



DEBATES OF THE SENATE

1st SESSION



45th PARLIAMENT



VOLUME 154



NUMBER 31

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Tuesday, November 4, 2025

The Honourable RAYMONDE GAGNÉ,
Speaker

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

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

THE SENATE

Tuesday, November 4, 2025

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

Prayers.

SENATORS' STATEMENTS

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

Hon. Kim Pate: Honourable senators, on this first anniversary of his departure to the spirit world, I rise to honour Mazina Giizhik-iban, a towering leader, judge, senator, mentor and friend whose life and work profoundly changed Canada and inspired millions globally. Like so many, I am immensely grateful for his decades of mentorship and friendship, his wisdom, humour, humility and courage, as well as the many personal moments that revealed his compassion and generosity.

The Honourable Murray Sinclair was among the first prominent men to raise, much less champion, the issue of missing and murdered Indigenous women when it was largely ignored. His demand for justice in the Helen Betty Osborne case exposed systemic racism, sexism and indifference. The Aboriginal Justice Inquiry of Manitoba, which he co-chaired, condemned Canada's criminal legal system for its massive failures toward Indigenous Peoples, calling the nation's treatment of its first citizens "an international disgrace."

As chair of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, he compelled Canada to confront the truth of its colonial and genocidal past. His leadership not only advanced national healing but also laid the groundwork for the National Inquiry into Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls in Canada and the movement toward implementing the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

Through his actions, he exemplified the Seven Sacred Teachings — love, respect, honesty, humility, courage, truth and wisdom — and consistently urged others to act with integrity and compassion, even when he stood alone.

In 2019, during debate on Bill C-83, which proposed replacing solitary confinement with structured intervention units, Senator Sinclair demonstrated his principled and moral strength when he changed his stance after listening to colleagues, ultimately opposing the bill because it lacked independent oversight. He powerfully linked the practice of segregation to the punishment rooms in residential schools as a reminder of the dangers of unchecked authority.

Beyond his public achievements, Murray Sinclair was deeply human. He engaged warmly with everyone, regardless of status, and left countless stories of kindness and humour. Colleagues, friends, survivors and family alike remember his big laugh, teasing wit and generous spirit. His advisers, staff and even strangers recall how he made everyone feel valued and seen.

Please join me in expressing heartfelt thanks to his family for sharing him with the world. Murray's legacy of justice, compassion, courage and reconciliation continues to guide and inspire. We promise to honour your example and invite you and others to haunt us or otherwise "nudge us if we fail to act."

Chi-meegwetch, Mazina Giizhik-iban.

BRIDGE AND FERRY TOLLS

Hon. Percy E. Downe: Honourable senators, it is wonderful to see the government leader back as well. He well knows that on August 1, 2025, Prime Minister Mark Carney announced that bridge and ferry tolls in Atlantic Canada would be reduced by at least half.

Everyone in Atlantic Canada benefits from the impact of this decision. For example, the toll on the federally owned Confederation Bridge was reduced from \$50.25 to \$20. Prince Edward Islanders are not getting any special treatment, only long-overdue results. Given that both the toll-free Champlain Bridge in Montreal, which cost over \$4 billion to build, and Confederation Bridge, which cost \$1 billion, are owned by the Government of Canada, Islanders had long wondered why this double standard in which some Canadians benefited from a toll-free bridge while others were stuck paying \$50 to cross was not being corrected.

As busy and important as the Champlain Bridge is, it does not exist to meet a constitutional requirement; Confederation Bridge does. As a condition of joining Canada in 1873, the Government of Canada made a constitutional promise to the citizens of Prince Edward Island for "continuous communication" between Prince Edward Island and the rest of the country. Eventually, that took the form of the permanent fixed link that is Confederation Bridge, a development which required a 1993 amendment to the Constitution of Canada that clarified "That a fixed crossing joining the Island to the mainland . . ." fulfilled the requirement.

On August 1 of this year, tolls were reduced for the Marine Atlantic service between Cape Breton and Port aux Basques, Newfoundland and Labrador, from \$101.05 to \$50.55; the Marine Atlantic service between Cape Breton and Argentia, Newfoundland and Labrador, from \$215.55 to \$107.80; the ferry service between Saint John, New Brunswick, and Digby, Nova Scotia, from \$128.00 to \$64.00; the ferry service between the Magdalen Islands, Quebec, and Souris, Prince Edward Island, from \$110.15 to \$55.10; and the ferry service between Wood Islands, Prince Edward Island, and Caribou, Nova Scotia, from \$86.00 to \$43.00. Removing these barriers to travel and trade in Atlantic Canada will build a better future for all, and I'm sure all Atlantic Canadian senators join me in thanking Prime Minister Carney.

Colleagues, as you know, I'm in favour of user fees for federal infrastructure, but I'll leave it to others to carry the banner that the Champlain Bridge should have a toll.

I want to thank Prime Minister Carney for his commitment, I want to thank Prime Minister Carney for his accountability, and I want to thank Prime Minister Carney for doing better.

Thank you, colleagues.

VISITOR IN THE GALLERY

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, I wish to draw your attention to the presence in the gallery of Beverly Fullerton, Minister of Health, Mental Health and Addictions for the Métis Nation-Saskatchewan. She is the guest of the Honourable Senators Pate and Muggli.

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

Hon. Senators: Hear, hear!

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF SENATORS

Hon. Tracy Muggli: Honourable senators, I'm standing today as chair of the Progressive Senate Group, or PSG, to take a moment to celebrate some of the incredible women I've had the privilege of working alongside this past year. I've taken to calling these folks "our famous four for 2025." They are colleagues who lead with heart, lift us up and do it all with their own unique styles and personalities.

Senator Michèle Audette was recently awarded an honorary doctorate from Saint Paul University. Michèle brings people together in ways few others can. A tireless champion for reconciliation and Indigenous women and girls, she reminds us to listen more deeply, believe in the strength of our voice and lead with empathy.

Senator Amina Gerba, PSG liaison, was crowned Afro-Ancestral Queen of Canada, and honestly, this title suits her perfectly. Amina has built bridges across communities and championed women in business. She has inspired entrepreneurs to dream bigger and leads with energy and joy, qualities that follow her wherever she goes.

• (1410)

Senator Judy White, PSG Deputy Leader, was inducted into Dalhousie University's Schulich School of Law's Bertha Wilson Honour Society, which celebrates extraordinary alumni and their contributions to law and public service. She is grounded, thoughtful and full of humour. She brings a steady voice and a sharp wit to every conversation, both here in the chamber and in our PSG family.

Finally, colleagues, this year Senator Wanda Thomas Bernard received an honorary doctorate from the University of Sheffield in recognition of her outstanding work as a social worker, educator, researcher and community activist.

Senator Bernard also received an award that now bears her own name: the inaugural Senator Wanda Thomas Bernard Legends Award. There's really no better way to describe her; she truly is a legend, I think you'll all agree. Wanda has spent her life opening doors for others and making sure no one is left behind.

Senator Bernard has always been a leader in our group, and this recognition acknowledges the leading she's done outside this place, inspiring generations to believe they belong in every room.

Together, our famous four remind us of the efforts so many of our colleagues have put in, not only here in Ottawa but also in their communities and regions across the country.

I feel gratitude to call each of you colleagues and friends. For my part, you've made this first year in the Senate richer, more enjoyable and far more inspiring than I could have imagined.

Congratulations, and here's to many more years of working, learning and laughing together.

Thank you. *Meegwetch.*

VISITOR IN THE GALLERY

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, I wish to draw your attention to the presence in the gallery of Grand Chief Jerry Daniels of the Southern Chiefs' Organization. He is the guest of the Honourable Senators Osler and McCallum.

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

Hon. Senators: Hear, hear!

[*Translation*]

THE LATE HONOURABLE LISE BACON, C.M., G.O.Q.

Hon. Claude Carignan: Honourable senators, it is with a heavy heart that I rise to pay tribute to a prominent figure in our country and our institution, the Honourable Senator Lise Bacon, who passed away last week.

Ms. Bacon paved the way for excellence through her career and commitment. She left her mark on the history of Quebec and Canada through her service-oriented public life.

Born in Salaberry-de-Valleyfield and raised in Trois-Rivières, she was never content to sit on the sidelines. She always wanted to be part of the action.

She was the second woman elected to the Quebec National Assembly in 1973 after Claire Kirkland-Casgrain, and she became the first woman to hold the position of deputy premier of Quebec.

After working in the business world from 1976 to 1981, she was re-elected as a member of the Quebec Liberal Party in 1981, 1985 and 1989. Her contribution is about more than just titles

and official duties. What set her apart was her concern for the community and her conviction that politics should be an instrument of progress and fairness.

For many women and for all those who hoped such a thing could be possible, she was living proof that public engagement can go hand in hand with integrity and perseverance.

Elected as part of Premier Robert Bourassa's government, she was a pillar, a beacon that showed the way forward.

I was always impressed by her presence and charisma, but she was not reserved. On the contrary, Ms. Bacon was a warm, attentive and authentic woman.

When she became a senator in January 1994, she continued her mission and brought with her all the wisdom of her experience and all the passion of her commitment. She left the Senate on August 25, 2009, two days before I was appointed. I am saddened that I didn't have the privilege of working alongside her again as a colleague in this chamber.

My thoughts are with Ms. Bacon's family and loved ones. I offer them my sincere condolences and my gratitude for all that this remarkable woman accomplished.

Thank you, Ms. Bacon, for your invaluable contribution to Quebec and Canadian society.

[*English*]

VISITORS IN THE GALLERY

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, I wish to draw your attention to the presence in the gallery of Norah and Kate Arnold, family members of the Honourable Senator Arnold.

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

Hon. Senators: Hear, hear!

SOCIETY OF COMPOSERS, AUTHORS AND MUSIC PUBLISHERS OF CANADA

CANADIAN MUSIC CREATORS

Hon. René Cormier: Honourable senators, this Friday, November 7, the Canadian Society of Composers, Authors and Music Publishers, or SOCAN, invites everyone to celebrate the first Canadian Music Creator Day in honour of the birthday of the renowned Alberta-born singer-songwriter Joni Mitchell.

This date aims to recognize and honour the outstanding work of all those who, through their talent and creativity, shape the soundtrack of our nation.

[Senator Carignan]

[*Translation*]

SOCAN boasts 200,000 members and is celebrating its one hundredth anniversary this year. It campaigns for the fair compensation of its members so that music creators are duly paid for their work.

The statistics are very worrying. Less than 10% of the music streamed in Canada on digital online listening platforms comes from Canadian creators.

However, a recent poll conducted by Pollara on behalf of SOCAN found that 81% of Canadians believe it is essential to support local music creators to ensure that our culture remains vibrant and thriving for future generations, and 87% of respondents said it is important that the music they listen to is created by humans, not artificial intelligence.

In an article published in *Words & Music* on October 14, 2025, Howard Druckman wrote the following:

SOCAN and other industry leaders recently spoke before the House of Commons heritage committee It was suggested that the government require AI companies to be more transparent about exactly what copyrighted music they are using. This transparency will help rights holders identify when their music is being used, and allow us to move to a proper licensing system for AI, so that creators are rewarded for their work.

[*English*]

Honourable senators, if we truly care about our cultural and economic sovereignty, we must do more to support our local creators and legislate and regulate appropriately to maintain a sustainable, innovative and inclusive music industry.

From Indigenous artists like Dominique Fils-Aimé, Jeremy Dutcher and Elisapie to francophone singer-songwriters such as Ariane Moffatt, Pierre Lapointe, Lisa LeBlanc and Les Hay Babies to the legendary icons Joni Mitchell, Sarah McLachlan and Édith Butler, all of these artists create works that make Canada shine on stages around the world.

[*Translation*]

The Greek philosopher Plato said, "Music gives soul to the universe and wings to the mind."

People also say it has extraordinary healing powers. With that in mind, I invite the people of our country to listen to, share and celebrate our very own music on November 7 and all year long.

[*English*]

Supporting our artists means supporting our culture, our creative economy and the living heritage of our country. By celebrating our creators, we affirm who we are: a country that believes in the power of art and artists.

[*Translation*]

I wish everyone a happy Canadian Music Creator Day this Friday.

[English]

Thank you. *Meegwetch.*

VISITORS IN THE GALLERY

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, I wish to draw your attention to the presence in the gallery of Victor Tesolin, retired master corporal of the Royal Canadian Horse Artillery. He is accompanied by Kristin Scarfone. They are the guests of the Honourable Senator Hay.

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

Hon. Senators: Hear, hear!

[Translation]

EDMOND DAIGLE

CONGRATULATIONS ON ONE HUNDREDTH BIRTHDAY

Hon. Rose-May Poirier: Honourable senators, I rise today to share with you the inspiring story of Edmond Daigle, who will be celebrating his one hundredth birthday next Thursday, November 13.

Mr. Daigle was a veteran of the Second World War and a proud member of the Royal Canadian Legion of Richibucto. He enlisted on November 10, 1944, three days before his twentieth birthday.

After returning to Canada and his regular life in 1946, he worked several jobs. He got married at 30 and became the proud father of three girls: Maria, Yvette and Yvonne. They, too, chose to serve the public by becoming nurses.

Throughout his life, Mr. Daigle dedicated himself to his community and his legion, where he remains an active member. Even now, at 99 years of age, he continues to participate in community life.

• (1420)

I see him every Sunday in church. He still studies the Bible. Not only that, but on Saturday nights, he goes out dancing. What better proof could there be that any age is the right age to move, have fun and enjoy life to the full.

Over the years, I've often spoken in the Senate about people like Mr. Daigle and Flora Thibodeau, another member of a remarkable generation that never ceases to inspire us. Talking to them is like travelling through modern history, from the time of the first cars driving on roads, to the invention of television, to the first man walking on the moon. I also want to point out that Mr. Daigle, like my father, served in the Second World War. My father passed away shortly after he returned from his military service. Every time I see Mr. Daigle, I see my father and the courageous generation of people who answered the call of duty, sacrificing their freedom to protect ours.

To all veterans like Mr. Daigle, those still with us and those now gone, I thank you. We will remember them.

Honourable senators, please join me in recognizing the remarkable life of Edmond Daigle and in wishing him a very happy one hundredth birthday. Thank you.

Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

VISITOR IN THE GALLERY

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, I wish to draw your attention to the presence in the gallery of Isabelle Hudon, President and Chief Executive Officer of the Business Development Bank of Canada. She is the guest of the Honourable Senator Forest.

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

Hon. Senators: Hear, hear!

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

L'ASSEMBLÉE PARLEMENTAIRE DE LA FRANCOPHONIE

BUREAU MEETING AND PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE ON
FRANCOPHONE COOPERATION IN THE AREAS OF SUSTAINABLE
AGRICULTURE, FOOD SECURITY AND CLIMATE CHANGE,
JANUARY 21-24, 2025—REPORT TABLED

Hon. Éric Forest: Honourable senators, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the report of the Assemblée parlementaire de la Francophonie (APF) concerning the Bureau Meeting of the APF and Parliamentary Conference on Francophone Cooperation in the Areas of Sustainable Agriculture, Food Security and Climate Change, held in Can Tho, Vietnam, from January 21 to 24, 2025.

MEETINGS OF THE NETWORK OF WOMEN PARLIAMENTARIANS
AND THE NETWORK OF YOUNG PARLIAMENTARIANS, MAY 20-21,
2025—REPORT TABLED

Hon. Éric Forest: Honourable senators, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the report of the Assemblée parlementaire de la Francophonie (APF) concerning the Meetings of the Network of Women Parliamentarians and the Network of Young Parliamentarians of the Assemblée parlementaire de la Francophonie, held in Quebec City, Quebec, from May 20 to 21, 2025.

BUREAU MEETING AND ANNUAL SESSION,
JULY 9-13, 2025—REPORT TABLED

Hon. Éric Forest: Honourable senators, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the report of the Assemblée parlementaire de la Francophonie (APF) concerning the Bureau Meeting and Fiftieth Annual Session, held in Paris, France, from July 9 to 13, 2025.

