



DEBATES OF THE SENATE

1st SESSION



45th PARLIAMENT



VOLUME 154



NUMBER 77

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Tuesday, June 2, 2026

The Honourable RAYMONDE GAGNÉ,
Speaker

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

CONTENTS

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

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

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

THE SENATE

Tuesday, June 2, 2026

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

Prayers.

BUSINESS OF THE SENATE

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, I would like to note that we experienced technical difficulties resulting in a delay in the ringing of the bells. Is it agreed that we proceed with today's sitting?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

SENATORS' STATEMENTS

THE HONOURABLE FABIAN MANNING

Hon. Mohamed-Iqbal Ravalia: Honourable senators, I rise in the chamber today to pay tribute to a dedicated parliamentarian, a fierce advocate for our coastal communities and a very dear friend of mine. It is my distinct privilege to recognize the Honourable Senator Fabian Manning for an incredible milestone: marking 15 years as Chair of the Standing Senate Committee on Fisheries and Oceans.

Hon. Senators: Hear, hear!

Senator Ravalia: For a decade and a half, Senator Manning has been the steady hand at the helm of this crucial committee. As someone who hails from rural Newfoundland and Labrador, his connection to the water is in his very DNA. He didn't just study our fishing industry and marine ecosystems; he lived the reality of the people who depend on them.

Under his leadership, the Fisheries and Oceans Committee has tackled some of the most complex, vital issues facing our country. From championing the safety and recognition of our Canadian Coast Guard to addressing the delicate balance of our marine ecosystems, to leading the incisive *Peace on the Water* study and to standing up for hard-working Canadian harvesters, Senator Manning's approach has always been rooted in common sense, collaboration and a deep respect for the men and women who make their living from the sea.

He has travelled extensively, from coast to coast to coast, sitting down with Indigenous fishers, coastal mayors and industry experts. He has ensured that the voices of those working on the water are genuinely heard in the halls of Ottawa. He truly embodies the spirit of his famous Senate speeches by always ensuring he is "Telling Our Story."

Colleagues, leading a committee for 15 years is no small feat. It requires immense patience, a deep understanding of policy and an unwavering commitment to public service. Senator Manning has provided exactly that. He has guided our committee through shifting tides, changing governments and countless legislative studies with grace, humour and an unmatched passion for our home province.

Whether he is shedding light on the complexities of the commercial licensing regime or advocating for the resilient people who call our coastal communities home, he has proven time and again to be an invaluable asset to this chamber and to all of Canada.

As a former chair of this committee, I ask all honourable senators to join me in congratulating Senator Fabian Manning on 15 remarkable years as Chair of the Standing Senate Committee on Fisheries and Oceans. Fabian, thank you for your enduring dedication to our oceans, our fisheries, our country and for your global sense of humanity.

Thank you. *Meegwetch.*

Hon. Senators: Hear, hear!

CANADIAN PHOTONICS FABRICATION CENTRE

Hon. Colin Deacon: Honourable senators, last month the government announced that National Research Council Canada, or NRC, will spin off the Canadian Photonics Fabrication Centre, or the CPFC.

Making the CPFC a stand-alone commercial entity is phenomenal news. Why? Because the demand for compute capacity is skyrocketing in this AI era, doubling every three months. Spinning off the CPFC creates an opportunity to scale the latent sovereign potential resting within this highly advanced microchip manufacturing foundry.

Until recently, microchip processing capabilities doubled every two years, but that technology reached its limit. As a workaround, data centres began interconnecting chips, effectively making one extremely powerful microchip. But the limited data transmission capacity of copper wire restricted that workaround to 72 chips.

This is where the CPFC comes in. The CPFC makes the components that enable optical transmission of data using photons. Compared to electrons over copper wire, photons can securely transmit 100 times more data 100 times faster and up to 200 times further, while using only one tenth of the power.

The CPFC is a critical node in the global photonics supply chain. Countries strive to control strategic assets like this because they create sovereign power and geopolitical leverage.

The details of this spinoff have not yet been announced. That has caused me to worry that the incredible potential of this opportunity might not be fully understood by decision makers.

My fears are not unfounded. Reflect back on the privatization of Connaught Medical Research Laboratories in the 1980s. Connaught's stellar global reputation was earned over decades due to its leadership in commercializing the Salk polio vaccine, eliminating smallpox and producing penicillin, among many other accomplishments. The Canada Development Corporation ultimately sold Connaught to Sanofi Pasteur in 1989. Perhaps that strategic miscalculation was not fully realized until the COVID-19 pandemic.

The NRC has engaged a similar Crown corporation, the Canada Development Investment Corporation, to manage the CPFC spinoff. This government entity is led by talented generalists, but not domain experts who deeply understand the CPFC's strategic value.

Consequently, we need Canada's deep-tech investors and industry experts with market expertise to be engaged in this process. They have the insights, the incentives and the understanding needed to shape a shareholder and governance structure that will ensure that the CPFC's best-in-class manufacturing capabilities are scaled for the long-term benefit of all Canadians.

Colleagues, let's not miss this once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to unlock the Canadian Photonics Fabrication Centre's strategic economic and geopolitical value. Thank you.

Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

VISITORS IN THE GALLERY

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, I wish to draw your attention to the presence in the gallery of Ron Hallman, recently retired president and chief executive officer of Parks Canada, along with his family, as well as Carsten Sorensen, husband of Senator Sorensen.

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

Hon. Senators: Hear, hear!

RON HALLMAN

CONGRATULATIONS ON RETIREMENT

Hon. Karen Sorensen: Honourable senators, I'm pleased to stand today to congratulate my colleague and friend Ron Hallman on his retirement from Parks Canada.

• (1410)

In decades of public service, Ron has worked tirelessly to conserve Canada's natural and cultural heritage, particularly his work to support our national parks.

Ron's political career began in this institution as an executive assistant for the Honourable Dan Hays, a past senator for Alberta, before moving on to senior roles with the Department of Canadian Heritage and the Department of the Environment.

In 2003, he joined Parks Canada. Three years later, Parks brought him to my neck of the woods, where he served three years as Executive Director of Mountain Parks.

He subsequently served as Parks Canada's Vice-President of Protected Area Establishment and Conservation, senior assistant deputy minister at Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada and then president of the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency. Finally, Ron returned to Parks Canada as its president and CEO.

Ron's community involvement is extensive and diverse, reflecting his interests in public policy and Canadian heritage. A retired commissioned officer of the Royal Canadian Naval Reserve, he recently joined the board of directors of the Naval Museum of Alberta Society. This is in addition to his current roles as the chair of the board of directors of the Institute of Public Administration of Canada, member of the board of governors of the Banff Centre for Arts and Creativity and executive fellow at the University of Calgary School of Public Policy.

He has been named an international fellow of The Explorers Club and an honorary fellow of the Royal Canadian Geographical Society, which recently honoured him with their Joseph-Élzéar Bernier Medal.

Additionally, he's a former director of The Duke of Edinburgh's International Award and a recipient of the King Charles III Coronation Medal. I have no doubt he'll continue to serve our country in his retirement.

The national parks file is incredibly complex: It's a balancing act between the priorities of communities, businesses and visitors with the need to safeguard habitats and biodiversity. Ron's masterful management of this portfolio is seen in his accomplishments these past years. All Canadians have benefited from his accomplishments.

For me, as the former mayor of Banff, a town within a national park, I reflect on working with Ron personally. Together, we watched the bison herd flourish after their return to Banff National Park, worked on human-wildlife coexistence initiatives, increased the Roam Public Transit offering through Banff National Park and the entire Bow Valley, released federal land for housing projects in town and stood together to get legislation passed to assist in speedy recovery efforts in Jasper after the devastating fire in our sister community, to name but a few.

I'm happy to join the chorus of all those thanking Ron for his service and wishing him the best in his next chapter.

Thank you. *Hiy hiy.*

VISITORS IN THE GALLERY

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, I wish to draw your attention to the presence in the gallery of Laurie O'Connor, Executive Director of the Saskatoon Food Bank & Learning Centre. She is the guest of the Honourable Senator Muggli.

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

Hon. Senators: Hear, hear!

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, I wish to draw your attention to the presence in the gallery of Zachary Fathally, a young advocate for children's rights involved with the Young Canadians' Parliament and Children First Canada's Youth Advisory Council. He is the guest of the Honourable Senator Mohamed.

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

Hon. Senators: Hear, hear!

ALS AWARENESS MONTH

Hon. Farah Mohamed: Honourable senators, June is ALS Awareness Month. I rise to support the 4,000 Canadians navigating the profound challenges of amyotrophic lateral sclerosis, or ALS.

ALS is a relentless progressive disease that attacks the motor neurons controlling voluntary muscle movement. With no cure, its cruelty lies in leaving the mind intact while the body fails. It is a theft of independence that no Canadian should endure.

The statistics are sobering. Each year, 1,000 Canadians receive this life-altering diagnosis while, tragically, another 1,000 lose their lives to this devastating illness.

An ALS diagnosis does not just affect the individual; it fundamentally reshapes the lives of entire families, caregivers and communities.

I think today specifically of my friend Chris May. Until recently, Chris was an incredibly active, vibrant individual. Since his diagnosis, he has faced the rapid loss of his mobility, yet his response has been nothing short of inspiring. Despite the monumental challenges he faces, Chris chooses to dedicate his extensive background in advocacy to the fight for an end to ALS.

Investing in ALS research is an investment in innovation, health outcomes and hope. Canada has a strong foundation of researchers and clinicians, but we must continue our leadership role. By fostering cross-sector collaboration, we can accelerate discovery and expand access to clinical trials for patients

nationwide. An initiative like the Canadian Collaboration to Cure ALS is an excellent example of how this type of integrated teamwork can move the needle forward.

When the federal government, the scientific community, clinicians and the patient community work in tandem, we create a momentum that is impossible to ignore. My hope and, indeed, the hope of people like Chris is that we will continue to prioritize these efforts until we achieve a world free of ALS.

Thank you. *Shukran. Meegwetch.*

VISITORS IN THE GALLERY

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, I wish to draw your attention to the presence in the gallery of Nancy Turniawan, Senator Prosper's Grade 7 teacher, and her sister, Marian Macaulay.

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

Hon. Senators: Hear, hear!

ITALIAN HERITAGE MONTH

Hon. Tony Loffreda: Honourable senators, I rise today to recognize Italian Heritage Month. It is a time to honour the contributions that Italian Canadians have made and continue to make to the social, cultural, economic and political fabric of our country.

[*Translation*]

For generations, Italian-Canadians have helped to build Canada. Whether in the public service, the arts, construction, education, science, community involvement or business, their contributions have enriched every aspect of our society. Their legacy is marked by resilience, sacrifice, hard work and pride.

[*English*]

Italian Heritage Month is also an opportunity to celebrate the richness of Italian culture: its language, traditions, cuisine, music, values and strong sense of family and community. By preserving and sharing our heritage, we ensure that future generations remain connected to their roots.

For all Italian Canadians, this month-long celebration serves as an important reminder that cultural identity is something to cherish.

Celebrating Italian heritage means ensuring that future generations understand where they come from and feel connected to something greater than themselves. In an increasingly globalized world, maintaining those cultural ties is essential. It enriches Canada's multicultural fabric, strengthens our communities and reminds our youth that their heritage is something to carry forward with pride.

This year is particularly meaningful as we mark the eightieth anniversary of the Italian Republic. In fact, it was today — on June 2, 1946 — that a referendum was held in Italy to replace the monarchy with a republic.

Since the birth of the modern Italian Republic, Canada and Italy have developed an enduring friendship founded on shared democratic values, mutual respect and deep people-to-people ties.

That relationship was forged, in part, through sacrifice during the Second World War. Canadian soldiers played a critical role in the Italian campaign. Thousands of Canadians fought courageously on Italian soil, and many made the ultimate sacrifice in the cause of freedom and democracy.

The bonds created during that difficult chapter of history helped lay the foundation for the close diplomatic, economic and cultural relationship that Canada and Italy continue to enjoy today.

Honourable senators, as we celebrate Italian Heritage Month, may we continue to honour the generations who came before us, preserve the traditions that define us and strengthen the friendship between Canada and Italy for generations to come.

Thank you. *Grazie*.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

SENATE ETHICS OFFICER

INQUIRY REPORT CONCERNING SENATOR MARILOU MCPHEDRAN DEPOSITED WITH CLERK DURING ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE

Hon. Peter Harder: Honourable senators, I have the honour to inform the Senate that, pursuant to subsection 48(18) of the *Ethics and Conflict of Interest Code for Senators*, an Inquiry Report of the Senate Ethics Officer concerning Senator Marilou McPhedran was deposited with the Clerk of the Senate on June 1, 2026.

• (1420)

NATIONAL BIRD OF CANADA BILL

EIGHTH REPORT OF SOCIAL AFFAIRS, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE PRESENTED

Hon. Rosemary Moodie, Chair of the Standing Senate Committee on Social Affairs, Science and Technology, presented the following report:

Tuesday, June 2, 2026

The Standing Senate Committee on Social Affairs, Science and Technology has the honour to present its

EIGHTH REPORT

Your committee, to which was referred Bill S-221, An Act to provide for the recognition of the Canada jay as the national bird of Canada, has, in obedience to the order of reference of June 19, 2025, examined the said bill and now reports the same without amendment.

Respectfully submitted,

ROSEMARY MOODIE

Chair

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, when shall this bill be read the third time?

(On motion of Senator Martin, bill placed on the Orders of the Day for third reading at the next sitting of the Senate.)

NATIONAL IMMIGRATION MONTH BILL

NINTH REPORT OF SOCIAL AFFAIRS, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE PRESENTED

Hon. Rosemary Moodie, Chair of the Standing Senate Committee on Social Affairs, Science and Technology, presented the following report:

Tuesday, June 2, 2026

The Standing Senate Committee on Social Affairs, Science and Technology has the honour to present its

NINTH REPORT

Your committee, to which was referred Bill S-215, An Act respecting National Immigration Month, has, in obedience to the order of reference of June 18, 2025, examined the said bill and now reports the same without amendment.

Respectfully submitted,

ROSEMARY MOODIE

Chair

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, when shall this bill be read the third time?

(On motion of Senator Gerba, bill placed on the Orders of the Day for third reading at the next sitting of the Senate.)

**BILL RESPECTING CYBER SECURITY, AMENDING
THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT AND MAKING
CONSEQUENTIAL AMENDMENTS TO OTHER ACTS**

FOURTH REPORT OF NATIONAL SECURITY, DEFENCE AND
VETERANS AFFAIRS COMMITTEE PRESENTED

Hon. Marty Deacon, Chair of the Standing Senate Committee on National Security, Defence and Veterans Affairs, presented the following report:

Tuesday, June 2, 2026

The Standing Senate Committee on National Security, Defence and Veterans Affairs has the honour to present its

FOURTH REPORT

Your committee, to which was referred Bill C-8, An Act respecting cyber security, amending the Telecommunications Act and making consequential amendments to other Acts, has, in obedience to the order of reference of April 23, 2026, examined the said bill and now reports the same without amendment.

Respectfully submitted,

MARTY DEACON

Chair

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, when shall this bill be read the third time?

(On motion of Senator McNair, bill placed on the Orders of the Day for third reading at the next sitting of the Senate.)

WARTIME SERVICE RECOGNITION BILL

FIFTH REPORT OF NATIONAL SECURITY, DEFENCE AND
VETERANS AFFAIRS COMMITTEE PRESENTED

Hon. Marty Deacon, Chair of the Standing Senate Committee on National Security, Defence and Veterans Affairs, presented the following report:

Tuesday, June 2, 2026

The Standing Senate Committee on National Security, Defence and Veterans Affairs has the honour to present its

FIFTH REPORT

Your committee, to which was referred Bill S-246, An Act respecting the recognition of wartime service, has, in obedience to the order of reference of May 5, 2026, examined the said bill and now reports the same without amendment.

Respectfully submitted,

MARTY DEACON

Chair

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, when shall this bill be read the third time?

(On motion of Senator Yussuff, bill placed on the Orders of the Day for third reading at the next sitting of the Senate.)

CRIMINAL CODE

BILL TO AMEND—THIRD REPORT OF HUMAN
RIGHTS COMMITTEE PRESENTED

Hon. Paulette Senior: Honourable senators, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the third report of the Standing Senate Committee on Human Rights, which deals with Bill C-9, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (hate propaganda, hate crime and access to religious or cultural places).

(*For text of report, see today's Journals of the Senate, p. 974.*)

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

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

CANADA-EUROPE PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION

BILATERAL MISSION, NOVEMBER 9-15, 2024—REPORT TABLED

Hon. David M. Wells: Honourable senators, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the report of the Canada-Europe Parliamentary Association concerning the Bilateral Mission, held in Warsaw, Poland; Riga, Latvia; and Tallinn, Estonia, from November 9 to 15, 2024.

MEETING OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE OF PARLIAMENTARIANS OF THE ARCTIC REGION, SEPTEMBER 2-3, 2024—REPORT TABLED

Hon. David M. Wells: Honourable senators, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the report of the Canada-Europe Parliamentary Association concerning the Meeting of the Standing Committee of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region, held in Happy Valley-Goose Bay, Labrador, from September 2 to 3, 2024.

MEETING OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE OF PARLIAMENTARIANS
OF THE ARCTIC REGION, SEPTEMBER 22-24, 2025—
REPORT TABLED

Hon. David M. Wells: Honourable senators, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the report of the Canada-Europe Parliamentary Association concerning the Meeting of the Standing Committee of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region, held in Oulu, North Ostrobothnia, Finland, from September 22 to 24, 2025.

MEETING OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE OF PARLIAMENTARIANS
OF THE ARCTIC REGION AND ARCTIC FRONTIERS 2025: BEYOND
BORDERS CONFERENCE, JANUARY 25-28, 2025—REPORT TABLED

Hon. David M. Wells: Honourable senators, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the report of the Canada-Europe Parliamentary Association concerning the Meeting of the Standing Committee of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region and Arctic Frontiers 2025: Beyond Borders Conference, held in Tromsø, Norway, from January 25 to 28, 2025.

