 2

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota):** I declare the motion carried.

(Bill read the third time and passed)

\* \* \*

**SIKH HERITAGE MONTH ACT**

The House resumed from November 1 consideration of the motion that Bill C-376, An Act to designate the month of April as Sikh Heritage Month, be read the third time and passed.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota):** The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at third reading stage of Bill C-376 under private members' business.

• (1915)

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

*(Division No. 935)*

**YEAS**

Members

Aboultaif  
Albrecht  
Alleslev  
Amos  
Arnold  
Arya  
Aubin  
Badawey  
Bains  
Barsalou-Duval  
Beaulieu  
Berthold  
Bittle  
Blair  
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)  
Bossio  
Boudrias  
Boutin-Sweet  
Bratina  
Brosseau  
Cannings  
Carr  
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)  
Chen  
Choquette  
Clarke  
Cullen  
Dabrusin  
Davies  
Deltell  
Dhillon  
Doherty  
Drouin  
Dubourg  
Duguid  
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)  
Dzerowicz  
Eglinski  
El-Khoury  
Erskine-Smith  
Eyolfson  
Falk (Provencher)

Albas  
Aldag  
Allison  
Anandasangaree  
Arseneault  
Ashton  
Ayoub  
Bagnell  
Barlow  
Baylis  
Benzen  
Bezan  
Blaikie  
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)  
Boissonnault  
Boucher  
Boulerice  
Brassard  
Breton  
Caesar-Chavannes  
Caron  
Carrie  
Casey (Charlottetown)  
Chong  
Christopherson  
Cooper  
Cuzner  
Damoff  
DeCoursey  
Dhaliwal  
Diotte  
Donnelly  
Dubé  
Duclos  
Duncan (Etobicoke North)  
Duvall  
Easter  
Ehsassi  
Ellis  
Eyking  
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)  
Fergus

Fillmore  
Finnigan  
Fonseca  
Fragiskatos  
Fraser (Central Nova)  
Fry  
Gallant  
Généreux  
Gill  
Godin  
Goodale  
Gourde  
Grewal  
Hardcastle  
Harvey  
Hogg  
Hughes  
Hutchings  
Jeneroux  
Joly  
Jordan  
Julian  
Kelly  
Khera  
Kmiec  
Kwan  
Lambropoulos  
Lamoureux  
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)  
Laverdière  
Leitch  
Liepert  
Lloyd  
Long  
Ludwig  
MacGregor  
MacKinnon (Gatineau)  
Malcolmson  
Martel  
Mathysen  
McCauley (Edmonton West)  
McDonald  
McKay  
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)  
McLeod (Northwest Territories)  
Mihychuk  
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)  
Monsef  
Moore  
Morrissey  
Nantel  
Nater  
Ng  
Nuttall  
Oliver  
Ouellette  
Pauzé  
Peterson  
Philpott  
Poilievre  
Quach  
Ramsey  
Ratansi  
Rempel  
Rioux  
Rogers  
Rudd  
Rusnak  
Saini  
Samson  
Sarai  
Schiefke  
Schulte  
Sgro  
Sheehan  
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)  
Sikand  
Sohi  
Sorenson  
Stanton  
Stetski  
Stubbs  
Tan  
Thériault

Finley  
Fisher  
Fortier  
Fraser (West Nova)  
Freeland  
Fuhr  
Garrison  
Gerretsen  
Gladu  
Goldsmith-Jones  
Gould  
Graham  
Hajdu  
Hardie  
Hehr  
Holland  
Hussen  
Iacono  
Johns  
Jones  
Jowhari  
Kang  
Kent  
Kitchen  
Kusie  
Lake  
Lametti  
Lapointe  
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)  
Lebouthillier  
Leslie  
Lightbound  
Lobb  
Longfield  
Lukiwski  
MacKenzie  
Maguire  
Maloney  
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)  
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)  
McCrimmon  
McGuinty  
McKenna  
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)  
Mendicino  
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)

