



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

45th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

Standing Committee on Government Operations and Estimates

EVIDENCE

NUMBER 028

Tuesday, February 24, 2026

Chair: Kelly McCauley



Standing Committee on Government Operations and Estimates

Tuesday, February 24, 2026

• (1530)

[English]

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

Welcome to meeting number 28 of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Government Operations and Estimates.

Today we have with us Canada Post. We were originally going to be discussing Bill C-15, but of course, as everyone's aware, the parties made a deal without involving OGGO, and they settled some of the Bill C-15 issues. However, seeing as we already had a commitment from Canada Post to show up and since we're doing the supplementary estimates (C), we're going to move over to that discussion, as well as any other questions you might have for Canada Post.

Welcome, Ms. Chisholm. I understand that you have an opening statement.

The floor is yours for five minutes. Please go ahead.

Carrie Chisholm (Vice-President, Product Management and Customer Experience, Canada Post Corporation): Thank you very much.

[Translation]

Good afternoon, Mr. Chair and members of the committee.

Thank you for inviting Canada Post to appear today.

My name is Carrie Chisholm. I am the vice-president of product management and customer experience at Canada Post. I'm pleased to participate in today's discussion on Bill C-15 and the government's additional repayable funding as it relates to Canada Post. I look forward to answering the members' questions.

[English]

First, I'd like to share that I am very pleased with the government's new proposal to amend Bill C-15 to include language that protects free material for people who are blind or partially sighted, as well as reduced rates for eligible library materials. I would like to reaffirm that Canada Post had no plans to change these services. These are long-standing commitments that we will continue to honour, and we are very proud to do so.

Today, I'm here to focus on the provision in the bill, should it pass, that provides Canada Post with greater flexibility on the ability to update its established, regulated letter mail rate-setting process. This would only apply to regulated letter mail items and does

not include parcels or our direct marketing services. It is a change that we have long advocated for and that would help us address our substantial financial challenges.

Over the last 20 years, the mail industry has completely transformed. In 2006, we delivered almost 5.5 billion letters. Today, we deliver half that volume. Meanwhile, the number of addresses we deliver to continues to grow. The result is that the revenue we earn from mail no longer covers the cost to deliver it, which has significantly compounded our financial issues.

Since 2018, Canada Post has incurred more than \$5.5 billion in operating losses. Last year, we required an initial \$1-billion cash injection from the government simply to stay afloat. However, the funding was insufficient, largely due to ongoing labour uncertainty throughout 2025 and its impact on our revenue. Earlier this month, the government informed Canada Post that additional repayable funding up to \$1.01 billion would be made available to ensure the corporation can maintain its solvency and continue to serve Canadians with the reliable postal service they depend on.

We recognize the severity of our financial situation. Despite these challenges, the problems facing Canada Post are fixable. Having reached tentative agreements with our largest union in December, and thanks to the government's decision to lift some regulatory and policy barriers, we can start to turn a corner. Amending the letter mail pricing process can play a key role in this turnaround.

As proposed in Bill C-15, greater flexibility in the letter mail pricing process would enable us to align our mail business with the modern needs of Canadians. This would mean that the service of delivering letters could better cover its own costs and reduce the need for taxpayer support. In addition, a more streamlined process would significantly cut red tape.

For example, today it takes up to nine months to adjust pricing. It's a cumbersome process that exacts a heavy administrative toll on multiple government departments, decision-makers and agencies. These are all reasons that changing this process was amongst the list of recommendations in the Industrial Inquiry Commission report. It's also why we've included it in our transformation plan, which is currently under review by the government.

We welcome parameters when it comes to changing the pricing process, and we fully support checks and balances. We know Canadians and Canadian businesses are facing rising costs. We recognize that prices must be fair and continue to provide good value, so we are looking forward to working with the government to create a clear process that would ensure transparency, proper notifications to all stakeholders and evidence-based justification for any increases.

● (1535)

[Translation]

In closing, as you know, Canada Post has a dual mandate to deliver to all Canadian addresses while remaining financially self-sustainable. Every change we are making is about getting back to this mandate and ensuring that postal service remains accessible and affordable for everyone.

Thank you again to the committee. I would be pleased to take your questions.

[English]

The Chair: Wonderful. Thank you very much.

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

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

Thank you to Canada Post for joining us virtually today.

I want to start the conversation with this: One town back in the riding I represent sent me a concern that they had. They received a cheque for Canada Post utilities through UPS via a company in Utah. I'm curious; is that a standard practice that you guys do for paying utility bills to towns that lease out buildings to Canada Post?

Carrie Chisholm: I'm afraid I don't have any details on that. I'd be happy to take that away and look into it. I'm not familiar with the situation.

Jeremy Patzer: Okay. The company is Conservice out of Utah. They are apparently a third party utility payment system. I found it really ironic that Canada Post would be sending payment through UPS, through an American service to Canada, for goods from a Crown corporation to another level of government. I just found that quite ironic.

Carrie Chisholm: Okay. I've made a note of it. Thank you.

Jeremy Patzer: Thank you very much.

When it comes to rural post offices, we've heard that lifting the moratorium will not affect rural areas. What is Canada Post doing to make sure that rural post offices will remain open?

Carrie Chisholm: As was announced in September, the minister has provided some direction to us in terms of how we can lessen

regulatory and policy burden. One of them is the rural moratorium, as you mentioned. In our postal network, the rural moratorium was put in place in 1994. It was meant to protect rural post offices at the time, but it's remained unchanged for over three decades. Since that time, the country has shifted, with villages that have become towns, towns that have become cities and cities that have moved to full-grown areas. The needs of Canadians have changed.

Our proposed plan—we are currently still in discussion with the government—includes modernization of our post offices to better reflect where Canadians live and shop. We understand, of course, how important a role the rural, remote and indigenous communities play. Modernization will have to truly prioritize and protect access to vital services in these areas. As I mentioned, this is part of the proposed plan we've submitted to the government and are in discussion on, but we won't be able to share final details until it's fully endorsed and improved.

● (1540)

Jeremy Patzer: While the moratorium was in place, though, over 500 rural post offices closed. I recognize that part of the lifting of this moratorium is, as you said, for places that have changed from a village all the way up to a city. I understand the reasons you're doing that, of course. However, I'm looking more at some of the towns that are very rural and remote and that rely on the postal service for sending in water samples, say, on a weekly basis to make sure residents are drinking clean water. There's a lot of concern from folks that those kinds of post offices will end up on the chopping block.

Can you provide to this committee assurances that your plan will ensure that places like the town of Vanguard, for example, or even the village of Neville will not lose their post offices because of a strategy like this?