FIRST PART OF THE 2025 ORDINARY SESSION OF THE
PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY OF THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE,
JANUARY 27-31, 2025—REPORT TABLED

Hon. David M. Wells: Honourable senators, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the report of the Canada-Europe Parliamentary Association concerning the First Part of the 2025 Ordinary Session of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, held in Strasbourg, France, from January 27 to 31, 2025.

THIRD PART OF THE 2025 ORDINARY SESSION OF THE
PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY OF THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE,
JUNE 23-27, 2025—REPORT TABLED

Hon. David M. Wells: Honourable senators, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the report of the Canada-Europe Parliamentary Association concerning the Third Part of the 2025 Ordinary Session of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, held in Strasbourg, France, from June 23 to 27, 2025.

FOURTH PART OF THE 2025 ORDINARY SESSION OF THE
PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY OF THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE,
SEPTEMBER 29-OCTOBER 3, 2025—REPORT TABLED

Hon. David M. Wells: Honourable senators, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the report of the Canada-Europe Parliamentary Association concerning the Fourth Part of the 2025 Ordinary Session of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, held in Strasbourg, France, from September 29 to October 3, 2025.

• (1430)

HUMAN RIGHTS

NOTICE OF MOTION TO AUTHORIZE COMMITTEE TO STUDY THE POSSIBLE EXPANSION OF THE RIGHT TO VOTE

Hon. Marilou McPhedran: Honourable senators, I give notice that, at the next sitting of the Senate, I will move:

That the Standing Senate Committee on Human Rights be authorized to examine and report on the means of increasing democratic inclusion and strengthening democratic resilience, with attention to the possible expansion of the right to vote under Section 3 of the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*, which states: “Every citizen of Canada has the right to vote in an election of members of the House of Commons or of a legislative assembly and to be qualified for membership therein.”;

That, in particular, the committee examine:

1. the constitutional and legislative evolution of the right to vote in Canada, and the alignment of current requirements with the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* and Canada’s international human rights obligations, within the context of potential franchise expansion;
2. the ways of removing barriers to democratic inclusion faced by First Nations, Metis and Inuit, Black, gender-diverse, racialized, and other marginalized youth, and the potential impact of their inclusion on democracy in Canada;
3. the information available on voting or other participatory decision-making arrangements in Canada and other jurisdictions that include members younger than 18;
4. the administrative and operational readiness of federal election machinery to support the possible enfranchisement of younger citizens, including voter registration and information systems, the National Register of Electors and the National Register of Future Electors; and
5. the evidence on strategies to foster lifelong democratic participation, including the integration of effective civic literacy within education systems and digital environments;

That the committee be permitted, notwithstanding usual practices, to deposit reports on this study with the Clerk of the Senate, if the Senate is not then sitting, and that the reports be deemed to have been tabled in the Senate; and

That the committee submit its final report on this study to the Senate no later than March 31, 2027, and that the committee retain all powers necessary to publicize its findings for 180 days after the tabling of the final report.

[Translation]

BANKING, COMMERCE AND THE ECONOMY

NOTICE OF MOTION TO AUTHORIZE COMMITTEE TO EXTEND
DATE OF FINAL REPORT ON STUDY OF ACCESS TO CREDIT
AND CAPITAL MARKETS FOR SMALL- AND
MEDIUM-SIZED ENTERPRISES

Hon. Clément Gignac: Honourable senators, I give notice that, at the next sitting of the Senate, I will move:

That, notwithstanding the order of the Senate adopted on Thursday, November 20, 2025, the date for the final report of the Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Commerce and the Economy in relation to its study on access to credit and capital markets for small- and medium-sized enterprises as the basis for growth and improved productivity in the Canadian economy be extended from June 30, 2026, to October 31, 2026.

[English]

NATIONAL SECURITY, DEFENCE AND VETERANS AFFAIRS

COMMITTEE AUTHORIZED TO MEET IN CAMERA FOR
THE PURPOSE OF ITS STUDY OF BILL C-11

Hon. Marty Deacon: Honourable senators, with leave of the Senate and notwithstanding rule 5-5(k), I move:

That, notwithstanding rule 12-15(2), the Standing Senate Committee on National Security, Defence and Veterans Affairs be empowered to hold an in camera meeting on Wednesday, June 3, 2026, for the purpose of hearing witnesses and gathering specialized or sensitive information in relation to its study of Bill C-11, An Act to amend the National Defence Act and other Acts.

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to.)

QUESTION PERIOD

PUBLIC SAFETY

CHIEF FIREARMS OFFICERS

Hon. Dawn Anderson: Government leader, on December 5, 2023, correspondence from then-minister Dominic LeBlanc was submitted to the Senate Defence Committee. The minister committed to appointing resident chief firearms officers, or CFOs, in the territories, following consultations with territorial governments. On April 21, 2026, during ministerial Question Period, I asked Minister Anandasangaree for an update on the appointments, which he said he didn't have yet. Yet, on May 4, 2026, the minister's office advised that the federal government had resources in place to establish a territorial CFO and that the Government of Yukon had already identified an individual to serve for all three territories.

Today I received a copy of the RCMP final report, dated April 16, 2024, that informed that direction. The report raises a fundamental concern — that the government committed that appointments would follow consultations with territorial governments. None of the three territorial premiers or Indigenous organizations were consulted. How does the government reconcile the commitment with the consultation process that was undertaken, and who authorized the subsequent departure from the commitment to appoint CFOs in each territory?

Hon. Pierre Moreau (Government Representative in the Senate): Senator Anderson, thank you for the question. This is a very important issue. I am not aware of the dates and the reports and how the minister or if the minister was advised previously to his appearing or to the answer that he gave you. I will certainly raise the question with the minister, and I will get back to you with an answer.

Now, since it seems to be a very important issue for the northern territories, I would be encouraging you to discuss with your colleagues, Senator Karetak-Lindell and Senator Duncan, and the three of you can get back to me so I can properly inform the minister and bring to this chamber a proper answer to your question.

Senator Anderson: This issue is more than an administrative change. The original commitment to appoint resident CFOs in the territories recognizes the unique realities of the North, including the exercise of constitutionally protected harvesting rights under section 35, the need for equitable access to government services, consistent with section 15, and the federal government's commitments to reconciliation in the Calls to Action of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. If the Northwest Territories and Nunavut are still to be served by a CFO located in another jurisdiction, how does this arrangement fulfill the government's original commitment to northern residents, Indigenous Peoples and territorial governments?

Senator Moreau: I will reiterate the commitment of the government to work with the northern communities. This is such an important issue, and since I gave you an answer on the main question that you had, I don't have a direct answer to your

supplementary question, but I will certainly raise the question with the minister and provide you with the information. And thank you for the question.

HEALTH

PRESCRIBEIT

Hon. Leo Housakos (Leader of the Opposition): Government leader, welcome back. It's great to see your voice is even more powerful than usual.

Canadians were promised, government leader, that PrescribeIT would modernize our health care system and finally move providers beyond the outdated fax machines, but, honourable colleagues, after nearly a decade and almost \$300 million in taxpayer funding, the program handled less than 5% of prescriptions before being shut down. Even more concerning is the fact that, despite executive compensation approaching \$900,000 annually, the government-funded NGO responsible for the program could not clearly explain to Parliament why the program failed or why Canadians received so little value.

• (1440)

Government leader, can the government explain to Canadians why they received so little value for their \$300-million investment into this particular company PrescribeIT?

Hon. Pierre Moreau (Government Representative in the Senate): Thank you for your kind words. I am now looking forward to having a strong voice in the Senate, Senator Housakos. Thank you very much.

On your question, the health minister was here a few weeks ago, and I think that the issue was raised at that time on how the government is looking forward as far as health concerns and the work of the government with the provinces concerning those important issues. The government is committed to working with all the provinces, and we are certainly looking forward to receiving a return on the investment, because we are dealing with taxpayers' money.

On every issue, including health, IT and everything else, the government is looking forward to making sure that we are doing proper investment and that we get services for our investment.

Senator Housakos: That is precisely the problem, Senator Moreau. It is not the first time that we've had problems with subcontracting technological companies. We had the ArriveCAN application, which became a terrible scandal, costing \$900 million of taxpayers' funds, and to this day, we still don't have a clear answer. Your government has had a pattern of doing this with digital companies.

Is your government's plan to invest in new digital health and IT initiatives —

[Translation]

The Hon. the Speaker: I'm sorry, Senator Housakos, but the 30 seconds have expired.

[English]

Senator Moreau: The fact is that the government is dealing with IT — I know that it has been a problem. I was a member of the Quebec government, and we had the same issue with IT companies. That being said, it is the duty of the government to ensure they get what they need from an IT company as well. It's an issue, but the government is committed to doing the best it can to make sure that Canadian taxpayers have what they need for their —

[Translation]

CANADIAN HERITAGE

SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH IN FRENCH

Hon. Allister Surette: Senator Moreau, on May 8, the External Advisory Group on the Creation and Dissemination of Scientific Information in French published its final report in which the group highlighted the regulatory, financial and organizational barriers that are hindering the development of research in French in Canada.

The report highlights how the fragmented governance of the research sector and the difference in funding between small and large universities tend to have a disproportionate impact on funding for research in French.

Can the government representative in the Senate explain how the federal government intends to implement the 12 measures proposed by the advisory group to address the structural challenges identified in its report?

Hon. Pierre Moreau (Government Representative in the Senate): Thank you for the question, Senator Surette. Part of the answer lies in the reason the group was created. As you know, the External Advisory Group on the Creation and Dissemination of Scientific Information in French was part of one of the initiatives in the government's Action Plan for Official Languages 2023-2028. As such, given that the group itself is part of the government's policy and action plan, I'm confident that we will heed the recommendations in the report. I believe I speak for the government on that. The report was tabled not that long ago — I believe it was the end of March. The government has reviewed it, and we'll see what action it takes, but I'm optimistic.

Senator Surette: Thank you for that response. Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada also established the Advisory Panel on the Federal Research Support System, which also recommended enhancing support for francophone research in its final report in 2023.

Can you explain how this new report commissioned by Canadian Heritage will enable the two departments to collaborate and implement the recommendations made by these two expert groups?

Senator Moreau: Thank you for the supplementary question. I understand that the second report will allow the government to prevent any overlap among the different government departments and agencies.

On behalf of the Government of Canada, I'd like to reiterate that francophone researchers are within their rights to expect to be able to contribute to scholarship in either official language, theirs being French.

[English]

PUBLIC SERVICES AND PROCUREMENT

BUY CANADIAN

Hon. Tony Loffreda: Senator Moreau, welcome back. It is great to see you in good shape.

On December 16, 2025, the Carney government rolled out its new federal procurement rules, which were first announced in September. The Buy Canadian Policy seeks to protect and prioritize Canadian workers and industries and strengthen Canada's domestic economy. Six months into the program, can you speak to us about some of the early takeaways from the implementation of this made-for-Canada procurement policy?

For instance, how often are departments and agencies using one of the five exceptions listed in section 4.6 of the policy to exclude Canadian companies in their bid to procure goods and services to the federal government? Have the eligibility criteria used to define a Canadian supplier posed any problems or raised any concerns among Canadian businesses?

Hon. Pierre Moreau (Government Representative in the Senate): Thank you for the question. I cannot provide specific numbers, as they would partially be protected by commercial confidentiality. But the idea behind this whole thing is that, as the largest public buyer of goods and services, the government remains committed to using its purchasing power to support Canadian businesses and workers. The goal of the new Buy Canadian Policy is to ensure that federal procurement supports the Canadian supply chain and businesses.

The exceptions you mentioned are only instances where the policy would cause significant project delays due to the use of Canadian materials, or if those materials are unavailable.

However, I can tell you that the policy is already making positive changes, as the government has invested over \$950 million for the purchase of 55 new subway trains for Toronto's Line 2 from Alstom's facilities in La Pocatière and Saint-Bruno-de-Montarville in Quebec.

Senator Loffreda: Thank you for that answer; it is very positive and hopeful. Naturally, this policy will strengthen our domestic small- and medium-sized enterprise, or SME, ecosystem by building a more resilient economy and shielding ourselves from global disruptions and unpredictable foreign

events. I welcome the government's announcement that it would launch a small and medium business procurement program by spring of 2026 as part of this overarching policy. What can you tell us about this new program? Please provide us with an update if you can.

Senator Moreau: Thank you. The government knows that SMEs are the backbone of our economy. I have had many opportunities to give that answer. As we have previously discussed, it is implementing a number of measures to spur their innovation, help them reach international markets and acquire new equipment to increase their productivity. The government is also overhauling the defence procurement policy. So it is working on many fronts to ensure that Canadians receive the best services and equipment they need.

INNOVATION, SCIENCE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

Hon. Paul (PJ) Prosper: My question is for the Leader of the Government in the Senate.

Senator Moreau, this question follows a round table of Indigenous AI experts, convened by the Assembly of First Nations. Reports indicate that Minister Solomon's draft AI strategy is entitled "AI for All." This is a recurrent theme in the minister's vision of AI in Canada.

However, there are major barriers to broad AI adoption by First Nations, Inuit and Métis people. In part, these include a lack of access to infrastructure required to power and house the necessary servers, as well as legal infrastructure to inform data sovereignty and digital repatriation.

Senator, what concrete steps has your government taken to address these concerns?

Hon. Pierre Moreau (Government Representative in the Senate): Thank you, Senator Prosper. I cannot speak to the AI strategy, as it has not yet been released. However, I can say that the strategy will protect our data and focus on empowering workers and researchers by building Canada's AI.

• (1450)

Government work is being informed by a 28-member AI Strategy Task Force and consultation that has received over 11,000 public submissions.

The government has also committed to connecting 98% of Canadians, including Indigenous communities, to high-speed internet by 2026, which will be a first step on broad AI adoption by First Nations.

The government has also provided over \$420 million to support Indigenous businesses to build capacity and access to capital through their network of over 50 Indigenous financial institutions, enabling Indigenous businesses interested in AI to access resources.

Senator Prosper: Senator Moreau, an Assembly of First Nations, or AFN, resolution last December called on the AFN to work with the Government of Canada to develop:

. . . strict regulations that protect and empower the use of First Nations data in AI, in line with First Nations principles of Ownership, Control, Access, and Possession . . .

Can you tell us where the government is on developing these regulations around data governance and data sovereignty?

Senator Moreau: The idea is to protect all data: Indigenous Peoples' data and all Canadians' data.

The government believes that sovereign compute and sovereign cloud are foundational for Canada's digital future.

Sovereign compute means powerful, Canadian-controlled data centres that provide AI capacity for researchers and businesses in Canada.

Sovereign cloud means keeping sensitive information stored and managed under Canadian law and Canadian jurisdiction.

Together, they can deliver digital sovereignty for our country. That means that sensitive information and critical data should live in Canada —

[*Translation*]

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

[*English*]

IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES AND CITIZENSHIP

INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS

Hon. Marty Klyne: Senator Moreau, a recent IRCC evaluation found that the government's international student cap had a greater impact than expected. The department forecast 349,000 new study permit approvals in 2024, but less than 50% were approved.

Smaller provinces were hard hit, along with rural and regional institutions, with some having declines of nearly 60%.

International students are vital to Canada's economic future. We should be recruiting the smartest, brightest and most innovative students and professors to our universities; they support local economies, help with labour shortages, contribute to research and innovation and strengthen our long-term talent.

Reduced approvals have left some institutions with underused classrooms, vacant residences on campus and fewer students contributing to science, technology, engineering and math, as well as to local communities and economies with the skills they have.

How does the government —

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

Hon. Pierre Moreau (Government Representative in the Senate): Thank you.

The government has implemented many measures to support international students.

Notably, the government removed the need for a separate work permit in addition to their study permit and reduced the number of hours required to get a work permit alongside their studies, enabling them to focus more on their education.

The government bolstered the Canada Student Financial Assistance Program to make post-secondary education more accessible and help ease financial pressures on students and recent graduates.

The government will also maintain for one additional year the increase in full-time Canada Student Grants from 3,000 to 4,200 per year and interest-free Canada Student Loans from \$210 to \$300 per week.

Senator Klyne: These policies have led to a decline in enrolment and affected Canada's reputation as a destination for international students.

Saskatchewan institutions report that students who once looked to Canada are now choosing competitors such as Australia because they see Canada as a less desirable and predictable avenue for pursuing education.

How will the government restore international market confidence in Canada's study permit system among prospective students and education partners?

Senator Moreau: The government's focus is on rebuilding confidence in a way that supports students, protects Canada's reputation and ensures the institutions offering a strong student experience can continue to attract international talent.

The government has implemented a series of integrity measures, including a new letter of acceptance verification process, stronger financial requirements and changes to the post-graduation work permit program to better align with labour market needs.

EMPLOYMENT AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

YOUTH EMPLOYMENT

Hon. Yonah Martin (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Welcome back, government leader.

A recent study by the Bank of Canada warns that Canada is now stuck in a low-hire, low-fire labour market where it has become exceptionally difficult for unemployed Canadians to find work, near the worst level in 30 years.

Youth unemployment has surged above 14%. Long-term unemployment is rising due to structural issues like skill mismatches and policy-driven labour supply pressures.

How does your government justify policies that appear to be worsening these structural labour market imbalances rather than addressing them?

Hon. Pierre Moreau (Government Representative in the Senate): The government is addressing that important issue.

Youth unemployment is a structural issue of the economy that many countries face, not just Canada.

The government is acting to answer the concern it has heard from young Canadians through its engagement programs by publishing 100,000 Canada Summer Jobs on the job bank as of April 20; expanding the Student Work Placement Program to 55,000 for work-integrated learning opportunities for post-secondary students; expanding the Youth Employment and Skills Strategy to 20,000; and facilitating careers in Red Seal trades with a \$75-million expansion of the Union Training and Innovation Program in Budget 2025.

The government is also increasing, by 40%, the Canada Student Grants and increasing the Canada Student Loan limit, as I said in answer to Senator Klyne's question.

