



HOUSE OF COMMONS  
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES  
CANADA

45th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

---

# Standing Committee on Government Operations and Estimates

EVIDENCE

**NUMBER 018**

Thursday, November 27, 2025

---

Chair: Kelly McCauley





# Standing Committee on Government Operations and Estimates

Thursday, November 27, 2025

• (1530)

[English]

**The Chair (Kelly McCauley (Edmonton West, CPC)):** Good afternoon, everyone. Welcome to meeting 18 of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Government Operations and Estimates, which is of course known in the four corners of the world as the mighty OGGO.

Today we welcome the Treasury Board minister and his officials.

Pursuant to Standing Order 108(3)(c), the committee is undertaking a study of supplementary estimates (B) for the fiscal year ending on March 31, 2026. In addition, we have departmental results 2024-25 for the Treasury Board.

Will you be making an opening statement, Minister?

**Hon. Shafqat Ali (President of the Treasury Board):** Yes.

**The Chair:** Great. The floor is yours for five minutes. Please go ahead.

[Translation]

**Hon. Shafqat Ali:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Good afternoon.

[English]

I am delighted to be here with my officials to discuss the 2025-26 supplementary estimates (B), which propose \$10.8 billion in voted authorities. The investments listed in these estimates will support key priorities for Canadians, like dental care, indigenous support and defence.

First, the government is proposing \$1.6 billion for the Department of Health to support the Canadian dental care plan. The plan is making dental care more accessible and affordable for more than 5.5 million lower-income Canadians.

These estimates also provide important funding for indigenous priorities, including \$154.6 million for elementary and secondary education, and \$705.9 million for emergency management in first nations communities. This funding will support response and recovery activities for natural disasters, loss of essential services and health crises in first nations communities.

The government is also rebuilding, rearming and reinvesting in the Canadian Armed Forces. Supplementary estimates (B) present an additional \$1.1 billion in planned spending for the Department of National Defence, which includes \$294.5 million for various multi-year defence investments and \$215.1 million for the River

class destroyers to replace aging vessels and enhance Canada's naval abilities. Funding in these estimates brings the total authorities for the Department of National Defence up to \$46.7 billion for the 2025-26 fiscal year, which is an increase of roughly \$12.2 billion from the previous years.

My department, the Treasury Board Secretariat, is seeking \$926.8 million in funding. This proposed spending would be provided to departments and agencies to cover recently signed collective agreements with public servants. It would also fund public service insurance plans and programs, which have seen recent increases in coverage costs and claims.

I also want to briefly highlight our ongoing work to strengthen oversight, transparency and accountability through key reporting instruments such as the public accounts and departmental results report. The most recent public accounts provide Canadians with a clear and comprehensive picture of how public funds were managed over the last fiscal year, while the departmental results reports show how departments performed against their planned objectives. Together, these reports help ensure Parliament and Canadians can hold the government to account for both spending and results.

While we're making investments to support priority areas, we're also focused on finding savings. Through the comprehensive expenditure review, we will be reducing operational spending by \$13 billion annually by 2028-29. These savings are drawn from efficiencies, as well as initiatives and activities that are no longer needed, effective or aligned with the federal mandate.

We are also returning the public service to a more sustainable size. This is a challenging but responsible action. We greatly value the public service and will act with compassion and transparency. One of the ways the government will support this transition is through voluntary early retirement incentives. This incentive will help reduce the size of the workforce through attrition and voluntary departures to the greatest extent possible.

In closing, we're investing more in what matters most for Canadians and growing our economy. This is a transformational time for the government to seize the moment. This is a time to reimagine how we work, how we can improve services to Canadians, how we can build for the future and how we can build Canada strong.

I look forward to answering your questions.

● (1535)

[*Translation*]

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Thank you, Minister.

Before we start with Mr. Kelly, I do want to note today is the 25th anniversary of working here with our amazing clerk, Marc-Olivier Girard, known as the Mighty MOG.

Congratulations to you. Thank you for 25 years of service.

**The Clerk of the Committee (Marc-Olivier Girard):** Thank you.

**The Chair:** We will now turn things over to Mr. Kelly.

Mr. Kelly, welcome back to OGGO.

The floor is yours.

**Pat Kelly (Calgary Crowfoot, CPC):** Thank you.

It's good to be back here after an absence of quite a number of years.

Minister, you said that you're going to reduce and that there's a plan for a reduction of full-time equivalents. The public service right now, at least since September 2025, was down to 346,000 heading for a goal of 330,000. Much of the reduction that you were to make has already occurred. You have a few more to go, you said, mostly through voluntary reductions.

Why have you refused to provide the Parliamentary Budget Officer, and through him, parliamentarians, information to help us understand the personnel reductions that you have planned?

**Hon. Shafqat Ali:** It is a really important question. The comprehensive expenditure review is aligned with our government commitment with Canadians to spend less, invest more and to balance our government operational budget in the next three years. That's exactly what we're focusing on.

In terms of your question about the PBO's letter, my team will be working to respond to his letter as soon as possible but the timing was not reasonable when the letter came in because we haven't finalized those details. It would be unfair as an employer for us, as a government, to give that information to the PBO before communicating with public service employees.

We will be providing a response to PBO.

**Pat Kelly:** Wait a minute, Mr. Minister.

On October 30, you told this committee that you would release the information of the comprehensive spending review to the PBO and you have failed to do so.

**Hon. Shafqat Ali:** We said that we would provide it as soon as possible. The details were not finalized at the moment and it would have been unfair—

**Pat Kelly:** Was the cabinet briefed on the reductions?

**Hon. Shafqat Ali:** May I respond to your question—

**Pat Kelly:** It sounded like you're repeating your response to the question.

**Hon. Shafqat Ali:** No, I'm not repeating. I'm giving you the reason that it would not have been reasonable to provide that information to the PBO.

[*Translation*]

**Marie-Hélène Gaudreau (Laurentides—Labelle, BQ):** I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** I'm sorry. I'm going to interrupt.

Madame Gaudreau.

[*Translation*]

**Marie-Hélène Gaudreau:** The interpreters are doing a great job, but people need to be able to finish what they're saying. We can't ask the interpreters to work miracles. I need to hear the full interpretation in French, Mr. Chair.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Thanks.

Go ahead. Mr. Kelly.

Minister, he did ask a very straightforward question. I think the committee, parliamentarians and Canadians deserve a straightforward answer.

Mr. Kelly, I've restarted the clock. You have three minutes and 20 seconds.

● (1540)

**Pat Kelly:** Thank you.

Was cabinet not briefed on the reductions?

**Hon. Shafqat Ali:** I would say that the details were not finalized and we would not be able to provide the information to PBO until we communicated with public service employees. We're dealing with public service employees' livelihood—

**Pat Kelly:** Okay.

**Hon. Shafqat Ali:** We thank them for their service. I think it would have been unreasonable and unfair to share that information with someone else prior to communicating with public service employees. That's a reasonable, responsible way of [*Inaudible—Editor*]

**Pat Kelly:** No. Some would say it's an unlawful response. The Parliament of Canada Act allows the Parliamentary Budget Officer access to that information. You are denying information to the Parliamentary Budget Officer that is clearly laid out in the Parliament of Canada Act.

**Hon. Shafqat Ali:** No, sir, we are not.

We will be providing information to the PBO. I can ask my deputy to fill you in further on that.

**Pat Kelly:** We'll have time for the deputy in the next hour.

At what hour of what day...? Will you do it by the end of today?

**Hon. Shafqat Ali:** As soon as possible, we will provide that.

**Pat Kelly:** That sounds like what you might have said on October 30.

Will it be today or tomorrow, then, that the PBO will have that information?

**Hon. Shafqat Ali:** What I can commit is that we will provide it as soon as possible.

**Pat Kelly:** I'd like a date and time.

**Hon. Shafqat Ali:** I don't have a date. I will provide it as soon as possible.

**Pat Kelly:** Does the information not exist?

**Hon. Shafqat Ali:** We have to communicate with the public service employees. They're the impacted party here. This would be unreasonable, as an employer, to communicate with someone else before communicating with the public service employees.

**Pat Kelly:** No. That's—

**Hon. Shafqat Ali:** We're dealing with the livelihood of the public service, and I think it's fair that we finalize those details and communicate with them before we release it to the PBO.

**Pat Kelly:** Minister, you are asking parliamentarians to vote on these estimates while denying parliamentarians the information that they are entitled to in order to assess the estimates you have tabled. It is not acceptable to.... You are not free, under the Parliament of Canada Act, to pick and choose what you think is a fair or correct order of things.

I'll ask you again. Will you commit by—tomorrow is Friday—tomorrow afternoon? Will you comply with the lawful request for information by the Parliamentary Budget Officer, yes or no?

**Hon. Shafqat Ali:** Mr. Kelly, let's not play politics with the lives of the public service employees. I'm within my legal authority. We have presented in Parliament main estimates, and you have all the information there, but you're asking about the PBO date.... With the legal authorities, as soon as possible we will be able to provide....

**Pat Kelly:** I think it is very telling that you think parliamentarians are playing politics when they ask for information to which they are entitled in order to study and assess estimates that have to be voted on, on behalf of taxpayers. You don't have the choice to decide whether or not you release the information.