Morneau  
Motz  
Nassif  
Nault  
Nicholson  
Oliphant  
O'Toole  
Paul-Hus  
Peschisolido  
Petitpas Taylor  
Picard  
Poissant  
Qualtrough  
Rankin  
Reid  
Richards  
Robillard  
Romanado  
Ruimy  
Sahota  
Sajjan  
Sangha  
Scarpaleggia  
Schmale  
Serré  
Shanahan  
Shipley  
Sidhu (Brampton South)  
Simms  
Sorbara  
Spengemann  
Ste-Marie  
Strahl  
Tabbara  
Tassi  
Tilson

*Private Members' Business*

Tootoo  
Trudel  
Vandal  
Vecchio  
Virani  
Warawa  
Webber  
Whalen  
Wilson-Raybould  
Wzesneskyj  
Young  
Zimmer— 273

Trost  
Van Kesteren  
Vandenbeld  
Viersen  
Wagantall  
Waugh  
Weir  
Wilkinson  
Wong  
Yip  
Zahid

Dhillon  
Doherty  
Drouin  
Dubourg  
Duguid  
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)  
Dzerowicz  
Eglinski  
El-Khoury  
Erskine-Smith  
Eyolfson  
Falk (Provencher)  
Fillmore  
Finnigan  
Fonseca  
Fragiskatos  
Fraser (Central Nova)  
Fry  
Gallant  
Généreux  
Gill  
Godin  
Goodale  
Gourde  
Hajdu  
Hardie  
Hehr  
Holland  
Hussen  
Iacono  
Johns  
Jones  
Jowhari  
Kang  
Kent  
Kitchen  
Kusie  
Lake  
Lametti  
Lapointe  
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)  
Lebouthillier  
Leslie  
Lightbound  
Lobb  
Longfield  
Lukiwski  
MacKenzie  
Maguire  
Maloney  
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)  
Mathysen  
May (Saamich—Gulf Islands)  
McCrimmon  
McGuinty  
McKenna  
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)  
Mendicino  
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)  
Soeurs)  
Monsef  
Morneau  
Motz  
Nassif  
Nault  
Nicholson  
Oliphant  
O'Toole  
Paul-Hus  
Peschisolido  
Petipas Taylor  
Picard  
Poissant  
Qualtrough  
Rankin  
Reid  
Richards  
Robillard  
Romanado  
Ruimy  
Sahota  
Sajjan  
Sangha  
Scarpaleggia

Diotte  
Donnelly  
Dubé  
Duclos  
Duncan (Etobicoke North)  
Duvall  
Easter  
Ehsassi  
Ellis  
Eyking  
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)  
Fergus  
Finley  
Fisher  
Fortier  
Fraser (West Nova)  
Freeland  
Fuhr  
Garrison  
Gerretsen  
Gladu  
Goldsmith-Jones  
Gould  
Graham  
Hardcastle  
Harvey  
Hogg  
Hughes  
Hutchings  
Jeneroux  
Joly  
Jordan  
Julian  
Kelly  
Khera  
Kmiec  
Kwan  
Lambropoulos  
Lamoureux  
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)  
Laverdière  
Leitch  
Liepert  
Lloyd  
Long  
Ludwig  
MacGregor  
MacKinnon (Gatineau)  
Malcolmson  
Martel  
McCauley (Edmonton West)  
McDonald  
McKay  
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)  
McLeod (Northwest Territories)  
Milychuk  
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-  
Moore  
Morrissey  
Nantel  
Nater  
Ng  
Nuttall  
Oliver  
Ouellette  
Peterson  
Philpott  
Poilievre  
Quach  
Ramsey  
Ratansi  
Rempel  
Rioux  
Rogers  
Rudd  
Rusnak  
Saini  
Samson  
Sarai  
Schiefke

Nil

## NAYS

## PAIRED

Members

Cormier

Fortin— 2

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota):** I declare the motion carried.

(Bill read the third time and passed)

\* \* \*

## CANADA REVENUE AGENCY ACT

The House resumed from November 5 consideration of the motion that Bill C-316, An Act to amend the Canada Revenue Agency Act (organ donors), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota):** The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division of the motion at second reading stage of Bill C-316, under private members' business.

