



DEBATES OF THE SENATE

1st SESSION



45th PARLIAMENT



VOLUME 154



NUMBER 55

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Monday, March 9, 2026

The Honourable RENÉ CORMIER,
Speaker pro tempore

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

CONTENTS

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

Publications Centre: Publications@sen.parl.gc.ca

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

THE SENATE

Monday, March 9, 2026

The Senate met at 6 p.m., the Speaker pro tempore in the chair.

Prayers.

SENATORS' STATEMENTS

COMBATTING HATE

Hon. Charles S. Adler: Honourable senators, a few weeks ago, my colleague who generally sits right in front of me, Nova Scotia Senator Tony Ince, pinned a Black History Month pin on me. The same day, the screen of my phone was assaulted by the American President's social media account. It displayed a photo of Barack and Michelle Obama portrayed as apes.

When confronting this kind of political pornography, I choose not to hate the dehumanizer; I choose to love the dehumanized. I choose to love Senator Ince and Senator Burey in our Canadian Senators Group, as well as Senator Gerba in the Progressive Senate Group, who I'm honoured to sit with on the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Refusing to hate the dehumanizer and instead loving the dehumanized is not something I do for altruistic reasons; I do it for my own sake. My neighbours know that I'm a child of Holocaust survivors, and they have heard me, from time to time, say that while I've never been in Auschwitz, Auschwitz has always been in me. Long before my grandparents boarded that cattle car to hell, Nazi propaganda films — Nazi pornography — portrayed Jews as vermin. Dehumanizing Jews made it easier to develop an enthusiasm for extinguishing them.

When I was on national talk radio in the United States, a man named Joshua from Georgia called in to tell me that Black Americans could never be real Americans. I asked him whether he loved me, and he said, "Yes, I listen every day, all three hours. I love you, Chuck." I said:

I love you too. Thank you for your loyalty. I love you so much that I want to tell you that every time you listen to me on the radio from now on, I want you to think of me as a Black man. Please think of me as a Black man, Joshua.

Years later, in Canada, I would say to my national audience that if they hated Black people, they should think of me as Black, and if they hated Indigenous Peoples, they should think of me as Indigenous. I told them the same with respect to gay people, Palestinian people, Jewish people, Muslim people, Sikh people and Hindu people. I told them that if they hated women, they should think of me as a woman.

A Jewish woman was suffering from massive chest pains 22 years ago, and the surgeon assigned to her file was a Muslim. The woman's best friend said, "You cannot put your heart in the hands of a Muslim." The Jewish woman responded the same way Barack Obama would have, saying, "Yes, I can." That Jewish

woman was my mother. Dr. Mohamed saved her life. I think of my gratitude to him every day that I get to spend committee time with Dr. Mohamed Ravalia — Senator Ravalia.

Three days ago, in Chicago, was the funeral for Jesse Jackson, best known for the words, "I am somebody. I may be poor, but I am somebody." He was speaking to me when he said those words four decades ago — and four days ago. I am somebody. I'm not vermin, my neighbours are not monkeys and I cannot love Canada without loving every Canadian, represented by everyone here in this house that, thank God, cares deeply about equality and human dignity. Thank you. *Meegwetch.*

Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

[*Translation*]

FRANCOPHONIE MONTH

Hon. Lucie Moncion: Honourable senators, as part of Francophonie Month, we have been asked to promote and showcase the tremendous promise that la francophonie holds for the future of the French language.

To be a francophone living in Canada is such a privilege and, at the same time, such a challenge. Resilient and highly adaptable, we francophones are proud of our roots and our accents, and of belonging to the French-Canadian people.

In this month of March, we are celebrating our francophonie. Events are being organized and held across Canada in French. They showcase our language, our culture, our proponents and our artists, who express themselves in the language of Molière and contribute to our country's linguistic diversity. By working hard to make our language and culture flourish, we are all making Canada a great place to live in French.

Tomorrow, March 10, I will be launching an inquiry on the Desjardins Group. I have chosen Francophonie Month do to so in order to call attention to the phenomenal success of a francophone financial institution that has achieved distinction in Quebec, Canada and elsewhere in the world for the past 125 years. In a country like ours, francophone companies that have remained true to their values and vocation for 125 years are few and far between. Recognizing and celebrating their achievements is therefore a must.

This March, let's showcase our francophone community and our pride in speaking French.

Thank you.

Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY

Hon. Julie Miville-Dechêne: Honourable senators, in Quebec, International Women's Day took place against a backdrop of gender-based violence and disturbing studies that have raised fears of setbacks.

Since the beginning of the year, so in just two months, there have been seven femicides in Quebec that have made the headlines. That's unusually high. The following women have been murdered: Sonia Maricela Gonzalez Vasquez, Marie-Kate Ottawa, Véronic Champagne, Susana Rocha Cruz, Mary Tukulak Iquiqu, Tadjan'ah Désir and, most recently, Danielle Lascelles.

Ms. Lascelles was allegedly killed in Saint-Jérôme by her partner, who, like many others, had a history of domestic violence. The victim's brother said we need to find a way to better protect women in Quebec, that they deserve more respect than that.

• (1810)

Another chilling story, one that is reminiscent of the British hit series *Adolescence*, took place on the grounds of a Montreal high school. In an interview with *La Presse*, the student recounted that she was late for school, so she was walking quickly when she noticed that a former classmate was following her. He suddenly started stabbing her, near her eye, once, then twice.

She thought she was going to die. The teenager kept repeating one thing to her attacker: "I'm sorry." She recognized him right away. She had rejected the boy several times. The girl survived and agreed to share her story to denounce violence against girls.

Is this an isolated incident or a symptom of a deteriorating climate in our schools? Professor Francis Dupuis-Déri from the Université du Québec à Montréal interviewed 110 people in 200 public schools in eight regions of Quebec. The vast majority of teachers who took part believe that the problems of misogyny, homophobia and transphobia are more prevalent than before and that it is primarily boys who are responsible. It is a minority of boys, yes, but these boys are the ones insulting girls.

Here are some examples: "Your place is in the kitchen." Girls are referred to as bitches or whores. Some boys say that girls should not want to work in certain male-dominated fields and that they should instead stay home and take care of their children and their husband. Some boys also trivialize sexual violence.

Female teachers who say they are feminist are accused of being anti-men. They are told that they are useless to society. This is a qualitative study, so it is impossible to know to what extent these misogynistic remarks are widespread. However, the data shows that girls express little overt intolerance.

Let us not turn a blind eye to these worrying signs. Social media and influencers are contributing to this, so we must find a way to create a healthy and inclusive climate in our schools. Thank you.

Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

[English]

VISITORS IN THE GALLERY

The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore: Honourable senators, I wish to draw your attention to the presence in the gallery of Liza Arnason and Aronke Emmanuel from the Ase Community Foundation for Black Canadians with Disabilities. They are the guests of the Honourable Senators Clement and Bernard.

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

Hon. Senators: Hear, hear!

COMMONWEALTH DAY

Hon. Yonah Martin (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, today, March 9, is Commonwealth Day. As we join 56 nations in celebration, we reflect on our shared values of democracy, literacy and international co-operation.

On March 8, I had the distinct honour of attending a Commonwealth Day event in Vancouver, hosted by the Royal Commonwealth Society of Canada Mainland of B.C. Branch. Under the leadership of President Shawn Wade, it was a privilege to witness the awarding of medals and certificates to students who excelled in the annual essay and speech contests. Seeing the brilliance of these young people reminds us that the "common wealth" we share is found most profoundly in our youth.

The theme for this year, "One Resilient Common Future: Transforming our Common Wealth," holds a deep resonance for Canadians. It reminds us that our resilience is not a passive trait; it is a commitment to ensuring that our diversity and our shared resources are used to uplift the members of our global family.

Honourable senators, this commitment to a resilient future is inseparable from International Women's Day, which we also celebrated yesterday.

We see this resilience in the remarkable achievements of our Canadian women throughout history, trailblazers and courageous leaders who have strengthened our nation. We see it especially in the heroic women of the Canadian Armed Forces, like our colleague Rear-Admiral (Ret'd) Rebecca Patterson.

For me, leadership and inspiration have always been personal. I stand here today because of the incredibly strong, intelligent and beautiful women in my life. I think of my late mother, Kye Soon Kwon, whose courage and sacrifice are the very foundation of my life, and I look to my daughter, Kiana Mi-Sun Martin, who is my greatest inspiration and a reminder of the bright, bold future we are building for the next generation.

To all the women of our nation, of the Commonwealth and of the world, your strength is the bedrock of our communities.

Honourable senators, let us remember that a resilient common future is only possible when women and girls can live with safety, dignity and opportunity.

Happy Commonwealth Day and happy belated International Women's Day.

Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

CONFLICTS IN UKRAINE AND IRAN

Hon. Yuen Pau Woo: Honourable senators, barely two weeks ago, on the fourth anniversary of Russia's illegal invasion of Ukraine, the Government of Canada put out a powerful statement underscoring the impact of war on children:

For every nation, its children are a sacred and inviolate pledge of continued future existence. The future of a nation's children should never be held hostage by ideological or partisan political fights, let alone be a deliberate target of a military campaign or a state-administered program with the aim to change their identity.

We were given a stark reminder of this grim reality two days ago when yet another Russian missile struck Kharkiv killing 10 civilians, including at least 2 children.

The UN has verified that conflict-related violence in Ukraine in 2025 killed more than 2,500 civilians and injured 12,142. The total number of killed and injured civilians in 2025 was 31% higher than in 2024.

It is right, therefore, that our government should condemn illegal wars of aggression and attacks on civilians, especially children. Yet, only a few days after the Canadian government's robust statement on the need for protection of civilians in Ukraine, a school in Iran was bombed by the U.S.-Israeli military coalition, resulting in the destruction of the Shajareh Tayyebah primary school in the town of Minab and the death of over 135 schoolgirls.

The pattern of the strike shows that distinct structures at the school were directly struck, indicating that the attack was carried out by highly accurate guided munitions rather than errant weapons whose guidance or propulsion systems failed.

I would have expected a similarly robust condemnation of this war crime from the government, but instead we got a muscular defence of the U.S.-Israeli war of aggression against Iran, a war that violates the UN Charter.

There is no justification for that war. In spite of the horrible regime in Tehran, there was no imminent threat and negotiations were under way. In fact, Iran had agreed to zero stockpiles of uranium. The nuclear program had been destroyed according to President Trump.

The U.S. is fighting a proxy war on behalf of Israel, a country that is still perpetrating the gravest of international humanitarian law violations in Gaza and the West Bank.

As the world turns its gaze towards the carnage in Iran, the atrocities and abuses in Palestine are getting even less attention than before. Is that why Israel has launched its assault on Tehran?

Colleagues, as we speak, there is a debate in the House of Commons on the illegal war in Iran. I hope we can have the same debate in this chamber and show that we are a chamber that stands for the defence of international law.

Some Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PARLIAMENTARY BUDGET OFFICER

CERTIFICATE OF NOMINATION TABLED

Hon. Patti LaBoucane-Benson (Legislative Deputy to the Government Representative in the Senate): Honourable senators, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, a certificate of nomination and biographical notes for the proposed appointment of Annette Ryan to the position of Parliamentary Budget Officer.

THE SENATE

NOTICE OF MOTION TO EXTEND SITTING ON WEDNESDAY, MARCH 11, 2026

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

That:

1. notwithstanding the order adopted by the Senate on June 4, 2025, the sitting of Wednesday, March 11, 2026, continue beyond 4 p.m., if Government Business is not completed, and be adjourned at the later of the completion of Government Business or 4 p.m.;
2. notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph one of this order, the sitting not continue beyond the ordinary time of adjournment provided in the Rules; and
3. committees of the Senate scheduled to meet on that day be authorized to do so after 4 p.m. for the purpose of considering Government Business or if a

Minister of the Crown is appearing, even though the Senate may then be sitting, with rule 12-18(1) being suspended in relation thereto.

• (1820)

QUESTION PERIOD

GLOBAL AFFAIRS

ISLAMIC REVOLUTIONARY GUARD CORPS

Hon. Leo Housakos (Leader of the Opposition): My question is for the Leader of the Government in the Senate.

Canada's reputation as a safe haven for terrorists from the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps, or IRGC, has grown. For the past decade, the Liberal government has dragged its feet on designating the IRGC as a terrorist organization and now continues to drag its feet on dismantling the networks of their agents operating on Canadian soil. Even our allies' intelligence reports warn that Canada is now viewed as a serious place of "concern" for Iranian regime activity, noting that known regime agents and affiliates continue to roam freely throughout Canadian communities.

Government leader, when is the government going to take this breach very seriously, and when is the Canadian government going to expel agents of the IRGC, who are active, doing business and interfering right here in our own country?

Hon. Pierre Moreau (Government Representative in the Senate): The government takes all allegations of terrorist financing extremely seriously. Canada designated the Islamic Republic of Iran as a regime that has engaged in terrorism and systemic gross human-rights violations. As a result, thousands of senior Iranian government officials, including top IRGC members, are inadmissible to Canada, and may be investigated and removed if they are already in Canada.

Canada is also committed to screening all military-aged men coming from Iran to ensure that IRGC members or regime-affiliated individuals do not obscure their military service history. As of February 5, 2026, the Canada Border Services Agency has reviewed 17,800 applications for potential admittance inadmissibility —

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

Senator Housakos: Government leader, for years now the government has been ignoring warnings from the Iranian diaspora right here in Canada. Also, Canadians expect their government to defend our sovereignty and protect them from being targeted by the Iranian regime. We had a public inquiry just a year ago, and the government refused to expand the scope of that inquiry to include Iran and the IRGC.