Carrie Chisholm: A significant part of our transformation plan, once it's endorsed and approved by the government, would be part of consultations with the municipalities we would be engaging with, whether in a retail network or community mailboxes. This has to be taken into clear consideration in terms of each municipality—the services the post offices offer and the needs of the community.

Consultation is at the forefront of everything that would be part of our transformation plan to ensure that we have an approach that fits the community. It can't be one-size-fits-all. Each community is too unique to look at it in such a way.

Jeremy Patzer: Has the minister given you a very clear definition of what "rural" means for the sake of determining what a rural post office would be?

Carrie Chisholm: From my perspective, in my position, I have not been engaging with those specific conversations, so I can't comment as to whether they've given us a specific definition. It's better to ask that question directly of them.

Jeremy Patzer: We're still waiting for confirmation of when he'll show up to this committee again.

For you guys at Canada Post, then, do you have your own definition that you utilize when you are referring to something as rural?

Carrie Chisholm: The definition, as far as I understand from my current point of view, is rooted in the rural moratorium, which is partly why it needs to be relooked at with regard to our statistical data for Canada as opposed to where the boundaries were drawn in 1994.

Jeremy Patzer: Okay; sounds good. Thank you for that.

I have 30 seconds more. Do you have any specific details of your plan for keeping rural post offices open? Do you have any information on it that you could table with this committee to provide some further assurances? I'm just wondering if there's any further information you'd like to share with this committee. If so, you could send it as a brief.

Carrie Chisholm: Yes—at this time, though, our transformation plan hasn't been approved. We continue to work with the government to make sure that it's there. I want to reassure this committee that, of course, we recognize the vital role that rural and remote communities play, and this will be part of how we approach this transformation—very carefully, from a municipal perspective.

Jeremy Patzer: Thank you.

The Chair: Thanks.

Ms. Chisholm, we have a policy within the committee that for any information we request, we require it within 21 calendar days. That's just so you are aware.

Carrie Chisholm: Thank you for letting me know.

The Chair: Mr. Gasparro, the floor is yours.

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

There's been significant discussion at this committee by me and others regarding the preferred rate postage for two specific groups: municipal libraries and blind Canadians. Can you just confirm, as others have confirmed, whether the intention is to maintain these preferential rates and exemptions for libraries and Canadians who are blind?

Carrie Chisholm: Yes. Yesterday, there was a decision that those provisions within Bill C-15 would be removed. As I mentioned in my opening statements, these services—regardless of how Bill C-15 would have been shaped with literature for the blind included or reduced rates for library mail—are ones that Canada Post would continue to offer. They're both long-standing services. We're completely proud to offer them and would have continued to do so.

• (1545)

Vince Gasparro: Excellent. I know that people in my riding of Eglinton—Lawrence will be very happy to hear that.

I also know that many Canadians are worried about the future of the Canada Post service. In your estimation, what services at Canada Post should be prioritized?

Carrie Chisholm: Can you specify what you mean by services? I'm assuming delivery services is what you're referring to.

Vince Gasparro: I am. As a follow-up on the services that Canada Post provides, what do you see Canada Post looking like in 2050 or 2075? Basically, where do you see Canada Post moving forward in the 21st century?

Carrie Chisholm: I would just say that it's important to remind everybody that we have a dual mandate, which is to continue to service and deliver to all Canadians. We are very proud of the mandate. We also have the flip side, which is of course to remain financially self-sustaining. That's why we've been working very closely with the government to submit a transformation plan that showcases how we can return to financial sustainability so that we're not reliant on taxpayer funding.

The components of the transformation plan are very much tied to the minister's announcement in September related to the areas in which we have an opportunity to change some of the regulatory and policy pieces that have potentially made it more difficult for us to transform. That is still the root of the transformation plan. It includes all of our products and services from a delivery perspective, including parcels, letter mail and direct marketing services. It also speaks to where those services would be offered in terms of our retail outlets or other areas to make sure that the communities have accessibility and can transact with us in different ways.

The details of the transformation plan, as I mentioned, are still under review and in discussion with the government. I'm not able to go into the specifics, but rest assured that they tie very closely to what was announced in September.

Vince Gasparro: I'm glad you referenced the mandate to serve all Canadians. Why is the mandate still relevant in today's digital economy?

Carrie Chisholm: As for the perspective of why it's still relevant, we are a national infrastructure that doesn't deliver only letter mail; we also deliver direct marketing services, which allow small and large businesses to promote themselves and grow. Of course, we also offer parcel delivery from coast to coast. I'm sure that we all have personal experiences of the growth of e-commerce during the pandemic, as well as the preferences of people moving online.

We are built nationally to be able to service all Canadians from coast to coast to coast on all of our products and services. It's still important that we continue to do that, and it's relevant to all the products we offer, not just letter mail. It needs to be there for what you need to get. Whether you're a consumer, a small business or a larger commercial customer, it's still important that we're able to service from a national perspective.

Vince Gasparro: What steps is Canada Post taking to focus on efficiency and reduce the executive team to ensure that the organization is positioned to lead us into a more sustainable and modern future?

Carrie Chisholm: One thing that's important for returning to financial self-sustainability is looking at all aspects of the corporation. The announcement from the minister back in September really spoke to the cost of operations in terms of how we can be more efficient and effective with our current network. That is a key part of it in terms of what we need to do.

As we also move forward with the transformation plan, we need to make sure that we're looking at all different levels of the organization to be reflective of how we're transforming and how we need to move forward. That's critical. We also have a large number of positions in which attrition will come into play over the next five to 10 years. This gives us an opportunity to look at it.

Specifically from a management perspective, as we move forward to transformation, we have eliminated some executive and management positions as part of corporate-wide restructuring in order to better set ourselves up. As our transformation plan continues to be reviewed, the continuous review of how we're structured to make sure that we're rightsizing the organization to support how we're transforming is critically important.

We also understand that it's in line with the government's expectations of us to make the changes to the leadership and changes within the corporation to modernize and to transform.

• (1550)

Vince Gasparro: I'm glad you mentioned—

The Chair: I'm sorry; we're well past.

Go ahead, Madame Gaudreau.

[*Translation*]

Marie-Hélène Gaudreau (Laurentides—Labelle, BQ): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I will continue in that spirit.

We talked about attrition. I'm wondering if the customers have expressed concern about what might happen and what will happen as a result of the downsizing under the transformation plan.

Have you heard of people who are upset or concerned?

Carrie Chisholm: Thank you for your question. I will answer in English.