[English]

FISHERIES AND OCEANS

STUDY ON SEAL POPULATIONS—NOTICE OF MOTION TO
AUTHORIZE COMMITTEE TO REQUEST GOVERNMENT RESPONSE
TO THE EIGHTH REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE TABLED DURING
THE FIRST SESSION OF THE FORTY-FOURTH PARLIAMENT

Hon. Fabian Manning: Honourable senators, I give notice that, two days hence, I will move:

That, pursuant to rule 12-23(1), the Senate request a complete and detailed response from the government to the eighth report of the Standing Senate Committee on Fisheries and Oceans, entitled *Sealing the Future: A Call to Action*, deposited with the Clerk of the Senate on May 23, 2024, and adopted by the Senate on September 24, 2024, during the First Session of the Forty-fourth Parliament, with the Minister of Fisheries being identified as minister responsible for responding to the report, in consultation with the Minister of Foreign Affairs and the Minister of National Revenue.

NATION-BUILDING VALUE OF TOURISM

NOTICE OF INQUIRY

Hon. Karen Sorensen: Honourable senators, I give notice that, two days hence:

I will call the attention of the Senate to the nation-building value of tourism in Canada.

QUESTION PERIOD

NATURAL RESOURCES

ENERGY SECTOR

Hon. Leo Housakos (Leader of the Opposition): Government leader, welcome back. We have missed you the last couple of weeks.

At the Asian summit last week, Prime Minister Carney declared that Canada is “. . . an unabashed energy superpower . . .” and he urged Asian nations to look to us as a reliable trading partner for oil, gas and critical minerals.

Yet, under his government, Canada’s energy sector has been stifled by policies that choke investment, delay projects and drive capital elsewhere, including Bill C-48, Bill C-69 and the emissions cap and the carbon tax.

How does the Prime Minister go to an international forum, look world leaders in the eyes and call Canada an energy superpower when his own government has systematically undermined our energy sector and has continued to drive out foreign investment?

Hon. Pierre Moreau (Government Representative in the Senate): Thank you very much for your kind words. Just like you, I very much missed Question Period for the last two weeks.

Now to your question, Senator Housakos, the Prime Minister was in the Indo-Pacific, one of the fastest-growing regions in the world, to expand trade and investment opportunities for Canadians. The government also announced the launch of free trade agreements, or FTAs, with the Philippines and Thailand, and led it forward.

The numbers typically show that within six years of signing an FTA, trade doubles. That means more opportunities for Canadian workers here in Canada. The new government is laser-focused on opening markets, creating opportunities across the country and doubling the trade for non-U.S. exports.

The Prime Minister has committed himself to making Canada an energy superpower. You should wait for this afternoon’s budget to see whether or not he is delivering on that.

Senator Housakos: Government leader, the world wants what we have, and we have what the world wants. It’s not very complicated. What we actually need is a prime minister who is committed to unleashing the energy capacity of this country. If we don’t hear anything less than that the government is ready to repeal Bill C-48, repeal Bill C-69, get rid of the emissions cap and, fundamentally, once and for all, also get rid of the industrial carbon tax, that means the government’s not serious. Are you ready to do all those things today in the budget?

Senator Moreau: You are well aware that I’m not the one who will deliver the speech for the budget. The government wants to build and make Canada an energy superpower in both conventional and clean energy while reducing emissions. That’s the commitment of the government, and it has been repeated many times.

The government’s goal is to support nation-building projects that bring Canadians together by ensuring that they are efficiently reviewed. As the Prime Minister said, any project, whether it’s a pipeline or something else, will —

The Hon. the Speaker: Thank you, Senator Moreau.

[Translation]

JUSTICE

MANDATORY MINIMUM PENALTIES

Hon. Claude Carignan: Welcome back, leader.

On October 31, the Supreme Court of Canada ruled the one-year mandatory minimum jail sentences for the most heinous crime of accessing or possessing child pornography are unconstitutional.

In response to this split 5-4 ruling, like most Canadians, Manitoba's NDP premier, Wab Kinew, strongly condemned this ruling. He said:

Child sexual abuse images and video, this is like one of the worst things that anyone can do. Not only should [you] go to prison for a long time, they should bury you under the prison. You shouldn't get protective custody.

Leader, do you stand with the Manitoba's NDP premier in denouncing this Supreme Court ruling?

Hon. Pierre Moreau (Government Representative in the Senate): Thank you for your good wishes, Senator Carignan.

The government is aware of the Supreme Court's split ruling, and is looking at what action it can take against such crimes in the future.

We clearly agree with the first part of what the premier said, namely, that crimes related to the abuse or exploitation of children are the most reprehensible and heinous crimes anyone can commit. I've been informed that, in the months to come, the government intends to introduce measures from its election platform to better protect children from these horrible crimes. We vehemently condemn crimes against children and every form of child abuse.

• (1430)

Senator Carignan: Thank you. I can see that a little rest enabled you to find answers to questions. I appreciate that.

Will the government also take advantage of the Bill C-14 study to reintroduce mandatory minimum sentences for sexual crimes against minors, which are among the most heinous crimes of all?

Senator Moreau: Senator Carignan, I was under the impression that I had answers prior to my medical incident. I'm sorry you haven't found that to be the case. However, I will strive to keep up the good work.

As I said, the government is currently studying the consequences of the Supreme Court ruling. Our information suggests that the government intends to take quick action on this type of crime, not only on crimes against children, but also on everything bail-related.

[English]

PUBLIC SERVICES AND PROCUREMENT

INDIGENOUS PROCUREMENT

Hon. Tony Loffreda: Senator Moreau, welcome back. I am glad to see you here again.

The government committed to ensuring that at least 5% of the total value of federal contracts each year is awarded to Indigenous businesses. This initiative — to be implemented in three phases — was set for full implementation by the end of 2024-25. How are the departments performing overall? Have they met the deadline? Do you have an estimate of how many Indigenous businesses have benefited from this policy so far and what the total economic value of these contracts has been?

I read in the news just yesterday that over the last few years, about 60% of roughly \$1 billion in contracts annually was awarded to Indigenous businesses in Ottawa. Communities across all of Canada should be benefiting from this program.

Hon. Pierre Moreau (Government Representative in the Senate): Thank you for your question, Senator Loffreda.

The adoption of the 5% procurement target has resulted in billions of dollars in contracts awarded to Indigenous businesses, which is a crucial part of the government's support for Indigenous economic development and the way we want to do business with Indigenous communities.

In the last fiscal year, the federal government exceeded the 5% procurement target, awarding over \$1.2 billion to Indigenous businesses, allowing them to enter supply chains and scale their businesses, thereby creating more jobs across Canada and bringing wealth to Indigenous communities as well.

Senator Loffreda: Thank you for that response. In support of this initiative, the government committed to co-developing a transformative Indigenous procurement strategy with Indigenous partners. Launched in fall 2022, the department's website notes this dialogue remains open, but there's no indication that engagement sessions have been scheduled since March 2025. When can we expect a report of these sessions? Could you share some preliminary findings or themes that have emerged from the discussions so far?

Senator Moreau: Unfortunately, I cannot share any preliminary findings at this time. I will say that Canada's new government was elected with a clear mandate to ensure programs and policies deliver smarter, faster and more effectively, and that includes Indigenous communities. With Procurement Assistance Canada, the government is helping Indigenous businesses from across Canada access federal procurement contracts, but there is work left to be done and the government recognizes this.

EMPLOYMENT AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

EMPLOYMENT EQUITY

Hon. Donna Dasko: Welcome back, senator.

In Budget 2024, following the recommendations of the Employment Equity Act Review Task Force in 2023, the government promised to expand the definition of “designated groups” in employment equity legislation, including two new designated groups — Black people and 2SLGBTQI+ people — while replacing the term “Aboriginal Peoples” with “Indigenous Peoples,” replacing the term “members of visible minorities” with “racialized people” and updating the corresponding definition, and aligning the definition of “persons with disabilities” with the Accessible Canada Act to make it more inclusive.

My question is this: When will the government be implementing these changes? Thank you.

Hon. Pierre Moreau (Government Representative in the Senate): Thank you for the question. I don’t have a specific answer to give you on that question, but I will certainly raise the question with the minister. I’ll come back to you as soon as I can and let you know if there’s an agenda or a specific moment when the government is intending to implement this legislation.

Senator Dasko: Perhaps a supplementary question might not apply, but given the extent of changes recommended, what measures will you be putting in place to ensure accountability and transparency as the changes are rolled out? Thank you.

Senator Moreau: With the same engagement for the supplementary question, I’ll raise the question with the minister and I will certainly get back to you sooner.

TRANSPORT

PICKERING LANDS

Hon. Robert Black: My question is for the Government Representative in the Senate. Welcome back, colleague.

Senator Moreau, in 1972, the government acquired 18,600 acres of land northeast of Toronto, known as the Pickering Lands, to develop a future airport. In 2015, Transport Canada transferred approximately 4,700 acres to Parks Canada for the creation of the Rouge National Urban Park. Then in 2017, an additional 5,200 acres were transferred, with the government retaining 8,700 acres for a potential airport. At that time and until 2024, the remaining land was being leased out by Transport Canada for various uses, including agricultural production. Senator Moreau, in January 2025, your government announced:

. . . the Pickering Lands will not be used for a future airport site. The Government of Canada intends to transfer the high conservation value lands to Parks Canada.

Senator Moreau, what is your government’s plans for the Pickering Lands and who have they invited to participate in the initial consultation process?

Hon. Pierre Moreau (Government Representative in the Senate): Thank you, Senator Black, for your kind words. As you noted, the government announced it intends to transfer portions of the Pickering Lands with high conservation value to Parks Canada to expand the Rouge National Urban Park. I can confirm that Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada alongside Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada, which is responsible for rural development, are part of the discussions on this matter. Moreover, as the custodian of the Pickering Lands, Transport Canada is working closely with Parks Canada, Public Services and Procurement Canada, the Canada Lands Company and Housing, Infrastructure and Communities Canada. The government will also work very closely with Indigenous, provincial and municipal partners.

I do want to assure you, senator, that the public consultation will ensure that various perspectives from the community and stakeholders are recognized.

Senator Black: Can you please advise this chamber when the public consultations will be launched for the communities surrounding the Pickering Lands and how long it will be open for? Can you also reassure Canadians that your government will not approve any future development plans on prime ag land needed to produce the food we all eat — three times a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year — whether it’s those lands or other lands deemed prime ag land?

Senator Moreau: Thank you for your question, senator, and I will get back to you as to when the consultation will take place and how long it will last.

[Translation]

PUBLIC SAFETY

FORCED LABOUR AND CHILD LABOUR

Hon. Julie Miville-Dechêne: Senator Moreau, this year, a little over 5,000 companies doing business in Canada reported on their efforts to reduce the risk of forced labour and child labour in their supply chains. This represents 1,000 fewer businesses than in 2024, the first year of the implementation of the Fighting Against Forced Labour and Child Labour in Supply Chains Act, which I sponsored.

How did this major setback happen? What explains such poor performance by federal institutions that should be setting the example, when half of them did nothing to comply with this legislation?

Hon. Pierre Moreau (Government Representative in the Senate): Thank you for the question. This is one of the reasons why I missed Question Period. I want to share some information with you on the number of companies that reported on their efforts and the difference between 2024 and 2025.

• (1440)

Since 2024, with the implementation of the Fighting Against Forced Labour and Child Labour in Supply Chains Act, Canadian companies and businesses have been allowed to submit joint reports. These submissions can include parent companies and their subsidiaries, for example. However, in 2025, 40% of the reports filed by companies were joint reports from parent companies and their subsidiaries, for a total of 1,652 reports. This could explain the difference in the figures you suggested between 2024 and 2025.

As for intergovernmental entities, I will probably come back to that with your supplementary question.

Senator Miville-Dechêne: I'm not sure I agree with you on the numbers.

More specifically, products made using forced labour by Uighurs in China are still entering Canada all the time, including red dates and tomato products from the Xinjiang province. Why is the government not honouring its previous promises and giving more resources to the Canada Border Services Agency to carry out this specific mandate?

Senator Moreau: I can't tell you if there are funds allocated to the Canada Border Services Agency specifically for that type of infraction, but I know the agency's funding was substantially increased.

With respect to the numbers you mentioned, I would be very happy to share them with you to see if they're consistent with the figure you have, which was 5,176 businesses. We would have to subtract 1,652 joint reports from the numbers you gave us.

[English]

GLOBAL AFFAIRS

SUPPORT FOR UKRAINE

Hon. Yonah Martin (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Senator Moreau, a recent report from the Committee for Freedom in Hong Kong Foundation and the Raoul Wallenberg Centre for Human Rights revealed that millions of dollars' worth of Canadian-made technology has ended up in Russian weapons used against Ukraine, shipped through Hong Kong shell companies. The report also highlights that our sanctions enforcement has done next to nothing to stop these transfers. Meanwhile, our allies, including the U.S. and the U.K., have sanctioned those same Hong Kong intermediaries but Canada has not.

Leader, how can your government claim to stand with Ukraine when it can't even stop Canadian defence technology from helping Putin's war machine?

Hon. Pierre Moreau (Government Representative in the Senate): It is quite clear that the Government of Canada, and not only the actual Government of Canada but every government in Canada, is standing very strong beside Ukraine. I don't think this specific question that you're asking has anything to do with the intention of the Government of Canada to stand strong beside the Ukrainian people. The government is very clear that the Russian aggression is unacceptable and that we will stand beside Ukraine no matter what happens, and forever, I'd say.

Senator Martin: Actions do speak louder than words. Senator Moreau, your government jumps at every opportunity to create new offices and roles to reward its Liberal allies, such as Chrystia Freeland's role as Special Representative for the Reconstruction of Ukraine, yet it does very little in the realm of tangible actions to correct a lethal mistake.

Will your government commit to immediately sanctioning the Hong Kong entities named in the report?

Senator Moreau: If facts matter, I think the government has made it very clear that it stands beside Ukraine. We are all aware that the Canadian government spends millions of dollars to help Ukraine and condemns the unacceptable invasion on Russia's part.

VETERANS AFFAIRS

ACCESS TO HEALTH CARE

Hon. Salma Atallahjan: Government leader, earlier this year, Canada's veterans learned that the government department that is supposed to take care of them is now severely limiting coverage for shock-wave therapy, a treatment used by hundreds of veterans for chronic pain and other service-related injuries. Veterans Affairs Canada now plans to cap this therapy at just three sessions for life. Veterans are evidently disappointed at this decision, especially as the Department of National Defence is spending billions setting up new bureaucracies to spend further billions in procurement contracts.

Leader, why is your government penny-pinching when it comes to the health and well-being of the brave men and women who already sacrificed so much for our country?

Some Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

Hon. Pierre Moreau (Government Representative in the Senate): The government has made it clear that it wants to invest in the Canadian Armed Forces. I disagree on the fact that we are not taking care of our veterans. I'm sure that more has to be done, but the government is committed to standing by its Armed Forces.

My own family was among those who went to the Second World War. I am very committed to bringing to the government anything that would draw attention to the care of the Armed Forces and our veterans. I know that we have a visitor here in the gallery, and I think they have to understand that the Canadian government stands beside its Armed Forces.

Senator Ataulhjan: Senator Moreau, will your government reverse this uncaring decision and ensure that our veterans continue to receive this much-needed treatment they deserve?

Senator Moreau: I'm taking good note of your question, and I will raise it with the minister.

FINANCE

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Hon. Krista Ross: Senator Moreau, welcome back. I'm going to ask you a similar question to one that I asked your predecessor almost exactly one year ago.

For the past decade, typically, the Auditor General signed their independent report in September, and the government tabled the public accounts by the end of October. That, obviously, wasn't the case last year, since they were tabled on December 17, coming very close to the end of the Financial Administration Act's mandated tabling date. Your predecessor answered last year, saying the Treasury Board confirmed they would amend the public accounts production master plan and have the public accounts tabled by October 15 starting in 2025.

Well, the usual date and the new deadline have both come and gone. When will the public accounts be tabled?

Hon. Pierre Moreau (Government Representative in the Senate): I don't have the answer to your question, but I will raise the question with the minister. I will review what my predecessor told you last year at the same time, and I will certainly get back to you with an answer.