Will you commit to Canadians today that your government will not merely investigate but immediately clearly identify all these IRGC terrorists and expel them from Canada?

Senator Moreau: To expel them, we must investigate them first. Additionally, Iranian nationals must apply for visas to come to Canada, and these applicants are carefully assessed by Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada, or IRCC. This includes Iranian nationals seeking visa extensions.

I said earlier that we have opened over 170 investigations and cancelled over 235 visas related to the Iranian regime. The government is taking that question very seriously.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

ARCTIC SOVEREIGNTY

Hon. Leo Housakos (Leader of the Opposition): Government leader, last week during a parliamentary association trip to the United Kingdom, a theme that repeatedly arose was Arctic security and defence in Canada.

Obviously, the Canadian government has announced \$81 billion of defence spending over the next few years, which is more than welcome and is something the opposition has been requesting for a very long time. We all recognize around the international community, particularly the Five Eyes and G7, that China and Russia have been very active in the Arctic. They have been putting their money where their mouths are with military equipment and staking out claims, while Canada, which has a natural claim to that very strategically important territory, both economically and for national defence and security, has been slow in taking action. It takes time to ramp up the billions of dollars of spending and to put in place the necessary infrastructure.

What is our short-term plan for defending our interests and security in the Arctic?

Hon. Pierre Moreau (Government Representative in the Senate): Canada is a proud Arctic country, and we are making decisions to ensure that our sovereignty over the Arctic is defended. The Government of Canada is investing over \$72 billion into the new defence policy *Our North, Strong and Free* and nearly \$40 billion into Canada's NORAD Modernization Plan, which supports an increased Canadian Armed Forces presence in the North and the Arctic.

The government must ensure it has appropriate and well-situated refuelling facilities across all three of Canada's coasts to support our Royal Canadian Navy. That's why the government has invested over \$107 million in the Nanisivik Naval Facility to ensure our sovereignty in the Arctic.

Senator Housakos: Government leader, I appreciate all of those expenditures, but it will take a decade for all of that to ramp up. In the meantime, China and Russia are already staking claims. They have already put military operations in place. They are already patrolling the Arctic. We need to do something more than just open up a consulate in Alaska. This particular failure

and neglect over the last 10 years has put us at the feet of Donald Trump and made us reliant upon the United States of America for defence more than ever.

What will we do in the short term to rectify the problem?

Senator Moreau: The massive investments I just referred to a moment ago are very strong commitments by Canada to defend the Arctic and the sovereignty of our entire country. We are very well aware of the geopolitical situation, and that is the reason why we have made unprecedented investments in the Canadian Armed Forces.

FINANCE

INCOME TAX CREDITS

Hon. Tony Loffreda: Senator Moreau, we are close to tax season, so allow me to get technical. We have been approached by many Canadians with inquiries that merit discussion.

Celiac disease is a serious autoimmune disease. Approximately 1% of Canadians live with this condition. The only treatment is a strict gluten-free diet for life, yet gluten-free foods often cost 150% to 500% more than their gluten-containing counterparts. While Canadians with celiac disease may claim incremental food costs through the Medical Expense Tax Credit, the system is burdensome and difficult to access.

Given the government's commitment to bringing down costs for Canadians, will it consider replacing this complex system in the forthcoming spring economic statement with a simple, refundable annual tax credit for those living with celiac disease?

There's a petition with 34,000 signatories in the other place.

Hon. Pierre Moreau (Government Representative in the Senate): I cannot comment on any change in the taxation system. As you know, Senator Loffreda, the government understands that affordability is an important issue for Canadians, and, thus, it has introduced many measures to tackle the affordability crisis, such as Bill C-19 regarding the price of groceries.

The government is also interested in facilitating access to the financial supports that Canadians are entitled to, an example of which would be the implementation of the Automated Federal Benefits system.

For my part, I can ensure that the issue you are raising today reaches the ministers so they can see what they should do to help Canadians with celiac disease.

Senator Loffreda: Thank you for that. There is a petition with 34,000 signatures, so it is of concern.

Gluten-free food is not a lifestyle choice for people with celiac disease; it's a medical necessity and the only treatment available. It can cost significantly more than regular products.

• (1830)

Does the government recognize that this creates an unavoidable and lifelong financial burden? Will it consider targeted tax relief for some programs in the near future, as you mentioned in the first part of your answer?

Senator Moreau: Concerning the petition, there are a number of very important signatures on the petition that was tabled, and the government is giving proper attention to the issue. The government recognizes the financial burden celiac disease puts on many Canadians, and that is why persons with celiac disease are able to claim the incremental cost associated with buying gluten-free food products as a medical expense when they file their taxes. However, the government knows that not all Canadians who are eligible for benefits receive them —

[Translation]

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

CANADIAN HERITAGE

CBC/RADIO-CANADA

Hon. Julie Miville-Dechéne: My question is for Senator Moreau.

Both Radio-Canada and CBC have decided to do business with American giant Amazon Prime by adding to that platform the streaming news channels RDI and CBC News Network, which will be available to Prime subscribers for \$4.99 each —

BUSINESS OF THE SENATE

The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore: We will check to see if the interpretation is working.

Since it is still not working, we will suspend the sitting. Is it agreed, honourable senators?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

(The sitting of the Senate was suspended.)

(The sitting of the Senate was resumed.)

CANADIAN HERITAGE

CBC/RADIO-CANADA

Hon. Julie Miville-Dechéne: Senator Moreau, Radio-Canada and CBC have decided to do business with American giant Amazon Prime by adding to that platform the streaming news channels RDI and CBC News Network, which will be available to Prime subscribers for \$4.99 each.

According to Quebec minister Mathieu Lacombe, this makes no sense. There is a political consensus in Quebec that it's unacceptable for Radio-Canada to offer Canadian content to an American platform that is helping to undermine the vitality and reach of our Quebec culture.

Isn't this basically a deal with the devil?

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

Senator Miville-Dechéne, my understanding is that RDI and CBC are subscription-based services that have to be distributed. Fewer and fewer people have cable subscriptions, while more and more Canadians, especially young Canadians, consume digital media.

This morning, I heard the vice-president of Radio-Canada explain that the Crown corporation's decision was based on the fact that it wants French and English content by CBC and RDI to be available across Canada, including in communities that don't have access to RDI and CBC News Network content because they don't have cable.

My understanding is that Radio-Canada made this decision because ensuring that news and culture reaches a wide audience is important —

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

Senator Miville-Dechéne: Do you not feel somewhat alarmed by or uncomfortable about this business decision?

I understand that many young Quebeckers use Prime, but why not broadcast RDI on a platform such as TOU.TV in order to assert our cultural sovereignty and have viewers support local platforms rather than capitulating to the power of foreign streaming giants?

Senator Moreau: RDI and CBC are already broadcast on a Canadian digital platform called RiverTV, which is owned by Quebecor.

My understanding is that the desired outcome is a wider audience. All of RDI's content is being broadcast, and this whole situation stems from commercial agreements that are constantly being negotiated. The vice president of Radio-Canada said this morning that negotiations were also under way with other broadcasters.

[English]

FINANCE

COST OF LIVING

Hon. Yonah Martin (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Government leader, Sylvain Charlebois, known as “the Food Professor,” warns that rising energy prices are poised to hit Canadians not only at the gas pump but also in their kitchens. Food inflation could climb even higher, worsening already

record-high levels of food insecurity. To make matters worse, Senator Moreau, your government's industrial carbon tax is scheduled to rise once again on April 1, adding more pressure to an already stressed food supply chain.

Senator, Canadians cannot afford another hike in food prices while your government ignores the root causes of food inflation. Will you commit today to scrapping the industrial carbon tax — or, at minimum, freezing its upcoming increase — to provide meaningful relief to Canadian families?

Hon. Pierre Moreau (Government Representative in the Senate): The industrial carbon tax is a tool to make polluters pay for their pollution. The idea is for the government to ensure polluters pay more when they are doing things that are harmful to the environment.

• (1840)

Now, you're talking about inflation. Inflation is tied to global supply chains. Climate-driven shocks are in fact related, and that's a good reason why the industrial carbon tax should remain. Climate-driven shock is part of the cause of inflation, just as are other currency pressures, which have been volatile in recent years. So there are many things that are related to inflation. I think the industrial carbon tax is a good tool to prevent inflation from going higher.

Senator Martin: But the fact is that a quarter of Canadian households are food insecure and a third of food bank users are children. They're facing another steep increase in food prices because of the industrial carbon tax, which is set to rise again on April 1. Targeted relief helps but does not address the causes of inflation. Will your government remove the industrial carbon tax, the food packaging tax and other burdens to deliver lasting relief to Canadian families?

Senator Moreau: I think my first answer gives you an idea of the second one.

As far as the government is concerned, you can address affordability with a number of measures. That's why the government lowered taxes for 22 million Canadians and is cutting the consumer carbon tax, not the industrial one but the consumer carbon tax. We are protecting Pharmacare, lowering the requirement to access the Disability Tax Credit and providing immediate relief on groceries.

CANADIAN HERITAGE

LIBRARY AND ARCHIVES CANADA

Hon. Yonah Martin (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Honestly, senator, Canadians cannot afford your deficit-spending government.

The Globe and Mail, on another note, is reporting that Library and Archives Canada is planning deep cuts to its access to information and privacy, or ATIP, team. The archives have repeatedly been the focus of damning reports from the Information Commissioner due to an extensive ATIP backlog.

[Senator Miville-Dechéne]

This decision threatens to make an already struggling system even worse. The commissioner's 2022 investigation found that nearly 80% of Library and Archives Canada's requests failed to meet legal timelines. The department itself admits its ability to comply will be impaired by staff reductions. Senator Moreau, what is your government's plan to ensure that transparency and accountability are preserved at Library and Archives Canada despite these cuts?

Hon. Pierre Moreau (Government Representative in the Senate): There is transparency across the government. The ongoing comprehensive expenditure review is not fundamentally a job-cutting exercise; it is about positioning the government to focus on its core priorities. The government has committed to managing these reductions through attrition and to approach this process compassionately, fairly and in line with Canada's obligation as an employer.

The reduction does not just cut employment all across the government. We are reducing expenses, and we are investing in Canada's economy. That's what we're doing, and that's what the government is doing across all services.

Senator Martin: I'll just repeat the Information Commissioner's findings that nearly 80% of Library and Archives Canada's requests failed to meet the legal timeline. Senator Moreau, historians, journalists and researchers rely on these records to understand Canada's history, yet many now must turn to foreign archives because access at home is so limited.

How can Canadians trust that your government is committed to transparency when it uses the guise of cost cutting to avoid accountability?

Senator Moreau: The government is taking its responsibility quite seriously, and the mandate it received from Canadians is to reduce spending and to increase investment. That's exactly what we're doing all across the services of the government, and we are doing it in a very responsible way.

NATURAL RESOURCES

ENERGY SECTOR

Hon. Leo Housakos (Leader of the Opposition): Senator Moreau, as the conflict in the Middle East continues to burn on, obviously, it has an impact on disrupting supply chains. When it comes to the energy sector, we see that Indo-Pacific nations are thirsting for Canadian energy. We see European nations desperate for Canadian energy. Prime Minister Carney has heard

it from them. The opposition leader went to Europe last week, and he's been hearing it from them, yet we've had a decade of red tape and constant impediments put in place by the Liberal government at the expense of the Canadian energy sector.

We only have one facility in this country right now, on the West Coast, that can take our large deposit of natural gas, transform it into LNG and ship it out. We have no capacity on the East Coast. When will your government, once and for all, acknowledge that their energy policies have been a catastrophe in this country for the economy and the energy sector? Now the whole world's energy supply is at risk because of the bad, bad decisions by this Canadian government.

Hon. Pierre Moreau (Government Representative in the Senate): It's not a bad decision to try to make Canada an energy superpower. The federal government has two memorandums of understanding, or MOUs, with Alberta to ensure that we are fast-tracking a project that could be an answer to that question. The current situation reinforces the fact that our allies are looking for a stable, reliable energy supply in an increasingly uncertain world. The Major Projects Office and the fast-tracking that the government has implemented are a solution to that. Canada could be reliable energy superproducer, and we're working on it with all the provinces and especially with the Government of Alberta with the two MOUs that we signed recently with that government.

Senator Housakos: With all due respect, government leader, once upon a time, Canada was an energy power. Right now, you've acknowledged you're trying to make Canada an energy power.

Last week, Canadian Natural Resources Limited deferred expansion plans for its Jackpine Mine in Alberta due to federal regulatory uncertainty. That means \$8.2 billion in delayed investment and a message to our allies and global energy markets that they cannot rely on Canadian energy under this government. If your government is truly serious about making Canada an energy superpower, repeal Bill C-69, get rid of the red —

The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore: Senator Moreau.

Senator Moreau: And drill. When we're talking about making Canada an energy superpower, we're not only thinking about drilling, but we're also thinking about clean energy, which your government didn't do in the past. So in making Canada an energy superprovider, we will be open to windmills — I'm not sure you're in agreement with that — regular energy and clean energy everywhere across the country.

[*Translation*]

The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore: Senator Moreau, we do not have anyone else on the list.

[English]

ORDERS OF THE DAY

BUSINESS OF THE SENATE

Hon. Patti LaBoucane-Benson (Legislative Deputy to the Government Representative in the Senate): Honourable senators, pursuant to rule 4-12(3), I would like to inform the Senate that as we proceed with Government Business, the Senate will address the items in the following order: second reading of Bill C-14, followed by second reading of Bill C-15, followed by Motion No. 53, followed by Motion No. 54, followed by all remaining items in the order that they appear on the Order Paper.