[*English*]

As I mentioned, in terms of having the dual mandate of delivering to all Canadian addresses and remaining financially self-sustaining, we have to look at our transformation plan as a holistic component of how we're evaluating our service; how we're designing products, services and our network to support all Canadians from coast to coast; and how the organization needs to be structured to support this as things change.

I am not aware of any direct discussions on the concerns about the size of our organization or how we're rightsizing. In my position, I just may not be privy to those conversations.

[*Translation*]

Marie-Hélène Gaudreau: Thank you.

Why does it take so long and why are we waiting to see the results? People are wondering whether their post office will survive and whether it will change mandates. They are also wondering whether they will have sufficient, effective infrastructure for all aspects of community mailboxes, including those of a particular size. I think they call them oversized.

Why is it taking so long right now to get up to date? It is now March.

Carrie Chisholm: Thank you for your question.

[*English*]

The announcement was made in September with respect to the areas in which we've had a little bit more flexibility to look at our transformation plan. As I already noted, we responded in November with a transformation plan that addresses what was announced in September, as well as areas that we need to look at and evaluate to make sure we have a transformation that brings us to being financially self-sustaining.

The conversations with the government are ongoing on the transformation plan. We have not yet finalized that plan or had it approved, so I'm not able to speak to the detailed components of it, outside what was announced by the minister, but we continue to work very closely with the government on it to this day to make sure that we're able to do that.

I would like to address your comment about people having concerns. It's very important for us from a transformation perspective that once the elements are approved, municipal consultations will be extremely key before we move forward. It's not simply that we would move forward, have the plan approved and start making any changes. Consultation will be key. There are differences from community to community, and we can't just have a blanket approach to how we do this. Consultations will be a very strong fundamental of our transformation plan going on.

[*Translation*]

Marie-Hélène Gaudreau: I'm reassured to hear you say that it won't be a blanket approach, but instead will be on a sliding scale based on needs.

This week, I have to go to the Îles de la Madeleine, and I'm sure the community will ask me if the frequency of postal service will change, for example. I don't think they're worried about the service ending. We've often asked that question. However, a private model could change everything.

Reassure me: Is efficiency in the delivery of things like medical parcels still in the cards for remote regions such as the Îles de la Madeleine?

• (1555)

[English]

Carrie Chisholm: When you're speaking to your constituents, in addition to talking about how important community and municipal engagement is overall in the transformation plan, the important thing for them to understand is that once the transformation plan is approved and everything is finalized, the details will be made much more public to Canadians, our customers and our employees. Once those details are there, that would be a significant place for people to start, before we begin municipal engagement.

It's critically important for people to understand and for you to share with your constituents that the plan will be made public once it's approved. Then, of course, there will be the municipal engagement process I mentioned, not only with regard to retail but also community mailboxes, etc.

[Translation]

Marie-Hélène Gaudreau: I have one last question for you. I have a few seconds left.

What are the main requests or comments regarding Canada Post's services, such as access to community mailboxes? Where do you need to focus your efforts? What stands out more in terms of what customers are saying?

[English]

Carrie Chisholm: We have had a lot of questions come up around how we will make sure community mailboxes remain accessible to Canadians. We have been speaking quite a bit about our delivery accommodation program, which was launched in 2014 to assist people to have access to their mail. This is a big one that's come up. We've been speaking quite a bit more frequently about the delivery accommodation program to bring better awareness of it in case people aren't familiar with it.

Again, it has been around since 2014, but this doesn't necessarily mean that people understand the specifics or understand that it includes many different aspects. It could mean moving a compartment lower, adding a tray for better accessibility or adding Braille to the box to make it easier for somebody who needs it, in addition to providing, if necessary, mail and parcel delivery to the door.

[Translation]

Marie-Hélène Gaudreau: Thank you.

[English]

The Chair: Thanks very much.

We will go to Mr. Gill, please.

Harb Gill (Windsor West, CPC): Thank you, Chair.

Thank you to the witness for appearing.

Per the Kaplan report, Canada Post is deemed to be in “an existential crisis” and “effectively insolvent”. Page 55 of the report states, “The notion that the January 2025 \$1 billion-plus loan/life-line will be repaid requires the complete suspension of disbelief.”

Now that another loan has been issued, what confidence can Canadians reasonably have that either of the loans will be repaid? Do you have any timelines for when the loan will be repaid? How

long will it take to repay the \$2 billion? Can you table the loan agreement with this committee?

Carrie Chisholm: Canada Post, as well as CUPW, participated in the Industrial Inquiry Commission led by William Kaplan in 2025. We absolutely welcomed the findings that came from the Kaplan report, which highlighted our financial situation and the dire need to make changes to Canada Post to allow us to transform.

While the Kaplan commission was going on, the first announcement of the \$1-billion cash injection was brought forward. This was in January 2025. That, of course, was meant to sustain the corporation until the end of the fiscal year—March 31, 2026. Unfortunately, due to the ongoing labour uncertainty in 2025 and the impacts on revenue, a secondary announcement regarding an additional access to up to \$1.01 billion was just made.

As you know, we and the minister have stated that these are repayable loans and that we, as the corporation, do not want to continue to rely on taxpayer funding and be supported by taxpayer funding. We need to return to financial sustainability—which is, of course, part of our mandate—to reach that point.

I am not privy to the details of the cash injections that have come through and cannot speak to the terms under which they would be repaid.

• (1600)

Harb Gill: Can you table the loan agreement with this committee?

Carrie Chisholm: I can certainly take it away and ask my colleagues for that. I just don't have the details. I'm sorry.

Harb Gill: Okay.

What are you doing differently that is going to make Canada Post sustainable or profitable, if I could go as far as thinking that? When will the transformational plan be implemented? It's been months, and we're all waiting. When are the community mailboxes being rolled out per the new plan, or is that the new plan?

Carrie Chisholm: Earlier, I mentioned our minister's announcement in September with respect to areas in which they would lessen the regulatory and policy items that have been in place for some time and that directly align with the Kaplan report. Community mailboxes, our retail network, delivery standards for letter mail and the rate-setting process for regulated letter mail that I mentioned in my opening statements are all components of the transformation plan that were submitted to the government last year, as requested. We continue to have conversations with the government regarding the specifics of the plan and the details that are in there.

We do not have a timeline at this point, because when we would commence the transformation initiatives has not yet been approved. We need to make sure that the transformation plan is approved by the government. We also need to make sure that we're then starting the announcements of consultation processes with the communities.

I do not have a timeline to share with you, because that's still part of discussions on the transformation plan overall.

Harb Gill: Can you share those discussions with us? We're curious as to what exactly is holding up the implementation of this plan. The minister has had it, as you just pointed out, for several months.

