



# DEBATES OF THE SENATE

---

1st SESSION



44th PARLIAMENT



VOLUME 153



NUMBER 235

---

OFFICIAL REPORT  
(HANSARD)

Tuesday, November 5, 2024

The Honourable PIERRETTE RINGUETTE,  
Speaker pro tempore

This issue contains the latest listing of Senators,  
Officers of the Senate and the Ministry.

## CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue).

*Publications Centre:* [Publications@sen.parl.gc.ca](mailto:Publications@sen.parl.gc.ca)

---

Published by the Senate  
Available on the Internet: <http://www.parl.gc.ca>

## THE SENATE

Tuesday, November 5, 2024

The Senate met at 2 p.m., the Speaker pro tempore in the chair.

Prayers.

### THE LATE HONOURABLE MURRAY SINCLAIR, C.C., M.S.C.

#### SILENT TRIBUTE

**The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore:** Honourable senators, we were deeply saddened by the news that the Honourable Murray Sinclair, our former colleague, passed away yesterday. As we meet today on the traditional territory of the Algonquin Anishinaabe people, I extend deepest sympathies on behalf of all senators and all associated with this place to his entire family.

Honourable senators, out of respect for our deceased colleague, I ask you to rise and join with me in a minute of silence.

*(Honourable senators then stood in silent tribute.)*

## SENATORS' STATEMENTS

### TRIBUTES

#### THE HONOURABLE JANE CORDY

**Hon. Pierre J. Dalphond:** Honourable senators, I rise today on behalf of the independent senators of the Progressive Senate Group, or PSG, to pay tribute to our former leader and the current dean of the Senate, the Honourable Jane Cordy, who has served this place for over 24 years.

As most colleagues well know, Senator Cordy was a teacher before her appointment to this chamber, and, even though she changed careers at 50, it is clear that she did not stop teaching and dealing with occasionally unruly students.

Senator Cordy has taught us the value of listening with an open mind. Certainly, we all arrive at this place with an idea of what we may hope to accomplish during our time here, but when we allow ourselves to be receptive to new ideas we may find new directions.

For example, we know Senator Cordy is responsible for the bill that established National Sickle Cell Awareness Day, and last week we heard her speak about her newest bill, which seeks to improve awareness of inherited blood disorders. Her dedication to this issue stems from a decision to attend an informal breakfast years ago when she was struck by the stories she heard.

Senator Cordy has taught us about hard work and how much one can accomplish as a senator when you dedicate yourself to the job. She is a well-respected and long-standing member of several parliamentary associations, notably the Canadian NATO Parliamentary Association and the Canada-United States Inter-Parliamentary Group.

She has served on numerous Senate committees, including the Special Senate Committee on Aging, and contributed to landmark Senate studies such as the National Security and Defence Committee report on *Canadian Security and Military Preparedness* that was released in the wake of the September 11 attacks and the mental health report *Out of the Shadows at Last* by the Social Affairs Committee.

I don't have enough time to even scratch the surface of the work that Senator Cordy has accomplished in her years as a senator.

Most of all, Senator Cordy, you have taught us the significance of kindness. Regardless of someone's affiliation, regardless of whether they are a senator, a staffer or a member of the administration, you treat everyone with genuine compassion.

I could add that you have tried to teach me how to dance like an East Coaster, but I will have to keep working hard on that one.

Jane, I know your family will appreciate having more time with you, and you will appreciate having more time for activities such as golf, pickleball and bridge games.

You will be missed here, and you leave a legacy behind you.

On behalf of the PSG, I wish you and Bob all the best in this new chapter of your lives. We will miss you, Jane.

**Hon. Marc Gold (Government Representative in the Senate):** Honourable senators, I rise today on behalf of the Government Representative Office to pay tribute to the Honourable Jane Cordy.

• (1410)

The number of days that Senator Cordy has spent serving Canadians in this chamber is 8,916. As our colleague Senator Dalphond said, that is over 24 years that Senator Cordy has dedicated to improving the lives of Canadians and fiercely advocating for her fellow Nova Scotians.

So, in a sense, it was only fitting that Senator Cordy's first speech in this chamber was about her hometown of Glace Bay, on the one hundredth anniversary of its incorporation, and the historic investments that the government of the day was making across Canada and specifically in the Atlantic provinces.

During her time in the chamber, Senator Cordy has sat on numerous committees, too many to name, but I would like to highlight her work on the Special Senate Committee on Aging, which was created with a broad mandate to review a wide range of complex issues, from financial security and retirement to

chronic diseases and palliative care. This work has had a lasting impact on how we deliver the public programs and services that seniors depend upon.

Over the last number of years, as we all know, Senator Cordy has seen and been a part of significant change here in the Senate, having been the first official leader of the Progressive Senate Group. Jane, I want to thank you for your incredible work during this critical time in the history of this institution. It was a delight working with you in our capacities over these years. I've always appreciated your kindness, thoughtfulness and political savvy in all of the interventions and counsel that you gave not only me but also our colleagues.

Let me also take a moment to talk about the job as a teacher that Senator Cordy held in Nova Scotia, as Senator Dalphond pointed out, for 30 years. I'm sure many in the chamber remember that special teacher they had who had an important impact on their life. Senator Cordy, I have no doubt that you were that special teacher to a large number of your students over the years, and that, in fact, continued here in the Senate, as there are so many of us who benefited from your wealth of wisdom and experience.

You will be sorely missed by all of us, Jane, and I wish you all the best in the future. I know that you will be enjoying spending much more time with your family, friends and particularly your four grandchildren. Once again, on behalf of the Government Representative Office, happy retirement, Jane. We're going to miss you.

**Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Donald Neil Plett (Leader of the Opposition):** Honourable senators, on behalf of myself and the opposition Conservatives, I wish to congratulate Senator Cordy as she embarks on her well-deserved retirement from the Senate of Canada.

Senator Cordy was appointed to the Upper Chamber by the Right Honourable Jean Chrétien on June 9, 2000. To put this into perspective, I thought I would highlight what else happened that year: The world survived Y2K and the Millennium Bug; the \$1,000 bill was removed from circulation; our now colleague Senator Duncan was elected the Premier of Yukon; Canadian astronaut Marc Garneau returned from space; the Reform Party was dissolved and replaced by the Canadian Alliance, and Stockwell Day became the first leader of the party; the Liberals were faced with the sponsorship scandal of Minister Gagliano; and former prime minister Pierre Trudeau passed away.

Colleagues, many events have taken place since our colleague's appointment. She has weathered several political storms. She has seen legislation improved and/or worsened, depending on what side of the political spectrum you associate with. She has also seen her fair share of governments — nine different parliaments to be exact. And although Senator Cordy and I have very opposing political perspectives, I believe we share a common opinion: that the Senate was a better place prior to the changes made by Justin Trudeau.

Collaboration, workability and collegiality were better obtained when the roles of the government and the opposition were distinct. Political affiliation in the good old Senate grounded our desire to ensure that the best interests of Canadians were at the forefront of all our decisions. I believe Senator Cordy can attest to the fact that Liberals and Conservatives may not have agreed on much politically, but at the same time, we understood the different perspectives, which is fundamental to ensuring healthy and robust debates.

Senator Cordy and I have rarely seen eye to eye in this chamber. As a matter of fact, I think we may have voted together only on the occasional adjournment motion. Regardless, we were friends, and this friendship was founded and made possible because of the mutual respect we had for each other, and we never considered partisanship a bad thing.

Over the years, Betty and I had the privilege of becoming good friends with both Jane and her husband, Bob, who is with us today. I will always cherish the time we have spent together at The Villages in Florida, playing golf or enjoying a meal and a glass of wine — sometimes four or five glasses, which often set the stage for more robust late-night debates. And if you think Jane is a staunch Liberal, wait until you get into a debate after a few too many drinks with Bob Cordy.

Jane, congratulations, and thank you for your tenure of 24 years of service to the Senate of Canada. I wish you and Bob good health and a happy retirement. Until we meet again.

**Hon. Raymonde Saint-Germain:** Honourable senators, it is my pleasure to bid farewell to a wonderful colleague and reference point of this institution, the Honourable Senator Jane Cordy, the only other female house leader with whom I had the privilege to work in this institution.

With her departure from this chamber, we will lose someone with a vast institutional memory of the Senate that only a few possess here. Senator Cordy, due to her generosity and collegiality, was never one to gatekeep her precious knowledge from new colleagues. I can think of many moments when she shared with me and others aspects of the Senate's history that have helped us better understand and make better decisions. She also shared some anecdotes that made both of us laugh out loud. As she shared those privately, I must show some restraint here.

On a more personal note, for 25 months, she was, as I said, my only female colleague at the leaders' table. I am grateful for the way she welcomed me into this tight circle, and I think I can say that for these two years, we shared a much-appreciated camaraderie. In those sometimes stormy meetings, I was able to observe her tact, strategic mindset and gentle but efficient leadership.

Senator Cordy is our longest-serving senator, having been around since her nomination in June of 2000. In all her years in the Senate, she has always stayed true to her values and beliefs. Her loyalty and sense of public service are beyond question. Even during the difficult period in 2014, when Liberal senators were ousted from caucus, she continued to serve with the utmost dignity. While I know this was a painful period that brought a lot of change to the Senate, Senator Cordy was never bitter and

always welcomed new colleagues with open arms. She was ready to work in a constructive manner on the aspects of this institution that needed modernization. For this, she deserves our gratitude.

By leaving the Senate, she will return fully to a place that is dear to her heart. I am, of course, talking about Atlantic Canada and her beloved Nova Scotia. In reading her maiden speech in this place, I couldn't help but notice the way she spoke with optimism, enthusiasm and conviction about her region and her community. Senator Cordy, I'm glad you will now be able to stay in that beautiful place, surrounded by your loved ones and freed from the exhausting journey to Ottawa.

Through my voice, all senators from the Independent Senators Group wish you the very best in your retirement. We know you will appreciate this well-deserved time with your loved ones. We wish you all the best in your new endeavours.

Thank you, *wela'lin*.

**Hon. Scott Tannas:** Honourable senators, let me lay out for you today's lesson plan. We are going to study and learn about parliamentary math. Yes, this is a pop quiz. Please take out your worksheets and pencils.

Question one — Senator Cordy was first named to the Senate in the year 2000. During how many parliaments was she a senator? Was it A, five; B, six; C, eight; or D, nine?

The answer is nine. Senator Plett and I worked together on that trick question. This is her ninth parliament. You are correct if you said that. Give yourself a point.

• (1420)

Question 2: Please name the standing committees that Senator Cordy was not a member of during her tenure in the Senate. Was it:

- (a) the Scrutiny of Regulations Committee and the Transport and Communications Committee
- (b) the National Finance Committee and the Banking Committee
- (c) the Official Languages Committee and the Audit and Oversight Committee
- (d) none — she did them all

If you answered (c) the Official Languages Committee and the Audit and Oversight Committee, please give yourself another point. Senator Cordy, you have a few days left to fix this.

Question 3: Your final question is a math problem. Senator Cordy has to travel to Ottawa from Halifax 30 times a year for 24 years and covers 957 kilometres each way. How many kilometres has she flown to attend the Senate during her career? The formula is the following: 30 times 24 times 2 times 957. What does that equal?

If you answered 1,378,080 or too far for too long, both answers are correct.

She was the schoolteacher we all hoped to have when we were in school. She was generous with her time, made us all feel welcome regardless of political stripe and always provided the big picture view during debates.

On a personal note, we worked together at a particularly difficult time when we were new leaders of new groups with a new virus, along with some more experienced folks and some other inexperienced leaders. She was always calm, steady and positive no matter what, even when those things may have been in short supply in our meetings. I've enjoyed working with you, Senator Cordy. It was a privilege.

Senator Cordy, you are a unique soul, and the Senate will never be the same without you. Our loss is your family's gain. My colleagues around me and I wish you a happy retirement and lots of time with your husband, your children and your grandchildren.

#### VISITORS IN THE GALLERY

**The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore:** Honourable senators, I wish to draw your attention to the presence in the gallery of Bob Cordy, Senator Cordy's husband; Alison Ripley and Michelle Brown, Senator Cordy's daughters; Patricia Hearn, Senator Cordy's sister; and Dennis Hearn, Senator Cordy's brother-in-law.

On behalf of all honourable senators, I welcome you to the Senate of Canada.

**Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear!

#### THE HONOURABLE JANE CORDY

##### EXPRESSION OF THANKS

**Hon. Jane Cordy:** Honourable senators, thank you very much. This is the tough part. I think it was more fun listening.

Thank you all so much. It makes my heart sing today to listen to everybody. I wanted to talk about some things. Before I start my actual speech, I'll say this.

Pierre, you said that you don't ever stop teaching when you're a teacher. When I first joined the Senate, everybody used to ask me, "What's the difference between teaching and being in the Senate?" My answer always used to be, "The kids are just bigger." I think you hit it right on the button, Pierre. I think you knew what it was.

Marc, I had forgotten about the Special Senate Committee on Aging chaired by Sharon Carstairs. We did great work. I feel like I was just looking out for my future interests when I joined that group because we came up with some great recommendations.

There is one thing that Don said in, perhaps, different words than I'm going to say, but it is really important for everybody: Yes, we did; Bob and I and Don and Betty used to golf. We had places in the villages, and we used to golf frequently. We were this far and this far — Don on the right and me on the left — but

we used to have great times golfing, and then we would either go out to dinner at a restaurant or go to one of our houses. I'm not a Scotch drinker, but when we went to one of our houses, I think we went through quite a bit of Scotch at our house when you would be there. We had a lot of fun.

I think it's important what Don said. We can be on the far right or the far left, or most of us are somewhere in between. Please stick with your political beliefs, but remember that we can still be friends at the end of the day, or we can have golf games or a drink after a golf game. I think that's really important because sometimes we become so intense about what our beliefs are that we forget that it is just a political belief. What makes Canada best is when we come together and we compromise and do what is best for our country.

Raymonde, I have to say that you spoke a lot about me being the other woman whom you worked with. Our offices were side by side, so we would often sit down early in the morning for coffee or late in the day. This is nothing against the men — this is not a criticism — but it was really nice to have another female leader when we went into our meetings.

Scott, you would have made a great teacher with all those comments. It's interesting when you talked about travelling too far for too long. The thought of spending another winter flying back and forth from Nova Scotia — after spending more time with my family in Nova Scotia — is another great reason for me to retire early.

Now I will actually speak to my prepared remarks. It's not an hour and a half long, as you will all be very glad to know.

Honourable senators, I would like to acknowledge that I'm speaking to you today on the traditional unceded land of the Algonquin Anishinaabe people.

Senators, I want to thank you so much for your kind words. I will read them over and over again, and I will probably send them to people to read because they have really touched my heart. Thank you for your best wishes since I gave notice that I would be taking early retirement, although I think very few places would consider the age of 74 to be an early retirement.

I was the eight hundred and forty-eighth senator to be appointed to this chamber. Thank you, Senator Varone, for that bit of trivia. If you want to know your number, just check with him. He has all of us down on his list. That number since Confederation — which is only slightly over a thousand senators appointed since Confederation — should make us all understand just how fortunate we are to have been chosen by our respective prime ministers to serve in this chamber.

I want to begin by paying tribute and saying a huge thank you to so many who have made our jobs easier. Our Parliamentary Protective Service personnel always work to keep us safe. They are professionals, and they always remain calm. I much appreciated their calmness and efficiency a few weeks ago. For those of us who were on Parliament Hill when shots were fired, you understand the bravery and dedication of our protective staff in a whole different way.

Our administrators and support team are led by our Clerk, Shaila Anwar, and they provide support to senators in so many ways, along with the Chamber Operations and Procedure Office, translators and technicians whose jobs increased significantly during COVID. To the Usher of the Black Rod, who always has a friendly “hello” and a smile, I thank you.

To our Senate pages — our brilliant young people from across our country — you make such a positive difference here in the chamber. The Senate has the Finance employees, Communications employees and Human Resources employees, many of whom work behind the scenes. We know you by name but not always by face. A thank you to all of you. Thanks to all who work behind the scenes to make our Senate function. You keep our buildings safe and clean, and you are appreciated.

Thank you to our bus drivers who drive us from the early morning until after midnight. You are so friendly no matter what time of the day it is — morning, noon or night. You get us to where we are going, and we always have a little chat. Finally, to our Speaker, Senator Raymonde Gagné, and our Speaker pro tempore, Senator Pierrette Ringuette, thank you for your leadership.

• (1430)

When I was sworn into the Senate in June 2000, the Speaker, Senator Gildas Molgat from Manitoba, was not present so the Speaker pro tempore, Senator Rose-Marie Losier-Cool from New Brunswick, presided. It is ironic that our Speaker from Manitoba is not able to be with us today and that it is another Speaker pro tempore from New Brunswick presiding as I prepare for my retirement.

Senators, my first staffer was Colette Favreau, who came out of retirement to help me set up my office. Matt Ryan from Cape Breton joined us shortly after, and he has been with me for over 20 years. Susanna Doherty from Newfoundland came to work with me after her graduation from the University of Ottawa 14 years ago. If you pass by her office, you might hear Susanna humming or singing. Her degree is in music, and she is an opera singer. Matt and Susanna have been an incredible team, working long hours when needed and offering suggestions when asked — and sometimes when they were not asked. We worked really hard in our office, but we laughed hard as well. I will miss you both, and I thank you for being great members of the dream team.

To the staff with whom I had the privilege of working as Leader of the Progressive Senate Group — Melanie, Heather, Caitlin, David and, for a short while, Jeremy — thank you for your advice, your attention to detail and for knowing that while we need to work hard in the world of politics, we need fun times as well. Thank you all.

To Bob, the love of my life: We celebrated our fifty-first wedding anniversary in August. You are my rock and my strongest advocate. Our life has been and continues to be an incredible adventure.

To our daughters, Alison and Michelle, who are here today: When I was appointed, Alison had just graduated in May from Mount Allison University, and Michelle had just finished her second year at St. Francis Xavier University. Here you are today,

strong and independent women. To our wonderful sons-in-law, Matt Ripley and Will Brown, who are in Dartmouth with our grandsons, Caleb and Cohen Brown and Luke and Liam Ripley, we love you all. Life has been great, but I am looking forward to being a full-time nana.

My sister Pat and her husband, Dennis Hearn, are here today, as they were back in 2000. Time has passed very quickly.

Honourable senators, there were about 33 women in the Senate in 2000. When I look around the chamber today, it makes me smile and it makes my heart sing.

Appointments were made differently in those days. I got a call from Prime Minister Chrétien's Director of Appointments Percy Downe who told me that I had been shortlisted for a Senate appointment. I met with Senator Downe the following week in Nova Scotia, and I was appointed on June 9, 2000. June is pretty hectic when you are a senator and when you are a teacher.

When I finished teaching on June 8, I couldn't tell anyone other than my husband and daughters and, of course, the school principal because he had to find a substitute teacher for the rest of June. On Friday afternoon, June 9, the principal announced to all the students that Mrs. Cordy was going to Ottawa to be a senator. One of the grade 1 students put up his hand and said to his teacher, "I didn't even know she played hockey." By the way, hockey was a pretty big deal in our school because there was a grade 5 student by the name of Sidney Crosby at Colby Village Elementary.

Another "by the way" is that I went home after that first week in the Senate and wrote report cards all weekend.

Honourable senators, I was only the third woman from Nova Scotia to ever be appointed to the Senate. The first was Margaret Norrie from Truro. You may know her daughter Margaret Norrie McCain, who followed in her mother's footsteps by making things better in our country, particularly in the field of early childhood education. She has been a great supporter of my alma mater Mount Saint Vincent University.

The second woman was Sister Peggy Butts, my high school principal, a brilliant woman and activist known as a "Rebel with a Cross." She couldn't take her seat right away because as a sister she couldn't own property. She did have land transferred to her before she was sworn in.

Today we have three women from Nova Scotia: Senator Wanda Thomas Bernard, Senator Mary Coyle and me. I hope the Prime Minister appoints at least one woman since there will be two vacancies in Nova Scotia after Senator Greene and I retire.

Honourable senators, I will be forever grateful to former Prime Minister Chrétien for appointing me to the Senate. As a girl growing up in Cape Breton and the oldest of eight children, it was not something I had ever dreamed of or even imagined. Mr. Chrétien appointed many strong women to the Senate during his years as Prime Minister, women like Landon Pearson, Catherine Callbeck, Sister Peggy Butts and Sheila Finestone, among others. It was an honour to attend his ninetieth birthday party this past January.

Honourable senators, I believe we do incredible work at the committee level here in the Senate. I have been fortunate to have been part of many excellent studies. In my few years on the Fisheries Committee, we examined the Aboriginal fishery relating to the *Marshall* decision. The seal fishery was an eye-opener to me, and if you haven't read the report you should. We studied the Great Lakes fishery. Committee members are very pleased that the Great Lakes will now come under Global Affairs Canada instead of Fisheries and Oceans Canada, since the Great Lakes are international waters.

Some of the reports of the Social Affairs Committee over the years were on migrant workers, cities, higher education and mental health. One result of the mental health report was the establishment of the Mental Health Commission of Canada, which was one of our recommendations.

I do believe, though, that the mandates of committees should be examined. Work was done by the Rules Committee, and it should be considered by the Senate as a whole. The mandate of the Social Affairs Committee, for example, is very broad, meaning that we are dealing with a huge number of bills, both government bills and private members' bills, leaving us with little time to carry out studies and certainly not long-term studies. I believe that is unfortunate.

Senator Housakos, we had quite a bit of excitement as Chair and Deputy Chair of the Internal Economy Committee. It was certainly not dull, as we were dealing with what the media referred to as the Senate expenses scandal. To say it drew public attention is a huge understatement. It was a good thing that we worked well together, because our days and evenings were very long between all of our meetings and all of the media calls.

Honourable senators, one of my favourite things to do as a senator is to speak to people around the country and tell them about the great work the Senate of Canada does — once a teacher always a teacher. I have spoken to elementary, junior high, high school and university students, sometimes here in Ottawa but most often in Nova Scotia. They are very aware of the issues our country is facing, and they are not afraid of voicing their concerns. I believe our future is in good hands.

One evening a few months ago, I was speaking to students from the Ottawa area here in our Senate Chamber. We were talking about what the Senate does, what senators do and how you become a senator. One young student raised his hand after we had been doing this for a while and pointed to the crow's nest up there, to Pierro Ros the console operator, and said excitedly, "But I want to know how I can get his job." Mr. Ros kindly agreed to answer many questions.

It is a good lesson for us to perhaps include other career opportunities available in the Senate when we are speaking to students. I want to publicly thank Mr. Ros for being so kind and generous with his time that evening.

Honourable senators, I've gotten to meet incredible Canadians during my time in the Senate, such as Lanre Tunji-Ajayi from the Sickle Cell Awareness Group of Ontario; Rugi Jalloh, President of the Sickle Cell Disease Association of Atlantic Canada; and Biba Tinga, the President of the Sickle Cell Disease Association of Canada. They are making a huge difference for those with sickle cell disease.

We have come a long way since I introduced a bill calling June 19 National Sickle Cell Awareness Day. Very few people at that time had even heard of it. Senator Carolyn Stewart Olsen was the friendly critic, and she knew about sickle cell disease because she had been a nurse in her other life. The bill passed, thanks to Carolyn and my MP, Darren Fisher, who sponsored the bill in the other place. Senator Mégie has introduced a bill on sickle cell disease in the Senate. Last week, I introduced a bill on blood disorders, which includes not only sickle cell disease but many rare blood disorders.

• (1440)

Of course, being a Nova Scotia senator meant looking at legislation and policies and how they would affect my province. Because of my years as an elementary schoolteacher, I have always had a strong interest in issues related to children and young people.

Being from Atlantic Canada, I find issues related to the military to be important to me and to so many people from my province. I was fortunate to become an international Vice-President of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly. Because of that, I travelled to Defence headquarters in Kabul, Afghanistan, with other executive members from the NATO countries. My brother was stationed at NATO headquarters in Kabul because he was the logistics person charged with setting up the base in Kandahar. It was an incredible experience to think that two Cape Bretoners — a brother and a sister — were in Kabul, Afghanistan, both on Government of Canada business.

I also had the pleasure of serving on the Canada-United States Inter-Parliamentary Group, and I served with Vance Badawey as Co-Chair of the Great Lakes subcommittee. The United States has been our greatest ally, and I believe it is important that we maintain a strong and healthy dialogue between our leaders and our Senate and House colleagues. The Canada-United States Inter-Parliamentary Group helps to make these meetings possible.

To all senators, our parliamentary associations provide great learning experiences.

As leader of the Progressive Senate Group, I had the chance to work closely with other leaders.

Senator Gold, it wouldn't be worth any amount of money to have your job, but you continue to be a strong leader and a strong advocate for us all. Thank you.

To Senator Saint-Germain — and Senator Woo for a short while — to Senator Tannas and to Senator Plett, it was a pleasure working with each of you — or on most days it was. We didn't always want to move in the same direction, and we fought each other for what we believed was best for our group and for the

Senate. That is what leaders should do. We sometimes looked at things differently, but I learned a lot from that experience — good things.

To Peter Harder, the first Leader of the Government in the Senate after the election in 2015, you deserve the very best things in life because of your ability to stay calm and soldier on as the Senate moved in a new direction.

Lastly but most importantly, I want to speak to my group, the Progressive Senate Group. You are an incredible, amazing team. It has been a pleasure working with each of you. We don't always agree with one another, and that is a positive thing. You supported me when I was the leader, and the nice thing about a smaller group is that no one's voice gets lost. I have tremendous respect for all of you because each of you brings different perspectives to our discussions. But more importantly, I will miss all of you. You are, without a doubt, the dream team — the Senate Olympic team. Thank you for your friendship and for our many serious discussions and our seriously laugh-out-loud laughter.