• (1925)

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

(Division No. 936)

## YEAS

Members

Aboultaif  
Albrecht  
Alleslev  
Amos  
Arnold  
Arya  
Aubin  
Badawey  
Bains  
Barsalou-Duval  
Beaulieu  
Berthold  
Bittle  
Blair  
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)  
Bossio  
Boudrias  
Boutin-Sweet  
Bratina  
Brosseau  
Cannings  
Carr  
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)  
Chen  
Choquette  
Clarke  
Cullen  
Dabrusin  
Davies  
Deltell

Albas  
Aldag  
Allison  
Anandasangaree  
Arseneault  
Ashton  
Ayoub  
Bagnell  
Barlow  
Baylis  
Benzen  
Bezan  
Blaikie  
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)  
Boissonnault  
Boucher  
Boulerice  
Brassard  
Breton  
Caesar-Chavannes  
Caron  
Carrie  
Casey (Charlottetown)  
Chong  
Christopherson  
Cooper  
Cuzner  
Damoff  
DeCoursey  
Dhaliwal

*Private Members' Business*

Schmale	Schulte
Serré	Sgro
Shanahan	Sheehan
Shipley	Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Sikand
Simms	Sohi
Sorbara	Sorenson
Spengemann	Stanton
Ste-Marie	Stetski
Strahl	Stubbs
Tabbara	Tan
Tassi	Thériault
Tilson	Tootoo
Trost	Trudel
Van Kesteren	Vandal
Vandenbeld	Vecchio
Viersen	Virani
Wagantall	Warawa
Waugh	Webber
Weir	Whalen
Wilkinson	Wilson-Raybould
Wong	Wrzesnewskyj
Yip	Young
Zahid	Zimmer — 272

## NAYS

Nil

## PAIRED

Members

Cornier

Fortin — 2

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota):** I declare the motion carried. Accordingly, the bill stands referred to the Standing Committee on Health.

(Bill read the second time and referred to a committee)

\* \* \*

## CANADIAN MULTICULTURALISM ACT

The House resumed from November 6 consideration of the motion that Bill C-393, An Act to amend the Canadian Multiculturalism Act (non-application in Quebec), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota):** The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at the second reading stage of Bill C-393 under private members' business. The question is on the motion.

● (1935)

[*Translation*]

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

(Division No. 937)

## YEAS

Members

Aubin	Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu	Boudrias
Gill	Moore
Nantel	Pauzé
Ste-Marie	Thériault — 10

## NAYS

Members

Aboultatif	Albas
Albrecht	Aldag
Alleslev	Allison
Amos	Anandasangaree

Arnold	Arseneault
Arya	Ashton
Ayoub	Badawey
Bagnell	Bains
Barlow	Baylis
Benzen	Berthold
Bezan	Bittle
Blaikie	Blair
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)	Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Boissonnault	Bossio
Boucher	Boulerice
Boutin-Sweet	Brassard
Bratina	Breton
Brosseau	Caesar-Chavannes
Cannings	Caron
Carr	Carrie
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)	Casey (Charlottetown)
Chen	Chong
Choquette	Christopherson
Clarke	Cooper
Cullen	Cuzner
Dabrusin	Damoff
Davies	DeCoursey
Deltell	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Diotte
Doherty	Donnelly
Drouin	Dubé
Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)	Duvall
Dzerowicz	Easter
Eglinski	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Ellis
Erskine-Smith	Eyking
Eyolfson	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)	Fergus
Fillmore	Finley
Finnigan	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fragiskatos	Fraser (West Nova)
Fraser (Central Nova)	Freeland
Fry	Fuhr
Gallant	Garrison
Généreux	Gerretsen
Gladu	Godin
Goldsmith-Jones	Goodale
Gould	Gourde
Graham	Hajdu
Hardcastle	Hardie
Harvey	Hehr
Hogg	Holland
Housefather	Hughes
Hussen	Hutchings
Iacono	Jeneroux
Johns	Joly
Jones	Jordan
Jowhari	Julian
Kang	Kelly
Kent	Khera
Kitchen	Kmiec
Kusie	Kwan
Lake	Lambropoulos
Lametti	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Laverdière	Lebouthillier
Leitch	Leslie
Liepert	Lightbound
Lloyd	Lobb
Long	Longfield
Ludwig	Lukiwski
MacGregor	MacKenzie
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maguire
Malcolmson	Maloney
Martel	Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
Mathysen	May (Saarich—Gulf Islands)
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McCrimmon
McDonald	McGuinty
McKay	McKenna
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)	Mendicino
Mihychuk	Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)	
Monsef	
Morneau	Morrissey