[*Translation*]

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

[*English*]

Senator Martin: I'm sorry, leader. Your government is already facing a failing grade on poverty. Now the bank warns of a structurally broken labour market.

Beyond helping students, we are talking about young Canadians. What does your government have to say to young Canadians who are struggling to see a viable path into the workforce or confidence in their economic future? You are failing them.

Senator Moreau: I am sorry to disagree, Senator Martin.

The government is working on creating jobs for all Canadians, including young Canadians.

The government is diversifying its economy by having agreements with many outside countries.

Excepting those living on another planet, we all know that we are in a geopolitical change with respect to U.S. policy. The government is working against that situation —

[*Translation*]

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

[*English*]

FINANCE

COST OF LIVING

Hon. Yonah Martin (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Food Banks Canada's latest poverty report assigns your government an overall failing grade of D+. The report's findings are abysmal: a 24% food insecurity rate, an 11% poverty rate and 39% of Canadians who feel worse off compared to last year.

Senator Moreau, after a year of expensive promises and announcements, experts are saying your government's actions are nowhere near enough to address this crisis.

How does your government justify yet another failing grade after nearly a decade in power as more Canadians are turning to food banks and falling behind on basic needs?

Hon. Pierre Moreau (Government Representative in the Senate): There is a long list of things the government is doing for affordability. We are lowering taxes for 22 million Canadians.

We are cutting the consumer carbon tax.

We are protecting pharmacare, dental care and child care and providing immediate relief on groceries.

On June 5, this coming Friday, there will be another measure for all Canadians. We worked hard to have that bill passed here in the Senate.

The government's work does not stop there.

More measures to solve the affordability crisis are coming: Bill C-15, sponsored by Senator Papatello; Bill C-20, sponsored by Senator Varone; and Bill C-26, which will be sponsored by Senator McBean to fund a provincial housing initiative.

The government is working on all aspects of the situation. We are there for Canadians and are building a stronger Canada.

Senator Martin: I'm sorry, but a D+ is a failing grade. You get a failing grade for structural failure.

Benefit programs like the Canada Groceries and Essentials Benefit amount to barely \$12 a month, senator.

• (1500)

When will your government present a real plan to reduce poverty and food insecurity rather than continuing with policies that are not working?

Senator Moreau: I'm sorry, but more than 12 million Canadians will be supported with the rising cost of essentials through the Canada Groceries and Essentials Benefit, which will provide immediate relief starting this coming Friday.

We're working on those issues. I know that you don't want to recognize that, but at least the facts are there. We are working on it. Canadians will receive cheques by this coming Friday for groceries.

GLOBAL AFFAIRS

EXPORT OF ARMS

Hon. Mary Coyle: Welcome back, Senator Moreau. It's nice to see you.

The conflict in Sudan has been described by UN officials as one of the worst humanitarian crises of the 21st century. Canada has maintained an arms embargo on parts of Sudan since 2004. However, experts who testified recently at the Standing Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade stated that the Canadian-founded STREIT Group has supplied armoured combat vehicles to the Rapid Support Forces, or RSF, in Sudan, which pose a risk of being used in violation of international humanitarian law. Canadian officials have not acted because the STREIT Group produced and transferred these vehicles from their overseas facilities. Sniper rifles produced by Sterling Cross Defense Systems in B.C. have also appeared in Sudan.

Senator Moreau, why has there been no action taken to address this issue of Canadian persons and entities supplying arms to the conflict in Sudan?

Hon. Pierre Moreau (Government Representative in the Senate): Thank you. It's an important question. Following those testimonies, we reached out to the minister. I have been told that Canada strictly enforces the arms embargo on Sudan under the United Nations, or UN, Sudan Regulations, which have been in place since 2004. This means that no Canadian companies are permitted to export arms to Sudan, neither directly nor through third countries. If these laws are violated, those responsible face legal consequences that could include the seizure of goods and criminal prosecution, leading to fines or imprisonment.

I cannot comment on specific cases, but I have been told that we are looking very closely at whether those restrictions are respected.

Senator Coyle: Project Ploughshares recommended, at the same Senate Foreign Affairs Committee, that Global Affairs Canada conduct a pilot study on the adoption of post-shipment controls and Canada's conventional arms control regime to safeguard against diversion. What is the government doing to proactively strengthen Canada's arms export control regime to ensure that Canadian weapons are not contributing to the devastating violence in Sudan?

Senator Moreau: Thank you for that question. Again, Canada has one of the strongest export control systems in the world, and respect for human rights is enshrined in our export controls legislation. All permit applications for control items are reviewed individually on a case-by-case basis under Canada's robust Risk Assessment Framework.

If there is a substantial risk that the export would result in a serious violation of human rights, the permit will be declined. Canada has made no exception to this legal requirement.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

MILITARY INVOLVEMENT IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Hon. Marilou McPhedran: Senator Moreau, my question is about the lack of transparency, possibly a lack of honesty and the potential hidden risks regarding Canada's military in the Middle East. Canadian Armed Forces members cannot be involved in foreign operations without the approval of the Government of Canada. We are told that our military members serving on exchange with U.S. forces remain in their posts but have been assigned other duties outside of the campaign against Iran. Yet, when asked about the exact time when our troops were told to perform these other duties, the Department of National Defence failed to respond.

Can you clearly explain to Canadians what these other duties in the Middle East actually entail? Are Canadian soldiers helping in this war directly or indirectly?

Hon. Pierre Moreau (Government Representative in the Senate): Thank you for the question, Senator McPhedran, but there is a security issue related to any answer that would be given to your question. Therefore, I don't have a specific answer to your question. I will raise the issue with the minister and, if it's possible, get back to you with an answer.

Senator McPhedran: If you could please also ask, as part of that question, this: Were these other duties assigned before or after the war against Iran started?

Senator Moreau: Once again, when I know what "other duties" mean, I will see whether or not I can answer the question. If it's possible, I will get back to you with this.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

CANADA-MERCOSUR FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Hon. Robert Black: Senator Moreau, the Government of Canada is moving quickly to negotiate trade deals with numerous countries in various regions, including the South American Common Market trading bloc known as Mercosur.

In recent correspondence with the National Cattle Feeders' Association, or NCFA, and the Canadian Cattle Association, both associations outlined concerns about how this trade deal may affect Canada's beef producers and the entire agriculture industry. To quote a letter from NCFA:

Allowing beef access in the Mercosur trade deal would result in increased imports of low-quality beef raised with lower standards for animal health, labour, food safety and environmental [issues].

Protecting animal health is foundational to Canada's beef industry and must remain an absolute priority. Protecting our own sectors must be an absolute priority in all trade policies and discussions. The Government of Canada must negotiate deals. Senator Moreau, how will your government balance the need for global trade diversification with the need to protect Canada's beef industry during these trade talks?

Hon. Pierre Moreau (Government Representative in the Senate): Thank you for the question, Senator Black. As I mentioned to Senator Martin in the previous answer, the government is engaging in trade negotiations across the globe to create new opportunities for Canadians. This includes restarting the path to a trade agreement with Mercosur, a market of over 280 million people. Central in the process is listening to and engaging with Canadian workers, businesses, exporters, and, in this case, farmers and stakeholders and using that input to better inform the trade negotiators. Signing trade agreements is meant to open markets to producers and manufacturers, not to jeopardize them.

Negotiations are starting. The government is aware of the challenge and the importance of protecting Canadian ranchers and Canada's beef industry.

Senator Black: Thank you. Global trade diversification is critical to our country's future success and sovereignty, but there must be significant consideration on how these trade deals will affect all sectors, including agriculture and agri-food. Canadian agriculture is a key pillar for the economic growth of our country. These trade deals must be science-based, transparent, sustainable and responsible.

Senator Moreau, how will your government consult with the agriculture and agri-food sector to ensure that trade deals like the one with Mercosur do not negatively impact Canadian farmers, producers and processors?

Senator Moreau: First, let me tell you that I totally agree with the premise of your question. I've been told that the minister regularly engages with the Canadian Cattle Association and agricultural stakeholders to hear their feedback. I have been informed that he, notably, met with them just before he left for international travel to France and the Philippines last May.

Global Affairs Canada also conducted a public consultation to receive the views of Canadians on this negotiation, and the what-we-heard report is now publicly available.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

ENERGY EFFICIENCY ACT

BILL TO AMEND—THIRD READING

Hon. Duncan Wilson moved third reading of Bill S-4, An Act to amend the Energy Efficiency Act, as amended.

He said: Honourable senators, I rise today to move third reading of Bill S-4, An Act to amend the Energy Efficiency Act.

I would like to first acknowledge all our colleagues on the Standing Senate Committee on Energy, the Environment and Natural Resources for their diligence in studying this bill. I also thank Senator David Wells as the critic and Senator Coyle and others whose amendments and observations have led to a thoughtful report.

[Translation]

The committee held eight meetings on this bill. Testimony was given at five of these meetings by the government, industry, non-governmental organizations and Indigenous groups, while the last three were spent on a clause-by-clause consideration of the bill. I'll speak to the amendments adopted shortly.

• (1510)

First of all, I would like to briefly explain why this work is so important to me.

In my previous role at the Vancouver Fraser Port Authority, I worked on initiatives to reduce energy consumption across port operations. In collaboration with our partners, we found practical ways to cut consumption, which helped reduce costs for businesses while minimizing environmental impact.

This experience allowed me to see for myself that energy efficiency is not an abstract concept. It produces concrete results for businesses, communities and our environment.

I am leaning on those lessons as I consider this bill. Modern energy efficiency standards are essential to our energy security, to the fight against climate change and to a stronger and more competitive economy.

Colleagues, the bill before us reflects a painstaking effort to modernize a law that has not been overhauled since 1992. The amendments adopted in committee ensure that the law remains clear, focused and effective in today's economy.

[English]

Let me begin with clause 2. This amendment may appear technical, but it speaks directly to the purpose of the act. The amendment clarifies that new types of energy efficiency standards must relate only to energy efficiency or the responsible use of energy.

That clarity matters because Bill S-4 introduces new tools that will allow us to go beyond simply measuring how much energy a product uses. It will allow us to consider durability, performance, how products interact with the grid and how they contribute to reducing overall energy demand.

With that flexibility must come focus. The amendment ensures that, as we evolve our approach, we remain grounded in our core objective of using energy more efficiently and responsibly. It also underscores the flexibility needed to target energy and cost savings directly while maintaining a clear legislative focus.

Colleagues, I want to touch on the committee's discussion about including commercial entities in Bill S-4. Doing so closes a simple but important loophole. Today, companies that import regulated products to sell in Canada must meet energy efficiency standards, while companies bringing them in for their own commercial use do not. This gap has driven up costs for Canadian equipment users and has created a pathway for underperforming equipment to enter local markets.

During committee discussions, important questions were raised on this matter. Would this apply to equipment already in use? Would businesses need to replace what they already own or add new labels? The answer is no. This change only affects new, regulated products entering Canada.

The committee agreed that the amendments raised were not necessary because the entire Energy Efficiency Act is underpinned by trade and commerce authorities that only kick in at the border and have no bearing on businesses' existing operations.

Bringing commercial entities under the act simply ensures that the same rules apply to everyone importing equipment. It protects Canadians from higher energy costs today, and it gives us a practical tool for the future, especially as we see growing energy demand from large users, like data centres.

[Translation]

I will now talk about the amendments to clauses 18 and 19.

The wording of these amendments is straightforward, but their scope is broad. Broadening the wording by replacing "Emerging Energy Sources" with "Renewable or Emerging Energy Sources" in Part II of the act reflects today's reality. Technologies such as wind and solar power are no longer emerging energy sources. They are established and reliable sources of energy and promoting them is an integral part of the responsible use of energy for the future.

Because this is such an important speech, today, I am wearing a new tie with sailboats on it to symbolize renewable energy.

This change — not my new tie, but the inclusion of renewable energy — sends a strong message. It reflects the reality of the current energy system in which renewable energy is no longer an ambition for the future but a well-established component of Canada's energy mix. At the same time, it leaves the door open. It recognizes that both renewable and non-renewable energy sources are essential to meeting the country's diverse energy needs.

The reasoned amendments adopted in committee do not change the focus of the bill; they strengthen it. They clarify the bill's purpose and ensure that the legislation reflects the energy systems of today and those we will build in the future.

Honourable senators, besides examining these amendments, it is worth taking a step back to recall what this bill aims to achieve.

The Energy Efficiency Act has been one of Canada's quiet successes, and energy efficiency remains one of the quickest and most cost-effective ways to reduce costs and strengthen our energy system. This is highlighted in an article published on May 7 in *Canada's National Observer*, which features a petition presented in the House of Commons calling for energy efficiency to be made a national priority.

The article notes that investing in energy efficiency not only enhances our national energy sovereignty but also provides consumers and businesses with greater protection against the impact of geopolitical shocks and the resulting increase in energy prices. In addition, energy efficiency measures produce results much faster than other major infrastructure projects, which can take years to complete. Moreover, every province and every region of our country will benefit from improved energy efficiency.

The petition presented in the other place notes that, by improving national energy productivity, energy efficiency measures generate between \$4 and \$7 in additional GDP for every dollar invested.

[English]

It bears reminding that the cheapest unit of energy is the one we don't use. Bill S-4 provides a pathway to do just that.

Colleagues, for more than 30 years, the Energy Efficiency Act has set minimum efficiency standards for products across the economy. These standards have eliminated the least efficient products from the marketplace and helped drive innovation in appliances, equipment and industrial systems.

The results are significant. Since 1995, these regulations have delivered more than \$110 billion in savings for Canadians. They have resulted in energy savings equivalent to powering every household in Canada — approximately 16 million households — for four entire years.

Energy savings through this act have also translated into the avoidance of more than 770 megatonnes of greenhouse gases. This would be the equivalent of taking all passenger vehicles in Canada off the road for an incredible 12 years.

But we no longer live in the world of 1992, when this act was born. Today, Canadians buy products online, supply chains are global and technologies are becoming more connected, intelligent and integrated.

The current act was not designed for that reality. Without modernization, we will fall behind on affordability, energy security and competitiveness. Bill S-4 addresses that gap.

It updates the act so it can keep pace with today's economy. It ensures that products sold online meet the same standards as those sold in stores, protecting consumers and creating a level playing field for businesses.

• (1520)

It enables modern labelling so that Canadians can access reliable information whether they shop in person or online. It introduces more flexible tools, allowing new technologies to be tested, assessed and brought to market more quickly. And it strengthens enforcement so that rules are applied fairly, consistently and efficiently across the marketplace.

Honourable senators, these are practical changes; they are not theoretical, and they are not controversial.

In fact, they respond directly to calls from stakeholders. More than 90 organizations have supported the modernization of this act, recognizing that it is overdue. In fact, every witness before the committee agreed that this modernization is overdue. That includes consumer advocates and energy efficiency experts — they all understand one thing: Energy efficiency is one of the easiest and most cost-effective ways to reduce costs and strengthen our economy.

It also plays a critical role in Canada's competitiveness. Modernizing this act will allow us to do the following: reduce energy costs for businesses, which frees up capital for investment and innovation; ensure Canadian markets are not undercut by inefficient imported products; use virtual and digital tools to make it easier and cheaper to confirm compliance; and support the electrification of Canada's economy by better managing demand and modernizing our systems, as outlined in the government's National Strategy for an Electrified Canadian Economy.

[Senator Wilson]

These are not abstract benefits. They translate directly into lower costs, stronger industries and greater economic resilience.

Colleagues, let me be clear about one more point: Passing this legislation does not in itself impose new requirements overnight. Many of the changes will require regulations developed through consultation with provinces, territories, industry, Indigenous partners and others. That process matters, and it is supported by stronger reporting and accountability going forward.

In addition, the amendments to clause 25 strengthen how we measure and report on progress. One amendment will require reporting that compares selected Canadian energy efficiency standards with those in other jurisdictions, including provinces, the United States, Mexico and, importantly, other relevant partners.

This amendment builds on work already under way and presents it in a more visible and accessible manner. It shines a light on how others are approaching these challenges, drawing from lessons learned and proven best practices, and it applies them in a Canadian context.

It is a practical approach — one that provides transparency to drive ongoing improvements, while staying focused and workable in a complex and evolving global marketplace.

[*Translation*]

The final amendment changes the bill's review schedule. This is a new requirement introduced by Bill S-4 into the Energy Efficiency Act. This amendment will now ensure that the first review of the act takes place five years after the bill comes into force, rather than 10 years. This new schedule will allow the government to respond faster to any problems arising from amendments made to the act under Bill S-4.

Honourable senators, there is no single solution to the challenges confronting Canada, especially the challenges of affordability, energy security, competitiveness and climate change. However, energy efficiency is one of the most practical and effective tools at our disposal. It reduces costs, strengthens systems and allows us to do more with what we already have.

Bill S-4 guarantees this tool's effectiveness, not only in the past and present, but also in the future.

The amendments passed in the Senate ensure that its implementation is clear, precise and credible.

[*English*]

In closing, colleagues, we are not starting from scratch with the bill before us. We are building on three decades of success. We are improving a proven framework. And we are ensuring it continues to deliver for Canadians in a modern, digital and increasingly competitive world. So let's move forward with modernizing the Energy Efficiency Act. Doing so will ensure that Canada continues to lead by using energy wisely and by building a stronger economy in the process.

Thank you. *Meegwetch.*

Hon. David M. Wells: Honourable senators, I rise today at third reading of Bill S-4, An Act to amend the Energy Efficiency Act.

I want to recognize the efforts of the bill's sponsor here in the Senate, the Honourable Duncan Wilson, and the Standing Senate Committee on Energy, the Environment and Natural Resources for their important work on this bill.

At second reading, I said that while the objective of improving energy efficiency may be understandable, this bill goes far beyond a simple technical modernization. I noted then that Bill S-4 significantly expands what the government may regulate, and it expands who may be captured under the act and substantially broadens unilateral punishments.

Since that time, the bill has undergone committee study. I would like to begin by acknowledging all senators who contributed to the work of the committee, as well as the witnesses who appeared and other senators who joined us. I also want to thank the sponsor of the bill, Senator Wilson, for his work throughout this process and for his engagement at committee and during clause-by-clause consideration and the amendment process. While we may not agree on every aspect of the legislation, I do appreciate the constructive and respectful manner in which the bill was studied and debated. Because at committee, we heard something important.

