



HOUSE OF COMMONS  
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES  
CANADA

45th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

---

# Standing Committee on Government Operations and Estimates

EVIDENCE

**NUMBER 020**

Thursday, December 4, 2025

---

Chair: Kelly McCauley





## Standing Committee on Government Operations and Estimates

Thursday, December 4, 2025

• (1530)

[English]

**The Chair (Kelly McCauley (Edmonton West, CPC)):** Good afternoon, everyone.

Welcome to meeting number 20 of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Government Operations and Estimates.

Pursuant to Standing Order 108(3)(c), the committee is resuming its study on the response of the government to the motion for the production of papers adopted on October 20 about contracts with Stellantis.

Welcome, Ms. Piruzza. We appreciate your patience.

[Translation]

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

[English]

**The Chair:** I'm sorry. Excuse us for two seconds.

[Translation]

**Marie-Hélène Gaudreau:** I'm only hearing English. It isn't even your voice, Mr. Chair.

[English]

**The Chair:** I'm sorry. Go ahead.

[Translation]

**Marie-Hélène Gaudreau:** I just want to make sure that everything's working.

Since you're speaking to me in English, I'll see if the interpretation is working.

[English]

**The Chair:** We're also getting feedback. It sounds like English and French are both coming through on the same channel. When I speak, I hear it repeating.

I'm sorry, but we're going to suspend for a few seconds.

• (1530)

(Pause)

• (1530)

**The Chair:** We're back. I'm sorry for that. Thank you for your patience, twice now.

I want to express my thanks to you for joining us in person. We understand there were lots of IT issues the last time. It's relatively

common with Zoom, with the committee, so we appreciate that you were able to join us today. I'm sorry you weren't able to join us last week. I want to give special thanks for your patience in putting up with our IT issues.

Colleagues, everybody participating around the table has received the unredacted version of the agreement. The motion was to have it unredacted by email, but industry would only provide it unredacted and printed, so that is what you get. This is confidential. It's not to be shared with anyone—with any staff or with anyone outside—by those who have received it today.

Mr. Gasparro, when you're back in person, you will receive a confidential copy. There may be other members at the table who have not received it and will not receive it in the future. Mr. Seebach, for example, who is here today, received it. The spirit was that it would stay with that one person. The next time we discuss it, if there is a next time, it would be with that MP and not with other MPs.

I would ask today, for any questions you put forward, that you do not read or bring up specific items from the contract. You can obviously ask about it, but don't say, "on page 13, I noticed that the chair of OGGO is to receive Christmas gifts," etc. Please don't refer to specifics.

We will go ahead with a five-minute opening statement.

Again, thank you for joining us today, and I'm sorry for all the IT issues. I know it was frustrating for you, but I'm glad you could join us today in person.

Please go ahead.

• (1535)

**Teresa Piruzza (Director, External Affairs and Public Policy, FCA Canada Inc.):** Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

Honourable members of the committee, thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today.

My name is Teresa Piruzza, and I am the director of external affairs for Stellantis Canada.

As you mentioned, I regret that I was unable to participate in last week's meeting, as I had intended—and attempted—to do. I was unable to join for reasons beyond my or Stellantis's control. I was, however, online with parliamentary IT throughout the duration of the meeting, but unfortunately, they were not able to fix the problem. I know you were frustrated by my non-attendance. Believe me that I was frustrated as well.

I hope my letter on Monday made it clear that Stellantis has no objection to members of the committee viewing unredacted versions of the SIF agreement, which I see that you have now received, with appropriate confidentiality safeguards in place. They are safeguards that reflect established parliamentary processes, which will be familiar to the members of the committee.

Stellantis has consistently taken the position that the commercially sensitive information contained in our agreement with the government should remain confidential. After the committee asked the government to provide a copy of the agreement, the government proposed redactions and we agreed to the proposed redactions as appropriate.

We understand and respect the important role of the OGGO committee. That is why we have agreed that the full agreement should be shared with the members in a confidential setting. We hope this will allow you to advance your study while also protecting the confidentiality of Stellantis's commercially sensitive information.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

We'll start our six-minute round with Mrs. Block, please.

The floor is yours.

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

Welcome, Ms. Piruzza. It's good to have you join us today.

As you are well aware—because you were watching the committee last week—department officials told us that it was Stellantis that proposed the redactions and outlined why every one of them was necessary. You have now written a letter and, in your opening remarks, claimed that Stellantis never requested for the documents to be redacted.

After this committee ordered the documents to be produced, who initiated the conversation regarding redactions?

**Teresa Piruzza:** I can't speak to others' testimony, but I can speak to the context and the process through which the agreements have been shared.

The context is essentially, as I said in my opening remarks, the importance of maintaining the confidentiality of commercially sensitive information. That's the context that overlays, almost like a lens, these agreements. I believe that's an objective that the government shares as well. That's the context that goes over this.

When we were advised that the agreement had been requested, the government provided some redactions, which we reviewed and agreed to—again—given that those redactions reflected our business information.

**Kelly Block:** How do you square your testimony today with the testimony that we received from ISED when they appeared? I'm going to quote the response that we got: "However, I can say that in our discussions with Stellantis, they outlined to us, for every redaction, why they felt it necessary for it to be protected commercially. We were comfortable with the redactions [that] they proposed."

That's a little bit different from what you're telling us here today.

• (1540)

**Teresa Piruzza:** Again, I can't speak to someone else's testimony to this committee. I can outline, again, the context and the process through which we were engaged. That is how the process went through in terms of the redactions that were proposed and that we reviewed and consented to. Essentially, it was a joint effort in terms of ensuring that our sensitive information is maintained confidential and redacted.

**Kelly Block:** I'm going to go back to the paragraph in the letter that you sent where you didn't say that this was a joint effort. You said, "To be clear: Stellantis did not propose or suggest any of the redactions applied to the version of the SIF Agreement that the Committee received from ISED."

Does that sound like it was a joint process and that there was a going back and forth on what would be redacted and what wouldn't be redacted?

**Teresa Piruzza:** Again, in terms of the context of the request and the process, the government provided us with a copy of a redacted agreement. We reviewed those redactions and agreed that they protected our information appropriately.

**Kelly Block:** Okay. I'm going to move on to another question.

Did ISED ever suggest sharing the fully unredacted contract with the committee?

**Teresa Piruzza:** It goes back to the lens that is always put, both with ourselves and with ISED—that shared objective—to ensure the confidentiality of our business information.

**Kelly Block:** They never at any point said, "These are parliamentarians. They have a right to see these contracts unredacted. Can we present them to the committee? Would you be comfortable with us presenting them to the committee unredacted?"

**Teresa Piruzza:** Our objective is, as Stellantis has continuously maintained, that any review of an agreement must be done in a confidential setting. The protection of the information that's in there is critical.

**Kelly Block:** I'm just trying to get an answer to the question that I've asked. Did they ever suggest that parliamentarians should receive these contracts unredacted under those circumstances that you've just outlined?

**Teresa Piruzza:** We respect OGGO and your privilege in terms of reviewing the agreement. That is why we did propose—and I see that you've now received—the unredacted copies.

**Kelly Block:** I guess my next question is this: Do you agree with their testimony?

**Teresa Piruzza:** I can only speak to my testimony and in terms of the process that I was engaged in.

**Kelly Block:** Okay. Then, in response to the question I asked about ISED ever suggesting that you share the fully unredacted contracts with parliamentarians, I'm going to assume that is a no.

Department officials told us they had back-and-forth conversations with Stellantis about the redactions. Is that correct?

**Teresa Piruzza:** They provided us with a copy of the redactions. We responded that we found them to be appropriate and then we had a further conversation with respect to those redactions.

**Kelly Block:** Thank you.

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

We'll go to Mr. Gasparro, but I'll apologize before we do. We do have with us today, as we've had recently, our legal counsel, Mr. Bédard and Ms. Gauthier. We'll keep it informal. If you have questions for them specifically, feel free to address them directly. You don't have to go through the chair or anything. Make use of them if you see fit.

We have Mr. Gasparro, please, for six minutes

Thank you for waiting.

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

Thank you, Ms. Piruzza, for being here. My questions are not directed to you, but through you to your company. They're around values. I have a bit of a preamble.

During the global financial crisis, the Government of Canada, from a present value perspective, lent then Chrysler over \$6 billion. The taxpayer lost over \$1.8 billion when the equity value of Chrysler was zero. Eleven thousand jobs were lost. Plants were shut down.

Fast-forward to today. The Government of Canada lent now Stellantis, from what we have seen, \$222 million. Just yesterday, your CEO was in Washington with the President, announcing that they are investing \$13 billion in the United States, practically blowing Canadian taxpayers' dollars.

Does Stellantis have a values problem in that they say one thing at one time to get whatever capital they need and then change their messaging when the environment is convenient for them?

• (1545)

**Teresa Piruzza:** Thank you for the question.

Stellantis has been in Canada for over a hundred years now and we remain committed to Canada. With respect to investments in Canada, over the last few years we have invested billions in Canada. We are increasing production at our Windsor assembly plant. We are adding a third shift and 1,500 jobs at the Windsor as-

sembly plant. Our research and development centre in Windsor has also enhanced its capabilities and added over 600 professional jobs at that location, and we have other investments through other locations as well.