*Adjournment Proceedings*

Motz	Nassif
Nater	Nault
Ng	Nicholson
Nuttall	Oliphant
Oliver	O'Toole
Ouellette	Paul-Hus
Peschisolido	Peterson
Petitpas Taylor	Philpott
Picard	Poilievre
Poissant	Quach
Qualtrough	Ramsey
Rankin	Ratansi
Reid	Rempel
Richards	Rioux
Robillard	Rodríguez
Rogers	Romanado
Rudd	Ruimy
Rusnak	Sahota
Saini	Sajjan
Samson	Sangha
Sarai	Scarpaleggia
Schiefke	Schmale
Schulte	Serré
Sgro	Shanahan
Sheehan	Shiple
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sikand	Simms
Sohi	Sorbara
Sorenson	Spengemann
Stanton	Stetski
Strahl	Stubbs
Tabbara	Tan
Tassi	Tilson
Tootoo	Trost
Trudel	Van Kesteren
Vandal	Vandenbeld
Vecchio	Viersen
Virani	Wagantall
Warawa	Waugh
Webber	Weir
Whalen	Wilkinson
Wilson-Raybould	Wong
Wrzesnewskyj	Yip
Young	Zahid
Zimmer— 263	

## PAIRED

## Members

Cormier

Fortin— 2

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota):** I declare the motion lost.

[*English*]

I wish to inform the House that because of the delay, there will be no Private Members' Business hour today.

**ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS**

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

[*English*]

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE

**Mr. Erin Weir (Regina—Lewvan, CCF):** Mr. Speaker, in June, I asked whether the government would consider sanctioning President Trump's personal business interests in order to lift the American tariffs from our steel and aluminum exports.

I would like to begin by mentioning the high cost of these tariffs for our country. Not only have they reduced current exports and cost jobs in the present, they are also hurting investments in Canada's

steel and aluminum industries, which will be costing our economy and employment in the long term as well.

What has the government done so far? Well, it has applied reciprocal tariffs on American steel and aluminum coming into our country. It also has retaliatory tariffs targeting products coming from politically sensitive American electoral districts. While that was a very clever type of retaliation, I really think it has run its course, given that they had American mid-term elections yesterday, with whatever political consequences have been felt. Unfortunately, the U.S. steel and aluminum tariffs still apply to Canadian exports. Therefore, we need to look at other options.

As I suggested back in June, one option could be to sanction the personal business interests of President Trump. Unlike previous American presidents, he has not divested his business assets. This makes him uniquely vulnerable to the possibility of sanctions from other countries. I would like to hear what the government's response is to that option.

I think another option we need to look at involves the recently agreed to USMCA. Just this evening, CBC reported that our ambassador to the United States has indicated that the Prime Minister will not participate in a signing ceremony as long as the American steel and aluminum tariffs remain in place. However, it does seem that the government is prepared to go ahead and sign the agreement. CNN interviewed the Prime Minister, and he said, "We're not at the point of saying that we wouldn't sign if it wasn't lifted, although we're trying to make that case."

It sounds as though the government is prepared to go ahead and sign the USMCA, even if American tariffs continue to apply to Canadian steel and aluminum exports. I think that is a big problem.

One of the obvious goals of a free trade agreement should be to not have that type of tariff in place between our two countries. Therefore, I find it concerning that the government is already signalling, by way of this interview the Prime Minister did on CNN, that the government is prepared to go ahead and sign the USMCA, even if the U.S. keeps these tariffs in place. I think we need our government to take a much stronger stand on that point, and we really need to see some strong action to get these American tariffs off our steel and aluminum exports.

To sum up, we have these American tariffs on Canadian steel and aluminum being sold south of the border. It is imposing huge costs on Canada's economy and on Canadian workers. My constituents and other Canadians need to know what the government's plan is and what the government's timeline will be to have these American tariffs removed.

• (1940)

**Mr. John Oliver (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, last month we reached consensus with the U.S., alongside Mexico, on a new modernized North American free trade agreement for the 21st century. Our government fought hard to reach a good agreement and we were successful. The ties across North America are essential for our shared economic prosperity, and we look forward to further deepening our close economic ties with the U.S. and Mexico.