Honourable senators, thank you for the friendship you have shown me during my time in the Senate. We have all been blessed to have been chosen as senators to represent our provinces and territories. Every region in this great country is different, and it is our job to fight for the people we represent. The Senate does exceptional work, and I have learned so much over the years.

But I am also excited to spend more time in Nova Scotia with my family and friends. My friends have been very generous when I am unable to attend events or to entertain as often as I would wish. So I am looking forward to the next few months of reconnecting.

To my family, you are my everything. To my Senate family, I will miss you all. Thank you.

**Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear.

#### DISTINGUISHED VISITOR IN THE GALLERY

**The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore:** Honourable senators, I wish to draw your attention to the presence in the gallery of our former colleague the Honourable General Roméo Dallaire.

On behalf of all honourable senators, I welcome you back to the Senate of Canada.

**Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear!

#### THE HONOURABLE JANE CORDY

**Hon. Wanda Thomas Bernard:** Honourable senators, as a member of the dream team, I rise today to share a few words about my colleague senator Jane Cordy, whose work and advocacy I have long admired.

As has been mentioned, she was appointed in 2000, only the third woman from Nova Scotia. Senator Cordy's capacity to teach and lead by example is admirable. When I first arrived in



the Senate, she was able to answer questions that I did not even know I had. It is easy to imagine that she was a very engaged and inspiring teacher. When she attended an event that I hosted in Nova Scotia last year, I was able to witness her connection with former students who shared special memories of their time together with such warmth and affection.

While many of our colleagues have already talked about Senator Cordy's leadership of the Progressive Senate Group, her work on committees and her interventions on too many files to even mention here, I want to bring to you some of her lesser-known work today, outside of her impressive leadership.

Did you know — well, yes, you do know now because of her speech if you were listening — she has been an advocate for the sickle cell community in Nova Scotia and across this country for many years? That work is so very special. Senator Cordy has been instrumental in the advocacy for more awareness about sickle-cell anemia. Senator Cordy identified an underserved community and used her position as a senator to advocate for them and with them. I sincerely thank you on behalf of all of them.

I also witnessed Senator Cordy's deep compassion when we were visiting federal prisons during the fact-finding trips for our Human Rights Committee's study of prisoners' rights. While the visits to the prisons were a shock for most of our committee members — I think Senator Pate and I were the only ones who had been to prisons before —

**Senator Pate:** Not the way they thought we might go.

**Senator Bernard:** — I will always remember Senator Cordy's sensitivity, compassion, care and love that she shared with the people with whom we met. She sees humanity in everyone everywhere. To say that I will miss her, her wisdom, her kindness, her allyship and her support is an understatement.

Senator Cordy, also known as "Lady Jane" in our group, I wish you the very best as you move on to your next chapter.

• (1450)

**Hon. Leo Housakos:** Honourable senators, I too want to rise to offer a few well-deserved words of tribute to Senator Cordy.

I came here in 2009 as a young, rambunctious Conservative, and across the aisle, I saw Senator Cordy, a vociferous Liberal who would fight hard for her region and the things she believed in. Some would say she was probably as partisan as I am on most days.

Of course, Senator Cordy and I had the good fortune of working together — as she mentioned — during the expense scandal that the Senate went through. The smart money at the time was betting that this would be like oil and water and probably the worst thing that the Liberal and Conservative caucuses could do, but Senator Cordy and I did three things. We argued hard on issues, but we listened with open minds and open hearts, and we always found consensus in the best interests of the institution because we knew, fundamentally, that wherever we stood on the political spectrum, we were here to serve Canadians. I have to say that our achievements during that time to make this

place more accountable and transparent could not have been done if I had not learned some of those valued principles from Senator Cordy. To me, she is a role model and a teacher.

During that difficult time, she showed leadership. We made some tough decisions that we take for granted today. Today, you see broadcasting in the Senate, you see expense disclosures of senators on websites of the Senate and you see the Standing Committee on Internal Economy, Budgets and Administration being made fully public and broadcast, but some of these small reforms of the time were revolutionary, and there was a lot of pushback. However, Senator Cordy and I believed they were necessary in the modern era, and we fought hard for them.

I'm proud to say that although we served during a moment of existential crisis in the Senate, we never had a vote. We never had a disagreement in an Internal Economy Committee meeting on any issue. We figured things out between us. That's one of your great legacies and tributes to this institution, and there are so many. You served on so many committees, Senator Cordy, and I won't go through all your achievements, but your mark has been left in this place. Everyone said to me, "How did you work with somebody so partisan?" I said, "She is partisan, she is strong, she is smart and she believes in what she believes in," but the words that always come to mind about Senator Cordy are "kind" and "nice."

The fundamental things I learned from her are that you can be firm, strong and even combative about the ideas you believe in, but you can do it in a dignified, nice and gentle way. There's something about Senator Cordy that typifies who she is: She has the art of being able to tell people to go to hell in such a way that they will ask her for directions.

I keep saying to people, "She is kind and nice, but she's not a pushover. She is one of the strongest women senators I have ever seen in this institution." She is a strong voice for Atlantic Canada, the Liberal Party and the independent Senate. I want to say this to Bob Cordy and to your beautiful family: Thank you for sharing this wonderful lady with this institution. The institution has been better for it.

Jane, I wish you a wonderful future full of health and happiness to you and to your family. God bless you.

**Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Mary Coyle:** Honourable senators, I rise today on the unceded lands of the Anishinaabe Algonquin Nation to honour, thank and celebrate our remarkable colleague — the humble and effective leader — the Honourable Jane Cordy.

Jane has served this chamber, the people of Cape Breton, the people of Nova Scotia, the people of Canada and the people of the world with great distinction for almost 25 years. Our former

Senate colleague and my guest today, General Roméo Dallaire, who honours us with his presence, asked me to share his observations on our colleague. He said:

Jane is known for always keeping a sensitive human focus. She is a very solid, hard-working senator, truly exemplary for others.

This praise is indisputable and resonates loudly for all of us. Jane is definitely a role model for me. Colleagues, as you heard, since Confederation, 107 Nova Scotia senators have been appointed to this chamber. As Jane said, she is woman number three in all of history to represent Nova Scotia. Margaret Norrie was the first in 1972, Sister Peggy Butts was the second in 1997, Senator Wanda Thomas Bernard is number four and I am number five of those 107. Colleagues, I believe we are all happy to see our chamber better reflect Canadians, with approximately half of our membership being women and with the growing diversity in our membership today. Jane, Wanda and I have talked about our desire to see more of Nova Scotia's capable women appointed to this chamber. There are 10 Senate seats for Nova Scotians, and we will be down to two women when Jane Cordy leaves us.

Honourable colleagues, Senator Jane Cordy had a distinguished career in education and community service before she joined this chamber. She will be leaving behind such an important legacy here. Her work on mental health and addiction; seniors and aging; children and education; multiple sclerosis, sickle cell disease and other inherited blood disorders; and NATO, gender security and Canada-U.S. relations are all to be commended and have a significant impact. What has also been impactful is Jane Cordy's generous, positive and inclusive approach to leadership. In recognition of her leadership talents, her interpersonal skills, her intelligence and her role in forming and building the new Progressive Senate Group, Jane was chosen to serve as its leader and has played a critical role in the success of that group.

Jane, you are a friend, an outstanding senator and representative of our province, and a good and kind person. Honourable senators, please join me in wishing Senator Jane Cordy a happy retirement with Bob, Alison, Michelle and those precious "grands." Thank you.

**Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear.

#### VISITORS IN THE GALLERY

**The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore:** Honourable senators, I wish to draw your attention to the presence in the gallery of Royal Canadian Legion President Berkeley Lawrence and his wife, Sarah Lawrence. They are the guests of the Honourable Senator Petten.

On behalf of all honourable senators, I welcome you to the Senate of Canada.

**Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear!

[ Senator Coyle ]

**The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore:** Honourable senators, I wish to draw your attention to the presence in the gallery of children and parents from across Canada affected by Type 1 diabetes, who are here for Breakthrough T1D's Kids for a Cure event. They are the guests of the Honourable Senator Sorensen.

On behalf of all honourable senators, I welcome you to the Senate of Canada.

**Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear!

#### DIABETES AWARENESS MONTH

**Hon. Karen Sorensen:** Honourable senators, of course, I will also take a moment to applaud Senator Cordy on 24 years. I am three years in. I am in awe.

Honourable colleagues, I rise today because November is Diabetes Awareness Month, and I'm pleased to welcome Kids for a Cure and share some news on the fight to cure Type 1 diabetes, or T1D.

As of November 1, the Juvenile Diabetes Research Foundation, or JDRF, has officially rebranded to Breakthrough T1D. This new name recognizes that 89% of Canadians living with Type 1 diabetes are adults and that 71% of new diagnoses happen in adults.

I'd also like to call attention to the amazing kids and their parents in the gallery today. These Kids for a Cure delegates have come from across Canada to advocate for funding toward a cure for Type 1 diabetes, with a particular focus on cell therapy research.

Cell therapies are so promising because they can be designed to reprogram existing cells or replace damaged and destroyed cells. For T1D, this means replacing the insulin-producing beta cells, in essence curing the condition. That means long-term complications such as heart disease, kidney disease and eye disease could be virtually halted or avoided entirely.

Breakthrough T1D is asking the federal government for \$15 million over four years on cures research for Type 1 diabetes. Breakthrough T1D will match this contribution, which would put the total investment at \$30 million over four years.

This research is so close, and cell therapies have the potential to significantly improve the quality of life for people living with T1D, while also reducing the strain on our health care system down the line.

It is my hope that these youth won't live with T1D for much longer. It is my hope that these parents can have a near future where they are not co-managing this disease with their child. It is my hope that the government will make this crucial investment in the health and well-being of Canadians and Type 1 diabetes.

• (1500)

Once again, I wish to commend everyone from Breakthrough T1D and Kids for a Cure for their tireless efforts for this cause.

Thank you.

### VISITORS IN THE GALLERY

**The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore:** Honourable senators, I wish to draw your attention to the presence in the gallery of members of HanVoice. They are the guests of the Honourable Senator Martin.

On behalf of all honourable senators, I welcome you to the Senate of Canada.

**Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear!

### HANVOICE CANADA

**Hon. Yonah Martin (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** Honourable Senators, it is an honour to rise and speak about an organization that embodies compassion, resilience and the relentless pursuit of justice.

HanVoice Canada is a non-profit organization dedicated to advocating for the rights of North Korean defectors and raising awareness about the humanitarian crisis in North Korea.

Founded in 2007, HanVoice operates with a profound commitment to supporting individuals who have escaped one of the world's most repressive regimes.

At its core, HanVoice is driven by a simple yet powerful mission: to support North Korean defectors in their transition to freedom and to ensure their voices are heard. This mission is not merely about offering aid; it's about empowering individuals who have endured unimaginable hardships and providing them with the tools and resources they need to build a new life in freedom.

In 2021, HanVoice launched a private sponsorship pilot program to resettle five North Korean refugee families in Canada, which makes Canada the third country, after South Korea and the United States, to accept North Koreans. This program offers a safe new start for North Korean refugees supported by the Korean-Canadian community in every aspect of the resettlement process.

It is important to recognize that the work of HanVoice is not done in isolation. It relies on the support and collaboration of dedicated volunteers, generous donors and committed partners. Together, these stakeholders form a network of compassion and solidarity that strengthens the organization's ability to effect change.

The impact of HanVoice extends beyond the immediate support it provides. By amplifying the voices of defectors, the organization helps to bring their stories to the forefront of global consciousness. This not only humanizes the crisis but also galvanizes collective action toward meaningful solutions.

One such voice is Ms. Kyu-lie Kim, a courageous North Korean escapee who last evening shared her harrowing story of suffering and loss, but also finding renewed hope for a better life in the U.K. She is in our chamber today, accompanied by HanVoice CEO Sean Chung, Executive Director David Vella and the leaders of 18 HanVoice campus clubs across Canada.

Honourable Senators, as we reflect on the mission and achievements of HanVoice Canada, let us also consider our role as parliamentarians in supporting this vital work and realize that we have the power to make a difference in the lives of refugees fleeing violence, forced labour, torture and injustice.

Canada can be part of the global solution. Thank you.

### THE HONOURABLE JANE CORDY

**Hon. Percy E. Downe:** Honourable senators, I've been waiting three weeks to give this statement. Then I missed that today was Senator Cordy's retirement tribute. Of course, I'm not going to pass up the opportunity to say a few words.

Frankly, I can't believe it's been so long that Senator Cordy has been in the Senate. The dean of the Senate is leaving us today. That will leave our Acting Speaker as the dean. It will leave three of us as refugees from the former Liberal caucus: Senator Massicotte, Senator Ringuette and myself, now that we're losing Senator Cordy.

Colleagues, 25 years ago I flew to Halifax because the then prime minister said, "A lot of people want this Jane Cordy in the Senate. Do you know her?" I always had the impression that the then prime minister maybe thought the Maritimes were so small we all knew each other. Not only did I not know her — I'd never met her. He said, "Go to Halifax."

We invited her for a cup of coffee at the Sheraton. We had a long chat. Colleagues, I can tell you that she hasn't changed a bit. The same enthusiasm, passion and willingness to work for and help others is still there today, 24 and a half years later. That's a lesson for all of us.

She never became cynical through the difficulties of getting things done. She kept working constantly. She mentioned it in her remarks. I understand she talked about some of the parliamentary associations. I know of the outstanding work she did with NATO on behalf of Canadian parliamentarians.

You can't talk about Senator Cordy without talking about Bob and her family. Like Bob and Jane, Roslyn and I have two daughters. Jane's daughters, Alison and Michelle, are older than ours. She gave me many roadmaps about what to expect in the future: "They are doing this and that now. They are in Bermuda. They are now back in Halifax." It was all helpful because everything that happened to us had happened to her. It was all good news, but that was important information for parenting.

Bob and his family paid a price for what Jane did for so many others, as all our families do. It's something we have to recognize as well. While Jane was doing her important work here, Bob and the family were living in Halifax — in Dartmouth, actually — without her, going to events and having family functions, some of which she had to miss. Sometimes, when she was home, she would get phone calls about things that had to be done. That's a contribution the family has made as well, and we should all recognize that today.

Senator Cordy, we're going to miss you, as others have said. We wish you the very best in whatever else you take up. I know book clubs, reviewing books and other activities will be an important part of your life.

Thank you very much.

---

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### JUSTICE

STATUTES REPEAL ACT—LIST OF ACTS OR PROVISIONS OF ACTS PROPOSED TO NOT BE REPEALED IN 2024—DOCUMENT TABLED

**Hon. Patti LaBoucane-Benson (Legislative Deputy to the Government Representative in the Senate):** Honourable senators, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the list of Acts or provisions of Acts proposed to not be repealed in 2024, pursuant to the *Statutes Repeal Act*.

### FINANCIAL PROTECTION FOR FRESH FRUIT AND VEGETABLE FARMERS BILL

BILL TO AMEND—SIXTEENTH REPORT OF BANKING, COMMERCE AND THE ECONOMY COMMITTEE PRESENTED

**Hon. Pamela Wallin:** Honourable senators, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the sixteenth report of the Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Commerce and the Economy, which deals with Bill C-280, An Act to amend the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act and the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (deemed trust — perishable fruits and vegetables).

(For text of report, see today's Journals of the Senate, p. 3241.)

**The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore:** Honourable senators, when shall this report be taken into consideration?

(On motion of Senator Wallin, report placed on the Orders of the Day for consideration at the next sitting of the Senate.)

[Translation]

### INTERNAL ECONOMY, BUDGETS AND ADMINISTRATION

SIXTEENTH REPORT OF COMMITTEE TABLED

**Hon. Lucie Moncion:** Honourable senators, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the sixteenth report of the Standing Committee on Internal Economy, Budgets and Administration, entitled *Financial Statements of the Senate of Canada for the year ended March 31, 2024*.

[ Senator Downe ]

• (1510)

[English]

### LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL AFFAIRS

STATUTES REPEAL ACT—NOTICE OF MOTION TO AUTHORIZE COMMITTEE TO STUDY 2024 REVISED REPORT AND LIST OF ACTS OR PROVISIONS OF ACTS PROPOSED TO NOT BE REPEALED IN 2024

**Hon. Patti LaBoucane-Benson (Legislative Deputy to the Government Representative in the Senate):** Honourable senators, I give notice that, at the next sitting of the Senate, I will move:

That the revised report on the *Statutes Repeal Act* for the year 2024, whose tabling was recorded in the *Journals of the Senate* of May 22, 2024, together with the list of Acts or provisions of Acts proposed to not be repealed pursuant to the same Act, tabled in the Senate on November 5, 2024, be referred to the Standing Senate Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs for examination and report; and

That the committee submit its report to the Senate no later than December 5, 2024.

### ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE PROMOTION PROHIBITION BILL

FIRST READING

**Hon. Patrick Brazeau** introduced Bill S-290, An Act to prohibit the promotion of alcoholic beverages.

(Bill read first time.)

**The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore:** Honourable senators, when shall this bill be read the second time?

(On motion of Senator Brazeau, bill placed on the Orders of the Day for second reading two days hence.)

### CANADA-EUROPE PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION

SECOND PART OF THE 2024 ORDINARY SESSION OF THE PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY OF THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE, APRIL 15-19, 2014—REPORT TABLED

**Hon. David M. Wells:** Honourable senators, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the report of the Canada-Europe Parliamentary Association concerning the Second Part of the 2024 Ordinary Session of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, held in Strasbourg, France, from April 15 to 19, 2024.

THIRD PART OF THE 2024 ORDINARY SESSION OF THE  
PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY OF THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE,  
JUNE 24-28, 2024—REPORT TABLED

**Hon. David M. Wells:** Honourable senators, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the report of the Canada-Europe Parliamentary Association concerning the Third Part of the 2024 Ordinary Session of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, held in Strasbourg, France, from June 24 to 28, 2024.

## QUESTION PERIOD

### FINANCE

#### ECONOMIC GROWTH

**Hon. Donald Neil Plett (Leader of the Opposition):** Government leader, every day we see evidence that this government is not worth the cost. Statistics Canada has reported that Canada's GDP barely grew in the third quarter of this year, coming in about a third lower than what the Bank of Canada had forecast in July. Canada's per capita GDP has now shrunk in eight of the last nine quarters.

In contrast, leader, the U.S. Department of Commerce reported last week that that country saw its GDP grow by 2.8% in the third quarter.

Leader, you like to blame the world for your government's own economic mismanagement. If that's true, Senator Gold, why is the United States performing almost three times better than Canada?

**Hon. Marc Gold (Government Representative in the Senate):** Thank you for your question. Every country's economy performs at different speeds at different times and different cycles. Canada's economy came out of the pandemic stronger than most. Canada was one of the first countries to start to lower its interest rates. Inflation is down in Canada.

We in Canada are very dependent on other countries in our trading relationships, as some are on us.

Our economy is doing well, and this government is continuing to manage the economy in a prudent and responsible way, making the investments necessary to assist Canada going forward and Canadians as they continue to go through challenging times.

**Senator Plett:** Well, the Statistics Canada report says that one of the only sectors lifting up our economy in the third quarter was — guess what — the energy sector. So, naturally, the NDP-Liberals are doing their best to kill it with their new emissions cap. It's the one area where we're doing well, leader.

How many more Canadian jobs and how much more investment does this incompetent Liberal-NDP government want to drive to the United States, leader?

**Senator Gold:** This government's policies with regard to the energy sector, an important sector in our economy, are well balanced and appropriate. Indeed, with regard to the caps on emissions, this government's position is that all emitters need to pay their fair share. It is an important point to underline that this is not a cap on production but on pollution that ensures that Canada, for the benefit of our children and grandchildren, can live in a cleaner and more sustainable environment.

**Senator Plett:** We'll all be broke.

## GLOBAL AFFAIRS

### SOFTWOOD LUMBER

**Hon. Yonah Martin (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** Leader, the NDP-Liberals' inaction on softwood lumber has real consequences for Canadian families. In September, Canfor announced two of its sawmills in northern British Columbia will close by the end of this year, leaving another 500 forestry workers out of jobs. In making this announcement, Canfor said:

The operating challenges we face have been further exacerbated by increases in the punitive US tariffs announced on August 13th — tariffs that are expected to more than double again next year. . . .

Leader, why does the Prime Minister think softwood lumber is a small issue, as he said on a U.S. celebrity talk show? Would those 500 workers agree?

**Hon. Marc Gold (Government Representative in the Senate):** The issue of how Canada manages its important, complicated and multi-faceted trade relationship with the United States is a serious one that this government, previous governments and all governments have at the top of the priority. I think I said on other occasions that the statement to which you referred is being taken quite out of context.

Canada and this government is working hard to defend Canadian interests, whether in the softwood lumber area or others, and has successfully prosecuted and defended Canadians' interests and will continue to do so.

**Senator Martin:** The NDP-Liberals have let nine long years and three presidential administrations go by without getting a deal on softwood lumber. Since then, American companies have received over \$8 billion in duties that should have gone to Canadian workers and businesses.

Leader, this is why we say, "not worth the cost." When will the NDP-Liberals bring home this money to Canada's forestry sector?

**Senator Housakos:** Bring it home.

**Senator Gold:** Thank you for your question. The negotiations, whether held pre-CUSMA, during CUSMA, thereafter or projected, between Canada and the United States on a broad suite of issues remain some of the most important issues that this government and any government will tackle. This government has a proven track record of prosecuting and defending

Canadians' interests against perhaps one of the most unpredictable administrations in American history, and it will continue to do so going forward.

#### CONFLICT IN GAZA STRIP

**Hon. Yuen Pau Woo:** Senator Gold, when I previously asked you what Canada was doing to stop the killing of civilians and children in Gaza, your reply was, in effect, that deaths of civilians are regrettable, Israel has the right to defend itself, and it is all the fault of Hamas anyway.

Since then, the Israeli government has killed thousands more innocent Palestinians, bombed hospitals and so-called safe zones and blocked humanitarian aid destined for Gaza, to name just a few of the horrors in the news.

When will the Government of Canada stop aiding and abetting violations of international humanitarian law in Gaza and sanction Israel for its actions?

**Hon. Marc Gold (Government Representative in the Senate):** Senator Woo, with the greatest of respect, your assumptions — and I'm not sure where you get them from — are incorrect.

- (1520)

Humanitarian aid continues to flow into Gaza, first and foremost. Second, Canada is a strong supporter both of Israel and the Palestinian people's right to live in peace and security and will continue to advance those objectives, notwithstanding the challenges that are being faced.

I'm not aware of any plans of the government to issue sanctions, but once again, and with the greatest of respect, I find the assumptions in your questions — although expressed in terms that are very confident and, indeed, eloquent — are simply not correct.

**Senator Woo:** The United States has made clear that it's giving a 30-day warning to Israel to let humanitarian aid in, and it has recently said there has been limited progress. That is the basis of my evidence.

Senator Gold, a number of senators had the honour of meeting this afternoon with Francesca Albanese, Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Palestinian territories. We learned from her that no one from the government has agreed to meet with her despite her many requests. Why is this government, which claims to uphold human rights and the rule of law, not willing to hear from a UN official who has arguably the most detailed understanding of historic human rights abusers in Palestine?

**Senator Gold:** Wow. Let me quote to you what Canada's Special Envoy on Preserving Holocaust Remembrance and Combatting Antisemitism Deborah Lyons said. This is the former Ambassador of Canada to Israel. She is horrified to see United Nations Special Rapporteur Francesca Albanese engaged in Holocaust distortion and inversion. The Canadian mission in Geneva stated:

. . . The recent remarks by Francesca Albanese are unacceptable and incompatible with her duty of impartiality, probity and good faith as an independent Special Rapporteur. . . .

And I could go on further.

#### ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE CHANGE

##### ENERGY TRANSITION PROGRAM

**Hon. Tony Loffreda:** Senator Gold, like me, the majority of Canadians support the transition to a lower carbon economy. We have ambitious targets to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions, and I am hopeful we are on the path towards meeting them.

But we know the transition will impact Canadians unevenly. What specific measures have the government implemented to help lower income Canadians take concrete action to contribute to the transition?

The government has introduced several measures to help reduce emissions, but many of those initiatives are targeting higher-income Canadians, individuals who can actually afford an electric vehicle or homeowners who can afford energy efficient retrofits. But what about lower-income Canadians, those who are renters or simply can't afford the luxury of a vehicle but who are still struggling financially?

**Hon. Marc Gold (Government Representative in the Senate):** Thank you for your question, senator. The government has put into place numerous programs to help Canadians transition to more energy-efficient technologies. Time doesn't permit listing all of them. Let me highlight the Canada Greener Affordable Housing Program. I understand the government is currently in discussions with both the provinces and territories to launch this new program in 2025. It is designed to better deliver the benefits of retrofits, whether insulation or heat pumps, to low- and medium-income households. Programs in each jurisdiction will take on the planning and coordination of retrofits, including the payment of contractors. Working directly with regional delivery partners will complement existing regional programs and enable such retrofits at no cost to homeowners and tenants. By working together, governments can offer effective and regionally tailored solutions that cut energy bills while improving environmental performance.

**Senator Loffreda:** Thank you for that answer. A 2024 study commissioned by Natural Resources Canada that explored Canadians' perceptions on the affordability of the energy transition revealed that energy costs are an ongoing concern among lower-income households. Has the government conducted any forward-looking studies or modelling on the projected costs of meeting our targets and how it might impact lower-income Canadians' financial capabilities? To transition will be expensive.

**Senator Gold:** Well, senator, thank you for your question. In the brief time I have, this is the main focus of the recently released Canada Green Buildings Strategy, which will help Canadians save money on their energy bills, help create good jobs and seize economic opportunities enabled by a low-carbon economy, all the while reducing harmful greenhouse gas emissions. Specifically, the strategy helps Canadians adapt heat pumps and save money on energy bills through programs targeted at low- and medium-income households.