With respect to our commitment in Canada, I think it's fairly clear, given the billions that have been invested over the last number of years and the advancements we've made.

**Vince Gasparro:** That sounds good, and we appreciate the foreign direct investment that has been placed in our country. However, I'm going to come back to it again. Your CEO was at the White House yesterday celebrating the rollback of, for example, fuel economy legislation. When I check your corporate filings, corporate sustainability for your products is a top priority. How do you rectify that?

Again, I'm coming back to this being a question of values.

**Teresa Piruzza:** Thank you.

I can't speak to American policies or American politics, but I can speak to our commitment in Canada in terms of the investments, as I just outlined, the advancements we're making and the employment we're increasing in Canada, as evidence of our commitment to Canada.

**Vince Gasparro:** When was the decision made to relocate Jeep Compass production? Was it made before or after Stellantis accepted government incentives?

**Teresa Piruzza:** If you're talking about the SIF agreement, that goes back, I believe, to 2022. Included in that time are our investments in Windsor, at the ARDC and in Brampton.

I know, and you may know, that at the end of October, Jeff Hines presented at INDU on operational and strategic decisions at that time. The decision for Brampton was rolled into a vehicle allocation plan across North America, which continues.

**Vince Gasparro:** You mentioned a third shift being added at the Windsor assembly plant, which will create 1,500 new jobs. However, 3,000 jobs are being lost in Brampton. That still leaves a net loss of 1,500 jobs. How does Stellantis justify this overall reduction?

**Teresa Piruzza:** Brampton is on an operational pause. It has not closed. Those employees remain employees of Stellantis.

**Vince Gasparro:** Thank you.

• (1550)

**The Chair:** Thanks, Mr. Gasparro.

We'll go to Madame Gaudreau, please, for six minutes.

[*Translation*]

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

It's a whole saga. That's a lot of zeros for the people watching us, because we trusted a successful company that has a large monopoly and that received help on that scale, unlike other industries, such as the forestry industry, which received crumbs.

Today, we're wondering how it took so long. We're wondering if it's for technological or other reasons. We don't know what happened. The answer no doubt lies in what was redacted. I have the document before me. We could have addressed the matter right off the bat.

It's possible to impute the motives behind deciding not to submit information in private. We're going to be told that it's to protect competition. That's one thing.

However, the most important thing is to understand how Stellantis, a multinational company, can make decisions that go against its contract, decisions that lead to job losses and that affect non-repayable loans of enormous value to citizens.

How can Stellantis explain what's going on right now?

[English]

**Teresa Piruzza:** We certainly appreciate government support for the industry and we appreciate the collaboration with the government, at all levels of government.

We are honouring our agreements. We've invested in Windsor. We've invested in the ARDC. We will continue to work with the government to find a suitable solution for Brampton as well.

[Translation]

**Marie-Hélène Gaudreau:** Have I understood correctly that, for example, if certain terms of the agreement aren't respected, you will correct the situation? When the terms and undertakings are not met, corrections are made. That's what you're telling us here, in public, isn't it?

[English]

**Teresa Piruzza:** We are actively planning, working and collaborating with government to find a solution for Brampton, as I said. We will honour our agreement.

[Translation]

**Marie-Hélène Gaudreau:** Have you established any steps or a communication process to keep both the government and the parliamentarians on this committee informed?

[English]

**Teresa Piruzza:** We are having conversations with government, and at this point, information that's been shared is confidential. We will continue to have those conversations again. I think all of us have a joint desire to find a solution for Brampton, and that's what we'll continue to work towards.

[Translation]

**Marie-Hélène Gaudreau:** Since I still have a bit of time left, I'd like to ask you one last question.

I've stopped the clock, Mr. Chair, because I feel like it's hard to focus. I have six minutes; we have to do a preamble, and there's a delay in the interpretation, so I think everyone for their understanding. I'll restart my clock.

Who in the department contacted you, and what did that person say when they spoke to you about the motion in question on the production of documents?

• (1555)

[English]

**Teresa Piruzza:** I can't recall exactly who, but it would have been someone from the SIF unit of ISED.

[Translation]

**Marie-Hélène Gaudreau:** No. It isn't working. I didn't understand a thing.

Could you repeat that, please?

[English]

**Teresa Piruzza:** I don't have the email so I don't know exactly, but it would have been through the department of ISED, the SIF unit.

[Translation]

**Marie-Hélène Gaudreau:** I wish you could.... I'm sorry; I can't hear.

[English]

**Teresa Piruzza:** I'm sorry. It keeps going on and off.

**The Chair:** We've suspended your time. We'll give you one more minute, but IT, I'm watching her. It is turning on and off by itself. Maybe turn it off and then we'll try one more time.

I'm going to suspend for two seconds here.

• (1555)

(Pause)

• (1555)

**The Chair:** We're back.

You have one minute, Ms. Gaudreau.

[Translation]

**Marie-Hélène Gaudreau:** Quite simply, I would like us to have access to the emails from the person at the department who contacted you about the motion.

[English]

**Teresa Piruzza:** I would have to go back to take a look.

**The Chair:** Could you provide that information to the committee, then?

**Teresa Piruzza:** I will, yes.

**The Chair:** That's wonderful.

We'll now go to Mr. Seeback for five minutes.

**Kyle Seeback (Dufferin—Caledon, CPC):** Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

Do you consider the entire SIF agreement that the committee has been given access to commercially sensitive and must, therefore, be kept confidential?

**Teresa Piruzza:** Do you mean the entire agreement?

**Kyle Seeback:** Yes, I mean the entire agreement.

**Teresa Piruzza:** From our perspective, any element that has our investment plans, product plans or other information that's business sensitive must be maintained confidential.

**Kyle Seeback:** The entire contract isn't confidential.

**Teresa Piruzza:** I wouldn't say the entire contract.

**Kyle Seeback:** Okay.

Earlier in your testimony, you said that the government, Industry Canada, made some redactions to protect commercially sensitive information, and you agreed that those redactions protected Stellantis' commercially sensitive information. Is that a fair statement?

**Teresa Piruzza:** I would say that they were appropriate.

**Kyle Seeback:** By default, that would mean that the rest of the contract is not commercially sensitive and, therefore, why should that not be available for us to question the government on the bona fides of this contract?

• (1600)

**Teresa Piruzza:** My understanding is that this is the study you're currently undertaking with respect to the agreement—

**Kyle Seeback:** Yes, but by your own letter from Stellantis, you've said that you're giving us access to this document and that we can't discuss it. It's to be reviewed in camera, and that's the condition. I can't go to a section right now and refer to it, despite the fact that you just said that most of it isn't commercially sensitive.

It seems to me that the contract that was given to us at the last meeting, which had commercially sensitive redactions that you've now agreed protect the commercially sensitive aspects of your business, should be available for members of Parliament to use to hold the government to account, because it doesn't protect any commercially sensitive information.

**Teresa Piruzza:** The information that was redacted was the commercially sensitive information, as indicated and as appropriate. With respect to the rest of the agreement, my understanding is—

**Kyle Seeback:** By default, the rest isn't commercially sensitive.

**Teresa Piruzza:** It isn't, not in the way of sharing any of Stellantis's information.

**Kyle Seeback:** Thank you. That is very helpful.

You do know that the other SIF agreement that Stellantis entered into and the special contribution agreement that Stellantis entered into were produced through an access to information request, and they are hosted on the CBC website. It's publicly available with commercially sensitive redactions. Is there any difference between that, which is publicly available, and this?

**Teresa Piruzza:** I can't speak to the SCA and the SIF agreement. The special contribution agreement is with NextStar, which is a separate entity that is not Stellantis, for one.

With respect to what was shared on CBC, again, I wasn't engaged at all in that process, so I'm not sure if that was through an ATIP—

**Kyle Seeback:** Yes.

**Teresa Piruzza:** —which sometimes redacts more than what is shared with Parliament. I can't comment further than that.

**Kyle Seeback:** Sure, it could redact more, but they're now in the public sphere. They're on the CBC website to download. I've downloaded them, and I've read them with redactions. It seems to me that, since we have a version of this contract that was redacted to protect commercially sensitive information, then the rest of the contract should be available for members of Parliament to use to hold the government to account. Do you agree or disagree with that?

**Teresa Piruzza:** I would suggest that it would be a question for Industry Canada.

**Kyle Seeback:** Or would it be a question for this committee?

**Teresa Piruzza:** It would be a question for this committee through Industry Canada.

**Kyle Seeback:** Thanks very much.

The industry minister in question period and in the House of Commons has said that you're in breach of contract and that they're going to sue you.

Do you consider Stellantis to be in breach of this contract?

**Teresa Piruzza:** I have not heard that.

No, we do not agree that we are in breach of contract.

**Kyle Seeback:** Right.

She says she's going to sue you, but they haven't sued you yet—have they?