We heard credible concerns from manufacturers, distributors, supply chain stakeholders and industry associations. We heard concerns about regulatory uncertainty. We heard concerns about broad delegated authority. We heard concerns about increased compliance costs and red tape.

We also heard concerns about the risk of unnecessary divergence from the currently unified North American regulatory approach.

Those concerns were not isolated observations; they were recurring themes throughout committee testimony and submissions. Importantly, many of those concerns directly aligned with the questions I raised at second reading.

Colleagues, the central issue that emerged during the committee's study was the addition of "commercial entities." At second reading, I questioned why the bill expands beyond traditional dealers — manufacturers, importers, sellers and lessors — to include end-users. At committee, I pressed the minister and officials directly on this point.

I asked what the government's view was of reaching into a company — for example, a farmer who owns a tractor or energy-consuming equipment already purchased or acquired through a lease arrangement — and potentially restricting the use of that equipment through regulation or penalties.

The minister's response was revealing. Minister Hodgson stated that he was not aware of whether that specific use case would, in fact, be captured under the regulations.

Officials then explained that the intent was to close loopholes involving products entering Canada for commercial use — things like vending machines or appliances used in apartment buildings. But, colleagues, intent is not law. What became clear throughout committee is that the wording of the legislation is broader than the explanations being offered for it. That is precisely why this issue matters. Courts will have less interest in the intent of the law versus the letter of the law. This aspect takes on increased significance because the new changes also give the minister unilateral rights to impose financial penalties.

At committee, I pressed further. I pointed out that the bill now creates a new provision that explicitly allows the government to target commercial entities — actors who are not necessarily importers, retailers or wholesalers, but simply end-users. I then asked a straightforward question: If the issue is low-efficiency products entering Canada, why could the government not address this at the border through import restrictions or HS code controls, as is done with other products?

The response from officials was that such an approach could indeed be used. So, again, the fundamental question remained unanswered: Why extend regulatory uncertainty and liability to end-users who do not control the manufacturing, design or original importation of the product? They are simply buying an approved product and they are using it. They control nothing of the product prior to them owning, but they are now somehow responsible for the things preceding their ownership.

After hearing the answers, I stated plainly at committee: "I didn't hear a good answer to that . . ." It's because I did not understand why a commercial entity would be captured where existing authorities over importers and retailers already existed.

What followed was equally important. Senator Fridhandler pursued the issue further and raised examples of landlords operating apartment buildings with HVAC systems that had already been lawfully purchased and installed.

• (1530)

He questioned whether those end-users could suddenly become subject to new obligations under this legislation simply because they now were considered commercial entities. Officials, again, responded that regulations and consultations would guide implementation.

We then heard from industry witnesses, and their testimony reinforced those concerns. I asked witnesses representing electrical and heating, refrigeration and air-conditioning stakeholders about long-term contracts, lease-to-own arrangements and bulk equipment purchases.

I asked whether there was concern that future rules or requirements could suddenly alter what equipment end-users were permitted to use after contracts had already been entered into. The answer was yes.

Ms. McGlogan, President and CEO of Electro-Federation Canada, specifically acknowledged concerns that commercial users could become liable for products that were misrepresented or later deemed unacceptable. More importantly, she warned that if products suddenly had to be removed or replaced, there would be significant burdens placed on those sectors and uncertainty about whether supply channels could adapt.

That testimony matters because it demonstrates that the concerns raised at second reading were not theoretical. Industry itself identified these risks.

We also heard concerns about divergence from the United States. Perry Chao of the Heating, Refrigeration and Air Conditioning Institute of Canada noted that certain definitions in Bill S-4 — including “commercial entity” — differ from approaches used in the United States. He further suggested that one approach would be to define a primary responsible party to ensure clarity around compliance obligations. That is precisely the type of safeguard several senators attempted to introduce through amendments. Those efforts were largely rejected.

Colleagues, I want to make an important point here about the committee process itself. Throughout those exchanges with the minister and officials, I repeatedly attempted to narrow the scope of the bill and obtain clear answers as to who exactly would be captured under these new authorities and where the boundaries actually were. However, time and again, the answers came back framed around future regulations, future consultations or future policy intent, rather than the wording of the legislation itself.

Respectfully, that is precisely the concern with framework legislation of this nature. Parliament is being asked to approve broad enabling powers first and rely on assurances later. Of course, we have no input into the regulatory process.

At committee, despite extensive questioning, we didn't receive a clear legislative explanation as to why the existing authorities over importers and sellers were insufficient or where the practical limits on the treatment of commercial entities would ultimately lie. I believe that this uncertainty is important for this chamber to recognize at third reading.

Colleagues, throughout committee, we repeatedly heard assurances about future regulations rather than clear limits written directly into the legislation itself. And the amendments that attempted to do that were turned down.

That is one of the central concerns with Bill S-4. It remains, to a very large extent, a framework bill, one that delegates significant authority now while leaving many of the practical limits and operational details to future regulation.

When Parliament delegates that level of authority to the executive, it becomes even more important that the legislation itself contain clear safeguards, principles and boundaries. That was the purpose of the amendments I proposed during the study of this bill.

Those amendments were not intended to weaken energy efficiency objectives. They were intended to improve clarity, predictability and fairness. Two of my amendments were, in fact, adopted.

One of the amendments I proposed and which were ultimately adopted deals directly with the most significant concern raised throughout committee study: the broad and uncertain treatment of “commercial entities” under Bill S-4.

As originally drafted, the bill created the potential for regulations to extend well beyond manufacturers, importers and sellers and into the day-to-day operations of businesses and end-users who had already lawfully acquired equipment in good faith.

Throughout committee, I repeatedly raised concerns about where the limits actually were. We heard examples involving farmers, apartment owners, hotels and other commercial operators who could potentially find themselves subject to new compliance obligations despite having no role in manufacturing or designing or labelling the products in question.

My amendment addressed that concern directly. It clarified that regulations affecting commercial entities may only apply in relation to the importation of an energy-using product into Canada or the shipment of such a product from one province to another.

That matters because it establishes a clear legislative boundary around the government's regulatory reach. It ensures the focus remains on products entering the marketplace, where the stated policy objective actually lies, rather than creating open-ended authority over the ordinary use of products already operated by Canadian businesses.

In practical terms, colleagues, the amendment reduces uncertainty, limits unnecessary regulatory exposure for businesses and helps prevent additional red tape for commercial entities that are not manufacturers, importers or primary market actors. Most importantly, it places an important safeguard directly into the legislation itself rather than leaving those limits entirely to future regulation or ministerial direction.

The second amendment I proposed and which was ultimately adopted deals directly with parliamentary oversight and accountability, something I believe becomes even more important when Parliament is being asked to delegate broad future regulatory authority through framework legislation.

As originally drafted, Bill S-4 required a formal parliamentary review 10 years after coming into force, with reviews every five years thereafter. In my view, that was far too long, given the significant new powers being introduced through this bill, including the expansion to commercial entities, the new corrective measures regime, the new administrative monetary penalties regime and the new exemptions and regulatory framework.

My amendment strengthened that oversight in three important ways. First, it brought the first statutory review forward from 10 years to 5 years. This will ensure that reviews will continue every five years thereafter on an ongoing basis and will allow Parliament to adjust the legislation where necessary in the event that the negative consequences that colleagues had suggested could happen do happen. Importantly, it allows those parliamentary reviews to specifically examine whether the act is actually working as intended, including its impacts on commercial entities and the real-world operation of the bill's new enforcement, penalties and exemptions regimes.

Colleagues, that matters because, throughout committee, we heard repeated concerns about uncertainty, regulatory drift and unintended consequences. When Parliament grants broad discretion to future governments and regulators, Parliament also has a responsibility to ensure there are meaningful mechanisms to revisit those powers, assess how they are being used in practice and determine whether the balance and effects Parliament originally intended are actually being respected.

This amendment does not alter the policy objectives of Bill S-4. What it does is strengthen accountability. It ensures Parliament will receive earlier and more substantive evidence about how these new powers are functioning while there is still time to identify problems, correct course if necessary and ensure the legislation remains proportionate, fair and grounded in its original purpose. Just as importantly, it helps protect Canadians, commercial entities and supply chains from the unintended consequences that can emerge when broad regulatory powers are delegated without sufficient ongoing parliamentary oversight.

If Parliament is going to grant significant new authority through this framework legislation, then Parliament also has a responsibility to ensure those powers are being exercised reasonably, predictably and in the manner originally contemplated.

I also proposed a number of additional amendments throughout committee study that were aimed at strengthening clarity, accountability and harmonization within the legislation itself. These amendments were not intended to weaken the energy efficiency objectives of Bill S-4. Rather, they were intended to ensure that those objectives could be pursued in a manner that is predictable, proportionate and aligned with the realities facing Canadian businesses and supply chains.

Among other things, those amendments would have enshrined principles of cost-effectiveness, technological feasibility and North American harmonization directly into the legislation. Others would have required the government to consider the importance of avoiding unnecessary divergence with the United States, Mexico and the provinces when developing future regulations, while another would have protected good-faith commercial entities from disproportionate liability related to labels or representations they do not control. In my view, it is unfortunate that the committee did not accept these protections and efficiencies.

Specifically, the risk of "Canada-only" requirements, increased compliance burdens and uncertainty for commercial entities will remain unresolved within the legislation before us today.

Honourable senators, our role at third reading is not simply to debate intentions. Our role is to assess the legislation Parliament is actually passing — not the regulations that may come later, not the assurances that may be offered today, but the actual legislative framework and the wording before us.

In the case of Bill S-4, too much remains dependent on future discretion. Too many safeguards were rejected. Too many legitimate concerns raised by industry and senators remain unresolved.

• (1540)

I support reasonable and effective energy efficiency measures. I support modernization where modernization is necessary, but modernization must come with clarity and fairness. Energy efficiency is a legitimate objective, but good intentions alone are not enough. Parliament has a responsibility to ensure that the legislation is clear, proportionate and accountable, particularly where broad future regulatory and unilateral penalty powers are being granted.

In too many respects, Bill S-4 still asks Parliament to trust that those limits will come later. I do not believe Parliament should delegate first and define the boundaries afterward. That is why I remain concerned that Bill S-4 does not strike the proper balance between modernization and government reach. Thank you, colleagues.

Some Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

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

Hon. Senators: Question.

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

Some Hon. Senators: Agreed.

An Hon. Senator: On division.

(Motion agreed to and bill, as amended, read third time and passed, on division.)

THE ESTIMATES, 2026-27

NATIONAL FINANCE COMMITTEE AUTHORIZED TO STUDY SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES (A)

Hon. Patti LaBoucane-Benson (Legislative Deputy to the Government Representative in the Senate), pursuant to notice of May 28, 2026, moved:

That the Standing Senate Committee on National Finance be authorized to examine and report upon the expenditures set out in the Supplementary Estimates (A) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2027; and

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

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to.)

FOOD AND DRUGS ACT

BILL TO AMEND—THIRD READING—DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Brazeau, seconded by the Honourable Senator MacAdam, for the third reading of Bill S-202, An Act to amend the Food and Drugs Act (warning label on alcoholic beverages).

Hon. David M. Wells: Honourable senators, I rise today to speak at third reading of Bill S-202, An Act to amend the Food and Drugs Act (warning label on alcoholic beverages).

I did not speak at second reading of this bill. Former senator David Richards served as critic at that stage of the debate. Following his retirement from the chamber, I assumed that role at third reading. As a result, some of my remarks today may carry aspects of what would traditionally be considered second reading observations. I ask colleagues for their indulgence in that regard.

Let me begin by acknowledging the Honourable Senator Patrick Brazeau for his sincere and determined advocacy on this issue. His commitment comes from deeply personal experience, and no one who has listened to his remarks or reviewed the committee evidence could doubt the seriousness with which he approaches the harms associated with alcohol abuse. Those harms are real.

Excessive alcohol consumption can devastate families, damage communities and place enormous pressure on our health care system. That's not in dispute. However, our responsibility as legislators is not simply to agree with the objective of improving public health. Our responsibility is to ensure that legislation is balanced, evidence-based, proportionate and workable in a practical way.

This is particularly important when legislation proposes mandatory warning labels that carry broader economic trade and regulatory implications. As the critic of this bill, it is my role to test some of the assumptions that have shaped this debate and to examine whether the evidence presented to Parliament has been fair, complete and properly contextualized.

Honourable senators, one of the central themes throughout committee study was the repeated comparison between alcohol and tobacco. Witnesses frequently emphasized that alcohol is classified as a Group 1 carcinogen by the International Agency for Research on Cancer, or IARC. That is the same category as tobacco and asbestos. That statement is factually correct, except that the way it was presented often lacked an important context.

The IARC classification system measures the strength of evidence that a substance can cause cancer. It does not measure the relative risk posed by that substance. The IARC, itself, clearly states that just because substances appear in the same category does not mean they are equally dangerous.

Tobacco is responsible for approximately 15% of cancers worldwide. Alcohol is responsible for approximately 3%. Those are both serious numbers, but the scale of harm is not equivalent, and that distinction matters.

It is also important to recognize that public health guidance surrounding alcohol remains scientifically contested in several respects. A recent U.S. Congressional oversight report examining the Biden administration's alcohol intake and health study concluded that the process has become fraught with bias, relied upon researchers with predetermined anti-alcohol positions and failed to provide balanced scientific representation.

The report further concluded that the study should not be relied upon in developing dietary guidance because it was “. . . irretrievably flawed . . .”

Whether one agrees with every conclusion in that report or not, it underscores an important point for legislators: Evolving public health recommendations must still be subject to rigorous scrutiny, transparency and balanced scientific debate.

If Parliament is going to mandate warning labels for consumers, those warnings should be accurate, proportionate and properly contextualized. Canadians deserve information; they also deserve precision.

At committee, witnesses often referenced increased cancer risks associated with alcohol consumption. Again, those risks are real, but there was very little discussion distinguishing relative risk from absolute risk. For example, we heard testimony that even moderate alcohol consumption could increase the risk of

breast cancer by 19%. Presented without context, that sounds alarming; however, the absolute increase in lifetime risk is significantly smaller.

According to the American Cancer Society, the average lifetime risk of breast cancer for women is approximately 13%. A 19% relative increase raises that figure to approximately 15.5%. That's still important information. It's critical, however, that Parliament present risk in a manner that's complete and understandable, not simply attention grabbing.

We should also be cautious about presenting scientific conclusions as fully settled when major international jurisdictions continue to debate both the methodology and interpretation of alcohol-related health studies.

The same Congressional report noted concerns about the increasing reliance on what it described as "the Canadian model." That approach asserts that no level of alcohol consumption is safe, despite longstanding studies suggesting more nuanced outcomes associated with moderate consumption.

Honourable colleagues, another concern I have with the legislation relates to the broader category and economic implications that received comparatively little attention during committee study. Canada's wine industry, breweries and distilleries are important contributors to local economies across the country. Collectively, Canada's alcohol production sector supports tens of thousands of jobs across agriculture, manufacturing, hospitality, tourism, transportation, retail and export industries. These are not isolated businesses. They are part of an integrated economic ecosystem that stretches from farmers and packaging suppliers to restaurants, hotels and rural tourism operators.

Many of these businesses are already operating in an environment of rising input costs, inflationary pressures, labour shortages and increased regulatory burdens. Parliament should carefully consider the cumulative effect of adding yet another federal compliance requirement to an already highly regulated sector.

• (1550)

In Newfoundland and Labrador, we have seen meaningful growth in craft brewing and distilling. Similar growth has occurred in regions across Canada where local producers have become important employers, tourism drivers and community partners. These businesses are already dealing with inflationary pressures, supply chain costs, transportation costs and evolving regulatory requirements. A mandatory federal labelling regime will create additional compliance obligations, redesign costs, inventory complications and administrative burdens, particularly for smaller producers that do not have the scale or flexibility of multinational corporations.

For many producers, especially small- and medium-sized Canadian companies, mandatory warning labels would require redesigning packaging, modifying bottling and printing processes, managing separate inventories and navigating evolving regulatory specifications. Those activities and costs are not insignificant. Large multinational corporations may be able to absorb those changes relatively easily. Smaller Canadian

producers often cannot. The result could be a regulatory framework that unintentionally disadvantages domestic producers while favouring larger global competitors with greater economies of scale.

We should also recognize that once Parliament begins legislating highly prescriptive warning frameworks, the scope of those requirements can expand significantly over time. Evidence before U.S. congressional investigators suggested that some public health advocates were not simply seeking informed consumer choice but broader behavioural and policy objectives designed to reduce alcohol consumption generally.

Honourable senators, these concerns are not theoretical. Recent reporting out of Ireland specifically and Europe in general demonstrates that governments implementing these regimes are already facing significant pressure surrounding costs, trade implications and market disruption.

Ireland's proposed warning label framework has now been delayed until at least 2028 following concerns around tariffs, trade uncertainty and economic impacts on producers and exporters. Several reports noted particular concern for smaller wineries, distilleries and exporters that would be required to create market-specific labels for individual markets and absorb additional compliance costs that larger multinational companies are far better positioned to manage.

That distinction matters in Canada. Many Canadian wineries, breweries and distilleries are not multinational corporations. They are regional employers, tourism operators and agricultural businesses deeply connected to rural and coastal communities.

Also, we cannot ignore the trade implications associated with legislation like this. During committee study, considerable discussion focused on Ireland's proposed alcohol warning label framework. What is particularly notable is that Canada itself raised concerns at the World Trade Organization, or WTO, regarding Ireland's approach. Canada warned that country-specific labelling requirements could create barriers to trade, increase costs for exporters and undermine market harmonization. Those concerns are particularly important for Canadian producers that export into highly integrated North American markets. Diverging labelling requirements create duplication, reduce efficiency and complicate cross-border trade.