Carrie Chisholm: As the vice-president of product management and customer experience, I am not privy to those direct conversations, so I could not tell you what is being asked or what details are being asked about in terms of clarification of our plan. I'm just not privy to those conversations.

Harb Gill: Is that my time, sir?

The Chair: That's your time. Thank you.

Ms. Rochefort, please go ahead.

[Translation]

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

Thank you, madam. I have just three questions for you.

I know there's been a lot of discussion about the preferential postal rates given to two groups: libraries and blind Canadians. I was wondering if you could confirm your intention to maintain preferential tariffs for these two groups, because I know how critical it is for them.

Carrie Chisholm: Thank you for your question.

[English]

As I mentioned in my opening statement, Canada Post was happy to hear that a change is being proposed in Bill C-15 to remove literature for the blind and to reduce postage for library mailings.

Regardless of whether those provisions were included in Bill C-15, Canada Post would have continued to honour those services. They're long-standing traditions that we have been doing for some time, since 1898 for literature for the blind and since 1939 for reduced postage for library mailings.

We're very proud to honour those services, and we have no intention of making any changes to them.

[Translation]

Pauline Rochefort: Thank you.

My second question is about services in rural communities, a topic that was discussed earlier. There are a number of rural communities in my riding. I'm thinking of my own village, Astorville, where we are lucky enough to have a great post office.

How are you going to ensure that you continue to provide good service to rural regions across Canada?

Carrie Chisholm: Thank you for your question.

[English]

We have two sides to our mandate, which are to remain financially sustainable and to make sure we are still delivering to every address in Canada.

Part of the national service and infrastructure we currently have set up for Canadians includes retail post offices and making sure that people have access to their post offices and the services within them.

Rural, remote and indigenous communities are a significant part of our Canadian economy, and they are an important part of the modernization that will need to take place as part of how we transform to be financially sustainable. As I mentioned, it is important that, once the plan is approved, the plan is made available to Canadians so that they understand what it means. We will also make sure to engage with our rural, remote and indigenous communities and prioritize the protection of those vital services as we go forward.

• (1605)

[Translation]

Pauline Rochefort: Lastly, how are you going to guarantee services for people with reduced mobility and seniors? Many of these people in my riding have expressed concerns.

Carrie Chisholm: Thank you for your question.

[English]

As I mentioned, we have a delivery accommodation program, which has been around since 2014. It may not be completely well known, although we're very proud of it. We have certainly been speaking a lot more to it to bring better awareness of the program and what it contains.

The intention of the program is to make sure that mail, direct marketing and parcels remain accessible to all Canadians. The program is free. It currently has 17,000 Canadians registered as part of it. However, it does naturally ebb and flow. We have had up to 40,000 Canadian addresses as part of it.

When I say ebb and flow, I mean that we offer seasonal options in which an individual would perhaps prefer, during the winter months, to look at something because they have concerns about accessing their mailbox due to snow or ice. It offers a variety of different options, depending on people's needs.

For us, it is certainly a program we're extremely proud of. It will underpin a lot of the transformation plan to make sure that there's an awareness and an understanding of how you can apply for the program and what options are available, because different options could service different needs. We want to make sure that it's not one-size-fits-all.

You'll continue to hear about that a lot from us. Again, we are quite proud of it. It has been available for some time, and it remains available.

[Translation]

Pauline Rochefort: Thank you for that.

That will be all, Mr. Chair.

[English]

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Patzer.

Jeremy Patzer: Thank you very much.

I wanted to pick up on something. When it comes to the transformation plan, has the minister given you a timeline for when he will approve your plan? Do you know when that is?

Carrie Chisholm: I haven't been part of those direct conversations, in my position, in terms of providing a timeline. I can tell you that the conversations are ongoing in terms of asking questions. I'm not aware of a specific timeline, but I'm not part of the direct conversations with the minister's office.

Jeremy Patzer: If you guys already had an approved strategic plan, how much money could you have really saved?

Carrie Chisholm: The transformation plan would be multi-year.

If you think back to what was announced in September, with respect to some of the items we've talked about today—community mailboxes, our retail network, changing our delivery standards for letter mail and the regulated rate process—all those things will take time. They're not instantaneous. We need to make sure that there aren't any impacts to Canadians and that we go through a consultation process. It certainly wouldn't be that, if it was approved tomorrow, we would return to financial sustainability by the end of 2026.

Jeremy Patzer: There was a strategic plan submitted five years ago, and it wasn't approved. It's just been sitting there in the background, on the back burner.

My point is this: If the strategic plan had been approved when it was submitted five years ago, do you think it's possible that you wouldn't be in as big of a mess as you are in today?

Carrie Chisholm: I can't comment on the elements of the strategic plan that was submitted five years ago.

There are a lot of compounding factors related to our financial situation. Between Commissioner Kaplan's report and the announcement by the minister in September, there are ways Canada Post can really start to turn a corner and change the financial position we're currently in, while still being able to stick to, of course, our mandate of delivering to every Canadian address and making sure we're returning to financial sustainability.

Jeremy Patzer: What factors, in your opinion, have had the biggest impact on you in the last couple of years, putting you \$750 million in the hole, year over year?

• (1610)

Carrie Chisholm: As I mentioned at the beginning, our network is designed to be a national network, and it is designed to deliver. It was predominantly designed, at the beginning, to deliver letter mail. In 2006, we delivered 5.5 billion letters. Today, we're delivering less than half of that. On average, people typically get only two letter mail pieces a week, compared with seven pieces 20 years ago. We have a national network that was built for that, and we just don't have the volume to be able to cover the cost of that network.

Things need to change. Some of the elements of the September announcement are about moving our delivery standards so that they are no longer required to be two, three or four days. It's about moving to a wider date range—three to seven days, as an example. Something like that would allow us to move away from having to transport letter mail in the air in order to make the network, which in itself would be a cost to the operational savings. A combination of those things would really help move us forward.

Again, having a national network designed for letter mail but with less than half of what we used to have is a challenge.

Jeremy Patzer: That's not a change you can just make on the fly. Is that what you're saying? Otherwise, the organization has refused to make that change on the fly.

Carrie Chisholm: The transformation plan is a multi-year plan, and it includes multiple different things. It's not a one-part piece. It is tied to the different elements announced by the minister and supported in the Kaplan report. It's not something we can get approval on and proceed with as an in-year change to our financial position. We need to make sure we're consulting with Canadians and engaging with the municipalities that are impacted as we move towards implementing the changes, in order to return ourselves to financial sustainability.

Jeremy Patzer: Thank you.

The Chair: Ms. Khalid.