**Teresa Piruzza:** Again, I haven't seen any of her comments from today, so I can't comment on that.

**Kyle Seeback:** You're not aware if the government has actually sued Stellantis.

**Teresa Piruzza:** Again, I've been here. I haven't seen anything.

**Kyle Seeback:** If it hasn't happened in the last two minutes, it hasn't happened.

**Pauline Rochefort (Nipissing—Timiskaming, Lib.):** I have a point of order, Chair.

**The Chair:** Thanks.

I'm sorry. I was just saying thank you to Mr. Seeback. We'll go to Ms. Sudds after the point of order.

Go ahead, please.

**Pauline Rochefort:** I simply want to verify with Mr. Seeback whether he has a copy of the contract or not.

**The Chair:** That's not a point of order.

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

**Pauline Rochefort:** Are we allowed to have a copy or not?

**The Chair:** That's not a point of order.

Please, Ms. Sudds, go ahead.

**Pauline Rochefort:** It's a relevant question.

**The Chair:** It's not a point of order, but he does have a copy. I explained that at the very beginning of the meeting.

**Pauline Rochefort:** I must have missed that.

**The Chair:** That's okay. Yes, he does.

**Iqra Khalid (Mississauga—Erin Mills, Lib.):** On that, Chair, at the beginning of the meeting, you said that only permanent members of this committee would—

**The Chair:** I did not say that.

I'm sorry. We'll get to you, Ms. Sudds, in a moment.

What I explained was that, per the motion, there would be people designated to have a copy. If someone has a copy today, they will continue to have that copy. Someone who doesn't have a copy today—for example, Ms. Jansen—will never have a copy. Should we ever come back to this study, whoever has a copy today will continue to have it, which was in the motion.

**An hon. member:** [*Inaudible—Editor*]

**The Chair:** Yes, it is. I've explained it.

We're going to continue with Ms. Sudds for five minutes.

Go ahead.

**Hon. Jenna Sudds (Kanata, Lib.):** Thank you, Chair.

Thank you for being here with us today. Obviously, there are lots of questions to dig into.

I'd like to ask when you were first contacted by the department about the proposed redactions to contracts. Did you agree to apply the same redactions to those contracts that were done when they were provided to the House of Commons Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development last year?

• (1605)

**Teresa Piruzza:** I can't recall the redactions that were provided to the environment committee, but I would suggest that if.... Again, that same lens is used whenever a request is made for these agreements with respect to information, so that similar lens would be applied each time there is a request for the agreements.

**Hon. Jenna Sudds:** In the documents from last year that went to the environment committee, Stellantis proposed redactions.

**Teresa Piruzza:** I really don't recall.

**Hon. Jenna Sudds:** Okay. That's fair enough. Perhaps that's something we could ask you to follow up on with the committee afterwards, if you don't mind. Thank you.

Moving on, given everything we've heard—hundreds of millions of dollars in public support, plant closures, jobs lost and now a dispute over contractual obligations—why should Canadians and this committee trust Stellantis's version of events over the written commitments Stellantis has signed with the Government of Canada?

**Teresa Piruzza:** As I indicated in my previous answer, this agreement covers our Windsor assembly plant, which has introduced new products and is introducing a third shift, and our research and development centre in Windsor, which has added over 600 positions and enhanced the research capabilities at Windsor. It is also committed to a solution for Brampton, working collaboratively with that government. That is our intent.

**Hon. Jenna Sudds:** Our understanding around the table here is that the funding in the SIF agreement is tied to production levels at the plant. Given that production's ending at Brampton, does Stellantis believe it is still entitled to keep the public funding it has already received?

**Teresa Piruzza:** That may be a question that goes into a bit of detail in the agreement with respect to claims and the processing of the grant. I say that only because you indicate that it's tied to production credits.

**Hon. Jenna Sudds:** That's fair enough. I'm sure we'll have a chance to dig into the contract in time.

**The Chair:** I'll allow you a bit more time if you want to pursue that, because I haven't read specifically the item you're referring to.

**Hon. Jenna Sudds:** It's okay. Thank you for that.

I'll continue. I have other questions, certainly.

Can you explain how closing the Brampton plant fits with the commitments that Stellantis made when it accepted the federal funding?

**Teresa Piruzza:** Let me be clear: Brampton has not closed. Brampton is on an operational pause and we continue to look for solutions for that facility. Brampton has not closed.

**Hon. Jenna Sudds:** That's perception, perhaps, but thank you.

You said earlier, in response to one of my colleagues, that Stellantis will honour its obligations in the agreement. We're not seeing evidence of that. In fact, that's frankly why we're here today. How do you propose that Stellantis is going to do that?

**Teresa Piruzza:** Again, this agreement covers a number of facilities, including our Windsor assembly plant, ARDC and Brampton. We are honouring our agreement. Billions have been invested in Canada over the last few years by Stellantis at our facilities. We are introducing a third shift, increasing production at Windsor and expanding capabilities at ARDC, and we are committed to finding a solution for Brampton.

• (1610)

**Hon. Jenna Sudds:** Thank you for that.

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

[Translation]

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

I'm trying to think like a business strategist. It's common to have temporary or permanent closures when things aren't going so well. For example, Windsor could have been closed down. However, the company is moving to the United States. Why is that?

[English]

**Teresa Piruzza:** I'm sorry. I'm not quite understanding. It's not moving. You mentioned Windsor and moving to the U.S. Windsor is continuing to produce again, and we're increasing production and adding a third shift at Windsor and increasing employment there by 1,400 to 1,500 employees. That remains the same.

[Translation]

**Marie-Hélène Gaudreau:** Basically, there was money for the Brampton site. I'm wondering about the viability of that site.

[English]

**Teresa Piruzza:** As I indicated in my most recent response, Brampton is on an operational pause, and we will continue to advance plans and collaborate with government to find a solution. Again, that's our shared objective. Everyone has the same objective.

[Translation]

**Marie-Hélène Gaudreau:** What about agreements with the United States? How far along are you in your strategy?

[English]

**Teresa Piruzza:** As I indicated, I can't speak to American policies, if that's what your question was.

[Translation]

**Marie-Hélène Gaudreau:** Is it possible to describe the current issues? Otherwise, we wouldn't be here today talking about jobs and money given by the government.

What's the overall picture?

[English]

**Teresa Piruzza:** I appreciate the role of OGGO and the study that you are undertaking with respect to this particular agreement with Stellantis. As I've indicated, the agreement covers all our facilities. We have been investing in Canada and will continue to invest in Canada, and we will continue to be committed to Canada.

[Translation]

**Marie-Hélène Gaudreau:** From what I understood from the interpretation, you have invested in Canada.

My last question is this: Will you continue to invest in Canada?

[English]

**Teresa Piruzza:** Yes, by virtue of, as I've indicated, increased production at Windsor, an additional 1,500 jobs at Windsor, expanding the capability of our research and development centre in Windsor and working in partnership with governments and other stakeholders for Brampton.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Mr. Patzer, go ahead please.

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

There was a headline from CBC News back on November 3: "Canada will start dispute resolution process over Stellantis jobs lost to U.S." In that article, Minister Joly was quoted as saying the following: "Today, before the close of business, the government will take the next step under the contracts to recover Canadian taxpayers' money" and "This means that we will start the 30-day period of the formal dispute resolution process in order to bring back production at the Brampton facility. This is the start of the dispute resolution process."

November 4 to December 3 is 30 calendar days. Have you guys entered into a dispute resolution process with the federal government?

**Teresa Piruzza:** As Minister Joly indicated, she was considering the dispute resolution process. We have been in conversation with the minister and the department with respect to moving forward on a plan for Brampton.

• (1615)

**Jeremy Patzer:** Okay.

You said earlier that it's your view that you are not in breach of the contract. If the minister is saying that you are and you're saying that you're not, I mean, how do we square that?

**Teresa Piruzza:** Again, I didn't see or hear her comments from today. I'll have to go back and take a look at exactly what she said.

To your point, no, we do not believe we are in breach of the contract. We are honouring our commitments.

**Jeremy Patzer:** Just for clarity, she said it yesterday in question period and she said it again today. She has said it publicly on the record multiple times.

One thing I found fascinating last week at committee was that when we had the deputy minister come in, he insinuated that the minister hadn't read the contract. He said everybody at the table, though, had read the contract, but then later said he didn't read the contract.

I'm curious to know, on your end, how many people have read the fully unredacted contract on the Stellantis end, even if it's just a rough ballpark number. You don't have to give me the exact number. Would it be more than one or two? How many people would review the contract?

**Teresa Piruzza:** Do you mean how many people within our company?

**Jeremy Patzer:** Yes. Roughly how many people would view it?

**Teresa Piruzza:** I'm trying to do a count. It would be me, someone in legal, someone in finance.... I'm going to say five or six have reviewed the entire agreement internally. There are sections. With respect to who has knowledge of the full agreement, not that many have read through the entire agreement.

**Jeremy Patzer:** How many people would have access to even just partial elements of the contract?

**Teresa Piruzza:** Again, at Stellantis in terms of the agreement, I don't have that number with respect to internally. Certainly internally, in terms of claims or in terms of legal review, there would be those departments that would focus on their sections of the agreement.

**Jeremy Patzer:** Is it fair to say that at least a couple of dozen people, maybe more, would have access to at least certain portions of this contract internally?