**Hon. Shafqat Ali:** Chair, that information is already—

**The Chair:** I'm sorry. I'm going to—

**Hon. Shafqat Ali:** It would not be fair if I don't have time—

**The Chair:** Sir—

**Hon. Shafqat Ali:** —to respond to the question. It would not be fair.

**The Chair:** Minister, the time is up.

Mr. Gasparro is up next. Perhaps he will allow you some time, but the time is up.

Mr. Gasparro, the floor is yours.

**Vince Gasparro (Eglinton—Lawrence, Lib.):** Thank you, Chair.

Minister, would you like to respond? You can take up some of my time.

**Hon. Shafqat Ali:** I would just say that this is what we're dealing with here—public service employees—and I'd like to thank them for their service to Canadians. This is their livelihood.

We're finding savings. We're balancing the operational budget. We're finding savings and investing in priorities that matter most to Canadians, like housing, infrastructure, defence.

The PBO sent that letter, and my team will be providing a response to that letter, but the time that was given was five working days. We had not finalized details at the time, and it would have been totally irresponsible and unreasonable for us to provide that information to the PBO prior to providing it to the impacted or affected parties, the public service employees.

That is my response. I just wanted to pass it on. The main estimates are before the Parliament, so all the details are there.

• (1545)

**Vince Gasparro:** You referenced public service and you referenced investments. In terms of public service and investments, I'd like to talk about the RCMP.

As you know, many Canadians and most parliamentarians believe the RCMP does vital service within our national security apparatus. Some of the investments our government is providing to the RCMP include an increase of almost \$18 million in operating capital, \$41 million in grants and contributions, and \$70 million related to health benefits, disability benefits. How will these funds improve policing effectiveness, officer welfare and public safety?

**Hon. Shafqat Ali:** First of all, let me express my sincere appreciation for and dedication to the public service employees across the country and RCMP and CBSA officers. They put their lives in danger in their work protecting Canadians and delivering services to Canadians.

In a comprehensive expenditure review, we had different targets for defence. It was 2% of that. Those savings were finding and reinvesting into priorities like training and providing tools to our law enforcement agencies by hiring 1,000 more CBSA officers, RCMP officers. We're investing in our armed forces to secure our borders and to secure our communities. These are necessary investments that we need to make in order to provide the tools for our law enforcement agencies to deliver services to Canadians.

**Vince Gasparro:** Drilling down a little bit on the investment piece, in the regional economic growth through innovation program, obviously multiple agencies are receiving funding under this program. How does the government coordinate these investments to maximize economic growth and innovation across different regions throughout the country?

**Hon. Shafqat Ali:** I can ask my deputy to give you more technical details on that.

**Bill Matthews (Secretary of the Treasury Board of Canada, Treasury Board Secretariat):** Certainly.

The key departments involved here are the regional economic development agencies. You have the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, you have PacifiCan on the west coast and you have CEDQ in Quebec, etc. Those agencies play a critical role in working together, in terms of delivering the government's agenda, to either support industries that are in need or to drive innovation. You'll see a lot of collaboration amongst those organizations, and the Department of Industry as well, to make sure we get maximum delivery and collaboration. Those organizations are the key ones.

**Vince Gasparro:** Great.

How is TBS working to align some of our new investments with Canada's innovation and productivity goals so that those investments deliver maximum impact for businesses and communities across the country?

**Bill Matthews:** With regard to the role of the Treasury Board Secretariat in this area, I would point to a couple of key policies. They're the policies around results. When there's a new program launched, there will be results defined or targets defined that actually come as part of the package to receive funding, which Parliament then votes on. Those results and measures are used to evaluate effectiveness. They're very important in terms of assessing ongoing effectiveness, even though some of these things take years to demonstrate fruition.

The other tool that we help departments with is the evaluation tool. When you have a new program, every five years or so there's an evaluation done on the results to make sure the program is getting the results intended. You will see all of that rolled up in departmental results reports that are tabled in Parliament every year around this time.

• (1550)

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Madame Gaudreau, go ahead, please.

[*Translation*]

**Marie-Hélène Gaudreau:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thank you for being here, Minister.

I have a lot of questions for you, but little time, so I may cut you off.

I'd like to come back to the matter of investment.

The way Quebec does things has come up a lot. Quebec separates investments. Unless I'm mistaken, this is what we're talking about, and I put the question to former Quebec finance minister

Mr. Leitão earlier. We are talking about capital investment, meaning investments in equipment and infrastructure to support production. My understanding is that the capital investment is not in the form of loans or tax credits, but we will own what it supports.

This is what I'd like to understand. How things are done in Quebec and how they're done in the federal government fall into two separate categories. I asked the Parliamentary Budget Officer about what we own, and he told me that it's about 4% of all the expenditures being charged by the government.

The investment numbers suggest that everything has been lumped under that category: tax credits, loans and so on. What does the government own? Was the 4% figure the Parliamentary Budget Officer gave us wrong? The government is calling it an investment, but no, it's spending.

[*English*]

**Hon. Shafqat Ali:** Thank you for the important question.

What I can tell you here is the supplementary estimates is where government is seeking \$10.8 billion to support a range of priorities, including dental care, equipment and training for the armed forces and first nations emergency management.

In the main estimates, over 66% of those expenses are transfers to provinces and territories.

[*Translation*]

**Marie-Hélène Gaudreau:** Minister, we're talking about the delivery of services. It's important to tell people the truth. These are services being delivered, meaning the government has decided to make this money available, to give it to people or to lend it out. Individuals own their teeth, even if the government provides them with dental care. It's important to tell it like it is.

The Parliamentary Budget Officer told us that it's not possible to implement the budget. I was flabbergasted after hearing Mr. Leitão say he didn't agree with the information given by the Parliamentary Budget Officer.

The government is cutting 16,000 jobs. Those 16,000 people are worried, they don't have answers, and they're calling my office. We scour the information, searching for anything that can be of help. Certain numbers I can understand, but I don't have details. Can you provide evidence to the contrary?

On one hand, the Auditor General told you that you weren't able to give effect to the budget. On the other hand, the Parliamentary Budget Officer said doing so wasn't possible. Now is the time for you to show me otherwise. Convince me. A lot of people are following these proceedings right now.

[*English*]

**Hon. Shafqat Ali:** There are many topics there. You talked about budget 2025, and then you talked about the CER and the PBO. I don't know if we'll have enough time, but I'll try to explain as much as I can.

First, budget 2025 is a transformational budget. It lays out a clear plan to build a stronger, more resilient Canada with targeted investments that support growth, security and affordability. It proposes generational investments of \$25 billion for housing and \$115 billion for infrastructure. For defence and security, it is \$30 billion, and for productivity and competitiveness, it is \$110 billion. This will allow us to meet the moment and enable \$1 trillion in total investments in Canada over the next five years.

Budget 2025 also proposes over \$25 billion to support workers and businesses and introduces long-term savings through a comprehensive expenditure review with reductions beginning in 2026-27 to ensure fiscal sustainability.

Then, when we come to the comprehensive expenditure review, it will achieve \$9 billion in 2026-27, \$10 billion in 2027-28 and \$13 billion in 2028-29 and ongoing. This will obviously include a reduction in the number of FTEs.

There's agreement with the union bargaining agreement that is in place. That would be followed and respected, and we'd do it in a way so that it has minimum impact on involuntary exits.

• (1555)

**The Chair:** Thank you, Minister. That is our time.

We'll go to Mr. Patzer for five minutes, please.

**Jeremy Patzer (Swift Current—Grasslands—Kindersley, CPC):** Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

Minister, over the last 10 years or so, there's been close to \$9.8 billion or \$9.9 billion returned to the Treasury Board from the Department of National Defence.

Are those funds being made available again to the Canadian Armed Forces, or have they been put back into consolidated revenue?

**Hon. Shafqat Ali:** My understanding is that that's additional funding for the Canadian Armed Forces. If you have a question related to the last 10 years, I'm going to ask my deputy to...

**Jeremy Patzer:** No.

**Hon. Shafqat Ali:** You don't want to know the details.

**Bill Matthews:** The short answer is that they're available, Mr. Chair, for the department. Those funds continue—

**Jeremy Patzer:** You can table them with this committee after, if you have that information. I appreciate it.

I have another question I'd like to ask the minister.

You also said earlier, Minister, that there is \$1.1 billion of new spending in these estimates here. Is part of that total figure the \$815 million that was returned in 2024-25?

**Hon. Shafqat Ali:** This is a technical question. I'm going to ask my deputy to respond to it.

**Jeremy Patzer:** No, it's not. You said it is new spending.

**Hon. Shafqat Ali:** Look—

**Jeremy Patzer:** You said it is new spending. Is it new spending?

**Hon. Shafqat Ali:** You're asking certain.... Do you want to get the right information, or do you not want to get it answered?

**Jeremy Patzer:** You're the President of the Treasury Board. You are the stopgap on where money goes.

**Hon. Shafqat Ali:** We are all here at committee. You have a question that you want to get answered, so I'm going to give you a proper answer. Let's clear that, your question in mind—just 30 seconds, please.

**Jeremy Patzer:** Mr. Matthews, if you have the information, if you could table it with this committee afterwards, I would greatly appreciate that. Thank you very much.

The estimates request \$476 million for the future fighter capability program. Is that earmarked for F-35s, or is that just a general number?

**Hon. Shafqat Ali:** I think those are questions for the Minister of National Defence and the finance minister. I think I can ask my colleague if we can get in touch with them.