*Adjournment Proceedings*

On the question of U.S. section 232 tariffs, our position remains unchanged. The U.S. tariffs imposed under the rationale of national security on steel and aluminum are unacceptable and an affront to the long-standing security partnership between the U.S. and Canada. These tariffs are illegitimate and unjustified, and that is a message that we have repeatedly shared with the U.S. administration.

It is overwhelmingly in the best interests of both Canada and the United States for these reciprocal tariffs to be lifted. In the meantime, we have taken strong, responsive measures to defend our steel and aluminum workers. That is why we responded earlier in July by imposing tariffs against U.S. imports, worth \$16.6 billion, equivalent to the value of Canadian steel and aluminum trade affected. This is the largest trade action Canada has taken since World War II.

Our government has also announced it is making available up to \$2 billion to defend and protect the interests of Canadian workers and businesses in the steel, aluminum and manufacturing industries. These measures are helping to strengthen the competitiveness of Canada's steel and aluminum companies and contribute to economic growth while increasing the capacity of the industries to innovate, grow value-added, support product and market diversification, and create and sustain jobs for Canadians.

As we have always said, the NAFTA talks are completely separate from these illegal section 232 tariffs. However, now that we have completed the USMCA, we have some wind in our sails and we continue to work for the permanent removal of the U.S. tariffs. In the meantime, our reciprocal countermeasures will remain in place until the tariffs are removed, and we are challenging the U.S. tariffs under World Trade Organization and NAFTA rules. All Canadians can rest assured that the removal of the section 232 tariffs is a priority for our government.

**Mr. Erin Weir:** Mr. Speaker, I certainly appreciate that the parliamentary secretary has stated the government's opposition to the illegitimate American tariffs on our steel and aluminum exports. I think everyone in the House shares the goal of removing those tariffs. The question we are debating this evening is how to achieve that goal.

The parliamentary secretary mentioned the government's existing retaliatory strategy, which was largely based on targeting certain American electoral districts. Now that the U.S. mid-term elections are over, I wonder whether the parliamentary secretary believes that strategy has worked or whether he would agree with me that some new strategy is now required.

I would like to hear some kind of a response to the possibility of instead targeting President Trump's personal business interests, rather than continuing with retaliation that targets the American people. I would also like a commitment that the government will not sign USMCA until these tariffs are lifted.

● (1945)

**Mr. John Oliver:** Mr. Speaker, our government will always stand up for Canadian workers, businesses and consumers. The recently agreed USMCA is proof of that. It safeguards more than \$2 billion a day in cross-border trade and tariff-free access for more than 70% of Canadian exports. In fact, with CETA and CPTPP, the USMCA means Canada now has tariff-free access to 1.5 billion consumers around the world. This is great news for our businesses and workers.

Just as we fought for Canadians at the NAFTA negotiating table, we will fight for them to remove these unfair U.S. tariffs.

NATURAL RESOURCES

**Ms. Jenny Kwan (Vancouver East, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, it was revealed two days ago, after the government decided to spend \$4.5 billion of public funds on a 65-year old leaky pipeline, that Kinder Morgan received a letter from the government, stating it had committed not one, two or three offences, but four offences. That was at the time when I asked the question.

Months had passed without mandatory monitoring reports being provided to the government and first nations. Safe underwater noise limits during expansion work had exceeded safe underwater noise limits, putting marine wildlife at risk, yet the government insisted Kinder Morgan deserved this bailout.

As I have said on numerous occasions now, this is not the course of action a climate leader takes. Here is the approach a climate leader takes.

My colleague, the member for Edmonton Strathcona, who had been providing true leadership on this file throughout her career in and out of politics, had put Motion No. 204 on notice in the House. The passing of that motion would compel the government to enact legislation to establish a legal regime to ensure that binding measures would be in place to ensure greater transparency and accountability for sound decision-making in delivering on Canada's commitments to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

This would include: prescribing legally-binding reduction targets for greenhouse gases for 2030 and 2050, consistent with commitments under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, which Canada adopted and ratified, and targets committed to in the Paris climate agreement; prescribing a duty to take measures to reduce or mitigate risks or impacts from climate change; establishing an independent climate advisory committee of experts, appointed by the Governor in Council, to advise governments on measures to meet targets based on scientifically, technologically and economically-sound analysis; for this committee to undertake audits based on progress indicators of the actions to deliver on these targets; and for the committee to submit to Parliament an annual report outlining the advice provided, actions taken and progress in meeting targets.