**Teresa Piruzza:** Potentially.

**Jeremy Patzer:** Okay. Interesting.

Did the government demand any job guarantees from Stellantis as part of the agreement?

**Teresa Piruzza:** You have the agreement, and there are various commitments that are spelled out in the agreement.

**Jeremy Patzer:** But it's not, like, a firm guarantee; it was just roughly that this should create.... I'll pick a random number. This contract is supposed to create  $x$  number of thousands of jobs. Is that a commitment to the contract, or is it just kind of loose?

**Teresa Piruzza:** No. There are commitments in the agreement.

**Jeremy Patzer:** Is this a standard contract or a unique contract?

**Teresa Piruzza:** I couldn't say. I believe SIF agreements are fairly standard, but that would be a question for Industry Canada.

**The Chair:** Thanks.

We'll finish up with Ms. Rochefort for five minutes.

**Pauline Rochefort:** Thank you very much.

It's a pleasure to meet you.

How many dollars in total have been disbursed in support of the Brampton plant?

**Teresa Piruzza:** My apologies...I don't have that number.

**Pauline Rochefort:** All right.

You spoke of an "operational pause". Can you define what an operational pause is?

**Teresa Piruzza:** An operational pause indicates that we continue to review the operations at that plant in terms of what the plan is for production moving forward.

**Pauline Rochefort:** How long can an operational pause last?

**Teresa Piruzza:** What do you mean?

**Pauline Rochefort:** Is an operational pause typically a month or two months?

**Teresa Piruzza:** That varies by facility and by the work that's done within the facility.

• (1620)

**Pauline Rochefort:** In broad strokes, if you're talking about potential plans that are being considered, as you are in this operational pause, can you provide an example of what could be considered?

**Teresa Piruzza:** That would be part of our production or planning, and I would suggest that it would be sensitive information.

**Pauline Rochefort:** One of my questions was to ask with whom you're discussing these plans. I understand that it's Minister Joly

and the ministerial staff. I want to note that in the Standing Committee on International Trade, Minister Joly did speak out and say that she was intending to pursue the matter as part of the dispute resolution process. That was clearly mentioned.

Within your company, who decides and where are these decisions made in terms of next steps? Are they Canadian decisions? Are they European decisions? Where are the decisions made?

**Teresa Piruzza:** With respect to our North American planning. It is a joint decision between the Canadian president and our CEO in terms of developing a plan that is appropriate and sustainable for Brampton.

**Pauline Rochefort:** When is it decided, then, that the plans are moving forward and that you are in breach of the contract? Are dollars returned at that point?

**Teresa Piruzza:** We continue to honour our commitments in the agreement. We're all working towards the shared objective of continued production at Brampton.

**Pauline Rochefort:** Have you ever returned the funds when a project hasn't gone forward? Has there been an instance in your company's history?

**Teresa Piruzza:** We always honour our agreements.

**Pauline Rochefort:** Coming back to the Windsor plant, I think you noted that you are hiring 1,500 and that at this point you've hired 600 employees. Is that correct?

**Teresa Piruzza:** No. The 1,500 is for the third shift at Windsor. The 600 is for a separate facility.

We have a research and development centre in Windsor called the "Automotive Research and Development Centre", or ARDC. They have, separate and apart from the 1,500, hired over 600 professionals for the research and development centre.

**Pauline Rochefort:** These are recent new hires.

**Teresa Piruzza:** That's correct.

**Pauline Rochefort:** How are you progressing with the hires for the third shift in Windsor at this point?

**Teresa Piruzza:** For hiring, I believe the process started in November. I can't remember, but the process has begun and the anticipated start of that third shift would be early 2026.

**Pauline Rochefort:** Thank you.

Those are all my questions for now.

**The Chair:** You have one minute.

**Pauline Rochefort:** I will leave it to my colleague.

**Iqra Khalid:** Thank you.

Ms. Piruzza, I appreciate your being here.

I hope you can anticipate and appreciate why this is such a big deal in communities that are losing thousands of jobs based on the implications of your business and whether to do business or not. Your business decisions impact real lives within our communities.

I'm sorry if this is a bit broad, but when you have disagreements between the Government of Canada and you as a company, how ultimately do you make those decisions? Is it based on the dollar value? Is it based on future prospects? Is it based on Canadian values? What makes you make the decisions where communities like Brampton lose thousands of jobs?

**Teresa Piruzza:** I certainly understand the concern you have—and that your constituents and people across the province have as well.

As I indicated, we remain committed to Canada, and we are actively working to find a plan for that facility.

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

Ms. Piruzza, thank you for joining us today. Again, thank you for putting up with our IT issues. I'm not going to blame you or say that you're the jinx, but thanks. We'll excuse you now.

I'll get to you in two seconds. I'll hear from you in a moment.

We will excuse you, Ms. Piruzza. Again, thank you very much.

We will suspend in a moment to bring in our new witnesses.

Go ahead, Mrs. Block.

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

I'm just a little concerned with the discrepancies between the testimony that we heard from the deputy minister and the testimony that we heard now from Ms. Piruzza with regard to who initiated the redactions. I'm wondering if this is a question of privilege and whether or not we should be looking to have you report that.

• (1625)

**The Chair:** Colleagues, I'm going to address this to everyone. It is in the green book. As it appears, it is, but I'm going to suggest that perhaps we.... Minister Lightbound is not available next Tuesday, so we do have some space. I'm wondering if we can agree to maybe have ISED come back to give their side—I don't want to say “of the story”—and address the comments made today and what they said previously. Then we can review it then, rather than say it is an issue now.

**Iqra Khalid:** I appreciate the concerns, and quite frankly, I have similar concerns. What I would ask is for a little bit of leeway until the end of the meeting today for me to understand what's going on. I'd be more than happy to work with colleagues to see if we can find a solution without breaking the back of the other work of the committee.

**The Chair:** Yes, that's fine. Perhaps we can discuss it at the end.

From reading the big green book, it is very clearly.... If we look at it purely from what was said last week and what the letter was that we received, then very clearly under.... I won't go into it, but it does appear that way. However, I think, to be fair.... We've encountered this before in the past, and we've offered an opportunity for them to come to address the issue.

I hope that's acceptable to you, Mrs. Block.

I think it is better that we do it like that—give them an opportunity to respond—rather than leave it as a simple he-said-she-said.

**Iqra Khalid:** Mr. Chair, I hope you don't mind if I ask what specific section you're looking at in the book.

**The Chair:** It says, “deliberately attempting to mislead the House or a committee (by way of statement, evidence, or petition)”. That's in chapter 3 on page 82.

**Iqra Khalid:** It's in chapter 3 on page 82. Thank you very much.

**The Chair:** That's the third edition. I know we just got the fourth edition a couple of days ago.

If that's acceptable, I won't rule on it now. I'll ask that perhaps we chat about it a bit further and seek another option rather than tie things up with the privilege issue at this moment.

Is that acceptable?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Chair:** Again, we will send you on your way. I hope your IT is better over Christmas.

Colleagues, we'll suspend for a few moments to bring in our new witnesses.

• (1625) \_\_\_\_\_ (Pause) \_\_\_\_\_

• (1630)

**The Chair:** Good afternoon. We are back. I appreciate everyone's patience.

Welcome, officials from PSPC and Shared Services. I understand you'll each be making a five-minute opening statement.

Colleagues, just very briefly, IT is asking us not to touch the mic button. I'm guilty of it as well. They will control it for us as we speak.

Who is speaking to us from PSPC?

Mr. Hammond, the floor is yours for five minutes. Please go ahead.

**Michael Hammond (Chief Financial Officer, Department of Public Works and Government Services):** Thank you very much, Mr. Chair and members of the committee.

Before I begin, I would like to acknowledge that we are gathered today on the traditional, unceded territory of the Algonquin Anishinabe people.

With me today are Dominic Laporte, senior assistant deputy minister, procurement; Nathalie Bertrand, senior assistant deputy minister, receiver general and pension; Mark Quinlan, senior assistant deputy minister, real property services; and Lorenzo Ieraci, assistant deputy minister, policy, planning and communications. We would be pleased to answer any questions you have regarding the supplementary estimates (B) and the departmental results report for Public Services and Procurement Canada.

Mr. Chair, Canada is facing a broad range of new and evolving challenges and the federal government is clearly focused on spending less on its operations while investing more to strengthen the country. With its far-reaching mandate that supports so much of the government's work, PSPC plays an essential role in these efforts.

There are several priorities the government is also targeting within the supplementary estimates now before Parliament. I will briefly outline some of these requests as they pertain to PSPC.

• (1635)

[*Translation*]

The largest item contained in the supplementary estimates (B) for the department is an \$11 million allocation for the emerging needs fund, managed by Public Services and Procurement Canada, to support advertising programs across government departments and agencies. The ongoing economic uncertainty means the Government of Canada will likely need to be more flexible and responsive in its advertising efforts.

This funding will enable the government to communicate with Canadians on the wide range of social, economic and geopolitical issues that affect their daily lives. The estimates also request a partial reprofile of a frozen allotment established under vote 1 in the amount of \$2 million to cover the costs of an out-of-court settlement resulting from a complaint to the Canadian International Trade Tribunal in May 2023.