**Jeremy Patzer:** Minister, it's in the estimates, and it's from the Treasury Board, too.

**Hon. Shafqat Ali:** It's the F-35s.

**Jeremy Patzer:** Okay, so, it's F-35s.

**Hon. Shafqat Ali:** If you want to get the right information, I think it's...but.... It's the F-35s, but for the specifics, the Minister of National Defence would be able to answer that.

**Jeremy Patzer:** Okay. Is that...?

**Hon. Shafqat Ali:** It's the F-35s. I just told you.

**Jeremy Patzer:** However, is it to upgrade the facilities? Is it as part of the purchase of the F-35s? What's it for?

**Hon. Shafqat Ali:** Again, it's a technical question that you're asking. I think it will be fair.... I'm going to ask my deputy to—

• (1600)

**Jeremy Patzer:** Minister, the point here is this: When you get a request for money, do you personally review it, or do you just get a piece of paper, stamp it and away it goes?

**Hon. Shafqat Ali:** We review, as a team, those submissions. The team works with it, and the deputy—he's the secretary for the Treasury Board Secretariat.... We both do it. If he's giving that response, it's not that one person does that job. It's the team who works on that.

**Jeremy Patzer:** Do you read all the requests as they come across your desk?

**Hon. Shafqat Ali:** Of course I read them. I try as much as I can absorb. I think I can pretty much absorb a lot.

**Jeremy Patzer:** Okay, that's good.

**Bill Matthews:** Maybe if I could, Mr. Chair....

**Jeremy Patzer:** Do you know what? In the second hour, you might have a chance.

**Hon. Shafqat Ali:** So, you don't want to know the answer, then?

**Jeremy Patzer:** I want to know that you know the answer. You're the minister.

**Hon. Shafqat Ali:** I know the answer, but it's technical. Let's use this time wisely.

**The Chair:** Excuse me.

Minister, I'm going to interrupt here. I'm going to stop the clock.

It is the member's time. I will allow him to ask the questions.

Go ahead, sir.

**Jeremy Patzer:** Thank you.

Do you have a request on your desk to send more of taxpayers' money to Canada Post?

**Hon. Shafqat Ali:** I am not aware of that. I will check with my department and let you know.

**Jeremy Patzer:** These estimates have over a billion dollars. I know that was the previous request, but there are reports now suggesting that it is going through that money a lot faster than it was planning to. I'm just curious. Do you have another request from them or not?

**Hon. Shafqat Ali:** I don't have that on my table.

**Jeremy Patzer:** It's a repayable loan.

Is the taxpayer going to get that money back from Canada Post? Do you know?

**Hon. Shafqat Ali:** What I can say is that I don't have that request on my table at the moment.

**Jeremy Patzer:** Are you aware of the terms of the deal that Canada Post got to receive the billion dollars?

**Hon. Shafqat Ali:** We can provide those details to the committee.

**Jeremy Patzer:** Are you aware of it, though? The question is, are you aware of it?

**Hon. Shafqat Ali:** It was given prior to my becoming president of the Treasury Board, so I think it's.... I was not president at the Treasury Board when that was given.

**The Chair:** Thanks. That's our time.

We'll go to Ms. Rochefort, please, for five minutes.

**Pauline Rochefort (Nipissing—Timiskaming, Lib.):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I'll go in a line of questioning that's different from that of my colleague, Minister, and start with one that's close to my heart, to some extent.

People in my riding want to know that the spending review won't hurt bilingual services. In my riding, about a third of the population is francophone, and in Canada there are about 11 million francophone Canadians. Can you explain how the Treasury Board is making sure that English and French services stay strong and that our

official language obligations are fully respected as we move forward with these estimates?

**Hon. Shafqat Ali:** I want to assure my colleague that nothing in the spending review will diminish our commitment to bilingual services. Canada's official language obligations are fully protected through clear rules and regulations, many of them established by the Treasury Board Secretariat to ensure that Canadians can always receive services in the official language of their choice.

We have also strengthened language requirements for managers in bilingual regions so that federal employees can work in the official language they are most comfortable with. These measures reinforce our commitment to strong, accessible English and French services across the country.

**Pauline Rochefort:** Thank you very much. That's very important. I appreciate that information.

To move forward, this week I had the opportunity to meet with the Public Service Alliance of Canada to discuss issues surrounding public service workers and services in rural Canada more specifically. I was happy to hear you state that there's an agreement in place as you move forward with the plans for attrition that have been agreed upon with the union.

The investments in these estimates, including funding for dental care, emergency management and compensation for federal public servants, all play a critical role in sustaining reliable services across rural and northern regions in Canada and in my riding. Basically, I want to make sure that as we move forward, if there are any cuts at a public service level, the service in rural Canada won't be negatively impacted. I was wondering if you might be able to comment on that.

**Hon. Shafqat Ali:** The government is committed to making sure public service employees are treated fairly and with compassion and empathy.

There is a collective agreement in place, not on this particular thing, but overall between the union and the employer. In it there are tools to deal with this type of situation, and we will be dealing with it accordingly. We'll try to ensure that there is minimum impact in that involuntary workforce adjustment.

• (1605)

**Pauline Rochefort:** Thank you. That's it for me for the moment.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much.

We'll go to Madame Gaudreau, please, for two and half minutes.

[Translation]

**Marie-Hélène Gaudreau:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Why are we here? We asked the Parliamentary Budget Officer whether he could explain the new unit of measure to us. He said that he hadn't received any such explanation but would have one soon. Now that the request has been put out there, we will get answers.

We're examining forecasted budget requirements. I realize it's general information, but people want to know more. I mentioned earlier that 16,000 jobs were being cut. Now we're being told to put our questions to other ministers.

I have very little time, so I really feel like submitting all of my questions in writing, letting a few days go by, perhaps the weekend, in order to get the answers I'm looking for. Taxpayers want answers.

I will ask a few questions. We've talked about the collective agreements three times. I'm concerned about what the Auditor General and the Parliamentary Budget Officer told us. According to the numbers, salaries are going up by 7.8%. Why are salaries going up?

On one hand, the collective agreements contain ranges for pay increments. On the other, the government says it wants to cut 16,000 jobs. I don't understand. Why are salaries going up?

[English]

**Hon. Shafqat Ali:** As I said, that workforce adjustment was... This government came with a commitment with Canadians to spend less and invest more, and to build the strongest economy in the G7, and to balance our operational budget in three years. That's exactly what we are doing.

In terms of the PBO situation, I have explained that already. I can restate that. We will be providing a response to the PBO.

[Translation]

**Marie-Hélène Gaudreau:** I'm almost out of time, so I'm going to come back to my question.

The Auditor General said the government needs to stop contracting out work. However, salaries are increasing. In the end, she was right. You're cutting the number of public servants, who have all kinds of skill sets, and opting to contract out the work. There will be fewer employees, but more contractors.

I'll follow up on this after, Mr. Chair.

[English]

**The Chair:** I'm afraid that's something you're going to have to get back to us in writing or perhaps later in the session.

We'll now go to Mrs. Jansen, please, for five minutes.

**Tamara Jansen (Cloverdale—Langley City, CPC):** Thank you so much.

Minister, this is how I understand it. One of your core responsibilities is oversight of government spending, especially when there are numbers that reach into the billions.

Earlier this week, we learned that the Minister of Industry and her deputy minister did not review the Stellantis agreement in its entirety, a deal publicly reported to be around \$15 billion, and naturally we're wondering if anyone actually reviewed the whole thing.

I realize you weren't there, but perhaps your colleagues can help. Did the Treasury Board see the full Stellantis contract before approving \$15 billion in spending?

**Hon. Shafqat Ali:** As my colleague, you said that I was not there, and I can ask, if you allow, my deputy to respond to the question.

**Tamara Jansen:** Please, yes. It's a yes or no if you saw the full contract.

**Bill Matthews:** Normally the way this would work is that the department responsible actually reviews the contracts. They would get authority from the Treasury Board to go ahead and transact deals, but it would not involve a page-by-page contract review.

● (1610)

**Tamara Jansen:** Okay. You didn't see the whole thing either. That's interesting.

The Minister of Industry didn't see it, the deputy minister didn't see the whole thing, the Treasury Board didn't see the whole thing, and you're approving billions.

Minister, respectfully, how does a contract of this magnitude clear your department without anyone reviewing it?

**Hon. Shafqat Ali:** As the deputy just stated, there are delegated authorities to ministers.

There are certain authorities that are delegated to ministers. If those agreements or contract submissions are under those authorities, they can go ahead and move, get into contracts and—

**Tamara Jansen:** I'm sorry.

I have a question now for Mr. Ali. I'm just wondering, are you concerned that if the industry minister and the deputy minister went to Treasury Board for approval of \$15 billion without reviewing the full agreement.... I'm sorry: Are you concerned about that? Does that seem like a good process?

**Hon. Shafqat Ali:** We actually have a robust process and procedure, and rules in place, and everyone adheres to...follow those rules. If the authorities are delegated to ministers, they are bound by those rules and regulations and policies. I expect that everyone follows those rules.

**Tamara Jansen:** Does that—

**Hon. Shafqat Ali:** If someone does not follow, there are rules to deal with it.

**Tamara Jansen:** If I understand it, you—or whoever it was at the time—are the person who has to worry about it and you have to be concerned about spending oversight.

It's your job to make sure they've actually fulfilled those obligations: The spending is justified, the risks are understood, the department has done its homework and taxpayers aren't getting taken for a ride.