## PUBLIC SAFETY

### SPECIAL REPORT OF THE NATIONAL SECURITY AND INTELLIGENCE COMMITTEE OF PARLIAMENTARIANS

**Hon. Percy E. Downe:** Senator Gold, I'm wondering if you could give us an update on when the leaders of the various groups in the Senate can read the unredacted report of the National Security and Intelligence Committee of Parliamentarians on foreign interference in Canada?

**Hon. Marc Gold (Government Representative in the Senate):** Senator, thank you for your question and for following up on this. I do not have an update on this. As you know, I transmitted the request to the government, but to date there has been no change and no decision reached in this matter.

**Senator Downe:** Given that situation, do you share my view that there is a cloud hanging over all senators given that some senators have been named unofficially as involved and others are not, there is confusion about who may or may not be named in the report and that the sooner the leaders of the groups get to read the report, they can take the required action, if any is required at all?

**Senator Gold:** Thank you again for your question. Again, that is an issue that has been communicated to the government and I will repeat it again.

## ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE CHANGE

### CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES

**Hon. Andrew Cardozo:** My question is for the Government Representative in the Senate. I have the honour of attending COP 16 last week in Cali, Colombia, the world conference on biodiversity. In short, the biodiversity of the planet is in rapidly increasing danger. There were some 100 delegates from Canada at the conference of 21,000 people from all over the world; from Canada, representatives from various federal and provincial departments and non-governmental organizations, and from Parliament, Senator Galvez and myself.

COP 16 focused on implementing the results of COP 15 in Montreal two years ago, designating 30% of land and sea for protection by 2030. The slogan was 30 by 30. COP 16 agreed to create a permanent Indigenous committee since so much of biodiversity degradation is taking place on Indigenous lands around the world. What is the government's plan in the follow-up to this pivotal conference?

**Hon. Marc Gold (Government Representative in the Senate):** Thank you for your question and your engagement on this important issue.

In addition to the role that Canada is playing in the international space spearheading our collective ambitions in this regard, at COP 16, Canada announced a total of \$62 million for seven projects working to protect biodiversity around the world. The projects will support initiatives including Indigenous-led projects for vulnerable communities.

Canada brought the Nature Champions Network together with increased membership. Canada led two panels in partnership with an Indigenous leadership initiative to highlight the importance of collaboration with Indigenous peoples. Indeed, backed by over \$12 billion in investments since 2015, the Government of Canada has led the largest campaign in Canadian history to support nature and nature-based climate solutions.

**Senator Cardozo:** The major theme of the conference was peace with nature. What is Canada's position on a question that is yet to be resolved and still in negotiation, namely the resources that would be available to developing countries to advance biodiversity protection?

**Senator Gold:** Thank you for your question. I don't know the answer to your question is the most accurate way of putting it. I'll certainly raise it with the minister.

## FINANCE

### COST OF LIVING

**Hon. Leo Housakos:** Senator Gold, after nine years of Justin Trudeau, not only does everything cost more, but this country is going through the worst decline in living standards in 40 years, the worst housing inflation, the worst drop in per person income and the worst economic growth in the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.

At the same time, half a trillion dollars in Canadian investment has gone to the U.S. versus the other way around. Canadian businesses are fleeing to the U.S. to escape your government's economic vandalism, and they are taking Canadian jobs with them.

Even Mr. Trudeau's top economic advisor, "carbon tax Carney" won't do business here. He is making life more expensive for Canadians with sweeping powers he's been given by your government, but the investment firm that he is chairing is now leaving Toronto for greener pastures in New York City. Imagine that, Senator Gold.

Hard-working Canadians don't have anywhere else to go, Senator Gold. It's unfortunate, but a reality. Why won't your government at least let them go to the polls? Why won't you call an election so the Canadian public can give you a report card?

**Hon. Marc Gold (Government Representative in the Senate):** Senator Housakos, the preambles sometimes vary, your question is always the same, but my answer is going to be the same. This government will continue to do its best to help Canadians and to serve Canadians. There is important work that needs to be done. We're doing it here in the chamber with a number of important government bills that are moving through our process. It is regrettable that things in the other place are stalled, but the government will continue to work hard for the benefit of Canadians.

• (1530)

**Senator Housakos:** Senator Gold, it is not good enough. Actually, your government is doing nothing. Colleagues, look at the scroll. Look at how much government business this government is doing.

Business investment per worker in Canada is barely half of that in the United States. Our GDP per capita is smaller than it was a decade ago, while the American economy is up 8% just over the last five years. It is no wonder that “carbon tax Carney” is now pulling his money out from this country. Meanwhile, your government now announces another crippling policy for Canadians by putting a cap on oil and gas production at the expense of already struggling families. It is unbelievable your government doesn't get your actions are killing Canadians.

**Senator Gold:** Senator Housakos, first of all, it is not a cap on production, so, please, at the very least — you are entitled to your opinion and you are entitled to your partisanship which you celebrate — no, the facts are that again, and with the greatest of respect, you have, perhaps unwittingly, said something that is not, in fact, true. The cap on energy is not a cap on production. It is a cap on emissions.

[Translation]

## NATURAL RESOURCES

### FORESTRY SECTOR

**Hon. Claude Carignan:** I would like to take this opportunity to say hello to Senator Dallaire. I see that he is still as passionate as ever about Question Period.

Leader, I would like to remind you that Prime Minister Harper reached a softwood lumber agreement with the United States within 80 days of his government coming to power. In March 2016, Prime Minister Trudeau promised to sign such an agreement within 100 days. Obviously, we are still waiting, and this failure has been devastating for the forestry industry across Canada, including Quebec.

Three weeks ago, the Petit Paris sawmill in Saint-Ludger-de-Milot closed its doors and 100 workers lost their jobs. Their union representative says that increased tariffs on exports to the U.S. are partly to blame. Why are forestry jobs so unimportant to your government?

**Hon. Marc Gold (Government Representative in the Senate):** Honourable senator, we don't think that jobs in this sector of our economy are unimportant. Far from it. The challenges that we are facing due to a wave of protectionism, not only in the U.S. but elsewhere as well, mean that the government has to work really hard to defend and promote our interests. That is what the government is doing every day.

**Senator Carignan:** The job losses weren't limited to Saint-Ludger-de-Milot. The Rivière-aux-Rats sawmill in Mauricie is closing for good come Christmas, killing 125 jobs.

The indefinite closure of Resolute Forest Products' sawmill in Maniwaki is also raising concerns in the community.

Leader, do we need an election so that these workers can elect a government that will fight for them?

**Senator Gold:** All across Canada, job losses are painful and unfortunate, not only for workers and their families, but for the whole community. The Government of Canada is working hard to protect the interests of workers, and it will continue to do so.

## GLOBAL AFFAIRS

### WOMEN'S RIGHTS

**Hon. Julie Miville-Dechêne:** Senator Gold, you don't need me to tell you that women are being mistreated around the world.

In Iran, a female dissident has been arrested for stripping down to her underwear to protest repression and the hijab laws. In Afghanistan, women no longer have the right to speak amongst themselves. They are treated worse than animals.

Yet Uzbekistan, Russia, China and, according to *The New York Times*, dozens of other countries now accept members of the Taliban as diplomats.

What is your take on this shift toward normalizing gender apartheid?

**Hon. Marc Gold (Government Representative in the Senate):** Thank you for your question and for your work on this important issue.

Simply put, this is unacceptable. I want to make it clear that Canada strongly condemns the latest Taliban decree prohibiting women from speaking to one another in public. Canada also condemns the other measures you described, which are, unfortunately, widespread around the world.

Our government will continue to stand up for women around the world, especially Afghan women and girls and their right to live with dignity. That's why we joined Germany, Australia and the Netherlands in launching a joint dispute under the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women.



**Senator Miville-Dechêne:** Thank you for your answer, Senator Gold.

In June, the United Nations, backed by Europe, sought and obtained the Taliban's participation in a conference about Afghanistan by agreeing to its condition that Afghan women not be invited and that women's rights stay off the agenda.

Do you agree with that kind of compromise, which some consider to be kowtowing?

**Senator Gold:** Obviously the government doesn't agree with excluding women in any context, including this one. The current government has been very clear about the fact that Afghan women and girls have been silenced under the Taliban regime.

As I said at the beginning of my response to your first question, this is unacceptable.

[English]

#### CONFLICT IN SUDAN

**Hon. Mary Coyle:** Senator Gold, since fighting began in Sudan in April 2023, the conflict has displaced more than 11 million people and caused 150,000 deaths. Both the Sudanese Armed Forces and the Rapid Support Forces have committed war crimes, including widespread massacres, sexual violence and ethnically targeted attacks. There are no protections for Sudanese civilians. The UN Secretary-General has recently dismissed calls for a peacekeeping force, citing lack of conditions for deployment. Former senator General Roméo Dallaire suggested that a multinational or African Union-led protection force could be deployed to protect civilians, citing the Kenya-led multinational force in Haiti as a precedent.

Given Canada's long-standing commitment to peacekeeping and human rights, can the government confirm that it is asking the United Nations, the African Union or other international partners to deploy a protection force in Sudan to prevent future atrocities?

**Hon. Marc Gold (Government Representative in the Senate):** Thank you for your question, senator.

Senator Dallaire, it is a pleasure and an honour to have you with us today.

The situation in Sudan remains not only volatile but highly troubling. The government, in the strongest possible terms, continues to condemn the violence. Canada continues to support the ongoing discussions to restore security and stability in Sudan. It will continue its ongoing work with international and regional partners. Ultimately, Canada will support African-led solutions. In addition, through financial contributions to the United Nations Interim Security Force for Abyei, or UNISFA, Canada contributes to the protection of civilians affected by combat, the improvement of the security situation for the Sudanese people and the enhancement of peace and stability in the region. This is a tragic and horrible situation for the people of the region, and Canada will work with its partners in the hope of improving the situation as best as it can.

**Senator Coyle:** Thank you. General Dallaire also highlighted that children bear a heavy toll and are often targeted and exploited in conflicts. According to the International Rescue Committee, an estimated 13.6 million Sudanese children are in urgent need of humanitarian assistance, with thousands more having been killed, maimed or forcibly recruited as child soldiers. Is Canada pushing for international protection efforts that address the urgent need to ensure the safety of Sudan's children?

**Senator Gold:** Again, I do not have a specific answer to that question, although Canada continues to work with its partners in the area. It also continues to provide important humanitarian assistance to the people of the region which will benefit children and others, whether that is to support emergency food and nutrition assistance, clean water, hygiene, sanitation and other essential services.

[Translation]

#### PUBLIC SAFETY

##### POLICE SERVICES

**Hon. Jean-Guy Dagenais:** Leader, allow me to express my disagreement with the statement you made last week when you said that the government does not direct the police. I witnessed that happening in my previous role, and in some cases, it was not subtle.

I want to come back to the police inaction with respect to pro-Palestinian supporters. On October 15, Canada listed Samidoun as a terrorist entity. What is your government's position on the fact that last Thursday, in Montreal, the leader of this group, which has been listed as a terrorist entity in Canada, was able to make a speech without any police intervention?

**Hon. Marc Gold (Government Representative in the Senate):** Thank you for the question. Colleague, I can't comment on your experience at the Sûreté du Québec.

• (1540)

First of all, with respect to what's going on, whether on the streets of Montreal or on university campuses, it is up to law enforcement to monitor situations to determine whether federal laws are being obeyed and to act accordingly.

I attended a major conference Sunday evening that was also attended by Irwin Cotler and Deborah Lyons, who spoke about the action plan that has been published and that details the training police officers should take. This is the direction we need to take.

**Senator Dagenais:** On the same subject, Samidoun's leader, Charlotte Kates, who was in Montreal, was arrested earlier this month in Vancouver, where she described the killers who carried out the October 7 massacre in Israel as "heroes." No charges have been laid.

How far does your government plan to go in tolerating terrorist sympathizers?

**Senator Gold:** Once again, you know very well what I think of such hateful comments. Let me repeat once again that it is not the role of the federal government, regardless of its political stripes, to tell police forces, provincial or otherwise, what to do. That's not the way it works in a democracy.

[English]

#### FIREARMS TRAFFICKING

**Hon. Donald Neil Plett (Leader of the Opposition):** Leader, Peel Regional Police in the Greater Toronto Area recently revealed that, on average, their officers are seizing an illegal gun every 30 hours — an increase of 87% over the last year. Peel's chief of police stated in a press conference last week:

Approximately 90% of these firearms that we seize are directly traced back to the U.S. And I can say in reality, the remaining 10% are also likely from the U.S.

Leader, for nine long years the NDP-Liberal government has overseen a 116% increase in violent gun crime. How much of this surge is due to the flood of illegal guns being smuggled across the border? It is all of it, Senator Gold, isn't it?

**Hon. Marc Gold (Government Representative in the Senate):** The smuggling of guns across the border has been and remains a very dangerous issue for the safety of Canadians, and that is why this government has invested significantly in the Canada Border Services Agency, or CBSA, resources to do more to halt the flow of illegal firearms, as I think I have mentioned in this chamber before. In 2021-22, the CBSA seized a record number of firearms that came across this border, but it is not enough. We know it is not enough. Work continues to be done — and needs to continue — in order to slow down and stop this illegal trafficking of guns that harms our society.

**Senator Plett:** Well, you and your NDP-Liberal colleagues like to congratulate yourselves for confiscating guns from law-abiding and licensed gun owners in our own country. Front-line police officers across Canada are telling your government the truth, whether you like it or not. They say the problem is the guns being smuggled in from the United States. Do you think they're wrong, Senator Gold?

**Senator Gold:** I know this is Question Period, but at least you could listen to my answers. I acknowledged in my answer that the smuggling of guns across our border is a serious problem. I also reminded colleagues — if I may finish, sir — that efforts have been successful in seizing increasing numbers and that more needs to be done. I don't know how much clearer I could be in response to your question.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### BUSINESS OF THE SENATE

**Hon. Patti LaBoucane-Benson (Legislative Deputy to the Government Representative in the Senate):** Honourable senators, pursuant to the order adopted December 7, 2021, I would like to inform the Senate that Question Period with the Honourable Bill Blair, P.C., M.P., Minister of National Defence, will take place on Thursday, November 7, 2024, at 3:15 p.m.

### SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

#### MOTION FOR ADDRESS IN REPLY—DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Gold, P.C., seconded by the Honourable Senator LaBoucane-Benson:

That the following Address be presented to Her Excellency the Governor General of Canada:

To Her Excellency the Right Honourable Mary May Simon, Chancellor and Principal Companion of the Order of Canada, Chancellor and Commander of the Order of Military Merit, Chancellor and Commander of the Order of Merit of the Police Forces, Governor General and Commander-in-Chief of Canada.

#### MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY:

We, Her Majesty's most loyal and dutiful subjects, the Senate of Canada in Parliament assembled, beg leave to offer our humble thanks to Your Excellency for the gracious Speech which Your Excellency has addressed to both Houses of Parliament.

**Hon. Pamela Wallin:** Honourable senators, this item stands adjourned in the name of the Honourable Senator Plett and, after my intervention today, I ask for leave that it remain adjourned in his name.

**The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore:** Honourable senators, is leave granted?

**Hon. Senators:** Agreed.

**The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore:** So ordered.

**Senator Wallin:** Honourable senators, I rise to speak today because a Speech from the Throne should be a vision for an entire country, for all its citizens, in all regions. I have a few thoughts about my part of the country.

Farming is a tough business. Mother nature is a cruel task master. Rail strikes and port closure make the razor-thin margins even thinner. Carbon taxes and emission caps are punitive and kill jobs. All this at a time when the world needs what we have more than ever.

Since the days of World War II, when Canada not only served alongside but fed our allies in Britain and Europe, farming and agriculture have truly been work that gives purpose to our plenty. Today, there are still foreign wars, and the world still needs what we produce.

Why does it seem that governments, and even this chamber, seem determined to make a tough business tougher? Even more troubling is that the endless rules and regulations seem to conspire to price the products they grow and the livestock they raise — the things that Canada creates to feed ourselves and the world — out of the market and our farmers out of business. It seems deliberate, sometimes even mean-spirited, targeting farmers with implausible restrictions on the use of fertilizer or rules that put undue burden for the ills of climate change on those who do more to save our air, soil and open spaces than anyone else.

The climate activists, including those around the cabinet table, too often ignore reality and seem insensitive to geography, weather, the size of the farm, new technology, trade wars, and to the current practices that have put our agricultural sector on the leading edge of sustainable practices globally.

Why are they doing this? Is it, as one cabinet minister noted, because the West doesn't vote Liberal? Are there simple urban biases? As for the Senate, we are constitutionally designated to be the voice of the regions, but we are increasingly seen to be no friend of the farmer — guilty of wilful ignorance. We embrace all manner of bills that seem hell-bent on everything from punishing the farmer who wants to bequeath land to the next generation, to replacing our food with lab-made versions of what we already have. It feels as if I am always explaining that food doesn't come from the store.

• (1550)

Several years back, in this place, we almost passed a bill that would have declared bread unhealthy — whole wheat or seven grain? The bill raised issues of legal liability and implications for trade and commerce, and if we had then tried to export a product that we had declared unhealthy, think of the consequences. We ship some 22 megatonnes of wheat to over 65 countries every year. We are one of the world's largest exporters of wheat. It would have been devastating for grain farmers.

In 2023, the agri-food system employed 2.5 million people, accounting for one in nine jobs and generating \$150 billion. That's 7% of our gross domestic product, or GDP. Our primary agricultural producers alone — just one part of the food chain — are responsible for a quarter of a million jobs, contributing 1.4% to the GDP. There are about 190,000 farms in Canada on more than 60 million hectares — although I still think in acres and sections — and what this land produces pays for everything from highways to health care to homes.

We have amazing innovators and entrepreneurs such as Murad Al-Katib, a good Saskatchewan boy who runs the global multi-billion-dollar business AGT Food and Ingredients Inc., exporting food products to the world, including lentils, to feed the growing and often undernourished populations throughout Southeast Asia. This is what agriculture does.

Last year, the Senate had the opportunity to pass Bill C-234 and give farmers some desperately needed relief from the carbon tax on gas and propane for heating outbuildings and barns and for the hugely expensive process of grain drying. Some of the arguments betrayed the ignorance of what modern farming is, and, in the end, we gutted the bill and sent it to the other place to die. Now there is a new round of punitive energy use rules — detailed just yesterday — that will, again, punish farmers and no doubt end up in costly court battles.

Another private member's bill — Bill C-293 — before our chamber right now takes aim at industrial animal agriculture, including auction markets, under the guise of pandemic preparedness, and it gives officials sweeping new powers to shut down agricultural facilities. Saskatchewan farmer Breeanna Kelln says that Bill C-293 targets the animal agricultural industry by unfairly linking it to pandemics and diseases — connections that have not yet been supported by science but that are making her operation even more precarious.

Then there is Bill C-275, which would amend the Health of Animals Act to impose fines on trespassers. It is very helpful for farmers who face the costly consequences of protesters who may think they are saving animals but who are actually contaminating and damaging farms and even endangering the animals. Once again, the Senate amended the bill, casting the legal net so wide that it could now capture farm families and employees. The problem is that activists are thrilled, as it makes the bill almost impossible to enforce.

The Bloc Québécois bill — Bill C-282 — is aimed at protecting Quebec's dairy quota and supply management system, but this too could jeopardize future free trade negotiations for all of Canada, including deals like the Canada-United States-Mexico Agreement, or CUSMA. It is a bill which, once again, divides the agricultural community and exacerbates the already powerful regional tensions in this country.

There is Bill C-280. We've been studying this at the Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Commerce and the Economy. It is a bill to offer some financial protection for producers of fresh products with a short shelf life. Once again, Senate amendments will undermine the true intent, giving higher priority to others up the supply chain rather than to those whose products are perishable. It will also potentially limit our access to U.S. markets.

Bill S-243 takes direct aim at the energy and agricultural sectors by calling for more restrictive financing for farms and agricultural operations on environmental grounds. Farms actually run on credit. Without it, farms can't operate; no business can.

There have been many tax rules aimed at the business of farming as well. Government threatened the right of farm families to split income for tax purposes when it is clear that these are family operations. It creates tax chaos and more accounting expenses, and now the retroactive capital gains changes — not yet supported by legislation — are making it difficult for small- and medium-sized businesses to plan.

You might have seen it, but Logan Docherty, a young Prince Edward Island farmer, broke down in tears before a House committee last week, where he said that handing down the farm to his generation is now probably out of reach.

You can see why the agricultural sector is concerned about whether its government understands how it works and its important contribution when so many obstacles are put in the way. When flawed legislation is passed, then the battles move from Parliament to the courts, and we continue to deal today with legally challenged bills like Bill C-48, Bill C-69 and now Bill C-59 aimed at greenwashing, but which actually silences those in industries such as energy and agriculture who dare not try to explain their progress on the climate front for fear of the legal challenges. In fact, some energy companies have even shut down their websites in fear of the fines for simply stating the facts.

Agriculture, ag tech and agri-food are all a successful and growing sector, but the cost of doing business is skyrocketing. Inputs — everything from multi-million-dollar combines to insurance bills to the cost of seed and feed — are spiralling and taking a heavy toll.

Outstanding farm debt in Canada has more than doubled in the last 20 years. In 2022, it totalled \$140 billion with profit margins as low as five cents on the dollar. These days, it is less.

Whenever a government wants to send a message to a foreign competitor — for example, making a show of saying “no” to Chinese electric vehicles, or EVs — the price ends up being paid by our canola farmers or our beef or pork producers, because they are the ones retaliated against. No cabinet minister pays a price.

Farmers have long survived on faith. In my part of the world, we call it “next year country,” hoping that next year might be better with no late hailstorms or rain or snow in the spring, or no new laws that can change the rules of the game. To survive and thrive, hope must always trump fear because the elements will always conspire. Mother Nature, war, trade deals and, of course, politics here at home will always be part of the risk.

There are two optimistic notes and appreciation from the Grain Growers of Canada for the good work of two members of Parliament, the Senate Banking Committee and this chamber, especially Senator Deacon and Senator Housakos, for their work to see the passage of Bill C-244 and Bill C-294 — the so-called right to repair bills — which will save our ag producers time and money so that they can fix their equipment in a timely manner while offering all the necessary protection for crucial diagnostic software development and intellectual property, or IP.

Let’s hope it will be an incentive for the provinces to follow suit.

[ Senator Wallin ]

We are the chamber of sober second thought. We know the other place is, by design, captured by electoral politics and partisan interest. That’s their role. It means our responsibility, however, is vital to those we represent to always consider the unintended consequences of the bills we receive and to ensure we do no harm as we consider those bills. That is our paramount obligation.

Thank you, colleagues, for listening.

**Some Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear.

(Debate adjourned.)

## NATIONAL FRAMEWORK ON ADVERTISING FOR SPORTS BETTING BILL

### THIRD READING

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Deacon (*Ontario*), seconded by the Honourable Senator Greenwood, for the third reading of Bill S-269, An Act respecting a national framework on advertising for sports betting.

**Hon. Leo Housakos:** Honourable senators, I rise to speak very briefly to Bill S-269, which is a bill put forward by the sponsor, Senator Deacon. I had the pleasure of chairing the Standing Senate Committee on Transport and Communications while we did a brief study on the bill. Of course, I am a friendly critic of the bill. I support the bill wholeheartedly.

• (1600)

We realized in the course of the study — and I think any one of us who watches, particularly, sports, as I do, a fair amount, which is still on television because even though younger generations are shifting off TV these days and, as we’ve heard, traditional broadcasters in the past are suffering, those boomers like myself who still follow a Sunday football game or a Saturday night hockey game —

**An Hon. senator:** You’re too young to be a boomer.

**Senator Housakos:** I’m there. I’m on the border. My kids call me “boomer” every time they walk pass the family room and I’m watching sports on TV.

Any one of us who does gets the impression half the time that instead being in our living room or family room, we're in the middle of a casino in Vegas or Atlantic City and surrounded by bookies because we've been bombarded over and over again by the same ad, usually a very glamorous one, of people glorifying, of course, sports betting.

Of course, we always knew there was a risk of that a few years ago when we passed this piece of legislation. What we did learn in the course of our study is that there have been some social ramifications. The only concern I have is that there is a tendency for people to think it is a widespread problem and that it touches many Canadians, that sports-betting addiction has become a huge problem and almost at a crisis level.

The truth of the matter is we weren't able to ascertain that wholeheartedly. At least I wasn't. I wasn't able to get a concrete statistic in terms of how many people are not using sports betting for entertaining purposes in a moderate, responsible fashion, but clearly there were enough advocates saying that even if the percentage is 3% or 4% or 5% or 7% or 10%, there are a number of people who did get addicted to sports betting. More often than not, it's people who don't have the means and capacity to afford it, and, of course, it spirals into other social problems, like family problems, financial problems and so on and so forth. Particularly of concern to me is that it does, I think, disproportionately touch young people.

In my life, I've had experiences of this with personal friends of mine at a very young age. We were all sports fanatics, but a couple of my friends got into the addiction of sports betting at a time when, of course, they were doing it in some nefarious circles, in dark lanes and with people who were not so nice. At least now you take your credit card or your bank account, and you empty it out. You go online, get carried away and place a bet.

It has become a problem. It has come to our attention. The bill proposed by Senator Marty Deacon is, I think, a reasonable bill. It doesn't address all the problems that we're facing, but I think it's a step forward. I think we should continue to be vigilant. I think we should also start asking ourselves this question: Why is it that sports teams in Canada, in particular, have become so addicted to revenue from gambling? I think there is a wider, broader problem that also needs to be drilled down, and we should try to figure out the details of that.