Once Canada establishes a unique mandatory packaging requirement, producers may be forced to maintain separate production and inventory streams for Canadian and export markets. That creates additional costs throughout the supply chain and reduces competitiveness for Canadian businesses operating internationally. Parliament should, therefore, carefully consider whether Canada could face similar objections if we move forward with our own unilateral labelling framework for imported beer, wine and spirits.

It is difficult for Canada to argue internationally that country-specific alcohol labelling requirements create unnecessary trade complications abroad while simultaneously dismissing similar concerns when they are raised domestically here at home.

We should also be mindful that alcohol regulation in Canada already involves a complex mix of federal and provincial oversight. Adding another layer of federal packaging and warning requirements risks increasing fragmentation within an already complicated regulatory environment.

At a time when governments across the country are discussing the reduction of internal trade barriers and improving economic competitiveness, Parliament should proceed carefully before introducing new requirements that may further complicate compliance across jurisdictions. Beyond international trade, we should also recognize the potential for interprovincial complications within Canada itself, where barriers and differing regulatory regimes already create significant challenges for businesses.

Honourable senators, I also want to briefly address the committee process surrounding this bill. The committee observation attached to the report noted that, “While briefs were received from some industry stakeholders, only one witness . . .” ultimately appeared before committee. Some interpreted that absence as evidence that the industry had something to hide. Of course, I would question that conclusion. To be frank, I suspect many industry stakeholders believe the outcome of the study had already largely been determined before they appeared.

One of our colleagues referred at one point in the hearings to the “. . . massive capacity of the profit-seeking alcohol industry versus the capacity of governments . . .” and said that “. . . the two-year-plus delay —” on warning labels “— in Ireland seems to be directly attributed to this situation.” She then referred to the “. . . well documented . . . intimidation methodology of the industry.”

Another colleague said:

I will probably say something off, but the power of the alcohol industry lobby appears to me as our Canadian version of the U.S.’s NRA. . . .

And, finally, the bill’s sponsor, Senator Brazeau, said:

Next week, we’ll probably be hearing from the alcohol lobby representatives and the industry. When I look at this panel and the next one, here is what I think is going to happen next week. I think the industry is going to come here, and they will try to discredit the scientists who have been working on this for quite a long time. They are going to try to discredit CCSA’s new drinking guidelines. They are going to try to discredit the Canadian Cancer Society’s numbers and ratios in terms of getting cancer with respect to alcohol. They are going to probably say that bills such as these are just for people who have problems with alcohol and nobody else.

When witnesses and stakeholders believe their participation will not receive fair consideration, confidence in the committee process suffers. That is not healthy for Parliament, regardless of the issue before us.

In fact, concerns surrounding transparency and predetermined outcomes are not unique to this debate in Canada. The same U.S. oversight investigation found evidence that some officials involved in developing alcohol guidance had discussed limiting public access to internal materials and shaping findings around a predetermined policy objective. Again, whether one accepts every conclusion of that report or not, legislators should take seriously any warning signs suggesting that scientific or regulatory processes risk becoming advocacy-driven rather than evidence-driven.

To be clear, I am not suggesting that industry perspectives should override public health considerations. They should not. Legislation is only strengthened when Parliament hears competing views, fully and fairly, before arriving at conclusions.

Honourable senators, none of the concerns I raise today diminish the sincerity of Senator Brazeau’s efforts or the importance of addressing alcohol abuse in Canada. He has unquestionably succeeded in elevating this discussion nationally. He has drawn attention to the health consequences associated with excessive alcohol consumption and forced Parliament to engage seriously with those issues, and that is important work.

My concern throughout this debate has not been whether Canadians deserve information. They do. My concern is whether Parliament is providing that information in a manner that is balanced, accurate, proportionate and mindful of the broader economic, regulatory and trade implications that may follow.

Honourable senators, good public policy requires balance. Public health objectives are important, but so too are proportionality, competitiveness and regulatory predictability.

The question before us is not whether Canadians should have access to health information. Of course they should. The question is whether this particular legislative approach has been demonstrated to meaningfully improve outcomes in a manner that justifies the broader economic, regulatory and trade consequences that may follow. Those are legitimate questions for us as legislators to ask. Thank you, colleagues.

[*Translation*]

The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore: Senator Brazeau, would you like to ask a question?

[*English*]

Hon. Patrick Brazeau: Would Senator Wells take a question, please?

Senator D. M. Wells : Yes.

Senator Brazeau: Thank you very much, Senator Wells, for your third reading speech. I have one or two questions.

• (1600)

I have worked on this for quite a number of years. I drank for 35 years, so I've been working on this for 41 years, because I've been sober for 6 and a bit now. I have dealt with a lot of the experts — doctors, health practitioners, et cetera — who have worked on this for decades. To me, the bottom line is this: It's either we side with the alcohol industry — because you know as well as I do that they do not want alcohol warning labels on their products because sales will go down. When we had the industry individual come before the committee, he basically said that they were waiting for a mandate before they would put cancer warning labels on their products.

Having said that, do you believe it's high time now that we give that mandate to alcohol companies? At the end of the day, this is about either siding with the alcohol companies or siding with the well-being and the health of Canadians. Seventy-five per cent of Canadians are not aware of the cancer correlation with alcohol consumption — seven fatal cancers. So, are Canadians deserving of having these cancer-warning labels despite heavy resistance from the alcohol industry?

Senator D. M. Wells: Thank you, Senator Brazeau.

I believe it goes beyond that.

The question, of course, is absolute: Should we side with the alcohol industry, or should we side with Canadians seeking more information or correct information? I don't think it's a question of siding; I think it's a question of balance. We regularly read about levels of alcohol that could be healthy. I can't speak for everyone, but I can speak for myself. I have read articles that have said that a glass of wine a week or whatever could be considered healthy.

We know the opposite, as well; we know that. I went through my speech today, and we also know there are other consequences of this.

I don't think it's at all a question of siding with one or the other side. There is a balance to be struck. Of course, the debate we're having and the work you have done over the years, Senator Brazeau, including what has come out publicly that you might not have expected to come out publicly, have contributed to the debate. Canadians know that. They appreciate it, and I appreciate it.

Does it extend to warning labels on every bottle of wine, beer or spirit? My thought is "no" because I don't think it can be applied fairly, proportionally and equally across the spectrum. As an example, there are thousands of vintners around the world that sell to Canada. Do they have to have a separate label for Canada, or would it be just as easy for them to say, "Forget the Canadian market; we have a global label, and then we have a label for Canada" for something that, maybe in their minds, is not proven?

What do we say to bar owners, who would then be faced with the issue of selling a bottle or a can of beer that has a warning label, but they pull a pint that has no warning label? Or do the glasses have to be labelled?

There is more to it, Senator Brazeau, than just asking, "Is this right or wrong? Is it right for Canadians? Is it right for the industry?" There are far greater considerations for liquor, as well, that's poured in a bar. You don't hand the bottle; you pour it into a glass. No label is obvious to someone purchasing through that medium.

My answer to your very clear question is I don't know, but I know there are sharp edges around this that aren't black and white.

Senator Brazeau: Thank you very much for that response.

Just in response to that from somebody with lived experience and having worked with the actual experts on this file, I'm hoping that all colleagues around here will view it the same way I do: It is a question of either siding with the alcohol industry or siding with the right of Canadians to know that there is a correlation between alcohol consumption and seven fatal cancers.

Having said that, you talked about trade and the economy. However, unfortunately, you have not touched upon the fact that Canada currently has a \$6-billion alcohol deficit, meaning that after all the sales, all across the country, from alcohol, Canada still has a \$6-billion deficit because of the costs associated with our legal system, our health system and other expenses with respect to society.

So, we have the alcohol industry, with deep pockets, and we have the industry that just doesn't want this to happen. You know this as well as I do: They are here on the Hill — how many times a year? — meeting with parliamentarians, ensuring that there are not cancer warning labels on their products.

What are we going to do about it? Are we going to side with the alcohol industry or side with the right of Canadians to know that alcohol consumption, not just excessive consumption — I'm going to correct you on that — not just excessive drinking but even minimal drinking could cause a lot of problems with families, health, et cetera.

Whom are we going to side with? We went through this with the tobacco companies 30 years ago. Are we going to do the same thing, or are we going to send a clear message to the other house that it is time to do this?

Senator D. M. Wells: Thank you, Senator Brazeau. I wasn't suggesting this was only an issue of excessive drinking; in fact, I don't think I said that. In my example, I referenced articles that I have read over the years that suggest an acceptable level.

I don't think there is anyone in this chamber who hasn't had some connection, such as a family member or a friend, who has had an issue with alcohol consumption. I know I have. I recognize the importance of it. I just don't know, and I'm not convinced that a regime where labelling on wine, beer and spirits

within Canada, on alcohol coming into Canada and alcohol being consumed in Canada — I don't know if there is a practical application that works.

I'm not at all suggesting that drinking should be acceptable across the board. I'm not at all suggesting that, but as parliamentarians, certainly as senators, we will make a decision when it comes to a vote. My role as critic — and my role as a colleague — is to point out some of the things that we should all consider when we decide to cast our vote.

Senator Brazeau: I have another question.

Actually, you did talk about excessive drinking at the beginning — a friendly correction.

Are you aware that all the articles that you read with respect to the “benefits of drinking” — there are a lot of women who have breast cancer in Canada and a lot of men who have colon cancer. There are a lot of women who, for a very long time, were told by their doctors to have a little glass of wine while they were pregnant. You tell that to their children who have fetal alcohol spectrum disorder and will for all their lives.

Are you aware that those studies — you didn't reference them, but you basically talked about them — that our Canadian scientists and those abroad have debunked those articles?

Senator D. M. Wells: The articles I was referencing were articles I have read in newspapers and magazines, not medical journals. They show up from time to time. I see ones that say dark chocolate can be good for you. I can't imagine that because dark chocolate is — well, anyway.

I'm just saying that I think we have all seen articles that have said that moderate drinking can be healthy. I don't know if it is or not. I have no idea. I'm not in that business. I'm not a researcher. I'm not a scientist.

• (1610)

So my only answer to that is that this was my reference. It wasn't medical journals; it was articles. I think all colleagues have seen that. We have also seen ones that talk about the dark side of alcohol consumption, which is valid as well. It wasn't my intent in that anecdote to reference that as science, but I just referenced that as this is what we see and read.

I don't know how far Canada should go in labelling. Clearly, I think there are rough edges around the proposal before us. I think there would be unintended consequences.

We heard from many groups, not just the liquor, beer or wine lobbies but others. There are restaurants and other parts of Canadian society that this would have an effect on, and I was pointing that out. I'm in no way advocating for the excessive use or the overuse of alcohol. As I said before, I know all colleagues have been touched in some negative way — and maybe very few in any positive way — by the use or overuse of alcohol.

The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore: Senator McPhedran, would you like to ask a question?

Hon. Marilou McPhedran: Yes, I would, please, Your Honour.

The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore: Senator Wells, would you take a question?

Senator D. M. Wells: I would. Thank you.

Senator McPhedran: Senator Wells, are you familiar with the commercial determinants of health and the way in which the hundreds of millions of dollars spent by alcohol and alcohol-adjacent companies influence people's choices?

Are you familiar with the fact that the labelling required for food, like peas and corn, is more exacting, demanding and focused on health than the labelling or the lack of labelling on alcohol?

Senator D. M. Wells: Senator McPhedran, I'm not aware of the details of those. I mean, I know that advertising has an effect, and that's why much of the media advertising on alcohol has restrictions. Of course, we always see companies sponsoring events, and that advertising is there. I'm sure they wouldn't be investing in that advertising if it didn't have some positive effects on their sales. But I'm not familiar with the other references you made.

Hon. Tracy Muggli: Would Senator Wells take a question?

Senator D. M. Wells: I will take a question.

Senator Muggli: Thank you. Senator Wells, I wanted to ask you about why you think it may not be practical to use a labelling process. I ask that because, number one, I was on the Standing Senate Committee on Social Affairs, Science and Technology that heard from witnesses. We tried extremely hard to get witnesses in the industry. They just didn't seem to be interested.

I will give you an example of a distillery in Saskatchewan. Lucky Bastard Distillers, a Saskatoon-based craft distillery, made Canadian industry history by becoming the first distillery to voluntarily include Canada's low-risk drinking guidelines and standard drink counts on their product labels.

I know the owners very well. I asked them how they decided to put labels on their products. They said, “Well, it was a no-brainer. Why would you not want to inform consumers, even though some people might think it impacts the industry?”

It certainly has not affected theirs. I'm curious if you can explain a little bit more about why you think it's not practical.

Senator D. M. Wells: Thank you, Senator Muggli. I'm not suggesting it's not practical for a distillery to make a choice, whether that's a health, business or community-minded choice. I'm not at all saying that. Essentially, yes, it's a Canadian labelling requirement, but we're reaching out to the world and saying, “Anything coming into Canada needs this unique label.”

In fact, we just had a discussion half an hour ago, when I was speaking on Bill S-4, about Canada jumping out of some of the more positive requirements in the North American appliance sector and saying, “No, we are going to be separate from that.” I talked about the risks associated with that, and we heard that from witnesses at committee. We’re talking about the same thing or an equivalent thing here. Canada will be, I believe, unique in the world to not do this.

I recognize that an individual decision by an individual company is a good thing if they think that’s a good thing. They are an individual business that chooses to do that.

For those who know me, I think less government in society is generally better. Freedom of the individual and freedom of business, not to run amok but to do things that are responsible for their businesses, are, in general, better. In this case, the business made a decision that they wish to do that, and I applaud them for being able to do that.

Senator McPhedran: Senator Wells, do you know what a Group 1 carcinogen is? Secondly, do you know that alcohol has been designated as a Group 1 carcinogen in Canada since 1988?

Senator D. M. Wells: I know in general what a Group 1 carcinogen is. I know that alcohol has been included in that category. I didn’t realize the year, but I accept that.

(On motion of Senator Wilson, debate adjourned.)

ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE PROMOTION PROHIBITION BILL

SECOND READING—DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Brazeau, seconded by the Honourable Senator Sorensen, for the second reading of Bill S-203, An Act to prohibit the promotion of alcoholic beverages.

Hon. Yonah Martin (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, with leave, I would like to take adjournment for the balance of my time.

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

(Debate adjourned.)

BUSINESS OF THE SENATE

The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore: Honourable senators, I would like to remind you to please put your electronic devices on silent and not on vibrate and to please place them away from microphones. Thank you for your cooperation.

CRIMINAL CODE

BILL TO AMEND—SECOND READING—DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Pate, seconded by the Honourable Senator Moncion, for the second reading of Bill S-208, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (independence of the judiciary).

Hon. Yonah Martin (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I note that this item is at day 15, so I move the adjournment for the balance of my time.

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

(On motion of Senator Martin, debate adjourned.)

BILL TO AMEND THE CANADIAN VICTIMS BILL OF RIGHTS AND TO ESTABLISH A FRAMEWORK FOR IMPLEMENTING THE RIGHTS OF VICTIMS OF CRIME

SECOND READING—DEBATE ADJOURNED

Hon. Leo Housakos (Leader of the Opposition) moved second reading of Bill S-236, An Act to amend the Canadian Victims Bill of Rights and to establish a framework for implementing the rights of victims of crime.

(On motion of Senator Housakos, debate adjourned.)

NATIONAL DIFFUSE INTRINSIC PONTINE GLIOMA AWARENESS DAY BILL

SECOND READING

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Martin, seconded by the Honourable Senator Housakos, for the second reading of Bill S-244, An Act respecting National Diffuse Intrinsic Pontine Glioma Awareness Day.

Hon. Rosemary Moodie: Honourable senators, I rise today to speak as the critic on this important bill, Bill S-244, An Act respecting National Diffuse Intrinsic Pontine Glioma Awareness Day.

First, I would like to thank Senator Martin for her dedication in raising awareness of diffuse intrinsic pontine glioma.

Bill S-244 will designate May 17 each and every year as national diffuse intrinsic pontine glioma awareness day. Diffuse intrinsic pontine glioma is a particularly aggressive form of brain cancer, which primarily affects children around the ages of 5 to

10, but it can also affect adults. I have dedicated my career to and have focused on supporting children's health and well-being. I have seen first-hand what this disease does to families and how devastating it can be on the life of a child.

• (1620)

As legislators, we have the responsibility to do all that we can to end the suffering of children and to improve their health outcomes. Raising awareness is the first step in achieving better outcomes, and this bill does exactly that.

Cancer remains one of the most common killers in our society. According to a recent paper published by the *Canadian Medical Association Journal*, Canada will face more than 254,000 projected new cancer cases, with close to 88,000 deaths in 2026 alone. Virtually everyone has been touched by the disease, as roughly two in five Canadians will develop cancer in their lifetime, while one in four will ultimately succumb to it.

Cancer affects not only its victims but those around them, who often need to care for their loved ones and watch them deteriorate slowly and die.

However, it's important to remember that not all cancers are created equal. Some cancers are easily treatable and even removable, while some, like diffuse midline glioma, are particularly harsh for the victims and for their families.

While it is incredibly important that progress move forward at a constant pace on the worst cancers affecting people in our society, sadly, that has not been the case for this terrible disease.

As my colleague noted and the bill states, this cancer attacks the brain stem of the victim, impairing their vital motor functions, including important actions such as swallowing, chewing and speaking. It does all this while leaving the victim's cognitive functions more or less intact, leaving them conscious and aware — a prisoner in their own body.

It is hard to get treatment for diffuse midline glioma. Access to qualified professionals is limited, as is the case in other areas of our health-care system. What makes diffuse midline glioma uniquely dangerous is the lack of research and development for new and improved therapies. The terrible truth is that victims today have essentially the same treatment options as their counterparts up to 40 years ago.

Diffuse midline glioma is typically treated with a round of radiation therapy, which — while it helps to alleviate symptoms in the short run — almost invariably results in the cancer's aggressive return within six to nine months later. This disease is no minor ailment, colleagues; it is one of the most serious things with which a patient can be diagnosed.