[Translation]

BAIL AND SENTENCING REFORM BILL

BILL TO AMEND—SECOND READING—DEBATE CONTINUED

Hon. Pierre J. Dalphond moved second reading of Bill C-14, An Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Youth Criminal Justice Act and the National Defence Act (bail and sentencing).

He said: Honourable senators, as sponsor, it is my responsibility to introduce, at second reading, Bill C-14, An Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Youth Criminal Justice Act and the National Defence Act (bail and sentencing). These are the two key elements of the bill.

Although this bill contains 62 clauses to amend the Criminal Code, they mainly concern two important stages of criminal trials: the first at the very beginning, namely the release on bail of an accused, and the second at the very end, namely the sentencing of a person found guilty.

• (1850)

The purpose of the proposed amendments is to improve public safety by targeting three groups of offenders: repeat offenders, persons involved in organized crime and persons who commit violent offences.

My presentation is divided into three parts. The first part concerns fact-based information offering a brief summary of the context surrounding the proposed amendments. The second part focuses on proposed amendments to the post-arrest release process. Lastly, the third and final part concerns the proposed sentencing-related additions.

[English]

Like most of you, I believe that policy choices in criminal law should rest more on a factual basis than on the public mood of the day.

Over the years, this chamber — and more often its Legal and Constitutional Affairs Committee — has noticed the paucity of data on many aspects of the criminal justice system. This is due, in part, to a lack of uniform data collection by the police, courts and other law enforcement authorities, all of which are part of the daily administration of criminal law justice, which rests with the provinces and territories.

Unfortunately, this is still the case. However, it remains possible to access a substantial amount of data relevant to this bill.

The first source is the annual reports from StatCan on police-reported crimes. These reports show that the rate of reported crimes increased by 12% from 2014 to 2024. Fortunately, the latest report, released in July 2025, indicates a decrease in this rate of approximately 4% in 2024 compared to 2023. Finally, the report shows that the rate of youth aged 12 to 17 charged across Canada did increase.

Of greater interest to us today is another report published by StatCan called the Crime Severity Index. This index is based on a combination of the volume of police-reported crimes and the relative severity of the crimes, leading to two sub-indices: the violent offences index and the non-violent offences index.

Overall, the Crime Severity Index was down 4% in 2024, the first decrease since the pandemic. However, data by province for 2024 indicates that the Crime Severity Index increased in Quebec, Nova Scotia, Newfoundland and Labrador, and the Northwest Territories, so there are also regional trends.

The significant national decrease resulted from a drop of 6% of the non-violent crime index, following a 9% increase from 2021 to 2023, while the violent crime index was down merely 1%, following an increase of 15% over the previous three years. Put differently, non-violent crimes seem to have gone down significantly, but not violent crimes.

There are also interesting trends to signal for both categories of crime. For example, amongst non-violent crimes, the rates of breaking and entering and motor vehicle theft declined substantially in 2024 thanks to the efforts and coordination by all levels of government, while the rate of shoplifting and theft below \$5,000 has continued to rise since 2022.

[Translation]

Statistics Canada reports show that 182,361 shoplifting complaints were made to police in 2024. This represents a 14% increase over 2023, and the fourth consecutive annual increase in this type of crime.

In 2024, Peel Regional Police in Ontario reported 8,505 shoplifting cases, for a 30.7% increase over 2023.

Statistics published on the Vancouver Police Department website show that two types of crime — theft and possession of stolen property — have been on the rise since 2021. The Montreal police website has similar statistics.

In fact, shoplifting increased by 67% nationally between 2014 and 2024. According to the Retail Council of Canada, shoplifting-related losses rose from \$5 billion to \$9 billion between 2018 and 2024. The Council adds that this increase is attributable to several factors, including a decline in police intervention, the ease of reselling stolen goods on social media and the involvement of organized crime, which operates within highly sophisticated shoplifting networks. In Ontario, pharmacies have been systematically targeted for theft, with the stolen goods being resold in shopping centres. They are small items that the police do not bother with, but it is all part of these networks, which is why the police are interested in the networks.

In 2024, targeted police operations led to the arrest of more than 1,000 people in Canada, many of them repeat offenders, and dismantled resale networks.

Among violent crimes, the Statistics Canada report indicates that the national homicide rate went down in 2024 for the second year in a row. However, 28 more women were killed in 2024, compared to 34 fewer men. It was also noted that in 2024, 42% of women killed were killed by a spouse or intimate partner, compared to 32% in 2023. The report also mentions that the victimization rate is higher among Indigenous people than non-Indigenous people, and that more than one-third of homicide victims are racialized.

Finally, the Montreal police website indicates that between 2023 and 2024, the number of cases of assault, sexual assault and other crimes against persons was on the rise, unfortunately.

Extortion, a violent crime that involves obtaining property through coercion, also remains a problem. Despite a 10% decline in 2024, the rate of this crime was four times higher in 2024 than in 2014, reaching 13,140 cases reported to the police nationwide. This type of crime is not always reported to the police. In addition, it appears that organized crime is increasingly involved in this type of crime.

On June 16, 2025, the Peel Regional Police in Ontario, which serve an area that includes the cities of Brampton and Mississauga, announced that it had conducted an investigation with other police forces and had successfully dismantled a criminal ring that was defrauding vehicle insurers and extorting small towing companies. The investigation managed to recover over \$4 million in property, firearms and ammunition. Police arrested 18 individuals, almost half of them having been released on bail while awaiting trial.

[English]

In B.C., it was reported that violent extortion crimes increased from 370 in 2014 to 3,216 in 2024. This represents an increase of over 500% in 10 years. In 2025, this crime remained a major issue in British Columbia. In response, on September 17, 2025, the B.C. government announced a special task force of 40 police

officers led by the RCMP to coordinate efforts in targeting organized crime activity involved in extortion-related threats, especially against the South Asian community.

It is in this context that the provinces and territories have asked the Minister of Justice and the Government of Canada to adopt measures targeting organized crime, recidivists and violent offenders.

- (1900)

In fact, Bill C-14 is now one of the top priorities arising from the First Ministers' Meeting held in Ottawa on January 29, 2026. They spoke about international trade and the sovereignty of Canada. They spoke about the barriers between provinces that are coming down. They concluded that Bill C-14 was a top priority for them.

Their call is supported by the National Police Federation as well as the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, an organization that is dear to our colleague Senator Forest. It is also supported by the data I have just reviewed, which shows that organized crime, recidivism and violent offenders continue to pose a serious risk to Canadians, especially in certain communities.

Of course, for the proposed amendments to be effective without creating further delay in an already overtaxed justice system, the provinces must dedicate the required additional resources. This includes hiring more Crown attorneys, appointing more justices of the peace, improving access to more courtrooms and staff, proper oversight to ensure compliance with conditions imposed on bail, additional capacity in provincial jails to end overcrowding, the involvement of social workers, access to mental illness support and other resources to address the root cause of many of these offences.

With all that said about the context, today we are called to focus on Bill C-14, mindful that it is one piece of a much larger puzzle within the criminal justice system.

I will now move to Bill C-14's proposed amendments to the bail stage of the criminal process. Bail decisions are among the most challenging aspects of the criminal justice system for judges. Decisions are made early in the process, often under significant time pressure and in relation to individuals who are presumed innocent yet, in some cases, may pose serious risks to the security of the community if released or try to escape the country to avoid a trial.

Furthermore, the judge must take into consideration the recognized rights of a person charged with an offence under section 11(e) of the Charter "not to be denied reasonable bail without just cause."

According to the Supreme Court of Canada, this provision protects ". . . both the right not to be denied bail without just cause and the right to bail on reasonable terms . . ." and conditions.

Section 11(e) entrenches the presumption of innocence at the bail stage and safeguards the liberty of accused persons.

In fact, in matters of bail, as in all other aspects of criminal proceedings, the principle of restraint must govern. Prisons should generally be an option of last resort. Police officers and judges should seek the least intrusive measures that will achieve the overall purpose of bail.

The ladder principle, which is an important bail principle premised on restraint, “. . . requires that the form of release imposed on an accused be no more onerous than necessary”

If the officer is of the view that bail should be denied, the accused must be brought rapidly before a judge or a justice of the peace, who will be guided by the principle of restraint.

Bill C-14 proposes statutory guidance to address concerns that the principle of restraint has sometimes been misunderstood as favouring release over public protection or the preservation of public confidence in the administration of justice, leading to uneven application across the country. That’s why the bill proposes a statutory framework of analysis.

Second, Bill C-14 proposes to add categories of offenders to the existing ones for which the accused has the burden to convince the judge that he or she be released on bail. These situations are called reverse onuses.

In our criminal system, the onus to convince a judge generally rests on the Crown. This means that when an accused is brought before a court, it is generally up to the Crown to convince the presiding judge that the accused should not be released on bail.

However, it is now well-settled law that the onus can be reversed and put on the shoulders of an accused in a narrow set of circumstances in order to promote the proper functioning of the bail system. The Supreme Court has already upheld reverse onuses, for example, in the case of an accused charged with drug trafficking, an offence that is very often tied to organized crime and where offenders thus have access to the means to flee the country.

The court has also upheld the reverse onus that applies when an accused person, already released on charges of an indictable offence, is then charged with another indictable offence.

In a more recent case, a trial court in B.C. — the Supreme Court of British Columbia — upheld the reverse onus that applies where an accused is on release and then returns to the court on charges of breaching their undertaking, summons or release order.

A reverse onus, for example, also applies when an individual is charged with violence against an intimate partner and has a prior conviction involving intimate partner violence. We did that in Bill C-75. These accused are then presumed to be a risk to the victim if released.

Bill C-14 proposes to extend the reverse onus for serious crimes such as human trafficking, organized or violent auto theft, violent extortion and assault or sexual assault involving choking or strangulation. These crimes are associated with either a

propensity to use violence by the accused or participation in organized crime. These characteristics are associated with a risk to public safety if the accused is released on bail.

For example, assaults and sexual assaults involving strangulation constitute a known risk factor for escalating violence or fatal violence against women leading to femicide.

For those offences that represent a heightened danger for victims and communities, the bill proposes to shift to the accused the onus to show the judge that detention is not necessary. This means that where a reverse onus applies, the starting point is a presumption of detention.

The existing reverse onus provision for accused persons who have a relevant prior conviction for violence with a weapon and are then charged with a similar serious offence will be expanded from 5 years to 10 years.

The bill also reinforces the quality of decision making regarding bail by emphasizing the need for the accused to show cause “. . . by clearly demonstrating that their proposed release plan addresses the risks posed by the accused”

Incidentally, it must be made clear that it is not the intent of the minister, the government or Parliament to impose upon the accused a higher threshold than the balance of probabilities, which is the applicable standard of proof, contrary to what was asserted in some briefs presented at the other place opposing that provision.

In addition, these amendments direct judges to scrutinize whether a proposed plan meaningfully addresses the risks posed by the accused, including risks to specific victims or the public more broadly.

These two requirements, the proposal of a plan and the obligation of the judge to scrutinize it carefully, respond to concerns that release plans have, in some cases, lacked sufficient structure, supervision or enforceability to prevent breaches or reoffending.

This being said, a reverse onus and the need for the accused to clearly demonstrate a credible and reliable release plan do not mandate or predetermine detention as the outcome. It is to be clearly understood that it will continue to be the presiding judge who will make the decision as to whether detention is justified or decide on the form and terms of the release on bail.

• (1910)

A third set of amendments, more technical, proposes several efficiency measures that address long-standing practical challenges identified by police, prosecutors, defence counsel and judges. I won’t elaborate much on them, except one measure that concerns the bail review scheme provided in the Criminal Code. The existing bail review scheme is complex and has been interpreted differently by courts across the country. Under the current law, it is unclear whether a judge can review the bail decisions of another judge of the same court. In some provinces, you have to appeal, even to the Supreme Court.

Bill C-14 would clarify that bail review decisions are reviewable by a judge of the same court so that neither the accused nor the Crown would be required to seek review before a Court of Appeal or the Supreme Court. As a matter of fact, the Criminal Code is silent on this issue.

These changes aim to bring clarity to the bail review scheme and to ensure that it operates more consistently and predictably nationwide.

Finally, it is worth mentioning that the House committee added an amendment requiring the Minister of Justice to table an annual report on the state of bail in Canada. This report will include information on bail outcomes, data on the accessibility of bail and disparities between different groups. Hopefully, the provinces will provide the necessary information, and, over time, consistent reporting will help build a clearer national picture of how bail operates and where improvements may be required.

Better bail data would support improved decision making at every stage of the process. For police, it could inform release decisions and risk assessments. For courts, it could shed light on the effectiveness of particular conditions or release plans. For governments, it could enable more informed policy development, resource allocation and evaluation of whether legislative reforms are achieving their objectives. Importantly, it would also allow justice partners to identify emerging issues earlier.

Before concluding my remarks on bail, I want to say that the minister and the government are mindful of the overrepresentation of Indigenous people and Black people in the criminal justice system, including as victims and survivors of crime. This is a known issue with Canada's criminal justice system. The reverse onus provisions, though targeting very specific subgroups of offenders, might result in more overrepresentation of these groups, as acknowledged in the Gender-based Analysis Plus associated with the bill. It is, therefore, an issue that should be monitored by the government and covered in the minister's annual report.

The minister also reminded me that the government is investing in programs addressing systemic discrimination and overrepresentation, including Canada's Black Justice Strategy, which plans investments of \$67.5 million over two years, with \$23.6 million starting in 2025-26 for the Department of Justice. Investment will also be made in Canada's Indigenous Justice Strategy, which identifies priority actions to address systemic discrimination and overrepresentation of Indigenous people in the justice system.