I am also concerned because more than a year ago we had the Trudeau government telling us if we pass Bill C-11 and we do it urgently, we will solve all problems in broadcasting and it will start creating a new flow of revenue for the traditional broadcasters and save them from the difficulties they're facing. But if you watch a number of broadcasts now from the traditional broadcasters, in a one-hour segment you basically see nothing but sports-betting ads, which is also of concern. That has to be looked at, and we must address why it's happening because, like anything else, I believe particularly when young people are being bombarded with ads that are sensationalizing certain types of behaviour, there is a tendency for those who have addictive tendencies to be drawn to it.

I'm standing on my feet now to fully support the bill by Senator Deacon. I think we should go forward with it. I think we should be vigilant and keep our eyes open going forward of what else we need to do as parliamentarians to address the problem. Senator Deacon, congratulations on your bill. I hope all of our colleagues endorse it. Thank you very much.

**The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore:** Is it your pleasure, honourable senators, to adopt the motion?

**Hon. Senators:** Agreed.

(Motion agreed to and bill read third time and passed.)

## NATIONAL STRATEGY FOR EYE CARE BILL

### DECLARATION OF PRIVATE INTEREST

**Hon. Daryl Fridhandler:** Honourable senators, I note for the record that I believe I have a private interest that may be affected by the matter currently before the Senate. The general nature of the interest is as the chairman, director and security holder of a private corporation engaged in Canada and elsewhere in eye care and treatment for macular degeneration.

**The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore:** Honourable senators, Senator Fridhandler made a declaration of private interest regarding Bill C-284, and in accordance with rule 15-7, the declaration shall be recorded in the *Journals of the Senate*.

### THIRD READING

**Hon. Mohamed-Iqbal Ravalia:** moved third reading of Bill C-284, An Act to establish a national strategy for eye care.

He said: Honourable senators, I rise today as Senate sponsor of Bill C-284, An Act to establish a national strategy for eye care and to designate an age-related macular degeneration awareness month. I would like to acknowledge the tireless efforts of MP Judy Sgro, who has championed a national strategy for eye care in the other place and raised awareness around age-related macular degeneration, or AMD, and other vision health issues. The bill's unanimous passage reflects a shared recognition of vision care's importance in our society.

I wish to begin by expressing my sincere gratitude to the Standing Senate Committee on Social Affairs, Science and Technology for their dedicated study and review of this bill. Over four insightful meetings, the committee heard from key stakeholders, including the Canadian Council of the Blind, Vision Loss Rehabilitation Canada, Indigenous Children Eye Examination and Health Canada. Their careful work underscores the Senate's commitment to improving health care outcomes for all Canadians. The bill was reported back to our chamber without amendment.

I would like to thank Senator Cormier and Senator Mégie for their observations, including that Health Canada should effectively consult official language minority communities if this bill is duly passed and that the national strategy explicitly consider regular eye care follow-ups as part of its prevention

methods, recognizing that regular eye care follow-ups are not always systemically practised. Collectively, the committee supported the need to reduce preventable blindness and improve eye health for Canadians through a coordinated approach.

One of the most celebrated aspects of Bill C-284 is its broad and inclusive design. It creates an opportunity to include everyone impacted by vision loss. This framework, which is intentionally not prescriptive, allows its potential to evolve and encompass a wide range of voices and needs as it develops.

The bill that is before us today is straightforward. It calls on the Minister of Health, in partnership with provincial governments, Indigenous communities, health care providers, researchers and other stakeholders, to develop a national strategy for eye care. It is designed to address essential elements such as prevention, early detection, treatment and accessibility for all Canadians, including enhanced access for Indigenous communities. The strategy would also encourage the development of innovative therapies and aim to standardize eye care practices across Canada's health care systems.

Like other strategy or framework bills, it has reporting requirements, in this case, 18 months after the day on which this bill comes into force.

• (1610)

Through designating February as AMD Awareness Month, this bill recognizes the unique challenges posed by AMD. This progressive condition affects millions of Canadians over the age of 55 and has widespread impacts on their independence, mental health and quality of life. As our population ages, we must continue to increase awareness and ensure accessible treatments are available.

Why February? Having Canada formally recognize February as AMD Awareness Month aims to commit the nation to a focused effort in raising public awareness and understanding of this significant eye condition. The Canadian Ophthalmological Society, the CNIB Foundation and non-profit organizations like Fighting Blindness Canada already lead educational campaigns during February that stress the importance of early detection, prevention strategies and effective management of AMD.

These campaigns include webinars, public workshops, vision screenings and outreach programs offering comprehensive print and digital resources. Pharmacies and local health authorities also play a key role by promoting eye health through informational displays and community events. Collectively, these initiatives emphasize regular eye exams and proactive measures to help Canadians safeguard their vision and navigate the challenges of AMD. Formally recognizing February as AMD Awareness Month would reinforce these efforts, highlighting the importance of education and support in promoting eye health and empowering individuals with the knowledge and resources they need.

During committee discussions, it became evident that the gaps this bill seeks to address are critical. We need to increase access to eye care services in both urban and rural areas, making

screenings and treatments affordable to all. We need comprehensive educational campaigns to highlight the importance of early eye checkups to prevent common conditions like cataracts and glaucoma. We must train more optometrists and vision health professionals and better integrate technology — including telemedicine and advanced diagnostic tools — to improve access, particularly in remote areas. Additionally, we must ensure that Indigenous communities can address their unique eye care needs.

While Bill C-284 doesn't stipulate funding for these gaps — after all, it is a private member's bill — it is a starting point that can catalyze conversations about future investments. A national framework would bridge the inconsistencies in eye care across our provinces and territories and address the rising prevalence of vision-related health concerns across our country. It would also support culturally appropriate, inclusive services tailored to the needs of our diverse communities.

Jurisdiction, often seen as divisive and complex, was an important point of discussion that also brought valuable insights. How do we ensure federal coordination without stepping on provincial jurisdictions?

Health Canada representatives assured us that this collaborative approach is well established. Previous strategies, whether for diabetes, palliative care, PTSD or autism, show how the federal government can successfully play a unifying role, bringing stakeholders together, reducing duplication and fostering solutions that benefit all. Canada has the opportunity to lead globally in delivering comprehensive eye care.

The reality is that this bill addresses an issue that touches the lives of countless Canadians: access to vision care. Our ability to see allows us to experience the beauty of our world, connect with others and navigate daily life. Yet for many Canadians, vision care remains out of reach, a luxury rather than an accessible component of our health care system.

I have personally seen the impact of this gap during my years as a family physician, and I know many of my colleagues have had similar experiences. Whether directly or indirectly, vision impairment affects us all. Over 8 million Canadians have an eye disease, with 1.2 million experiencing vision loss or blindness. Despite being largely preventable, 75% of vision loss cases remain undiagnosed and untreated due to gaps in accessibility and early detection.

Vision care is a crucial element of our health care system, yet many Canadians face barriers, particularly those in rural or remote areas or without private insurance. COVID-19, colleagues, has only amplified these challenges, causing missed appointments and delays in critical eye care.

Honourable senators, access to vision care and prioritizing eye health is a matter of collective responsibility. This bill is long overdue and one step in the right direction toward offering timely, essential supports to the millions of Canadians affected by vision loss. I strongly urge you, colleagues, to support this important piece of legislation without delay.

Thank you. *Meegwetch.*

**Hon. Donald Neil Plett (Leader of the Opposition):** One of the problems with being a critic to a bill, especially if you are a friendly critic, is that much of what you want to say has probably already been said. My remarks will be brief, but I want to make a few comments on this very important bill. I rise, of course, to speak to third reading of Bill C-284, An Act to establish a national strategy for eye care.

I want to thank both Senator Ravalia, my good friend across the way who sponsored the bill in the Senate, and, of course, my very good friend and member of the House of Commons Judy Sgro for bringing forward legislation on the important topic of eye care in Canada. Again, I can see where a good, staunch Liberal and a good Conservative can actually agree on good legislation, and I think this bill is one such example. Another was, of course, Bill S-269, which we just passed a few minutes ago.

As a reminder, Bill C-284 provides for the development of a national strategy to support the prevention and treatment of eye disease as well as vision rehabilitation to ensure better health outcomes for Canadians. It also designates February as Age-related Macular Degeneration Awareness Month.

During its study in committee, witnesses shared the many needs of eye care in Canada and how Bill C-284 is needed to help meet those needs. For my third reading speech today, I want to share a little bit about what the committee has heard and how Bill C-284 would begin the conversation of a better-coordinated approach to eye care in Canada. I want to begin, colleagues, by sharing a snapshot of eye care in Canada.

The proportion of the population in 2020 that reported having good vision without correction was about 75% among youth aged 12 to 19. Unsurprisingly, the proportion was lower as the respondents were older, to about 25% for those aged 55 years and older. In terms of global numbers in the country, approximately 1.2 million Canadians are blind or partially sighted, while over 8 million are at significant risk of blindness.

The number of Canadians living with vision loss is on the rise. Further, I was surprised by a 2022 report from Statistics Canada that states few studies have been done in Canada on eye health. This sentiment was echoed during committee study by Larissa Moniz from Fighting Blindness Canada, who said, “. . . vision health has been undervalued for a very long time . . .”

Statements like that, colleagues, further prove that vision health in Canada needs help, and Bill C-284 will help get the ball rolling. For example, of the four measures in the national strategy

for eye care, the second measure proposes to “promote research and improve on eye disease prevention and treatment . . .” and vision rehabilitation. The committee heard throughout its study about the need for better research, and their plea was corroborated by the report by Statistics Canada.

• (1620)

During committee study, Jennifer Jones, President and Chief Executive Officer of Fighting Blindness Canada, explained why Canada needs an eye care strategy:

. . . In truth, what we really need is a consistent application of care to national eye care. That’s the reason this strategy is so important to us. We want to make sure there is a comprehensive and consistent focus on the full spectrum of eye health care, which we are all going to speak to in turn — better education and awareness, better access to diagnosis and treatments, and more investment in research that will drive better outcomes and an improved quality of life.

Colleagues, we can all agree that we need better education and awareness, which translates to better prevention. With eye care, like health care, prevention is the best approach, and it starts from a young age. As I stated earlier in my speech, eyesight gets worse as we get older. One of the leading causes of blindness in Canada, and the leading cause in North America, is age-related macular degeneration, or AMD. According to the Canadian Association of Optometrists, AMD is a progressive disease, with symptoms worsening over time. In the early stages, while no symptoms can be felt, AMD can be detected with an eye exam. As time goes by, various treatments are available to slow down the disease as well as prevent severe vision loss. The key element to AMD, like many eye diseases, is early detection.

Bill C-284 would also raise awareness on AMD by designating the month of February as “Age-Related Macular Degeneration Awareness Month.”

Colleagues, over 1.5 million Canadians live with AMD. Canadians need to know before their diagnosis what can be done to slow down the progression of AMD, not when it is too late.

By raising the awareness of the importance of eye exams, we not only help eye care in the country and improve quality of life, but we can also improve other health indicators found through eye exams. While the eyes are said to be the windows to the soul, they are also indicators of good overall health. While the eyes can indicate a variety of emotions — from kindness to happiness to sadness — they can also be early detectors of various health issues. According to an article by the American Academy of Ophthalmology, an eye exam can detect 20 various health problems, such as high blood pressure due to unusual bends, kinks or bleeding from blood vessels. It can also detect early signs of heart diseases, lupus, Lyme disease, multiple sclerosis, an increase risk of stroke and the list goes on.

While Bill C-284 focuses on vision health, the potential of having better eye care in Canada goes beyond vision. We sometimes treat various branches of care in silos, but they can interact together and be preventive. That certainly seems to be the case with eye exams, and, hopefully, part of the strategy can also expand upon the numerous health indicators eye exams can provide.

To understand the real need for an eye strategy, during the committee study, Dr. Martin Spiro, President of the Canadian Association of Optometrists, made a great case when he shared a story:

As an optometrist, I would like to share a recent experience that is a stark reminder of why Bill C-284 is vital. Recently, a new patient presented to my clinic complaining about a decrease in their vision. Like so many Canadians, he had long felt that, since his vision had been fine, he didn't need to see an eye doctor. In fact, it had been over ten years since his last eye exam.

What he did not realize — and what we discovered during his exam — was that he had advanced glaucoma. By the time he sought care, the damage was significant and irreversible. If this patient had received routine care, this vision loss could likely have been preventable.

Stories like those are heartbreaking, colleagues. They are stark reminders of the importance of eye exams to prevent vision loss. Seventy-five per cent of vision-related diseases are preventable and treatable with early intervention. With better education and awareness of the importance of eye exams, we could significantly lower that percentage.

Jennifer Urosevic, President and Chief Executive Officer of Vision Loss Rehabilitation Canada highlighted the following:

... Today, more than 1.2 million Canadians live with blindness and low vision, and as our population ages, the number is set to double by 2050.

Just over 160,000 people access our services. Due to funding restrictions, we are only able to see a fraction of the 1.25 million people living with low vision or blindness who would benefit from our services. The Deloitte report in 2021 commissioned by the Canadian Council of the Blind indicated that vision loss costs to Canadians is \$32.9 billion each year.

Vision loss costs our economy \$32.9 billion each year. That is an astonishing number, even more so when you consider that 75% of vision-related diseases are preventable. With only 160,000 people accessing the services offered by Vision Loss Rehabilitation Canada, there is a large population not being served and whose quality of life could potentially be improved.

In the context of an aging population and multiple gaps in eye care in Canada, Bill C-284 would get the conversation going with partners across the country. By gathering provincial partners and various key stakeholders, the federal government can show real leadership to tackle vision loss in Canada.

Colleagues, this legislation aims to address serious issues in eye care in Canada.

I want to recognize Liberal member of Parliament Judy Sgro for putting this bill together. As a personal comment, senators who weren't here in 2017 might be surprised to know it is not the first time MP Sgro and I have worked and supported legislation together. Back in 2017, I introduced Bill S-224, the Canada prompt payment act, which passed our chamber but got stuck in the House of Commons. As Chair of the Standing Committee on Transport, Infrastructure and Communities, MP Sgro saw Bill S-224 as good legislation and lobbied her own government to pass federal prompt payment legislation.

In June 2019, the budget implementation act received Royal Assent, and it included the Federal Prompt Payment for Construction Work Act. Thanks to collaborative work between MP Sgro and myself, we paved the way for trade contractors to receive prompt payment when working on federal projects. I am therefore proud today to help my friend get her bill across the finish line.

Since 2015, partisanship in this place has unjustly and unfairly received a bad reputation from the government. Colleagues, the fact of the matter is that we and I have never opposed legislation purely on partisanship. When good legislation is put in front of me, is thoroughly debated and can bring good to Canadians, we will support it, it doesn't matter who the sponsor is or from which party. Bill S-224 was good legislation for trade contractors from coast to coast to coast, and MP Sgro made sure it became law regardless of the fact it was from a Conservative senator.

Bill C-284 is equally good legislation to improve eye care in our country, and regardless of it being from a Liberal MP, I am happy to help bring it over the line. It will help millions of Canadians who are living with eye disease, and at the end of the day, that is what matters: legislation that helps Canadians live a better life.

Therefore, I urge all senators to join me in supporting this bill today.

Thank you.

**The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore:** Are senators ready for the question?

**Hon. Senators:** Question.

**The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore:** Is it your pleasure, honourable senators, to adopt the motion?

**Hon. Senators:** Agreed.

(Motion agreed to and bill read third time and passed.)



• (1630)

## CANADIAN POSTAL SAFETY BILL

BILL TO AMEND—TWENTY-EIGHTH REPORT OF LEGAL  
AND CONSTITUTIONAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE—  
DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Cotter, seconded by the Honourable Senator Mégie, for the adoption of the twenty-eighth report of the Standing Senate Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs (*Bill S-256, An Act to amend the Canada Post Corporation Act (seizure) and to make related amendments to other Acts, with amendments*), presented in the Senate on October 8, 2024.

**Hon. Pierre J. Dalphond:** Honourable senators, as sponsor of Bill S-256, the Canadian postal safety act, I rise to speak to the Legal Committee's report on the bill. In the eternal words of former Senator Baker, I will be brief.

Thank you to members of the committee for a very collaborative study and amendment process on this bill, leading to the report before us. I am pleased that the report proposes to both simplify and strengthen the bill in response to committee evidence.

Before getting into the amendments, in the big picture, Bill S-256 is a means to respond to an aspect of the opioid epidemic that is killing Canadians across the country. The bill's purpose is to allow police, with a warrant, to ". . . search, seize, detain or retain Canada Post mail in the course of post . . ." This will help the police to disrupt the delivery of deadly drugs like fentanyl by Canada Post.

To achieve this, the bill proposes to amend the Canada Post Corporation Act to remove what has become, in my view and the view of many more, an arbitrary and outdated restriction from 1867 that applies only to Canada Post mail.

Subsection 40(3) of that statute contains this restriction, which currently prevents searches and seizures by police, even with a warrant, with exceptions around three other federal statutes: the Canadian Security Intelligence Service Act, the Customs Act and the Proceeds of Crime (Money Laundering) and Terrorist Financing Act. But there are no exceptions for statutes like the Criminal Code and the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act.

Accordingly, Bill S-256 aims to treat items in Canada Post mail the same way as the law already treats items sent by private couriers such as FedEx or Purolator, which police can search with a warrant. Indeed, with a warrant police can currently search emails, documents locked in a safe in a person's home, Canada Post mail before it is sent or after delivery and the like, but not when it is in the mail. Therefore, this change is quite moderate and natural, with similar contexts.

The idea for this bill comes from an article published in *Maclean's* on March 7, 2019, entitled "For fentanyl importers, Canada Post is the shipping method of choice." The article stated that people could buy illegal drugs on the dark web and easily have them delivered by Canada Post.

The Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police recommended this bill's main change in 2015 to provide police with the ability to search items for drugs, with a warrant, while in the course of post. This change should not have taken 10 years, but it is never too late to do the right thing and, hopefully, help save lives.

We should keep in mind that a 30-gram, letter-sized package can contain 15,000 fatal doses of fentanyl.

This change to the Canada Post Act has received support from the Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs, which represents 63 First Nations in Manitoba, and the Mushkegowuk Council, which represents eight First Nations in northern Ontario.

Why do they support this change? Because Canada Post is the sole entity that delivers parcels in these remote areas, and it's through Canada Post that the drugs come into the reserves.

The committee heard that the trafficking of drugs to remote communities by mail is a major problem that this bill can help address.

I turn now to the two significant amendments in the report. The effect of one amendment is to make clear that police searches of items in the mail apply only to cases where they obtain a general warrant or its equivalent. This requirement means that the evidentiary standard would be "reasonable grounds to believe" in all cases, as compared to "reasonable grounds to suspect."

"Reasonable grounds to believe" is the common standard in the Criminal Code and most federal enactments authorizing a search warrant in Canada. It is the higher standard.

General warrants are provided for in section 487.01 of the Criminal Code with their equivalent, for example, in section 11 of the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act.

This amendment responded to the excellent testimony of law professor Steve Coughlan, who is now at Dalhousie University. He is a former student of Senator Cotter — who nods in approval that he was a good student. Professor Coughlan addressed potential privacy concerns with the bill. Senator Simons organized his appearance as a witness.

I am very grateful to our colleagues Senator Simons and Senator Clement for their contributions to this subject. We all have reasonable grounds to believe that these efforts have ensured appropriate protections of privacy. I am also pleased that the amendment and some deletions make the bill much simpler.

The second important change in the bill is an amendment requested through the testimony and the brief from the Mushkegowuk Council. Specifically, their counsel requested that a provision be added to the Canada Post Corporation Act to permit Canada Post to conduct unobtrusive screenings for illegal drugs on all mail bound for a First Nation where it has been authorized to do so in a First Nation law or bylaw.

Crucially, the screening would not include opening or reading mail but may include the use of a scanner, canine detection or a similar non-intrusive device.

As we heard, this preliminary screening already takes place at airports, in courthouses and in mailrooms across Canada. As well, it has also been upheld by courts in the context of baggage searches by First Nations for arriving passengers.

Additionally, in Mushkegowuk communities — eight First Nations in northern Ontario — we heard that in 2023 the rate of fatal overdoses was three times higher than the Ontario average, which is itself a high rate. In 2021, the rate of opioid toxicity-related hospital visits was nine times higher. That is a real problem for these remote communities.

As well, a representative of the Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs confirmed their support for such an amendment to encourage Canada Post screenings for illegal drugs if authorized by a First Nation.

With such testimony, I believe the Senate has a responsibility to act. Thus, the committee adopted an amendment based on text provided by Mushkegowuk Council's representatives, with application to any Indigenous body holding section 35 constitutional rights on their own authority to encourage screening by Canada Post inspectors of mail addressed to a location on the relevant authority's land. This could include a reserve, or Indigenous lands prescribed by regulations made under the Canada Post Corporation Act.

At committee, senators also adopted subamendments to this proposal. These subamendments were from Senators Carignan and Oudar and brought greater precision to the language proposed, consistent with the intent of the Mushkegowuk Council's proposal.

It is important to understand that the aim of this amendment is to encourage Canada Post and law enforcement to take Indigenous jurisdiction and laws seriously, to respect self-determination and advance reconciliation, including legal reconciliation.

• (1640)

The committee heard that having Indigenous laws enforced can be difficult, including from the comments of Senator McCallum and Senator Prosper. Senator McCallum has also raised these issues with Bill S-271, regarding the RCMP, and Bill S-272, regarding the Director of Public Prosecutions.

This amendment to Bill S-256 before us does not force any Indigenous group or community to adopt laws to authorize screening. It is totally up to them as permissive legislation. However, if these authorities do so because of health and safety

concerns, Canada Post will have a moral duty to sit down with them and consider ways to conduct screenings within their inspection process.

Senators, I thank members of the committee again for their most valued and appreciated input. I believe Bill S-256 has some urgency as one piece of a larger collective response to the opioid epidemic.

I ask you, colleagues, to adopt the report and to engage in third reading as soon as possible.

Thank you, *meegwetch, wela'lin*.

**Some Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear.

(On motion of Senator Martin, debate adjourned.)

## HEALTH OF ANIMALS ACT

BILL TO AMEND—FOURTEENTH REPORT OF AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY COMMITTEE—DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Black, seconded by the Honourable Senator Downe, for the adoption of the fourteenth report of the Standing Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry (*Bill C-275, An Act to amend the Health of Animals Act (biosecurity on farms), with an amendment and observations*), presented in the Senate on October 29, 2024.

**Hon. Donald Neil Plett (Leader of the Opposition):** Honourable senators, I rise to speak to Bill C-275. Before I get to my comments about the report directly, allow me to set some context.

I grew up in Landmark, Manitoba, the centre of the country. For all those people in Toronto who think you are Central Canadian, you are not. Landmark, Manitoba, is Central Canada. I grew up there. It is an agricultural community.

Later, during my years in the plumbing industry, I worked with the sector, often doing installations of heating systems in barns and various outbuildings. The importance of agriculture and the need to be aware of its unique challenges have always been close to my heart.

When I was appointed to this chamber in 2009, I was delighted the first committee I was appointed to serve on was the Agriculture and Forestry Committee. At the time, the Harper government wanted their senators to serve on committees where they had some expertise — kind of unique — unlike today, when a housing developer with no agriculture background can be on the Agriculture Committee. We actually needed to know something about ag.

I sponsored every agricultural bill in the Senate during the Harper government in the years I served on that committee until I was appointed the Leader of the Opposition in the Senate in 2019.

My time on the Agriculture Committee ran concurrently with Senator Terry Mercer's. I have used his name a few times in the Senate. I used to use his name when I was cursing. Lately, I have used it in a much gentler and more collaborative tone. Terry and I were very good friends. He sat on the committee as a Liberal, and I as a Conservative.

In spite of our opposing political views, we rarely disagreed at committee. There were a few exceptions, such as the monopoly of the Canadian Wheat Board. By and large, when it came to agricultural issues, everyone on the committee was united. We made it our job to understand the industry and find out what was good for agriculture. When we discovered that, we supported it.

We were there because of our love for agriculture, our appreciation for producers and our recognition that agricultural policy should support the ag industry, not tear it down.

Honourable senators, I know that Senator Gold says we are using talking points and we say the same thing. You say that many times. Colleagues, I truly, honestly feel those days are gone.

Although I am no longer a regular member of the committee, I sit on it occasionally. I recently sat on the committee for the consideration of two different ag bills: The first one was a year ago on Bill C-234, the carbon tax exemption bill; and now, lately, the bill we are discussing today, Bill C-275, An Act to amend the Health of Animals Act (biosecurity on farms).

On both of these occasions, I found I no longer recognized our Agriculture Committee. I felt like I was no longer sitting around the table with senators who wanted what was best for the agricultural industry. Some did, for sure. Some still do. But too many of them were now advocating for their own special interest or playing some kind of a weird power game rather than watching out for the best interests of producers and, indeed, the entire agricultural sector.

In the committee's study of both Bill C-234 and Bill C-275, when farmers, producers and farm organizations came to the table and unanimously supported a position, I saw members of our committee treat them contemptuously. Instead of listening to witnesses, they lectured them. They treated them with hostility. Instead of trying to understand their position, they acted like skeptics and critics. Instead of guarding and defending the interests of agriculture in Canada, they took positions which were antagonistic toward the industry.

This not only surprised me, colleagues; it alarmed me. I was shocked to see — and I am sorry to say that — the Senate Agriculture Committee of today is no longer a friend of farmers. Senator Wallin alluded to that earlier in her response to the Speech from the Throne.

With Bill C-234, the agricultural community from coast to coast was unanimously asking for a simple change to the carbon tax which would exempt propane and natural gas from the carbon tax in the same way that gasoline and diesel were already exempted. They were unanimous, colleagues.

This would save producers millions of dollars, which could be put to good use by being reinvested in their farms or invested in cleaner technology. In some cases, it could very well be the difference between solvency and insolvency for their farming operation.