Although there have been evolving treatment options, including a recently accelerated approval by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, or FDA, of dordaviprone, the typical estimated survival post-diagnosis is a mere 9 to 15 months, and only 30% of patients are expected to live a full year. Less than 10% live for two years. At five years post-diagnosis, the survival rate is zero.

Remember, colleagues, that this disease primarily affects our children — children whose entire lives were laid out before them before being all but stolen by an incurable, fatal disease.

Honourable senators, this disease is putting our children through unspeakable horror before taking them from us far too young. An effective treatment is needed. It's long overdue. Funding for research is needed. Awareness is needed, and I believe this bill is a positive step in the right direction.

Across Canada, there are many families who share in this kind of grief. Senator Martin, in her speech, spoke the names of children who were deeply loved and are profoundly missed. These children are the ones who inspired this bill. I won't repeat them today, but we will think about them.

The only way we can stop this suffering will be by developing new, more effective treatments. This is where key organizations such as the Brain Canada Foundation come into play. Brain Canada serves as a national convenor of all the Canadian brain research community. This includes efforts to assess the different ways that brain diseases and disorders affect people at various stages of neurodevelopment and aging. Brain Canada's goal is to accelerate and support bold brain research so that its discoveries can improve brain health and benefit people in Canada and around the world.

We need to fund organizations such as Brain Canada and the many researchers in Canadian institutions and private research companies who are working to study brain diseases. This is where the federal government can step in. By investing in researchers, Canada can help the fight against diffuse midline glioblastoma and work towards making sure the disease is no longer a death sentence.

Recognizing May 17 as national diffuse intrinsic pontine glioma awareness day is important because it helps bring much-needed attention to a disease that remains under-recognized despite its severity. Increased awareness fuels research by drawing interest from the public, policy-makers and the scientific community, while greater visibility helps build momentum for change and encourages future investment in this area. It also plays a role in inspiring students and emerging researchers to pursue work in this field, strengthening the future of discovery and the future of care. Finally, formal recognition helps support and expand fundraising efforts, which are essential to advancing research and improving outcomes for those affected.

This is why I would encourage us to support this bill — because making May 17 the national diffuse midline glioma awareness day is a positive step in recognizing the collective effort that is needed to defeat this disease.

I would like to thank my colleague Senator Martin once again for reintroducing this bill. When we vote on Bill S-244, I encourage you to support this bill as well. We must remain committed to advancing this work. It is my sincere hope that the government will take this bill as a starting point from which to launch concrete, effective action with adequate funds attached.

Thank you. *Meegwetch*.

Hon. Hassan Yussuff: Would my colleague please take a question? [Translation]

Senator Moodie: I would.

Senator Yussuff: First, thank you for your leadership on children's health. I think, for all of us, we are aware of your career and how much of your life you have dedicated to this responsibility.

As a parent, I can't begin to imagine when a parent discovers their child is struggling with this disease. Given what we know of the outcome, it cannot be something that any one of us would struggle with in a way without being devastated.

Given that the bill is to raise awareness and to, of course, challenge the government to do better in terms of research funding and to increase the education that is required, I was wondering, Senator Moodie, if you would have any understanding of what the data is or how many children in our country struggle with this disease on an annual basis.

Senator Moodie: I don't have the exact number right now, Senator Yussuff. I know that the numbers are very small. Yes, it does affect a few children, but to be told when you get this diagnosis to go away and make good memories as the primary response does not feel like we're providing families with a good alternative to facing what is a terrible disease and an end to this child's life, inevitably.

While I don't know the exact numbers, I wouldn't want to venture a guess because I'm on the record. I would have to say that the numbers are small, but, in fact, the prognosis has not changed in over 40 years. Go away and make good memories is what we tell our families.

• (1630)

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

Hon. Senators: Question.

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to and bill read second time.)

REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

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

(On motion of Senator Martin, bill referred to the Standing Senate Committee on Social Affairs, Science and Technology.)

LIVING DONOR RECOGNITION MEDAL BILL

SECOND READING

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Wells (*Newfoundland and Labrador*), seconded by the Honourable Senator MacDonald, for the second reading of Bill C-234, An Act respecting the establishment and award of a Living Donor Recognition Medal.

Hon. Victor Boudreau: Honourable senators, I am pleased to rise today as critic to provide some constructive criticism on Bill C-234.

Like many of you, I am personally affected by this issue. Thanks to the selfless generosity of living donors, two of my close friends are still with us today. They are among the lucky few who have received life-saving transplants.

In 1998, one of those friends received a bone marrow transplant from his brother. In 2019, the other received a stem cell transplant from someone he had never met before.

I worked for the Government of New Brunswick for many years, and I have always been proud of the work that New Brunswick does to promote organ donation.

Regardless of their political affiliation, successive governments for our province have taken significant action to encourage people to make this essential sacrifice.

Along with Nova Scotia, New Brunswick is one of two Canadian provinces to have introduced a deemed consent program for post-mortem organ donation. That means that adults are automatically considered donors after their death, unless they have actively completed a form to opt out. I mention that to highlight the broad consensus that exists across the political spectrum on issues such as this. New Brunswick and Nova Scotia have succeeded in advancing these policies because politicians set aside their differences and worked for the common good.

The recent passage of Bill C-234 by the House of Commons is another illustration of this broad consensus. As the bill's sponsor pointed out in his speech, members of all parties were eager to rally around this initiative.

[English]

Of course, with this bill, we aren't talking about posthumous donations. We are talking about something even more remarkable. This bill seeks to provide recognition — some would argue long-overdue recognition — for living donors.

Before I continue, I would like to take a moment to salute the original sponsor of this bill in the other place, MP Ziad Aboutaif, who is himself a living donor. On December 8, 2003, he donated part of his liver to save the life of his son Tyler.

In his speech, Mr. Aboutaif was quick to point out that he is not alone. He said:

Across Canada, there are hundreds of people alive today because someone bravely, generously and selflessly gave a part of their body to another person to save their life.

He went on to say, “Living donors exemplify the highest ideals of selflessness, yet Canada lacks a formal system to celebrate their contributions.”

Bill C-234 will recognize these remarkable individuals through the creation of the living donor recognition medal.

Like many of you, I am sure, I was pleased to see that the scope of the bill was broadened through amendments at the committee level. What began as a bill designed to honour living organ donors was expanded to include all living donors, including those who donate stem cells and those who have demonstrated a particularly exceptional lifelong commitment to giving blood.

I understand that the bill’s sponsor happily accepted these changes.

There are many reasons to support this bill. Anything we can do to further encourage living donors is time and money well spent.

There are currently approximately 4,700 people in Canada waiting for transplants. Three quarters of those people are waiting for a kidney. They could all be helped through living donors.

As many of you already know, living donations are far more successful than posthumous ones. Proper matches are easier to find through living donations, and being able to schedule procedures ahead of time leads to much better health outcomes. From a medical perspective, a posthumous donation is an option of last resort.

Beyond better health outcomes, living donations have other benefits. Imagine being on a wait-list for a posthumous donation and being told that you can never be more than an hour away from your local hospital. Potential recipients often exist in a state of limbo like this for years. Meanwhile, their health continues to deteriorate. They feel terrible. In many cases, they can no longer work, and they are less present than they would like to be for their families.

Living donation unshackles people from a lifestyle that most of us cannot even imagine.

[*Translation*]

Based on my experience as a provincial health minister, I can tell you that it is rare that doing the right thing results in savings. However, organ donations from living donors are a perfect

[Senator Boudreau]

example of that. The numbers don’t lie. The annual cost of dialysis treatment is about \$100,000, while the cost of a transplant is \$70,000. Encouraging organ donations from living donors is not only a compassionate act but also a wise decision.

I firmly believe that this bill and the recognition it establishes will help raise public awareness and spark a debate on living organ donation. It will also encourage more people to take an interest in organ donation and the incredible impact it can have. I firmly believe that this initiative will help save more lives.

If this bill is passed, then Canada will become the second country in the world to include living donors in its national honours system. By honouring living donors, Canada can set an example, emphasize the importance of living organ donation and pay tribute to those who offer the gift of life.

I hope you will join me in supporting this very worthy initiative.

Thank you. *Meegwetch*.

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to and bill read second time.)

REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

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

(On motion of Senator Wells (*Newfoundland and Labrador*), bill referred to the Standing Senate Committee on Human Rights.)

[*English*]

STUDY ON HOUSING CRISIS AND CHALLENGES CURRENTLY FACING HOME BUYERS

SECOND REPORT OF BANKING, COMMERCE AND
THE ECONOMY COMMITTEE ADOPTED

The Senate proceeded to consideration of the second report of the Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Commerce and the Economy, entitled *Out of Reach: Unlocking Canada’s housing affordability crisis*, tabled in the Senate on February 3, 2026.

Hon. Toni Varone moved the adoption of the report.

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to and report adopted.)

• (1640)

[Translation]

STUDY ON PRACTICE OF INCLUDING NON-FINANCIAL MATTERS IN BILLS IMPLEMENTING PROVISIONS OF BUDGETS AND ECONOMIC STATEMENTS

FIFTH REPORT OF NATIONAL FINANCE COMMITTEE— DEBATE ADJOURNED

The Senate proceeded to consideration of the fifth report of the Standing Senate Committee on National Finance, entitled *Omnibus Budget Bills: A growing problem*, tabled in the Senate on March 24, 2026.

Hon. Éric Forest moved the adoption of the report.

(On motion of Senator Papatello, debate adjourned.)

STUDY ON FEDERAL PROGRAMS AND INITIATIVES TO SUPPORT THE CREATION OF HOUSING

SEVENTH REPORT OF NATIONAL FINANCE COMMITTEE ADOPTED

The Senate proceeded to consideration of the seventh report of the Standing Senate Committee on National Finance, entitled *Build Canada Homes: Proposals for Success and Accountability*, tabled in the Senate on March 26, 2026.

Hon. Éric Forest moved the adoption of the report.

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to and report adopted.)

[English]

AUDIT AND OVERSIGHT

TENTH REPORT OF COMMITTEE ADOPTED

The Senate proceeded to consideration of the tenth report (interim) of the Standing Committee on Audit and Oversight, entitled *Nomination of an External Member*, presented in the Senate on May 28, 2026.

Hon. Marty Klyne moved the adoption of the report.

The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore: It is moved by the Honourable Senator Klyne, seconded by the Honourable Senator White, that this report be adopted. Are honourable senators ready for the question?

Hon. Senators: Question.

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to and report adopted.)

[Translation]

INDIGENOUS PEOPLES

BUDGET—STUDY ON VOICES OF YOUTH INDIGENOUS LEADERS EVENTS—SIXTH REPORT OF COMMITTEE ADOPTED

The Senate proceeded to consideration of the sixth report of the Standing Senate Committee on Indigenous Peoples (*Budget—examine and report on the Voices of Youth Indigenous Leaders events—power to hire staff*), presented in the Senate on May 28, 2026.

Hon. Michèle Audette moved the adoption of the report.

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to and report adopted.)

[English]

THE SENATE

MOTION PERTAINING TO THE SITUATION IN GAZA— DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

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

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

Hon. Leo Housakos (Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, I rise very briefly today on Motion No. 13. Let me begin by saying this: Senators may hold very different views on the conflict in the Middle East. They may disagree strongly about the actions of the government of Israel, the actions of Hamas, the conduct of the war in Gaza or the role Canada should play internationally. Those are serious matters, and they deserve serious debate.

But that is not what concerns me most about this motion. What concerns me is the way our colleague Senator Woo appears to be using the floor of this chamber and the prestige of this institution, not merely to hold foreign actors to account but to embarrass Canada.

The motion asks the Senate to call on the Government of Canada to examine the risk that Canada and Canadians are complicit in violations of international humanitarian law, including war crimes, crimes against humanity and genocide.

That is an extraordinary allegation to place before this chamber. It is not a mere procedural matter, nor a debate in terms of where you stand on a very existential international crisis. It is not simply even a call for reflection. It is a motion that lends the Senate's voice to the suggestion that Canada may be complicit in some of the gravest crimes known to international law.

This is why I find it so troubling that Senator Woo has also given credence to what I can only describe as a kangaroo court: the so-called Palestine Tribunal on Canadian Responsibility. This was not a court of law. It was not a neutral judicial body. It was not an institution with the authority, the balance or the procedural safeguards required to make findings against Canada or Canadians. Yet it was presented as though it had some moral or quasi-legal authority to put this country in the dock.

Honourable senators, this is not serious accountability. It is just political theatre. It is not even troubling when such an exercise is associated with this very institution, the Senate of Canada. This chamber should not be used to legitimize one-sided proceedings that begin with the conclusion that Canada is guilty and then work backwards from there.

We are legislators, we are parliamentarians and, I underline, we are appointed parliamentarians. We are not here to lend institutional credibility to show trials. Canada is not perfect — by no means. No country is. Governments can and should be questioned on foreign policy, arms exports, humanitarian aid, diplomatic decisions and compliance with international obligations — that is all fair game. That is even our job. But I underline as well that we are an appointed body.

When it comes to many of these international issues, the final word stands with the House of Commons. They have the moral authority — which we do not have — as an elected chamber to have the final word on all these issues.

We have the right to question. We have the right to hold to account, but we have to be very diligent when we assert ourselves on the world stage to declare something of this nature.

But there is a difference, honourable colleagues, between holding the government accountable and dragging Canada's reputation through the mud. There is a difference between serious scrutiny and performative condemnation. There is a difference between debating policy and using the Senate to amplify accusations that Canada is complicit in genocide. Whatever one's views on Israel and Palestine, I do not believe this chamber should be used as a platform to dump on Canada. We should be careful with our words. We should be careful with the moral authority of this institution. And we should be especially careful before associating the Senate with tribunals or proceedings that lack the impartiality and the legitimacy that we would expect from any body making such grave accusations against our country.

Honourable colleagues, Canada has a long history of being respected around the world as a fighter for human rights and as a peacekeeper. I like to think there is no other country like us in the world. We have also had a long-standing tradition in probably one of the bloodiest and most difficult conflicts that we have seen for centuries going on in the Middle East, and Canada has always taken a temperate approach.

It's a two-state solution on that very important issue — I don't always agree with that position, certainly not with the current government, which went as far as to recognize the Palestinian state, and not with my own previous Conservative government, which stood steadfastly on a two-state solution. This, again, merits other debates at another time.

But for all the reasons I have highlighted here, honourable colleagues, I think it would be completely delinquent on the part of this institution to support such a motion that goes as far as discrediting our country from the position of the Senate of Canada. For those reasons, honourable colleagues, I cannot support this motion.

The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore: Senator Woo, would you like to ask a question?

Hon. Yuen Pau Woo: I would if Senator Housakos would take a question.

The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore: Senator Housakos, would you answer a question?

Senator Housakos: Sure, yes.

Senator Woo: I thank you for your intervention. We actually agree on more than you might assume. It is precisely because Canada has a history of being a peacemaker, an upholder of human rights and a defender of the international rules-based system that we need to ask ourselves each time if we are, in fact, acting in a consistent way and in a way that is true to those principles.

You make the assertion that this motion condemns Canada and accuses Canada of complicity. I ask you to point to me — and to all honourable senators — which part of the motion says that.

Senator Housakos: Senator Woo, your motion is as clear as can be. On a number of occasions — even in this chamber during Question Period — you have used those very terms in questioning the government leader. So there is nothing about Canada's complacency and compliance in dealing with and supporting this genocide. These are words you have used right here on the floor of the Senate on a number of occasions.

• (1650)

Senator Woo, as I have said, I have taken a clear, transparent position on why I don't support the motion. However, you have been waiting for a number of months to call the question, and I think you have had, on a number of occasions, the opportunity to provide a more lengthy debate than I have on this issue. So why we don't we allow our colleagues to make a decision on this motion and let the chips fall where they may? I don't have a problem calling the question if you don't.

Senator Woo: I am glad you are willing to have the question called. You haven't, of course, answered my question by pointing to where the motion declares that Canada is complicit. In fact, I invite all colleagues now to take a look at the motion, which asks the Canadian government to examine the risk of complicity in light of international findings that there have been serious violations of international humanitarian law. These are international findings, not my findings. They are the findings of the UN, the International Court of Justice and the International Criminal Court. So let me ask you this again, Senator Housakos: Can you point to the place in the motion where I condemn Canada for being complicit, as you have accused?

Senator Housakos: Senator Woo, I will encourage colleagues to take the time, because we will give adequate time to colleagues. We are not going to do a vote now or in 15 minutes; we will give colleagues 30 minutes to read the entirety of your motion. It is in black and white, and they will come to their own judgments. I therefore call the question.

The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore: Some senators want to ask questions. I have Senator McPhedran and Senator Fridhandler. Senator McPhedran, would you like to ask a question?

Hon. Marilou McPhedran: I would.

Senator Housakos: I will exercise my right to deny taking any more questions.

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

Some Hon. Senators: No.

Some Hon. Senators: Yes.

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

Some Hon. Senators: Yea.

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

Some Hon. Senators: Nay.

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

And two honourable senators having risen:

The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore: Do we have an agreement on the length of the bell?

Some Hon. Senators: Thirty minutes.

The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore: We have agreement on 30 minutes. Is leave granted?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore: Leave is granted. The vote will occur at 5:22 p.m.

Call in the senators.

• (1720)

Motion negated on the following division:

YEAS
THE HONOURABLE SENATORS

Al Zaibak	McPhedran
Audette	Muggli
Clement	Oudar
Coyle	Pate
Dean	Petitclerc
Gerba	Woo—12

NAYS
THE HONOURABLE SENATORS

Anderson	MacDonald
Arnold	Manning
Batters	Martin
Black	McBean
Boudreau	McCallum
Busson	Mohamed
Cardozo	Moreau
Dalphond	Osler
Deacon (<i>Nova Scotia</i>)	Petten
Deacon (<i>Ontario</i>)	Poirier
Downe	Pupatello
Duncan	Ringuette
Forest	Robinson
Francis	Ross
Fridhandler	Saint-Germain
Gignac	Sorensen
Harder	Surette

Housakos	Varone
Klyne	Wallin
LaBoucane-Benson	Wells (<i>Newfoundland and Labrador</i>)
Lewis	White
Loffreda	Yussuff—45
MacAdam	

ABSTENTIONS
THE HONOURABLE SENATORS

Hébert	Youance—3
Karetak-Lindell	

NATION-BUILDING VALUE OF TOURISM

INQUIRY—DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the inquiry of the Honourable Senator Sorensen, calling the attention of the Senate to the nation-building value of tourism in Canada.