Iqra Khalid (Mississauga—Erin Mills, Lib.): I believe Mr. Osborne has more questions than I do. I'll take whatever remaining time he allows me.

The Chair: Go ahead for five minutes, please, Mr. Osborne.

Tom Osborne (Cape Spear, Lib.): I just have a couple of questions.

We understand that the volume of mail has gone down over the last 20 years, and we understand why—greater reliance on email and so on.

I know parcel delivery is a competitive sector. Why has the private sector been able to grow in that area while Canada Post has gone from 62% in 2019 to 24% in 2024?

Carrie Chisholm: Parcel delivery is a competitive business, as you highlighted. We continue, as part of our mandate, to deliver parcels to all Canadian addresses. We are the sole carrier that can actually claim to deliver to all addresses in Canada; our competitors do not.

Prior to the pandemic, we had a substantial market share, as you noted. However, from an e-commerce perspective, everything drastically changed during the pandemic. People who weren't used to ordering and transacting online had no other options, so a volume of e-commerce and parcels became available during that time. The traditional carrier—us—as well as the competitors that were in the market in 2020.... A significant number of smaller entrants have now come into the market because of the volume that was made available. This has changed things quite drastically.

Our model is quite different from the models of non-traditional carriers. We have, of course, full-time employees who are offered benefits. Comparing this to some of the non-traditional carriers, it's a bit more of a contract model. They are more third party contractors than direct employees. The number of entrants of what I would call non-traditional carriers has been a substantial change, overall, in the industry. That's why you see such a shift.

Obviously, one thing that was highlighted in the Industrial Inquiry Commission report, which was part of our ongoing discussions and negotiations with our union last year, was the need to expand into weekend delivery. Basically, the entire e-commerce industry is seven days a week, and we need to move into that. That was, obviously, one of the findings in the industrial inquiry report: We need to make sure that we align our services to those of the market so that we don't continue to miss out on the opportunities for parcels and packages.

● (1615)

Tom Osborne: Outside the five-days-a-week delivery versus seven days—and I get that, if some of the people you contract with want delivery seven days a week, it would have an impact—what else is Canada Post doing to gain a greater market share of parcel delivery, which is where the future is? Some of your competitors did not see the decrease that Canada Post did over that time frame.

Carrie Chisholm: Certainly, from a parcels perspective, the labour uncertainty last year had a significant impact for our commercial customers, as I mentioned, and it impacted our revenues that came in. The uncertainty came in and made it difficult for them, so there were some that, of course, went to other carriers, and they were able to do so, to make sure that they felt they could continue to move their businesses. We definitely have plans, and they are incorporated in the transformation plans around the opportunity that we see possible for growing our parcels business and winning back our customers.

Tom Osborne: I have one final question. There was a comment made about Canada Post that, instead of rationalizing your footprint, you continue to carry 1990s-era infrastructure into a 2025 economy. Can you provide some comment on that?

Carrie Chisholm: I'm not sure I'm going to do this question justice. I'm sorry. Just from my vantage point and from a product management perspective, we have quite a large footprint for serving nationally, in terms of having 20 processing plants, a number of depots and things like that. We brought a brand new processing plant online in Scarborough, called the Albert Jackson processing plant, which has significant capacity to deliver e-commerce for us. At its peak, it can do up to a million packages a day, I believe. We continue to invest in the network where we need to, to make sure that we grow in the competitive businesses. However, I'm not able to ad-

dress, specifically, the comment about the rest of our infrastructure. I just don't have the knowledge or the details.

The Chair: That is our time.

Ms. Chisholm, I have a couple of questions for you, if you don't mind.

When Mr. Ettinger was last with us, he stated that it was solely up to Canada Post to make decisions on what is rural and non-rural. We have been bandying this about for a long time. For example, Gatineau was declared to be rural in 1993. Canada Post, therefore, has had more than enough time. Mr. Ettinger said Canada Post can decide, so why is there an ongoing delay? Why is it that, every time we ask a question, as was done today, we hear that it was set in 1993? If Canada Post has the power, what is it waiting for to address this?

Carrie Chisholm: I wasn't aware that we had the power to set this. My understanding was that within the boundaries of the 19...within the rural moratorium and what was decreed, compared to where we have an opportunity.... I'm not sure that's what Mr. Ettinger was speaking to, to reimagine and revision the—

The Chair: I'm going to interrupt. I'm sorry. I'm going to be a bit mean. You're getting into deputy minister word salad.

When are we actually going to see action? Taxpayers are going to write off \$2 billion, because taxpayers are not going to see that money. There's no real change. The question has been put quite fairly and straightforwardly to you, but it doesn't sound as though Canada Post is going to change or adjust.

Is that perhaps something Mr. Ettinger should answer?

Carrie Chisholm: The challenge is the timing. That's not something I can answer at this time, because it is part of our transformation plan. I can't give you a specific timeline of when we will start to move forward.

The Chair: However, you're here on supplementary estimates (C) in which Canada Post is getting an extra \$1 billion. Do you know what the cost of the new collective agreement will be per year if it's accepted?

● (1620)

Carrie Chisholm: I don't have that specific number available, but we can certainly respond back and provide the details to the committee.

The Chair: Thank you very much for appearing with us. We appreciate your time.

Go ahead, Mrs. Block.

Kelly Block (Carlton Trail—Eagle Creek, CPC): I'm not sure if we are done with the rounds. I assumed so.

The Chair: Yes, we are.

Kelly Block: You mentioned that we were dealing with supplementary estimates (C). Obviously, a few things changed in the last few days with the notice of meeting. On that note, when do supplementary estimates (C) have to be reported back to the House? What's the specific date for that?

The Chair: I don't have the exact date. It depends on the three sitting days prior to the last opposition supply day, but we don't know when that will be from the government.

Kelly Block: You don't know when that will be. Do we have the minister responsible for PSPC and the President of the Treasury Board appearing here to speak to the supplementary estimates before we run out of time?

The Chair: I was going to address that at the end, but I'll just address it now.

Mr. Lightbound will not be making himself available. The clerk and I have offered him our sitting days, our regular days for this meeting. He was not available, so we reached out and said that we would make a special meeting on a Monday, Wednesday or Friday to accommodate him. Unfortunately, we were told that we would not be able to meet at any time.

The President of the Treasury Board has made himself available on February 26, which will be after the supplementaries are deemed reported in the House.

Kelly Block: Thank you for those answers.

I would just register my disappointment, for sure, with the fact that Minister Lightbound is refusing to appear before committee to defend the supplementary estimates. I would also register that it is a smack in the face of parliamentary procedure to have a minister appear on supplementary estimates after they've been deemed reported.