*Adjournment Proceedings*

The legislation would mirror that enacted in the United Kingdom in 2008, 10 years ago. It would resemble measures taken by Germany, Denmark, Sweden and Finland.

As my colleague stated, her motion would deliver deeper action and accountability than the panel of experts the environment minister had proposed.

This is climate leadership and climate action, legally-binding targets with checks and balances to hold the government to account when it is not reaching them. A transparency and accountability model based on global best practices is what Canada needs right now. Instead, we have a toothless advisory panel for ad hoc consultations. We have Harper's targets. We also have the Auditor General and the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change telling the government that even those targets will be missed and that there is no accountability.

The United Kingdom took steps toward real accountability on climate action a decade ago. Will the government support Motion No. 204 and hold itself accountable to meet the climate targets that Canadians, today and tomorrow, need?

**Mr. John Oliver (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I want to reassure all members of the House and every Canadian watching at home that our government is committed to developing our country's abundant resources the right way by protecting investor confidence and promoting public trust, by advancing indigenous reconciliation and enhancing environmental performance, with the goal of getting good resource projects built in a timely, responsible and transparent way.

That has been our focus since we came to office in November 2015, and that is why we took a leadership role in forging the Paris Agreement on climate change. That is why we sat down with provinces and territories and consulted with indigenous leaders to draft the pan-Canadian framework to support clean growth and address the changing climate. That is why we tabled Bill C-69. That is why we are consulting on a framework for recognizing and implementing indigenous rights, and that is why we have put in place the Pipeline Safety Act, which came into force in June 2016.

We understand that Canadians depend upon our government to ensure that Canada's oil and gas pipelines are built securely and operated safely. The Pipeline Safety Act helps us do that by creating a culture of safety.

Bill C-69 would build on that by creating a new Canadian energy regulator with enhanced powers to oversee stronger safety and environmental protections. That includes new powers for federal inspection officers so they can act quickly and, if necessary, place a stop work order on any project that is operating unsafely or falling short of prescribed conditions. Such measures are critical to delivering on our vision of a Canada that works for everyone, a Canada that creates good jobs and expands our middle class, a

Canada that develops its resources sustainably and competitively, and a Canada that leads the global transition to a low carbon economy.

The Trans Mountain expansion project has the potential to be part of that vision, but we know we have more work to do to move forward the right way. That is why we have instructed the National Energy Board to reconsider its recommendations concerning the effects of project-related marine shipping, and to do so with the help of a special marine technical adviser. That is also why we relaunched our government's phase 3 consultations with indigenous groups affected by the project. The former Supreme Court Justice, the hon. Frank Iacobucci, serves as a special federal representative on legal and constitutional matters.

We are committed to growing the economy and protecting the environment at the same time.

• (1950)

**Ms. Jenny Kwan:** Mr. Speaker, as I have pointed out far too many times, the Liberals, unfortunately, talk a big game on climate change, but their actions do not back up their words. They kept Harper's climate targets. They bought a 65-year-old leaky pipeline, and it is no wonder that the Auditor General told them they would not meet their targets.

If the government passes Motion No. 204, it would put a true accountability measure in place to prevent any government of any stripe from failing to do what is necessary to prevent global temperatures from rising above 1.5 degrees. Holding themselves to their promises, and more importantly to combat climate change, is what true leadership looks like.

Will the government support Motion No. 204?

**Mr. John Oliver:** Mr. Speaker, the member's comments remind me of something the Prime Minister once said in response to one that member's previous questions. It is worth repeating here because it illustrates how wide the gulf is in the House. The Prime Minister said, "The NDP and Conservatives still think there is a choice to be made" between the economy and the environment.

They are wrong. They are making a false choice. Economic growth and environmental protection are not competing interests. They are equal components of the single engine that will drive Canada's innovation and prosperity for generations to come.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota):** The motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted.