Senator Ross: Thank you. As part of your predecessor's answer, he let us know that the tasks included in the master plan would be attributed to the organizations involved in the production of the public accounts, with specific timelines to meet the targeted tabling date.

Given that we haven't met the new tabling date, are you able to identify which organizations have failed to meet the timelines associated with their tasks?

Senator Moreau: Obviously, I don't have the answer to that question at this moment, but I will inquire and get back to you with the answer.

GLOBAL AFFAIRS

CANADA-CHINA RELATIONS

Hon. Leo Housakos (Leader of the Opposition): Government leader, "Prime Minister Elbows Up" and "Prime Minister Elbows Down" has not been able to deliver on the single most important promise of the April election, which is a trade deal with the United States, yet he had no problems running to Beijing to meet the most nefarious dictator from the most nefarious dictatorship in order to try to negotiate a trade deal.

The question is simple: A year ago, right before prorogation, we rushed to put in place the Countering Foreign Interference Act because CSIS, the RCMP and many other agencies in this country informed the government of the poor behaviour of Beijing and China in regard to infiltrating our economy, institutions, et cetera.

By the way, a year later, the Countering Foreign Interference Act that we passed in this very chamber is not even in place. Do you think it's logical that the Prime Minister is not spending the time required on the \$30-trillion economic partner to the south but is running to Beijing to negotiate with a dictator?

Hon. Pierre Moreau (Government Representative in the Senate): I said earlier that what the Prime Minister did with what we call the "Asian tour" is to diversify the Canadian economy. You're aware that the world economy is changing and that the U.S. economy is changing drastically.

What we are trying to do is to build a stronger economy, and to do that, we have to develop new markets. That is exactly what the leadership of the Prime Minister is now demonstrating. He's travelling to engage with other leaders in the world to strengthen the Canadian economy so that we will not depend on only one major partner but that we will diversify the Canadian economy. That's what Canadians deserve, and I think that the Prime Minister is aiming for the better good of all Canadians.

• (1450)

Senator Housakos: I was part of a government that signed 41 free trade deals — the Stephen Harper government — and most of them were with those Asia-Pacific nations. But let me tell you this: Our focus was always on our number one trading partner, which is that \$30-trillion economy our country relies on. The question, again, is a very simple one: We all understand the foreign interference challenge that we have had from Beijing and the nefarious dictatorship. Seven months in, all of a sudden, this government has gone back to their friends in Beijing, and it's almost like Liberal Party business as usual. Aren't you as concerned as we are about that?

Senator Moreau: As you know, Senator Housakos, diplomacy is about having constructive and, at times, difficult conversations. I understand that while in Beijing, Minister Anand met with her counterpart to discuss issues of sensitivity and to identify key areas where Canada and China can work together, including the environment, energy and health.

The government is committed to ensuring the strategic partnership with China continues to move forward constructively and pragmatically, because we need to build a strong economy, and that —

The Hon. the Speaker: Thank you.

CANADIAN HERITAGE

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

Hon. Yonah Martin (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Government leader, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, or CBC, the taxpayer-funded broadcaster that receives over \$1 billion a year from the government, is now in Federal Court to block the release of its Gem streaming subscriber numbers after Canada's Information Commissioner ruled that the CBC's secrecy claims over this data were unfounded. Yet instead of respecting transparency, the broadcaster is spending public money to hide basic information that would show Canadians whether their investment is delivering results.

Leader, why should taxpayers pay for the CBC's lawyers to keep them in the dark?

Hon. Pierre Moreau (Government Representative in the Senate): The government is probably thinking that Canadians deserve that the CBC be well funded by the government. But since your question raises the issue of a challenge in court, it is not proper for me to comment when the justice is now studying the review and the procedure that was brought forward by the CBC. I will not comment on this, like I will not comment on any matters that are in front of a court of justice.

Senator Martin: But all the money that they are spending is taxpayer money. So I'm asking, Senator Moreau, will your government direct the CBC to drop this costly court case and comply with the Information Commissioner's ruling, or do you believe state-funded media should be above the same transparency laws that apply to everyone else?

Senator Moreau: The CBC is allowed to make its own decisions on whether there has to be a challenge in court. Since this challenge happened, it's not for me to comment here at the Senate or anywhere else. We will have to wait and see what the judgment is. When the judgment is rendered, I'll be happy to answer more deeply on your question.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

BILL TO AMEND THE WEIGHTS AND MEASURES ACT, THE ELECTRICITY AND GAS INSPECTION ACT, THE WEIGHTS AND MEASURES REGULATIONS AND THE ELECTRICITY AND GAS INSPECTION REGULATIONS

SECOND READING—DEBATE ADJOURNED

Hon. Toni Varone moved second reading of Bill S-3, An Act to amend the Weights and Measures Act, the Electricity and Gas Inspection Act, the Weights and Measures Regulations and the Electricity and Gas Inspection Regulations.

He said: Honourable senators, I wish to begin by acknowledging that the land on which we gather is the traditional unceded territory of the Algonquin Anishinaabe Nation.

I am pleased to rise at second reading in support of Bill S-3, An Act to amend the Weights and Measures Act, the Electricity and Gas Inspection Act, the Weights and Measures Regulations and the Electricity and Gas Inspection Regulations.

It's a real barn burner of a bill, a real page-turner, if you will. I encourage all senators to read it. In fact, after trick-or-treating and "Halloweening" on Friday night, my daughter came home quite nervous and had trouble sleeping. She asked me, "Dad, can you read me your speech?" I obliged.

In all seriousness, trade measurement touches the lives of every Canadian each and every day. Whether you are fuelling your car, buying fruits and vegetables at the grocery store or paying your electricity bill, Canadians rely on accurate and reliable measurements.

Financial transactions based on measurement occur in virtually all major industry sectors in the commercial and retail supply chains. The accuracy of devices used to buy or sell goods based on measurement has a direct impact on the pockets of all Canadians.

The government's responsibility for the trade measurement laws and requirements governing the accuracy and reliability of the purchase and sale of measured goods is grounded in the Constitution Act of 1867. These laws are essential to the fair, efficient and competitive operation of the marketplace and contribute to a strong and resilient economy.

Measurement Canada, an agency of Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada, is responsible for administering and enforcing Canada's trade measurement laws and its requirements from coast to coast to coast.

As part of its legislative mandate, the agency evaluates and approves scales, gas pumps, electricity and natural gas meters, electric vehicle chargers and other measuring devices for use in Canada and also tests and certifies the accuracy of these devices once they are installed in the marketplace. The agency also calibrates and certifies the physical test standards used to certify devices. It investigates business and consumer complaints of

suspected inaccurate measurement. The agency continues to recognize private sector organizations to test and certify measuring devices.

The laws governing the accuracy and reliability of the purchase and sale of measured goods have served consumers and businesses well for many decades. However, they have not kept pace with the current market environment and today's digital age. These laws have not been substantially updated since the 1980s, at a time when the predominant measurement technologies were mechanical and transactions were paper-based. They came into effect before the internet and before mobile and wireless technologies became the predominant way that businesses and their customers interact. As such, the current laws are not well suited to adapt to the increasingly automated, software-enhanced and digitally enabled measurement systems.

The current legislative framework for trade measurement reflects the time it was created in. It is static, prescriptive, overly complex and burdensome. The compliance and enforcement tools are limited and tend to be punitive rather than preventative. They are not scalable to reflect the impact of non-compliance, resulting in penalties that are not always suitable to the offence. They need to be improved to achieve desired changes in behaviour and improve compliance in the marketplace.

Digital technologies are fundamental to the way businesses and consumers interact in the marketplace, and the pace of technology development continues to shorten product life cycles. Trade measurement laws governing financial transactions should reflect this — namely in the purchase and sale of measured goods — and protect consumers and businesses. This will help to prevent loss due to inaccurate measurement and unfair business practices while, at the same time, encouraging innovation, improving timely access to advances in measurement technologies and increasing businesses' ability to adapt to an ever-evolving marketplace and customer preferences.

This bill amends the Weights and Measures Act and the Electricity and Gas Inspection Act with the goal of modernizing Canada's trade measurement framework to address these challenges.

The proposed legislative changes would create a framework that would do the following: reduce barriers to business success, reduce the burden on regulated parties, increase protections for consumers and allow increased efficiency of service delivery.

For example, proposed amendments to the Weights and Measures Act will grant temporary permission to manufacturers to introduce new measurement technologies into the marketplace without delays. This will facilitate Canadians' access to innovative measurement technologies and business approaches, particularly in new and rapidly expanding industries such as clean fuel measurement where research and development is essential to the advancement of the industry's goals.

It will also allow businesses to purchase and use new state-of-the-art measurement technologies while providing sufficient safeguards for effective oversight of their performance while extending protections to businesses and consumers.

In addition to many other services, Measurement Canada inspectors annually conduct approximately 10,000 inspections of measuring devices that monitor performance in the marketplace and, where needed, may institute corrective actions. Additionally, around 1 million measuring devices are certified by authorized third-party service providers approved by Measurement Canada to perform inspections. Each year, thousands of new, increasingly complex devices enter the marketplace, which requires the agency to adopt risk-based approaches and efficiencies in order to provide effective marketplace surveillance.

• (1500)

To ensure continued oversight and to adapt to the expansion in the number of trade measurement devices and improving technology, these proposed amendments will allow Measurement Canada to introduce sampling as a risk-based approach for conducting device inspections under the Weights and Measures Act. These amendments will allow inspectors to inspect thousands of devices of the same type using statistical sampling. This will increase the efficiency of regulatory oversight and the agency's operations overall. Sampling as a risk-based approach to inspection work is currently only permitted under the Electricity and Gas Inspection Act.

The expanded adoption of risk-based approaches will enable Measurement Canada to better focus on monitoring and implementing corrective actions in areas where the risk and costs associated with inaccurate measurements are higher. Additionally, it will allow the agency to allocate more resources towards addressing consumer and business complaints related to suspected measurement inaccuracies and unfair business practices.

The legislative amendments will allow the agency to leverage modern tools and strengthen service delivery. Proposed amendments will allow timely, accessible and cost-effective inspection services, particularly in areas that are difficult to access, through the use of digital technologies to access, diagnose and resolve issues remotely via the internet. This will allow the government to harness advances in digital technologies to provide consumers and businesses with protection against loss due to inaccurate measurement in communities where access to services can be limited to a few service providers. This will reduce travel costs for inspection services and benefit device owners who must comply with mandatory recertification requirements.

The amendments will also streamline processes and reduce the regulatory and administrative burden, creating exemptions from the full suite of requirements that can be burdensome for small businesses, for example, those who sell electricity and natural gas to customers in recreational trailer parks or as part of seasonal business. The administrative burden on small businesses to meet the requirements of the Electricity and Gas Inspection Act can be quite substantial, especially when their primary business is not the selling of electricity and natural gas. These proposed amendments would exempt these businesses from some or all requirements of the act.

Safeguards and protections in the proposed amendments would ensure that customers of businesses with these exemptions would receive the same level of protection against potential loss due to inaccurate measurement as customers of businesses without exemptions.

Now you know why my daughter needed help falling asleep.

The proposed changes to Canada's trade measurement framework will keep pace with international trading partners. As other countries move towards stronger, more flexible approaches in trade measurement accuracy, Canada must keep pace. Canada is a country with recognized expertise in the field of trade measurement, but it must move towards a more flexible, future-focused legislative framework to stay relevant globally, reduce unintended barriers to trade and ensure continued international confidence in Canada-based transactions involving measurement.

Another important goal is to increase operational efficiencies so that government spending on the delivery of legislative and regulatory mandates is streamlined.

The proposed amendments will eliminate prescriptive administrative requirements, enabling digital and client-focused methods for reporting the entry, movement and corrective actions of measuring devices in cases of measurement inaccuracy or unfair practices.

Some small businesses lack the expertise in understanding regulatory requirements and often do not have the support or the resources to understand and act upon their obligations. The proposed amendments would allow Measurement Canada to work with small businesses to prevent non-compliance by helping them establish preventative control plans. These plans will outline a business strategy to identify, prevent and eliminate non-compliance within the law. This will reduce measurement inaccuracy and potential losses for their customers as well as avoid penalties due to non-compliance.

Currently, the Electricity and Gas Inspection Act allows the verification of electricity meters using sampling, removing the need to test and verify the accuracy of each of the millions of individual meters installed in residential and commercial locations across Canada. Proposed amendments to the Weights and Measures Act would grant the same authority for scales and the verification of thermal energy meters.

I would now like to speak about other amendments that support the modernization of the two acts and set them up for the future. The modernization of the two acts provides an opportunity to amend definitions and introduce new terms. It proposes several changes to serve the marketplace better and provide greater clarity about Measurement Canada's duties under the acts.

Through this act, the government is proposing to expand or replace several definitions to allow for the inclusion of new technologies, new ways of doing business and greater flexibility in the delivery of services.

For instance, it proposes to expand the definition of "meter" to include software and digital components since meters are no longer strictly mechanical. It sets the economy up for success in a world where measurement devices are increasingly connected to each other remotely.

As more and more modes of conveyance are being used to deliver services involving trade measurement, it proposes adding a definition of "vehicle." This would allow for clarity in the interpretation of the acts. Service delivery must ensure that consumers receive protection against inaccurate measurement. It reflects the growing number of services provided using various kinds of vehicles, such as via systems built directly into forklifts and waste collection trucks.

This act replaces the definition of "accredited meter verifier" with "authorized service provider" because their duties are so much more than verifying meters for accurate measurement. Referring to them as authorized service providers gives them flexibility to expand their roles and authorities. As the programs grow to inspect emerging measurement technologies for clean fuels — such as electric vehicle charging stations — or to use digital approaches to inspect devices, the roles of the authorized service providers may be expanded.

The bill also proposes to repeal several outdated or unused provisions. This will help reduce the regulatory burden on businesses. It also repeals the requirements in the Electricity and Gas Inspection Act for inspectors to conduct voltage tests on devices because it is rarely done and has been deemed unnecessary.

Additionally, the bill proposes amendments to both acts to correct several inconsistencies in outdated legislation and to bring clarity to the legislative authorities to work confidently and more efficiently.

With these changes, Measurement Canada inspectors can determine the amounts payable when investigating a dispute over inaccurate measurement. This will clarify that their role in disputes is not just to verify inaccuracy but to also recalculate the amount charged in the bill under dispute.

These changes, while being housekeeping in nature, propose to introduce a legislative requirement to review both acts every 10 years or so, so that they may remain relevant and better serve the needs of Canadians.

Finally, to allow legislation to come into force seamlessly, it includes several consequential amendments to update any provisions that refer to other amended provisions as a result of this bill — for example, updating various offence-related provisions in both acts to reflect the changes to inspector powers so there is consistency throughout.

Taken together, this creates transitional provisions recognizing that whatever was previously approved, permitted or issued under the current Electricity and Gas Inspection Act will remain so in the new act.

A healthy trade measurement framework underpins a strong economy by contributing to a fair and competitive marketplace and international, business and consumer confidence. The proposed legislative amendments will bring Canada's trade measurement framework into the digital age and provide the needed flexibility to continue to keep pace with rapidly advancing measurement technologies and evolving trade measurement practices.

They will leverage modern tools to better serve Canadians through the use of digital approaches and sampling while enhancing measurement accuracy and facilitating an increase in the timeliness of the introduction of new measurement technologies.

In conclusion, this bill will reduce red tape, enhancing a strong economy where businesses and consumers alike can conduct their transactions with confidence. These amendments will better regulate trade measurement not just for the present but for a rapidly evolving future. Honourable senators, I thank you for your time and indulgence. I trust you see the merits of these amendments as I do in maintaining Canada's international competitiveness.

Thank you. *Meegwetch.*

Some Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

Hon. Denise Batters: Would the senator take a question? Thank you. As this is the chamber of sober second thought, government bills are usually introduced in the House of Commons. Certainly, they can also be introduced here, but it is more common that they are introduced in the House of Commons first, and then we take the second more detailed look at them. So why did the Government of Canada decide to introduce this particular bill in the Senate?