Finally, among other requests, contained within the estimates is a proposed transfer of \$3 million from PSPC to the Department of Indigenous Services for the national indigenous procurement initiative. This funding will benefit indigenous communities and companies by providing access to good jobs and a broad range of procurement opportunities. This money will also help to support the government's goal of awarding at least 5% of the total value of federal contracts to businesses managed and led by indigenous people.

[*English*]

Now I'll turn to the department's 2024-25 departmental results report.

In its latest report, PSPC had 42 departmental results indicators, of which 27 met their targets. PSPC met its targets in areas such as client satisfaction, delivery of real property projects, reduction in greenhouse gas emissions, compliance of linguistic services and the processing of security screening for contractors and subcontractors.

Efforts are ongoing to improve results in other areas, including contracts awarded to small and medium-sized businesses, women and indigenous suppliers and the number of employees facing potential pay inaccuracies at the pay centre.

A number of factors are expected to strengthen the department's ability to meet its targets going forward. These include improvements to the way we collect and use data and the implementation of AI to support operational activities, including pay and procurement modernization initiatives.

In closing, PSPC will strive to build on its record of strong service delivery and ensure value for money as we support the government in fulfilling its ambitious agenda.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Mr. Davis, the floor is yours.

**Scott Davis (Assistant Deputy Minister, Chief Financial Officer, Shared Services Canada):** Thank you, Mr. Chair, for this opportunity to discuss Shared Services Canada's request in the 2025-26 supplementary estimates (B).

I'm accompanied today by Paule Labbé, the assistant deputy minister of Shared Services Canada, strategy and engagement branch.

Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge that we are on the traditional, unceded territory of the Algonquin Anishinabe people.

First, I'd like to situate our work. SSC is at the centre of efforts of the Government of Canada's priority to transform government and modernize operations. Our mandate is clear. It's to deliver secure, reliable and efficient digital services that enable federal departments and agencies to deliver services to Canadians and businesses.

[*Translation*]

Shared Services Canada, or SSC, is essential to the operations of government. We are present wherever the GC operates—spanning about 4,000 locations across Canada and around the world. SSC has dedicated teams that work around the clock, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

SSC is shifting government away from siloed, decentralized systems toward unified, enterprise-wide models that enable digital government. This approach strengthens both security and reliability, ensuring that sensitive information is safeguarded and remains under Canadian control.

By consolidating key systems in SSC's enterprise data centres, we have achieved important cost savings, significantly improved the availability and stability of government services, and reinforced the protection of critical government data.

SSC's approach has delivered savings. Our actual spending decreased by \$174 million from 2023-24 to 2024-25. Some of these reductions are related to the following: Our core mission to consolidate and modernize information technology services, or IT services, has enabled these efficiency gains. For example, by leveraging government purchasing power to buy and manage mobile devices in bulk, we saved \$20 million. Additional savings came from reducing the use of professional services—those costs are down by \$81 million from 2022-23 to 2024-25.

● (1640)

[English]

In this year's supplementary estimates (B), SSC is seeking a net increase of \$48.5 million. These requests are relatively routine and include \$45 million to provide core IT services, including software, hardware and technology-related services for new employees, and \$8 million to support the continued transfer of cloud operations from Statistics Canada to SSC, plus \$2 million for associated benefits. Transfers to other departments will also reduce SSC's appropriation by \$7 million. Finally, the estimates make a technical adjustment to reflect the increased needs of the Department of National Defence. This does not affect SSC's direct funding, as appropriations flow to DND.

While these estimates are standard, budget 2025 reinforces SSC's role in digital transformation across the Government of Canada and in enabling the adoption and scaling of artificial intelligence across the public service.

SSC is developing a sovereign, made-in-Canada AI platform for government-wide deployment in partnership with leading Canadian AI companies, the Communications Security Establishment and the Department of National Defence. We are leading a competitive procurement process for generative AI productivity tools for government employees, which include three Canadian pre-qualified vendors. We are applying AI and robotic process automation across SSC's internal operations to increase efficiency and service to departments and agencies.

SSC will also advance work to consolidate the management of Government of Canada desktop computers, similar to our approach for smart phones, improving portability across departments while reducing costs and increasing security.

SSC is also identifying new savings within its operations.

**The Chair:** I'm sorry, Mr. Davis, but I have to ask you to wrap up, please.

**Scott Davis:** Here are my last couple of points.

Under the comprehensive expenditure review, SSC will realize ongoing savings of \$318.5 million. We will achieve that by standardizing platforms, eliminating low-use or redundant licences, consolidating contracts to eliminate duplication and secure better pricing, finding efficiencies in business processes and continuing to close legacy data centres.

The bottom line is that a more effective and efficient government improves program and service delivery to Canadians, and SSC is proud to be part of that.

[Translation]

I look forward to answering your questions.

Thank you.

[English]

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

I just realized we had all those IT issues when Stellantis was here, and we could have just turned it over to Shared Services.

We'll start with Mr. Seeback for six minutes, please.

**Kyle Seeback:** Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

I'm going to put a motion on notice.

**The Chair:** Are you reading it into the record?

**Kyle Seeback:** Yes, I'm going to read this motion into the record.

I move:

That Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada be ordered to send to the committee the redacted copy of Strategic Innovation Fund Agreement No. 813-816251 and Amendment Agreements No. 1 and No. 2, without any conditions or confidentiality requirements, within 24 hours of receiving this request from the committee.

● (1645)

**Pauline Rochefort:** I have a point of order, Chair.

We have an agenda, and we've been moving on to another matter. This is out of...

**The Chair:** He's just putting it on notice. He's not moving it. He's allowed to.

Continue, Mr. Seeback.

**Pauline Rochefort:** Even bringing it forward at this point, it's not in line with the agenda that's been approved.

**The Chair:** Members can put motions on notice. He's just reading it into...

**Pauline Rochefort:** Why are you allowing him to read it?

**The Chair:** Because I'm allowing it. Members can read.... He's just putting it on notice. He's not moving it, so we're not going to be debating it. He's just putting it on notice.

**Pauline Rochefort:** Yes, but it shouldn't even be allowed to be read at this point. We have—

**The Chair:** I am allowing it.

Continue, Mr. Seeback.

**Kyle Seeback:** I've read the motion.

**The Chair:** That's perfect.

**Kyle Seeback:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** Would you provide it in writing for us?

**Kyle Seeback:** I will provide it in writing in both official languages.

I'm going to share the rest of my time with Kelly Block.

**The Chair:** Okay.

Mrs. Block, you have five minutes

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

Thank you for joining us today, although I will voice my extreme disappointment over the fact that Minister Lightbound is not appearing before this committee to defend the supplementary estimates, nor is the deputy minister. It's standard practice for a minister and a deputy minister to appear before parliamentarians to defend their estimates, so I'm both frustrated and disappointed, to say the least.

Given the most recent quarterly report from Canada Post, we find that they will run out of funds by December 31, 2025. That's at the end of this year. Their financial report states, "The Corporation will need to access short-term financing".

Is there a current request from Canada Post to access more funding from the government?

**Michael Hammond:** Thank you for the question, Mr. Chair.

I'm actually going to turn to my colleague Lorenzo, who is the lead on the Canada Post file for PSPC.

**Kelly Block:** Thank you.

**Lorenzo Ieraci (Assistant Deputy Minister, Policy, Planning and Communications, Department of Public Works and Government Services):** Thank you for the question.

As noted, Canada Post has obviously posted a third-quarter loss that was fairly substantive, and that followed the second-quarter loss.

The Government of Canada made a \$1-billion repayable loan that was made available to Canada Post for this year. Given their current projections, they will likely need to have some additional support on an ongoing basis. There are conversations going on right now between Canada Post and our department as well as others, in terms of how the corporation can continue to operate in the current environment.

I would note the good news that, on November 21, the union, CUPW, noted that they and Canada Post have reached an agreement in principle, which should help to hopefully resolve the labour dispute that Canada Post and its union have been in for the last two years.

**Kelly Block:** Thank you very much.

You noted that Canada Post and your department are currently in conversations about their financial situation. Does this mean that the government plans to approve another loan or more funding for Canada Post?

**Lorenzo Ieraci:** Thank you for the question.

Those conversations are ongoing, and those items are being discussed and considered. It would probably be premature for me to respond to that question directly.

**Kelly Block:** Given that they have indicated the corporation will need to access short-term financing by the end of this year and that there is nothing in supplementary estimates (B) for them, potentially, is that because you are still having those conversations with Canada Post? By what vehicle would you be providing additional funding to Canada Post?

**Lorenzo Ieraci:** Thank you for the question. I have a two-part response, if you'll permit it.

First, Canada Post generates revenues, of course, through their ongoing activities. They also have other mechanisms available to them as a Crown corporation to be able to seek access to funding in order to maintain their operations. As the Canada Post Corporation Act identifies, the corporation is able to access funds from the government in situations where they need to.

There is no funding for Canada Post in supplementary estimates (B), as you identified. In theory, in terms of how Canada Post would be able to access funding, the two vehicles available to the Crown corporation—beyond those I've just mentioned—would be either through main estimates or through supplementary estimates. Supplementary estimates (B) obviously has passed, but it could be either through supplementary estimates or through the main estimates that they would be able to access additional funding, should that decision be made.