We would like to have the opportunity to question the minister prior to this. This is really unacceptable to the parliamentarians around this table, that we have ministers refusing to come in a timely manner to defend the estimates.

Thanks.

The Chair: We have Ms. Gaudreau and then Ms. Khalid.

Ms. Chisholm, we're going to excuse you. We'll let you go, and thanks for joining us.

Carrie Chisholm: Thank you very much. Have a great day.

The Chair: As for your point, I agree regarding Minister Lightbound, which is why—

An hon. member: Oh, oh!

The Chair: I'm sorry. Let me finish, please, and then it's Ms. Gaudreau and then you.

I agree, which is why the clerk and I reached out to make any time available through March. The clerk and I met yesterday, and we'll reach out again to the President of the Treasury Board to see if he can come. I think we have time on March 10. We'll reach out to

try to find time and see if he will shift his appearance before the estimates are actually deemed reported.

We'll now go to Madame Gaudreau and then Ms. Khalid.

[*Translation*]

Marie-Hélène Gaudreau: Mr. Chair, I just want to summarize what we've just seen.

There was a conclusion about free mail for the blind and libraries, and now we have a witness. That's one thing.

At the same time, for anything budget-related, we don't meet with anyone once the budget has been prepared. We're asking that representatives and ministers appear in person, but if that's not possible, they can also appear virtually, the goal being to have a discussion and get answers to our questions before moving on to the final vote.

[*English*]

The Chair: Go ahead, Ms. Khalid.

Iqra Khalid: Thank you, Chair.

I wanted to let everybody know the reason Minister Lightbound is not available to come to committee. He is on paternity leave for a new baby. It's not that he has refused to attend. I know for a fact—I've had many conversations with the minister—that he is very attentive to what this committee has to say and has to contribute. He is not refusing; he is otherwise occupied.

I know that the President of the Treasury Board is more than willing and able to attend and answer any questions from the committee. I'm happy to connect with Minister Lightbound to see if a virtual option is available or if there are any other ways we can engage. However, I would appreciate it if we could all stop saying that the minister refused to attend, because that's not the case at all.

• (1625)

The Chair: It would be wonderful if the President of the Treasury Board would reconsider his date and would make it earlier. As I said, the clerk is already on that.

With regard to the minister and whatever term you wish to use, he's not attending to defend the estimates. There is \$1 billion in Canada Post alone. We heard today, repeatedly, that there's no real plan to address it. There are lots of others. It will be wonderful if he is able to attend virtually for one hour.

Iqra Khalid: There is a difference. When we accuse somebody of refusing, to me and to anybody listening or paying attention to what's happening in committee, it shows that they are actively not wanting to come to this committee. In this instance, the minister has not refused to attend, but he is otherwise occupied with his family and with his new baby.

I would appreciate it if we were a bit more careful with the language we use and with what we accuse our ministers of doing or not doing. I'm sure they are all trying their level best. Quite frankly, I'm not in any position to defend anybody. I just want to make sure that we are being accurate in how we portray people and their intentions.

The Chair: Your point is taken. It's up to the committee to decide what language it will use or what interpretation it will have of Minister Lightbound's inability to join us, but we take your point.

We'll go to Ms. Block.

Once we're done, we'll suspend quickly and bring in our new witnesses. I think we have to do a sound check on someone as well.

Kelly Block: I would have hoped that the information would be provided to the clerk and to the chair. It's not that we need to know all of someone's personal information, but that would have explained a lot.

In this instance, is someone taking on the responsibilities of the minister for PSPC while he is on paternity leave? I know it happens when other ministers take maternity leave, so I'm wondering if this will be a prolonged period and if that's been given any thought.

The Chair: We'll get back to you.

We'll go to Ms. Rochefort, and then we'll suspend.

Pauline Rochefort: For the record, I am satisfied that the minister appeared twice and gave very—

The Chair: This is on the supplementary estimates. It's completely different.

Pauline Rochefort: Nonetheless, he was present and gave us an opportunity to question him on many issues and options that might have evolved, so I'm satisfied with the excellent presentations he's made.

The Chair: Thanks.

I am not satisfied. There's \$1 billion in Canada Post. Canada Post has been unable to send anyone who could provide any responses. It's also part of parliamentary tradition that ministers show up to defend their estimates.

We understand that Ms. Khalid will reach out to see if we can get at least one hour virtually, which I think will satisfy our requirements, but I appreciate the feedback.

Iqra Khalid: I just want to say on the record that the minister has appeared three times in the past two months.

Jeremy Patzer: I would also just like to put on the record—

The Chair: Okay. We are getting—

Jeremy Patzer: —that he has not appeared for the supplementary estimates (B) either. He has avoided what the parliamentary tradition of this place actually is.

The Chair: Now we're getting into a back-and-forth argument. I think our points have been made.

We'll suspend for about five minutes. We will do a test for one of our witnesses, and then we'll reconvene.

• (1625) _____ (Pause) _____

• (1630)

The Chair: Thank you, everyone. We are back in session.

We welcome our witnesses from the Canada transport safety board.

Mr. Marier, I understand you have a five-minute statement. Before you start, I want to pay tribute to your predecessor, Ms. Fox. She was with us quite a few times over the years and was a fantastic representative for your department. Although I'm sure you'll do wonderfully, we miss her and we want to say thanks. I'm sure she's watching from home right now on CPAC. I want to offer a sincere thanks from our committee for the work that Ms. Fox did.

The floor is yours, please.

• (1635)

Yoan Marier (Chair, Canadian Transportation Accident Investigation and Safety Board):

Good afternoon. I'd like to thank the committee for inviting the Transportation Safety Board of Canada to be present today. I am joined by my colleagues Mélanie Scott, chief operating officer, and James Clarkin, director general of corporate services.

The TSB was created in 1990 by the Canadian Transportation Accident Investigation and Safety Board Act, referred to as the CTAISB Act. Our mandate, and sole purpose, is to advance safety in the air, marine, pipeline and rail modes of transportation under federal jurisdiction. We achieve this by conducting investigations, identifying safety deficiencies and making recommendations to prevent future accidents. We also communicate important safety issues to Canadians through our reports and outreach activities.

The TSB is independent. It operates at arm's length from government departments and agencies, reporting directly to Parliament through the President of the Kings Privy Council for Canada. This independence ensures impartiality and freedom from external influence. We are neither a regulator nor a court, and we do not assign fault or determine civil or criminal liability. We have one clear role: to improve transportation safety. In doing so, we play an essential role in protecting lives and ensuring public safety across Canada's transportation system.