• (1510)

Senator Varone: To the best of my knowledge, it's common practice for the Senate to deal with housekeeping matters of the government and, additionally, matters that do not have any financial or monetary implications. That's the reason why it's starting here.

Hon. Yonah Martin (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): It is my understanding that modernization has been a long time coming. It has been decades since it has been modernized, so why has it taken so long? I haven't read the bill carefully, so are we looking at sweeping changes? Do you have a sense of how much change this will bring?

Senator Varone: Thank you for the question. My sense is that given that the bill was last amended prior to mobile phones and the internet, measurement technology has come a long way since then. Successive governments have always overlooked it because other priorities lay ahead of them.

It is housekeeping, it is time, it is relevant, and I think we just need to move forward. Why other governments didn't do it — successive governments — I couldn't tell you.

Senator Martin: That leads me to my second question. If this has been a long time coming, and we're looking at sweeping changes in this new digital age — you mentioned that there will be support for small businesses, but they are already really overburdened, and I'm concerned about there being potentially more red tape for them. I'm curious about the support that small businesses will receive.

Senator Varone: I've not heard about the support they will receive, but I did pay attention to the deletions of the previous acts, and to me, when I read it, it did relieve substantial burdens for small businesses in terms of the reporting and their accounting now that everything can be digitally monitored.

(On motion of Senator Martin, debate adjourned.)

NATIONAL FRAMEWORK FOR A GUARANTEED LIVABLE BASIC INCOME BILL

SECOND READING—DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Pate, seconded by the Honourable Senator Duncan, for the second reading of Bill S-206, An Act to develop a national framework for a guaranteed livable basic income.

Hon. Marty Klyne: Honourable senators, I have to begin by thanking Senator Varone for that engaging, enlightening and entertaining speech.

I rise today to speak to Bill S-206, An Act to develop a national framework for a guaranteed livable basic income.

First, I wish to thank Senator Pate for her steadfast advocacy on behalf of Canadians facing poverty, insecurity and systemic disadvantage. Her efforts have helped sustain an important conversation in this chamber about economic justice and human dignity.

I support this bill going to committee and trust the committee will address the important issues, including those which lead to setting the table for an environment that stimulates and enables people who are unemployed or going to be unemployed to find meaningful work, a just transition.

The idea of a guaranteed livable income has deep roots in Canadian social policy debates. It has resurfaced at pivotal moments during economic upheaval, labour strife, technological change and widening inequality. Today, in the aftermath of the

pandemic and amid the rise of automation, artificial intelligence and unprecedented wealth concentration, the concept of a basic income has once again captured public imagination.

The pandemic revealed both the strength and fragility of our social safety net. Programs like the Canada Emergency Response Benefit, or CERB, showed that direct income support can be deployed rapidly to address urgent needs, and that was the aim: to get money out quickly to eligible Canadians and Canadian businesses — without bureaucratic hoops and hurdles — to avoid a financial crisis like that of 2008. However, pandemic relief measures also exposed gaps in our employment insurance system and highlighted how precarious work had become for many Canadians. At the same time, these programs revealed vulnerabilities, including the potential for fraud, inefficiency and unintended disincentives.

Beyond the pandemic, technological change is profoundly reshaping the world of work. Robotics, 3D printing and AI have not only dramatically increased productivity but also reduced job security in sectors such as manufacturing, construction, transportation and retail. Now, even knowledge-based jobs, once thought safe — in law, medicine, finance and the creative industries — face disruption from generative AI.

The numbers are sobering. Studies estimate that nearly half of all current jobs are at risk of automation within two decades. McKinsey projects that 45% of current tasks could already be automated and that 60% of occupations could see at least a third of their work replaced by existing technologies. Leading economists warn these trends could displace millions of workers, suppress wages and widen inequality, especially for those without advanced education or adaptable skills.

Canadians are paying attention. Recent polling shows that 32% see a basic income guarantee as the most effective way to mitigate AI's impact on jobs, 26% favour major investments in re-skilling and 22% want limits on the rapid adoption of AI. Canadians clearly expect their government not only to manage the technical dimensions of AI but also to safeguard its human consequences.

In this context, a guaranteed livable income, a financial floor allowing every person to live with dignity regardless of employment, has understandable appeal. It challenges us to consider what we owe one another in an age of disruption. But we must also ask this question: If we simply provide a guaranteed income, are we comfortable with that as a long-term solution?

Work is more than a paycheque. It gives us identity, belonging and a reason to get out of bed. Canada's productivity depends on a labour force. Working people contribute to Canada's productivity by providing the essential labour force and enhancing it through their skills, education and efficiency, which are crucial for generating economic output and driving long-term economic growth.

A universal payment risks detaching income from contribution. If people are permanently removed from the workforce, it could weaken productivity and social engagement. On the other hand, if a basic income supplements rather than replaces work, it becomes extremely expensive.

We should focus on helping Canadians gain the skills and training they need to rejoin the workforce, not merely on providing unconditional payments. The committee should therefore examine how a guaranteed livable income might influence motivation, skill development and labour participation not only among recipients but also among those just above the eligibility threshold.

Other countries have grappled with similar challenges. In response to job anxiety and automation, Germany invested heavily in — in fact, doubled down on — advanced manufacturing and reshored parts of its value chain, strengthening both its economy and workforce resilience. China has implemented similar measures and finds itself in a situation of labour scarcity.

With that in mind, I would like to highlight eight more points for the committee's consideration. Now we're getting into Varone country.

One is social cohesion and the "politics of envy." Economist Greg Mason of the University of Manitoba cautions that most universal-basic-income research focuses narrowly on recipients' behaviour while neglecting the attitudes of those who do not qualify.

Those earning just above the threshold may perceive unfairness, a dynamic Mason calls the "politics of envy." Such resentment could undermine social cohesion and public support.

Fairness is not only about policy design but also about perception.

• (1520)

Canadians must see any income support system as equitable, inclusive and motivating — not divisive.

My second point is sustainability and tax reform. The Parliamentary Budget Officer, or PBO, estimates the gross cost of a guaranteed income at \$107 billion this year under a nuclear family model, assuming the elimination of existing low-income tax credits. Moreover, according to the same report, a basic income could reduce annual employment earnings among low-income individuals by nearly \$5 billion.

Implementing a nationwide guaranteed income program would be among the most expensive and complex social reforms in Canadian history. It could require abolishing many tax

exemptions and deductions and fundamentally restructuring both federal and provincial tax systems. This demands careful study at committee with the right expert witnesses.

My third point is fairness and targeted investment. Equal income does not mean equal opportunity. According to the 2021 PBO report, a low-income single-parent family would lose more than \$5,300 annually under a uniform basic income compared to targeted benefits.

The updated 2025 analysis assumes eliminating programs such as the Disability Tax Credit, the caregiver credit, the medical expense credit and workers' compensation — all essential supports for Canadians facing hardship.

Replacing such programs risks harming the very people we aim to help. We've seen the consequences of this approach before: The Ontario Autism Program moved from targeted supports to flat-rate payments and, despite doubling its budget, left many families in crisis. The lesson is clear: One-size-fits-all policies cannot replace needs-based support without leaving high-needs individuals worse off.

My fourth point is constitutional and interjurisdictional implications. Social assistance is primarily a provincial responsibility. A federally administered guaranteed income would require complex negotiations with provinces and territories and potentially restructuring federal transfers.

The committee should examine how federal-provincial cost-sharing could be designed and whether there is a political will among first ministers to pursue such a transformation in the current fiscal climate.

The fifth point is lessons from the Canada Emergency Response Benefit, or CERB, and Employment Insurance, or EI. CERB provided crucial emergency relief during the pandemic — \$2,000 a month for Canadians who lost income. But its success should not be conflated with the feasibility of a permanent program. Instead, the experience underscores the need to modernize Employment Insurance.

EI remains vital for protecting living standards earned through work and preventing poverty through contributory, temporary support. A comprehensive review of EI — in collaboration with business and labour — could achieve many of the stability and dignity goals that basic income seeks, without dismantling our existing fiscal framework. Former senator Diane Bellemare's work in this area could be invaluable to the committee.

My next concern is reaching marginalized Canadians. Roughly 10% of Canadians do not file taxes and, therefore, fall outside the data on which basic income payments would rely. Ironically,

they are often the very people most in need of help. The committee should study how to reach those outside the tax system and what mechanisms would ensure accuracy, accountability and program integrity.

The seventh point is considering alternatives. Public opinion suggests Canadians prefer targeted, employment-linked programs over universal transfers. An Angus Reid survey found that 59% of Canadians support a youth guarantee program connecting Canadians under 30 to work, 65% support a job path program for all unemployed Canadians, and 74% support a professional training program for all Canadians.

My last point is about the promise and peril of a simple idea. As Professor David Green, Chair of the BC Basic Income Panel, observed:

If we want to address poverty, what simpler way (is there) to proceed than to send everybody a cheque that is equivalent to the poverty line? . . . The problem is when you get close to it and you ask, "How would I actually implement that?"

Basic income is often viewed as a magic bullet or the panacea — expected to reduce poverty, improve health, increase education and strengthen communities. But no single policy can bear all those expectations.

Colleagues, my caution about a guaranteed livable income should not be mistaken for complacency. We must confront poverty, inequality and economic insecurity, but we must do so through targeted, evidence-based and collaborative measures.

This debate is about the kind of society we want to build. Automation and AI are reshaping our world. The pandemic exposed vulnerabilities we cannot ignore. Canadians are asking for security, dignity and opportunity. A guaranteed livable income is one possible response, but not a simple one. It touches the very foundation of our economy, our federation and our social contract. That is why I support sending this bill to committee for careful, comprehensive study. When the numbers are on the table, it could be another story.

Let the study of this bill be guided by evidence, compassion and prudence so that whatever path Parliament takes will strengthen both the economic foundations and the social fabric of our country.

Thank you, *hiy kitatamihin*.

(On motion of Senator Patterson, debate adjourned.)

CHIGNECTO ISTHMUS DYKELAND SYSTEM BILL

SECOND READING—DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Quinn, seconded by the Honourable Senator Osler, for the second reading of Bill S-216, An Act to declare the Chignecto Isthmus Dykeland System and related works to be for the general advantage of Canada.

Hon. Paul (PJ) Prosper: Honourable senators, I hadn't planned on rising on this item. However, I do feel compelled to after Senator McNair's question last week. He asked Senator MacDonald the following question:

Once again, though, I fail to follow the train of thought as to why it is necessary to exercise the declaratory power. There is nothing that's requiring that. The funding is settled. The parties would be much better off starting the work and remediating the dykes.

For me, as someone from Nova Scotia who supports this bill, I want to explain why Parliament exercising the declaratory power is important. No, it's not related to pressuring the government for funding. It has to do with the duty to consult related to Aboriginal and treaty rights, found under section 35 of the Constitution Act, 1982, and who has jurisdictional leadership regarding this duty.

When I started my career decades ago, Indigenous lawyers were arguing that the Crown, which signed our treaties, was indivisible. We continue to push back against the downloading of the federal government's fiduciary duty to First Nations and other Indigenous Peoples to provincial governments. We have seen that there is an inconsistent standard at the provincial level for consultation.

Under this bill's previous iteration as Bill S-273, Chief Rebecca Knockwood of the closest-impacted community, Fort Folly First Nation, better known as Amlamgog, testified before the Standing Senate Committee on Transport and Communications, noting the following:

Currently, there are real issues with how the Government of New Brunswick undertakes consultation. Under the consultation process in New Brunswick, we are often informed that a project has been determined to have little or no impact on Aboriginal and treaty rights or has been approved with little to no consultation with our communities. Provincial consultation to date on this project has been inadequate. Archaeological work has been conducted without full Mi'kmaq involvement. Likewise, the provincial environmental impact assessment process excludes First Nations from key aspects of the process, including the technical review committee.

As a result of these issues, we at MTI were forced to develop our own impact assessment process: the Mi'gmaq Rights Impact Assessment, or MRIA, Framework. While the federal government and proponents have had no issues in

following this Mi'kmaq-led impact assessment process, the province continues to refuse to recognize it. Indigenous consultation under the federal guidelines and Indigenous inclusion under the federal Impact Assessment Act is more comprehensive than the New Brunswick process and aligns better with the MRIA process.

Deep and meaningful consultation is required for this project as well as a proper Mi'gmaq Indigenous Knowledge Study. For a project of this significance in our culturally significant area, we feel a federal impact assessment is necessary. We feel this bill will assist in ensuring that the federal government has a significant role in both the consultation and impact assessment processes and a greater likelihood that the process complies with the MRIA. Considering the significance of this area for the Mi'kmaq, considering that the federal government's consultation and impact assessment process is more thorough and considering that we cannot afford to wait for the jurisdictional battle to be settled, the Mi'kmaq chiefs in New Brunswick would ask you to support the bill put forward by Senator Quinn. The land should be transferred to federal jurisdiction until this project has been completed. . . .

• (1530)

Ms. Jessica Ginsburg, a lawyer for Kwilmu'kw Maw-klusuaqn, also known as KMKNO, and the main negotiating body for the Mi'kmaq of Nova Scotia, noted:

The Mi'kmaw Nation has a general interest in all lands, waters and other resources of Nova Scotia, as the Mi'kmaq have never surrendered, ceded or sold their Aboriginal title to any of their lands and waters in the province.

The Mi'kmaq have a title claim to all of Nova Scotia and are co-owners of the lands, waters and resources of this province. Both Canada and Nova Scotia are aware of and acknowledge the title and rights claims of the Mi'kmaq and the fact that any potential impacts to Mi'kmaq rights and title are subject to the duty to consult and accommodate.

She goes on to say:

The question of how to uphold the Crown's duty to consult in the face of potential regulatory exemptions and gaps needs to be addressed. The bill itself should contain a guarantee that decisions made pursuant to it shall be consistent with the goal of reconciliation and the Crown's duty to consult obligations.

Any diminution of the consultation opportunities afforded to the Mi'kmaq of Nova Scotia is unacceptable. Before these lands were of significance to Canada as an economic and transportation corridor, they were of significance to the Mi'kmaq people as an economic and transportation corridor, with use and occupancy by Mi'kmaq since time immemorial. Today, the area continues to hold high significance for its long-standing traditional use, its archaeological potential both on land and under water and its spiritual significance in connection with Mi'kmaq legends. It is the focus of numerous consultations, and it presents economic opportunities for the Mi'kmaq associated with

local infrastructure developments such as the new interprovincial transmission lines. It is therefore imperative that the Mi'kmaq continue to be involved with all of the multidimensional decisions affecting this important area.

While the New Brunswick government has recently changed, and there is a party more willing to negotiate and respect the rights of the Mi'kmaq in place now, we know that Nova Scotia has recently been failing in its duty to consult and cooperate with the Mi'kmaq. The lack of consultation has been so grievous that it has sparked mass protests in an area called Hunter's Mountain, and it has prompted several emails from the Assembly of Nova Scotia Mi'kmaq Chiefs.

It is also of note that Mi'gmawe'l Tplu'taqnn, writing on behalf of eight of nine member Mi'kmaq communities, denounced the New Brunswick review process in their comments on the proposed "one project, one review" process and the cooperation agreement between New Brunswick and Canada.

In their letter dated October 8, 2025, they talked about how they feel consistently and systematically left out of key conversations and decisions, and went so far as to say that their concerns are:

. . . compounded by a provincial duty to consult process which routinely ignores or minimizes impacts on our rights. Substitution of the New Brunswick EIA process for the federal Impact Assessment process will result in less protection of Mi'gmaq rights in New Brunswick.

Colleagues, using the declaratory power allows the federal government to take jurisdictional leadership regarding the duty to consult. Further, it is also important in relation to the leadership of any environmental impact assessment process.

Senators, without the leadership of Parliament to invoke the declaratory power, the Mi'kmaq peoples are left necessarily divided across an arbitrary boundary line in the Chignecto Isthmus. We are a people divided between two provincial environmental impact assessment schemes and caught between two provincially led consultation processes that have been, in many ways, proven to be deficient in their ability to address Mi'kmaq concerns.