● (1650)

**Kelly Block:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** We'll go to Ms. Khalid, please, for six minutes and then to Madame Gaudreau for six minutes.

**Iqra Khalid:** Thank you very much, Chair.

Thank you to the witnesses for appearing today. I'll start with PSPC, if that's okay.

According to the departmental results report for 2024-25, PSPC successfully reduced the cost of procurement services to \$0.93 per \$100 of the contract value, which is significantly ahead of your \$1.75 target. What operational efficiencies or innovations helped you to get to that reduction? Are there lessons for other departments to take from there?

**Michael Hammond:** Thanks very much for the question.

Maybe I'll turn it over to Dominic Laporte. He's ADM of procurement, and he could speak to some of the efficiencies that are happening within the procurement branch.

**Dominic Laporte (Senior Assistant Deputy Minister, Procurement Branch, Department of Public Works and Government Services):** Thank you.

We are very pleased with these results. I would say the key to this is that we're seeing the progress made with the electronic procurement solution. Most of our contracts now, 99%, are leveraging that solution. It means that bidders are able to file their bids directly into EPS.

There's much more involvement from our procurement officers. Just in terms of data analysis, there's much more that we can do. It's really reaping the benefits of the last few years from the investment that has been made into electronic procurement solutions. At the same time, we're also leveraging our procurement vehicle that we use. I think the more we have clients leveraging, for example vehicles like standing offers or supply arrangements, the more we're able to achieve those savings.

**Iqra Khalid:** Thank you for that. I find that to be very enlightening. I appreciate that.

Going on, that same report shows that 94% of procurement requests were fulfilled within service level standards, which is well above the 80% target. Can you talk to us a little bit about what factors enabled PSPC to achieve these high levels of timeliness? How is the department continuing to improve procurement efficiency?

**Dominic Laporte:** That's a good question. Thank you for that.

Again, with the danger of repeating myself, EPS has been one of the drivers. I would also say that we're working with our clients to make sure that we put in place a procurement solution that is going to be used for many kinds of different requirements. That goes a long way, and we're able, basically, to fast-track procurement.

I have to also say that we invest every day in the training of our procurement officers. I'm very pleased with our 1,300 procurement officers working with PSPC. Learning is happening. Efficiencies are being derived as we invest in technology.

**Iqra Khalid:** Thank you.

How does that play into our buy Canadian policy, support Canada policies, knowing that a lot of Canadian businesses are SMEs? How does PSPC plan to work to ensure that our policies are met?

**Dominic Laporte:** Well, of course, we want to become our best customer. We want to make sure that every dollar invested in procurement has an economic impact for Canadian suppliers. As you know, the buy Canadian policy was announced by the Prime Minister on September 5. Our department is working on that as we speak. We also want to prioritize the use of Canadian steel, Canadian aluminum and Canadian wood.

We want to prioritize Canadian suppliers. When we have bids, how can we make sure that taxpayer money goes to Canadian suppliers? It's the same thing when it comes to Canadian content. We make sure that we're going to be driving Canadian content. By doing that, we're also going to be driving the supply chains of Canadian industries. It's going to be key to adapt. This is where we can really use procurement as a key lever for economic development and to face the current situation.

**Iqra Khalid:** What are some of the concrete steps to take to make sure that Canadian companies are prioritized in terms of the current framework of PSPC and procurement?

• (1655)

**Dominic Laporte:** What has been announced so far is basically in terms of making sure, for example, when we have a construction project, an infrastructure procurement or a defence procurement in the future, that the steel required for these projects is going to be

melted and poured in Canada. That's going to be one example that I can give here publicly.

All those elements are key. It's the same thing with wood for the new Build Canada Homes strategy. It's making sure that the wood that we're going to be purchasing is going to be from Canada. That's only one example. There's also making sure that contracts are going to Canadian suppliers. A lot of work is happening on that front.

Also, something that is important to keep in mind is that, oftentimes for Canadian suppliers, it's a seal of approval for them to penetrate other markets. If they receive federal government contracts, they're able to rely on that and use that as a marketing tool for other export markets, which is a huge plus. I'm hopeful that, in the future, we're going to be able to leverage vendor preference management to reward our good suppliers, those who deliver on time and on budget.

**Iqra Khalid:** Do you think that your whole online procurement system has made it easier for less complex organizations to now also be part of the procurement process, or is it going to be hindering further efficiencies if we try to support SMEs?

**Dominic Laporte:** I think we're always investing. We're always looking into AI. To be very frank, we also need to invest more in our electronic procurement solution. We also want to make procurement more accessible.

Again, one of the announcements in the budget was the harmonized procurement regulation. Right now, we have 11 trade agreements that are each incorporated into domestic law. It's very difficult. You don't have one set of regulations. What we want to do is streamline, simplify the obligation on procurement, so that suppliers who are bidding on our contracts can better appreciate their obligations. Also, we've been developing standard contract clauses to simplify contractual obligations. These things are incorporated into our electronic procurement solution.

**Iqra Khalid:** Thanks very much.

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

[*Translation*]

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

Thank you to the witnesses for being here as we approach Christmas.

I was the one who moved the motion on Canada Post. There was an agreement on November 21. Have they seen the plan?

**Lorenzo Ieraci:** Thank you for your question.

On November 21, the union indicated that it and the Canada Post management had reached agreements in principle. The union's website states that the union and the Canada Post management still have to agree on the conditions to make it possible to implement new collective agreements and that the union members will then be asked to vote to give their approval—

**Marie-Hélène Gaudreau:** They've seen the plan. They've seen the reform.

**Lorenzo Ieraci:** Are you talking about the union members?

**Marie-Hélène Gaudreau:** Mr. Ettinger had 45 days to submit a reform plan to the government.

**Lorenzo Ieraci:** I'm sorry. I didn't quite understand your question.

**Marie-Hélène Gaudreau:** Should I start all over again?

I sit on two committees.

[*English*]

Overall, I think I lose a lot of minutes.

[*Translation*]

I could speak in English, but I prefer to speak in French.

Thank you very much for your understanding. We're all tired leading up to the winter break.

Let's start over.

There's the reform; it's a matter of 45 days. There was an agreement in principle on November 21. Have people seen that agreement, yes or no?

**Lorenzo Ieraci:** Yes.

**Marie-Hélène Gaudreau:** They've seen the reform plan.

**Lorenzo Ieraci:** No. I'm sorry, but those are two different things.

The reform plan, which Canada Post had to submit to the government within 45 days, was provided by Canada Post management to Minister Lightbound. That plan is currently being reviewed by our branch and by the minister and his office.

**Marie-Hélène Gaudreau:** When will it be ready?

On November 10, I learned from the media that the plan had been tabled. It's extremely important for us to receive it so that we can analyze it at the same time as you.

There are 17 million addresses, 4 million of which are home to users who are very concerned about what's going on. Christmas is coming, and there's been an agreement in principle since November 21, but I get the impression that people really wouldn't want the gifts to be delivered.

What's going on?

**Lorenzo Ieraci:** I'd like to make a small clarification. The agreement in principle is an agreement as part of the negotiations between the union and—

• (1700)

**Marie-Hélène Gaudreau:** —and reform.

**Lorenzo Ieraci:** No.

**Marie-Hélène Gaudreau:** I'm really talking about the reform.

**Lorenzo Ieraci:** Yes, there's the reform. However, on the one hand, there's the agreement to enter into a collective agreement and resolve union issues. On the other hand, there's the transformation plan that Canada Post's management submitted to the minister in response to the minister's instructions to implement the recommendations of Commissioner Kaplan, whose report was released in May.

**Marie-Hélène Gaudreau:** Why don't we have it yet?

**Lorenzo Ieraci:** The minister has to approve the transformation plan that Canada Post proposed. It's the transformation approach chosen by Canada Post, but that doesn't necessarily mean that the minister will agree with Canada Post on every point.

**Marie-Hélène Gaudreau:** However, this is an urgent matter. It's fundamentally important to question the very nature of Canada Post. We have heard witnesses share all their concerns about that. We're also losing money every day, so we have to ask ourselves some questions.

What I don't understand is that the transformation plan was tabled on November 10. I learned about it through the media. I hope the committee will receive it on December 11. However, we're coming up to the holidays, and we still haven't heard anything. How can that be?

**Lorenzo Ieraci:** As you mentioned, the CEO of Canada Post will be testifying on December 11. He will probably present his point of view to you.

Once again, the plan that was tabled details the approach that Canada Post wants to adopt to implement Commissioner Kaplan's recommendations.

**Marie-Hélène Gaudreau:** Okay.

I asked a question in the House this week about Build Canada Homes. I'm going to ask you.

The supply for Build Canada Homes has to come from Canadian suppliers. Well, back home in Laurentides—Labelle, a softwood lumber mill has just closed down. The number of closures is increasing week by week. Where are you going to get the supply for Build Canada Homes? Explain that to me.