Hon. Bernadette Clement: Honourable senators, I rise today to speak to the inquiry opened by my friend and sibling in the Senate Senator Sorensen, who has spoken so powerfully about the nation-building value of tourism.

When I tell people I'm from Cornwall, I often hear, "Oh yes, I've driven past that on my way to Montreal or Toronto." I heard it again last night at a reception.

Or I'll hear, "Isn't that the city that smells terrible?"

Let me set the record straight, here and now. When you're on Highway 401, you have three opportunities to take the off-ramp to my home city. Take that opportunity, especially in the summer, and you'll discover that the paper mill is closed. We mourned the loss of that paper mill — we still do — but the smell is gone.

You may be thinking: Is this speech just an ad for tourism in Akwesasne, Cornwall and the United Counties of Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry? Yes and no.

My thesis — and it is a thesis — will be illustrated by examples from these beloved areas, just in time for you to consider a stop this summer.

• (1730)

What I'll argue is this: If you are looking for hope and optimism during difficult times, if you are seeking connection and community or if you want a reminder of the best that Canada can be, there is no better way to find it than through local tourism.

Take Upper Canada Village as an example. It's a reminder of our past and how nation building forever altered our local landscape with the building of the St. Lawrence Seaway. Upper Canada Village is a beloved place, made even more welcoming and inclusive after author Keisha Cuffie told its stories from a Black perspective. They will celebrate Emancipation Day on August 1, and you're invited. We all need more connection to our history, and this is an exceptional place to start.

While you're in the area, take in the Glengarry Highland Games, where a community of fewer than 1,000 welcomes tens of thousands of visitors. Scotland doesn't seem so far away when you're surrounded by hundreds of bagpipes and kilts in Maxville, Ontario, or — as Senator Coyle told us in her speech to this inquiry — in Antigonish, Nova Scotia. Over 75 years after the first games, this event is a source of immense pride for locals. Honourable senators, you're invited. You don't need to be Scottish to appreciate these games.

The Akwesasne Powwow takes place every September on the weekend after Labour Day. Honourable colleagues, you are all invited to attend. The best dancers, drummers and artisans of the region gather there to compete and connect. Try some strawberry juice, shop for gorgeous beaded earrings and engage in reconciliACTION through education, connection and celebration.

[*Translation*]

In September, the town is transformed once again for Franco-Ontarian Day. Students from La Citadelle and L'Héritage proudly display their Franco-Ontarian identity by parading through the town dressed in green and white to the sound of the songs *Notre place* and *Mon beau drapeau*. Cornwall's francophone community thrives every day, but it is most visible and most celebrated on September 25.

[*English*]

And Cornwall loves a celebration, by the way: Pride, Culture Fest, Cornwall's Night Market, Festival International Afro & Diversités de Cornwall SDG, Fiesta Filipino, Devfest, Cornwall Art Walk and many county fairs.

The village, the games, the powwow, the festivals and the marches exist because hundreds of people commit their time, skills and energy to projects bigger than themselves.

The same goes for eastern Ontario's agri-tourism: strawberry, blueberry and apple picking, lavender fields, sugar shacks, sunflower farms, alpacas, skating trails and a pizza farm — yes, a pizza farm! Fraser Creek grows as many ingredients as they can for their pizzas, and the rest is sourced locally. Cornwall pizza is some of the best in Ontario. I have so many Cornwall pizza T-shirts, folks, from when I was mayor of Cornwall. I take them out on the weekends. Our pizza is second to none.

Farmers in eastern Ontario grow more than corn and they produce more than milk. They offer a connection to the land and to the people who keep us fed and nourished.

[Translation]

People come from far and wide to fish on the St. Lawrence River, which gives them an opportunity to reconnect with a living history. This waterway has fed Indigenous communities for countless generations and continues to do so. Well before the construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway, the St. Lawrence River served as a major trade route that supported agriculture, travel and many people's livelihoods.

We are very proud of the River Institute, a leader when it comes to governance, partnership and youth engagement. Many communities along the St. Lawrence River that rely on the waterway, such as Cornwall, have appointed themselves as guardians of the river.

Our first-rate green space, Lamoureux Park, connects us to the waterway. The bike path there not only connects communities along the river but also attracts cyclists from across the region.

[English]

Our bike paths along the river are fabulous.

I was in Montreal in Mile End recently in a bookstore. To tell you the truth, it was a brand new romance bookstore. My arms were full of romance novels and, of course, at that moment, I was recognized as the former mayor of Cornwall. I was recognized because that city, this city, our city, my city is the most wonderful city for waterfront bike paths.

On the banks of the St. Lawrence River is the Port Lands — an idea and a partnership full of potential for connection and economic reconciliation. You've heard me speak of the Port Lands before. Co-owned by Akwesasne and Cornwall, its development could draw in more visitors and give us an opportunity to see and to live the possibilities of relationship building.

You can't get more nation building than a project that is connected to 50-50 ownership of riverfront land between a municipality and a First Nation. I'm not saying it's going to be easy. I'm just saying: Imagine what we're learning about economic reconciliation here. It makes us feel competent and unafraid of the challenge of full partnership.

More than ever, we need stories like these about partnerships that can tackle something big, set the tone for an entire region and say to both locals and visitors alike: You're welcome here.

Honourable senators, you're welcome in eastern Ontario, where you'll find examples of all that's good about this country.

Thank you. *Nia:wen.*

[Translation]

Hon. Éric Forest: After our colleague's highly enthusiastic comments and her invitation that we visit Cornwall, I'd like to thank Senator Sorensen for drawing the Senate's attention to the importance of the tourism industry in Canada's and Quebec's development.

I couldn't pass up this opportunity to speak, having spent the 1980s in this industry as head of the Office du tourisme et des congrès de Rimouski. In fact, in the late 1970s, I helped create regional tourism associations in the Gaspé and Lower St. Lawrence regions that were charged with promotion and marketing, tourist reception and information, and tourism development.

Senator Sorensen invited a Parks Canada official to the Senate today. In 1982, when I was the mayor of Pointe-au-Père, we signed the first partnership agreement with Parks Canada to operate and develop the Pointe-au-Père lighthouse. Local management of the marine historic site gave the green light to a number of community and tourism industry initiatives, such as the opening of the Empress of Ireland museum and public access to the *Onondaga* military submarine.

As mayor of Rimouski, I also had the opportunity to support this industry by helping to strengthen our visitor facilities and tourist attractions, ensuring that Rimouski and the Lower St. Lawrence region become more enticing, and helping to develop our brand image, which focuses on promoting maritime Quebec.

Canada is renowned worldwide for the vastness of its landscapes, the richness of its biodiversity, the vitality of its cities and the depth of its cultures, particularly those of First Nations, Inuit and Métis peoples. Tourism helps showcase these assets while generating tangible and measurable economic benefits for our communities.

Economically speaking, the tourism industry acts as a powerful regional driver. Unlike other sectors concentrated in major urban centres, tourism is highly decentralized. It benefits small municipalities, villages, northern regions and less densely populated areas. Every visitor who stays in a region contributes to the local economy. They stay in local accommodations, eat in local restaurants, buy local products, visit local attractions and use local transportation services.

This spending creates local jobs — often ones that cannot be outsourced — in the hospitality, restaurant, recreation, cultural, agri-tourism and local retail sectors. They also support an entire chain of suppliers: agricultural producers, artisans, service companies, tour guides and seasonal workers. Thus, every dollar invested or spent on tourism generates a multiplier effect that benefits the entire community.

For example, in the Lower St. Lawrence tourism region, which stretches from La Pocatière to La Mitis, the tourism industry comprises 500 businesses and nearly 6,000 jobs, and draws 1.2 million visitors and economic benefits of \$438 million annually, which is quite significant for this region.

Tourism is one of Canada's fastest-growing sectors, contributing \$50.8 billion to Canada's gross domestic product, or 1.8% of total GDP. The tourism sector supports more than 265,000 businesses in 5,000 communities across the country. One in ten workers in Canada is supported by the tourism industry.

Tourism also plays a crucial role in regional economic diversification. In many communities, particularly those historically dependent on natural resources, tourism offers a sustainable and resilient alternative. It helps stabilize the local economy, reduce dependence on a single sector and attract new investment.

• (1740)

For many municipalities, tourism is a strategic lever for maintaining local services, funding infrastructure and retaining young talent.

However, the importance of tourism can't be measured solely in economic terms. Its cultural and social impacts are just as essential. Tourism is a powerful tool for showcasing our heritage, whether historical, natural or intangible. It encourages the conservation of heritage sites, iconic landscapes, local traditions and traditional knowledge.

In many regions, festivals, cultural events and artistic initiatives largely owe their existence to tourism. These activities strengthen a sense of belonging, foster intergenerational transmission and contribute to the cultural vitality of communities. When this happens, tourism becomes a catalyst for creativity and for identity expression.

It is also a potent tool for intercultural dialogue. By welcoming visitors, we open a window into our way of life, our values and our history. It also offers an opportunity to learn from others, broaden our outlook and cultivate mutual understanding.

In a world marked by division, tourism can play a subtle but vital role in building bridges between peoples.

For Indigenous communities, tourism represents a unique opportunity to share their cultures, their stories and their understanding of the land through an approach rooted in respect, self-determination and reconciliation. When properly managed and led by the communities themselves, Indigenous tourism contributes to economic self-sufficiency while promoting greater recognition of their fundamental contribution to Canadian identity.

However, we must remember that tourism development must be carried out in a responsible and sustainable manner. Protecting the environment, managing visitor flow, respecting local communities and addressing job insecurity are key issues. Well-planned tourism can support the green transition by promoting local and nature-based tourism, public transport and eco-friendly practices.

I wanted to highlight a fine example of collaboration in the Lower St. Lawrence, where various organizations and government departments have joined forces with the Wolastoqiyik Wahsipekuk Nation, formerly the Maliseet of Viger First Nation, to build a land-based marine mammal observation site in Gros-Cacouna.

[Senator Forest]

[English]

This is the perfect example of what we are looking for when we talk about sustainable tourism: a flagship tourist attraction that showcases our identity and our diverse cultures, while promoting conservation, science and public education.

[Translation]

Investing in tourism is not simply about promoting a destination. It is about investing in our regions, our culture, our local economies and our collective ability to build vibrant, inclusive and resilient communities. It is about recognizing that every village, every region and every territory has a story to tell and value to offer.

Canada has everything it needs to be a world-class destination, including exceptional landscapes, a unique cultural richness, two official languages, exceptional cuisine and a diverse population, which is our greatest strength.

However, international competition is fierce, and the challenges are very real. Labour shortages, rising costs, the vulnerability of seasonal businesses, regional accessibility and climate change all pose significant challenges.

Senator Sorensen's inquiry is a great opportunity to call on the federal government to take action to strengthen the tourism industry.

Allow me to highlight a few issues that I believe are important. First and foremost, we must ensure that the regions are accessible. Regional tourism cannot exist without suitable and accessible transport. We must support the maintenance and restoration of regional air links, support our local airports and reduce the costs that are hindering access to our regions.

As for the workforce, no tourism strategy can succeed without dedicated staff. Qualified, trained and competent staff ensure a warm welcome, efficient management of operations and the ability to adapt to unforeseen circumstances.

In times of heightened international competition, service quality is becoming a decisive and inescapable strategic advantage. Visitors now compare their experiences in Canada to experiences elsewhere in the world, and demand a high standard of hospitality, safety and professionalism.

Investing in training, promoting tourism careers and retaining talent are therefore top priorities. With a focus on skills, we can ensure the sustainability, competitiveness and lasting growth of our tourism industry.

Most of our tourism businesses are SMEs. They are resilient and creative, but vulnerable. The stricter entry conditions for foreign workers has taken a toll on these businesses. We understand the need to more effectively calibrate admission and integration capacity, but we must avoid absolute measures and consider the realities in each of our regions.

We also need to support training and skills recognition, and help the regions find concrete solutions, especially to the seasonal housing issue. Working in tourism has to become a viable, valued and lasting choice once again.

We need to keep in mind that when a tourism business closes because of a worker shortage, it's not just a door that closes; it's a village that gradually grows poorer.

Canada has to get better at telling the world its story. We have to keep supporting Destination Canada, investing in targeted campaigns and promoting the things that make us stand out: our culture, our regions, our Indigenous communities and our diversity.

After seeing what is happening in the United States, many Canadians and international tourists are looking for destinations that are more stable, more predictable and safer. We must seize this important opportunity. Canada must capitalize on this strength.

In closing, the tourism industry is much more than just another economic sector. It reflects who we are and what we want to share with the world. By supporting tourism, we are supporting local jobs, regional vitality, cultural diversity and community pride. We are investing in an open and welcoming Canada that is deeply rooted in its regions.

While it is not a miracle sector, tourism has the great advantage of bringing consumers to us, unlike other sectors that rely on the export of our raw materials, such as many of our natural resource sectors. Visitors spend money here on accommodations, food, entertainment and transportation. They eat at our restaurants, stay at our hotels, visit our cultural attractions and shop at our local businesses, thereby injecting large amounts of fresh capital into our local economy.

[English]

I, therefore, urge you to continue to recognize, support and promote the tourism industry as an essential pillar of our economic, social and cultural future. Thank you. *Meegwetch*.

(On motion of Senator White, debate adjourned.)

• (1750)

[Translation]

THE SENATE

MOTION TO RECOGNIZE MAY 25 OF EACH YEAR AS WORLD AFRICA DAY ADOPTED

Hon. Amina Gerba, pursuant to notice of May 26, 2026, moved:

That the Senate of Canada:

- officially recognize May 25 as World Africa Day in Canada, to mark:

- the importance of relations between Canada and African countries;
- the essential contribution of African and Afro-descendant communities to Canadian society; and
- the shared values of solidarity, diversity, peace and international cooperation; and

- encourage the Government of Canada and public institutions to recognize this day each year; and

That this recognition be a first step toward officially incorporating this day into the calendar of national days recognized by the Government of Canada.

She said: Honourable senators, I rise today to move a motion to recognize May 25 as World Africa Day in Canada.

This motion is simple in form but significant in scope. It calls on us to recognize the contribution of a continent that is playing an increasingly significant role in today's world. It also calls on us to recognize the millions of Canadians of African descent who contribute to our country's prosperity, diversity and vitality every day.

This motion comes at a particularly important time. In 2025, Canada adopted its very first Africa Strategy, signalling its commitment to building strong, long-lasting ties with a continent whose importance on the global stage is growing.

Recognizing World Africa Day today means moving from intention to action. It means giving a human face to this ambition. It asserts that the relationship between Canada and Africa is based first and foremost on the people, the communities and that ties that already unite us.

[English]

Honourable colleagues, recognizing Africa Day would be a meaningful way to reinforce that vision. It would show that Canada's relationship with Africa is not only about diplomacy, trade and development but also people, mutual respect and building a shared future.

[Translation]

May 25 commemorates the 1963 creation of the Organisation of African Unity, now the African Union. The date symbolizes the unity, solidarity and determination of the African peoples to build their shared future.

For 63 years now, this day has been celebrated around the world to showcase the richness of African cultures, the diversity of African peoples and the remarkable contributions of African diasporas.

It is a day of special significance in Canada because Africa is not merely one of Canada's partners. It is now an integral part of our social fabric. More than 1.4 million Canadians are from Africa or trace their roots to Africa. Through their work, their engagement and their leadership, they contribute to our society's vitality every day. They participate in every sector: our universities, our hospitals, our businesses, our public institutions, our laboratories, our community organizations and our cultural communities. They help to drive our economy forward, enrich our democracy and strengthen the diversity that is one of Canada's greatest assets.

Recognizing World Africa Day means fully acknowledging this contribution.

[English]

Recognizing Africa Day also means acknowledging the important role of Canadians of African origin and Afro-Canadians. It means honouring generations whose dedication, resilience and leadership have helped build a stronger Canada.

[Translation]

This recognition is also future-oriented. Africa is now one of the most dynamic parts of the world. Its population is young, its creativity is extraordinary and its influence is growing. By 2050, one-quarter of the world's population will be African. That's a wake-up call. Africa is not only part of our shared history; it's also an essential part of our shared future.

Recognizing World Africa Day is also an important opportunity for education and awareness.

Every year, World Africa Day can help people learn about the history of the African continent, its great civilizations, its cultural and linguistic diversity and the remarkable contributions of African-Canadians.

All too often, Africa is still portrayed through incomplete narratives despite being the cradle of humanity and a continent with a track record of innovation, knowledge and creativity. Recognizing this day would help enhance mutual understanding and dialogue among the communities that make up Canada.

Our Parliament already recognizes a number of commemorative months and days that reflect the diversity of our society and enrich our collective memory.

The purpose of this motion is clear. It specifically calls on the Government of Canada to officially recognize May 25 as World Africa Day and to include it in the national calendar, along with other days already officially recognized. This is important because it reflects the reality of Canada today, because it highlights contributions that deserve greater recognition and because it offers a glimpse into a continent whose importance to our collective future will only grow.

Recognizing this day would be a simple but profound gesture.

[English]

But simple gestures can carry great meaning and convey recognition, respect, friendship and hope.

[Senator Gerba]

[Translation]

Honourable senators, by officially recognizing World Africa Day, Canada would send a clear message of openness, respect and appreciation to the African communities and communities of African descent that contribute to our country's prosperity. It would also send a strong message to a continent with which we wish to deepen our relationship.

I therefore urge you, colleagues, to support this motion so that Canada officially recognizes May 25 as World Africa Day and includes it in its national calendar. Thank you.

Hon. Manuelle Oudar: Honourable senators, I would first like to acknowledge my colleague Senator Gerba, who gave notice of this motion last Tuesday.