The minister also referred to parts of Bill C-16, An Act to amend certain Acts in relation to criminal and correctional matters (child protection, gender-based violence, delays and other measures), which includes a new crime called coercive control, which is very important in the matter of control of women by intimate partners. That bill is known by its short title, "Protecting Victims Act." It is currently going through the committee stage in the other place. It will directly address some of the issues I just mentioned by emphasizing that particular attention must be paid to the needs of Indigenous persons and Black persons in relation to restorative justice.

Finally, I want to draw your attention to section 493.2 of the Criminal Code, which requires a peace officer, justice or judge to give particular attention to the circumstances of an accused person who is Indigenous or who belongs to a vulnerable and overrepresented population when making a bail decision. This obligation is complemented by section 515(13.1), a Senate amendment to the former bill on bail reform that requires judges to include in the record a statement that sets out whether and how they have applied the requirements of the previous sections to give particular attention to the circumstances of the accused who belong to Indigenous or overrepresented groups.

I will now turn to my third and last point, sentencing. Bill C-14 proposes targeted amendments designed to ensure that sentences better reflect the seriousness of certain forms of offending and the harm caused to victims and communities. These amendments provide clearer statutory direction in circumstances where denunciation, deterrence and accountability are particularly important.

The proposed changes can be divided into three categories: additions to the list of aggravating factors found at section 718.2 of the Criminal Code, broadening the scope for consecutive sentences and excluding conditional sentence orders for certain serious offences.

Section 718 of the Criminal Code sets out the purpose and principles of sentencing. Section 718.1 states the fundamental principle of proportionality, which is that a sentence must always be proportionate to the gravity of the offence and the moral blameworthiness of the offender. These sections are not amended.

As for section 718.2 — which is amended — entitled "Other sentencing principles," it imposes on a judge the obligation to consider whether a sentence should be increased or reduced to account for any relevant aggravating or mitigating circumstances. The provision explicitly sets out what constitutes aggravating factors.

As the Supreme Court of Canada described in *R. v. Nasogaluak*, mitigating and aggravating factors, after consideration of the other sentencing objectives, which are the big principles, will "... push the sentence up or down the scale of appropriate sentences for similar offences." The weight of such factors is decided in each case based on the facts before the court.

The bill proposes to add as an aggravating factor the fact that the offence was committed against a person who was providing services as a first responder. I think Senator Housakos previously introduced a similar bill. Violence against first responders not only endangers their personal safety but also undermines the ability of emergency services to function effectively and protect communities. By requiring courts to treat assaults on first responders acting in the course of their duties as aggravating factors, Bill C-14 reinforces the importance of safeguarding those who serve on the front lines of public safety.

The bill, amongst other factors, also proposes to add as another aggravating factor offences committed with the use of violence against another person by an offender who was convicted of a similar offence within the previous five years. That addition targets repeat violent offenders.

- (1920)

Another aggravating factor is stealing material that belongs to necessary infrastructure, and it is specifically targeting the theft of copper from telecommunications companies — a crime which is unfortunately on the rise. It has severe consequences, like breaking down the communication network for the time of repair.

The second category of amendments imposes mandatory consecutive sentences in connection with the following categories of offences, despite the fact that both offences committed arise from the same event or series of events: One refers to a combination of an arson offence and an extortion offence. That could be a case where a criminal sets fire or threatens to set fire to a store if the owner does not pay a certain amount of money. That would be considered two separate offences and would lead to consecutive sentences. The same will apply to offences that are accompanied by violence or are committed for the benefit of organized crime, specifically in the case of motor vehicle theft, or a combination of violent and organized crime offences of motor vehicle theft, as well as breaking and entering.

The bill would also require courts to consider consecutive sentences for repeat violent offenders who have a previous conviction for a similar offence within the preceding five years. This ensures that each offence is fully recognized at sentencing and the totality of the harm caused is reflected in the sentence imposed.

Such amendments, however, do not detract from a court's statutory requirement under section 718.2(c) of the Criminal Code to consider, where consecutive sentences are imposed, whether the combined sentence is unduly long or harsh. Of course, the principle of proportionality also continues to apply, as well as the right not to be subjected to any cruel or unusual punishment under section 12 of the Charter such that the sentence ordered must not be grossly disproportionate to an otherwise fit and proportionate sentence.

I now move to the third category of proposed amendments on sentencing, which excludes — at the request of the provinces and territories — the availability of conditional sentence orders, known as CSOs or house arrest, for serious sexual offences. The bill also proposes to exclude conditional sentence orders where the Crown proceeds by indictment in cases of sexual assault and sexual offences exploiting children or persons with a disability. This will ensure that sentences for the most serious sexual offences are served in custodial settings that reflect the gravity of the harm involved, the need for denunciation and the importance of public confidence in the justice system.

In addition to the above modifications, Bill C-14 also restores the availability of driving prohibitions for manslaughter and criminal negligence causing death or bodily harm caused by driving a car, which unfortunately was deleted in the previous iteration of amendments to the Criminal Code. The bill requires courts to prioritize denunciations and deterrence when sentencing those convicted of certain offences.

Incidentally, for these serious sexual offences, courts prioritize imprisonment to deter. And it's rare that a conditional sentence order would be made in the case of serious sexual offences. The amendment will foreclose the courts — in the rare cases where it could be done — from making a conditional sentence order.

Before I conclude, I need to mention that the bill includes targeted amendments to the Youth Criminal Justice Act. Before time runs out, I wish to highlight three changes to the Youth Criminal Justice Act.

First, the bill aims to clarify the definition of “violent offence” by specifying that it includes all offences where bodily harm is caused. As drafted in the Youth Criminal Justice Act, it says that a violent offence “. . . includes as an element the causing of bodily harm” This meaning was very unclear for some judges, so the phrase “as an element” will be removed. If the offence results in bodily harm, it will be considered a violent offence. The term “violent offence” will also be clarified to include young persons committing an offence involving the use or trafficking of a firearm.

Second, the bill proposes to allow the police to publish the identity of a young person without a court order for a maximum period of 24 hours in an urgent situation where there is imminent danger to public safety and where a court order could not, with reasonable diligence, be obtained. We are now talking about the recent event in B.C. Under the current law, the police could not identify the offender as things were progressing. Currently, police can publish the identity of a young person only further to a court authorization and for a maximum period of five days. In exceptional circumstances, when there is urgency and you cannot reach any judge, then you will be allowed to proceed without judicial authorization only because the safety of the community is at risk.

Third, an amendment will allow the police to access records of extrajudicial measures, other than extrajudicial sanctions, during a two-year period to assist in investigation. Essentially, it is unclear if the police can have access to the records of an investigation that was concluded without a charge when it involved a young person. This would allow access within a period of two years. There is no period mentioned now in the law, so somehow the access could be unlimited. That access will now be limited to two years, but it will be clarified that police can have access.

I know that in some briefs, defence lawyers are arguing they should also have access. This is an issue that will be considered, I suppose, at the committee stage.

While these amendments address violent offending by youth, the proposed amendments do not affect the Youth Criminal Justice Act's emphasis on rehabilitation, reintegration and proportionality, recognizing the distinct principles that should apply in the youth justice context.

In conclusion, Bill C-14 responds to concerns consistently raised across the country about repeat violent offending and some particular crimes that are becoming endemic, the whole in a calibrated way and remaining firmly grounded in the foundational principles of Canadian criminal and constitutional law.

Of course, Bill C-14 is only one piece of a much larger puzzle within the criminal justice system, as I mentioned before. Parliament and the provinces and territories shall remain aware of that caveat and act accordingly. Thank you very much for your attention.

[Translation]

Hon. Kim Pate: Would Senator Dalphond take some questions?

Senator Dalphond: With pleasure, Senator Pate.

Senator Pate: Thank you.

[English]

Senator Dalphond, there were lots of numbers in your speech, and thank you for that. I want to remind you and ask you a question based on a little bit of history.

In January 2024, Bill C-48 came into force. It included targeted measures aimed at repeat violent offenders, particularly in the area of intimate partner violence, with reverse onus provisions. One of the issues raised — as you have raised — was that there was a large increase in the proportion of women killed by a spouse in a situation of intimate partner violence, and that was the rationale. You've repeated that rationale. Bill C-48 has been in effect for more than a year — in fact, two years — so that raises some questions about the correlation or the causal impact of certain bills.

• (1930)

In addition, there's a significant body of evidence suggesting that harsher bail increases, rather than decreases, crime. That research has been the basis for some other changes that have been made.

I'm curious about what steps were taken to evaluate the concrete impacts of Bill C-48 in terms of crime prevention before enacting more reverse onuses. As successive ministers of justice — Minister Verani, Minister Lametti and even Minister

Fraser — have pointed out, there is a paucity of data coming from provinces. You alluded to that, but you presented some data. In fact, recently, Minister Fraser said the following:

It's not as though there's an effective national dataset that will demonstrate conclusively that certain changes will or will not have a desired impact.

Despite these statements, the federal government has announced no new strategy, initiative or proposal to improve data collection regarding the bail system. Why not take that step first before embarking on a path that we've already been on for two years, which has been shown to be ineffective?

Senator Dalphond: Thank you for the questions. There are many questions. They are very important and deserve to be considered.

I wonder if it's Bill C-48 or Bill C-75 where we have intimate partner violence. Yes, we introduced that two years ago. Is it effective? To a certain extent, it's effective, but, this unfortunate and very tragic event that happened in B.C. last year gave rise to Bailey's Law, which was introduced in the other place by an MP. It involved a mother of two who was killed by her estranged partner while he was released on bail.

The message here in the amendments is that we should take these things even more seriously. With the amendment, such a person will not only have the reverse onus but will also have to come up with a credible and reliable release plan, and the judge will have to consider that release plan seriously and comment on it.

The bill, if adopted, will impose a stricter burden on the accused, who has a reverse onus because he has already been convicted. In the case referred to, the man previously convicted of intimate partner violence offences will have to put forward a credible and reliable plan if he wants to be released, and the judge will have to consider it seriously. He, the accused, should come up with more uniformity and consider other serious matters.

With regard to the second point about the data, I not only alluded to it, but I clearly referred to it as one of the major gaps that compels us to act without a proper set of data, but we do, in fact, have some data. If the suggestion is to wait until we have more data to act, I prefer to apply the principle of prudence, saying, let's act now and collect more data later. Let's not wait any longer so that some of the repeated offenders or criminals can act —

[Translation]

The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore: I'm sorry to interrupt you, Senator Dalphond, but your time has expired. Are you asking for five more minutes to answer questions?

Senator Dalphond: If the chamber is willing to give me five more minutes.

[English]

The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore: Is leave granted for 10 more minutes?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Senator Pate: Thank you, Senator Dalphond. As a former judge and now the government sponsor of this bill, I think you're well aware that making decisions without data can be incredibly problematic. When making decisions, there's a saying that I'm sure you're familiar with: Bad facts make bad law. Moreover, one individual high-profile case can result in significant challenges.

Bill C-75 also introduced measures. At every stage, the Legal and Constitutional Affairs Committee emphasized the need for data, indicating that these decisions have yet again been made without data being provided by the provinces.

Why not, instead, insist that the government go back to the provinces and territories and insist on receiving that data? They're saying this is a data-driven and data-based series of decisions. Why not prove that? In fact, the data shows just the opposite: the approach they're taking will do exactly what you alluded to. It will result in more people, particularly marginalized groups, being jailed. It will result in more youth and others who are easier to catch being caught up in the system.

Senator Dalphond: I think I've answered already, but I can only say that data collection is done by the provinces and territories, not by the federal government. The jurisdiction of criminal law is a federal jurisdiction; it's a federal obligation; it's a federal duty. The provinces and territories have come to Ottawa — attorneys general first and then the first ministers. They are all asking for these measures. They are responsible for the administration of justice within their provinces and territories. The police are asking for these measures.

The results of some arrests that were done and real facts show that, unfortunately, for example, what is being proposed for shoplifting offences is to be tough when it's done as a part of organized crime. It's not targeting the person who is going to a store to steal bread because he cannot afford to pay for bread. We're talking about people who are part of an organized network. They go and steal about \$300 or \$400 every day. They appear before the judge, and the judge releases them sometimes without conditions. They are back on the street and then go back in. Why do they do that? It's because they're part of a network.

The police have arrested many of them, and they are repeat offenders. So we have to address that issue. We cannot remain silent and wait while more of that kind of crime occurs. Thank you.

Hon. Denise Batters: Thank you, Senator Dalphond, for taking more questions. I'm the critic of the bill, so I have some definite questions for you on this.

First of all, section 1 of Bill C-14 sets out the short title of this bill as the "Bail and Sentencing Reform Act."

The bill is now 39 pages long, and there are some provisions which take away some house arrest provisions and some possibilities for aggravated sentencing, but there is only one clause in that 39-page bill that would actually increase the sentence for one offence, that being, ". . . contempt of court increases from 90 days to two years less a day."

Sadly, many Canadians now feel less safe in our society. Given this, why is the Liberal government incorrectly trying to portray to the Canadian public that a significant part of this bill involves increasing criminal sentences?

Senator Dalphond: Thank you, Senator Batters. I'm looking forward to hearing your speech. Yes, I know you're as prepared as I am.

To be exact, you said that's only one offence that has been increased. Yes, technically speaking, you are right. But the reality is that when we change the rules for some types of offences to impose upon judges an obligation to impose consecutive sentences, we're going to have sentences where the whole sentence for the convicted offender will be a longer sentence than he or she would have received now under the current system. Because, as you know, under the current system, normally, if it's a series of events, the sentences run at the same time, so the longest one determines the length of imprisonment, but they don't add to each other; they run concurrently. This will no longer be possible, so the person will be detained for a longer period.