[Translation]

Since its inception in 1990, the Transportation Safety Board of Canada, or TSB, has completed more than 2,000 investigations, made more than 630 recommendations, and issued hundreds of safety communications. We learn new lessons from every investigation, which fuels our commitment to improving transportation safety in Canada. Over the years, more than 84% of the responses to the board's recommendations have been assessed as fully satisfactory, demonstrating the TSB's concrete impact on the improvement of safety.

[English]

While this progress is real, significant risks remain. In October 2025 we released the latest edition of the TSB Watchlist, which highlights seven systemic safety issues that continue to put Canadians at risk. These are not isolated problems. They are long-standing, deeply rooted challenges that have appeared in investigation after investigation, across sectors and across the country. The watch list is both a warning and a road map. It shows where action is urgently needed, where progress has stalled and where sustained leadership from regulators and industry can prevent future tragedies. We will continue to keep these issues in the national spotlight until levels of risk have been measurably reduced.

Meeting these challenges requires the right tools, expertise and infrastructure for the future. This is why we are preparing for the new transportation safety and technology science hub at the National Research Council campus in Ottawa.

[Translation]

This state-of-the-art facility will allow for stronger collaboration, equip us with cutting-edge tools and enhance our ability to conduct rigorous investigations.

[English]

Even with this progress, the scale, complexity and public impact of our work continue to grow. In 2025 alone, there were 3,851 occurrences reported to the TSB. Currently, we are managing 86 active investigations nationwide, including the investigation into the highly publicized implosion of the *Titan* submersible during its descent to the *Titanic* and the investigation into the overturning of a Bombardier aircraft after it struck the runway while landing at Toronto airport.

We also continue to support hundreds of investigations led by our international counterparts, including the recently released investigation report into a helicopter that struck a passenger aircraft last year in Washington. We also lead investigations into international occurrences, such as the September 2025 incident in St. Martin, in which a WestJet aircraft's right landing gear collapsed on touchdown.

Collectively, these investigations, both domestic and international, reflect the global attention and scrutiny on transportation safety and the increasing technical complexity of our work.

[Translation]

Since the TSB's inception, we have delivered high-quality investigations. However, the risk profile is shifting. Canada's transportation landscape has changed dramatically since the TSB was established. Public expectation for clear, easily accessible safety information has grown. Technology has advanced at an unprecedented pace, making our investigations more complex, and emerging fields are appearing on our radar more frequently.

[English]

With these advancements come new risks, greater potential for accidents, vast amounts of data requiring deeper analysis and responsibilities that didn't exist when the CTAISB Act was introduced. All of this makes our role more critical than ever.

The TSB is lean and efficient, with just 233 employees and a total budget of approximately \$40 million. We currently fulfill our mandate effectively, but we operate with very limited flexibility. This means we can remain agile under normal circumstances, but we are operating with a thin margin.

[Translation]

It is essential to have the capacity to keep pace with rapid innovation, emerging risks and the growing expertise required to address them.

[English]

The TSB will continue to fulfill its mandate with independence, professionalism and a deep commitment to public safety. We are proud of the work we've accomplished, the trust Canadians place in us and the TSB's standing as a world-recognized organization and respected international partner.

As transportation evolves and new challenges emerge, we must ensure that the TSB remains ready and resilient so we can continue to protect the safety of all Canadians today and into the future.

• (1640)

Thank you.

We are prepared to answer your questions.

The Chair: Thanks very much.

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

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

Thank you very much for joining us today. I've looked forward to this meeting.

I've always been very intrigued by the *Titan* submersible, so I look forward to reading the report when that one is finished. It's something that drew national and international media attention for sure. I don't want to ask you any questions specific to that one, but I do have a few questions on short-line railways.

I have quite a few short lines that operate in my riding, and I asked a couple of them separately about issues that were impacting them that would be relevant to this meeting. One thing they both came up with unprompted was the issue around the TSB Watchlist and how short-line rails are viewed and treated the same as the class I railways. Given that the short lines operate at slower speeds and quite often with significantly shorter and smaller trains, I wonder if there is any way for Transport Canada or for you guys to acknowledge the difference between the short lines and the class I railways.

Yoan Marier: In the case of rail investigations, the vast majority of the investigations we conduct involve, as you mentioned, the class I railways. The short lines are a very small proportion of the investigative work that we do. However, when we develop the TSB Watchlist, the only rail-specific issue that is currently on it is the issue of crews not following signal indications. We look at the overall risk. We've identified this risk for the rail sector, so we've decided not to exclude short lines and just really point to the overall risk. When we take another look at the watch list in the near future, it could be something to think about for sure.

Jeremy Patzer: It may be something to consider generally, talking about the public safety issues that impact class I. It definitely has an impact on the short-line guys, and sometimes it makes it a little bit harder and more onerous for them to do their job, because they don't operate at the same capacity. Also, they are reinvesting, as a percentage, significantly more back into the track to make sure they have a high-quality track to operate on. Even at that, they are still operating at lesser speeds.

When you work on the TSB Watchlist recommendations, do you take into consideration trying to avoid any unintended consequences or perhaps over-regulation? I guess it's finding the right balance. Obviously, regulation is required, but how do we find the right balance of not being too onerous with our regulations? What does it look like for you?

Yoan Marier: It's tricky work, for sure, to find the right balance, as you mentioned.

The watch list is really the key safety issue that needs to be addressed to make Canada's transportation system even safer. It is a combination of recommendations that we have issued throughout the years, data from our investigations and feedback we receive when we have discussions with industry-scale stakeholders. We collect all of that, and then we identify the key issues.

When we developed the watch list, we really tried to strike the right language to identify the issues without sounding too alarmist, because our goal is really to make these issues actionable. We want them to be actioned in the future so that change can be advanced, and for that, we have to strike the right balance.

Jeremy Patzer: You mentioned in your opening remarks the lean and efficient nature of your department and how you operate. Thank you very much for being efficient with taxpayers' dollars.

When it comes to the comprehensive expenditure review, is there any risk of your department's having funding cut or maybe some positions lost due to the CER?

James Clarkin (Director General, Corporate Services, Canadian Transportation Accident Investigation and Safety Board): I can take that.

Under CER, we advanced a number of initiatives that we feel are just working smarter. That's basically using new AI on our operational side to become more efficient and so on.

Right now, we feel that we'll be able to improve our service and make our inspections and investigations more efficient; however, we don't see that we'll have to lose any technical capacity in the future.

• (1645)

Jeremy Patzer: Are you guys not going to be receiving any cuts to funding or staff at this point in time?

James Clarkin: We are receiving cuts. Potentially in the future, we may reduce administratively on internal services, but right now we don't foresee it. We think we can manage with attrition.