This is why I worked with Senator Quinn to ensure that there were explicit references to the importance of the isthmus throughout the bill and why I strongly believe that exercising the declaratory power is so important. By Parliament declaring that the Chignecto Isthmus project is ". . . for the general Advantage of Canada or for the Advantage of Two or more of the Provinces," we are ensuring that the duty to consult and the honour of the Crown are held to the highest standard. We have very recent examples of consultation failing at the provincial level, and we cannot allow it to fail in this project, which is so significant to the Mi'kmaq and to Canada as a whole. *Wela'liog*. Thank you very much.

(On motion of Senator Clement, debate adjourned.)

[Senator Prosper]

[*Translation*]

JUDICIAL INDEPENDENCE DAY BILL

SECOND READING—DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Moreau, P.C., seconded by the Honourable Senator Dalphond, for the second reading of Bill S-219, An Act to establish Judicial Independence Day.

Hon. Pierre J. Dalphond: Honourable senators, this item stands adjourned in the name of Senator Martin, and I ask for leave of the Senate that, following my intervention, the balance of her time to speak to this item be reserved.

The Hon. the Speaker: Is leave granted, honourable senators?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

The Hon. the Speaker: So ordered.

Senator Dalphond: Honourable senators, I rise today to support Bill S-219, An Act to establish Judicial Independence Day.

On June 10, Senator Moreau gave his first speech in this place to thank us for making him feel welcome, to tell us about his background and to express his interest in working with us all. He also spoke of his love of the French language, the role of the Senate and the importance of judicial independence. After all, his life partner is a highly respected judge.

• (1540)

Being an astute observer, he then said the following:

The separation of powers is the foundational principle of that independence in that it guarantees the impartial treatment of citizens before the courts and in dealings with the state. Like the rule of law, judicial independence guarantees human dignity and respect for human rights. It enables judges to resist all outside interference.

However, under the influence of fear, exacerbated populism, dehumanization or individuals greedy for absolute power, democracy is retreating.

[*English*]

Unfortunately, you don't have to go far to see that happening; just look south of the border. There, over the past few months, members of the U.S. administration have described federal district judges across the U.S. as "'left-wing,' 'liberal,' 'activists,' 'radical,' 'politically minded,' 'rogue,' 'unhinged,' 'outrageous,' 'overzealous,' [and] 'unconstitutional,' '[c]rooked,' . . ." and even worse things that I will not quote.

Moreover, in attempts to intimidate members of the U.S. judiciary, frivolous proceedings have been initiated by the administration against sitting state and federal judges. Let me

give you one example. In May of this year, Chief Judge George L. Russell III of the United States District Court for the District of Maryland issued two standing orders prohibiting federal immigration officials, for two business days, from removing any alien detainee who had filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus with his court.

“Habeas corpus” is a Latin expression that basically means, “Bring me the person.” It is one of the most fundamental rights in common law countries, which requires an authority to bring a detainee before a judge to determine whether the detention is legal.

Chief Judge Russell was concerned that without such orders, many of the petitioners would be transferred to detention facilities outside the state of Maryland, maybe Florida, or even removed from the U.S. before a judge had the opportunity to consider their claims of illegal detention.

Instead of appealing this order, the Department of Homeland Security filed a civil claim against the chief judge and the 15 other judges in the district seeking a declaration that the orders were a direct assault on the department’s absolute authority to police immigration matters and enforce immigration laws. It sought an injunction to invalidate the orders and send a message to the judges.

On August 26, a federal judge from a different district dismissed the claim on the basis of judicial immunity, a necessary component of judicial independence. In his conclusion, quoting an appellate judge, the judge wrote:

A reciprocal respect for the roles of the Executive and the Judiciary may be too much to hope for in this most fraught and polarized of times, but it remains the only way that our system of constitutional governance can ever hope to work.

Unfortunately, in Canada, we have recently witnessed a series of attacks against the judiciary. At best, this reflects a misunderstanding of the role of the judiciary. At worst, it is an alarming attempt to galvanize resentment and contempt for our constitutional system of governance.

In such a context, Bill S-219, though short and simple, provides a welcome opportunity to reflect on what judicial independence means and underscore its significance to all Canadians.

In simple terms, an independent judge is one who is free to decide a case based only on the facts and the law and is, therefore, free from any influence from government, media, organized groups or any other outside parties.

As Senator Moreau put it, judicial independence “. . . enables judges to resist all outside interference.”

Colleagues, this is an important point: Judicial independence exists for the benefit of all Canadians, not the judges themselves. It serves important social goals, summarized by the Supreme Court as follows:

One of these goals is the maintenance of public confidence in the impartiality of the judiciary, which is essential to the effectiveness of the court system. Independence contributes to the perception that justice will be done in individual cases. Another social goal served by judicial independence is the maintenance of the rule of law, one aspect of which is the constitutional principle that the exercise of all public power must find its ultimate source in a legal rule. . . .

[*Translation*]

Senator Moreau addressed this point in the following terms back in June:

The separation of powers is the foundational principle of that independence in that it guarantees the impartial treatment of citizens before the courts and in dealings with the state. Like the rule of law, judicial independence guarantees human dignity and respect for human rights. It enables judges to resist all outside interference.

In 1986, in *Beauregard*, Chief Justice Dickson explains that the courts are not charged solely with adjudicating individual cases, but also act as:

. . . protector of the Constitution and the fundamental values embodied in it—rule of law, fundamental justice, equality, preservation of the democratic process, to name perhaps the most important. In other words, judicial independence is essential for fair and just dispute-resolution in individual cases. It is also the lifeblood of constitutionalism in democratic societies.

[*English*]

In practice, judicial independence has two dimensions.

On an individual level, judges must have adjudicative independence. This is the judge’s ability to decide a case based on the evidence and the law alone, free from fear or favour.

On an institutional level, the courts must enjoy independence from the executive and legislative branches of government when it comes to matters of administration, which bears directly on its judicial function.

As former Chief Justice McLachlin wrote in 1989:

. . . the judiciary, if it is to play the proper constitutional role, must be completely separate in authority and function from the other arms of government.

In fact, our constitutional order is premised on this separation of powers.

Judicial independence has its historical origins in the traditions we have inherited from the United Kingdom, including the English Act of Settlement of 1701.

In 1997, former Chief Justice Lamer of the Supreme Court wrote:

Judicial independence is an unwritten norm, recognised and affirmed by the preamble to the Constitution Act, 1867. In fact, it is in that preamble, which serves as the grand entrance hall to the castle of the Constitution, that the true source of our commitment to this foundational principle is located.

• (1550)

Since the Supreme Court has acknowledged that judicial independence is largely an unwritten constitutional principle in Canada, perhaps all the better that we write it down in our calendars, as Bill S-219 proposes.

The importance of judicial independence has long been recognized in international law. For example, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights states in Article 10 that “Everyone is entitled in full equality to a fair and public hearing by an independent and impartial tribunal . . .” when facing criminal charges. It is also recognized in the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights adopted by the United Nations in 1966, which states in Article 14 that “. . . everyone shall be entitled to a fair and public hearing by a competent, independent and impartial tribunal established by law.”

Recognizing January 11 as a day to mark judicial independence will signal to the public, and to the international community, that judicial independence is deeply valued in Canada. Why this day in particular? No, colleagues, it is not an attempt to compete with Sir John A. Macdonald Day, which recognizes a lawyer and a drafter of our federal Constitution — resting on various principles that include the independence of the judiciary.

[*Translation*]

As the preamble to Bill S-219 states, this date is being proposed in order to commemorate the following:

Whereas, on January 11, 2020, tens of thousands of people, including hundreds of judges from 22 European countries, took part in the “1,000 Robes March” in Warsaw to express their opposition to attacks on judicial independence in Poland;

There may have even been thousands of judges. We know that Poland is still grappling with these kinds of issues.

As Senator Moreau pointed out, this demonstration took place after the Polish parliament sought to repeal the principle of job security for judges. In other words, judges whose rulings were not to the government’s liking could be dismissed. The protest was triggered by this so-called “gag law,” which prohibited judges from reviewing court composition under penalty of dismissal.

[Senator Dalphond]

[*English*]

This movement may remind some of us of the 2007 events that took place in Pakistan when President Pervez Musharraf suspended Chief Justice Iftikhar Chaudhry out of concern that the latter might challenge the former’s efforts to retain power. Widespread protests by lawyers in gowns, opposition parties and citizens eventually led to the Chief Justice’s reinstatement by the President. Events like this show that citizens care about judicial independence.

Further to the events in Poland, the International Association of Judges, which has observer status at the United Nations, formally requested that the United Nations commemorate the “1,000 Robes March.” Bill S-219 will achieve that in Canada.

In conclusion, judicial independence is something to be both protected and celebrated. I hope you will join me in supporting the adoption of Bill S-219 at second reading in the coming weeks in order to send it to committee before the year’s end.

Thank you. *Meegwetch.*

Hon. Denise Batters: Will Senator Dalphond take a question?

Senator Dalphond: With pleasure.

Senator Batters: Last week, I noticed you did a little bit of media regarding the proposal for some substantial raises for federally appointed judges in Canada. Most federally appointed judges currently earn about \$400,000 a year. This proposal would see an increase of about \$28,000 on top of their regular annual increases, and the government has actually responded to this —

[*Translation*]

The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore: I’m sorry, Senator Batters. Senator Dalphond, your time has expired. Are you asking for more time?

Senator Dalphond: I’d be happy to answer a question from Senator Batters.

The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore: Is leave granted, honourable senators?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

[*English*]

Senator Batters: That’s the amount they currently have.

The government’s response has so far been to say that they think these federally appointed judges’ salaries are adequate, and this additional increase isn’t necessary to attract substantial

candidates. Given your past positions, one news outlet asked you for your input on this. They didn't quote you directly in this section, but they said:

. . . he is not particularly convinced by the government's arguments. He said following the commission's recommendations would cost about \$30 million to \$40 million per year, while noting the government boosted military spending by about \$9 billion this year — including significant raises for service members.

The reference is to our military veterans and current serving members.

Why was that your position? Do you view that to be a matter of judicial independence, and, if so, what do you think about the government's response to it?

Senator Dalphond: Thank you for this excellent question.

Judicial independence has many components. One is the security of tenure, which is that you have been appointed and cannot be removed unless you're impeached by Parliament; both houses have to vote on a motion to impeach you. That is protected in section 99 of the Constitution Act. It was designed to be a full protection.

The second thing is that the Constitution also provides that judges are entitled to a salary to be voted upon by both houses of Parliament, so it is guaranteed that they will be paid. The Supreme Court has interpreted this rule as meaning that the salary should be sufficient to attract good people — that's what the law says — and also to ensure that they are devoted to the job and that they will do it independently.

The Supreme Court has said that, in order to guarantee this, the judges cannot negotiate with the government. That would become difficult, because the judges decide so many cases involving the government. So if the government granted them an increase in salary, those favoured judges would give more convictions — or the contrary: If they don't get the increase in salary, they will seek to punish the government. So the Supreme Court has said that we need an independent mechanism through which judges and the government will present their arguments before a neutral panel, and that neutral panel will come up with a report that would propose things or not.

This process was followed, and, in July, this independent commission proposed that judges' salaries be increased by \$28,000, and they explained why. The judges were asking for \$60,000, and the commission came out with this recommendation.

They also acknowledged the fact that the salary is indexed every year based on the industry average.

That being said, the next step was for the government to respond to that report, which they did on Monday. The government said they refused that proposal from the commission. Now it's up to the judges to decide if they accept that response or if they challenge it via a constitutional challenge before a court.

I don't know what the current president of the association will do or what the board of directors will do, but it's up to them to decide if they want to challenge this or accept it, considering the whole set of circumstances that the country is going through.

Senator Batters: Just to follow up on that part, what do you think of the government's response on that, saying that they believe this to be an adequate amount and they don't believe it's necessary to have the further increase? Do you think the government's response adequately respects judicial independence?

Senator Dalphond: The Supreme Court has said that judges could have their salary affected by measures that affect all of the public service, but measures that would target judges and not the rest of the civil service would be seen negatively by the courts as a sign that the judges are not treated properly. That would be considered a breach of judicial independence and the guarantees that come with it.

So if you're providing a substantial increase to the salary of the Canadian Armed Forces, you have to explain why you're not providing a minimal increase to the judges. We'll see what happens with the civil service. In a few minutes, we'll know the government's perspective on the future of the civil service and the —

• (1600)

[*Translation*]

The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore: Senator Dalphond, your time has expired. Are you asking for more time to finish your answer to Senator Batters' question? I know that Senator McPhedran also has questions for you. Are you asking for additional time to respond to Senator Batters and Senator McPhedran?

Senator Dalphond: This is a subject I know well, and I would be happy to talk about it. If my colleagues are willing to listen to me for longer, I'd be happy to do so.

The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore: Is leave granted, honourable senators?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Senator Dalphond: I will finish replying to Senator Batters, then.

This justification by the government is a justification —

[*English*]

— that appears to me to be weak, but there are other justifications in the answer. There are many aspects in that government answer. When you balance all these things, some decisions will have to be made. I'm not the one who is going to decide on behalf of the judges. I'm not sitting as a judge anymore, but I would say that it's not a black-and-white answer to your question.

It's full of nuances. Some parts of the answer are a rehashing of the arguments that were made before the commission, and this is not good. We have to say that the commission considered the uncertainty of the U.S. situation and made the proposal.

Other arguments made by the government in the report are what I would characterize as rational arguments. The tests for the court to decide if the answer is constitutionally valid would be simple rationality. Maybe it meets the test; maybe it doesn't meet the test. I leave it there. If somebody wants to hire me, I would be pleased to assist. I'm joking.

It's a question that calls for nuances, so I can't give you an easy answer because it needs more thinking.

Hon. Marilou McPhedran: Thank you very much, Your Honour. I very much appreciate the recognition.

I have a question for you, Senator Dalphond, which comes out of an experience I had a few months ago. I was a member of an international delegation of parliamentarians, and we were in the halls of Congress and the Senate in Washington. I was truly shocked to see a poster outside the congressional office of a Republican senator, which was taller than I am, and wide, with photos of judges, calling them names, none of which were the least bit respectful, and calling for their impeachment.

I found myself wondering about parliamentary privilege in this context. I realize that's not the focus of this bill, but we are seeing some signs from certain parliamentarians of clear messaging of contempt — not just disrespect — of major institutions that uphold our democracy in this country. Do you have any thoughts on this vis-à-vis judges and attacks on judges by parliamentarians?

Senator Dalphond: I haven't seen these posters, but I guess it's a lineup of the usual suspects; so after police lineups — a parliamentary lineup now.

This is quite regrettable, but, as you know, in the U.S., a federally appointed judge can be impeached with the same procedures as those used to impeach a president. Over the years, some judges were impeached. It doesn't happen very often, but it does happen.

Certainly, when I look south of the border, I pray that our leaders in this country will not follow this track and that they will be respectful of what has made this country a peaceful country, a country of respect, where the rule of law is complied with, which comes with the independence of the judiciary and respect for the work of judges. If they are not happy with some of those judgments, it's part of the rules that they can amend the law.

Things were said about the judgment of the Supreme Court last week on pornography and its support for pornography. You have to read the judgment to understand that this is not what the judgment says. This is not something that Parliament cannot fix. If you find something that doesn't fit the Charter of Rights, it's up to the government to fix it. You don't even have to use the "notwithstanding" clause to fix it, but I invite people to read the judgment before commenting on it and to inform themselves

about what it means and also what it means to be respectful of what is sometimes the last rampart in a democracy, which is the courts.

(Debate adjourned.)

VOTE 16 BILL

BILL TO AMEND—SECOND READING—DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator McPhedran, seconded by the Honourable Senator Sorensen, for the second reading of Bill S-222, An Act to amend the Canada Elections Act and the Regulation Adapting the Canada Elections Act for the Purposes of a Referendum.

Hon. Paulette Senior: Honourable senators, I rise today on the unceded, unsundered territory of the Anishinaabe Algonquin Nation to speak to the second reading of Bill S-222.

This bill is an important piece of legislation that proposes to amend the Canada Elections Act to expand the franchise to all Canadian citizens aged 16 and 17.

I would like to express my appreciation to Senator McPhedran for sponsoring and moving this bill forward.