• (1940)

So to say that it doesn't change anything, I think, is not true. Well, at least it's an imprecision in what you say. For sure, the result for all these offences is going to be longer sentences.

Senator Batters: Certainly, those provisions are very limited, so we'll have a chance to discuss that more at committee.

Secondly, with Bill C-5, the Liberal government widely expanded the ability of convicted criminals to receive house arrest as their sentence, and Bill C-14 — this bill — takes away the ability to get house arrest for some of those offences. But there remain many serious offences that do continue to be eligible for house arrest, and that includes human trafficking — which you actually in your speech tonight called a serious crime — robbery and weapons trafficking. Why did the Liberal government oppose the Conservative amendment at the House committee which would have stopped house arrest for those types of serious crimes?

Senator Dalphond: Thank you very much for another excellent question. Again, I think all these are nuances in criminal law — as well as other fields of law, but more in criminal law — but you are referring to offences that are hybrid offences in most cases; that's the cases you're referring to. The person can be charged on indictment or on a summary offence.

If it's a summary offence, it is because the Crown is of the view that it's not a case that deserves to be treated like the most serious charge, which is through an indictment. So, if the Crown opts to go by indictment, that person will not be eligible for a conditional sentence order. However, if the Crown is of the view

that what fits more is a summary conviction, of course, that would remain available. And that's probably what fits more all the criteria that the Criminal Code provides for sentencing — the seriousness of the crime, the particular circumstances of the accused and the consequences for the victim. All these things have to be factored in.

The Crown will do the first screening, and the court will act accordingly. But it will be up to the Crown — the prosecutor — to decide if they go with an indictment or summary conviction. If they go with an indictment, the end result is that there is no possibility of getting a conditional sentence order.

Senator Batters: Yes, it certainly still remains, though, a human trafficking conviction, whether it's summary or indictable, and I actually can't really think of an example in which I would consider human trafficking to ever not be a serious crime.

Another issue is this: You mentioned in your speech tonight what a serious crime extortion is, but Bill C-14, which was introduced by the Carney Liberal government in late October, when this scourge of extortion was already quite well known in Canada, makes only minimal mention of extortion as a crime and dealing with the consequences of that. Extortion has gone up 330% over the last 10 years, so why didn't the government use the legislative measure of this bill, Bill C-14, to combat it in a more serious way?

Senator Dalphond: I forgot: What was your first comment?

Senator Batters: You mentioned what a serious crime extortion is. So why didn't the government use this bill to combat it in a more serious way? It really has just a minimal mention in the bill.

Senator Dalphond: Sorry, yes, the first part was about human trafficking; I remember now. Yes, human trafficking is a very serious offence, but all the participants are not necessarily committing the most serious offences. For example, a person who drives a car, and he brings in the car someone who is part of that network. That person knows more or less, but doesn't do much — maybe that person doesn't deserve to be charged under an indictment, but on a summary conviction. It might be somebody who was not even aware — should they have been more suspicious? Maybe not.

There are always nuances in all the types of participation that the offender is accused of. That's why I say there are cases where a summary conviction might be most appropriate.

About arson and extortion, certainly extortion is a major issue. That's why there are many provisions here to ensure that if you are accused of extortion and violence, or in the case of organized crime, you have a reverse onus at bail —

The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore: I'm sorry to interrupt again, Senator Dalphond. Two other senators — Senator Coyle and Senator Simons — wish to ask questions. Are you asking for five more minutes to answer those questions?

Senator Dalphond: I ask for four more minutes. I think at some point it will become a cruel punishment, but so far I can take it.

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Hon. Mary Coyle: Thank you, Senator Dalphond, for all of the hard work you've put into this. It's very obvious. Like you, I think all senators here really would appreciate it and appreciate there's a little more data here, but still not sufficient, as my colleague has pointed out. And when we're looking at our criminal justice system, we really would like to have a clear, evidence-based foundation. These are serious matters that we're doing here.

I have two questions, but I'll ask the first one quickly. Senator Dalphond, could you tell us what non-carceral public safety investments is the government planning to have accompany Bill C-14 in areas such as housing, mental health care and gender-based-violence prevention — these sorts of upstream investments — so that we're not always putting all of our resources downstream in this criminal justice system?

Senator Dalphond: The question could be directed more to Senator Moreau. Certainly, for housing, the government, in the budget, in Bill C-15, has a tremendous amount — well, not tremendous but a series of provisions about that. There is the creation of the new corporation Build Canada Homes and the fact that one third of the budget — as a matter of fact, most of the projects by Build Canada Homes will be not-for-profit projects. They will be kind of social programs. I'm glad I'm a member of the National Finance Committee, so I know about this.

Of course, this is intended to fill a niche which is not filled by the market and to support the municipalities and provinces that want to provide housing at a price which is way below the market price and to address poverty and homelessness. But this would not be automatic. It would take months and years to see the results, but I think this is one of the initiatives.

I have referred to the initiatives under the Black Justice Strategy and Indigenous programs. I think the government could maybe do more, but certainly they are not backtracking. I asked the questions, because when I refer to the minister, I'm referring to the answers he gave to me to the questions I specifically put to him because I share your concerns, and I share many of the concerns that were expressed here today.

But I believe this is part of a much larger picture, and I think the federal government is doing some work on that; maybe more can be done. Also, the provinces have to look at that too. For example, one of the main things about crime is enforcement, and there are fewer crimes when there are more police and more policing and when you know that the risk of being caught is higher than lower. The RCMP will recruit 1,000 more new officers this year, representing a budget of \$1.8 billion. So there are many measures. If you look in the budget — it was a big book — there are many government measures to alleviate the pressure.

At the end of the day, the optimal situation is to address the root problems, because policing and judges are at the end of the spectrum. However, the protection of society is also an important priority for all of us living within it. We should not have problems; when we do, we must address them.

• (1950)

Safety is an issue for many Canadians in many communities. I refer to the data indicating that shoplifting is becoming an issue. Some small shops are shutting down because 10% of people are taking things without paying. They say there is no point in continuing because the margin is less than 10%. We have to address all these issues. This is part of the answer, but more must be done.

The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore: We are out of time.

(On motion of Senator Martin, debate adjourned.)

BUDGET 2025 IMPLEMENTATION BILL, NO. 1

SECOND READING—DEBATE ADJOURNED

Hon. Sandra Pupatello moved second reading of Bill C-15, An Act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on November 4, 2025.

She said: Honourable senators, I hope this will be the most exciting speech — given at 7:50 p.m. — that we've heard in some time; it's a bit of pressure.

It's my privilege to introduce the government's Bill C-15, An Act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in parliament on November 4, 2025, more commonly referred to as the budget implementation act, or BIA.

[*Translation*]

As the bill's sponsor in the Senate, I would like to thank the Minister of Finance and National Revenue for entrusting me with this responsibility.

I appreciate the opportunity to explore in some detail the key elements of Bill C-15, whose purpose is to legislate many of the priorities proposed in Budget 2025.

We are at a critical juncture. We are living in uncertain times and constantly wondering what will happen next.

Bill C-15, the budget bill, aims to address these uncertainties and activate the levers over which the government has control, as the Prime Minister said.

[*English*]

This 638-page document is not for the faint of heart. I plan to go through each line with you; that would be the most helpful way. I was just checking whether you are all truly listening to me.

For brevity, today I won't address every measure in the bill that would make it worthy of the Senate's support.

[Senator Dalphond]

I want to highlight items that Canadians looking for a more affordable life would find helpful, items that would make things easier for businesses and some of the queries put forward by members of various committees that looked at Bill C-15 in pre-study.

[*Translation*]

We had the benefit of receiving a copy of the bill when it was introduced in the other place. This allowed us to get a head start and split it up across a number of Senate committees, which then began their pre-study.

[*English*]

I'm feeling the other senator's pain in his English and mine in my French.

[*Translation*]

This allowed us to get a head start, since typically there are few changes or amendments to a budget bill. We were able to work almost in parallel with the other place, which was also studying the budget bill in its own committees.

I found this exercise very useful. Ministers responsible for several sections of the bill were able to receive feedback, requests for clarification and even amendments, when necessary, early in the legislative process.

[*English*]

Bill C-15 naturally starts with a number of tax measures, many of them making the lives of individuals more affordable. An example in Part 1 of the bill, which changes the Income Tax Act and the Income Tax Regulations, is that the limit of the Lifetime Capital Gains Exemption would be expanded so it applies to up to \$1.25 million of eligible capital gains, applicable to dispositions that occur on or after June 25, 2024, with indexation of the limit to resume in 2026. That's an increase from just over \$1 million and good news for the many people who are homeowners.

Another bill, Bill C-4, aims to provide tax relief to nearly 22 million people by reducing the lowest marginal personal income tax rate from 15% to 14%.

Bill C-15 continues this benefit. It would also exempt the Canada Disability Benefit from income, maximizing its benefits, and proceed with expanding the list of expenses recognized under the disability supports deduction. This expanded list is meant to better support people with disabilities when they're working, including things like service animals, ergonomic work chairs and navigation devices for low vision.

For the many who work as personal support workers — a field of work we all came to appreciate much more during and after COVID — Bill C-15 introduces a temporary personal support workers tax credit to provide up to \$1,100 per year to eligible personal support workers, recognizing their vital contributions in our communities in a very tangible way.

A number of Finance Committee members asked questions about this measure to ensure it captured the personal support workers who work in many areas of health care. They confirmed that it included eligible health care establishments, including hospitals, nursing care facilities, residential care, facilities for care of the elderly, home health care establishments and other similar health care facilities or establishments.

More clarifying language regarding the responsibilities of employers was also added in an amendment, creating an explicit obligation in the Income Tax Act for employers to certify their eligible employees' eligible earnings in the prescribed form and manner — a request that came from many of the unions that represent personal support workers.

On another important note, Division 44 of Part 5 enacts the national school food program act. This sets out the Government of Canada's vision for the National School Food Program, which aims to provide meals for up to 400,000 more children each year beyond those served by existing school food programs, with \$260 million per year starting in 2029-30. The current \$1-billion, five-year program started in 2025.

This division sets out the government's commitment to maintaining long-term funding to be provided to provinces, territories and Indigenous Peoples for the ongoing implementation and maintenance of the program. This would, in effect, make the program permanent, something that has long been called for.

For businesses, Part 1 of Bill C-15 aims to enhance Canada's Scientific Research and Experimental Development, or SR&ED, tax incentive program by increasing the enhanced credit expenditure limit from \$3 million to \$6 million, extending eligibility for the enhanced credit to certain Canadian public corporations and restoring capital expenditures as eligible costs.

As part of the government's plan to attract and catalyze private sector investments, the bill would also ensure 100% first-year expensing for eligible manufacturing and processing machinery and equipment as part of Budget 2025's productivity super-deduction.

[*Translation*]

We often talk about our lagging productivity. The budget includes concrete measures to encourage businesses to invest in innovation to boost their productivity.

When we discussed the budget bill last autumn, I gave you specific examples of companies, especially small start-ups that don't have a huge bank account to draw on. These measures are crucial to their growth.

• (2000)

[*English*]

For example, there is an increase in that expenditure limit on which an enhanced 35% tax credit can be earned — from \$3 million to \$6 million — and a reinstatement of the eligibility of capital expenditures — machinery and equipment, et cetera — for both the deduction against income and investment tax credit components of that Scientific Research and Experimental Development, or SR&ED, program.

This brings our SR&ED tax program back in line with other OECD countries. We used to lead in this area, but we have not renewed those levels or the items that companies could include for many years. We have to keep it up.

As U.S. tariffs continue to raise costs for Canadian manufacturers, this measure will stimulate domestic manufacturing, enhance investment and reduce tax burdens for Canadian businesses. To protect the integrity of Canada's tax base, Bill C-15 would also reform and modernize transfer pricing rules — the ones that govern where our companies will pay their income tax when they do business outside Canada. These changes come on the heels of public feedback going back to 2021 and better align with OECD standards, which is good.

The revised transfer pricing rules and documentation requirements included in the bill would apply to taxation years beginning after November 4, 2025.

Colleagues, knowing that Canada's commitment to fighting climate change positions us to surpass economies that fail to adapt to this reality, Canada's new government is exploring initiatives to further Canada's standing as a clean energy superpower.

As part of the government's Climate Competitiveness Strategy, Bill C-15 includes the enabling legislation to deliver the Clean Economy Investment Tax Credits, refundable credits equal to 15% of the capital costs of eligible investments in equipment related to low-emitting electricity generation, electricity storage and the transmission of electricity between provinces and territories — more encouragement to go green and to buy and sell within Canada. Budget 2025 also proposes including the Canada Growth Fund as an eligible entity under the Clean Economy Investment Tax Credits. It also proposes to introduce an exception so that financing provided by the Canada Growth Fund would not reduce the cost of eligible property for the purpose of computing the clean electricity investment tax credits. These measures would apply to eligible properties that are acquired or become available for use on or after budget day.

Furthermore, Bill C-15 enhances the suite of existing investment tax credits to further support investments in decarbonizing technologies and clean technology manufacturing, including the Carbon Capture, Utilization, and Storage Investment Tax Credit, or CCUS ITC. It maintains its full credit rates for an additional five years, up to 2035, which will provide a higher level of support for businesses investing in carbon capture, utilization and storage.

The Clean Technology Manufacturing Investment Tax Credit would be broadened to include more critical minerals essential for clean technology supply chains. The Critical Mineral Exploration Tax Credit would be expanded to cover 12 more minerals necessary for defence, semiconductors, energy and clean technologies, 4 of which I've heard of before: manganese, tungsten, tin and chromium. An amended list that some of the organizations forwarded also included phosphate. I am happy to furnish the complete list to all chemists here today.