[Translation]

Accordingly, the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m. pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 7:54 p.m.)





## CONTENTS

Wednesday, November 7, 2018

<b>STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS</b>			
<b>NHL Retirement</b>		Mr. Trudeau .....	23381
Mr. Tootoo .....	23377	Mr. Scheer .....	23381
		Mr. Trudeau .....	23381
<b>2018 World Under-17 Hockey Challenge</b>		<b>Veterans Affairs</b>	
Ms. Ludwig .....	23377	Mr. Caron .....	23382
		Mr. Trudeau .....	23382
<b>Bear Clan Patrol</b>		<b>The Environment</b>	
Mrs. McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo) .....	23377	Mr. Caron .....	23382
		Mr. Trudeau .....	23382
<b>Remembrance Day</b>		<b>International Trade</b>	
Mr. Rioux .....	23378	Ms. Ramsey .....	23382
		Mr. Trudeau .....	23382
<b>Diwali</b>		Mr. Boulerice .....	23383
Mr. Julian .....	23378	Mr. Trudeau .....	23383
<b>Bernard Landry</b>		<b>Privacy</b>	
Mr. Thériault .....	23378	Mr. Rayes .....	23383
		Mr. Trudeau .....	23383
<b>Remembrance Day</b>		Mr. Rayes .....	23383
Mr. Poilievre .....	23378	Mr. Trudeau .....	23383
		Mr. Kent .....	23383
<b>Remembrance Day</b>		Mr. Trudeau .....	23383
Mr. Harvey .....	23378	Mr. Albas .....	23384
		Mr. Trudeau .....	23384
<b>Remembrance Day</b>		Ms. Raitt .....	23384
Mr. Bratina .....	23379	Mr. Trudeau .....	23384
		Ms. Raitt .....	23384
<b>Remembrance Day</b>		Mr. Trudeau .....	23384
Mr. Paul-Hus .....	23379	<b>Poverty</b>	
		Ms. Blaney (North Island—Powell River) .....	23384
<b>Jewish Refugees</b>		Mr. Trudeau .....	23384
Mr. Graham .....	23379	Ms. Sansoucy .....	23384
		Mr. Trudeau .....	23384
<b>Oceans Protection Plan</b>		<b>Carbon Pricing</b>	
Mr. Casey (Charlottetown) .....	23379	Mr. Poilievre .....	23385
		Mr. Trudeau .....	23385
<b>Veterans Affairs</b>		Mr. Poilievre .....	23385
Mr. Bezan .....	23379	Mr. Trudeau .....	23385
		Mr. Poilievre .....	23385
<b>Diwali and Bandi Chhor Divas</b>		Mr. Trudeau .....	23385
Mr. Saini .....	23380	Mr. Poilievre .....	23385
		Mr. Trudeau .....	23385
<b>Poverty</b>		Ms. Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona) .....	23385
Ms. Ramsey .....	23380	Mr. Trudeau .....	23386
		<b>Natural Resources</b>	
<b>Bernard Landry</b>		Mr. Cullen .....	23386
Mr. Deltell .....	23380	Mr. Trudeau .....	23386
		<b>Fisheries and Oceans</b>	
<b>Inuit Day</b>		Mr. Whalen .....	23386
Ms. Jones .....	23380	Mr. Trudeau .....	23386
<b>ORAL QUESTIONS</b>			
<b>Privacy</b>			
Mr. Scheer .....	23381		
Mr. Trudeau .....	23381		
Mr. Scheer .....	23381		
Mr. Trudeau .....	23381		
Mr. Scheer .....	23381		
Mr. Trudeau .....	23381		
<b>Carbon Pricing</b>			
Mr. Scheer .....	23381		