However, as you may recall, the majority of the committee refused to listen to producers and, instead, amended the bill in a way which would ensure the bill would never become law. Under the guise of improving the bill, Senator Dalphond inserted a poison pill. To its credit, the Senate as a whole rejected those amendments at report stage, and the bill was returned to its unamended state. For a moment, I was hopeful. There was a light at the end of the tunnel.

Then Senator Dalphond, together with his good friend Senator Woo, managed to convince this chamber to amend the bill again, knowing full well that if there were amendments, the bill would languish, which it is doing today. Those amendments were passed by this chamber at third reading and, to this day, Bill C-234 sits on the Order Paper in the House of Commons and will likely never become law because of it.

Farmers never got the much-needed relief from the carbon tax that most Canadians in this chamber claimed they wanted farmers to receive. Colleagues, that was December 12, 2023, almost one year ago.

Today, the bill continues to languish in the other place. I will not be surprised if it lies there until the next election, which we are all hoping — some of us more than others — will be soon, and then this bill will die, and a common-sense Conservative government will bring this back, and it will become law. There is hope for these farmers.

You will not be part of giving them that hope. Those of you who voted the way you did will not be a part of it, and you will not be able to accept credit for them getting that hope.

Colleagues, today we are in the exact same situation with Bill C-275.

• (1650)

Bill C-275 seeks to add additional legal protection for farmers in order to mitigate biosecurity risks introduced by unauthorized visitors. Note the term "unauthorized visitors," better known as "trespassers." It proposes amendments to the Health of Animals Act that would make it an offence for individuals to enter without lawful authority areas where animals are kept if such entry could expose the animals to diseases or toxic substances.

It introduces stricter penalties for trespassers and recognizes the potential biosecurity risks that unauthorized entries pose to animal health and, by extension, the Canadian food supply chain.

This bill is an unapologetic response to increasing concerns over farm trespassing incidents across Canada involving animal rights activists. These incidents not only compromise the biosecurity of farms but also impose significant stress on farm operators, threatening both animal welfare and the country's food security.

Action is needed to protect our agriculture producers and their livestock, and this legislation provides exactly that, or at least it did before the Agriculture Committee got a hold of it.

Colleagues, biosecurity threats to Canadian farms are not hypothetical; they are real and present dangers. Diseases like African swine fever, or ASF, avian influenza and others pose significant risks to animal health and to the agricultural economy. An outbreak of ASF in Canada, for example, could result in a \$24 billion economic hit to the pork industry, affecting thousands of jobs and export markets.

Moreover, the mental health impact on farmers due to trespassing and potential biosecurity breaches cannot be overstated. Incidents of unauthorized entries have left farm families distressed, impacting their livelihoods and well-being.

The necessity of Bill C-275 lies in its potential to serve as a deterrent against such activities, protecting farms from biosecurity risks and supporting the mental health of farm operators.

At committee, agricultural producers vigorously supported this bill as much-needed legislation. Matthew Atkinson, President of the Canadian Cattle Association, said this:

Trespassers on beef cattle farms, ranches and feedlots are a biosecurity hazard. The proposed amendments to Bill C-275 would provide a targeted intervention to this on-farm food safety and biosecurity risk by limiting the access of unauthorized entrants to animals and their feedstocks.

Darren Ference, Chair of Turkey Farmers of Canada, said:

. . . Bill C-275 is a critical piece of legislation that will strengthen biosecurity as well as safeguard animal health and welfare and the safety of farm personnel. As a turkey farmer deeply committed to the welfare of my animals and the success of our industry, I urge you to support this bill and work towards its swift enactment into law. . . .

Colleagues, the challenge of protecting biosecurity is neither theoretical nor aspirational. The implementation of formal biosecurity protocols in Canadian agriculture has been a longstanding and ongoing process that gained significant momentum in the late 1980s and early 1990s.

Today, strict biosecurity protocols are in place for avian farms, the bee industry, beef cattle farms, the cervid industry, dairy farms, the equine industry, the goat industry, the mink industry, the sheep industry and the swine industry. But while biosecurity protocols exist at all levels, including regional, national and international, it is important to realize that the responsibility for farm-level biosecurity rests with farmers themselves.

As noted by the Canadian Food Inspection Agency, or CFIA:

Biosecurity may be considered as a whole-farm approach to animal health management. The cooperation of visitors and agri-service personnel is an important part of a plan, but, ultimately, the owner or manager must be willing to do what is necessary to ensure that established protocols are followed by family members, employees, and visitors.

Critics of this bill like to say that this means biosecurity measures are voluntary, but this presents an inaccurate picture. Biosecurity on farms is as voluntary as locking or not locking your doors in a high-crime neighbourhood: It's your choice, but no one who cares about their property or the safety of their loved ones would fail to do so.

Furthermore, industry associations have integrated biosecurity protocols into their mandatory on-farm programs, including the Dairy Farmers of Canada, the Chicken Farmers of Canada, the Turkey Farmers of Canada and the Canadian Pork Council. The protocols are mandatory if a producer wants to continue accessing the market for their products, which means that anyone who does not abide by them will quickly be out of business. There is nothing voluntary there.

It is the producer who bears all of the responsibility and risk for biosecurity at the farm level, and it is something that they take seriously.

I have witnessed this first-hand. In my previous life, my company did a lot of work on hog farms, being in Manitoba, which is a large hog-producing area in the country. My men would tell me:

I no longer have to shower before I come to work because I'm going to need to have five or six showers during the course of the day.

They would have to shower before they walked into a barn. They would shower when they walked out to get a pair of pliers or something else they had forgotten from their truck. Then they would shower again when they walked back into the barn. We also owned a truck and trailer wash, where we washed a lot of farm vehicles. Trucks that had been on a farm were regularly brought to our truck wash; before they could go to another farm, they had to be washed and disinfected.

Farmers take this seriously. They are trying to do everything they can to ensure nothing happens, and then we say, "Well, let's not penalize trespassers."

Biosecurity protocols are significant and rigorously enforced by producers, yet, at this point, farmers still do not have the tools necessary to ensure compliance with those protocols.

They can enforce the protocols with their employees, family members and visitors, but they are helpless in one key area: with respect to individuals who come to their farms without authorization — in other words, trespassers.

At committee, there was a fixation on the idea that this bill should apply to everyone, not just trespassers. The argument was made that the sanctions imposed in Bill C-275 should also apply to anyone legally present on the farm, and, regrettably, an amendment was made to this effect.

Think about that, colleagues. What the amendment did was remove five words from clause 1, as passed by the House. The bill had previously read:

No person shall, without lawful authority or excuse, enter a building or other enclosed place in which animals are kept, or take in any animal or thing, knowing that or being reckless as to whether entering such a place or taking in the animal or thing could result in the exposure of the animals to a disease or toxic substance that is capable of affecting or contaminating them.

The amendment removed the words “. . . without lawful authority or excuse . . .” This was proposed by a judge. In doing so, it made the sanctions in the act apply to not just persons who were present “without lawful authority or excuse,” but to everyone. This includes producers themselves, their own employees, their temporary foreign workers, visitors, family members and delivery drivers. This, colleagues, is misguided and misdirected to the point of being malicious.

• (1700)

As I said earlier, producers who currently carry all of the responsibility and all of the risk for a biosecurity outbreak are already highly motivated to prevent one. Yet should they find themselves in an unfortunate situation where — through their own lapse in judgment or error — they cause a biosecurity incident, they would now be facing fines of up to \$25,000 or three months in jail or both on summary conviction.

On an indictable offence, the punishment would be a fine of up to \$100,000 or one year in prison or both. And this is in addition to the financial, emotional and mental impacts of the biosecurity incident on their operation.

And we had seven senators vote in favour of that, colleagues.

At committee, Senator Dalphond claimed that since he grew up on a farm, he was representing farmers by introducing this amendment. Yet in the same breath, he acknowledged that at one point his father “. . . lost thousands of chickens because of a sickness that contaminated not only one, but many buildings.” Those are Senator Dalphond’s words.

Senator Dalphond also said:

I know what biosecurity is. I know it’s an important risk, and I know who pays at the end of the day. It was not the government. It was my father.

I agree with that. But by some strange logic, Senator Dalphond said this in defence of his amendment that he introduced — if it were law during the biosecurity incident on his very own father’s farm, his father could have seen a fine of up to \$100,000 and spent a year in jail for an outbreak which had already cost him dearly.

This is the lunacy of this amendment. It does not help the agricultural sector; it hurts it. It is like amending a bill meant to punish home invaders, but instead making it apply to homeowners who accidentally leave their door unlocked. Imagine facing criminal charges and potential jail time because you forgot to double-check your own door, on top of already

dealing with the trauma and losses from the break-in itself. That is not just missing the point of the legislation, but it’s also actively punishing the very people whom the law is supposed to protect.

Senator Dalphond may have grown up on a farm, but he certainly does not understand agriculture.

While Bill C-275 was drafted to protect farmers, Senator Dalphond’s amendment to the bill destroyed that intent and instead targets producers. Instead of protecting them, it now threatens them.

Senator Dalphond gave two reasons for making this amendment. No, let me correct that; he gave three reasons. The first one — and this is ironic — was that he felt it would somehow force me to speak to Bill C-355 on his timetable. I’m not clear how he expected this to play out, but he seemed to think his amendment put me in some kind of a hammerlock.

He even clipped that portion of the committee hearings and tweeted it, which was then promptly retweeted by animal rights activists. My office has been fielding phone calls ever since, patiently trying to explain parliamentary procedure to the callers.

On that point, it’s interesting to note that some of those calls have been coming from the United States. One caller from New York told my office that animal rights groups in Canada had contacted their counterpart organizations in the U.S. and asked them to mobilize their members to call my office. I guess if you do not have enough support for your movement at home, you will beat the bushes to try to find it somewhere else.

Senator Dalphond had two other reasons for making his amendment: One reason was because of a concern that the bill exceeded federal jurisdiction, and another reason was because he claimed it would do more to strengthen biosecurity protections.

Those may sound like good reasons until you realize that they are unnecessary and that the amendment actually endangers the entire bill, promising to leave the agricultural community with nothing instead of something.

Allow me to explain, beginning with the question of jurisdiction. I hope there will be some people who will speak to this later and explain this even better, and I’m sure there will be, but I will take a stab at it.

This concern has been raised repeatedly, both under this bill and when it was introduced by MP John Barlow in its earlier form as Bill C-205. During the debate over Bill C-205, the government opposed the legislation, partly due to jurisdictional concerns. But with Bill C-275, the government ended up supporting the bill after the Conservatives introduced an amendment at committee which addressed the concern.

MP Francis Drouin, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, said this during his second reading speech on Bill C-275:

This amendment would . . . mitigate against the legal issues I outlined earlier. By shifting the focus to entry into on-farm biosecurity zones, it would bring the bill under federal jurisdiction because it would be more clearly related to agricultural options inside the farm gate. It would also reinforce the benefit of biosecurity zones, which are an important part of agricultural practices to prevent the spread of animal disease.

Senator Dalphond's amendment addresses concerns which were raised in the House of Commons and addressed to the satisfaction of the government — the government that Senator Dalphond is supporting.

The bill ended up passing the House by a wide margin — colleagues, listen to this — with the support of 133 Liberals, 112 Conservatives, 20 Bloc Québécois and 3 independents. That is a total of 278 elected members of Parliament, including the Prime Minister and all of his cabinet, including the current and former Ministers of Agriculture.

Colleagues, at committee, Joseph Melaschenko, the Senior Counsel with the Agriculture and Food Inspection Legal Services from the Department of Justice, was present to aid us in our deliberations. I asked him this question: “. . . would you have advised the government on the constitutionality of this bill?”

It's a simple question.

His answer was “Yes, the Department of Justice looks at constitutional issues in support of government witnesses that appear at this committee.”

This means we can be certain of two things: First, he advised the government on the bill's constitutionality; and second, the government ended up supporting the bill. Thus, it is obvious that, as explained by MP Francis Drouin, the bill as amended by the House of Commons is constitutional in the government's view. The constitutional question was settled; 278 members of the House of Commons agreed, but Senator Dalphond did not.

This leaves us with Senator Dalphond's second argument that the amendment will somehow motivate producers to be more vigilant about implementing and enforcing biosecurity protocols on their farms. As I already explained, colleagues, this is nothing short of frivolous and vexatious. Producers already carry all the risk and all the responsibility for biosecurity. They do not need a legislative gun to their head to convince them. Such a rationale shows how out of touch Senator Dalphond and six other members of the Agriculture and Forestry Committee are with the agricultural industry and its producers.

Colleagues, there is only one group of stakeholders who support this amendment: It is the animal rights activists, their lawyers and their university professors.

The animal rights activists have been very active on this file, and their reason for doing so is simple: They raise hundreds of thousands of dollars off of it, and they want to be able to

continue to illegally enter farms, barns, feedlots, broiler houses, hatcheries, farrowing houses and any other agricultural facility that they decide to invade. They claim that they have a greater interest in animal welfare than the very people whose future and livelihood depends on the welfare of these animals — the producers.

The real agenda of animal rights activists is no secret. It is to eventually shut down livestock farming in its entirety from the death by a thousand cuts. Their objective is not to improve this bill, but to defeat it.

• (1710)

But, colleagues, if you doubt me, perhaps you will believe the animal rights activists themselves. Let me quote from an email that Animal Justice sent out on October 25, right after Senator Dalphond amended the bill, right after.

This is what it read, colleagues:

Dear [supporter], we are so excited to share this week's achievement with you. Bill-275, a federal agricultural gag bill that attempted to punish people for exposing animal suffering on farms, has just been dealt a major blow in the Senate. Critically, the Senate Agriculture Committee amended the bill so that it no longer targets animal advocates. Now, the bill ensures that farm operators who cause disease outbreaks can be held to account for failing to protect animals against biosecurity risks.

Now listen very carefully to this part, to the end of it:

You kept the pressure on and spoke up for animals, and this amendment is a giant nail in the coffin of this dangerous proposed law!

“This amendment is a giant nail in the coffin of this dangerous proposed law,” and yet Senator Dalphond and Senator Varone and Senator Pate and others say this amendment helps.

Make no mistake about it, colleagues. The objective of the animal rights activists is to kill this bill, and they are using Senator Dalphond and six other senators who voted in favour of this amendment to do that. Senator Bernard, Senator McBean, Senator Pate, Senator Petitclerc, Senator Simons and Senator Varone — these are the senators who helped the animal rights activists put “. . . a giant nail in the coffin of this dangerous proposed law” because the activists do not want to be impeded by heavier consequences for trespassing and risking the health of the very animals they pretend to care about.

At committee, Senator Simons acknowledged that this amendment could very well kill the bill. She said:

If we amend this bill, given current political climate, there is a good chance it may not come back out of the House. . . .

And then, shamefully, she went on to suggest that such an outcome should have no bearing on how senators voted on the amendment because, in her words, “. . . that is not our fault or our problem.”

What are we doing here, colleagues? What is our problem? What is our responsibility? “That’s not our fault or our problem.”

Well, I’m sorry, senators, but it is the fault of those very senators unless we kill this report. It is the fault of those senators and anybody who votes for this report, who supported this amendment at committee, and it will be the fault of every senator in this chamber who does not vote to overturn this report.

And I would add that if the problems facing agriculture are not our problem, then let me suggest to those of you who believe that: You should certainly not be sitting as a member of the Senate Standing Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. If agriculture and farmers are not your problem, what are you doing there, colleagues? Find a committee that you believe in.

I cannot help but wonder whether these senators — and particularly whether a large housing developer from Toronto — would be happy if people trespassed on their property. And yet he comes to a committee one time, substitutes and casts the deciding vote, the last vote, to amend this bill.

As I asked the Animal Justice lawyer at committee, I would like to know from senators who supported this amendment:

. . . if I had evidence that you were treating your pet dog in a bad way in your house, do you think it would be okay for me to come pry open your window and crawl into your living room to take pictures of you mistreating your dog? . . .

Or would that be trespassing, and should I be charged for it? Because that’s what we’re saying is okay for these trespassers.

This is the kind of behaviour that is being enabled by these senators. The amendment they supported is going to put “a giant nail in the coffin” of Bill C-275. And, remember, those were not my words; they were the words of Animal Justice.

Colleagues, the agenda of the animal rights activists is not ambiguous. It is crystal clear. Although they claim to promote animal welfare, this is little more than an undisguised effort to incrementally impose their world view on every Canadian with the help of witting and unwitting parliamentarians.

To put it bluntly, animal rights activists do not believe that any animals should be in captivity, period. As Senator Wallin stated earlier — and this is not verbatim — we don’t get our food from Safeway; we get it from the farms. It is not simply about elephants and great apes. It is about freeing every single animal in zoos and farms and no longer seeing animals killed for human consumption.

You may find this hard to believe, so allow me to quote from the Three-Year Strategic Plan of Animal Justice, beginning with their “Vision,” which says it plainly:

Animal Justice’s top priority from 2023 to 2025 is protecting farmed animals, because of their numbers and extent of suffering.

In 2022, over 841 million land animals were killed for food in Canada — a record high. An estimated 10 billion aquatic animals are also killed annually.

Note the emphasis here: “Suffering” does not mean being held in conditions which do not meet animal welfare standards. It means being held in captivity for any reason, and especially if the end use is killing those animals for human consumption.

So, colleagues, you had better not go home and eat a steak this weekend, or a piece of chicken, because you don’t want that to happen anymore. You want us to be rid of all of this.

This is the constituency and the agenda which Senator Dalphond’s amendment panders to.

But here’s the counter-argument that the activists made at committee and which Senator Dalphond and his allies parrot. They claim that animal protection advocates have never caused a disease outbreak on a farm, so there is no need for this bill. This argument is so absurd that I should not even have to respond to it, but you know me; I will.

For starters, although it is difficult to conclusively prove the precise origin of any outbreak, outbreaks following unauthorized entry have happened and have raised serious concern that they could have been caused by the activists who had just invaded the private property.

The most recent example of this was a 2023 outbreak of avian influenza in Sonoma County, California, where a state investigation found that activists may have spread avian flu to a farm. Animal activists have tried to make the case that since the source of the outbreak cannot be conclusively proven with “absolute evidence,” this incident should be ignored. This is both absurd and misleading. It suggests that even though having protesters illegally entering and trampling over your property is a possible vector of disease, it should be ignored because there is no “absolute evidence.” Even the California Department of Food and Agriculture noted that while there was no “absolute evidence,” it was “plausible” that the virus was introduced to that farm during those incidents.

Furthermore, this risk of contamination was confirmed by the Quebec court decision in the 2022 Porgreg farm case which found 11 animal activists guilty of breaking and entering, obstructing a peace officer and mischief, after invading a pigsty and refusing to leave. Although the prosecution was not able to conclusively prove that the activists caused the subsequent illness and death of several pigs that followed their invasion, the judge noted in his decision that such actions “. . . could cause the spread of viruses or diseases that could kill many pigs, or even an entire herd. . . .”

The risk is real, and the consequences are severe. Suggesting that there is no need to discourage risky behaviour since that behaviour has not yet conclusively resulted in an outbreak is like telling your children — or, in most of our cases now, maybe your grandchildren — that they should play with matches because they have been playing with them for years and they haven't burned the house down yet. That is how absurd this is.

It simply does not matter, colleagues, if there is a provable case of an outbreak or not. Nobody argues with the fact that an outbreak is a possible and plausible consequence of an illegal invasion of private property. We can argue about whether that risk is high or low, but it cannot be argued that the risk does not exist.

• (1720)

Frankly, colleagues, anyone who supports activists storming into barns uninvited cannot honestly claim to be a supporter of animal welfare. Such activity does nothing but threaten the welfare of the very animals they claim to care about, with the potential for devastating results for both the animals in those barns and those in the surrounding farms.

Our agriculture community is asking that we pass this bill unamended to help them mitigate this risk. In closing, let me again underscore that Bill C-275 is meant to be preventative. One of its main goals is to deter unlawful behaviour before that behaviour results in disastrous consequences. The fact that animal rights organizations are fighting so hard against it demonstrates that this bill will discourage them from unlawfully entering farms. The bottom line is that producers are already incentivized to follow biosecurity protocols. Trespassers are not; therefore, this legislation is needed.

Senator Dalphond's amendment is not needed to either ensure the constitutionality of the bill or strengthen the impact of the bill on biosecurity protections. This bill as we received it from the House is supported by producers, agriculture organizations across the country, the government, current and former ministers of agriculture, Animal Health Canada and the Canadian Food Inspection Agency. The exact same amendment made by Senator Dalphond at committee was previously considered by the House of Commons Agriculture Committee and rejected. Listen to this, colleagues: Following the rejection of that amendment, at third reading, this bill was passed by a vote of 278 to 36.

I want to compare very quickly one other bill, and we are going to talk about that later in the week. The report was introduced today. Bill C-280 has also been amended by some of the same senators. That bill was voted on in the House of Commons, and the vote was 320 to 1. Then we get a committee together here with 10 senators and say we know better, and then we have a senator who says that's not our problem and not our concern. And then we say we're legitimate. Then you wonder why we say the Senate isn't legitimate. You tell us time and again how independent you are and that you're not on anyone's side. Well, are you on the side of farmers?

How can this be in a democratic society? Even if we believe we should have voting rights like they do in the House of Commons, we must believe in a democracy.

Let's say we were all united, every one of us believed the same thing, there was no dissent in this chamber and we had a full Senate of 105. The vote on Bill C-275 would be 278 to 133. Which one should win, the 278 or the 133? If we voted on Bill C-280, it would be 280 to 106. Yet we believe we have the right to do this and that it's not our concern.

Colleagues, we have an obligation to present good amendments, but what about when they have already been presented? It is the same thing with Bill C-280: It was presented in the other place, and they turned it down. But we say, "No, you guys don't know what you're talking about, and we are not dependent on anyone." I read Senator Simons's article. I'm not sure when she wrote it, but I read today where she says we're not accountable to anyone. We're not beholden to anyone. We don't report to anyone. I don't know the exact words and am not going to stumble through this, but in essence, that is what she said: that we aren't beholden to what they're doing over in the other place.

Colleagues, each of those 280, 278, 320 represent approximately 100 to maybe 130,000 people.

**Senator Housakos:** They represent voters.

**Senator Plett:** They represent voters. We don't represent them. Who are we representing? To whom are we accountable? To whom do you answer when you go home? I know to whom I answer because I'm part of a caucus, and I'm proud of it. If you aren't part of a caucus, that's fine too, but who are you accountable to?

**Senator Housakos:** Themselves.

**Senator Plett:** Are you accountable to no one? Senator Simons says we're not at fault and it doesn't matter. To whom do you report? No one, because you've been appointed. No one can kick you out of here. You've been here. Some of us have to be a little more careful because we're afraid there could well be some move to get rid of us before our time; that's been done in the past. Fortunately, I only have eight months left so by the time anything could be done, maybe I would be gone; the Senate doesn't move that fast. Nevertheless, colleagues, we are all accountable to someone.

Maybe you're independent. Maybe you don't answer to the Prime Minister. Maybe you don't answer to the Liberal caucus. However, you must answer to someone. I don't know care how smart they are or what their businesses or backgrounds are: How can 7 people be smarter than the 278, which includes, by the way, the gentleman who put you all here — who appointed every one of you? Whether you like it or not, he appointed you. He voted the right way on both of these bills. What are you going to do?

I need to underscore this point. The amendment made to Bill C-275 does not reflect the Senate's role of providing sober second thought to improve legislation sent to us by the other chamber. Because this amendment was already considered by the other place and rejected, moving this amendment again in this chamber is contrary to the clear will of the elected House of Commons.



This is the kind of behaviour that pours fuel on the fires of cynicism regarding the Senate's value and role. Senators, this is what leads to the call for the abolition of this institution, which refuses to acknowledge the will of the people and rebuffs the clear intent of their elected representatives.

I have been as strong a defender of this institution as anyone here, but these are the kinds of things that lead all of us to say that if this is as good as we can be, then this chamber needs to shut down. Should this chamber decide to go this route, we will, in the minds of many Canadians, be living up to one senator's description of this place as not being a chamber of sober second thought, but rather a "chamber of drunken second chances." That is what this will do, colleagues.

Colleagues, I urge, implore and beg you to help the farming industry. We passed two bills here today because some of us didn't care if they were brought forward by independents or Liberals; we cared about the legislation. We passed two bills just two days ago, those of Senator Colin Deacon and Senator Leo Housakos, because we didn't care who brought those bills forward; we care about this country. That's what's happening here, colleagues. People are looking at who the sponsor and critic are, and saying:

If Senator Plett is going to talk for 40 minutes, then I'm voting against it. It is not because we should vote against it but because, boy, he railed on me for so long, and now I'm angry at him. Now I'm going to vote against it for sure.

**Senator Housakos:** I'll vote for you.

**Senator Plett:** Thank you.

I urge you, colleagues, to make the right choice today. Stand up with our producers, stand up for our producers and stand up with those who support them. Reject the report of the Senate Agriculture Committee on Bill C-275 and return the bill to the version that was overwhelmingly supported by the House of Commons and passed by them at third reading.

Thank you, colleagues.

**Hon. René Cormier (The Hon. the Acting Speaker):** Senator Plett, would you take a question?

• (1730)

**Senator Plett:** If you promise to be good to me, yes.

**Hon. Denise Batters:** Senator Plett, there is one thing I'm curious about. It sounds like there were some constitutional questions raised about this, yet it sounded like the entire Liberal cabinet supported this. I'm assuming that probably included the justice minister, so I am anxious to hear about that.

In the last year, we've sadly seen a few different situations, as you were alluding to, where members on Senate committees have gutted bills that were passed by the House of Commons. I'm thinking about Bill C-234, the carbon tax exemption for farmers;

Bill C-275, which is this bill regarding biosecurity on farms; and Bill C-280, the financial protection for fresh fruit and vegetable farmers act. All of those bills would help Canadian farmers, and all of those bills were introduced in the House of Commons by Conservative MPs, but I'm sure that's just a coincidence.