Colleagues, at the start of my remarks, I mentioned the critical nature of the moment we find ourselves in. Amid a sizable trade shock and lingering uncertainty, times have been tough for Canadian businesses and families alike. Bill C-15 offers relief to businesses. Part 3 of Bill C-15 amends the Excise Tax Act, the Underused Housing Tax Act, the Select Luxury Items Tax Act and other related texts to implement those measures. The bill extends the Enhanced GST Rental Rebate to 100% to qualifying cooperative housing corporations and student residences built by universities, public colleges and school authorities, which will further incentivize the construction of affordable housing in Canada.

As for the Underused Housing Tax Act, Division 2 of Part 3 of the bill would end the underused housing tax in respect of 2025 and future calendar years. It also subsequently repeals the Underused Housing Tax Act and the Underused Housing Tax Regulations. When we asked why at committee, we received a refreshing answer: The amount that the program brought in did not warrant the cost of running it.

Finally, Division 3 of Part 3 would amend the Select Luxury Items Tax Act to end the luxury tax in respect of subject aircraft and vessels and would amend the Select Luxury Items Tax Regulations to provide greater clarity on the tax treatment of those subject items. These actions will reduce burdensome administrative and compliance costs and support the aviation and boating industries at a time of ongoing global uncertainty. It was never applied to Ontario-made cars purchased for under \$100,000.

To advance Indigenous tax jurisdiction frameworks, Part 4 of Bill C-15 would amend the First Nations Goods and Services Tax Act to, among other things, establish an opt-in framework for interested Indigenous governments to levy a value-added sales tax under their own laws on fuel, alcohol, cannabis, tobacco and

vaping products within their reserves or settlement lands. It also makes process-type improvements and machinery-of-government changes to streamline the administration of taxes under that act.

[*Translation*]

The government is introducing measures to make life more affordable for Canadians, and it is also advancing legislation that will increase competition and consumer choice.

Ultimately, these measures will give Canadians more control over their personal finances. Part 5 of the bill, for example, would amend several statutes to implement measures to modernize and support Canada's financial sector.

[*English*]

Division 15 of Part 5 amends the Bank Act to raise the amount of funds that can be withdrawn immediately from a retail deposit account after the deposit of a cheque or other instrument and to remove the delay for the withdrawal of funds deposited by a cheque or other instrument that is not deposited in person. The minimum amount is being raised from \$100 to \$250. That, too, is an amendment to the bill we initially saw. Cheque payments accounted for only 2% of total payments made in Canada in 2024 but represented 22% of all payment value. Cheques still matter to many people. Some of us still use them, and some of us do not take pictures of them in order to deposit them.

[*Translation*]

This will allow more Canadians to increase their purchasing power and reduce their reliance on short-term credit, like payday loans or overdraft protection, which would primarily benefit low-income individuals and seniors.

[*English*]

Meanwhile, Division 17 of Part 5 of the bill would amend the Bank Act, the Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation Act and the Financial Consumer Agency of Canada Act to make it easier for credit unions to enter the federal framework and expand so they can continue to serve more Canadians. Notably, Division 9 of Part 5 of the legislation introduces a complete consumer-driven banking act to ensure that individuals and businesses can safely and securely share their data with participating entities of their choice. This will facilitate access to lower-cost products, clearer choices and better tools to manage debt and reduce financial stress for Canadians. That proposed act addresses, among other things, accreditation and common rules governing national security, data sharing, security safeguards, consent, authentication, liability, complaints, administration, enforcement and screen scraping. This division would also make related amendments to the Access to Information Act, the Financial Consumer Agency of Canada Act and the Budget Implementation Act, 2024, No. 1, and it would repeal the existing Consumer-Driven Banking Act.

• (2010)

Moreover, Division 45 of Part 5 of the bill enacts the stablecoin act, which imposes requirements on persons and entities that create stablecoins and make them available for purchase, directly or indirectly, by persons in Canada.

That act also sets out the objects of the Bank of Canada in respect of that fiat-backed stablecoin — a type of cryptocurrency whose value is intended to remain stable relative to government-issued currency — and requires the bank to maintain a public registry of stablecoin issuers. It also addresses, among other things, the redemption of stablecoins by issuers, the reserve of assets that issuers must maintain to fulfill their redemption obligations and the policies, such as in the areas of governance, risk management and data security, that they must establish. Well, thankfully, regulation is arriving.

[*Translation*]

This, honourable colleagues, will foster innovation and competition in the financial sector and build trust in digital payments.

The government is also taking steps to protect Canadians from financial fraud, whether it be SMS phishing, mysterious links, hidden phone calls or fake bank emails. All of these threaten the financial well-being of Canadians and are becoming increasingly sophisticated and hard to detect.

[*English*]

Division 16 of Part 5 would amend the Bank Act to, among other things, prohibit the activation of certain capabilities for a personal deposit account in Canada without the express consent of the person in whose name the account is kept, permit a natural person in whose name such an account is kept to deactivate certain account capabilities, adjust certain transaction limits on the account, require institutions to establish policies and procedures for detecting and preventing consumer-targeted fraud and require institutions and the Commissioner of the Financial Consumer Agency of Canada to prepare annual reports on consumer-targeted fraud.

Division 18 of Part 5 amends the Special Economic Measures Act to protect Canada's financial system from potential unintended consequences of sanctions and ensure financial institutions do not unduly profit from sanctions obligations so that, for example, banks are not benefiting from an individual's assets that have been frozen by the government.

You've heard the government often speak of making a seismic difference in the building of homes. This budget puts its money where its mouth is.

Government efforts are already helping to scale up the supply of homes and bring down costs. But restoring affordability over the long term will require sustaining this momentum and closing the supply gap. This is where Canada's new housing agency, Build Canada Homes, comes in. Federal dollars invested in Build Canada Homes will be leveraged to attract private capital, investors and builders to expand housing supply.

By putting conditions in place to catalyze maximum investment while mainstreaming advanced methods of construction, Canada has the potential to cut building timelines by up to 50%, reduce costs by as much as 20% and lower emissions by approximately 20% during construction.

Division 3 of Part 5 of Bill C-15 would provide, among other things, that an aggregate amount not exceeding \$11.5 billion to fund the operations and activities of Build Canada Homes and an aggregate amount not exceeding \$1.5 billion as a contribution of capital to, or to purchase shares in, Canada Lands Company Limited may be paid out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

Bill C-15 would also enact the high-speed rail network act, which establishes a legislative framework to facilitate the implementation of a rail network that allows for the carrying of passengers at high speed between Quebec and Ontario.

I had the chance to mention at committee that this issue is near and dear to a number of senators, and a number had many questions of Alto when they were brought before the Finance Committee. Senator Gignac and I had, in previous roles, spent a few million dollars updating the 16 reports and studies that had been done long before he and I became ministers of economic development and trade in our respective provinces. After lots of talk, now it seems we're seeing some action. But good process is key, and I expect that the Minister of Transport will field many more questions as he comes before committee members this week.

The act deems the construction of the railway lines that are to be part of the high-speed rail network to have been approved under section 98 of the Canada Transportation Act. It provides that the construction, operation, decommissioning and abandonment of each segment of the high-speed rail network, and any incidental physical activity, are subject to the Impact Assessment Act. It permits certain land to be subject to a notice of right of first refusal or a notice of prohibition on work, amends the expropriation process in relation to the high-speed rail network, provides that Indigenous knowledge that is provided in confidence in relation to the high-speed rail network is treated as confidential, and makes certain parts of the Official Languages Act applicable to certain entities, including those that operate a railway that is part of the high-speed rail network.

We spent a lot of time on Division 5 of Part 5 at committee as well. It amends the Red Tape Reduction Act to authorize ministers to grant temporary exemptions from the application of provisions of certain acts of Parliament and instruments with the aim of facilitating the design, modification or administration of regulatory regimes to encourage innovation, competitiveness or economic growth. This became known as the regulatory sandbox, and there were many questions.

The government heard concerns regarding this clause as it was originally drafted. It supported the proposed guardrails as amended by the other place. The scope now of regulatory sandboxes has been restricted and cannot be used to grant exemptions from certain federal laws. It is limited to the clean technology or financial technology sectors. Parliamentary oversight and reporting have been strengthened by requiring the minister to engage in a public consultation process, and the

minister is now required to table a report to Parliament within 90 days of the exemption. A “two-key” solution has also been added. Two ministers must now approve the exemption.

Another clause eliminating red tape for Canada Post, clause 196 of Bill C-15, seeks to amend the Canada Post Corporation Act to modernize the stamp rate-setting process to allow Canada Post to more expediently update stamp rates. However, stakeholders, including the Canadian National Institute for the Blind and the Canadian Urban Libraries Council, warned that the amendments as initially drafted may unintentionally end or jeopardize the long-standing Canada Post practice of delivering materials free of postage to blind Canadians via the Literature for the Blind program as well as providing reduced rates of postage for library materials. Amendments that now appear in this bill clarify that these services will remain in place.

Division 27 of Part 5 of the bill amends the Export and Import Permits Act to authorize the Governor-in-Council to add articles to the Export Control List and the Import Control List for reasons related to Canada’s economic security interests. Items evolve so quickly in that world that we must give our ministers the ability to react quickly to a changing landscape.

Division 28 of Part 5 of the bill amends the Aeronautics Act to further strengthen Canada’s aviation safety and security regimes — a crucial move at a time when global aviation and aerospace are under extreme pressure.

Division 29 of Part 5 amends the Canada Transportation Act to provide the Minister of Transport with the authority to make interim orders to give effect to international standards or ensure compliance with Canada’s international obligations. Again, as the international environment changes daily, our ministers have to be able to respond quickly.

[Translation]

For air passengers, amendments that build on previous reforms will strengthen air passenger protection regulations and make them more effective by broadening their powers. These amendments will include mandatory compensation for baggage disruptions, losses or delays, as well as refunds where government-issued travel advisories result in cancellations.

• (2020)

[English]

As we are all aware, Budget 2025 released details on the government’s Comprehensive Expenditure Review with the aim of delivering \$13 billion in savings annually by 2028-29. Combined with other measures, Budget 2025 delivers \$60 billion in savings and revenues over five years. The government has stated that these savings will involve workforce adjustments to return the size of the public service to a more sustainable level, while also protecting diversity in the public service workforce and ensuring a strong, younger generation of public servants.

[Senator Papatello]

Division 7 of Part 5 of the bill amends the Public Service Superannuation Act to provide a temporary early retirement option during a period for which a workforce reduction initiative is in effect. It also makes a related amendment to the Income Tax Regulations. Group 1 includes eligible public servants who are at least 50 years of age or older who joined before January 2013, and Group 2 includes eligible public servants who are 55 years of age or older who joined after January 2013. Both groups will be eligible to apply to retire with an immediate pension based on years of service with no penalty for early retirement, subject to parameters set by the Treasury Board. A number of questions were raised at our committee related to the reduction of the workforce.

In conclusion, honourable senators, as Canadians continue to feel the impact of ongoing challenges, including the uncertainties brought about by the developments on the trade and tariff front, I trust you will find these measures a great start in advancing the government’s agenda, which aims to give Canada’s business community a competitive edge and aims to bring financial relief to many of our fellow Canadians.

[Translation]

I would be happy to speak further to Bill C-15 tomorrow at the Standing Senate Committee on National Finance. The Minister of Finance will be joining us to answer questions directly.

Thank you for your attention and I eagerly look forward to examining budget Bill C-15 further in committee. Merci.

Hon. Senators: Hear, hear!

[English]

Hon. Andrew Cardozo: Would the senator take a question?

Senator Papatello: Yes, thanks.

Senator Cardozo: Thank you, Senator Papatello. Congratulations on sponsoring this bill, and congratulations on your speech. I’m sure you could have gone on a lot longer with more detail and kept us totally riveted.

My question is about Alto. I am a senator from Ottawa, and I’m very pleased about the idea of high-speed rail coming through Ottawa. There had been earlier proposals that it would go from Montreal to Toronto without coming to Ottawa, so this is welcome news.

I do want to raise with you some of the concerns that have been put forward. You will have heard about this. Many of us in the Senate have heard those voices as well, certainly both in terms of communications to us and in the local media.

The concern includes a couple of things. One is that there is not enough information that Alto has shared so far, and certainly when you are dealing with expropriation on this large scale, there will be some inconvenience felt, whether it's to individual farms or entire communities. My concern is that we could end up with a debate that's rural folks versus urban folks. Urban dwellers will benefit most from this high-speed rail.

Given the kinds of exemptions that we're giving in this bill, how can we ensure that Alto conducts adequate consultation with people? If it's really not workable in the end, would the government consider using the current corridors of railway lines that exist so that we wouldn't have to deal with that level of expropriation?

Senator Papatello: Thank you. I am pleased to receive the question and delighted that Minister MacKinnon, our Minister of Transport, will be appearing before the National Finance Committee on Wednesday, given the number of questions that were raised at the committee's prior meeting. We have certainly passed those questions along to him. I expect him to come very prepared.

In particular around expropriation, let me give you a little bit of information. First, there is not yet a defined route. In terms of the many emails that I have received — I'm sure you have received them as well — a route has not been determined. Until they actually determine the route, then they would move to the next step of public consultation.

In fact, the measures of the act around expropriation align Canada with the provinces' regimes, both Ontario and Quebec. Similar measures are well established for major infrastructure projects in both Ontario and Quebec through the Building Transit Faster Act, 2020 as well as the Act respecting expropriation respectively. There were a number of questions that we put to Alto at committee — you were there as well — giving them many examples of where it has been done in the past and just how fairly people have been treated. It will not provide solace, I think, given the uncertainty that is there today because a route has simply not been selected. I anticipate that the minister is going to address this in much more detail on Wednesday.