For my entire professional career, and now here in this distinguished chamber, my focus has been on the dismantling of systemic barriers and the empowerment of marginalized people. These barriers are often built on arbitrary classifications, whether they are based on race, sex, gender, gender identity, economic status or the intersection of such characteristics. I can tell you, without doubt, that such artificial constraints prevent individuals from realizing their potential and contributing fully to our democracy.

Today I ask you to consider with me another arbitrary line: the barrier of age 18, often defended as a fixed marker of competence and maturity. This prompts me to wonder what democratic principle can justify telling an entire segment of our population that they are old enough to pay taxes, old enough to work and old enough to take on these significant responsibilities, yet not old enough to have a voice in shaping the laws that govern their very existence.

Bill S-222 is an invitation for us to examine inclusion and resilience in our democracy and to consider the evidence now available to help us answer if the time has finally come in Canada — as it has in democracies such as Austria, Scotland, Wales and soon in England and Ireland — to bring down this barrier and enfranchise our youngest citizens by expanding voting rights to include 16- and 17-year-olds. Please allow me to tell you why I believe the answer is a resounding "yes."

My experience working to advance equality has shown me that exclusion is never neutral. When barriers are erected, whether they deny a woman economic self-sufficiency or deny a young person a vote, a powerful, destructive message is broadcast: You do not belong; your input is not valued.

The current voting age is a vestige of a time when the age of majority was tied to military service and property ownership. This is not the reality of modern Canada.

When we look at the historical barriers faced by women, we see that they were upheld by arguments claiming incapacity or immaturity. We dismissed those arguments because we realized that democracy demands inclusion. We are stronger, our laws and policies are better, and our governance is more legitimate when more citizens' voices are heard. Extending the vote to 16- and 17-year-olds is a necessary and logical continuation of our nation's journey toward equality as set out in the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms entrenched in our Constitution.

This is not about granting a privilege; it is about recognizing a right that is already earned through participation in civic life. They pay income taxes, they contribute to the economy, and they are directly impacted by government decisions on everything from student loan debt and climate policy to their access to health and social services.

• (1610)

Arguments against Bill S-222 often revolve around the perceived lack of maturity or political awareness of 16- and 17-year-olds. But I ask you this, my colleagues: What is the principle here? Are we truly serving democracy when we define civic competence by a birthday rather than by capacity?

Look at the world today. This is a generation that is politically savvy, hyperaware and deeply engaged. These young people are not passive observers; they are the architects of global movements. They lead the charge on climate justice. They organize online and offline against racial inequality and systemic discrimination. And they navigate complex digital-information environments with an acuity that, frankly, surpasses many older generations.

Furthermore, we must consider the educational component. Research — particularly from jurisdictions where voting rights have been extended — shows that enfranchising high-school-aged students has a lasting positive impact on voter turnout. When the voting age aligns with civic education in the classroom, young people are more likely to vote, and they establish a habit of democratic participation that lasts a lifetime.

When we say, "You are not ready to vote," we remove the responsibility and the incentive to learn and participate. When we say, "Your vote matters," we empower them to become better citizens.

Honourable colleagues, as a nation that proudly adheres to the Westminster parliamentary system, let us look at our peers in the Commonwealth. The argument that Canada must maintain the status quo is increasingly difficult to defend when key members of our own parliamentary family are moving forward.

Just this year, the United Kingdom, the historical home of our parliamentary tradition, has committed to lowering the voting age. This is not a radical, outlier position; it is the direction of modern, mature democracies.

Beyond England, countries and regions within the Commonwealth, such as Scotland and Wales, have already lowered the voting age to 16 for their devolved elections. Malta, a full Commonwealth member, has extended the franchise to 16 for all elections. So did Austria, Germany, Argentina and Brazil — the list of democratic nations recognizing the maturity and voting capacity of this age group is growing.

Canada has always prided itself on being a leader in democratic rights. When it comes to the franchise of our youth, we are now in danger of straggling behind. Allow me to share some observations about Vote16 that have convinced me that Bill S-222 is our chance to inquire, to question, to learn and to grow our knowledge about democratic participation.

Velma Morgan is no stranger to this chamber; she is the Chair of Operation Black Vote Canada, dedicated to extending the pipeline for Black political leadership in Canada, including for youth and marginalized communities. Velma has been clear that youth from historically under-represented groups, including Black youth, are part of the pool of potential new electors because early voting rights can help build healthy political habits and elevate marginalized voices.

As Velma has often said:

You can't be what you don't see. . . . We can't continue to have the same type of people, the same type of lived experiences making public policy for other people

Operation Black Vote Canada joins many other organizations in supporting this bill. These include UNICEF Canada, the Samara Centre for Democracy, Laidlaw Foundation and one that is closest to my heart, the Canadian Women's Foundation, where I was the president and CEO. The Canadian Women's Foundation shares this message about the bill on its website:

Count girls and gender-diverse young people in so that when they turn 16, they have more of a voice on the pressing issues that impact their lives: climate change, poverty, discrimination, and more.

As I conclude, honourable senators, Bill S-222 represents progress. It represents our continued commitment to breaking down arbitrary barriers to participation. It represents a trust in the energy, the intelligence and the passion of the next generation of Canadian leaders.

We have an opportunity today to take a crucial step toward building a more robust, more representative and more legitimate democracy. Let us recognize the maturity of these young Canadians. Let us explore the choices made by our Commonwealth peers.

Colleagues, I urge you to support the passage of Bill S-222 and to allow it to proceed to committee for further study.

Thank you, *meegwetch*.

Hon. Flordeliz (Gigi) Osler: Would Senator Senior take a question?

Senator Senior: I'd be happy to.

Senator Osler: Thank you, Senator Senior, for that speech. In it you mentioned civic education in the classroom. I agree that strengthening civic knowledge is necessary to strengthen democracy, but I also note education falls under provincial-territorial jurisdiction. Do you know which provinces and territories have civics curricula in Grade 7 through 12, or is that the type of information we would learn about at committee?

Senator Senior: I couldn't list them for you, but this is one of the things we could explore as we get this bill to committee to ensure that we can understand where it already exists and be able to have some sort of measurement of how that's working in terms of participation of 16- and 17-year-olds.

But what's also really important to note is that there are mock scenarios during elections for young people who participate. Rock the Vote or other such initiatives have been very active during elections, provincially and federally, and in some cases municipally as well, so young people have been very engaged in those scenarios.

Hon. Katherine Hay: Senator, will you take a question? Thank you.

You know I'm probably on the bandwagon now, from my background. I have a fundamental belief that nothing for them without them, and that includes young people. I agree with you, Senator Senior, that young people themselves are already leading. They are involved in every single community in this country. They are in their schools. They are volunteers. They are driving. They are building solutions. They are serving their country as cadets or they are actively in service for their country, and some of this is even landscape-changing.

Statistics Canada shows the population of young people is about 8.5 million in Canada, so dropping the age to 16 is fundamentally important. Some are already voting.

In your speech, you noted that when barriers are reinforced and/or erected, this message is clear to young people — and I agree — “You do not belong. Your input is not valid.” Yet our very future is on them. They are our future.

Senator, rather than what we see now as platitudes and good education, how do you see empowering young people from the age of 16 coast to coast to coast, which is important, with the right to vote and to have a meaningful impact on our future? Could you explain?

Senator Senior: That is quite a question. Thank you.

In fact, I began my career working with young people and communities, particularly in the Greater Toronto Area. I also had the opportunity when I was on campaign trails to work with young people. They were the most engaged, the most excited and the most inspiring young people to work with.

• (1620)

Keeping this barrier in place will serve to lose young people who are already at a stage in their lives where if you capture their attention now, it will be maintained for a lifetime.

Within the sphere of young people I'm engaged with, encouraging them to vote is something that I do personally every year. It's something that they know Auntie P is going to come with: I'm going to ask, “Have you voted?” I'm not going to tell them whom to vote for, but I will ask if they have voted and exercised that right. I no longer have to do that with all of them. Once the practice is there, they get involved. Also, if they are not sure, we will engage in a conversation. I think that's part of what we're missing, because they are curious and we need to be able to address —

The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore: I'm sorry, Senator Senior, your time has expired. Are you asking for more time to answer that question?

Senator Senior: Yes.

The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore: Honourable senators, do you agree to more time for that question?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore: It is agreed. Senator Senior, please conclude.

Senator Senior: Thank you, colleagues.

To wrap up my answer, I would love to have the kind of society that embraces the idea of young people being fully engaged in our democracy, asking tough questions about the tough issues ahead of us — such as climate change — and being able to influence public policy regarding the future that they will be living in.

(On motion of Senator Pate, debate adjourned.)

THE SENATE

MOTION PERTAINING TO THE SITUATION IN GAZA— DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Woo, seconded by the Honourable Senator Dean:

That, in light of findings and orders from the International Court of Justice and the International Criminal Court on the situation in Gaza, the Senate call on the Government to examine the risk to Canada and Canadians of complicity in violations of international humanitarian law, including war crimes, crimes against humanity and genocide, and to report on its findings within three months of the adoption of this motion.

Hon. Baltej S. Dhillon: Honourable senators, I rise today to speak in support of Senator Woo's motion, which calls upon our government to examine the risk to Canada and Canadians of complicity in violations of international humanitarian law regarding the situation in Gaza.

Let me begin by acknowledging the horrific attacks on Israeli civilians on October 7, 2023. No country should ever face such violence, and every nation has the right to defend its citizens. But that right is not without limits. International humanitarian law and the principle of proportionality are there to ensure that the defence of one population never results in the devastation of another.

I thank Senator Woo for his courage and conviction in bringing this motion forward and my colleagues Senators Pate, Gerba, Dean, Muggli and McPhedran for their compelling interventions. Their voices echo a moral urgency and remind us that when the world's conscience is tested, silence is not neutrality; it is complicity.

Colleagues, I certainly will not pretend to have deep knowledge of international criminal and humanitarian law. But I, like all of you and every other human being, can feel and know when it is broken. In the face of the unrelenting suffering in Gaza — with children pulled from rubble, families permanently separated and the dignity of human life forfeited — we cannot look away. We must confront an uncomfortable truth: that knowing better imposes upon us the duty to do better.

As someone with a background in law enforcement, I have seen first-hand that enforcing the law is not just about punishment, but also prevention. That same principle applies beyond our borders. When a nation enforces the norms of international law, it does more than uphold rules; it also safeguards humanity.

Enforcement is the antithesis of complicity because it interrupts the chain of wrongdoing. Complicity thrives in systems where accountability is weak, norms are bent by convenience and moral fatigue becomes policy.

In our own justice system, the principle of accessory after the fact exists precisely to deter complicity. It punishes those who, by act or omission, enable or assist wrongdoers after they have committed a crime. That principle should resonate deeply as we assess our nation's role in the international arena and our relationships with countries that commit heinous violations of human rights.

This same principle underpins international frameworks such as the Geneva Conventions, the Genocide Convention and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. These laws were born from the ashes of human tragedy — Nuremberg, Rwanda, Srebrenica — to ensure that humanity would never again allow itself the luxury of indifference.

Colleagues, we all know the saying, "History may not always repeat itself, but it often rhymes." The question before us is whether Canada will continue to hum along to the same tragic tune or instead have the courage to rewrite it.

This motion poses a simple but profound question: Are our laws, actions and omissions making us accessories to the suffering happening in Gaza, the West Bank or elsewhere? Do our policies align with the principles we claim to defend?

Last Thursday, my office attended an online presentation organized by the Legal Centre for Palestine and Forensic Architecture, a research agency based at the University of London. I encourage you all to read their report, entitled *The Architecture of Genocidal Starvation in Gaza*, which describes a humanitarian system under extreme duress.

Their presentation highlighted the weaponization of aid, where relief itself becomes a tool of control. At checkpoints, a so-called spoilage system has caused nearly 40% of perishable food to rot before reaching civilians. One whistle-blower quoted a senior official as saying, "A hungry Gazan is a quiet Gazan."

Worse still, the report by Forensic Architecture shows that some of these very aid distribution points have become killing grounds. The shelling of a civilian aid queue at the Kuwait Roundabout and the tragedy on al-Rashid Street — known to many as "the flour massacre," where civilians seeking food were struck by tank shells, gunfire and drones — remind us that humanitarian corridors can themselves be weaponized into instruments of despair.

• (1630)

Beyond the immediate horrors, the systematic destruction of agricultural systems, water and sanitation networks and nearly 70% of health facilities is a deliberate project of societal collapse. Colleagues, a ceasefire alone does not reverse this. This destruction ensures that when the ability to sustain life itself has been destroyed, the genocidal process continues.

This is why Senator Woo's motion matters. It calls on the government to:

. . . examine the risk to Canada and Canadians of complicity . . . and to report on its findings within three months of the adoption of this motion.

Some may ask: How does one examine the risk of complicity? How do we measure a moral hazard? Those are fair questions. But the difficulty of the task is not a reason to avoid it.

Where do we start? Allow me to offer some considerations.

First is policy coherence. The government can review all international and domestic frameworks — including aid, arms exports, trade and diplomatic relations — to ensure they are consistent with Canada's obligations under international humanitarian law. Mechanisms such as the risk assessment model of the Arms Trade Treaty — of which Canada is a state party — or the OECD Due Diligence Guidance for Responsible Business Conduct offer useful templates for assessing complicity in trade. Government consultations on this exercise should also include legal experts, humanitarian agencies and civil society voices.

Second is narrative accountability. Our words, like our actions, have power. Narratives, whether intentional or not, can normalize complicity. Renowned author Chinua Achebe once wrote this proverb: “. . . until the lions have their own historians, the history of the hunt will always glorify the hunter.” In this context, Achebe was commenting on how colonization diminished the struggles and voices of the marginalized, and the lesson applies here too.

History and suffering cannot be weighed by origin or age. Whether an atrocity unfolds in a city that is millennia old or in a newly founded state, tragedy and the loss of human dignity look the same everywhere. Let's ask ourselves: Whose suffering are we seeing and whose suffering are we overlooking?

Third is the diplomacy of conscience. Diplomacy is a delicate dance, and I am sure our former diplomats — Senators Boehm, Harder, Hébert, Cuzner and Wallin — understand this dance well. Yet diplomacy detached from values risks appeasement. Canada's strength in the world has never rested solely on economic might but also on moral credibility. When we trade with nations under investigation for war crimes, we must ask: What does that complicity purchase and at what cost to our values?

Colleagues, acknowledging wrongdoing is never easy. Acknowledging complicity is even harder, because it means admitting that we knew and yet failed to act. But introspection is not weakness; it is leadership.

In Finland, political leaders embrace a concept known as humble government. This form of governance prizes collaboration and builds trust with citizens. Most importantly, it encourages the government to review its own actions in light of new insights and information. If humility can be institutionalized, so too can accountability.

Canada could lead by example by publicly reviewing its humanitarian, military and trade frameworks and publishing its findings within the three months, as this motion asks. Doing this will ensure that our action and inaction alike do not undermine the cause of justice. As we all know, scrutiny is not the enemy of governance.

Honourable senators, our task is not to apportion blame but to prevent history's rhyme from becoming another verse of sorrow. As we debate and eventually vote on this motion, I hope we choose action over complicity, examination over evasion and truth over timidity. Because in the end, the measure of a nation is not how loudly it proclaims its values, but how bravely it examines its own reflection.

For the people of Gaza and the West Bank, such examination of complicity is not an academic exercise — it is a lifeline. It is urgent; it is now. For Canada, it is a necessary moment of moral clarity.

Thank you, colleagues.

(On motion of Senator Patterson, for Senator Wallin, debate adjourned.)

NEWFOUNDLAND'S NATIONAL WAR MEMORIAL AND TOMB OF UNKNOWN NEWFOUNDLAND FIRST WORLD WAR SOLDIER

INQUIRY—DEBATE CONCLUDED

Hon. Fabian Manning rose pursuant to notice of October 29, 2025:

That he will call the attention of the Senate to Newfoundland's National War Memorial and the Tomb of an unknown Newfoundland First World War soldier.