Senator Plett, I am a senator from Saskatchewan, the agricultural heartland of Canada, or the breadbasket of Canada, as it is often called. It is a key part of my job to stand up for the people of my province of Saskatchewan. I regularly hear from farmers about how important these bills are to their livelihood, as you were saying you hear this from people in Manitoba.

Do the senators who are gutting these important agricultural bills realize the profoundly negative impact that their actions are having on Canadian farmers?

**Senator Plett:** Thank you very much for that question. I do need to disagree with you on one thing: I think the agricultural heartland of our country is Manitoba, but we'll leave that debate for our own caucus next week.

Senator Batters, you are absolutely correct when you talk about the coincidence that these are all Conservative bills. They are all bills that I mentioned, of course. Even though I don't agree, I understand that, at the end, there was a strong cabinet push on Bill C-234. Our government leader here pushed strongly to defeat the private member's bill, as he does when the moment suits him, but he stays out of it when the moment does not suit him. But in that particular case, he found the energy.

I can understand why Senator Dalphond, having been a staunch, strong Liberal all his life, would want to support it, and he was told by the Liberal cabinet, "We need to do this."

You are absolutely right; these were almost unanimous. As a matter of fact, on Bill C-280, one senator didn't vote. She said it was because one constituent didn't want her to vote, so she didn't, and I will allow her to answer for herself. But the rest of them did, including the Prime Minister and, indeed, the justice minister.

As you know, I'm not a constitutional expert. I've been promised by some constitutional experts and professors that they may have a few words to say about this, and I'm looking forward to hearing what they have to say. But I did ask the witness whom the government sent here — the constitutional expert — whether he had advised the government, and he had. I didn't ask him to go into what he had told the government, but he clearly advised the government that he believed it was constitutionally sound. I don't think that the justice minister would have voted for a bill that he thought would not pass muster.

I hope that answers your question, Senator Batters.

**Hon. Paula Simons:** Honourable senators, I rise to speak to the report on Bill C-275, An Act to amend the Health of Animals Act (biosecurity on farms).

And since we are all thinking about America tonight, I want to start with some American news about H5N1, or avian influenza A, known colloquially as “bird flu.” As the name suggests, the disease spreads primarily amongst birds. That includes farm-reared poultry and wild birds such as waterfowl, shorebirds and raptors.

But in the United States, disturbingly, the disease has jumped the species barrier. This strain of avian influenza is now infecting American dairy cows. It has been detected in more than 400 separate dairy herds across 14 states. And now avian influenza is showing up in the milk supply to such an extent that Tom Vilsack, the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture, informed the press this week that the U.S. Department of Agriculture is about to begin testing raw milk in bulk for signs of the virus.

I am happy to say that pasteurizing kills the disease, but in America, there is currently a big political fad for drinking raw milk, so that has the authorities there concerned about vectors for human infection.

As of last week, the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention had identified 36 cases of people infected with this strain of avian influenza; almost all of them were farm workers, primarily in Washington State and California. Some were poultry workers, while others worked on dairy farms.

While avian influenza is lethal to birds, so far the humans who have been infected have reported relatively mild illness — upper respiratory symptoms and inflamed eyes. No one has been hospitalized, and there have been no fatalities. And thus far, I am happy to say that no cases of infected cows — or people — have been reported in Canada.

But the spread of this influenza variant, which has so nimbly jumped the species barrier, should make us sit up and take notice. Some experts are concerned that if this influenza variant successfully mixes its genetic material with the more typical autumn flu strains — perhaps in a farm worker who is infected with both viruses at the same time — we could end up someplace much less pleasant.

I agree with Senator Plett; the concerns about biosecurity on farms are very real. We must protect not just our flocks and herds but also our farmers and farm workers — and everyone else — from the spread of infections that can wipe out livestock and farm livelihoods and can potentially pose the risk of igniting another pandemic.

Avian influenza is far from the only pathogen that puts people and animals at risk. We’re talking about everything from distemper to African swine fever, from hoof-and-mouth disease to bovine tuberculosis, and even COVID-19, which can be spread to and by mink being raised on fur farms.

Years ago, as a journalist, I covered the BSE crisis in Alberta, where bovine spongiform encephalopathy — otherwise known as mad cow disease — shut down Alberta’s beef exports and wiped out many producers. Even though the disease affected only a handful of cows, the fear of the disease devastated our beef industry, and it took years to recover.

So let’s talk about biosecurity on farms and what Bill C-275 does and doesn’t do to address it.

In its original and unamended form, the bill focused almost entirely on trespassers, with the goal of dissuading animal rights activists from coming onto farms and disrupting their operations.

Under the terms of the original bill, any person who entered a building or other enclosed place where animals were kept, without lawful authority or excuse, could be fined up to \$100,000 under the Health of Animals Act, if their entering such a place or taking in some animal or thing could reasonably be expected to expose the animals to a disease or toxic substance. They could also face a sentence of up to one year in prison. An organization convicted of an indictable offence under the act could face fines of up to \$500,000.

In Canada, trespass law falls under provincial jurisdiction, and fines for illegal entry range from province to province, from \$5,000 to \$10,000 up to \$25,000, for a repeat offence.

John Barlow, the Alberta MP who sponsored this bill, made his frustration with those penalties plain. Here is what he told our committee in his testimony last spring when he complained that existing provincial laws weren’t doing enough to stop animal rights activists and their fundraising campaigns:

I believe existing trespassing laws aren’t sufficient because they are not harsh enough. Last year, in the United States, these groups raised more than \$80 million from videos and so on that they are posting online. So, if we don’t have fines that are sufficient to pose a deterrent, there is really no financial hammer to stop this.

In other words, his concern was not biosecurity; it was PR.

Farms are unique as workplaces where families often have their homes on site. I can’t imagine how upsetting and disorienting it would be for a farm family to wake up in the middle of the night to find political protesters on their property.

There is also a real problem in rural areas with police response time. I know that on the Prairies, where farms are huge and often far away from RCMP detachments, many people feel helpless to deal with trespassers on their property, whether they are there to protest or simply to pilfer.

As a long-time journalist, I support a free press. I understand the public value of whistle-blowers. Animal rights activists can rightly point to cases where trespassing on farms has yielded disturbing examples of animal abuse and neglect.

Nevertheless, I think that people who commit criminal trespass as a form of civil disobedience, even with the noblest of intentions, should face appropriate penalties for doing so including, where warranted, charges of breaking and entering under the Criminal Code, if and when such charges would pertain. But the regime of fines laid out in Bill C-275 is so disproportionate as to be absurd, as Senator Plett recognized.

I say again that trespass is a provincial responsibility. By trying to create an alternate parallel trespass law, Bill C-275, as some witnesses testified, may trespass into provincial jurisdiction.

• (1740)

Let me quote again from testimony we heard at committee, this time from Angela Fernandez, a professor of law at the University of Toronto:

... First, if the bill is meant to target trespassers coming onto farms, then its title is misleading; it is not really about biosecurity on farms. You might ask what the big deal is about the mismatch between the title and the substance. In constitutional law, if you have a mismatch between the substance and what's sometimes called the purpose and effect of a statute, this can be called "colouring the law with a substitute purpose," a doctrine known in constitutional law as "colourability."

This constitutional law doctrine specifically describes a situation in which a statute has the formal trappings of being about a certain matter, but it is not really about that matter. This is a problem if that matter falls outside the jurisdiction of the government that is passing it — in this case, the federal government.

Now, let it be said that section 95 of the Constitution Act 1867 clearly divides the responsibility for agriculture between the provinces and the federal government. The federal government is well within its rights to legislate on matters involving agriculture, and that includes the Health of Animals Act. But let's look at what Bill C-275 actually does.

The original bill wouldn't just encompass animal rights protesters with a righteous political agenda. Interpreted broadly, it might capture anyone who strayed onto a farm property even if they were there for a relatively innocuous reason, such as hunting or snowmobiling, or a more nefarious one, such as straight-up theft. In other words, the bill, as originally drafted, could lead to the extraordinary punishment of trespassers of all sorts under the guise of biosecurity.

Provinces certainly have the power to enact higher trespass fines, if they so wish, to protect rural landowners. But it's disingenuous to pretend this bill, as drafted, was primarily about biosecurity because even leaving the constitutional debate aside, Bill C-275, as presented to our committee, was poorly conceived public policy.

My friends, there has never been a confirmed case in Canada of an animal disease being spread and carried by protesters — never. Even in the one case that Senator Plett cited from Sonoma County in California, it was found that trespassers were a plausible vector. It was also found that the area was rich in shorebirds and waterfowl, which could also have caused the contamination.

Why has there never been a confirmed case in Canada of an animal disease being spread and carried by protesters? Well, there are two obvious reasons for this. One is that such farm protests don't happen all that often — they are outliers. The other is that protesters, many of them being city folk, aren't all that likely to spread an agricultural pathogen if and when they come to a farmyard. If you or I were to show up to protest at a farm, we would be unlikely to have pathogens dangerous to livestock clinging to our shoes, clothes or car tires.

The far greater risks, as you well might imagine, are more mundane and the more quotidian. They may come from people who travel from farm to farm making deliveries, doing maintenance or selling supplies. There can be issues too if farmers share machinery and move equipment from barn to barn, potentially spreading diseases if they don't use the kind of washing equipment that Senator Plett referenced. Then there's the issue of cross-contamination within a farm operation, which might explain how avian flu ended up infecting thousands of dairy cows across the United States.

At the same time, we learned in our committee that biosecurity protocols in Canada are largely voluntary. The Canadian Food Inspection Agency, or CFIA, does not enforce them. It is left to producer groups to make sure farmers are following good biohazard protocols. But if producers break those rules, the producer groups can only impose economic or social sanctions and not legal penalties. How absurd would it be to have a law that set huge fines for trespassers coming onto farms but no fines at all for the people whose negligence might far more realistically cause contagion?

So after hearing all the testimony, our committee agreed on an amendment to address the problem. It removes the phrase "without lawful authority or excuse" from the first clause of the bill. This would mean that any person could be prosecuted if they're entering an enclosed place or taking in an animal or thing could reasonably be expected to expose animals to a disease or toxic substance. They could be prosecuted if they were trespassers, negligent farm operators or negligent farm workers.

That wouldn't mean that you could prosecute a hapless farm employee or temporary foreign worker for making an innocent mistake. The law would still only apply to people who commit acts that could "reasonably be expected" to spread disease. Indeed, the law would actually protect farm workers, including economically vulnerable temporary foreign workers, by making their work sites safer and healthier and minimizing the threat of the spread of disease to those who earn their living caring for livestock.

Senator Plett asked me if I were a friend of farmers. I think, based on my experience covering the bovine spongiform encephalopathy, or BSE, outbreak, that protecting farm livelihoods is being a friend to farmers. When I said things were not our problem, as Senator Plett well knows, I was not referencing the situation of biosecurity on farms; I was referring to the shenanigans and the antics in the other place, which are most assuredly not our problem.

This is an amendment that we passed at committee after seven hearings and 10 hours of expert testimony from livestock producers, veterinarians, law professors, infectious disease experts and, yes, animal rights activists. We didn't take that action lightly or because we wanted to score ideological or political points. We did it out of a sincere concern about biosecurity on farms and a wish to help craft legislation that actually works to protect farmers, farm animals and human health.

If we vote against this report, we not only strip the bill of a vital amendment designed to enhance public health and safety, we also eliminate an important observation passed by our committee, noting that our biosecurity rules in Canada are voluntary on-farm and calling on the government and the CFIA to reconsider that state of affairs.

For the Senate to vote down a report from a committee that worked long and hard on this bill in a good faith and non-partisan way should be an extraordinary step, reserved for times when a committee has strayed somewhat out of bounds or when the committee made a decision perhaps without possession of all the facts. We should not make a precedent of voting down a report simply because some parliamentarians did not like the result of a committee's work. Based on that logic, we could relitigate every committee decision.

So I ask, let us please accept this report and begin third reading debate in earnest and hash out these issues in this chamber, where they deserve to be heard, because we are on the side of farmers and on the side of Canadians. We need to craft legislation with sober second thought, exercising our responsibilities to analyze private member's bills and hold them to the scrutiny that they deserve, not just to protect farm animals and people who work on farms but to protect the human health of everybody who might be vulnerable to the viruses that are out there. Thank you. *Hiy hiy.*

**Hon. Brent Cotter:** Honourable senators, I rise to speak to the Standing Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry's report on Bill C-275.

Now, I'm no longer on the beloved and occasionally overpopulated Agriculture and Forestry Committee, but my fondness for its work is undiminished. I don't hold myself out as an expert in the area of agriculture, certainly not with respect to the policy and substance of Bill C-275. I'm reading, listening to and observing the decisions of others on this bill, especially in the other place.

[ Senator Simons ]

For now, and speaking to the report, I intend to confine my remarks to the issue of those who advanced amendments to Bill C-275 on a key basis, a basis that the original bill was about trespassing and, consequentially, an unconstitutional intrusion into provincial jurisdiction over property and civil rights. Therefore, it required an amendment to the bill as reported back to us.

I have nothing to say about motive or the use of this debate as some form of political football. That's not my interest. My main point will be that the issue of constitutionality is a wrongheaded interpretation of both the legislation and the Constitution's division of powers between the federal and provincial orders of government.

I want to start by describing how we in this place should think about these questions of alleged unconstitutionality, something that we hear on a relatively regular basis. Indeed, you will recall that, with respect to nearly every piece of legislation that comes to us, the Attorney General provides a Charter statement — sometimes helpful, sometimes less helpful — on questions of unconstitutionality as it relates to the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. It is my considered view, only slightly related to this conversation, that we also ought to be having statements from the Attorney General of Canada regarding the question of constitutionality as it regards the division of powers, historically the main constitutional question that bedeviled our country and enriched constitutional lawyers.

• (1750)

As a matter of principle, in my view, we ought to take the same approach to the questions of constitutionality regardless of our support for or opposition to a piece of legislation. That is, we ought not to approach the question in an opportunistic way as it suits our particular interests in the moment, so to speak. The Constitution of Canada deserves better than to serve as a tool for this form of argument.

Now, one approach would be to accept the view of those who say that questions of constitutionality should be left to the courts. This is certainly attractive, but I suggest to you that this is too simplistic an approach and, in a certain way, beneath us. Each of us took an oath or affirmation, and it includes a commitment to the Constitution of Canada. Surely, this does not mean, at the very least, that we would turn a blind eye to the question of constitutionality with respect to every law we examine in this place. Surely, we owe it to Canadians to say with a certain level of confidence that a law we propose to pass appears to meet the requirements of the most fundamental law in our country. Less than this is surely an abdication of responsibility.

At the other end of the spectrum, surely, we are not required to provide a seal of certainty on every piece of legislation over which we deliberate. The best constitution lawyers can't and won't do that, and so a standard of constitutional perfection is both ridiculous and beyond us. So we are somewhere in between.

Let me offer some points to consider before I turn to questions of this bill.

Legislation starts with the presumption of constitutionality. With government legislation, the Attorney General provides, as I mentioned, Charter statements — a form of constitutional imprimatur — and the Attorney General has a legal obligation to be attentive to that question, especially where there's a fairly high — maybe very high — probability of unconstitutionality. It's not certainty but significant.

Nor can it be that we should set aside legislation where there is an arguable case as to unconstitutionality. This message, this standard, was articulated by the constitutional experts who testified at the Agriculture and Forestry Committee.

Most controversial laws lend themselves to an arguable case of unconstitutionality, so this cannot possibly be the basis upon which we would withhold our approval of legislation. With respect, that would be a dangerously low bar, and it's not the one the Attorney General of Canada applies.

In my view, this leaves us trying to identify a fairly high standard, something in the vicinity of "at least probably or a high degree of probability of unconstitutionality," closer to the language that guides the Attorney General.

This key is to have an immutable standard that we should embrace for every piece of legislation, and not move it around as suits our will. You might be saying to yourself, "Well, I'm not a constitutional lawyer. How am I to know?" That's a fair point. But like everything in this place where we lack the knowledge or skill set — and I just referred to my own deficit with respect to agriculture — we listen carefully, we consult and we do the best we can.

So if this, or something close to it, is the standard, let's look at the original law here and see if it fits that "probably unconstitutional" standard. The main argument is that the prohibition on entering property without lawful excuse where animals are kept is really a trespass and an intrusion into provincial jurisdiction. Senator Plett and Senator Simons helpfully laid the groundwork for that. A secondary argument is that the legislation purports to do something within federal jurisdiction — creating a federal offence — but is really intended to do something else within provincial jurisdiction and is therefore "colourable" — that is, an unconstitutional "end-around," if I could call it that.

My first point is that the law forbids entry for a particular purpose, which could have serious consequences. There is some debate on how serious or not, but nevertheless, that's the point. On its face, it's a valid exercise of federal criminal law jurisdiction, and I'll say more about that in a moment.

My second point is that activities can have more than one aspect from a constitutional point of view, in this case, trespass and a crime. Many driving offences have this: provincial driving offences and dangerous driving or driving under the influence of alcohol. The same event might bring together two legitimate laws burdening, in this case, the driver, with the provincial law regarding maybe careless driving or — you name it — speeding, but also the federal law about dangerous driving. When we have that situation, we have what is known as a law that has a double aspect where both the provincial law and the federal law are valid. So the legislation that's being proposed does not in any

way invalidate provincial laws of trespass. It tries to establish, probably on the basis of criminal law, a criminal offence for the same kind of behaviour. As I say, in this context, they would both be valid.

Let me offer what I think is a compelling example of this. It highlights a few significant words. It is the reference regarding genetic non-discrimination. It was a constitutional reference that went to the Supreme Court of Canada. It was found to be valid as a matter of criminal law. It was a law criminalizing compulsory genetic testing and the non-consensual use of genetic test results. It's a valid criminal law despite an unquestionable overlap with provincial jurisdiction over property and civil rights because it was a valid exercise of the criminal law power, which required three things: number one, a prohibition; number two, a penalty; and number three, that it be directed at a legitimate public purpose such as health, public order, security, morality or the environment.

Well, there are a few words in there, and you can take your pick, but surely some of them apply to this law. And then, as a matter of having more than one aspect, you can see that in genetic testing. Part of it is provincial jurisdiction over health, property and civil rights, but part of it governed by the criminal law, which is what the genetic testing legislation did. Both are constitutional, which should take us to the view that Bill C-275 should not be tampered with on constitutional grounds.

I want to take you to another argument that Senator Simons and I discussed earlier and to which she made reference. The bill is focused unquestionably on what happens on farms. That's the whole point of the bill. The bill, at its core, is about agriculture. In constitutional terms, Bill C-275 is "in relation to agriculture." This is pretty obvious, and we have already acknowledged this. Where do we send the bill? I know he secretly calls it the "Rob Black and friends committee," but it is the Agriculture Committee. It's where we send bills dealing with — you got it — agriculture. You may be saying at this point: What's the big deal?

It is this. When we think about the division of powers between federal and provincial governments, between Ottawa and the provinces, we nearly always think about sections 91 and 92 of the Constitution Act. They're big long lists, but whether you like it or not, we have to pay some attention to those lists because our job is limited to the section 91 list. That's how it's taught in law school, and most of the big constitutional action prior to the Charter was about those two sections of the Constitution.

But section 95, as Senator Simons observed, gives power to the federal government in relation to agriculture. Indeed, it is a concurrent jurisdiction with the provinces, but it is so powerful that the Constitution recognizes that in the case of a conflict, federal legislation in relation to agriculture dominates. It is, in the language of constitutional law, paramount.

This isn't conflict between federal and provincial agriculture law, but I think it conveys to us a fairly powerful statement of the meaningfulness of the federal jurisdiction over agriculture. Indeed, the focus with respect to that federal jurisdiction tends to be with respect to agriculture as it applies to what happens on the farm. One of the constraints is that once food goes into the food distribution chain, it becomes a more complicated issue, but the farm activity is thought of as predominantly federally regulated.

You may like or not like Bill C-275 in its original form, although as Senator Plett noted — and he stole my observation of this — 278 members of Parliament liked it. But the argument that it was constitutional in its original form is compelling. The need for a committee amendment for the purpose of establishing its constitutionality just doesn't hold water.

• (1800)

The bill, in the form in which it came to us, possessed a constitutional “belt,” which is criminal law, and “suspenders,” which is agriculture. If that is not enough, and as has already been noted, a parliamentarian who has the greatest official legal duty — and I've written about when attorneys general have failed in this regard, including a member of Senator Plett's party — to uphold the constitutionality of our laws, the Attorney General of Canada voted for this bill in its original form twice.

Thank you very much.

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Manuelle Oudar:** Thank you for giving me this opportunity to speak. I decided to rise today as a member of the Standing Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, but also as the former president of a board that has promoted workplace health and safety for many years. I will be brief, much briefer than my colleagues, but I thank each of the senators who spoke today for their insight.

I also want to thank the members of the Standing Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, because I really appreciated the debates that were held. Thank you to the committee chair, Senator Black, and to all of the committee members: Senators Simons, Burey, Dalphond, Klyne, Marshall, McBean, McNair, Petitclerc, Richards and Sorensen.

We all understand the importance of the subject now before us. Here are some figures from Statistics Canada. The agriculture and agri-food industry employs 2.3 million people in Canada, which represents one in nine jobs in Canada. It generates \$150 billion or close to 7% of our GDP. I think that we all understand how important this subject is.

The committee heard from many groups and witnesses. I think that all members of the Standing Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry want to do their job properly.

Today's debate is very healthy. We've heard a lot about biosecurity. That's our goal. We've also heard constitutional perspectives. I'm grateful to Senator Cotter for his constitutional insights.

[ Senator Cotter ]

I'm not going to talk to you about the constitutional aspects today. I've reviewed everything that happened in the other place, including the votes and the constitutional analysis. I've assimilated all of it, and I respect the work that's been done on this.

I'm not going to talk to you about constitutional law or freedom of expression, either. As a lawyer, I hold freedom of expression very dear. It's protected by the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. As you all know, the Charter takes precedence over any act passed in Canada.

Instead, I'm going to talk about the amendment, but before I do that, I'd like us to take the time to review proposed section 9.1 in the bill. This bill essentially has two clauses. That's what I'll be talking to you about for the next few minutes. Proposed section 9.1 reads as follows:

No person shall, without lawful authority or excuse, enter a building or other enclosed place in which animals are kept, or take in any animal or thing —

— like a camera, for example —

— if their entering such a place or taking in the animal or thing could reasonably be expected to result in the exposure of the animals to a disease or toxic substance —

— and that's not all, because that substance also has to be “capable of affecting or contaminating them”.

So you see, colleagues, there are several steps that have to be followed, and I believe that the use of the conditional tense in the proposed section demonstrates that all the necessary assessments were done and that it was determined that this wording would not infringe on either freedom of expression or freedom of information. The proposed section is clear on this point, which is why I now want to draw your attention to the amendment.

The amendment proposed by my colleague Senator Dalphond would delete the words “without lawful authority or excuse.” The proposed section would therefore read as follows: “No person shall enter a building or other enclosed place in which animals are kept . . . .”

If these words can be deleted, then what purpose were they serving? This was why I objected in committee to the amendment proposing to delete them. I think it would violate the rights of workers who are on the premises to perform job-related duties, for example. In fact, it would deny them a defence, because this bill provides for criminal offences.

For example, a worker who is present on a farm and who is accused of bringing in a substance that is capable of contaminating the animals could face criminal charges. By removing the words “without lawful authority or excuse,” we would be denying workers a defence, so it would no longer be available to them in court. That is why I objected to deleting those words.

As I was telling you earlier, honourable senators, 2.3 million people work in the agriculture and agri-food sector. However, according to Statistics Canada, if we only consider primary agriculture, which refers to crops and livestock, it alone employs 278,373 workers.

I'm new to the Senate, but I decided that my duty will be to advocate for workers, but also all Canadians, to uphold their rights and protect defences that they may need to use in court. As I mentioned not only to my colleague Senator Dalphond, but also to all the senators I have had the privilege of interacting with on this important topic, that is precisely why I was against deleting these words.

I trust both the wisdom of the committee members and the wisdom of the Senate. Since joining the Senate, I have been impressed by the sound judgment of all senators. The debate we are currently having is healthy and useful, and I thank all senators who have shared their insights. There is a French expression that says that enlightenment comes when ideas collide, but I'm confident that we'll come up with a good solution. I urge my colleagues to protect workers, but also, since you mentioned inspections, I believe that people who are on the premises should have a lawful authority or excuse to enter. It would be inconceivable if health and safety inspectors, for example, couldn't rely on such a defence in court.

That concludes my brief remarks today, specifically on the amendment, and I thank you for the opportunity to speak to this issue, honourable senators.

[*English*]

**Hon. Judy A. White:** Honourable senators, I move that further debate be adjourned to the next sitting of the Senate.

**Some Hon. Senators:** No.

**The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore:** Senator Pate, would you like to ask a question, or are you speaking on debate?

**Hon. Kim Pate:** On debate.

Honourable senators, I speak today as the critic of Bill C-275. I would like to speak to the report.

No doubt it goes without saying that protecting the health and safety of animals and workers on farms is of the utmost importance to farmers, producers, workers, consumers and animal welfare advocates alike — in fact, to all Canadians. Putting preventive measures and practices in place to keep animals healthy has been a long-standing and successful practice on Canadian farms.

Although it is mostly a provincial area of regulatory responsibility, at the federal level, the Health of Animals Act provides a legislative framework for the Canadian Food Inspection Agency to address issues with respect to animal disease and biosecurity.