Is there something we can do to ensure someone is held accountable for not actually fulfilling those things if we're not even checking?

**Hon. Shafqat Ali:** There are rules in place for oversight, and there are guidelines. There are authorities delegated to ministers. If anyone goes beyond that or does not follow those guidelines and policies, I think there is a mechanism to deal with it. They should be held accountable.

**Tamara Jansen:** Do you know, Minister, if anybody has read the entire contract?

**Hon. Shafqat Ali:** Again, that contract was not in my... I was not a president of the Treasury Board, so—

**Tamara Jansen:** Mr. Matthews or Mr. Trudel, no? Has anyone read the entire contract?

**Bill Matthews:** There would be people from both the justice department and in ISED who would have reviewed. I will take it back to see if there was anyone within TBS who reviewed the entire contract, but the bulk of the work would have been done by the Department of Justice and the line department ISED.

**Tamara Jansen:** Okay. My biggest concern, honestly, is that we rubber-stamp a bad deal because we don't know who's read what. Aren't you supposed to be the ones who say, hold on, does this actually make sense? Isn't that what the Treasury Board is about? Your name is on the bottom of the cheque.

**Hon. Shafqat Ali:** Thank you. I agree with you that we're accountable to Canadians. We need to be transparent, and we take every precaution—

**Tamara Jansen:** You believe that there is a mechanism so—

**The Chair:** That is our time. I'm sorry.

Ms. Khalid, go ahead, please.

**Iqra Khalid (Mississauga—Erin Mills, Lib.):** Thank you, Chair.

Thank you to the minister and to his colleagues for attending today to answer these questions on supplementary estimates (B).

I'll start with talking a bit about the public service, if that's okay. I know that it's been a bit of a roller-coaster ride with public servants between the COVID pandemic to now in terms of working from home and then being asked to come back to work and then between full-time, part-time and half-time.

My question is specifically about the early retirement options that public servants have been asking about and what that might mean for job security across the public service. I'd like you to maybe speak about how the government is approaching this in a way that protects our workforce and reassures employees of the future as well, and ensures that any workforce adjustments minimize involuntary departures as well. We want to protect the public service.

• (1615)

**Hon. Shafqat Ali:** We're going through a challenging time. This is a new norm of a global economic shift we're dealing with. We have made the commitment to Canadians in this mandate that we will spend less and invest more and balance our operational budget in the next three years, and that's exactly what we're doing.

What we're trying to do is find savings and invest in the priorities that matter most to Canadians, which are housing, infrastructure

and the Canadian Armed Forces, which means there are more opportunities in those areas, and Canadian Armed Forces housing. By doing so, we're focusing on a buy Canada approach as well.

To me, this is a very challenging and difficult issue that we're dealing with, the public service livelihood, and, to me, this is not a political issue. This is a real issue that impacts on those public service employees and their families. Therefore, we do it in a way that we find other tools and options that have a minimum impact as an involuntary workforce adjustment. There is an early retirement option. There is an early retirement incentive and there is attrition. That is the mechanism we have and we haven't finalized the details yet. The team is still working on it.

I can ask Bill if he can shed light on this one because this is a really important issue and we do it in a way that we will not hurt people's livelihood.

**Bill Matthews:** The early retirement incentive is designed to allow employees who don't meet the age requirement to retire without having that penalty. It would not award them additional pension benefits; it would just avoid the penalty. The regime itself does require legislative approval. It is in BIA 1, and so we will be working through the details and then moving to implement once the proper approvals have been achieved.

**Iqra Khalid:** Thank you very much for that clarification.

On providing support to people, we talk about budget 2025 and we talk about supports especially for those who are marginalized and seeking equality of opportunity. I want to talk specifically about women. People want to make sure that spending cuts are not hurting women and diverse communities specifically, or the government's GBA+ commitments.

Can you explain how we're making sure the review does not undermine equity and inclusion and that it does indeed support those who need it the most?

**Hon. Shafqat Ali:** Thank you for the question.

**The Chair:** I'm afraid there were only eight seconds left for a response, but there will be one more intervention from the Liberal side. Perhaps you can answer during that time.

Mr. Kelly, go ahead for five minutes.

**Pat Kelly:** What will the early retirement incentive program cost?

**Hon. Shafqat Ali:** I can ask my secretary to respond to that question.

**Pat Kelly:** If you don't know the answer, we'll maybe get to that in the next hour.

Why is there a need for the program if you are successfully reducing numbers through voluntary attrition?

**Hon. Shafqat Ali:** That early retirement incentive is a part of this voluntary attrition exercise.

**Pat Kelly:** You said that you have reduced the number already to 346,000 as of September without this program. You're only going down another 16,000.

• (1620)

**Hon. Shafqat Ali:** If my colleague could dive deep into that information, he will find more appropriate information. It says that in the next three years, by 2027-28, we will achieve that goal.

**Pat Kelly:** According to the PBO summary I read, the number in September 2025 was 346,000. The budget says that you're going to hit 330,000 by 2028-29. I hope I'm not going too deep here. I have to go deeper to do the subtraction—

**Hon. Shafqat Ali:** You said that we already had done it, so why is it needed.

**Pat Kelly:** No, you have gone from a height of 358,000. You kind of got halfway there without this program. You don't know what it's going to cost. I'm just wondering if you need the program at all.

**Hon. Shafqat Ali:** That's a program we need and that's why we're achieving those goals.

**Pat Kelly:** You don't know what it will cost or if you need it. You've also said that the reason you can't give the PBO the information it has asked for and is lawfully entitled to receive is that you are concerned about the individual workers in the public service.

If you're going to get to your goal through people leaving voluntarily, there are no individuals who will be forced out. Furthermore, they're self-selecting. There is no privacy issue here. There is no individual whose either privacy or information would be out early.

Why don't you just do what you're required to under the Parliament of Canada Act and give the PBO the information that it's asked for so that parliamentarians have access to the PBO's advice before we vote on these supplementary estimates?

**Hon. Shafqat Ali:** We will respond to the PBO as early as possible, most probably in the first week of December.

**Pat Kelly:** You said on the 30th you would do so and you didn't. How are we to take you at your word now?

**Hon. Shafqat Ali:** I don't know. You're making up that I said the 30th.

**Pat Kelly:** No, I mean when you appeared at this committee on the 30th.

**Hon. Shafqat Ali:** I am not sure.

**Bill Matthews:** I don't recall a date being committed to.

**Hon. Shafqat Ali:** Chair, did I say that? I don't recall that.

**The Chair:** I'm sorry. I'll just interrupt, and I'll stop the clock.

You did state on October 30, to me, that you would provide the information.

**Hon. Shafqat Ali:** I did not give a date, Chair.

**The Chair:** I'm not arguing with you. I'm just stating that's when....

I'll turn it back over to Mr. Kelly.

**Pat Kelly:** It is disappointing that we are not getting the information that has been requested.

Let's just pick one, for example, the Department of Fisheries and Oceans. That one seems to be heavy on operations, and it's one that the PBO wanted to know about. Can you not tell us anything about

what types of reductions you're going to be looking for in that department?

**Hon. Shafqat Ali:** As I said, the early retirement incentive program will help to manage a reduction through attrition and voluntary departures. All employees will be treated with compassion, in accordance with their collective agreement terms and conditions of employment.

**Pat Kelly:** I didn't ask you how you were going to reduce the numbers. I asked you what types of operations might be affected or what types of employees you are going to be looking at.

**Hon. Shafqat Ali:** Every department was asked to put forward proposals. All ministers were asked to put forward proposals. They put forward proposals, and that's where we'll finalize those CERs.

**The Chair:** Thanks.

I'm trying to balance your time against cutting you off, Minister.

**Hon. Shafqat Ali:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** Ms. Romanado, welcome. I'm not sure you've been with OGGO before.

**Sherry Romanado (Longueuil—Charles-LeMoine, Lib.):** I don't think I have, so I'm delighted to be here.

Thank you so much.

**The Chair:** The floor is yours for five minutes. Welcome.

**Sherry Romanado:** Thank you so much, Chair.

Through you, I'd like to thank the witnesses for being with us today.

Minister, you spoke about the extraordinary moment Canada's facing and the generational investments that we need to get right. Some of my colleagues highlighted some of them. As we move forward, we're making sure that the federal dollars we invest strengthen opportunities for Canadian workers, support our industries and deliver benefits here at home. Can you elaborate on that and on the importance of the buy Canada approach?

• (1625)

**Hon. Shafqat Ali:** Thank you so much, my friend, for the important question.

We are going through a time like no one has seen before. This is a global economic shift. There are new economic realities. With what we see south of the border, with the tariff situation, I think it's important for us to find ways to build Canada strong and to find the road that leads to success for future generations.

One of the policies we are implementing is a buy Canadian policy, which will move us from best efforts to clear obligations to buy Canadian so that federal dollars directly support Canadian workers and industries.

We're moving from reliance to resilience. Budget 2025 provides a clear investment to fully implement that policy across departments, agencies and Crown corporations, making it consistent and effective.

We are also developing harmonized procurement regulations to bring Canada's complex rules into one clear framework, which will simplify operations, reduce legal risk and give suppliers the clarity they need to compete. Through new supports for small and medium-sized businesses, we're helping Canadians break firmly into federal markets. We are focused on that.

To assist, as the Treasury Board president, I have launched a red-tape review to reduce those duplicative regulatory burdens so that we can grow our economy faster and make it the strongest economy in the G7.