He said: Honourable senators, St. John's is home to one of only two National War Memorials in Canada, and the memorial in Newfoundland is the oldest one, having been unveiled on July 1, 1924, when Newfoundland was a self-governing dominion of the British Empire. The unveiling took place 15 years before the National War Memorial was built here in Ottawa.

Our war memorial is located on Water Street in the capital city of St. John's on a piece of land formerly known as King's Beach. This was the last place where many of our Royal Newfoundland Regiment soldiers stood on Newfoundland soil before boarding the waiting ship, the SS *Florizel*, and departing for war.

During World War I, approximately 12,000 Newfoundlanders and Labradorians enlisted to fight alongside Great Britain, Canada, Australia, New Zealand and the United States.

During the First World War, the battalion-sized Newfoundland Regiment was the only North American unit to fight in the Gallipoli Campaign in 1915. Later in the war, the regiment was virtually wiped out at Beaumont-Hamel on July 1, 1916, the first day of the Battle of the Somme.

The first recruits in the regiment were nicknamed the Blue Puttees due to the unusual colour of their puttees, which is the covering for the lower part of the leg from the ankle to the knee. The blue colour was chosen due to the shortage of dark khaki material on the island of Newfoundland at the time.

In December of 1917, George V bestowed the regiment with the right to use the prefix “Royal” before its name. It was the only military unit to receive this honour during the First World War.

Following World War I, the Great War Veterans’ Association and the Newfoundland Patriotic Association launched a campaign to have a national war memorial established. They developed a committee to establish the design and undertake the fundraising to pay for the proposed memorial, and within a very brief period of time, the donations began to pour in.

The memorial commemorates all of Newfoundland and Labrador’s wartime achievements on land and sea. Construction of the memorial was supervised by Lieutenant-Colonel Thomas Nagle, who was the Roman Catholic padre of the Royal Newfoundland Regiment, and retired captain Gerald Whitty.

Designed by British artists Gilbert Bayes and Ferdinand Victor Blundstone, the female allegorical sculpture Victory, Liberty, or the Spirit of Newfoundland sits on a granite pedestal. She holds a flaming torch in her left hand, high above her head. The torch, which symbolizes freedom, is the memorial’s highest point, prioritizing freedom as a central motivation for Newfoundland’s wartime contribution. In her right hand, she holds a sword which represents both Newfoundland’s willingness to serve during the First World War and their loyalty to the British Empire. The sword is below her waist, but not completely lowered. It is poised for battle and is meant to depict that, while the war is over, Newfoundland was, and is, ready and willing to fight for its freedom and liberty.

• (1640)

The female sculpture rises above four lifelike bronze figures. We have a sailor from the Newfoundland Royal Naval Reserve, a lumberman from the Forestry Corps, a fisherman in oilskins and wellington boots from the mercantile marine and a soldier from The Royal Newfoundland Regiment. Altogether, they provide a tangible connection to Newfoundland and Labrador and those who served overseas and on the home front.

On the front of the monument below the figures are five plaques commemorating Newfoundland and Labrador’s contributions in different conflicts. In the centre, the original 1924 plaque honours those killed during the First World War. Plaques dedicated to those fallen in the Second World War, the Korean War, Afghanistan and the War of 1812 were added later.

In 2019 the memorial was designated as a national historic site based on the artistic significance and the fact that the memorial was inspired by John McCrae’s famous poem *In Flanders Fields*. Field Marshal Earl Douglas Haig, the former commander of the British Expeditionary Force during most of World War I, unveiled the National War Memorial in St. John’s on July 1, 1924. Twenty thousand people — 10% of the Island’s population at the time — came out to witness the unveiling.

In preparation for the centennial in 2024, the memorial received a \$6.1-million restoration. Part of the project was entrusted to local St. John’s sculptor Morgan MacDonald. His difficult and time-consuming task was to bring the sculptures back to their original state after a century of being exposed to the elements.

The appearance of the sculptures had been altered, leaving them covered with a greenish tint, the result of a product called oxidation. Morgan MacDonald is well known nationally for his sculpting work, but says that this particular project was a true labour of love and that it was very personal. That was because Morgan’s great-grandfather Joe Babstock was a veteran of the First World War, who survived several battles and German captivity.

As he carried out his restoration work on the statues, Morgan said he felt a deep connection to the artists who originally constructed the statues over 100 years ago and considered it a great honour to have such a privilege to be the person restoring the statues to their original state. He said, “It’s from an era bygone. This is a quality of workmanship you don’t see anymore . . .” He added, “It’s very humbling to me. I look up to this kind of craftsmanship.”

I feel confident in saying that my fellow Newfoundlanders and Labradorians and I look up to Morgan MacDonald’s craftsmanship as well. The final result from his hours of hard work in restoring the statues on the war memorial is, indeed, the highest quality of workmanship, and we are forever grateful for what he has accomplished. He has created his own legacy and should be very proud of it.

The restoration project beautified the whole area, saw the installation of new lighting and was completed by adding new accessible walkways and stairs. It is difficult to explain with mere words the elegance of the finished product. It is a credit to those who designed, constructed and financed the project, but much more important than that, it is a most fitting tribute to those brave men and women who fought and died for the peace and freedom we enjoy in this country today.

Another major component of the restoration project was the creation of the tomb of the unknown soldier.

The unique military history of Newfoundland was recognized by the Commonwealth War Graves Commission, and for the very first time, the commission approved a second tomb of an unknown soldier within the same country.

The tomb is built of Caledonia granite originally quarried in Rivière-à-Pierre, Quebec. The granite was selected for its colour, matching that of the war memorial itself. The bronze work, showing a medieval sword, a First World War helmet and branches of the maple and laurel leaves, symbolizing both victory and defeat, was designed by Canadian artist Mary Ann Liu and cast in Roberts Creek, British Columbia. Three of the corner pieces show the different variants of the Memorial Cross during the reigns of three Canadian monarchs since the cross’s inception — that of George V, George VI and Elizabeth II — while the fourth corner piece is that of a poppy.

The cover stone of the tomb, weighing approximately 1,100 kilograms, is made of Labrador granite with a stone called “blue eyes.” The tomb is inscribed with the words “Known Unto God” in both English and French. A forget-me-not — a symbol of remembrance for the Newfoundland Regiment — is also carved into the granite. Newfoundland’s coat of arms is carved into the front of the tomb. It is indeed a spectacular piece of art, and with its completion, the time had arrived to bring our hero home.

The process of accomplishing that goal of bringing our hero home is a story in itself, but while many were involved in making it happen, three respected and admired sons of Newfoundland and Labrador, who are members of the Royal Canadian Legion, were the driving force behind its successful conclusion.

Frank Sullivan, Berkley Lawrence and Gary Browne had a dream, and they were not going to rest until it was realized.

As a 40-year veteran, Sullivan was inspired by the repatriation of other nations’ unknown soldiers and felt a strong personal connection because his own great-uncle Private Charles Canning had served with the Royal Newfoundland Regiment in World War I and was killed in 1918. He has no known gravesite. Sullivan felt the unknown soldier in Ottawa did not represent Newfoundland and Labrador’s unique and proud history, particularly the Royal Newfoundland Regiment, so it was he who first came up with the idea of repatriating a Newfoundland soldier.

Berkley Lawrence comes from a Newfoundland family with four generations of military service that started with his grandfather Private Stephen Lawrence, a soldier who survived the Battle of Beaumont-Hamel. A quarter of a century ago, when the tomb of the unknown soldier was being established at the National War Memorial here in Ottawa, Berkley was a serving member of the Canadian Armed Forces.

A call went out to his unit, asking for volunteers to stand guard over the tomb, and Berkley raised his hand. He then spent many hours as a sentinel over the Ottawa tomb, and that experience created a yearning to bring one of our boys home to Newfoundland.

Gary Browne, a retired Royal Newfoundland Constabulary Deputy Chief and veteran of the Canadian Armed Forces, is a well-known author of military and police history. As the author of three books on Newfoundland and Labrador’s military history, he is recognized from Newfoundland to Gallipoli. He has been involved in building monuments in Newfoundland and Labrador, Belgium and Türkiye.

The first request to Veterans Affairs Canada here in Ottawa, asking for their assistance in the repatriation of a Newfoundland soldier, was turned down flat, with a firm “no.” However, those government officials surely underestimated the resolve and passion of Frank, Berkley and Gary.

Securing the early support of Newfoundland and Labrador’s federal minister Seamus O’Regan and Newfoundland and Labrador’s provincial Minister of Tourism and Culture Steve Crocker, the dream of these three men was beginning to feel like a possibility. A short time later, Minister Crocker took the

request to a meeting in Ottawa with the then-Minister of Veterans Affairs Lawrence MacAulay, and he also arranged for Frank, Berkley and Gary to sit down and discuss the proposal with our then-premier Andrew Furey.

Gary Browne told me that, following the meeting with Premier Furey and with the guaranteed support of Minister MacAulay, he was confident that the wheels were in motion to fulfill the dream of bringing one of our boys home to Newfoundland.

Award-winning Newfoundland author Michael Crummey, who co-wrote *Newfoundland at Armageddon*, a documentary film about the Battle of Beaumont-Hamel, said he was struck by how personal the loss still seemed to be for many people he spoke to during his research.

“I think this place is so small, and the ties between everybody are so tight,” Crummey said in an interview.

Six degrees of separation does not apply here, it’s one or two at best. So it does feel like all of those losses affected all of us, that our lives would be completely different if the First World War had not happened.

The operation to bring the unknown soldier home was called “Operation DISTINCTION.” On May 13, 2024, the body of an unknown Newfoundland soldier was exhumed from a military cemetery in Cagnicourt, France. The soldier was a member of the Royal Newfoundland Regiment who was killed during the First World War. He is believed to have died in northern France and was buried among other Newfoundland soldiers, but his identity was never confirmed. The remains were identified as belonging to a Newfoundland soldier through forensic archaeology and archival research, which discovered a Royal Newfoundland Regiment shoulder title near the grave.

The members of the Royal Newfoundland Regiment had clear markings on their uniforms. To declare their allegiance to the mother country, a caribou button, or a Newfoundland flash, was attached to the shoulder of their uniform.

The effort to repatriate an unknown Newfoundland soldier dates back to 1920, when Thomas Nangle, the regiment’s padre, first advocated for the move. The goal was to provide a symbolic gravesite for the more than 820 Newfoundlanders who have no known grave.

On the morning of May 25, 2024, at a moving and solemn ceremony at Beaumont-Hamel Memorial, as the “Ode to Newfoundland” rang out over the former battlefield, the Government of France transferred the body of the unknown soldier to the Government of Canada, and later that day the proud son of Newfoundland touched down in St. John’s to a hero’s welcome more than 100 years after the First World War. It was a special and touching moment in the history of our province.

A hearse carrying the casket made a solemn procession past several sites of historical significance to the Royal Newfoundland Regiment, including the training grounds in Pleasantville, the harbour where the *S.S. Florizel* would have tied up, the Sergeants’ Memorial, The C.L.B. Armoury and the National War Memorial itself. Large crowds lined the streets to

see the hearse as it drove by. Many made the sign of the cross as the hearse passed, and you could read their lips as they said “thank you.” It was a once-in-a-lifetime event.

• (1650)

From June 28 to June 30, 2024, the remains of the unknown soldier lay in state at the Confederation Building in St. John’s, where thousands of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians paid their respects.

Most Canadians know July 1 as Canada Day. However, in our province of Newfoundland and Labrador, the day has an additional and more solemn meaning. It is also known as Memorial Day and marks the anniversary of the Battle of Beaumont-Hamel during the First World War, a battle in which hundreds of Newfoundland soldiers were killed in action.

The commander of the 29th British Division said of the actions of the Newfoundland Regiment on that July morning:

“It was a magnificent display of trained and disciplined valour, and its assault only failed of success because dead men can advance no further.”

Each year on July 1, many Newfoundlanders wear a sweet forget-me-not flower in honour of the soldiers of the Royal Newfoundland Regiment.

As the sun rose over the hills of St. John’s harbour on July 1, 2024, you surely felt that the year’s Memorial Day would be like no other. A major ceremony was going to be held at the Newfoundland National War Memorial to commemorate its one-hundredth anniversary, and during this centennial celebration we would inter the remains of the unknown Royal Newfoundland Regiment soldier.

The Governor General of Canada, the Prime Minister and the Premier of our province, who was designated as the next of kin, joined thousands of others as the soldier departed the Confederation Building and made his way to the Newfoundland National War Memorial.

There was a different feel in the air in St. John’s that morning. The silence of the crowd was deafening. Having the privilege to stand on the memorial that day was a moment I will cherish and never forget. I thought about all the families, especially the mothers and the wives who never saw their sons or husbands return home. I thought of the children who had to grow up in those tough economic times in Newfoundland without a father

figure in their lives. I thought about what our province would be like today if those brave soldiers had returned home. As the casket was lowered into the tomb, I thought of the soldier who lay in it and how happy he must be on that day to be finally laid to rest in Newfoundland soil. It was a proud moment for Newfoundland and Labrador.

In the words of Frank Sullivan, whose dream of repatriating the soldier had now come to fruition, he had this to say —

The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore: Senator Manning, your time for debate has expired. Are you asking for five more minutes?

Senator Manning: Two minutes, please.

The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore: Two more minutes. Is it agreed, honourable senators?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Senator Manning: In the words of Frank Sullivan, whose dream of repatriating the soldier had come to fruition, he had this to say: “Newfoundlanders and Labradorians now have an individual to represent their collective service and sacrifice,” and “At the going down of the sun and in the morning, we shall remember them.”

July 1 of 2024 will be remembered as a significant day in the history of Newfoundland and Labrador, and I want to express a most sincere thank you to all the people who made that day a reality, especially Frank Sullivan, Berkley Lawrence and Gary Browne. You have made us proud, so I will close with a few words of our provincial anthem, “The Ode to Newfoundland.”

As loved our fathers, so we love
Where once they stood we stand
Their prayer we raise to heav’n above
God guard thee Newfoundland
God guard thee, God guard thee
God guard thee Newfoundland.

Thank you.

Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

(Debate concluded.)

(At 4:54 p.m., the Senate was continued until tomorrow at 2 p.m.)