<b>Veterans Affairs</b>	
Mr. Martel .....	23386
Mr. Trudeau .....	23386
Mrs. Wagantall .....	23386
Mr. Trudeau .....	23386
Mr. Brassard .....	23387
Mr. Trudeau .....	23387
Mr. Brassard .....	23387
Mr. Trudeau .....	23387
<b>Employment Insurance</b>	
Mr. Choquette .....	23387
Mr. Trudeau .....	23387
<b>Public Services and Procurement</b>	
Ms. Kwan .....	23387
Mr. Trudeau .....	23387
<b>Veterans Affairs</b>	
Mr. Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis) .....	23388
Mr. Trudeau .....	23388
<b>International Trade</b>	
Mr. Allison .....	23388
Mr. Trudeau .....	23388
Mr. Deltell .....	23388
Mr. Trudeau .....	23388
<b>Indigenous Affairs</b>	
Mr. Rusnak .....	23388
Mr. Trudeau .....	23388
<b>Ethics</b>	
Mr. O'Toole .....	23388
Mr. Trudeau .....	23389
<b>Telecommunications</b>	
Mr. Aubin .....	23389
Mr. Trudeau .....	23389
<b>International Trade</b>	
Mr. El-Khoury .....	23389
Mr. Trudeau .....	23389
<b>Justice</b>	
Mr. Scheer .....	23389
Mr. Trudeau .....	23389
<b>The Environment</b>	
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands) .....	23389
Mr. Trudeau .....	23390

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

<b>Veterans Ombudsman</b>	
Mr. Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation) .....	23390
<b>Government Response to Petitions</b>	
Mr. Lamoureux .....	23390
<b>Apology to Jewish Refugees</b>	
Mr. Trudeau .....	23390
Mr. Scheer .....	23393
Mr. Caron .....	23395
Mr. Beaulieu .....	23396
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands) .....	23397

<b>Committees of the House</b>	
<b>Procedure and House Affairs</b>	
Mr. Bagnell .....	23397
<b>Citizenship and Immigration</b>	
Ms. Rempel .....	23398
Mr. Lamoureux .....	23400
Mr. Angus .....	23401
Mr. Tabbara .....	23401
Mr. Maguire .....	23401
Mr. Lamoureux .....	23402
Motion .....	23402
(Motion agreed to) .....	23402
<b>Petitions</b>	
<b>Minimum Wage</b>	
Ms. Boutin-Sweet .....	23402
<b>Pay Equity</b>	
Ms. Boutin-Sweet .....	23402
<b>Tax Havens</b>	
Mr. Choquette .....	23402
<b>Seniors</b>	
Mr. Choquette .....	23402
<b>Rail Transportation</b>	
Mr. Aubin .....	23402
<b>Questions Passed as Orders for Returns</b>	
Mr. Lamoureux .....	23403
<b>Motions for Papers</b>	
Mr. Lamoureux .....	23403

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

<b>Canada-Israel Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act</b>	
Bill C-85. Second reading .....	23403
Mr. Samson .....	23403
Ms. Ramsey .....	23404
Mr. Albrecht .....	23405
Mr. Ste-Marie .....	23405
Ms. Ramsey .....	23405
Mr. Lamoureux .....	23407
Mr. Ste-Marie .....	23407
Mr. McCauley .....	23407
Mr. Lamoureux .....	23409
Mr. Ste-Marie .....	23409
Mr. Maguire .....	23409
Mr. Godin .....	23410
Mr. Lamoureux .....	23411
Mr. Aubin .....	23411
Mr. Ste-Marie .....	23411
Mr. Lamoureux .....	23412
Ms. Lapointe .....	23413
Motion agreed to .....	23414
(Bill read the second time and referred to a committee) .....	23414

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

<b>Criminal Code</b>	
Bill C-375. Third reading .....	23415
Motion agreed to .....	23416

(Bill read the third time and passed).....	23416
<b>Sikh Heritage Month Act</b>	
Bill C-376. Third reading.....	23416
Motion agreed to.....	23417
(Bill read the third time and passed).....	23417
<b>Canada Revenue Agency Act</b>	
Bill C-316. Second reading.....	23417
Motion agreed to.....	23418
(Bill read the second time and referred to a committee).	23418

<b>Canadian Multiculturalism Act</b>	
Bill C-393. Second reading.....	23418
Motion negated.....	23419

**ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS**

<b>International Trade</b>	
Mr. Weir.....	23419
Mr. Oliver.....	23419
<b>Natural Resources</b>	
Ms. Kwan.....	23420
Mr. Oliver.....	23421

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

---

### SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

---

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

---

### PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

---

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

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

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

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

---

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