**Sherry Romanado:** Further to that, I know that my colleague touched on the important new investments we're making across the government, including in national defence. As the parliamentary secretary for national defence, I have to say that I am quite pleased that we are making those historic investments of \$81.8 billion over the next five years.

Can you elaborate on how those investments, especially here at home, can not only help support the economy in these turbulent times but also help reinvigorate the defence industry in Canada? We have such incredible industries here, especially in Quebec, in aerospace. What is the importance of reinvigorating that industry and supporting it so that we can get the men and women in uniform what they need?

**Hon. Shafqat Ali:** That is an amazing question, and I think your family is in the forces.

This is the time when we need to sustainably build our forces to be stronger, and that's why it is important to invest in our Canadian Armed Forces, to provide them the tools and training they need to secure our borders and to strengthen our capabilities. We're investing in naval ship repairs, in more capabilities and additional.... We have actually raised salaries by 20% and are hiring more personnel. These are really important steps towards making the Canadian Armed Forces and industries sustainable so we can assist Europe and build....

I think my time is up, but this is the way to build Canada strong, and that's what we're doing.

• (1630)

**The Chair:** Thank you.

To finish up, we have Madame Gaudreau, please.

[*Translation*]

**Marie-Hélène Gaudreau:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Ali, perhaps you don't know, but your colleague Mr. Guilbeault resigned. Things aren't going well. One, things are not going well, but two, I was expecting to get answers.

According to the slogan, the government was going to spend less, invest more and be transparent. For that reason, I was expecting the government to spend less, to invest in things that we would own and to be transparent about it. We asked for that information. As parliamentarians, we need the information in order to vote on issues. What's more, we are supposed to provide that information to taxpayers, because it's their money.

With all due respect, Minister, who has the power to do that? Whose duty is it?

[*English*]

**Hon. Shafqat Ali:** I am here to serve Canadians to the best of my abilities. I believe, and our government believes, in accountability. This is a new government. It believes in accountability and transparency, and that's why we have put forward this budget 2025, which is the most transformational generational budget. It has all of the information, if you look into it. It has investments for future generations to build Canada strong, to build communities strong, and investments in the Canadian Armed Forces. We are investing in major projects. We're investing millions in affordable housing. We're investing in infrastructure. We're focused on making Canada a superpower in the energy sector, which means more jobs, opportunities—

[*Translation*]

**Marie-Hélène Gaudreau:** Mr. Chair, I'm down to my last few seconds, and I would like that time to be split evenly between the question and answer.

I was doubtful the government would be open about this. We heard that the decision was made and that people would have to deal with it.

What were the consultations about? They resulted in a ton of recommendations. In fact, we made recommendations and gave them to the government.

I'm really discouraged, because I get the feeling this was all done in a slapdash manner, and it scares me.

That's all.

[*English*]

**Hon. Shafqat Ali:** I can restate my commitment to accountability and transparency. This new government is committed to transparency and accountability. We have the rules in place. We follow those and expect everyone to adhere to those rules.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much.

We excuse you, Minister. Thanks for being with us.

Colleagues, we're going to suspend for a couple moments as we clear out the minister and get set up for our next round.

We're suspended.

• (1630)

(Pause)

• (1635)

**The Chair:** Thank you, everyone, for your patience.

We are back with the officials from Treasury Board.

We will begin with Mr. Patzer for five minutes.

Please go ahead, sir.

**Jeremy Patzer:** Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Matthews, since the minister didn't know, can you at least tell this committee what lapsed funding is?

**Bill Matthews:** I can tell you that across the government, the last fiscal year was around 8% lower than usual or previous years. I should mention that for defence, they have special authorities around carrying forward money because of the complexity of their projects. They only pay when they get the bills from the suppliers.

This bleeds into one of your previous questions about the money in supplementary estimates (B). There's a mix in there of money that was in the previous year and that has come forward again as unspent. That's for River class destroyers as well as the F-35. There's also some new money for drones, some base infrastructure, some training and things like that. It's a combination in there.

**Jeremy Patzer:** Can you clarify whether any of that counts toward the \$1.1 billion in new spending that the minister was talking about?

**Bill Matthews:** The \$1.1 billion is what is in these estimates. As I just mentioned, it is a mix of things that you may have seen or would have seen in previous years' estimates that were not spent. It comes into this year's, but it has to be voted on by Parliament. That's why it's there, as well as new money.

**Jeremy Patzer:** Okay. So it's not fully new money. It's some new money, but it's also some of the—

**Bill Matthews:** Right. When you're voting money for projects like national defence, they're so big that when you do see some slippage, it will roll over from one year to the next. They are at times very difficult projects to forecast the cash flow on. You err on the side of caution, because you're not allowed to overspend. It's natural for defence to see this kind of movement.

**Jeremy Patzer:** With regard to Canada Post and the \$1 billion-plus loan that was sent to them, there is a section in the Canada Post act that says repayment will be taken from annual revenue “in so far as such revenues are sufficient”.

I mean, it has posted another record loss. We're never getting that money back, are we?

**Bill Matthews:** The loan is repayable until there's a decision taken that says it's not. It is repayable. As to whether they will need additional funds, they now have a labour agreement, as was mentioned. How they will rebound in terms of picking business back up that may have been lost during the rotating strikes will have a heavy influence on their cash flows going forward. I'm sure they're keeping a close eye on that.

• (1640)

**Jeremy Patzer:** Section 31 of the act also allows the Minister of Finance, by extension through the Treasury Board, to send money to Canada Post. Is there an outstanding request for more funding—bailout funding, for lack of a better term—for Canada Post?

**Bill Matthews:** There's nothing, on my office, in terms of a request for additional funding, but the normal flow would be Canada Post through the minister of PSPC over to finance. If the Minister of Finance is in side with additional funding, it would come to Treasury Board Secretariat at that time.

**Jeremy Patzer:** Are you able to write a clause in there that would essentially override that section 32 to make sure that the taxpayer is made whole as a condition within a set period of time, or does that section 32 prohibit you from being able to make sure that taxpayers are made whole?

**Bill Matthews:** In terms of the specifics on that one, I would say that in general you can't override legislation with policy or agreements. I don't know this act in detail, but that would be a decision for the Minister of Finance to take when deciding what conditions to put on any funding for Canada Post.

**Jeremy Patzer:** There are reports that Canada Post has said it's going to need another loan of I think \$500 million. I guess keep your eyes open for that, going forward.

When it comes to contracts, you said earlier that you don't review all the contracts before money gets sent out. Do you not find it alarming that you would get requests for large sums of money only to find out that legal hasn't read the entire contract and that the minister hasn't read the entire contract before it comes to you? Does that not alarm you as somebody who is part of the process flow to either approve or not approve money before it goes out the door?

**Bill Matthews:** There are people who have read the contract. I guarantee you that there are lawyers who have read the contract inside the Government of Canada, etc. I can't recall the timing of the Stellantis contract in terms of the current minister and the current deputy. I'm not even sure if they were present at the time it was signed. The role for Treasury Board Secretariat is around approving the terms and conditions. As long as a program respects the terms and conditions that were set out and approved by the government, then it is off to the responsible minister and the department to fulfill those conditions.

**Jeremy Patzer:** I believe we heard on Tuesday—

**The Chair:** I'm sorry. That is your time.

Thank you.

Mr. Gasparro is next.

**Vince Gasparro:** Thank you, Chair.

Thank you all for being here, and thank you for your service.

Overall, how does the TBS ensure that our new spending not only meets immediate needs but also positions Canada as a leader in attracting global investment? What's some of the thought that's put into it?

**Bill Matthews:** The flow will be that when new initiatives for investment are approved in the budget, we're going to set aside tax measures, but there will also be new programs in which dollars are actually being spent. If they are new programs, they will come to Treasury Board Secretariat for approval. These programs would include their objectives, how they plan to attain them, their performance measures and a cash flow. The Treasury Board Secretariat would be working with the responsible department to make sure their performance measures and their approach meet the intent of the government.

**Vince Gasparro:** The Treasury Board Secretariat departmental results show that 91% of a sample of government programs included suitable measures for tracking performance and informing decision-making. I think that's pretty impressive. I'm glad to see that the department has exceeded its target.

What steps is TBS taking to close the gap overall, and how will departments be held accountable for meeting this target?

**Bill Matthews:** The performance report for Treasury Board Secretariat, in many cases, is a roll-up of other departments' results. That's just its role as a central agency.

The member has highlighted an area where the department is doing pretty well. There are others where there's clearly some work to do across the system. TBS would focus on where gaps and objectives are not being met. We would work with the department around improvement plans, and they would then go forward and try to reach those.

I will say that there's a frustration in the system, including my own, around performance reporting. In many programs in the government, there's just not sufficient data to report on whether the program is meeting its objectives. That's one of the things that my colleagues and I, with the minister, would like to improve upon: making sure we actually get the relevant data to measure the program and that we can truly go out and get it when it comes time to do an evaluation. There's some homework for us to do on the reporting of results.

• (1645)

**Vince Gasparro:** Can we drill down a little bit on that? How are you going to try to get the data you're looking for?

**Bill Matthews:** The place to do that is to really push hard when a program comes in with its performance objectives and measures and ask, "How are you going to get this data? Can you get it?"

We have a very elaborate regime, in many cases, that has layers on it, but it turns out that in some cases, departments are not able to report in the way they intended, and you end up with an evaluation on program performance that is inconclusive. When you get one of those evaluations, it's a trigger to go back to the department and say, "Okay, rethink your performance metrics."