**Dominic Laporte:** I'll go ahead and answer the question.

The “buy Canadian” policy has to apply not only to government procurement, but also to federal government subsidies. The same principles will be established by each department to promote steel, Canadian softwood lumber, aluminum—

**Marie-Hélène Gaudreau:** There won't be any more softwood lumber. Mills are having to close because they aren't supported. We asked to offset 50% of the countervailing duties and set up a wage subsidy program. We were met with silence. *Nyet*; we'll get nothing at all. However, Stellantis has received billions of dollars. At a given point, we can see that we're being laughed at.

**Dominic Laporte:** I can't comment on the subsidies that are given. However, I can tell you that if the Government of Canada uses its purchases to support the demand for Canadian softwood lumber, it will make a big difference.

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

[*English*]

**The Chair:** We'll go to Ms. Jansen, please, for five minutes.

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

I'll be talking to Mr. Laporte, I believe. I have a question on your fraud findings. The report says something about how PSPC "could have encountered" fraud, collusion and wrongdoings in 2024-25. The wording's a bit weird.

Did PSPC uncover any fraud or collusion last year? Answer yes or no.

**Dominic Laporte:** [*Technical difficulty—Editor*] ADM of procurement. One of my colleagues, Catherine Poulin, is responsible for those investigations. I have limited knowledge, but we uncovered some instances of fraud. She was at this committee talking about overbilling and the fact that we've so far been able to recover more than \$5 million for overbilling.

**Tamara Jansen:** How many cases were found?

**Dominic Laporte:** This is information that, unfortunately, I don't have. I'm not privy to these investigations and the numbers of cases. I'm not able, unfortunately—

**Tamara Jansen:** Is anybody else...?

**Michael Hammond:** I'm sorry, Mr. Chair. I'm afraid we probably don't have the best information here. Catherine Poulin, who is the ADM responsible for our oversight branch, would be able to provide those details, but I'm happy to respond if that's of interest.

**Tamara Jansen:** You mentioned that \$5 million has been recovered, but we don't know how much was taken.

**Dominic Laporte:** [*Technical difficulty—Editor*] subcontractors who were overbilling some departments. A lot of action has been taken on that front, but I'm not able to elaborate on that.

It's not that I don't want to. I'm not privy to the details of those investigations. However, we're more than happy to provide that information and follow up.

**Tamara Jansen:** Please do, yes.

On the fraud tip line, the report mentions that there's been a 250% increase in tips to the tip line. I don't find percentages very helpful, so I'm wondering what the actual number is of tips you've received.

• (1705)

**Dominic Laporte:** Again, I'm not the one receiving those tips. We would be happy to...

**Michael Hammond:** Mr. Ieraci might be able to—

**Lorenzo Ieraci:** Thank you. I was just waiting for my mic to come on.

Mr. Chair, we'll come back to you on the actual numbers, instead of percentages.

If you'll permit me to go back to the previous question—

[*Translation*]

**Marie-Hélène Gaudreau:** I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

The interpreters are doing a great job, but it's very difficult for them when the witnesses are speaking extremely quickly, so it would be good to slow down. Breathe. We're at the end of the day. The chair is very generous. Take your time.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Would you repeat that? You were going too quickly for me.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh!

**The Chair:** Madame Gaudreau has a good point, as usual. Thank you. We will proceed a bit more slowly.

**Lorenzo Ieraci:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I apologize to the interpreters.

To go back to the previous question, if I may, I want to correct the \$5-million amount. Through three cases that were identified, PSPC identified overbilling totalling \$4.5 million. Of that, \$4.1 million has been recovered and work is ongoing to recover the rest. I believe seven cases in total were referred to the RCMP. I believe that's right.

The report identifies one of the things our colleagues have spoken about, which is the fact that PSPC has been augmenting its ability to do data analytics and access more information so that we, as a department, are able to more accurately and more quickly detect instances of fraud and refer them to the RCMP.

I hope that helps.

**Tamara Jansen:** I do have questions on that. Obviously, it lists your new tools in the report: analytics, anti-fraud hub, overbilling checks and so forth. How many suspicious invoices did your fraud analytics flag last year?

**Lorenzo Ieraci:** Unfortunately, I don't have the answer to that question right in front of me.

We'll have to come back to you, if that would be okay.

**Tamara Jansen:** Okay. I'd like to know how much money, in dollars, was stopped or recovered because of these tools.

**Lorenzo Ieraci:** Like I said, it's either \$4 million or \$4.1 million that has been recovered from the \$4.5 million that was identified as overbilling.

**Tamara Jansen:** It's a bit odd that the report isn't a bit more clear on that. You say that it could have happened, but then there are really no numbers in there. For me, I think it would be so much easier if there were a bit more information in a departmental report like that.

I understand that you guys are going to commit to including real fraud metrics, which you're going to hand to us. Will you commit to putting them in departmental results reports, going forward?

**Lorenzo Ieraci:** This is a two-part question, Mr. Chair.

Part one is, yes, we will absolutely provide you a response, in writing to the clerk, to the two questions we're unable to answer, and yes, absolutely we will take it under advisement in terms of how much detail we can provide.

One of the challenges we face with reports such as departmental results reports is, of course, that they are for a period of time. They are for the previous fiscal year, and by the time they are issued oftentimes those numbers have changed and have been updated. It's a challenge that we always face with these types of reports, but absolutely, we'll—

**Tamara Jansen:** We're looking for numbers of cases found, dollars at risk and actions taken to protect taxpayers.

**Lorenzo Ieraci:** Thank you. It's noted.

**Tamara Jansen:** Thank you.

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

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

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

Thanks to all of you for being here.

PSPC identified procurement modernization as a top priority for 2024-25. Could you walk the committee through the most significant improvements made this year to streamline procurement and better serve the departments?

**Dominic Laporte:** Thank you for the question.

We made several improvements. We spoke about the electronic procurement solution. Our continuous investment in that solution is something that is paying off a lot.

We're also taking measures because we heard a lot about professional services. What we want to do is work with our clients to move them from time-based contracts to solution-based contracts. This is one of the key improvements. We want to make sure that we're also putting in a cap and really working with our clients to find the most optimal solution to meet their procurement obligations and procurement needs. That's an example.

I'm also very pleased to report—and I would say that this in itself is a huge modernization initiative—the launch of the vendor performance management framework. What we want to do is keep a scorecard for each of our suppliers in the future. They're all going to have a rating as to whether or not they deliver on time and on budget.

We're going to be leveraging that scorecard for future tender opportunities. The good suppliers, those who always provide great quality and services to the Crown, will be rewarded for that. We're also going to be able to take action against those suppliers who maybe provide deficient or poor services. That's, for example, something we've put in motion on top of so many other initiatives we're working on to modernize procurement.

• (1710)

**Vince Gasparro:** Okay. That's great.

I want to move on to Indigenous Services. On the plan to transfer \$3 million to Indigenous Services Canada to support their procurement initiatives, can you outline the intended results, any early success you're seeing, any issues, etc.?

**Lorenzo Ieraci:** Thank you for the question.

The transfer to Indigenous Services Canada enables Public Services and Procurement Canada to use the grants and contributions that are available through Indigenous Services Canada to help indigenous organizations participate and take advantage of federal procurement.

Through this program, I'll give a couple of examples that might be helpful. The first is that we provided funding to help the Ontario First Nations Economic Developers Association, which added 280 businesses to their directory for indigenous businesses and supported more than 100 first nations economic development officers in their work. They work with indigenous companies to enable them to participate in federal procurement.

We have a second example with the Council for the Advancement of Native Development Officers, or Cando, where again we work with them and we provide them with assistance so that they can do things like a procurement mentorship program, launching a national web series and creating a virtual resource hub, which again allows them to inform businesses of federal opportunities within their communities and their nations. They work closely with our colleagues in Procurement Assistance Canada.

These are just a couple of examples of the way we leverage this to be able to transfer funds to Indigenous Services Canada, which in turn is able to provide funding to indigenous organizations and community groups in order to help indigenous businesses participate in federal procurement.

**Vince Gasparro:** Can you explain how this initiative connects with the strategic partnerships initiative and how both work together to expand not only indigenous economic participation, which also relates very heavily to economic reconciliation...?

**The Chair:** You have 25 seconds.

**Lorenzo Ieraci:** I'm not as familiar with the strategic partnerships initiative. What I would say is that the funding we get through the supplementary estimates (B) and we transfer is PSPC's approach to help indigenous communities, groups, organizations and businesses participate in federal procurement, and our federal programs should be complementary to each other.

**The Chair:** You did that in 23 seconds. Well done.

Madame Gaudreau, please, you have two and a half minutes.

[*Translation*]

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

I want to talk about the digital shift because there's one thing I don't understand. Why do we continue to award so many contracts, worth billions of dollars, to GAFAM, that is, Google, Apple, Facebook—now Meta—Amazon and Microsoft? We use their tools. We're talking about a digital shift and an increase in contracts.

We're funding those who are killing us right now. That's powerful. We abolished the digital services tax, and now we're going to give money to those digital giants. I'm at a loss.

There are models in Europe and other G7 countries. No one can convince me that we can't do the same thing. France, the United Kingdom and Germany, I believe, are taking a stand because they're levying a tax.

Give me an answer on that.

● (1715)

**Scott Davis:** Thank you for your question.

I'll give you some of our figures.