THE SPEAKER

The Honourable Raymonde Gagné

THE GOVERNMENT REPRESENTATIVE IN THE SENATE

The Honourable Pierre Moreau

THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION

The Honourable Leo Housakos

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 Brian Francis

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

CLERK OF THE SENATE AND CLERK OF THE PARLIAMENTS

Shaila Anwar

LAW CLERK AND PARLIAMENTARY COUNSEL

Julie Wellington

USHER OF THE BLACK ROD

J. Greg Peters

THE MINISTRY

(In order of precedence)

(November 1, 2025)

The Right Hon. Mark Carney	Prime Minister
The Hon. Shafqat Ali	President of the Treasury Board
The Hon. Rebecca Alty	Minister of Crown-Indigenous Relations
The Hon. Anita Anand	Minister of Foreign Affairs
The Hon. Gary Anandasangaree	Minister of Public Safety
The Hon. François-Philippe Champagne	Minister of Finance and National Revenue
The Hon. Rebecca Chartrand	Minister of Northern and Arctic Affairs
	Minister responsible for the Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency
The Hon. Julie Dabrusin	Minister of Environment and Climate Change
The Hon. Sean Fraser	Minister of Justice
	Attorney General of Canada
	Minister responsible for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency
The Hon. Steven Guilbeault	Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture
	Minister responsible for Official Languages
The Hon. Mandy Gull-Masty	Minister of Indigenous Services
The Hon. Patty Hajdu	Minister of Jobs and Families
	Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario
The Hon. Tim Hodgson	Minister of Energy and Natural Resources
The Hon. Mélanie Joly	Minister of Industry
	Minister responsible for Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions
The Hon. Dominic LeBlanc	Minister of Internal Trade
	President of the King's Privy Council for Canada
	Minister responsible for Canada-U.S. Trade, Intergovernmental Affairs and One Canadian Economy
The Hon. Joël Lightbound	Minister of Government Transformation, Public Works and Procurement
The Hon. Heath MacDonald	Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food
The Hon. Steven MacKinnon	Minister of Transport
	Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
The Hon. David J. McGuinty	Minister of National Defence
The Hon. Jill McKnight	Minister of Veterans Affairs
The Hon. Lena Metlege Diab	Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship
The Hon. Marjorie Michel	Minister of Health
The Hon. Eleanor Olszewski	Minister of Emergency Management and Community Resilience
	Minister responsible for Prairies Economic Development Canada
The Hon. Gregor Robertson	Minister of Housing and Infrastructure
	Minister Responsible for Pacific Economic Development Canada
The Hon. Maninder Sidhu	Minister of International Trade
The Hon. Evan Solomon	Minister of Artificial Intelligence and Digital Innovation
	Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Southern Ontario
The Hon. Joanne Thompson	Minister of Fisheries
The Hon. Rechie Valdez	Minister of Women and Gender Equality
	Secretary of State (Small Business and Tourism)
The Hon. Buckley Belanger	Secretary of State (Rural Development)
The Hon. Stephen Fuhr	Secretary of State (Defence Procurement)
The Hon. Anna Gainey	Secretary of State (Children and Youth)
The Hon. Wayne Long	Secretary of State (Canada Revenue Agency and Financial Institutions)
The Hon. Stephanie McLean	Secretary of State (Seniors)
The Hon. Nathalie Provost	Secretary of State (Nature)
The Hon. Ruby Sahota	Secretary of State (Combatting Crime)
The Hon. Randeep Sarai	Secretary of State (International Development)
The Hon. Adam van Koeverden	Secretary of State (Sport)
The Hon. John Zerucelli	Secretary of State (Labour)

SENATORS OF CANADA

ACCORDING TO SENIORITY

(November 1, 2025)

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
The Honourable		
Pierrette Ringuette	New Brunswick	Edmundston, N.B.
Percy E. Downe.....	Charlottetown	Charlottetown, P.E.I.
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.
Claude Carignan, P.C.	Mille Isles	Saint-Eustache, Que.
Elizabeth Marshall.....	Newfoundland and Labrador	Paradise, Nfld. & Lab.
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.
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.
Chantal Petitclerc	Grandville.....	Montreal, Que.
Yuen Pau Woo	British Columbia.....	North Vancouver, B.C.
René Cormier	New Brunswick	Caraquet, 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.
Raymonde Saint-Germain.....	De la Vallière.....	Quebec City, Que.
Rosa Galvez	Bedford.....	Lévis, Que.
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.
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 Kline.....	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.

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
Pat Duncan.....	Yukon.....	Whitehorse, Yukon
Rosemary Moodie.....	Ontario.....	Toronto, Ont.
Stan Kutcher.....	Nova Scotia.....	Halifax, N.S.
Tony Loffreda.....	Shawinegan.....	Montreal, Que.
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 (PJ) 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.
Daryl S. Fridhandler.....	Alberta.....	Calgary, Alta.
Kristopher Wells.....	Alberta.....	St. Albert, Alta.
Pierre Moreau.....	The Laurentides.....	Saint-Lambert, Que.
Suze Youance.....	Lauzon.....	Blainville, Que.
Allister W. Surette.....	Nova Scotia.....	Halifax, N.S.
Nancy Karetak-Lindell.....	Nunavut.....	Arviat, Nunavut
Baltej S. Dhillon.....	British Columbia.....	Surrey, B.C.
Martine Hébert.....	Victoria.....	Montreal, Que.
Todd Lewis.....	Saskatchewan.....	Lajord No. 128, Sask.
Danièle Henkel.....	Alma.....	Dollard-des-Ormeaux, Que.
Duncan Renwick Wilson.....	British Columbia.....	Vancouver, B.C.
Dawn Arnold.....	New Brunswick.....	Moncton, N.B.
Katherine Hay.....	Ontario.....	Mississauga, Ont.
Tony Ince.....	Nova Scotia.....	Dartmouth, N.S.
Farah Mohamed.....	Ontario.....	Toronto, Ont.
Sandra Pupatello.....	Ontario.....	Windsor, Ont.

SENATORS OF CANADA

ALPHABETICAL LIST

(November 1, 2025)

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address	Political Affiliation
The Honourable			
Adler, Charles S.	Manitoba	Winnipeg, Man.	Canadian Senators Group
Al Zaibak, Mohammad	Ontario	Toronto, Ont.	Canadian Senators Group
Anderson, Dawn	Northwest Territories	Yellowknife, N.W.T.	Conservative Party of Canada
Arnold, Dawn	New Brunswick	Moncton, N.B.	Independent Senators 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
Cormier, René	New Brunswick	Caraquet, N.B.	Independent Senators Group
Coyle, Mary	Nova Scotia	Antigonish, N.S.	Independent Senators Group
Cuzner, Rodger	Nova Scotia	Cape Breton, N.S.	Progressive Senate Group
Dalphond, Pierre J.	De Lorimier	Montreal, Que.	Independent Senators 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
Dhillon, Baltej S.	British Columbia	Surrey, B.C.	Independent Senators Group
Downe, Percy E.	Charlottetown	Charlottetown, P.E.I.	Canadian Senators Group
Duncan, Pat	Yukon	Whitehorse, Yukon	Government Representative's Office
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
Greenwood, Margo	British Columbia	Vernon, B.C.	Independent Senators Group
Harder, Peter, P.C.	Ottawa	Manotick, Ont.	Progressive Senate Group
Hay, Katherine	Ontario	Mississauga, Ont.	Progressive Senate Group
Hébert, Martine	Victoria	Montreal, Que.	Independent Senators Group
Henkel, Danièle	Alma	Dollard-des-Ormeaux, Que.	Progressive Senate Group
Housakos, Leo	Wellington	Laval, Que.	Conservative Party of Canada
Ince, Tony	Nova Scotia	Dartmouth, N.S.	Canadian Senators Group
Karetak-Lindell, Nancy	Nunavut	Arviat, Nunavut	Independent Senators Group
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

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address	Political Affiliation
LaBoucane-Benson, Patti	Alberta	Spruce Grove, Alta.	Government Representative's Office
Lewis, Todd	Saskatchewan	Lajord No. 128, Sask.	Canadian Senators Group
Loffreda, Tony	Shawinegan	Montreal, Que.	Independent Senators Group
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
McBean, Marnie	Ontario	Toronto, Ont.	Independent Senators Group
McCallum, Mary Jane	Manitoba	Winnipeg, Man.	Conservative Party of Canada
McNair, John M.	New Brunswick	Grand-Bouctouche, N.B.	Independent Senators Group
McPhedran, Marilou	Manitoba	Winnipeg, Man.	Non-affiliated
Miville-Dechéne, Julie	Inkerman	Mont-Royal, Que.	Progressive Senate Group
Mohamed, Farah	Ontario	Toronto, Ont.	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.	Government Representative's Office
Muggli, Tracy	Saskatchewan	Saskatoon, Sask.	Progressive Senate 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.	Government Representative's Office
Poirier, Rose-May	New Brunswick—Saint-Louis-de-Kent	Saint-Louis-de-Kent, N.B.	Conservative Party of Canada
Prosper, Paul (PJ)	Nova Scotia	Hants County, N.S.	Canadian Senators Group
Pupatello, Sandra	Ontario	Windsor, Ont.	Government Representative's Office
Quinn, Jim	New Brunswick	Saint John, N.B.	Canadian Senators Group
Ravalia, Mohamed-Iqbal	Newfoundland and Labrador	Twillingate, Nfld. & Lab.	Independent Senators Group
Renwick Wilson, Duncan	British Columbia	Vancouver, B.C.	Progressive Senate Group
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
Senior, Paulette	Ontario	Pickering, Ont.	Independent Senators Group
Simons, Paula	Alberta	Edmonton, Alta.	Independent Senators Group
Smith, Larry W.	Saurel	Hudson, Que.	Conservative Party of Canada
Sorensen, Karen	Alberta	Banff, Alta.	Independent Senators Group
Surette, Allister W.	Nova Scotia	Halifax, N.S.	Independent Senators Group
Tannas, Scott	Alberta	High River, Alta.	Canadian Senators Group
Varone, Toni	Ontario	Toronto, Ont.	Independent Senators Group
Verner, José, 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.	Progressive Senate Group
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.	Independent Senators Group
Yussuff, Hassan	Ontario	Toronto, Ont.	Independent Senators Group

SENATORS OF CANADA
BY PROVINCE AND TERRITORY

(November 1, 2025)

ONTARIO—24

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

SENATORS BY PROVINCE AND TERRITORY

QUEBEC—24

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
The Honourable		
1	Patrick Brazeau	Repentigny Maniwaki
2	Leo Housakos.....	Wellington..... Laval
3	Claude Carignan, P.C.	Mille Isles Saint-Eustache
4	Larry W. Smith.....	Saurel Hudson
5	Josée Verner, P.C.	Montarville Saint-Augustin-de-Desmaures
6	Chantal Petitclerc	Grandville..... Montreal
7	Éric Forest.....	Gulf Rimouski
8	Raymonde Saint-Germain	De la Vallière..... Quebec City
9	Rosa Galvez	Bedford..... Lévis
10	Pierre J. Dalphond	De Lorimier Montreal
11	Julie Miville-Dechéne.....	Inkerman Mont-Royal
12	Tony Loffreda	Shawinigan Montreal
13	Amina Gerba	Rigaud Blainville
14	Clément Gignac.....	Kennebec Lac Saint-Joseph
15	Michèle Audette	De Salaberry Quebec City
16	Manuelle Oudar.....	La Salle Quebec City
17	Pierre Moreau.....	The Laurentides Saint-Lambert
18	Suze Youance.....	Lauzon..... Blainville
19	Martine Hébert	Victoria..... Montreal
20	Danièle Henkel.....	Alma Dollard-des-Ormeaux
21
22
23
24

SENATORS BY PROVINCE—MARITIME DIVISION

NOVA SCOTIA—10

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
The Honourable		
1	Michael L. MacDonald	Cape Breton Dartmouth
2	Wanda Thomas Bernard	Nova Scotia (East Preston) East Preston
3	Mary Coyle	Nova Scotia Antigonish
4	Colin Deacon	Nova Scotia Halifax
5	Stan Kutcher.....	Nova Scotia Halifax
6	Paul (PJ) Prosper.....	Nova Scotia Hants County
7	Réjean Aucoin.....	Nova Scotia Cape Breton
8	Rodger Cuzner	Nova Scotia Cape Breton
9	Allister W. Surette.....	Nova Scotia Halifax
10	Tony Ince.....	Nova Scotia Dartmouth

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	Jim Quinn	New Brunswick Saint John
5	Joan Kingston.....	New Brunswick New Maryland
6	John M. McNair	New Brunswick Grand-Bouctouche
7	Krista Ross	New Brunswick Fredericton
8	Victor Boudreau	New Brunswick Shediac
9	Dawn Arnold.....	New Brunswick Moncton
10

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	Raymonde Gagné, <i>Speaker</i>	Manitoba Winnipeg
2	Marilou McPhedran	Manitoba Winnipeg
3	Mary Jane McCallum	Manitoba Winnipeg
4	Flordeliz (Gigi) Osler.	Manitoba Winnipeg
5	Charles S. Adler	Manitoba Winnipeg
6

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	Baltej S. Dhillon.....	British Columbia Surrey
6	Duncan Renwick Wilson	British Columbia Vancouver

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	David M. Arnot.....	Saskatchewan..... Saskatoon
5	Tracy Muggli	Saskatchewan..... Saskatoon
6	Todd Lewis	Saskatchewan..... Lajord No. 128

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 Nancy Karetak-Lindell	Nunavut.....	Arviat

YUKON—1

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

CONTENTS

Tuesday, November 4, 2025

	PAGE		PAGE	
SENATORS' STATEMENTS		Fisheries and Oceans		
The Late Honourable Murray Sinclair, C.C., O.M., M.S.C.		Study on Seal Populations—Notice of Motion to Authorize Committee to Request Government Response to the Eighth Report of the Committee Tabled During the First Session of the Forty-fourth Parliament		
Hon. Kim Pate	918	Hon. Fabian Manning	922	
Bridge and Ferry Tolls		Nation-Building Value of Tourism		
Hon. Percy E. Downe	918	Notice of Inquiry		
Visitor in the Gallery		Hon. Karen Sorensen		922
Hon. the Speaker.	919	<hr/>		
Accomplishments of Senators		QUESTION PERIOD		
Hon. Tracy Muggli	919	Natural Resources		
Visitor in the Gallery		Energy Sector		
Hon. the Speaker.	919	Hon. Leo Housakos		922
The Late Honourable Lise Bacon, C.M., G.O.Q.		Hon. Pierre Moreau		922
Hon. Claude Carignan.	919	Justice		
Visitors in the Gallery		Mandatory Minimum Penalties		
Hon. the Speaker.	920	Hon. Claude Carignan.		923
Society of Composers, Authors and Music Publishers of Canada		Hon. Pierre Moreau		923
Canadian Music Creators		Public Services and Procurement		
Hon. René Cormier	920	Indigenous Procurement		
Visitors in the Gallery		Hon. Tony Loffreda		923
Hon. the Speaker.	921	Hon. Pierre Moreau		923
Edmond Daigle		Employment and Social Development		
Congratulations on One Hundredth Birthday		Employment Equity		
Hon. Rose-May Poirier	921	Hon. Donna Dasko		924
Visitor in the Gallery		Hon. Pierre Moreau		924
Hon. the Speaker.	921	Transport		
<hr/>		Pickering Lands		
ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS		Hon. Robert Black		924
L'Assemblée parlementaire de la Francophonie		Hon. Pierre Moreau		924
Bureau Meeting and Parliamentary Conference on Francophone Cooperation in the Areas of Sustainable Agriculture, Food Security and Climate Change, January 21-24, 2025—Report Tabled		Public Safety		
Hon. Éric Forest	921	Forced Labour and Child Labour		
Meetings of the Network of Women Parliamentarians and the Network of Young Parliamentarians, May 20-21, 2025—Report Tabled		Hon. Julie Miville-Dechéne		924
Hon. Éric Forest	921	Hon. Pierre Moreau		924
Bureau Meeting and Annual Session, July 9-13, 2025—Report Tabled		Global Affairs		
Hon. Éric Forest	922	Support for Ukraine		
Finance		Hon. Yonah Martin		925
Public Accounts		Hon. Pierre Moreau		925
Hon. Krista Ross		Veterans Affairs		926
Hon. Pierre Moreau		Access to Health Care		925
		Hon. Salma Ataullahjan		925
		Hon. Pierre Moreau		925

CONTENTS

Tuesday, November 4, 2025

	PAGE		PAGE
Global Affairs		Chignecto Isthmus Dykeland System Bill (Bill S-216)	
Canada-China Relations		Second Reading—Debate Continued	
Hon. Leo Housakos	926	Hon. Paul (PJ) Prosper	933
Hon. Pierre Moreau	926		
Canadian Heritage		Judicial Independence Day Bill (Bill S-219)	
Canadian Broadcasting Corporation		Second Reading—Debate Continued	
Hon. Yonah Martin	927	Hon. Pierre J. Dalphond	934
Hon. Pierre Moreau	927	Hon. Denise Batters	936
		Hon. Marilou McPhedran	938
ORDERS OF THE DAY		Vote 16 Bill (Bill S-222)	
Bill to Amend the Weights and Measures Act, the Electricity and Gas Inspection Act, the Weights and Measures Regulations and the Electricity and Gas Inspection Regulations (Bill S-3)		Bill to Amend—Second Reading—Debate Continued	
Second Reading—Debate Adjourned		Hon. Paulette Senior	938
Hon. Toni Varone	927	Hon. Flordeliz (Gigi) Osler	940
Hon. Denise Batters	930	Hon. Katherine Hay	940
Hon. Yonah Martin	930		
National Framework for a Guaranteed Livable Basic Income Bill (Bill S-206)		The Senate	
Second Reading—Debate Continued		Motion Pertaining to the Situation in Gaza—Debate Continued	
Hon. Marty Klyne	930	Hon. Baltej S. Dhillon	941
		Newfoundland's National War Memorial and Tomb of Unknown Newfoundland First World War Soldier	
		Inquiry—Debate Concluded	
		Hon. Fabian Manning	942