Hon. Robert Black: Would you take another question?

Senator Papatello: Yes.

Senator Black: Thank you. My question is also about Alto and the high-speed rail.

I know the route hasn't been completely sorted out, but certainly wherever it goes, it will cross farmland. What do we tell farmers who reside, have properties and conduct business between Toronto and Quebec City and whom have told us that, in fact, this high-speed rail will split their farms — or could split their farms — and make their farming operations unsustainable and not financially viable? What do we tell farmers about that, when and if a route is selected and it goes right through numerous farms between Toronto and Quebec?

Senator Papatello: Thank you. Not to repeat it, but, again, those are the same questions that I have received in emails from many people, mostly rural Canadians. I think it is true, as Senator

Cardozo stated, there are benefits that might be seen by the large populations around urban settings, but the impact will certainly be felt by our rural communities where the train will actually be going through.

When the route is selected, at that point, I think that type of public consultation is going to be key. I heard the mayor from the United Counties of Prescott and Russell this morning on CBC Radio, talking about the impact even in small towns. Where does the road go, et cetera? These are all very good questions. I think they are prepared to answer those and also to deal with landowners when it comes to that.

Unfortunately, in Canada, we don't have enough exposure to building very large projects. That's a whole separate issue, but I would like to think that we have to get this methodology done properly so that we can continue to use it. In particular, from the moment that I came in, we have all talked about these large infrastructure projects that are finally coming to Canada, and we need to address how we do it in order to do it properly.

Senator Black: Can you confirm that when the time comes, there will be frank, open, honest and long dialogue with those folks who are farming today and may, in fact, not be able to do so in the future?

Senator Papatello: I am certain that I'm going to put that question to the minister when we see him on Wednesday, just in case you are not there. We will certainly ask him about all of the landowners, for sure, and farmers in particular who are looking to continue farming for multiple generations.

Hon. Colin Deacon: Senator Papatello, would you take another question?

Senator Papatello: Yes.

Senator C. Deacon: Thank you.

I wanted to ask about the Red Tape Reduction Act components of the bill. I'm a big fan of regulatory modernization and agility, and I have been pushing for the use of sandboxes.

Can you give me some insight into the pushback from the opposition in the House of Commons to add red tape to the Red Tape Reduction Act process? It doesn't make any sense to me. It is a well-proven method around the globe. It has been proven to be very helpful as a way for regulators to understand innovators and for innovators to understand the objectives of regulators and how to modernize regulations. What was the reason for these changes? I see them as a step backwards.

Senator Papatello: Thank you for that question. I don't want to make assumptions on the part of the opposition in the House of Commons.

• (2030)

However, I will say that there were concerns that were equally expressed at the Senate committee from those who heard the bill and talked about, in particular, the regulatory sandbox and lack of regulation and protection.

We heard from a number of environmental groups, for example, who were worried their laws would be exempt and that people would be running roughshod over environmental objectives just for the sake of it.

Since there were so many questions, the amendments that, in fact, were put forward before the bill actually landed here very much scoped the use of these regulatory sandboxes, so it's limited to technology sectors. It also limited which acts would be allowed to be in that sandbox.

In addition, it added oversight so that two ministers have to sign off on the exemption. It also obligates the minister to prepare a report within 90 days when they've given an exemption.

There are a number of checks and balances that have been added. I think time will tell once it's actually in use, and we can reference several technology-type companies — the finance sector, for example — they can show what they can do, use their innovation and prove that the laws are not being trodden on, and that it's actually working well. That will eventually lead to better regulation, in my view.

Hon. Leo Housakos (Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, I rise today as the critic of Bill C-15, the Budget 2025 implementation act.

It goes without saying that the sheer size of this legislation is a serious obstacle to proper scrutiny by this chamber. As amended by the other place, the bill now spans 604 pages, contains 606 clauses and amends or repeals more than 50 statutes and regulations.

It bundles together tax reforms, infrastructure authorizations, financial sector changes, social benefit adjustments, Indigenous tax frameworks, housing and GST/HST measures, veterans' and RCMP pension updates, competition and consumer protection rules, environmental and energy regulatory changes, digital and financial data-governance regimes and the creation of several new framework statutes.

In addition, it authorizes more than \$44 billion in spending.

In an effort to manage this unwieldy package, the Senate asked its committees to undertake a pre-study. Eleven committees reviewed portions of the bill, with the Standing Senate Committee on National Finance taking the lead. Their reports, taken together, exceeded 9,000 words and identified many concerns.

During clause-by-clause consideration, the House of Commons Standing Committee on Finance considered 35 amendments to the bill and adopted 14 of them. These include: amendments to the Income Tax Act; to add phosphate to the list of eligible critical minerals and correct a technical issue in the tax provisions; amendments to the Canada Post Corporation Act to preserve free postage for materials for the blind and reduced postal rates for library materials; amendments to the Red Tape Reduction Act to add further conditions and reporting

requirements to the regulatory sandbox provisions, because some of us do actually care about transparency; an amendment to the Bank Act to increase the amount of a cheque subject to immediate access from \$100 to \$250; an amendment to the Personal Information Protection and Electronic Documents Act, requiring consultation with the Privacy Commissioner before certain data mobility regulations are made; and an amendment to the Human Pathogens and Toxins Act, requiring a report to Parliament when a minister grants an exemption in urgent public health or safety circumstances.

Taken together, that record illustrates both the scale of the bill and the breadth of the issues we are dealing with today, underscoring that we cannot address legislation of this scale with real thoroughness. Instead, we are left skimming across the surface like a stone skipping across the surface of the water. That is regrettable, but it is the reality before us.

So with the time I have, I want to begin with a brief overview of the bill and then draw your attention to a few concerns that, I believe, should concern all of us.

Let me begin with the overview.

Bill C-15 has five parts.

Part 1 amends the Income Tax Act and related regulations to implement a range of personal and business income tax measures. These include excluding the Canada Disability Benefit from taxable income, extending the enhanced credit rate for the Carbon Capture, Utilization, and Storage Investment Tax Credit through 2035, and allowing immediate expensing for certain new property additions tied to productivity-enhancing assets, among other changes.

Part 2 repeals the Digital Services Tax Act and the Digital Services Tax Regulations, and makes consequential amendments to other legislation.

Part 3 makes several indirect tax changes. Among other things, it confirms that osteopathic services provided by practitioners who are not osteopathic physicians are subject to GST and HST.

It also extends the Enhanced GST Rental Rebate to eligible co-operative housing corporations and student residences, permits input tax credits for redeemed coupons where payments are made solely in the course of commercial activities, and removes both the underused housing tax and the luxury tax as they apply to aircraft and vessels.

Part 4 creates an opt-in framework under the First Nations Goods and Services Tax Act that would allow participating Indigenous governments to impose their own value-added sales tax — under their own laws — on fuel, alcohol, cannabis, tobacco and vaping products within reserves or settlement lands. It also makes administrative and machinery-of-government changes intended to simplify tax administration under the act.

Part 5 consists of 45 divisions. Together, they implement a wide range of measures by amending numerous acts across multiple policy areas. They enact three new statutes.

Bill C-15 does all of this in 167,185 words.

I will acknowledge that there is much in Bill C-15 that Conservatives agree with. Obviously, there's so much in there. Repealing the Digital Services Tax, eliminating the underutilized housing tax measures, amending the Select Luxury Items Tax Act measures, creating early retirement options for public servants to help reduce the size of the federal workforce, supporting the growth of the federal credit unions, making changes to the RCMP Superannuation Act and introducing the Stablecoin Act are all positive measures — to name but a few.

However, the constructive elements in the bill are seriously overshadowed by two very significant concerns. The first is the repeated tendency of the Liberal government to sidestep parliamentary accountability.

When confronted with economic or public health emergencies, this government repeatedly seeks to free itself from what it appears to view as the inconvenience of parliamentary scrutiny. We saw this in 2020, when the Liberal government introduced Bill C-13, the COVID-19 Emergency Response Act. That bill would have granted the then-finance minister Bill Morneau sweeping powers to spend, borrow and tax without parliamentary approval until December 2021, a period of roughly 21 months.

It was only after strong Conservative opposition that the government was forced to significantly scale back that proposal. The fact that this was their instinctive response — to shift significant power to the executive branch — is telling. Unfortunately, it was not a one-off.

We saw this again in Bill C-5, which introduced the Building Canada Act. Faced with the economic turbulence caused by President Trump's tariffs, Prime Minister Carney moved to give ministers sweeping authority to override numerous acts of Parliament and regulations in order to advance projects deemed to be in the national interest.

I agree, Senator Papatello, we haven't had national projects of any magnitude over the last 10 years. Under that legislation, the government not only sought the power to bypass any or all of the acts or regulations listed in Schedule 2 but also wanted the power to add additional acts to the exemption list by order-in-council.

Once again, the opposition pushed back and pushed back hard. As a result, the bill was scaled back. Seventeen acts of Parliament were removed from the list of laws that could be bypassed, including the Access to Information Act, the Canada Elections Act, the Criminal Code, the Indian Act, the Explosives Act and a dozen others that I do not have time to list.

Of course, the success of the opposition was due to the fact that we had two successive minority parliaments. Imagine what would have happened if we had had majority parliaments over in the House.

Now, in Bill C-15, we see the same pattern again. The government once more tried to give itself the power to exempt an entity from any act of Parliament except the Criminal Code. It did so through the "sandbox" provision in the Red Tape Reduction Act, a measure Conservatives supported in principle but not without clear guardrails and firm limits.

• (2040)

At committee, the official opposition succeeded in amending this part of the bill by adding 14 more amendments to the list of laws that could not be bypassed. Those include the Access to Information Act, the Auditor General Act, the Canada Elections Act, the Conflict of Interest Act, the Export and Import Permits Act, the Financial Administration Act, the Foreign Influence Transparency and Accountability Act, the Investment Canada Act, the Lobbying Act, the Nuclear Safety and Control Act, the Privacy Act, the Proceeds of Crime (Money Laundering) and Terrorist Financing Act, and the Public Servants Disclosure Protection Act.

It is alarming that the government would seek the power to bypass acts of Parliament of that significance, yet we repeatedly see this tendency for them to try to skirt parliamentary oversight.

For example, during our committee study of Bill C-15, two ministers refused to appear and testify before the Fisheries and Oceans Committee and the Energy, the Environment and Natural Resources Committee. I do not think this should be interpreted as diminishing the role of the Senate because I believe it reflects the government's view of Parliament as a whole. The Prime Minister prefers to run government the way a CEO runs a business: by relying on executive authority to make decisions, rather than submitting those decisions to meaningful parliamentary scrutiny and accountability.

That same reflex is also evident in the government's repeated insistence on exempting laws and regulations from the Statutory Instruments Act. While there can be legitimate reasons to bypass this legislation, those occasions should be few and far between. Yet, under this government, they have become routine. In Bill C-15 alone, there are 11 instances in which a law or regulation is exempted from the Statutory Instruments Act, and that, colleagues, should raise red flags.

The Statutory Instruments Act, or SIA, serves a critical purpose in our parliamentary process. It was enacted in the early 1970s to replace the outdated Regulations Act, and it stands as a safeguard for Canadians against unchecked executive rule-making. In 1968, the MacGuigan committee issued a stark warning that delegated legislation was proliferating too easily, evading scrutiny and escaping public view.

The solution was to introduce the SIA, which created a rigorous process for how regulations are made, including legal vetting before they come into force, mandatory registration, prompt publication in the *Canada Gazette*, judicial notice and indexing for public access.

It also mandates that regulations be reviewed by the Standing Joint Committee for the Scrutiny of Regulations, thereby embedding parliamentary oversight into the ordinary course of federal rule-making.

Bypassing this legislation strips away those protections, leaving Canadians vulnerable. Without front-end legal checks, rules evade standardized quality control. Delayed or absent publication in the *Canada Gazette* obscures the law from public view. And when committee scrutiny is sidelined, accountability is reduced to patchy, discretionary disclosure after the fact.

The result is diminished transparency, a weakened public right to know the rules that govern daily life and a greater risk of unaccountable power in the hands of regulators. Adherence to the SIA is not merely procedural; it is a cornerstone of democratic governance, and that is why this government's repeated decision to bypass it is troubling.

The point, colleagues, is that these are not isolated procedural shortcuts. They reveal a broader governing approach, one that treats scrutiny as an obstacle to be managed rather than a constitutional safeguard to be upheld and respected. Whether by limiting ministerial accountability before committees or by repeatedly carving decisions out of the normal legislated safeguards, the pattern is the same: less transparency, less oversight and more power concentration in the executive hands of government.

That is my first concern.

But there is also a second, broader concern in the context surrounding this bill, and that is the erosion of fiscal discipline.

This is not just some Conservative talking point. The government's own projections in Budget 2025 make the problem impossible to ignore. Consider the following, honourable colleagues:

First, total spending projected in Budget 2025 has increased by almost \$40 billion for this fiscal year, reaching \$580.9 billion. That is an increase from 15.9% of GDP to 16.5%.

Second, over the next five years, the government plans to add \$320 billion in new spending, an amount equal to more than half of this year's entire budget.

Third, our public debt charges — colleagues, listen to this — are expected to reach \$55.6 billion this year, but it doesn't end there. They are projected to rise to \$76.1 billion by 2029-30. In other words, the federal government now spends more money servicing the national debt than in transfer payments for health to the provinces. Think about that, honourable senators. In fact,

over the next five years, even if every dollar raised through the GST was devoted solely to interest payments, the government would still come up more than \$37 billion short.