We work in partnership with Public Services and Procurement Canada, which makes a lot of purchases. We also make a lot of them in IT. Last year, our purchases totalled approximately \$3.1 billion. Of the contracts awarded, 65.9%, representing a value of \$1.12 billion, were awarded to Canadian small or medium-sized businesses. More than 32.5% of the contracts awarded, representing a value of \$554 million, were awarded to Canadian small or medium-sized businesses that have companies in—

**Marie-Hélène Gaudreau:** I really don't have a lot of time. I would love to have a breakdown of that data. I hope that will reassure me. That said, we aren't just talking about money; we're also talking about jobs. Even TVA is on the verge of dying.

The tax has an impact. We're now clamouring after the digital giants, who are already multi-millionaires and don't even endorse what.... In short, I'm pretty discouraged.

You're caught up in contracts that don't benefit us, unless I'm mistaken.

**Scott Davis:** Since we're a fairly large buyer, one of the things we focus on a lot to help these companies is—

**Marie-Hélène Gaudreau:** We have to find solutions to favour other suppliers.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Thank you.

We'll go to Mr. Gill and then finish with Ms. Rochefort.

**Harb Gill (Windsor West, CPC):** Thank you, Chair. The question I have is regarding the planned spending, which was exceeded by almost two-thirds of a billion dollars. Respectfully, the \$667 million in a single year that you overspent is not a rounding error.

What specific controls failed, and what are you going to do about it?

**Michael Hammond:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Is this question directed at PSPC?

**Harb Gill:** Yes, sir.

**Michael Hammond:** Our planned spending is based on our main estimates. As you know, we have supplementary estimates, which we're talking about today, and those actually increase the budget throughout the year. When you see an overspend against our planned spending, it is, in general, related to an item that was approved in year.

Last year, we did have additional funding that was approved for our pay system, so that actually increased the in-year budget avail-

able to PSPC. That would explain why we were over our planned spending.

**Harb Gill:** You missed about one-third of the planned targets, which signals a deeper operational issue to me. When departments miss that many performance targets, that's a structural problem, not an isolated event.

What changed mid-year that made those targets unattainable?

**Michael Hammond:** Thank you for the question. I would say that we achieved 27 out of our 42 targets. We exceeded.... We are taking steps in the areas where we have challenges in order to improve them. I know that there are actions in place to make improvements. I will open it up to my colleague Lorenzo, who may have some more specific details on those targets where we did not....

**Lorenzo Ieraci:** Thank you.

I'll just note that the report does include a number of footnotes at the bottom of each one of the pages, which also provide a bit more information in terms of some of the explanations. Some of the indicators will need to be updated based on recent changes, and in other instances, the department continues through programs to try to make sure that we reach those targets, as they are in some cases obviously aspirational.

**Harb Gill:** That's not the answer I was looking for. Nevertheless, both PSPC and SSC let more than \$100 million lapse last year.

Which projects were delayed? Which branches were responsible? Who was being held accountable?

**Scott Davis:** I can start. We can provide that in writing to the committee. There's a series of detailed projects. On any given day, we're doing 40 to 50 multi-million dollar projects, so it's a series. It's a mix, but absolutely, I can provide that.

**Harb Gill:** Sure.

PSPC is asking for \$11 million for government advertising, almost half of the total being shared across the government.

What justifies your department getting the lion's share? That's almost five other departments combined. You need more than them. Why?

● (1720)

**Michael Hammond:** Thank you for the question. This is funding that's related to the emerging needs fund that PCO has approved and has asked PSPC to deliver. It provides flexibility for the government to be able to respond to emerging issues that arise during the year and are not part of the original advertising plan. It's really a fund that's available for immediate advertising in order to reach Canadians.

I'll also turn to Natalie Bertrand, if she wishes to add anything more on that particular topic.

**Nathalie Bertrand (Senior Assistant Deputy Minister, Receiver General and Pension Branch, Department of Public Works and Government Services):** Thank you for the question.

Again, as my colleague pointed out, this is a subset of the central fund that is held and managed by PCO. We only receive part of the advertising fund. Again, it is to respond to urgent or unforeseen needs—anything that would happen outside of the annual planning cycle that is managed by PCO.

As an example, this year the government ran a campaign on temporary EI benefits out of ESDC to assist workers who were impacted by the tariffs.

**Harb Gill:** You now spend more on contractors than on your own employees. How much of that is because the government plans to reduce the number of public servants, and how much is because your department relies too heavily on contractors? Specifically, what skills and functions have you decided you will not rebuild in-house, and what is the long-term cost of that choice?

**Michael Hammond:** We do spend a great deal on contracting within PSPC in particular. That's primarily because we're in the process of implementing a number of major capital projects. We are involved in the renovations around Parliament. That is contracted out to specific construction companies that are specialists in doing this sort of work. We don't employ public servants who are tradesmen on a regular basis.

Again, we're supplementing our requirements for these specific projects, which explains why our professional services costs are quite high.

**The Chair:** Ms. Rochefort, go ahead, please.

**Pauline Rochefort:** Mr. Chair, I'll share my time with my colleague, Ms. Sudds.

I have just a quick question. I'm just interested, from a rural perspective, in Shared Services. Basically we know that there are issues with the service across our country.

Can you explain how your investments in cloud migration and network upgrades will help make federal digital services more reliable for Canadians living outside urban areas? Can you maybe just comment as well on any cybersecurity issues from a rural perspective?

**Scott Davis:** Thank you for the question. Maybe I'll start with the latter and go backward.

Cybersecurity issues are a reality across the country, regardless of where you are. SSC, in collaboration with the cyber tripartite, block 3.5 trillion cyber-attacks per year. It's an impressive number and it's a scary number from a bad actor perspective.

When we look into rural, SSC has been working with low-orbit satellites and some of the satellite capabilities in the north. We've deployed—I have the number here somewhere—between 300 and 500 low-orbit satellites, enabling the north and continuing to enable the north to function.

We continue to invest in hubs. We have hubs in Montreal, Toronto and Vancouver, which sit as central points to deploy across the country the capabilities that Canadians need to be serviced with.

**Pauline Rochefort:** That's very impressive. Thank you for that answer.

**Hon. Jenna Sudds:** I don't actually have any further questions, but I do have a motion that I'd like to table.

Given the discussion today and the interest in having the ISED officials back, I propose that, in regard to communications on redactions made to the contract ordered by the committee on October 20, 2025, the committee reinstate officials from the Department of Innovation, Science and Economic Development to appear before the committee on Tuesday, December 9, for one hour.

**The Chair:** Are you putting that on notice?

**Hon. Jenna Sudds:** I'd like to table it, given the interest in getting them here sooner rather than later and getting to the bottom of this.

• (1725)

**The Chair:** Because it's not a matter at hand, you would have to put it on notice, but I think we generally have agreement within the committee that we'll proceed in that manner. Are we in agreement?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Hon. Jenna Sudds:** Wonderful.

[*Translation*]

**Marie-Hélène Gaudreau:** Mr. Chair, it's a good thing I understand a bit of English because I think a few words are missing in French. It should be “before appearing before the committee on Tuesday, December 9”. I just want to make sure it's written correctly in French. I read the motion in English.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Would you repeat it, Ms. Sudds?

**Hon. Jenna Sudds:** Yes.

[*Translation*]

Would you like me to reread it in French or English?

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Read it in whatever language works for you.

**Hon. Jenna Sudds:** I propose that, in regard to communications on redactions made to the contract ordered by the committee on October 20, 2025, the committee reinstate officials from the Department of Innovation, Science and Economic Development to appear before the committee on Tuesday, December 9, 2025, for one hour.

[*Translation*]

**Marie-Hélène Gaudreau:** That's great.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** This solves the issue I brought up earlier about having their feedback before we look at a privilege issue, so thank you for bringing that forward. If we have unanimous consent, we will adopt that.

(Motion agreed to)

**The Chair:** Wonderful. You have about one minute left, Ms. Sudds.

**Hon. Jenna Sudds:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** PSPC and Shared Services, thanks for being with us again. I will dismiss you.

Colleagues, just very quickly, we heard back from Mr. Guzman and the secretary of state. Mr. Guzman is better. They're offering the end of January, but I don't know what our schedule will be when we come back—whether we're still on Tuesday and Thursday. If it's fine with everyone here, we'll wait till we get the notice of what our schedule will be, then I'll leave it to the clerk to book.

Secondly, on Thursday—everyone will like this—we're going to shave off a half-hour, if everyone's fine with that. Some issues have popped up and it looks like we're going to have Canada Post for 90 minutes, not the full two hours.

I hope everyone is happy with—

**Iqra Khalid:** It helps me to get ready for the Christmas party, Chair.

**The Chair:** I suspected as much. I didn't wish to make assumptions, but I'm just advising everyone.

Colleagues, we had spoken about perhaps having the Transportation Safety Board and PSPIB, which are under the OGGO umbrella, for next week, for the second half. I'll leave it to the parties to chat off-line and advise what they would like to see for the second hour, if anything, for next Tuesday.

Thank you very much. It was good to see you again, Mr. Ieraci. I appreciate everything.

Colleagues, have a great weekend.

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>