• (1810)

When we first received this bill at the Standing Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, it was not debated at second reading. Its preventive measures only applied and were targeted to a small group of people deemed to be on farms without lawful authority or excuse. This targeting was at odds with how this bill was presented. It was characterized as an attempt to regulate and ensure animal health and biosecurity on farms. Indeed, its focus on only some of those who may be present on farms, and particularly the bill's resulting criminal law sanctions, made the bill seem more like an attempt to impose rather arbitrary anti-trespass laws that did not address biosecurity threats on farms directly.

The amendment that was brought forward at committee removed this inconsistency and ensured that the offence for exposing animals to disease that is being created in this bill now applies to all those who pose this risk. Concerned witnesses argued that the bill aimed to target only trespassers on farms rather than actually focusing on how best to address known serious risks to biosecurity on farms.

Perhaps most notably, Dr. Mary Jane Ireland, the Chief Veterinary Officer and Executive Director at the Canadian Food Inspection Agency, or CFIA, told the committee, "The CFIA is not aware of any confirmed cases of animal disease in Canada due to trespassers."

The only examples consistently brought up to justify the need for this bill to be targeted at protesters were actually disproven at committee. For instance, the sponsor and others pointed to a case in Saint-Hyacinthe where a pig farm was targeted by protesters who were alleged to have caused an outbreak of rotavirus. Contrary to the insinuation at committee, an investigation of the farm by the Ministère de l'Agriculture, des Pêcheries et de l'Alimentation du Québec, or the Quebec Ministry of Agriculture, found that — rather than the entry of protesters — animal density, accumulation of manure, inadequate ventilation and insect infestation were more likely causes of an outbreak of rotavirus.

The protesters involved were charged and convicted with breaking and entering and obstructing police, not merely trespassing. But neither the Crown nor the judge found any merit to claims of any sufficient evidence to support that these trespassers were linked to the outbreak.

Similarly, the committee was advised that contrary to the narrative that a distemper outbreak on an Ontario mink farm was the result of protesters being on the farm, evidence actually pointed to the release of the minks by protesters, following which:

One or multiple mink that would have been released would have had to come into contact with an animal outside. . . .

The releasing of animals in this manner is already illegal under the existing criminal law on mischief and various provincial anti-trespass and anti-interference legislation. For example, in Ontario there is a clause in the Security from Trespass and Protecting Food Safety Act for a prohibition against interference or interaction with any farm animal in or on an animal protection zone on a farm, an animal processing facility or prescribed premises without prior consent. Any breach of this provision allows the court to make a restitution order to pay damages for any loss or damage suffered by the owner, including for diseases brought onto the farm, and a penalty of \$15,000 for a first offence and \$25,000 for any subsequent offence.

In the case of this bill, being so fixated on trespass as the cause of biosecurity risks, it actually missed a very real biosecurity risk posed by interactions with wild animals. The sponsor of the bill in the House of Commons also pointed to a case in the United States of a Sonoma Valley avian flu outbreak that we've already heard a bit about as evidence of the need for the bill's provisions.

At committee, the House of Commons sponsor asserted that the California Department of Food and Agriculture report issued on this case definitively connected protesters to the outbreak. However, the report actually says that the avian flu outbreak was most likely introduced by wild birds or the wind, possibly one of the two employees who were cohabiting but who worked on different farms in breach of established biosecurity protocols on both of the two farms or a handful of other plausible biosecurity risks found on the farms. Nothing in this bill would address or prevent risks to health and safety of animals based on those factors from their report.

This is not to say that people who trespass on farms where animals are kept cannot possibly introduce an infectious disease. This is possible. However, as we heard:

... it is simply orders of magnitude more likely to occur as a result of workers who have daily close interactions with the animals. . . .

For this reason alone, the amendment makes perfect sense. It is in line with the crucial need to take biosecurity on farms seriously. In fact, if the bill is to truly address biosecurity on farms, then this amendment does nothing more than remove the targeting of this bill to only one group — on the basis of a hypothetical possibility that is highly unlikely to occur — in order to apply its measure to all on farms and ensure that the bill meets its purpose in a more meaningful way.

The Agriculture Committee's amendment would make the bill more likely to decrease biosecurity risks on farms. However, there is much evidence that much more is needed to be done. The evidence and facts that we heard at committee tell us so.

Colleagues, this is not a novel amendment. A previous iteration of this, Bill C-205 in the Second Session of the Forty-third Parliament, was amended in this exact same way in the other place by their Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food. The amendment occurred for the same reason that Bill C-275 was amended by our Agriculture Committee.

[ Senator Pate ]

So although this bill may have the proverbial belt and suspenders, if I may carry that discussion a little further from Senator Cotter's analogy, it actually lacks the pants it needs to ensure that biosecurity needs are met.

To make sure that the bill truly addresses its stated purpose of ensuring biosecurity on farms, much more is needed, but at this point, this version of the bill ensures that its application is directed to all and responds to the activities that evidence indicates are most likely to be the sources of risk to biosecurity on farms, absent wild birds and other wild animals.

It is for these reasons that I will be voting in support of this report. Thank you, *meegwetch*.

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Pierre J. Dalphond:** Honourable senators, I would like to speak to the amendment, but I am not ready to do so at this time. I move that the debate be adjourned for the balance of my time.

**The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore:** It is moved by the Honourable Senator Dalphond, seconded by the Honourable Senator White, that further debate be adjourned until the next sitting of the Senate.

Is it your pleasure, honourable senators, to adopt the motion?

**Some Hon. Senators:** Agreed.

**Some Hon. Senators:** No.

[*English*]

**The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore:** All those in favour of the motion will please say "yea."

**Some Hon. Senators:** Yea.

**The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore:** All those opposed to the motion will please say "nay."

**Some Hon. Senators:** Nay.

**The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore:** In my opinion the "yeas" have it.

*And two honourable senators having risen:*

**The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore:** Do we have agreement on a bell? Thirty minutes. Is there leave for 30 minutes?

**Hon. Senators:** Agreed.

**The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore:** The vote will occur at 6:48. Call in the senators.



• (1850)

Motion agreed to on the following division:

YEAS  
THE HONOURABLE SENATORS

|             |                  |
|-------------|------------------|
| Adler       | Kingston         |
| Arnot       | LaBoucane-Benson |
| Aucoin      | Loffreda         |
| Audette     | MacAdam          |
| Bernard     | McBean           |
| Busson      | McNair           |
| Cardozo     | Mégie            |
| Cormier     | Miville-Dechêne  |
| Coyle       | Moncion          |
| Cuzner      | Moreau           |
| Dagenais    | Muggli           |
| Dalphonf    | Pate             |
| Dasko       | Petitclerc       |
| Dean        | Petten           |
| Duncan      | Senior           |
| Francis     | Simons           |
| Fridhandler | Varone           |
| Gerba       | White            |
| Gignac      | Woo              |
| Gold        | Youance          |
| Hartling    | Yussuff—42       |

NAYS  
THE HONOURABLE SENATORS

|             |        |
|-------------|--------|
| Ataullahjan | Martin |
| Batters     | Oudar  |
| Burey       | Plett  |

|                               |   |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Carignan                      | Ravalia   |
| Deacon ( <i>Nova Scotia</i> ) | Richards  |
| Deacon ( <i>Ontario</i> )     | Robinson  |
| Downe                         | Ross  |
| Forest                        | Saint-Germain                                     |
| Galvez                        | Seidman   |
| Housakos                      | Sorensen  |
| MacDonald                     | Tannas  |
| Manning                       | Wells ( <i>Newfoundland and<br/>Labrador</i> )—25 |
| Marshall                      |   |

ABSTENTIONS  
THE HONOURABLE SENATORS

Nil

**Hon. Donald Neil Plett (Leader of the Opposition)** moved:

That the Senate do now adjourn.

He said: Your Honour, as we did last week, I think we should go home, collect our thoughts and decide whether we want to come back and work collaboratively. I suggest we do that overnight and come back tomorrow refreshed to deal with all the government business before us. With that in mind, I move the adjournment of the Senate.

**The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore:** Is it your pleasure, honourable senators, to adopt the motion?

**Hon. Senators:** Agreed.

(Motion agreed to.)

(At 6:56 p.m., pursuant to the order adopted by the Senate earlier this day, the Senate adjourned until 2 p.m., tomorrow.)



**THE SPEAKER**

The Honourable Raymonde Gagné

**THE GOVERNMENT REPRESENTATIVE IN THE SENATE**

The Honourable Marc Gold

**THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION**

The Honourable Donald Neil Plett

**FACILITATOR OF THE INDEPENDENT SENATORS GROUP**

The Honourable Raymonde Saint-Germain

**THE LEADER OF THE CANADIAN SENATORS GROUP**

The Honourable Scott Tannas

**THE LEADER OF THE PROGRESSIVE SENATE GROUP**

The Honourable Pierre J. Dalphond

---

**OFFICERS OF THE SENATE**

**CLERK OF THE SENATE AND CLERK OF THE PARLIAMENTS**

Shaila Anwar

**LAW CLERK AND PARLIAMENTARY COUNSEL**

Philippe Hallée

**USHER OF THE BLACK ROD**

J. Greg Peters

## THE MINISTRY

(In order of precedence)

(November 1, 2024)

|                                      |   |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| The Right Hon. Justin Trudeau        | Prime Minister  |
| The Hon. Chrystia Freeland           | Minister of Finance   |
|                                      | Deputy Prime Minister   |
| The Hon. Lawrence MacAulay           | Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food   |
| The Hon. Dominic LeBlanc             | Minister of Public Safety, Democratic Institutions and Intergovernmental Affairs            |
|                                      | Minister of Public Services and Procurement   |
| The Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos            | Minister of National Revenue  |
| The Hon. Marie-Claude Bibeau         | Minister of Foreign Affairs   |
| The Hon. Mélanie Joly                | Minister of Fisheries, Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard                                  |
| The Hon. Diane Lebouthillier         | President of the King's Privy Council for Canada  |
| The Hon. Harjit S. Sajjan            | Minister of Emergency Preparedness  |
|                                      | Minister responsible for the Pacific Economic Development Agency of Canada                  |
|                                      | Minister of Sport and Physical Activity   |
| The Hon. Carla Qualtrough            | Minister of Indigenous Services   |
| The Hon. Patty Hajdu                 | Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario       |
|                                      | Minister of Innovation, Science and Industry  |
| The Hon. François-Philippe Champagne | Leader of the Government in the House of Commons  |
| The Hon. Karina Gould                | Minister of International Development   |
| The Hon. Ahmed Hussen                | Minister of Veterans Affairs  |
| The Hon. Ginette Petitpas Taylor     | Associate Minister of National Defence  |
|                                      | Minister of National Defence  |
|                                      | Minister of Export Promotion, International Trade and Economic Development                  |
|                                      | Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Southern Ontario       |
| The Hon. Jonathan Wilkinson          | Minister of Energy and National Resources   |
| The Hon. Anita Anand                 | Minister of Transport   |
|                                      | President of the Treasury Board   |
| The Hon. Steven Guilbeault           | Minister of Environment and Climate Change  |
| The Hon. Marc Miller                 | Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship   |
| The Hon. Dan Vandal                  | Minister responsible for Prairies Economic Development Canada                               |
|                                      | Minister responsible for the Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency                  |
|                                      | Minister of Northern Affairs  |
| The Hon. Randy Boissonnault          | Minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Official Languages                        |
| The Hon. Sean Fraser                 | Minister of Housing, Infrastructure and Communities   |
| The Hon. Mark Holland                | Minister of Health  |
| The Hon. Gudie Hutchings             | Minister responsible for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency                           |
|                                      | Minister of Rural Economic Development  |
|                                      | Minister for Women and Gender Equality and Youth  |
| The Hon. Marci Ien                   | Minister of Diversity, Inclusion and Persons with Disabilities                              |
| The Hon. Kamal Khara                 | Minister of Canadian Heritage   |
| The Hon. Pascale St-Onge             | Minister of Labour and Seniors  |
| The Hon. Steven MacKinnon            | Minister of Crown-Indigenous Relations  |
| The Hon. Gary Anandasangaree         | Minister of Citizens' Services  |
| The Hon. Terry Beech                 | Minister of Tourism   |
| The Hon. Soraya Martinez Ferrada     | Minister responsible for the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Region of Quebec |
|                                      | Minister of Mental Health and Addictions  |
|                                      | Associate Minister of Health  |
| The Hon. Jenna Sudds                 | Minister of Families, Children and Social Development                                       |
| The Hon. Rechie Valdez               | Minister of Small Business  |
| The Hon. Arif Virani                 | Minister of Justice   |
|                                      | Attorney General of Canada  |

# SENATORS OF CANADA

## ACCORDING TO SENIORITY

(November 1, 2024)

| Senator                              | Designation                            | Post Office Address               |
|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|
| The Honourable                       |  |                                   |
| Jane Cordy.....                      | Nova Scotia.....                       | Dartmouth, N.S.                   |
| Pierrette Ringuette.....             | New Brunswick.....                     | Edmundston, N.B.                  |
| Percy E. Downe.....                  | Charlottetown.....                     | Charlottetown, P.E.I.             |
| Paul J. Massicotte.....              | De Lanaudière.....                     | Mont-Saint-Hilaire, Que.          |
| Stephen Greene.....                  | Halifax - The Citadel.....             | Halifax, N.S.                     |
| Michael L. MacDonald.....            | Cape Breton.....                       | Dartmouth, N.S.                   |
| Pamela Wallin.....                   | Saskatchewan.....                      | Wadena, Sask.                     |
| Yonah Martin.....                    | British Columbia.....                  | Vancouver, B.C.                   |
| Patrick Brazeau.....                 | Repentigny.....                        | Maniwaki, Que.                    |
| Leo Housakos.....                    | Wellington.....                        | Laval, Que.                       |
| Donald Neil Plett.....               | Landmark.....                          | Landmark, Man.                    |
| Claude Carignan, P.C.....            | Mille Isles.....                       | Saint-Eustache, Que.              |
| Elizabeth Marshall.....              | Newfoundland and Labrador.....         | Paradise, Nfld. & Lab.            |
| Judith G. Seidman.....               | De la Durantaye.....                   | Saint-Raphaël, Que.               |
| Rose-May Poirier.....                | New Brunswick—Saint-Louis-de-Kent..... | Saint-Louis-de-Kent, N.B.         |
| Salma Ataullahjan.....               | Ontario (Toronto).....                 | Toronto, Ont.                     |
| Fabian Manning.....                  | Newfoundland and Labrador.....         | St. Bride's, Nfld. & Lab.         |
| Larry W. Smith.....                  | Saurel.....                            | Hudson, Que.                      |
| Josée Verner, P.C.....               | Montarville.....                       | Saint-Augustin-de-Desmaures, Que. |
| Jean-Guy Dagenais.....               | Victoria.....                          | Blainville, Que.                  |
| David M. Wells.....                  | Newfoundland and Labrador.....         | St. John's, Nfld. & Lab.          |
| Denise Batters.....                  | Saskatchewan.....                      | Regina, Sask.                     |
| Scott Tannas.....                    | Alberta.....                           | High River, Alta.                 |
| Peter Harder, P.C.....               | Ottawa.....                            | Manotick, Ont.                    |
| Raymonde Gagné, <i>Speaker</i> ..... | Manitoba.....                          | Winnipeg, Man.                    |
| Ratna Omidvar.....                   | Ontario.....                           | Toronto, Ont.                     |
| Chantal Petitclerc.....              | Grandville.....                        | Montreal, Que.                    |
| Yuen Pau Woo.....                    | British Columbia.....                  | North Vancouver, B.C.             |
| René Cormier.....                    | New Brunswick.....                     | Caraquet, N.B.                    |
| Nancy J. Hartling.....               | New Brunswick.....                     | Riverview, N.B.                   |
| Kim Pate.....                        | Ontario.....                           | Ottawa, Ont.                      |
| Tony Dean.....                       | Ontario.....                           | Toronto, Ont.                     |
| Wanda Thomas Bernard.....            | Nova Scotia (East Preston).....        | East Preston, N.S.                |
| Lucie Moncion.....                   | Ontario.....                           | North Bay, Ont.                   |
| Marilou McPhedran.....               | Manitoba.....                          | Winnipeg, Man.                    |
| Gwen Boniface.....                   | Ontario.....                           | Orillia, Ont.                     |
| Éric Forest.....                     | Gulf.....                              | Rimouski, Que.                    |
| Marc Gold.....                       | Stadacona.....                         | Westmount, Que.                   |
| Marie-Françoise Mégie.....           | Rougemont.....                         | Montreal, Que.                    |
| Raymonde Saint-Germain.....          | De la Vallière.....                    | Quebec City, Que.                 |
| Rosa Galvez.....                     | Bedford.....                           | Lévis, Que.                       |
| David Richards.....                  | New Brunswick.....                     | Fredericton, N.B.                 |
| Mary Coyle.....                      | Nova Scotia.....                       | Antigonish, N.S.                  |
| Mary Jane McCallum.....              | Manitoba.....                          | Winnipeg, Man.                    |
| Robert Black.....                    | Ontario.....                           | Centre Wellington, Ont.           |
| Marty Deacon.....                    | Waterloo Region.....                   | Waterloo, Ont.                    |
| Yvonne Boyer.....                    | Ontario.....                           | Merrickville-Wolford, Ont.        |
| Mohamed-Iqbal Ravalia.....           | Newfoundland and Labrador.....         | Twillingate, Nfld. & Lab.         |

| Senator                | Designation               | Post Office Address         |
|------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Pierre J. Dalphond     | De Lorimier               | Montreal, Que.              |
| Donna Dasko            | Ontario                   | Toronto, Ont.               |
| Colin Deacon           | Nova Scotia               | Halifax, N.S.               |
| Julie Miville-Dechêne  | Inkerman                  | Mont-Royal, Que.            |
| Bev Busson             | British Columbia          | North Okanagan Region, B.C. |
| Marty Klyne            | Saskatchewan              | White City, Sask.           |
| Patti LaBoucane-Benson | Alberta                   | Spruce Grove, Alta.         |
| Paula Simons           | Alberta                   | Edmonton, Alta.             |
| Peter M. Boehm         | Ontario                   | Ottawa, Ont.                |
| Brian Francis          | Prince Edward Island      | Rocky Point, P.E.I.         |
| Dawn Anderson          | Northwest Territories     | Yellowknife, N.W.T.         |
| Pat Duncan             | Yukon                     | Whitehorse, Yukon           |
| Rosemary Moodie        | Ontario                   | Toronto, Ont.               |
| Stan Kutcher           | Nova Scotia               | Halifax, N.S.               |
| Tony Loffreda          | Shawinigan                | Montreal, Que.              |
| Brent Cotter           | Saskatchewan              | Saskatoon, Sask.            |
| Hassan Yussuff         | Ontario                   | Toronto, Ont.               |
| Bernadette Clement     | Ontario                   | Cornwall, Ont.              |
| Jim Quinn              | New Brunswick             | Saint John, N.B.            |
| Karen Sorensen         | Alberta                   | Banff, Alta.                |
| Amina Gerba            | Rigaud                    | Blainville, Que.            |
| Clément Gignac         | Kennebec                  | Lac Saint-Joseph, Que.      |
| Michèle Audette        | De Salaberry              | Quebec City, Que.           |
| David M. Arnot         | Saskatchewan              | Saskatoon, Sask.            |
| Flordeliz (Gigi) Osler | Manitoba                  | Winnipeg, Man.              |
| Margo Greenwood        | British Columbia          | Vernon, B.C.                |
| Sharon Burey           | Ontario                   | Windsor, Ont.               |
| Andrew Cardozo         | Ontario                   | Ottawa, Ont.                |
| Rebecca Patterson      | Ontario                   | Ottawa, Ont.                |
| Iris G. Petten         | Newfoundland and Labrador | St. John's, Nfld. & Lab.    |
| Jane MacAdam           | Prince Edward Island      | West St. Peters, P.E.I.     |
| Judy A. White          | Newfoundland and Labrador | St. George's, Nfld. & Lab.  |
| Paul J. Prosper        | Nova Scotia               | Hants County, N.S.          |
| Joan Kingston          | New Brunswick             | New Maryland, N.B.          |
| John M. McNair         | New Brunswick             | Grand-Bouctouche, N.B.      |
| Réjean Aucoin          | Nova Scotia               | Cape Breton, N.S.           |
| Krista Ross            | New Brunswick             | Fredericton, N.B.           |
| Rodger Cuzner          | Nova Scotia               | Cape Breton, N.S.           |
| Marnie McBean          | Ontario                   | Toronto, Ont.               |
| Toni Varone            | Ontario                   | Toronto, Ont.               |
| Paulette Senior        | Ontario                   | Pickering, Ont.             |
| Mary Robinson          | Prince Edward Island      | Charlottetown, P.E.I.       |
| Mohammad Al Zaibak     | Ontario                   | Toronto, Ont.               |
| Manuelle Oudar         | La Salle                  | Quebec City, Que.           |
| Victor Boudreau        | New Brunswick             | Shediac, N.B.               |
| Charles S. Adler       | Manitoba                  | Winnipeg, Man.              |
| Tracy Muggli           | Saskatchewan              | Saskatoon, Sask.            |
| Fridhandler, Daryl S.  | Alberta                   | Calgary, Alta.              |
| Wells, Kristopher      | Alberta                   | St. Albert, Alta.           |
| Moreau, Pierre         | The Laurentides           | Saint-Lambert, Que.         |
| Youance, Suze          | Lauzon                    | Blainville, Que.            |

# SENATORS OF CANADA

## ALPHABETICAL LIST

(November 1, 2024)

| Senator                         | Designation                | Post Office Address         | Political Affiliation        |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|
| The Honourable                  |                            |                             |                              |
| Adler, Charles S.               | Manitoba                   | Winnipeg, Man.              | Non-affiliated               |
| Al Zaibak, Mohammad             | Ontario                    | Toronto, Ont.               | Canadian Senators Group      |
| Anderson, Dawn                  | Northwest Territories      | Yellowknife, N.W.T.         | Progressive Senate Group     |
| Arnot, David M.                 | Saskatchewan               | Saskatoon, Sask.            | Independent Senators Group   |
| Ataullahjan, Salma              | Ontario (Toronto)          | Toronto, Ont.               | Conservative Party of Canada |
| Aucoin, Réjean                  | Nova Scotia                | Cape Breton, N.S.           | Canadian Senators Group      |
| Audette, Michèle                | De Salaberry               | Quebec City, Que.           | Progressive Senate Group     |
| Batters, Denise                 | Saskatchewan               | Regina, Sask.               | Conservative Party of Canada |
| Bernard, Wanda Thomas           | Nova Scotia (East Preston) | East Preston, N.S.          | Progressive Senate Group     |
| Black, Robert                   | Ontario                    | Centre Wellington, Ont.     | Canadian Senators Group      |
| Boehm, Peter M.                 | Ontario                    | Ottawa, Ont.                | Independent Senators Group   |
| Boniface, Gwen                  | Ontario                    | Orillia, Ont.               | Independent Senators Group   |
| Boudreau, Victor                | New Brunswick              | Shediac, N.B.               | Independent Senators Group   |
| Boyer, Yvonne                   | Ontario                    | Merrickville-Wolford, Ont.  | Independent Senators Group   |
| Brazeau, Patrick                | Repentigny                 | Maniwaki, Que.              | Non-affiliated               |
| Burey, Sharon                   | Ontario                    | Windsor, Ont.               | Canadian Senators Group      |
| Busson, Bev                     | British Columbia           | North Okanagan Region, B.C. | Independent Senators Group   |
| Cardozo, Andrew                 | Ontario                    | Ottawa, Ont.                | Progressive Senate Group     |
| Carignan, Claude, P.C.          | Mille Isles                | Saint-Eustache, Que.        | Conservative Party of Canada |
| Clement, Bernadette             | Ontario                    | Cornwall, Ont.              | Independent Senators Group   |
| Cordy, Jane                     | Nova Scotia                | Dartmouth, N.S.             | Progressive Senate Group     |
| Cormier, René                   | New Brunswick              | Caraquet, N.B.              | Independent Senators Group   |
| Cotter, Brent                   | Saskatchewan               | Saskatoon, Sask.            | Independent Senators Group   |
| Coyle, Mary                     | Nova Scotia                | Antigonish, N.S.            | Independent Senators Group   |
| Cuzner, Rodger                  | Nova Scotia                | Cape Breton, N.S.           | Progressive Senate Group     |
| Dagenais, Jean-Guy              | Victoria                   | Blainville, Que.            | Canadian Senators Group      |
| Dalphond, Pierre J.             | De Lorimier                | Montreal, Que.              | Progressive Senate Group     |
| Dasko, Donna                    | Ontario                    | Toronto, Ont.               | Independent Senators Group   |
| Deacon, Colin                   | Nova Scotia                | Halifax, N.S.               | Canadian Senators Group      |
| Deacon, Marty                   | Waterloo Region            | Waterloo, Ont.              | Independent Senators Group   |
| Dean, Tony                      | Ontario                    | Toronto, Ont.               | Independent Senators Group   |
| Downe, Percy E.                 | Charlottetown              | Charlottetown, P.E.I.       | Canadian Senators Group      |
| Duncan, Pat                     | Yukon                      | Whitehorse, Yukon           | Independent Senators Group   |
| Forest, Éric                    | Gulf                       | Rimouski, Que.              | Independent Senators Group   |
| Francis, Brian                  | Prince Edward Island       | Rocky Point, P.E.I.         | Progressive Senate Group     |
| Fridhandler, Daryl S.           | Alberta                    | Calgary, Alta.              | Progressive Senate Group     |
| Gagné, Raymonde, <i>Speaker</i> | Manitoba                   | Winnipeg, Man.              | Non-affiliated               |
| Galvez, Rosa                    | Bedford                    | Lévis, Que.                 | Independent Senators Group   |
| Gerba, Amina                    | Rigaud                     | Blainville, Que.            | Progressive Senate Group     |
| Gignac, Clément                 | Kennebec                   | Lac Saint-Joseph, Que.      | Canadian Senators Group      |
| Gold, Marc                      | Stadacona                  | Westmount, Que.             | Non-affiliated               |
| Greene, Stephen                 | Halifax - The Citadel      | Halifax, N.S.               | Canadian Senators Group      |
| Greenwood, Margo                | British Columbia           | Vernon, B.C.                | Independent Senators Group   |
| Harder, Peter, P.C.             | Ottawa                     | Manotick, Ont.              | Progressive Senate Group     |
| Hartling, Nancy J.              | New Brunswick              | Riverview, N.B.             | Independent Senators Group   |
| Housakos, Leo                   | Wellington                 | Laval, Que.                 | Conservative Party of Canada |
| Kingston, Joan                  | New Brunswick              | New Maryland, N.B.          | Independent Senators Group   |
| Klyne, Marty                    | Saskatchewan               | White City, Sask.           | Progressive Senate Group     |
| Kutcher, Stan                   | Nova Scotia                | Halifax, N.S.               | Independent Senators Group   |
| LaBoucane-Benson, Patti         | Alberta                    | Spruce Grove, Alta.         | Non-affiliated               |
| Loffreda, Tony                  | Shawinegan                 | Montreal, Que.              | Independent Senators Group   |