Senator Gerba, it is truly an honour for me to add my voice to yours and speak in support of the official recognition of May 25 as World Africa Day in Canada.

May 25, 1963, was a defining moment. Many leaders from across the African continent gathered in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, to establish the Organisation of African Unity, which has since become the African Union. That meeting was the culmination of a long struggle for independence and self-determination.

That decision, taken collectively by 32 heads of state, remains one of the most significant political acts of the 20th century.

[English]

This day has also taken on a global dimension that goes beyond its institutional origins. It has become an annual gathering.

• (1800)

Millions of people around the world come together to celebrate what unites them. This connection is expressed through family heritage, cultural ties or sincere appreciation of richness and diversity. More than 100 countries now observe it.

This growing awareness is also felt in Canada. From coast to coast, Canadians maintain family, cultural or personal connections with the African continent. These ties enrich Canada's social fabric and highlight values dear to us, such as solidarity and diversity.

Africa Day offers us a concrete opportunity to express this solidarity and demonstrate our commitment to it. It also highlights the living diversity that enriches our communities. The African continent brings together an extraordinary range of wisdom, knowledge and life paths. Behind this diversity are aspirations and values that bring us closer together and remind us of our shared humanity.

This day is also an opportunity to recognize the remarkable contributions of African and Afro-descendant communities to Canada's economic, cultural, scientific and social life.

[*Translation*]

This idea is especially important for our institutions. The Senate of Canada, in particular, has a mandate to represent our country's diverse —

The Hon. the Speaker: Senator Oudar, I would ask you to pause for a moment, please.

Could everyone please make sure that your cell phones, laptops and iPads are turned off? Thank you. You may continue.

Senator Oudar: I was saying that this idea is especially important for our institutions. The Senate of Canada, in particular, has a mandate to represent our country's diverse regions, communities, and experiences that shape our shared identity. The work of this institution invites us to contemplate that rich diversity and fosters a better understanding of the events that have shaped other parts of the world, events whose influence even now reverberates well beyond borders. Officially recognizing World Africa Day and adding it to Canada's calendar of national days is consistent with that mandate.

I am also thinking of the next generation, a generation that will inherit not only our history, but also the choices we make today. Affirming the importance of the ties between Canada and Africa is a gesture that can strengthen relationships destined to endure and evolve over time.

This recognition also reflects our daily efforts to maintain the vital foundations of our society: respect and a desire to work together in a hope-filled future.

Commemorative days matter. They create a space in which shared memory, recognition and dialogue can endure. They also validate many people's history and experiences as an integral part of Canada.

Honourable senators, Canada is built on a host of stories that meet, cross paths and leave their mark. Some go back generations. Others are still being written today. Together, they make up the country as we know it, a country still under construction. Naturally, May 25 has a place in this story. It reminds us that our history always gains more depth when we take the time to include all of the voices that shaped it. May 25 gives us an opportunity to recognize these legacies and the place they hold already in Canadian life.

Colleagues, *asante sana*, which means "thank you very much." *Meegwetch.*

[*English*]

Hon. Mohamed-Iqbal Ravalia: Honourable senators, I rise today as well in support of the motion introduced by Senator Gerba to have the Senate officially recognize May 25 as "World Africa Day in Canada."

It is a privilege to speak in favour of a colleague whose work reflects both conviction and generosity of spirit, who calls me her brother and whose commitment to strengthening Canada's relationship with Africa is both timely and deeply important.

From humble beginnings to a seat in this chamber, her story is reflective of her remarkable tenacity and drive. Senator Gerba has brought to this chamber not only knowledge but lived experience and a perspective that enriches our understanding of the continent.

When she speaks about Africa, she does so with clarity, pride and a sincere desire to build bridges. She reflects the aspirations of those of us from the continent who have chosen to call Canada home. That is evident in this motion, which invites us to approach Canada-Africa relations with a greater seriousness, deeper respect and a more forward-looking vision.

I also want to say how much I value the perspectives of our fellow colleagues from Africa, Senator Danièle Henkel and Senator Farah Mohamed, and what they bring to this chamber. Your contributions are meaningful, and your presence is a reminder that this institution is stronger when it reflects the richness of the communities and cultures that make up our country. You bring insight, experience and a perspective that broadens our work in very real ways.

It is interesting that the four of us who originate from the continent represent the north, east, west and south of this magnificent part of the world, covering all bases, so to speak.

I am also thankful for the friendship and initiative of our former colleague Mobina Jaffer. She was a founding member of the African Canadian Senate Group, or ACSG, and a very strong voice for the African-Canadian relationship. I am grateful for the work of the ACSG members, who continue to build ties with the diaspora and have a firm love for the continent. I believe this combination highlights Africa's rich demographic citizenry, which encompasses representation from a broad racial composition.

For many of us, the relationship between Canada and Africa is not just a matter of trade and policy. It is also a matter of people, of family histories, of community ties and of shared aspirations.

Across Canada, and in many of our own communities, we see the strength of the African diaspora in business, public service, education, the arts and civic life. Those contributions deserve recognition, and they remind us that this relationship already lives within our country. Our advocacy strengthens that bond.

Senator Gerba's motion also speaks to something practical and necessary. Africa is a continent of remarkable growth, innovation and demographic momentum. Canada must approach that reality cautiously and not from a distance. We should approach it with purpose, with respect and with the confidence that comes from seeking a genuine partnership, which has been absent for so long. That means building relationships that are mutually beneficial and grounded in building long-term trust.

At a time when the world often feels unsettled, I believe it is especially important to invest in partnerships that are principled and enduring. A stronger connection between Canada and Africa can serve our shared interests in peace, prosperity, education, trade and human development. It can also help Canada foster stability and promote democracy, which is so relevant in an ever-changing world.

Colleagues, I thank Senator Gerba for bringing forward this motion and for the leadership she continues to show in this chamber.

I am also grateful for the contributions of Senators Danièle Henkel, Farah Mohamed and our beloved Mobina Jaffer, and for all the examples they have set through their service.

• (1810)

It is for all these reasons that I support this motion with deep conviction and respect.

Thank you, *asante*.

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

Hon. Senators: Question.

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to.)

NATIONAL SECURITY, DEFENCE AND VETERANS AFFAIRS

COMMITTEE AUTHORIZED TO EXTEND DATE OF FINAL REPORT
ON STUDY OF DEFENCE PROCUREMENT IN CONTEXT OF
COMMITMENT TO INCREASE DEFENCE SPENDING

Hon. Marty Deacon, pursuant to notice of May 26, 2026, moved:

That, notwithstanding the order of the Senate adopted on Wednesday, October 29, 2025, the date for the final report of the Standing Senate Committee on National Security, Defence and Veterans Affairs in relation to its study on defence procurement in the context of Canada's commitment to increase defence spending be extended from June 18, 2026, to March 31, 2027.

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

Hon. Senators: Question.

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to.)

(At 6:12 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)

(June 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

(June 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.
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.
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-Dechéne	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
Rosemary Moodie	Ontario	Toronto, Ont.
Tony Loffreda	Shawinegan	Montreal, Que.

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
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 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

(June 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
Dalphon, 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

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
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
Sorensen, Karen	Alberta	Banff, Alta.	Progressive Senate Group
Surette, Allister	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, Josée, P.C.	Montarville	Saint-Augustin-de-Desmaures, Que.	Canadian Senators Group
Wallin, Pamela	Saskatchewan	Wadena, Sask.	Canadian Senators Group
Wells, David M.	Newfoundland and Labrador	St. John's, Nfld. & Lab.	Conservative Party of Canada
Wells, Kristopher	Alberta	St. Albert, Alta.	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

(June 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 PateOntario	Ottawa
4	Tony DeanOntario	Toronto
5	Lucie Moncion.....Ontario	North Bay
6	Robert BlackOntario	Centre Wellington
7	Marty DeaconWaterloo Region	Waterloo
8	Yvonne Boyer.....Ontario	Merrickville-Wolford
9	Donna DaskoOntario	Toronto
10	Peter M. BoehmOntario	Ottawa
11	Rosemary Moodie.....Ontario	Toronto
12	Hassan Yussuff.....Ontario	Toronto
13	Bernadette Clement.....Ontario	Cornwall
14	Sharon BureyOntario	Windsor
15	Andrew Cardozo.....Ontario	Ottawa
16	Rebecca Patterson.....Ontario	Ottawa
17	Marnie McBeanOntario	Toronto
18	Toni VaroneOntario	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
2	Leo Housakos	Wellington
3	Claude Carignan, P.C.	Mille Isles
4	Josée Verner, P.C.	Montarville
5	Chantal Petitclerc	Grandville
6	Éric Forest	Gulf
7	Raymonde Saint-Germain	De la Vallière
8	Rosa Galvez	Bedford
9	Pierre J. Dalfond	De Lorimier
10	Julie Miville-Dechéne	Inkerman
11	Tony Loffreda	Shawinegan
12	Amina Gerba	Rigaud
13	Clément Gignac	Kennebec
14	Michèle Audette	De Salaberry
15	Manuelle Oudar	La Salle
16	Pierre Moreau	The Laurentides
17	Suze Youance	Lauzon
18	Martine Hébert	Victoria
19	Danièle Henkel	Alma
20
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
4	Colin Deacon	Nova Scotia
5	Paul (PJ) Prosper.....	Nova Scotia
6	Réjean Aucoin.....	Nova Scotia
7	Rodger Cuzner	Nova Scotia
8	Allister Surette	Nova Scotia
9	Tony Ince	Nova Scotia
10

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 Fabian ManningNewfoundland and LabradorSt. Bride's
 - 2 David M. WellsNewfoundland and LabradorSt. John's
 - 3 Mohamed-Iqbal RavaliaNewfoundland and LabradorTwillingate
 - 4 Iris G. PettenNewfoundland and LabradorSt. John's
 - 5 Judy A. WhiteNewfoundland and LabradorSt. George's
 - 6
-

NORTHWEST TERRITORIES—1

Senator

Designation

Post Office Address

The Honourable

- 1 Dawn AndersonNorthwest TerritoriesYellowknife
-

NUNAVUT—1

Senator

Designation

Post Office Address

The Honourable

- 1 Nancy Karetak-LindellNunavutArviat
-

YUKON—1

Senator

Designation

Post Office Address

The Honourable

- 1 Pat DuncanYukonWhitehorse
-

CONTENTS

Tuesday, June 2, 2026

	PAGE		PAGE
Business of the Senate	2406	Wartime Service Recognition Bill (Bill S-246)	
<hr/>		Fifth Report of National Security, Defence and Veterans Affairs Committee Presented	
SENATORS' STATEMENTS		Hon. Marty Deacon	2410
The Honourable Fabian Manning		Criminal Code (Bill C-9)	
Hon. Mohamed-Iqbal Ravalia	2406	Bill to Amend—Third Report of Human Rights Committee Presented	
Canadian Photonics Fabrication Centre		Hon. Paulette Senior	2410
Hon. Colin Deacon	2406	Canada-Europe Parliamentary Association	
Visitors in the Gallery		Bilateral Mission, November 9-15, 2024—Report Tabled	
The Hon. the Speaker	2407	Hon. David M. Wells	2410
Ron Hallman		Meeting of the Standing Committee of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region, September 2-3, 2024—Report Tabled	
Congratulations on Retirement		Hon. David M. Wells	2410
Hon. Karen Sorensen	2407	Meeting of the Standing Committee of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region, September 22-24, 2025—Report Tabled	
Visitors in the Gallery		Hon. David M. Wells	2411
The Hon. the Speaker	2408	Meeting of the Standing Committee of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region and Arctic Frontiers 2025: Beyond Borders Conference, January 25-28, 2025—Report Tabled	
ALS Awareness Month		Hon. David M. Wells	2411
Hon. Farah Mohamed	2408	First Part of the 2025 Ordinary Session of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, January 27-31, 2025— Report Tabled	
Visitors in the Gallery		Hon. David M. Wells	2411
The Hon. the Speaker	2408	Third Part of the 2025 Ordinary Session of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, June 23-27, 2025— Report Tabled	
Italian Heritage Month		Hon. David M. Wells	2411
Hon. Tony Loffreda	2408	Fourth Part of the 2025 Ordinary Session of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, September 29-October 3, 2025—Report Tabled	
<hr/>		Hon. David M. Wells	2411
ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS		Human Rights	
Senate Ethics Officer		Notice of Motion to Authorize Committee to Study the Possible Expansion of the Right to Vote	
Inquiry Report Concerning Senator Marilou McPhedran Deposited with Clerk During Adjournment of the Senate		Hon. Marilou McPhedran	2411
Hon. Peter Harder	2409	Banking, Commerce and the Economy	
National Bird of Canada Bill (Bill S-221)		Notice of Motion to Authorize Committee to Extend Date of Final Report on Study of Access to Credit and Capital Markets for Small- and Medium-Sized Enterprises	
Eighth Report of Social Affairs, Science and Technology Committee Presented		Hon. Clément Gignac	2412
Hon. Rosemary Moodie	2409	National Security, Defence and Veterans Affairs	
National Immigration Month Bill (Bill S-215)		Committee Authorized to Meet In Camera for the Purpose of its Study of Bill C-11	
Ninth Report of Social Affairs, Science and Technology Committee Presented		Hon. Marty Deacon	2412
Hon. Rosemary Moodie	2409	<hr/>	
Bill Respecting Cyber Security, Amending the Telecommunications Act and Making Consequential Amendments to Other Acts (Bill C-8)			
Fourth Report of National Security, Defence and Veterans Affairs Committee Presented			
Hon. Marty Deacon	2410		

CONTENTS

Tuesday, June 2, 2026

	PAGE		PAGE
QUESTION PERIOD		ORDERS OF THE DAY	
Public Safety		Energy Efficiency Act (Bill S-4)	
Chief Firearms Officers		Bill to Amend—Third Reading	
Hon. Dawn Anderson	2412	Hon. Duncan Wilson	2418
Hon. Pierre Moreau	2412	Hon. David M. Wells	2421
Health		The Estimates, 2026-27	
PrescribeIT		National Finance Committee Authorized to Study	
Hon. Leo Housakos	2413	Supplementary Estimates (A)	
Hon. Pierre Moreau	2413	Hon. Patti LaBoucane-Benson	2424
Canadian Heritage		Food and Drugs Act (Bill S-202)	
Scientific Research in French		Bill to Amend—Third Reading—Debate Continued	
Hon. Allister Surette	2413	Hon. David M. Wells	2424
Hon. Pierre Moreau	2413	Hon. Patrick Brazeau	2426
Public Services and Procurement		Hon. Marilou McPhedran	2428
Buy Canadian		Hon. Tracy Muggli	2428
Hon. Tony Loffreda	2414	Alcoholic Beverage Promotion Prohibition Bill	
Hon. Pierre Moreau	2414	(Bill S-203)	
Innovation, Science and Economic Development		Second Reading—Debate Continued	
Artificial Intelligence		Hon. Yonah Martin	2429
Hon. Paul (PJ) Prosper	2414	Business of the Senate	2429
Hon. Pierre Moreau	2414	Criminal Code (Bill S-208)	
Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship		Bill to Amend—Second Reading—Debate Continued	
International Students		Hon. Yonah Martin	2429
Hon. Marty Klyne	2415	Bill to Amend the Canadian Victims Bill of Rights and to	
Hon. Pierre Moreau	2415	Establish a Framework for Implementing the Rights of	
Employment and Social Development		Victims of Crime (Bill S-236)	
Youth Employment		Second Reading—Debate Adjourned	
Hon. Yonah Martin	2416	Hon. Leo Housakos	2429
Hon. Pierre Moreau	2416	National Diffuse Intrinsic Pontine Glioma Awareness Day	
Finance		Bill (Bill S-244)	
Cost of Living		Second Reading	
Hon. Yonah Martin	2416	Hon. Rosemary Moodie	2429
Hon. Pierre Moreau	2416	Hon. Hassan Yussuff	2431
Global Affairs		Referred to Committee	2431
Export of Arms		Living Donor Recognition Medal Bill (Bill C-234)	
Hon. Mary Coyle	2417	Second Reading	
Hon. Pierre Moreau	2417	Hon. Victor Boudreau	2431
National Defence		Referred to Committee	2432
Military Involvement in the Middle East		Study on Housing Crisis and Challenges Currently Facing	
Hon. Marilou McPhedran	2417	Home Buyers	
Hon. Pierre Moreau	2417	Second Report of Banking, Commerce and the Economy	
International Trade		Committee Adopted	
Canada-Mercosur Free Trade Agreement		Hon. Toni Varone	2433
Hon. Robert Black	2418	Study on Practice of Including Non-financial Matters in	
Hon. Pierre Moreau	2418	Bills Implementing Provisions of Budgets and	
		Economic Statements	
		Fifth Report of National Finance Committee—Debate	
		Adjourned	
		Hon. Éric Forest	2433

CONTENTS

Tuesday, June 2, 2026

	PAGE		PAGE
Study on Federal Programs and Initiatives to Support the Creation of Housing		Nation-Building Value of Tourism	
Seventh Report of National Finance Committee Adopted		Inquiry—Debate Continued	
Hon. Éric Forest	2433	Hon. Bernadette Clement	2436
		Hon. Éric Forest	2437
Audit and Oversight			
Tenth Report of Committee Adopted		The Senate	
Hon. Marty Klyne	2433	Motion to Recognize May 25 of Each Year as World Africa Day Adopted	
Indigenous Peoples		Hon. Amina Gerba	2439
Budget—Study on Voices of Youth Indigenous Leaders		Hon. Manuelle Oudar	2440
Events—Sixth Report of Committee Adopted		Hon. Mohamed-Iqbal Ravalia	2441
Hon. Michèle Audette.	2433		
The Senate		National Security, Defence and Veterans Affairs	
Motion Pertaining to the Situation in Gaza—Debate Continued		Committee Authorized to Extend Date of Final Report on Study of Defence Procurement in Context of Commitment to Increase Defence Spending	
Hon. Leo Housakos	2434	Hon. Marty Deacon	2442
Hon. Yuen Pau Woo	2434		
Hon. Marilou McPhedran.	2435		