I'm probably making my friend Antoine squirm here, but he knows how I feel.

**Vince Gasparro:** Would you like to add to that?

We don't want you squirming too much—just a little.

**Antoine Brunelle-Côté (Assistant Secretary, Expenditure Management Sector, Treasury Board Secretariat):** No, I'm not squirming at all.

As Bill explained, when we review proposals that come before the Treasury Board, we set ambitious goals, but when setting ambitious goals, it's always a challenge to measure results and ensure that the departments promote things they can measure. We're pushing them hard to put forward performance that can be measured.

**Vince Gasparro:** I want to drill down on one social policy matter.

In my riding of Eglinton—Lawrence, there are quite a few seniors who rely on the Canada dental care plan. Just a few days ago, the Minister of Health announced that close to six million Canadians overall, or about 15% of the total population, use this plan. How will the new spending build and expand the Canada dental care plan?

**Bill Matthews:** There is funding in the supplementary estimates (B) for the dental plan, and that is largely because the take-up on that plan has been greater than initially forecast. The take-up has been terrific. Maybe it's because there was a backlog of people waiting for these types of services that you've seen this initial wave, but there are additional funds for the plan to make sure that those who are eligible can receive the services they're entitled to.

**Vince Gasparro:** Great. Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much.

We're now going to the top of the order again with Mrs. Block.

Go ahead, Mrs. Block, for five minutes.

**Kelly Block (Carlton Trail—Eagle Creek, CPC):** Thank you, Chair.

I'm looking forward to hearing from you, Mr. Matthews, and from those sitting at the table with you, your responses to the questions that we, as parliamentarians, have for you.

I'm looking at your website. It states that for the year 2024-25, the Government of Canada met only 53% of its departments' mandated goals. What are the consequences, if any, when departments continue to fail or barely reach their goals? This may follow up on Mr. Gasparro's questions, but when 47% of departments don't meet their mandated goals, what is the recourse of the Treasury Board Secretariat?

**Bill Matthews:** When we are establishing goals for departments, or when they are establishing them with our help, we do want stretch goals, because you do want to aim high.

That number is low. I'm not entirely sure which figure the member is looking at, but I know of two that are on TBS's departmental results report that jump off the page. On high-volume services, the system as a whole is down around 52%. Also, on the number of IT systems that we would view as being healthy, again, we're I believe below 50%. Those are two numbers where you have to dig in and find out why.

With the health of IT, it's a question of resourcing and prioritizing the spend in IT. On the high-volume services, you can't really be generic about it. You have to look at each one and ask what's going on there. Was their take-up bigger than we expected? Were they unable to hire staff? What's the background on this? It really is on a case-by-case basis.

To answer the question of what the recourse is, the Treasury Board Secretariat, with the support or endorsement of the Treasury Board, can put conditions around improvement on departments or put additional reporting requirements on departments as a way to try to keep an eye on things, but it starts with, what's your plan to improve?

• (1650)

**Kelly Block:** Thank you.

The Department of Citizenship and Immigration failed to meet 55.6% of its departmental targets in 2024-25. Now, it is requesting an additional \$624 million in funding through the supplementary estimates. Why is the Government of Canada rewarding departments with more funding when they fail to meet more than half of their departmental targets?

**Bill Matthews:** Again, you have to really look into the detail of which targets are not being met and why. In some cases, the answer to meeting more of the targets is indeed resources, and it's not really an effective punishment to hold back resources if you have a department that is not in general meeting its goals. You have to really understand the reason.

I think more detailed questions about which ones are being met and which ones are not are probably more appropriate for the department in question, but I would reiterate that the instinct to withhold resources for those departments that are not doing as well as we would like may not be the right instinct.

**Kelly Block:** Well, one could make a number of guesses as to what is going on in the Department of Citizenship and Immigration in not meeting their departmental targets.

I'll move on.

Regarding the operating expenditures for the interim federal health program, less than a week ago, the Standing Committee on Health called for the Auditor General to investigate this program amidst rising concerns over the ballooning costs.

This year, an additional \$598 million in funding will be added to the program through these estimates. Why is Treasury Board looking for approval to give a program \$142 million more than last year when there is an audit pending for allegations of abuse within it?

**The Chair:** Give a brief answer, please.

**Bill Matthews:** Certainly.

The request has been made for an audit, but obviously, until there is an audit done and there are conclusions, they are not proven. The recipients of the funding in this envelope are entitled to it—there's a backlog of cases—and other measures are being looked at to possibly better control the growth in this area as well. Also, I've not spoken to the Auditor General about a planned audit yet.

**The Chair:** Thanks very much.

We'll go back to Mrs. Romanado, please, for five minutes.

**Sherry Romanado:** Thank you very much, Chair, and through you to the witnesses.

This may sound like a bizarre question, but it's something that I'm actually quite interested in. It's with regard to the expenditure cycle for the Government of Canada. What is the impact on it with respect to the change in when we table our budget? We made the decision to do a fall budget now so that it would allow provinces, territories, municipalities and so on to be able to do their planning. They often do their budgets in the spring, but they need to know what's coming down the pipe, really.

Would it be possible to elaborate a little bit on what that impact is in terms of the expenditure cycle for the Treasury Board Secretariat? As well, what does that mean in terms of any additional changes that need to happen?

**Bill Matthews:** There are two main benefits to tabling in the fall. As just mentioned, one is around giving provinces and territories more clarity about the federal government's plans while they develop their own budgets. I've already spoken to a few provincial colleagues who are quite pleased with that.

The second one is that parliamentarians have often expressed frustration about the lack of alignment between the budget when it's in the spring and the main estimates typically tabled around the same time that reflect nothing of the budget. Tabling the budget in the fall, as has been done this year and will happen going forward, gives departments a chance to get budget measures into their main estimates, which Parliament will see in 2026 before April 1, and allow better alignment there. Departments are going to have to work very hard to get their submissions for new funding into the main estimates. That will be our job over the next few months with departments.

The other piece will be investments but also reductions. There has been some dialogue this afternoon around the CER and when the details will show up. The full details will be in the main estimates and the departmental plans that go with it when they are tabled in 2026. The reductions we've been talking about don't actually take effect until April 1. That's where you will see the traditional parliamentary reporting with those details, outside of PBO requests, etc., which has already been discussed.

• (1655)

**Sherry Romanado:** In that regard, with respect to those departmental results reports, would it then take us an additional fiscal year before we're able to see those? If we're shifting that, I'm curious to know when the reporting will be, and the planning, because we're kind of off cycle at the moment.

**Bill Matthews:** I actually think it works better. For the main estimates, the good companion piece is the departmental plans. You get the high level, and the departmental plans will still go with those. They should reflect the same things the main estimates reflect in terms of investments.

The companion piece to the departmental results report is the Public Accounts of Canada. They both happen in the fall and they will continue to do so.

**Sherry Romanado:** To go back to some of the programs you talked about in terms of the CER, or the comprehensive expenditure review, when we do the review next year to see how we did in terms of the cuts that were made or forecast and so on, is there a plan to do an updated training session for parliamentarians to understand a little bit more about the impact of these changes? This is pretty new for parliamentarians, in terms of the CER. Is there a plan to provide parliamentarians with a little bit more of an in-depth update on how this is working?

**Bill Matthews:** I'm not aware of any plan for tailored briefings to parliamentarians in terms of the plans. I will say that the format of the reporting that departments use in their departmental plans and the results will be standard across the board so that parliamentarians will have an easier time to digest them. Obviously, committees are free to dig into those. We are certainly open to receiving any requests through the minister and his office around additional training that might be needed.

**Sherry Romanado:** Okay.

I'm good. Thank you.

**The Chair:** Madame Gaudreau, go ahead, please.

[*Translation*]

**Marie-Hélène Gaudreau:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Matthews, I'd like to learn a bit more and understand how things work. Who instructs you to put forward estimates based on requests? Does the order come directly from the Prime Minister's Office?

**Bill Matthews:** Government decisions regarding investments have to be approved by Treasury Board. They are then included in the estimates.

I will ask my colleague Mr. Brunelle-Côté whether he has anything to add.

**Marie-Hélène Gaudreau:** I didn't get an answer from the minister. I'd like to know where the order came from. We want answers, but we don't have any.

Please explain to me how the process works.

**Antoine Brunelle-Côté:** The main priorities are obviously laid out in the Speech from the Throne, and they are reflected in the budget. The budget decisions are made mainly by the finance minister, the Minister of Finance and National Revenue, to be precise, and the Prime Minister.

As the secretary of Treasury Board explained, once an expenditure appears in the budget, it must be approved by Treasury Board. Only after Treasury Board approval is the item included in the main estimates.

**Marie-Hélène Gaudreau:** Great.

I bring up investment a lot, because I try to discuss it with the chartered professional accountants I know. They cannot understand why everything is lumped together in this unit of measure. The government can own aircraft, submarines or buildings, but the Parliamentary Budget Officer told us that what the government owns is 4%.

I mentioned teeth earlier. The government isn't investing in teeth; rather, it's providing a service. How do you untangle it all?

• (1700)

**Bill Matthews:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

There are two chartered accountants at the table: myself and my counterpart Ms. Boyer. Everyone talks about accounting standards. They aren't going to change. The public accounts of Canada will continue to provide expenditures and assets, as usual.