Fourth, this year's deficit is projected to reach \$78.3 billion, almost double what was forecast in the *2024 Fall Economic Statement*. Over the next five years, the government projects that our cumulative deficits will exceed \$320 billion. All of this will be added to the national debt, pushing our total federal liabilities to \$2.9 trillion.

If that does not alarm you, colleagues, it should. If you are taking comfort in the fact that the government claims to have fiscal anchors, I would suggest that confidence is misplaced because in Budget 2025 — Prime Minister Carney's first budget — the government breached all three of the 2024 fiscal anchors.

Anchor 1 was to cap the deficit at \$40.1 billion in the fiscal year 2023-24. As I said, we blew past that marker. Anchor 2 was to maintain a declining debt-to-GDP ratio. The government's current projections tell us they are not even going to bother trying to hit this one for at least four more years. Anchor 3 was to have declining deficits.

Those are three fiscal anchors and three failures to abide by them.

After breaking those commitments, the government sought to reassure Canadians by introducing two new anchors. The first was a promise to balance day-to-day operating spending with revenues by 2028-29. The second was a commitment to maintain a declining deficit-to-GDP ratio.

We were assured that these would serve as guardrails to keep the government out of the fiscal ditch. Colleagues, I sincerely wish that they were true, but, remarkably and regrettably, they are not.

The promise to balance the operating budget by 2028-29 does nothing to constrain spending in the current fiscal year because that measure does not even come into play for another four years. A requirement to balance the operating budget four years from now is not a guardrail. It is a signpost. It is a dream. It tells us where the government says it wants to go, but it does not do anything to force fiscal discipline today, without which you will not get to your destination.

Likewise, the promise to maintain a declining deficit-to-GDP ratio also does nothing to constrain spending this year. Why? Because this fiscal year is the base year. We are not measuring this year against the year before. We are measuring future years against this one. That means wherever we land this year becomes the benchmark. This year's deficit-to-GDP ratio is not being restrained by the anchor; it is setting the anchor.

That is concerning because last year our deficit-to-GDP ratio was 1.2%. This year, according to the budget itself, it will rise to 2.5%, an increase of 108% in a single year. And it is that new 2.5% level that will now become the standard against which future years are judged.

Colleagues, the reality is this: There is no fiscal anchor for this year.

But it gets worse. Not only do these so-called fiscal anchors fail to apply to the current fiscal year, but they are also largely meaningless for the years ahead.

Take the first anchor: the promise to balance day-to-day operating spending with revenues by 2028-29. That commitment gave us no reassurance because, as the Parliamentary Budget Officer has pointed out, the government's expanding definition of capital investment is so broad that it includes tax expenditures and subsidies, which align with neither international standards nor accepted practices. In other words, it is easily manipulated. Spending can simply be shifted from the "operating" column to the "capital" column in order to create the appearance of meeting targets.

• (2050)

But, colleagues, even if the government never takes advantage of that accounting flexibility, even if it does not shift a single dollar from one category to another, this anchor still means very little because it captures only part of the total spending while placing no meaningful limit on overall expenditures and no limit at all on the continued growth of our national debt.

So what about the second anchor, the promise to maintain a declining deficit-to-GDP ratio? I'll admit it sounds good at first. It sounds like the government is slowly going to rein in spending, but that is not the reality.

A declining deficit-to-GDP ratio is an ineffective fiscal anchor because it does not ever require the government to reduce the annual deficit. In fact, it permits the deficit to grow every single year, year after year. As the economy expands, the deficit can expand with it, yet the government will still claim to be operating within its so-called fiscal guardrails.

Let me illustrate this for you. If the deficit reaches \$78.3 billion this year, as projected in the budget — it's not me saying this — then next year, based on the government's own GDP projections, the Carney government will be able to run a deficit of \$81.8 billion and still claim that they fall within the 2.5% deficit-to-GDP ratio. Those are pretty good mathematics, I guess, and very good talking points.

The year after that, the deficit could rise to \$83.6 billion, then to \$90.5 billion and then, before you know it, \$94.3 billion, just year after year. In other words, between now and 2029-30, the government could increase the annual deficit by more than 20% and still claim to be within their fiscal anchor. This would mean that within four years the legislated borrowing cap, which Bill C-15 raised to \$2.5-plus trillion, would need to be raised repeatedly over the next few years to more than \$3.3 trillion, all while operating within the fiscal parameters and the fiscal anchors set by the government.

I invite you, colleagues, to go back to 2015 and check and see what the nation's debt was as compared to the projected \$3.3 trillion. I guarantee that if you take the time to look at it,

you'll fall off your seats. Colleagues, the simple truth is this: We are operating without effective fiscal anchors and without fiscal discipline.

On November 6 of last year, Fitch Ratings underscored that concern when it said:

Canada's . . . proposed budget . . . underscores the erosion of the federal government's finances While Canada's rating is broadly stable, persistent fiscal expansion and a rising debt burden have weakened its credit profile and could increase rating pressure over the medium term.

Fitch then identified three central problems: first, a deficit that is now roughly double the pre-pandemic average; second, gross general government debt projected to reach 111% of GDP by 2026, far above the "AA" median of 45%; and third, the government's failure to set out any credible path back to fiscal normalcy.

Fitch concluded with this damning observation:

. . . the Canadian government has a track record of upward deficit revisions, with subsequent budget updates consistently worse than prior projections. . . . Most recently, for instance, the government breached all three Budget 2024 guideposts, which included: 1) capping the federal deficit at CAD40.1 billion in FY 23-24, 2) maintaining a declining debt-to-GDP ratio, and 3) shrinking deficits.

Colleagues, there is no doubt that we are living in difficult times, and difficult times can call for a government to take meaningful action. However, those circumstances do not relieve a government from its duty to remain accountable to Parliament or disciplined in its use of public funds. If anything, they heighten that duty, and, in both respects, this government is falling short.

Bill C-15 is not just a large and unwieldy budget implementation bill; it reflects a government that has grown increasingly comfortable with concentrated power, reduced oversight and weakened fiscal restraint. And that is what makes this bill so troubling. The problem is not confined to particular clauses; it is the governing direction behind them: more freedom for the executive, less meaningful review by Parliament and fewer real limits on the use of public money.

These are not abstract concerns. They affect not only how power is exercised but also the fiscal course that successive Liberal governments have charted for the country toward higher spending, higher borrowing, rising debt charges and a weaker foundation for the years ahead.

Colleagues, I'm not trying to be alarmist, but I'm concerned. I'm concerned by a government that has become too comfortable asking Parliament for less scrutiny and Canadians for more debt. I'm concerned by a pattern that weakens accountability at the very moment it weakens fiscal discipline. And I am concerned because these decisions do not end with this bill; they shape the kind of country we're building and the burdens we're leaving the next generation of Canadians.

Bill C-15 contains some measures of merit, no doubt — I dealt with some of them early on in this speech — but the governing approach it reflects and the fiscal context surrounding it should concern every senator in this chamber. Thank you, colleagues.

(On motion of Senator Kingston, debate adjourned.)

FOREIGN INFLUENCE TRANSPARENCY COMMISSIONER

MOTION TO APPROVE APPOINTMENT ADOPTED

Hon. Patti LaBoucane-Benson (Legislative Deputy to the Government Representative in the Senate), pursuant to notice of February 24, 2026, moved:

That, in accordance with section 9(2)(b) of the *Foreign Influence Transparency and Accountability Act*, S.C. 2024, c. 16, s. 113, the Senate approve the appointment of Anton Boegman as Foreign Influence Transparency Commissioner.

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to.)

[*Translation*]

THE ESTIMATES, 2026-27

NATIONAL FINANCE COMMITTEE AUTHORIZED TO STUDY MAIN ESTIMATES WITH THE EXCEPTION OF VOTE 1 TO BE STUDIED BY JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

Hon. Patti LaBoucane-Benson (Legislative Deputy to the Government Representative in the Senate), pursuant to notice of February 26, 2026, moved:

That the Standing Senate Committee on National Finance be authorized to examine and report upon the expenditures set out in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2027, with the exception of Library of Parliament Vote 1;

That, for the purpose of this study, the committee have the power to meet, even though the Senate may then be sitting or adjourned, and that rules 12-18(1) and 12-18(2) be suspended in relation thereto;

That the Standing Joint Committee on the Library of Parliament be authorized to examine and report upon the expenditures set out in Library of Parliament Vote 1 of the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2027; and

That, in relation to the expenditures set out in Library of Parliament Vote 1, a message be sent to the House of Commons to acquaint that house accordingly.

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to.)

• (2100)

[*English*]

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. Patti LaBoucane-Benson (Legislative Deputy to the Government Representative in the Senate): Honourable senators, with leave of the Senate and notwithstanding rule 5-13(2), I move:

That the Senate do now adjourn.

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

(*At 9:02 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 Lucie Moncion

THE LEADER OF THE CANADIAN SENATORS GROUP

The Honourable Flordeliz (Gigi) Osler

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)

(March 1, 2026)

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. Lena Metlege Diab	Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship
The Hon. Sean Fraser	Minister of Justice
	Attorney General of Canada
	Minister responsible for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency
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
	Associate Minister of National Defence
The Hon. Marjorie Michel	Minister of Health
The Hon. Marc Miller	Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture
	Minister responsible for Official Languages
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	Secretary of State (Small Business and Tourism)
	Minister of Women and Gender Equality
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 (Combating 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

(March 1, 2026)

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.
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.
Pat Duncan.....	Yukon.....	Whitehorse, Yukon

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
Rosemary Moodie	Ontario	Toronto, Ont.
Stan Kutcher	Nova Scotia	Halifax, N.S.
Tony Loffreda	Shawinigan	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

(March 1, 2026)

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
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

(March 1, 2026)

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	Robert Black	Ontario..... Centre Wellington
7	Marty Deacon.....	Waterloo Region..... Waterloo
8	Yvonne Boyer	Ontario..... Merrickville-Wolford
9	Donna Dasko.....	Ontario..... Toronto
10	Peter M. Boehm	Ontario..... Ottawa
11	Rosemary Moodie	Ontario..... Toronto
12	Hassan Yussuff.....	Ontario..... Toronto
13	Bernadette Clement	Ontario..... Cornwall
14	Sharon Burey	Ontario..... Windsor
15	Andrew Cardozo	Ontario..... Ottawa
16	Rebecca Patterson.....	Ontario..... Ottawa
17	Marnie McBean.....	Ontario..... Toronto
18	Toni Varone	Ontario..... Toronto
19	Paulette Senior	Ontario..... Pickering
20	Mohammad Al Zaibak	Ontario..... Toronto
21	Katherine Hay	Ontario..... Mississauga
22	Farah Mohamed	Ontario..... Toronto
23	Sandra Pupatello.....	Ontario..... Windsor
24

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

Monday, March 9, 2026

	PAGE		PAGE
SENATORS' STATEMENTS		Finance	
Combatting Hate		Cost of Living	
Hon. Charles S. Adler	1661	Hon. Yonah Martin	1666
		Hon. Pierre Moreau	1666
Francophonie Month			
Hon. Lucie Moncion	1661	Canadian Heritage	
		Library and Archives Canada	
International Women's Day		Hon. Yonah Martin	1666
Hon. Julie Miville-Dechêne	1662	Hon. Pierre Moreau	1667
Visitors in the Gallery		Natural Resources	
The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore.	1662	Energy Sector	
		Hon. Leo Housakos	1667
Commonwealth Day		Hon. Pierre Moreau	1667
Hon. Yonah Martin	1662		
Conflicts in Ukraine and Iran			
Hon. Yuen Pau Woo	1663		
<hr/>		<hr/>	
ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS		ORDERS OF THE DAY	
		Business of the Senate	
Parliamentary Budget Officer		Hon. Patti LaBoucane-Benson	1668
Certificate of Nomination Tabled			
Hon. Patti LaBoucane-Benson	1663		
The Senate		Bail and Sentencing Reform Bill (Bill C-14)	
Notice of Motion to Extend Sitting on Wednesday, March 11, 2026		Bill to Amend—Second Reading—Debate Continued	
Hon. Patti LaBoucane-Benson	1663	Hon. Pierre J. Dalphond	1668
		Hon. Kim Pate	1673
		Hon. Denise Batters	1674
		Hon. Mary Coyle	1675
QUESTION PERIOD			
		Budget 2025 Implementation Bill, No. 1 (Bill C-15)	
Global Affairs		Second Reading—Debate Adjourned	
Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps		Hon. Sandra Pupatello	1676
Hon. Leo Housakos	1664	Hon. Andrew Cardozo	1680
Hon. Pierre Moreau	1664	Hon. Robert Black	1681
		Hon. Colin Deacon	1681
National Defence		Hon. Leo Housakos	1682
Arctic Sovereignty			
Hon. Leo Housakos	1664		
Hon. Pierre Moreau	1664		
Finance		Foreign Influence Transparency Commissioner	
Income Tax Credits		Motion to Approve Appointment Adopted	
Hon. Tony Loffreda	1665	Hon. Patti LaBoucane-Benson	1686
Hon. Pierre Moreau	1665		
Canadian Heritage		The Estimates, 2026-27	
CBC/Radio-Canada		National Finance Committee Authorized to Study Main Estimates with the Exception of Vote 1 to be Studied by Joint Committee on the Library of Parliament	
Hon. Julie Miville-Dechêne	1665	Hon. Patti LaBoucane-Benson	1686
Business of the Senate	1665		
		Adjournment	
Canadian Heritage		Hon. Patti LaBoucane-Benson	1686
CBC/Radio-Canada			
Hon. Julie Miville-Dechêne	1665		
Hon. Pierre Moreau	1666		