| Senator                 | Designation                       | Post Office Address               | Political Affiliation        |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| MacAdam, Jane           | Prince Edward Island              | West St. Peters, P.E.I.           | Independent Senators Group   |
| MacDonald, Michael L.   | Cape Breton                       | Dartmouth, N.S.                   | Conservative Party of Canada |
| Manning, Fabian         | Newfoundland and Labrador         | St. Bride's, Nfld. & Lab.         | Conservative Party of Canada |
| Marshall, Elizabeth     | Newfoundland and Labrador         | Paradise, Nfld. & Lab.            | Conservative Party of Canada |
| Martin, Yonah           | British Columbia                  | Vancouver, B.C.                   | Conservative Party of Canada |
| Massicotte, Paul J.     | De Lanaudière                     | Mont-Saint-Hilaire, Que.          | Independent Senators Group   |
| McBean, Marnie          | Ontario                           | Toronto, Ont.                     | Independent Senators Group   |
| McCallum, Mary Jane     | Manitoba                          | Winnipeg, Man.                    | Non-affiliated               |
| McNair, John M.         | New Brunswick                     | Grand-Bouctouche, N.B.            | Independent Senators Group   |
| McPhedran, Marilou      | Manitoba                          | Winnipeg, Man.                    | Non-affiliated               |
| Mégie, Marie-Françoise  | Rougemont                         | Montreal, Que.                    | Independent Senators Group   |
| Miville-Dechéne, Julie  | Inkerman                          | Mont-Royal, Que.                  | Independent Senators Group   |
| Moncion, Lucie          | Ontario                           | North Bay, Ont.                   | Independent Senators Group   |
| Moodie, Rosemary        | Ontario                           | Toronto, Ont.                     | Independent Senators Group   |
| Moreau, Pierre          | The Laurentides                   | Saint-Lambert, Que.               | Non-affiliated               |
| Muggli, Tracy           | Saskatchewan                      | Saskatoon, Sask.                  | Non-affiliated               |
| Omidvar, Ratna          | Ontario                           | Toronto, Ont.                     | Independent Senators Group   |
| Osler, Flordeliz (Gigi) | Manitoba                          | Winnipeg, Man.                    | Canadian Senators Group      |
| Oudar, Manuelle         | La Salle                          | Quebec City, Que.                 | Independent Senators Group   |
| Pate, Kim               | Ontario                           | Ottawa, Ont.                      | Independent Senators Group   |
| Patterson, Rebecca      | Ontario                           | Ottawa, Ont.                      | Canadian Senators Group      |
| Petitclerc, Chantal     | Grandville                        | Montreal, Que.                    | Independent Senators Group   |
| Petten, Iris G.         | Newfoundland and Labrador         | St. John's, Nfld. & Lab.          | Non-affiliated               |
| Plett, Donald Neil      | Landmark                          | Landmark, Man.                    | Conservative Party of Canada |
| Poirier, Rose-May       | New Brunswick—Saint-Louis-de-Kent | Saint-Louis-de-Kent, N.B.         | Conservative Party of Canada |
| Prosper, Paul J.        | Nova Scotia                       | Hants County, N.S.                | Canadian Senators Group      |
| Quinn, Jim              | New Brunswick                     | Saint John, N.B.                  | Canadian Senators Group      |
| Ravalia, Mohamed-Iqbal  | Newfoundland and Labrador         | Twillingate, Nfld. & Lab.         | Independent Senators Group   |
| Richards, David         | New Brunswick                     | Fredericton, N.B.                 | Non-affiliated               |
| Ringuette, Pierrette    | New Brunswick                     | Edmundston, N.B.                  | Independent Senators Group   |
| Robinson, Mary          | Prince Edward Island              | Charlottetown, P.E.I.             | Canadian Senators Group      |
| Ross, Krista            | New Brunswick                     | Fredericton, N.B.                 | Canadian Senators Group      |
| Saint-Germain, Raymonde | De la Vallière                    | Quebec City, Que.                 | Independent Senators Group   |
| Seidman, Judith G.      | De la Durantaye                   | Saint-Raphaël, Que.               | Conservative Party of Canada |
| Senior, Paulette        | Ontario                           | Pickering, Ont.                   | Independent Senators Group   |
| Simons, Paula           | Alberta                           | Edmonton, Alta.                   | Independent Senators Group   |
| Smith, Larry W.         | Saurel                            | Hudson, Que.                      | Canadian Senators Group      |
| Sorensen, Karen         | Alberta                           | Banff, Alta.                      | Independent Senators Group   |
| Tannas, Scott           | Alberta                           | High River, Alta.                 | Canadian Senators Group      |
| Varone, Toni            | Ontario                           | Toronto, Ont.                     | Independent Senators Group   |
| Verner, Josée, P.C.     | Montarville                       | Saint-Augustin-de-Desmaures, Que. | Canadian Senators Group      |
| Wallin, Pamela          | Saskatchewan                      | Wadena, Sask.                     | Canadian Senators Group      |
| Wells, David M.         | Newfoundland and Labrador         | St. John's, Nfld. & Lab.          | Conservative Party of Canada |
| Wells, Kristopher       | Alberta                           | St. Albert, Alta.                 | Non-affiliated               |
| White, Judy A.          | Newfoundland and Labrador         | St. George's, Nfld. & Lab.        | Progressive Senate Group     |
| Woo, Yuen Pau           | British Columbia                  | North Vancouver, B.C.             | Independent Senators Group   |
| Youance, Suze           | Lauzon                            | Blainville, Que.                  | Non-affiliated               |
| Yussuff, Hassan         | Ontario                           | Toronto, Ont.                     | Independent Senators Group   |



**SENATORS OF CANADA**  
**BY PROVINCE AND TERRITORY**

(November 1, 2024)

---

---

**ONTARIO—24**

---

---

| Senator        | Designation                                  | Post Office Address  |
|----------------|--|----------------------|
| The Honourable |  |                      |
| 1              | Salma Ataullahjan.....Ontario (Toronto)..... | Toronto              |
| 2              | Peter Harder, P.C. ....Ottawa.....           | Manotick             |
| 3              | Ratna Omidvar.....Ontario.....               | Toronto              |
| 4              | Kim Pate.....Ontario.....                    | Ottawa               |
| 5              | Tony Dean.....Ontario.....                   | Toronto              |
| 6              | Lucie Moncion.....Ontario.....               | North Bay            |
| 7              | Gwen Boniface.....Ontario.....               | Orillia              |
| 8              | Robert Black.....Ontario.....                | Centre Wellington    |
| 9              | Marty Deacon.....Waterloo Region.....        | Waterloo             |
| 10             | Yvonne Boyer.....Ontario.....                | Merrickville-Wolford |
| 11             | Donna Dasko.....Ontario.....                 | Toronto              |
| 12             | Peter M. Boehm.....Ontario.....              | Ottawa               |
| 13             | Rosemary Moodie.....Ontario.....             | Toronto              |
| 14             | Hassan Yussuff.....Ontario.....              | Toronto              |
| 15             | Bernadette Clement.....Ontario.....          | Cornwall             |
| 16             | Sharon Burey.....Ontario.....                | Windsor              |
| 17             | Andrew Cardozo.....Ontario.....              | Ottawa               |
| 18             | Rebecca Patterson.....Ontario.....           | Ottawa               |
| 19             | Marnie McBean.....Ontario.....               | Toronto              |
| 20             | Toni Varone.....Ontario.....                 | Toronto              |
| 21             | Paulette Senior.....Ontario.....             | Pickering            |
| 22             | Mohammad Al Zaibak.....Ontario.....          | Toronto              |
| 23             | .....  |                      |
| 24             | .....  |                      |

---

---

SENATORS BY PROVINCE AND TERRITORY

QUEBEC—24

| Senator                         | Designation           | Post Office Address         |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|
| The Honourable                  |                       |                             |
| 1 Paul J. Massicotte .....      | De Lanaudière .....   | Mont-Saint-Hilaire          |
| 2 Patrick Brazeau .....         | Repentigny .....      | Maniwaki                    |
| 3 Leo Housakos .....            | Wellington .....      | Laval                       |
| 4 Claude Carignan, P.C. ....    | Mille Isles .....     | Saint-Eustache              |
| 5 Judith G. Seidman .....       | De la Durantaye ..... | Saint-Raphaël               |
| 6 Larry W. Smith .....          | Saurel .....          | Hudson                      |
| 7 Josée Verner, P.C. ....       | Montarville .....     | Saint-Augustin-de-Desmaures |
| 8 Jean-Guy Dagenais .....       | Victoria .....        | Blainville                  |
| 9 Chantal Petitclerc .....      | Grandville .....      | Montreal                    |
| 10 Éric Forest .....            | Gulf .....            | Rimouski                    |
| 11 Marc Gold .....              | Stadacona .....       | Westmount                   |
| 12 Marie-Françoise Mégie .....  | Rougemont .....       | Montreal                    |
| 13 Raymonde Saint-Germain ..... | De la Vallière .....  | Quebec City                 |
| 14 Rosa Galvez .....            | Bedford .....         | Lévis                       |
| 15 Pierre J. Dalphond .....     | De Lorimier .....     | Montreal                    |
| 16 Julie Miville-Dechêne .....  | Inkerman .....        | Mont-Royal                  |
| 17 Tony Loffreda .....          | Shawinigan .....      | Montreal                    |
| 18 Amina Gerba .....            | Rigaud .....          | Blainville                  |
| 19 Clément Gignac .....         | Kennebec .....        | Lac Saint-Joseph            |
| 20 Michèle Audette .....        | De Salaberry .....    | Quebec City                 |
| 21 Manuelle Oudar .....         | La Salle .....        | Quebec City                 |
| 22 Pierre Moreau .....          | The Laurentides ..... | Saint-Lambert               |
| 23 Suze Youance .....           | Lauzon .....          | Blainville                  |
| 24 .....                        | .....                 | .....                       |

SENATORS BY PROVINCE—MARITIME DIVISION

**NOVA SCOTIA—10**

| Senator                      | Designation                      | Post Office Address |
|------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------|
| The Honourable               |                                  |                     |
| 1 Jane Cordy .....           | Nova Scotia .....                | Dartmouth           |
| 2 Stephen Greene .....       | Halifax - The Citadel .....      | Halifax             |
| 3 Michael L. MacDonald ..... | Cape Breton .....                | Dartmouth           |
| 4 Wanda Thomas Bernard ..... | Nova Scotia (East Preston) ..... | East Preston        |
| 5 Mary Coyle .....           | Nova Scotia .....                | Antigonish          |
| 6 Colin Deacon .....         | Nova Scotia .....                | Halifax             |
| 7 Stan Kutcher .....         | Nova Scotia .....                | Halifax             |
| 8 Paul J. Prosper .....      | Nova Scotia .....                | Hants County        |
| 9 Réjean Aucoin .....        | Nova Scotia .....                | Cape Breton         |
| 10 Rodger Cuzner .....       | Nova Scotia .....                | Cape Breton         |

**NEW BRUNSWICK—10**

| Senator                     | Designation                             | Post Office Address |
|-----------------------------|---|---------------------|
| The Honourable              |   |                     |
| 1 Pierrette Ringuette ..... | New Brunswick .....                     | Edmundston          |
| 2 Rose-May Poirier .....    | New Brunswick—Saint-Louis-de-Kent ..... | Saint-Louis-de-Kent |
| 3 René Cormier .....        | New Brunswick .....                     | Caraquet            |
| 4 Nancy J. Hartling .....   | New Brunswick .....                     | Riverview           |
| 5 David Richards .....      | New Brunswick .....                     | Fredericton         |
| 6 Jim Quinn .....           | New Brunswick .....                     | Saint John          |
| 7 Joan Kingston .....       | New Brunswick .....                     | New Maryland        |
| 8 John M. McNair .....      | New Brunswick .....                     | Grand-Bouctouche    |
| 9 Krista Ross .....         | New Brunswick .....                     | Fredericton         |
| 10 Victor Boudreau .....    | New Brunswick .....                     | Shediac             |

**PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—4**

| Senator                | Designation                | Post Office Address |
|------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|
| The Honourable         |                            |                     |
| 1 Percy E. Downe ..... | Charlottetown .....        | Charlottetown       |
| 2 Brian Francis .....  | Prince Edward Island ..... | Rocky Point         |
| 3 Jane MacAdam .....   | Prince Edward Island ..... | West St. Peters     |
| 4 Mary Robinson .....  | Prince Edward Island ..... | Charlottetown       |

SENATORS BY PROVINCE—WESTERN DIVISION

**MANITOBA—6**

| Senator                                | Designation    | Post Office Address |
|--|----------------|---------------------|
| The Honourable                         |                |                     |
| 1 Donald Neil Plett .....              | Landmark ..... | Landmark            |
| 2 Raymonde Gagné, <i>Speaker</i> ..... | Manitoba ..... | Winnipeg            |
| 3 Marilou McPhedran .....              | Manitoba ..... | Winnipeg            |
| 4 Mary Jane McCallum.....              | Manitoba ..... | Winnipeg            |
| 5 Flordeliz (Gigi) Osler.....          | Manitoba ..... | Winnipeg            |
| 6 Charles S. Adler.....                | Manitoba ..... | Winnipeg            |

**BRITISH COLUMBIA—6**

| Senator                 | Designation            | Post Office Address   |
|-------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|
| The Honourable          |                        |                       |
| 1 Yonah Martin.....     | British Columbia ..... | Vancouver             |
| 2 Yuen Pau Woo.....     | British Columbia ..... | North Vancouver       |
| 3 Bev Busson .....      | British Columbia ..... | North Okanagan Region |
| 4 Margo Greenwood ..... | British Columbia ..... | Vernon                |
| 5 .....                 | .....                  | .....                 |
| 6 .....                 | .....                  | .....                 |

**SASKATCHEWAN—6**

| Senator                | Designation        | Post Office Address |
|------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| The Honourable         |                    |                     |
| 1 Pamela Wallin.....   | Saskatchewan ..... | Wadena              |
| 2 Denise Batters ..... | Saskatchewan ..... | Regina              |
| 3 Marty Klyne.....     | Saskatchewan ..... | White City          |
| 4 Brent Cotter .....   | Saskatchewan ..... | Saskatoon           |
| 5 David M. Arnot.....  | Saskatchewan ..... | Saskatoon           |
| 6 Tracy Muggli .....   | Saskatchewan ..... | Saskatoon           |

**ALBERTA—6**

| Senator                       | Designation  | Post Office Address |
|-------------------------------|--------------|---------------------|
| The Honourable                |              |                     |
| 1 Scott Tannas.....           | Alberta..... | High River          |
| 2 Patti LaBoucane-Benson..... | Alberta..... | Spruce Grove        |
| 3 Paula Simons .....          | Alberta..... | Edmonton            |
| 4 Karen Sorensen .....        | Alberta..... | Banff               |
| 5 Daryl S. Fridhandler .....  | Alberta..... | Calgary             |
| 6 Kristopher Wells.....       | Alberta..... | St. Albert          |

SENATORS BY PROVINCE AND TERRITORY

---

**NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR—6**

---

| Senator                      | Designation                     | Post Office Address |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------|
| The Honourable               |                                 |                     |
| 1 Elizabeth Marshall .....   | Newfoundland and Labrador ..... | Paradise            |
| 2 Fabian Manning .....       | Newfoundland and Labrador ..... | St. Bride's         |
| 3 David M. Wells .....       | Newfoundland and Labrador ..... | St. John's          |
| 4 Mohamed-Iqbal Ravalia..... | Newfoundland and Labrador ..... | Twillingate         |
| 5 Iris G. Petten .....       | Newfoundland and Labrador ..... | St. John's          |
| 6 Judy A. White .....        | Newfoundland and Labrador ..... | St. George's        |

---

**NORTHWEST TERRITORIES—1**

---

| Senator               | Designation                 | Post Office Address |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|
| The Honourable        |                             |                     |
| 1 Dawn Anderson ..... | Northwest Territories ..... | Yellowknife         |

---

**NUNAVUT—1**

---

| Senator        | Designation | Post Office Address |
|----------------|-------------|---------------------|
| The Honourable |             |                     |
| 1 .....        |             |                     |

---

**YUKON—1**

---

| Senator           | Designation | Post Office Address |
|-------------------|-------------|---------------------|
| The Honourable    |             |                     |
| 1 Pat Duncan..... | Yukon.....  | Whitehorse          |

---

# CONTENTS

Tuesday, November 5, 2024

|   | PAGE |  | PAGE |
|---|------|--|------|
| <b>The Late Honourable Murray Sinclair, C.C., M.S.C.</b>  |      | <b>Internal Economy, Budgets and Administration</b>          |      |
| Silent Tribute . . . . .                                  | 7443 | Sixteenth Report of Committee Tabled                         |      |
| <hr/>   |      | Hon. Lucie Moncion . . . . .                                 | 7452 |
| <b>SENATORS' STATEMENTS</b>                               |      | <b>Legal and Constitutional Affairs</b>                      |      |
| <b>Tributes</b>   |      | Statutes Repeal Act—Notice of Motion to Authorize            |      |
| The Honourable Jane Cordy                                 |      | Committee to Study 2024 Revised Report and List of Acts      |      |
| Hon. Pierre J. Dalphond . . . . .                         | 7443 | or Provisions of Acts Proposed to Not be Repealed in 2024    |      |
| Hon. Marc Gold . . . . .                                  | 7443 | Hon. Patti LaBoucane-Benson . . . . .                        | 7452 |
| Hon. Donald Neil Plett . . . . .                          | 7444 | <b>Alcoholic Beverage Promotion Prohibition Bill</b>         |      |
| Hon. Raymonde Saint-Germain . . . . .                     | 7444 | <b>(Bill S-290)</b>  |      |
| Hon. Scott Tannas . . . . .                               | 7445 | First Reading  |      |
| <b>Visitors in the Gallery</b>                            |      | Hon. Patrick Brazeau . . . . .                               | 7452 |
| The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore. . . . .                 | 7445 | <b>Canada-Europe Parliamentary Association</b>               |      |
| <b>The Honourable Jane Cordy</b>                          |      | Second Part of the 2024 Ordinary Session of the              |      |
| Expression of Thanks                                      |      | Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe,             |      |
| Hon. Jane Cordy . . . . .                                 | 7445 | April 15-19, 2014—Report Tabled                              |      |
| <b>Distinguished Visitor in the Gallery</b>               |      | Hon. David M. Wells . . . . .                                | 7452 |
| The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore. . . . .                 | 7448 | Third Part of the 2024 Ordinary Session of the Parliamentary |      |
| <b>The Honourable Jane Cordy</b>                          |      | Assembly of the Council of Europe, June 24-28, 2024—         |      |
| Hon. Wanda Thomas Bernard . . . . .                       | 7448 | Report Tabled  |      |
| Hon. Leo Housakos . . . . .                               | 7449 | Hon. David M. Wells . . . . .                                | 7453 |
| Hon. Mary Coyle . . . . .                                 | 7449 | <hr/>  |      |
| <b>Visitors in the Gallery</b>                            |      | <b>QUESTION PERIOD</b>                                       |      |
| The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore. . . . .                 | 7450 | <b>Finance</b>   |      |
| <b>Diabetes Awareness Month</b>                           |      | Economic Growth  |      |
| Hon. Karen Sorensen . . . . .                             | 7450 | Hon. Donald Neil Plett . . . . .                             | 7453 |
| <b>Visitors in the Gallery</b>                            |      | Hon. Marc Gold . . . . .                                     | 7453 |
| The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore. . . . .                 | 7451 | <b>Global Affairs</b>  |      |
| <b>HanVoice Canada</b>                                    |      | Softwood Lumber  |      |
| Hon. Yonah Martin . . . . .                               | 7451 | Hon. Yonah Martin . . . . .                                  | 7453 |
| <b>The Honourable Jane Cordy</b>                          |      | Hon. Marc Gold . . . . .                                     | 7453 |
| Hon. Percy E. Downe . . . . .                             | 7451 | Conflict in Gaza Strip                                       |      |
| <hr/>   |      | Hon. Yuen Pau Woo . . . . .                                  | 7454 |
| <b>ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS</b>                                |      | Hon. Marc Gold . . . . .                                     | 7454 |
| <b>Justice</b>  |      | <b>Environment and Climate Change</b>                        |      |
| Statutes Repeal Act—List of Acts or Provisions of Acts    |      | Energy Transition Program                                    |      |
| Proposed to Not be Repealed in 2024—Document Tabled       |      | Hon. Tony Loffreda . . . . .                                 | 7454 |
| Hon. Patti LaBoucane-Benson . . . . .                     | 7452 | Hon. Marc Gold . . . . .                                     | 7454 |
| <b>Financial Protection for Fresh Fruit and Vegetable</b> |      | <b>Public Safety</b>   |      |
| <b>Farmers Bill (Bill C-280)</b>                          |      | Special Report of the National Security and Intelligence     |      |
| Bill to Amend—Sixteenth Report of Banking, Commerce and   |      | Committee of Parliamentarians                                |      |
| the Economy Committee Presented                           |      | Hon. Percy E. Downe . . . . .                                | 7455 |
| Hon. Pamela Wallin . . . . .                              | 7452 | Hon. Marc Gold . . . . .                                     | 7455 |
|   |      | <b>Environment and Climate Change</b>                        |      |
|   |      | Conference of the Parties                                    |      |
|   |      | Hon. Andrew Cardozo . . . . .                                | 7455 |
|   |      | Hon. Marc Gold . . . . .                                     | 7455 |

## CONTENTS

Tuesday, November 5, 2024

|                                      | PAGE |  | PAGE |
|--------------------------------------|------|--|------|
| <b>Finance</b>                       |      | <b>Speech from the Throne</b>  |      |
| Cost of Living                       |      | Motion for Address in Reply—Debate Continued   |      |
| Hon. Leo Housakos . . . . .          | 7455 | Hon. Pamela Wallin . . . . .   | 7458 |
| Hon. Marc Gold . . . . .             | 7456 |  |      |
| <b>Natural Resources</b>             |      | <b>National Framework on Advertising for Sports Betting<br/>Bill (Bill S-269)</b>                    |      |
| Forestry Sector                      |      | Third Reading  |      |
| Hon. Claude Carignan . . . . .       | 7456 | Hon. Leo Housakos . . . . .  | 7460 |
| Hon. Marc Gold . . . . .             | 7456 |  |      |
| <b>Global Affairs</b>                |      | <b>National Strategy for Eye Care Bill (Bill C-284)</b>  |      |
| Women's Rights                       |      | Declaration of Private Interest . . . . .  | 7461 |
| Hon. Julie Miville-Dechéne . . . . . | 7456 | Third Reading  |      |
| Hon. Marc Gold . . . . .             | 7456 | Hon. Mohamed-Iqbal Ravalia . . . . .   | 7461 |
| Conflict in Sudan                    |      | Hon. Donald Neil Plett . . . . .   | 7463 |
| Hon. Mary Coyle . . . . .            | 7457 |  |      |
| Hon. Marc Gold . . . . .             | 7457 | <b>Canadian Postal Safety Bill (Bill S-256)</b>  |      |
| <b>Public Safety</b>                 |      | Bill to Amend—Twenty-eighth Report of Legal and<br>Constitutional Affairs Committee—Debate Continued |      |
| Police Services                      |      | Hon. Pierre J. Dalphond . . . . .  | 7465 |
| Hon. Jean-Guy Dagenais . . . . .     | 7457 |  |      |
| Hon. Marc Gold . . . . .             | 7457 | <b>Health of Animals Act (Bill C-275)</b>  |      |
| Firearms Trafficking                 |      | Bill to Amend—Fourteenth Report of Agriculture and<br>Forestry Committee—Debate Continued            |      |
| Hon. Donald Neil Plett . . . . .     | 7458 | Hon. Donald Neil Plett . . . . .   | 7466 |
| Hon. Marc Gold . . . . .             | 7458 | Hon. René Cormier . . . . .  | 7473 |
|                                      |      | Hon. Denise Batters . . . . .  | 7473 |
|                                      |      | Hon. Paula Simons . . . . .  | 7474 |
|                                      |      | Hon. Brent Cotter . . . . .  | 7476 |
|                                      |      | Hon. Manuelle Oudar . . . . .  | 7478 |
|                                      |      | Hon. Judy A. White . . . . .   | 7479 |
|                                      |      | Hon. Kim Pate . . . . .  | 7479 |
|                                      |      | Hon. Pierre J. Dalphond . . . . .  | 7480 |

---

**ORDERS OF THE DAY**

**Business of the Senate**

Hon. Patti LaBoucane-Benson . . . . . 7458