The government presented the budget using a different definition of investment. The purpose was to show exactly what the government was doing to increase investment in Canada.

[*English*]

The theory there is, yes, government spending on capital assets is an investment, but there are also other measures a government can take to attract investment into Canada. They are presenting those all together as a capital investment plan.

That will not change the Public Accounts of Canada and how we actually report results.

[*Translation*]

**Marie-Hélène Gaudreau:** I gather that the figures are right, but the government decided to play with them to paint a picture.

What should we expect from the Auditor General? Ultimately, she will provide clarity around what is actually an investment.

I want to know what the tax credits involve. I understand, because to me, they provide economic benefits.

The people we talk to ask us what the investments are. The fact is they are not laid out clearly in the budget. Am I wrong?

Help me to understand.

**Bill Matthews:** You aren't necessarily wrong.

Mr. Chair, there aren't any standards for presenting the budget.

**Marie-Hélène Gaudreau:** All right.

**Bill Matthews:** Every province does things differently. This time, the Government of Canada decided to use a new format for investments. The reason was solely to highlight the investments. Some like it, others don't.

**Marie-Hélène Gaudreau:** The thing is we have to compare apples with apples. We can't compare what is happening in Quebec with what's happening somewhere else. When Quebec invests in hospitals, it owns them. The government is saying it's the same way in Quebec, but that's not the case. This is the choice the government made on the basis of the numbers it had, and afterwards, the Auditor General will give us the results. Isn't that how it works?

[English]

**The Chair:** Answer briefly, Mr. Matthews.

[Translation]

**Bill Matthews:** The Auditor General will continue to audit the federal government's public accounts and financial statements, but she won't audit the budget.

**Marie-Hélène Gaudreau:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

[English]

**The Chair:** Mrs. Jansen has the floor and then Mr. Gasparro.

**Tamara Jansen:** Thank you.

Mr. Matthews, since we were chatting earlier I have a question for you specifically again on the Stellantis contract.

On Tuesday, the Department of Industry told us that no single lawyer reviewed the entire Stellantis contract. They specifically said, to my amazement, that legal isn't even present during negotiations. They explained that only a few lawyers would have seen select parts of the contract.

If there's no single lawyer who's reviewed a contract of \$15 billion, would it be responsible for the President of the Treasury Board to sign off on the spending?

**Bill Matthews:** Mr. Chair, in terms of how the agreement and the deal was reached, I wasn't there. I can't really comment on that. I'll go back and listen to that testimony with great interest.

Again, we are dealing with the parameters. Cabinet makes decisions that establish the parameters of a program or an initiative or a deal. If the department's proposal to Treasury Board respects those parameters and Treasury Board policies, then the responsible minister is given the authority to go ahead.

**Tamara Jansen:** Okay, so would you expect that lawyers would have combed through that humongous \$15 billion contract with a fine-tooth comb to protect Canadian taxpayers before it came to you?

**Bill Matthews:** I would expect that the responsible departmental officials in justice, ISED and maybe others would have reviewed all relevant material. I will go back and listen to that testimony with interest.

• (1705)

**Tamara Jansen:** Earlier, Minister Ali said there are mechanisms to deal with people violating TBS guidelines. Could you tell me a little more about that?

**Bill Matthews:** Sure.

Treasury Board policies and Treasury Board directives are mandatory, and there's a way for a department to seek an exemption, if warranted, and Treasury Board can grant exemptions, or I can grant them.

Where you have departments that are not respecting Treasury Board policy, there are things Treasury Board can do. They could remove delegation for contracting authority or for HR authorities, etc. Effectively, the most common one would be additional reporting or an improvement plan. If it's too severe, then you would actually see pulling back of contracting authority.

**Tamara Jansen:** Would you not consider having at least one lawyer look through the entire contract?

As I said, I was absolutely stunned when they said they don't have legal during negotiations. Then on top of it, to say that no one single lawyer actually sat through the entire...they were parsed out pieces of the contract.... Would that have broken the rules? That seems very unusual to me for a \$15-billion contract.

**Bill Matthews:** I can't speak to what happened in this case.

The normal case, when I was in line departments, is that when you're reviewing a major agreement or deal you would get legal advice as part of that, and they would sign off on this.

I cannot speak to the detailed process that the department followed—

**Tamara Jansen:** You are saying it would be the norm that Treasury Board would expect that there would be proper lawyer oversight before it comes to you for signing.

**Bill Matthews:** Before a department reaches a deal, there would be legal risk analysis and a sign-off of some sort. You're not going to find that in a Treasury Board policy. That's just my own expectation and it's my experience as well.

**Tamara Jansen:** Honestly, I would expect, just as a regular Canadian taxpayer, that you would have proper legal oversight. It just blew my mind when they mentioned that.

**Bill Matthews:** As I said, I will go back and read that testimony. I'm curious.

**Tamara Jansen:** It was Stephanie Tanton who said that. She was very clear at the Tuesday meeting.

The job of the Treasury Board is you're there to ensure things like there are provisions to protect the Canadian jobs in the agreement. Is that correct?

**Bill Matthews:** Again, if there's a program involved, which is a series of agreements, there would be parameters in the program that they would need to respect.

My recollection of Stellantis is that it's not a particular program, it's a one-off agreement. The broad parameters of that would not be approved by Treasury Board, they would have been negotiated by the department.

**Tamara Jansen:** You would have nothing to do with ensuring that there were job guarantees. Whose job would it be to ensure there were job guarantees?

From what I understand, the Treasury Board has to make sure spending is justified, risks are understood, the department has done its homework and taxpayers are getting what they pay for.

Whose job is it to make sure there are job guarantees or claw-backs if things don't happen, or, like in the case of Stellantis, they leave?

**The Chair:** Give a very brief answer, please.

**Bill Matthews:** Certainly, Mr. Chair.

The department would be responsible for making sure that they had enough protection to respect the government's decision, in terms of whatever guarantees were established when it was approved.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Ms. Rochefort, go ahead please.

**Pauline Rochefort:** Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

I was pleased to read, in the departmental results, that the Treasury Board Secretariat had identified \$9.6 million in spending reductions in 2024-25. I think it was listed that there were reductions in operations, professional services, transfer payments, travel and so on.

How did that affect your obligations to deliver on priorities or any significant projects that you might have had?

**Bill Matthews:** I will turn to my chief financial officer in a moment to just elaborate for a bit.

TBS is a very human-centric organization, so we are very heavy on people. We are not delivering programs directly to Canadians. Where we typically look for savings is just making sure we are looking at the areas of highest risk and consolidating where we can in terms of functions, and taking a look at some things that maybe we used to do in the past that no longer add value.

I don't know if you wish to add anything, Annie.

**Annie Boyer (Assistant Secretary and Chief Financial Officer, Treasury Board Secretariat):** Yes.

I don't have the reference for the \$9-million reduction in savings, but I know there's a \$15-million reduction in our spending, because the Canadian digital service program was transferred to Employ-

ment and Social Development Canada. There's a reduction in our spending due to a transfer of a program to another department.

• (1710)

**Pauline Rochefort:** Well, just on that note, I'm equally interested in knowing how AI is improving the services of the Treasury Board.

**Bill Matthews:** AI is one of the interesting pieces that we are looking at throughout government. Every department is doing some mini-experimentation with artificial intelligence. At TBS, it's very helpful for us in terms of reviewing and processing. We have analysts experimenting with using it to edit memos, etc.

I think it's too early to say, "Point me exactly to where the productivity gains have been." If you talk to colleagues in the private sector, they will tell you they're experiencing the exact same thing. We're all experimenting and all trying to figure out where the true production or productivity savings are. There's more to come on that in the future, I think.

**Pauline Rochefort:** I'll just come back briefly to a comment that was made by the minister. I'd like to understand just how involved you are, for example, in the purchase of fighter jets.

**Bill Matthews:** It's national defence, Public Services and Procurement Canada and the Defence Investment Agency, which is relatively new, that would be involved in that, along with partners from the Department of Industry, ISED.

Treasury Board would have a role in terms of approvals for contracts, project authorities and getting regular status updates. This project has been under way for a while. Where the department might be seeking additional money or a change in plans, they may have to come to Treasury Board, but defence has pretty broad authorities with PSPC to manage on a day-to-day basis.

**Pauline Rochefort:** Very good.

Maybe just give a final comment on the environmental footprint. Did you see, through your departmental results, if there are any comments on the reduction in the government's environmental footprint?

**Bill Matthews:** Treasury Board Secretariat has something called the greening government program or organization. It's a small group that is very much focused on reducing emissions from government operations, so inside government.

The two to highlight are that 83% of our light-duty vehicles are now green—so that's great; and then if you look at emissions from government buildings, comparing 2025 to previous years, you'll see that we've come down 42%, I believe, over the last 20 years or so. We're making good progress so that we're on track. The eventual goal there is net zero obviously, so there's still a way to go.

**Pauline Rochefort:** My colleague here always says, "thank you for your service", so I say thank you for those results. That's very impressive—good work.

**The Chair:** Thanks.

We'll go to Mrs. Block for five minutes and then Madame Gaudreau.

**Kelly Block:** Thank you, Chair.

Mr. Matthews, according to the TBS website, GC InfoBase, in 2024-25, Public Safety Canada set a total of 28 goals, and 14 of them are sitting at 0%. This is a department where 98% of the executives received bonuses in 2023-24, when they met only 35.7% of their goals.

The department is requesting an additional \$43 million in supplementary spending in these estimates. Given that the Treasury Board sets the policy framework for how bonuses are awarded, what do you have to say when 98% of executives receive bonuses within a department when they haven't even met half of their stated goals?

**Bill Matthews:** Again, you would have to look at which goals are not being met and why. If there are goals that are not being met because the required approvals weren't taken, etc., or something was delayed, you have to really dig in and determine what the cause is.

In terms of those results and how we are monitoring at TBS, we are launching a new risk and compliance framework that will help us better assess how departments are doing in terms of where they are carrying risk, and some of those risks could be around delivery.

In terms of Treasury Board Secretariat's involvement in the awarding of performance pay to executives, that is up to the department's deputy head to make those determinations in terms of whether their executives are meeting what was asked of them or not. We don't have line of sight into those decisions. That is a deputy head decision.

• (1715)

**Kelly Block:** The Treasury Board is responsible for setting the policy framework. When you see incidents like this, where a department is not meeting even half of the goals they set, regardless of what the excuses or reasons may be, has the Treasury Board had a conversation in regard to reforming how bonuses are rewarded?

**Bill Matthews:** Regarding performance pay and the link to departments achieving their published targets or results, I have not had any of those conversations. I can tell you that, in terms of the approach we take at TBS for our own employees, we are looking at whether the executives met the expectations in their own performance agreement. Some are tied to delivering on certain programs, and some are not. Some are more corporate related. You really have to understand why the targets are not being met and then the link to the executives before passing any judgment, I think, on whether there's a bigger problem.

**Kelly Block:** Thank you very much, Chair. That is all that I have for today.

**The Chair:** Thanks.

Madame Gaudreau.

[Translation]

**Marie-Hélène Gaudreau:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I'd just like to finish what I was saying earlier about the contracting out of work, because the Standing Committee on Government

Operations and Estimates is the committee that examines those contracts. I wasn't on the committee when you went through that nightmare, Mr. Chair. Nevertheless, I'm very worried.

I was asking the minister questions earlier. Salaries are going up, collective agreements are in place and 16,000 jobs are being eliminated through attrition. Where does it say that less work will be contracted out and that the work will be assigned in accordance with the skill sets of the public servants who remain? Thousands of them are keeping their jobs. Where does it say that?

I am very worried. This is a fiasco. Are we charging towards another wall?

**Bill Matthews:** In the budget, the government stated its intention to reduce spending on consultants by 20%.

**Marie-Hélène Gaudreau:** You are talking about a 20% reduction, not an 80% reduction. Is that right?

**Bill Matthews:** Yes.

However, it doesn't apply to all services. We contract out certain types of work, shipbuilding and other such tangible activities. There is a difference between spending on consultants and spending on shipbuilding or a new IT system.

[English]

That's fine. That's in the budget. We will work on that. There's some really good disclosure around government spending on contracts and what it's for in the public accounts.

In terms of the balance between the public service and contracting and reductions, number one, all public servants aren't created equal. In cases where we can do the work with public servants rather than with contractors, we should be doing it with public servants every single time, but there are skill sets we do not have in the public service that we need outside help for—construction, etc.—and that's fine as well.

I think you'll see in departments' plans, main estimates, etc. where they plan to spend money and where the reductions will be by skill set.

The one that's worth highlighting is that we did put in a special regime for experts in the digital domain. Basically, through our chief information officer, departments are forced to look at the digital talent we have inside the government before they go outside. That's one specific thing we've done, but where we can do the work with public servants, that will obviously be the priority.

[*Translation*]

**Marie-Hélène Gaudreau:** Mr. Chair, my sense is that we're going to have to keep a watchful eye. I don't want to relive the same nightmare, especially when we're talking about contracting out digital work. You must have trouble sleeping from time to time.

I'll leave it there.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Thanks very much, Madame Gaudreau. I think we all wish to avoid another digital nightmare.

Colleagues, if you don't mind, I have a couple of quick questions for Mr. Matthews—a couple maybe just for an answer and a couple maybe to take away.

I'm glad Mrs. Block brought up the issue about the bonuses and the lack of alignment, I guess, with what's achieved. I'm glad it was brought up, because I've brought it up at public accounts to many different ministers and many different department heads. The excuse or the answer is always, well, we follow Treasury Board guidelines.

If you wish, I can go through all the blues from the many times we've brought it up. They always blame Treasury Board: Yes, we've failed massively, but we're only following Treasury Board guidelines. The onus seems to be placed on the guidelines.

You mentioned not passing judgment. I think 98% of executives and management are getting bonuses when results are failing. According to GC InfoBase, 47% of the results were not achieved. Just from memory, in the previous year it was close to 50%. In the year previous, it was 53%. We have this massive failure, and department officials are always saying, oh, we're just following the rules. So I'll put that back with you.

I'm glad you talked about departmental plans. When you look at the departmental results, fully 19% of last year's departmental results had no results available—I know you're probably laughing inside, because we've brought this up every year for the last several years—or to be achieved in the future. Of course, the estimates are based on a one-year achievement. I'm hoping that you will actually stop that procedure or practice in the departments where they're actually presenting departmental plans to Parliament without actual goals attached. I do appreciate that.

On the stretch goals, I wonder if you could get back to us. I know you mentioned that departments are missing results because of stretch goals. We actually go through and look. For a fair amount of where they've missed the results, they've actually dropped less than last year. If you look at the departmental plans, I would happily bet money that more than 50% of the goals for next year are actually below what they actually achieved the previous year. So I don't think it's because they have stretch goals when most of them are actually showing lower; their goals are to actually achieve less than they have previous years and the previous year before that. I'll just leave that with you.

I do have a quick question. I want to follow up with Mr. Kelly—who has left the room—about the PBO and the CER. The PBO wrote to the five departments asking for the information. He didn't write to Treasury Board. He wrote to the five ministers. But the

comptroller general responded. Who directed her not to provide the information to the PBO?

It was October 30 when we asked the minister. He said yes. I know that on October 31, the cabinet was briefed by the comptroller general and others on the CER. But it's still not released. Who would have directed her to refuse to hand over the data to the PBO that's required under the Parliament of Canada Act?

• (1720)

**Bill Matthews:** There are a couple of points in there, Mr. Chair. One, on the decision of the comptroller general to write to the PBO and say they were unable to respond right now, it was not a “no”; it was that they couldn't respond within this deadline. There was no consultation on the deadline.

That decision was taken between me, the comptroller general and colleagues at the Department of Finance. It was just felt that because all five were in the same boat, just one response would be a useful thing to give—

**The Chair:** Are you saying that on October 31, when the comptroller general briefed the cabinet committee on this, she briefed them with incomplete numbers?

**Bill Matthews:** The comptroller general would not have briefed the cabinet committee on—

**The Chair:** You're saying that the comptroller general did not brief anyone on this?

**Bill Matthews:** On the CER?

**The Chair:** Yes.

**Bill Matthews:** The comptroller general would not have been briefing on the CER, no. She will now be monitoring results. The decision was this: We know that all five aren't in a position to respond, so we just thought one response was better. This was not, no, we will not respond; this was we can't respond in this timeline.

The five departments in question are all working to respond as quickly as they can. Those responses to the PBO, to the request, will come from the departments on behalf of their minister, not from TBS.

**The Chair:** I appreciate that. So the decision was made by you and finance, but not by the departments themselves. The PBO writes to the departments. No offence, but it's not to you and not to finance; it's to the departments.

**Bill Matthews:** That's fair, Mr. Chair.

There was dialogue between Treasury Board Secretariat and departments about this. It was not written out of the blue without consulting departments. They were not in a position to respond.

**The Chair:** I think we will agree to disagree. We hope that we will see the document or the information very soon.

I do echo Mr. Kelly's comments. It's bizarre to ask us to vote on a budget and on the cuts when the information is not shared with us. Then to sit and say that you have to inform others what the cuts will be after Parliament, uninformed, announces the cuts.

I appreciate your feedback. I'm glad you were able to join us today. Mr. Matthews has been with us so much that I think he's reached OGGO super-elite status. You get a complimentary upgrade on your next visit with us.

Anyway, thanks very much for being with us.

Colleagues, I have a couple of quick announcements just to update everyone. We had set aside December 2 for our meeting with Mr. Guzman and Secretary Fuhr. It was for a two-hour meeting. They have stated they will not honour our motion and they are refusing to meet separately. They will only appear together for one hour.

I'm not asking for a decision or anything from the committee yet, but we'll bring it up at the next meeting. We've given them several alternatives, but they will not appear separately and will only appear for one hour.

You saw the note that December 11 is Canada Post now. We do apologize. I think we said repeatedly that it would be the 4th, but it is December 11. I appreciate everyone's patience with that.

On December 4 we will have the representative from Stellantis in person for one hour. In the second hour we had invited the minister for PSPC. We made several dates available and unfortunately the minister will not make himself available to defend his estimates. We're looking at the second hour being PSPC officials.

I'll leave that with everyone and we can take up the issue of the motion calling for two separate hours for Mr. Guzman and the secretary and then how we wish to follow up with the minister for PSPC at our next meeting.

Again, witnesses, thanks for being with us today. We appreciate the information and the feedback you provided.

Colleagues, thanks very much for your patience as we play around with our schedule.

We are adjourned.

---





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

---

### SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

---

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

---

### PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

---

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

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

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

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

---

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