Jeremy Patzer: Are there any potential concerns, though, about maintaining transportation safety as it pertains to that?

Yoan Marier: Our mandate, as I mentioned in my opening remarks, is really to conduct investigations, identify safety deficiencies and make recommendations. We are able to fulfill our mandate without any issues.

As James mentioned, we are faced with some cuts as part of the CER exercise. They do not compromise our mandate. We will still be able to fulfill it with these cuts.

Right now, we're really focusing on finding efficiencies, as well as managing vacant positions and potentially attrition. That's what we're focusing on to meet these cuts as part of CER.

The Chair: Thanks.

Go ahead, Mr. Osborne.

Tom Osborne: Thank you.

You answered one of my questions around finding efficiency, so I won't go down that avenue.

I want to start by recognizing the good work the Transportation Safety Board does and the reputation you've gained on an international basis. While some of my questions may seem challenging, they are not meant to be offensive to your positive reputation and the good work you do.

In your opening remarks you talked about advancements, and it almost seems contradictory. I need to get my mind around it. With these advancements come new risks, with greater potential for accidents. I would think that with advancements, there would be less potential for accidents.

Can you elaborate on your comment?

Yoan Marier: I was talking about emerging technologies and new things that are appearing on the radar.

I can give you a few examples, to clarify. Drones, space flight and composite materials are all things that we have had to deal with more and more in our investigations. We have to develop our own internal capacity to be able to meet these new areas that we now have to investigate. This requires ongoing work for us to stay up to date and current on how we conduct these investigations. This is what I was referring to.

Tom Osborne: You talk about the risk profile shifting and Canada's transportation landscape changing dramatically.

Can you elaborate a little on that?

Yoan Marier: The public expectations for fast and accessible information have grown. It's something we definitely noticed in the occurrence that happened in Toronto in February 2025, when the interest in our investigation was so high that it made our website crash.

How we communicate information and how we conduct these investigations is shifting. Our mandate is not shifting, of course. It's really how we address these investigations that can shift, based on public expectations and new technologies that we are seeing.

Tom Osborne: The other question is this: After years of recommendations from the board and supposedly better technology, shouldn't we be seeing a reduction in the number of occurrences that you have to investigate? Why is it that we're not seeing a reduction?

Yoan Marier: Over the years, as I mentioned, we have issued 630 recommendations, and out of those, about 84% have been addressed as fully satisfactory. We are closing recommendations as fully satisfactory every year, which shows that we are having a concrete impact.

The way people travel is also changing regularly. There can be higher volumes in some sectors, and higher volumes mean more accidents, which means that we have to investigate more. There can be a shift in volumes, but we don't have a lot of control over that, so we focus on flagging the safety deficiencies that come out of our investigations for them to be addressed.

Tom Osborne: You mentioned that you continue to support hundreds of investigations led by international counterparts. Are we seeing a reciprocal number of investigations in which international counterparts are helping us?

• (1650)

Yoan Marier: Under International Civil Aviation Organization annex 13, which is basically the convention that governs international investigations on the air side—I'm talking mostly about air investigations—there are some agreements between the countries. For instance, there are a lot of manufacturers and operators that are based out of Canada, so if a Canadian-made aircraft has an issue in another country, that country would lead the investigation, and Canada, as the state of the manufacturer, for example, would support the investigation. This is what I'm talking about.

Yes, it's absolutely reciprocal. If something happens in Canada and it's an American manufacturer, we'll be working with the NTSB on these types of issues, for sure.

Tom Osborne: Was the Washington aircraft a Canadian-made aircraft?

Yoan Marier: Yes. That's exactly why we were involved in that one, and we were working with the NTSB.

Tom Osborne: Regarding the 84% of responses and the 16% that you haven't received, can you elaborate on how old some of that 16% is and what sectors stand out in that 16%? What can be done to get a more timely response?

Yoan Marier: The 16% is a total of 81 recommendations. I can give you some numbers. There are 44 recommendations in air, 23 in marine and 14 in rail that are still outstanding. They can be outstanding for various reasons.

Some of them are very recent, and there hasn't been time to address them yet. Some of them are much older, and they are still outstanding because our assessment of the risks is not the same as that of the regulator, and there is essentially a disagreement on how to address the issue, which means that the regulator does not address the issue and the recommendation remains outstanding. There can be many reasons for that.

The Chair: Thanks very much.

We'll go to Mr. Barsalou-Duval.

Welcome to OGGO, sir. The floor is yours for six minutes.

[*Translation*]

Xavier Barsalou-Duval (Pierre-Boucher—Les Patriotes—Verchères, BQ): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thank you to the Transportation Safety Board for being with us today.

I'm going to start by asking you about the accident that occurred on January 12 in Saint-Alexandre-de-Kamouraska. I imagine you know the one I'm talking about. A Via Rail train struck two trucks that were parked very close to the track. I think the truck drivers were even sleeping in their trucks at the time of the accident.

First, how soon can we expect the Transportation Safety Board's accident report to be made public? How far along are you in the process?

Yoan Marier: The accident was in the assessment phase for a few weeks and was classified fairly recently. I would have to check that to give you the most up-to-date information. I can provide the details to the committee later on.

Xavier Barsalou-Duval: I know that the Transportation Safety Board of Canada, or TSB, went to the site. It was made public. I also know that a kind of preliminary investigation is done at the site. However, if I'm not mistaken, the decision to conduct a detailed investigation was subsequently made. Is that correct? Did you decide whether or not you were going to conduct a detailed investigation? Have I properly understood your process?

Yoan Marier: That's correct.

We will deploy investigators to the accident site so they can assess the circumstances of the accident. It will be a preliminary assessment, if you will. They will use that information to classify the accident.

Our investigation classification ranges from a class 2 accident to a class 5 accident.

A class 2 investigation is for a very serious accident that needs a complex investigation. The accident in Toronto, when the plane flipped over, is an example of a class 2 investigation. This type of investigation takes a long time and involves a very lengthy report. It will often come with recommendations.

A class 3 investigation is a regular one, let's say. It takes a year and a half and involves a report of about 30 pages.

A class 4 investigation involves a more basic report, usually about 10 pages. The report focuses on factual information about the accident.

A class 5 investigation involves simply collecting data for statistical purposes.

The investigators deploy to the accident scene and classify the accident, and then they determine the next steps based on the classification.

Your question was about classification, but unfortunately, I don't have that information at the moment. I can provide an answer to the committee.

• (1655)

Xavier Barsalou-Duval: Okay. We would indeed appreciate it if you could provide us with that information. We want to know what the classification is and how soon we can expect results. Depending on the classification level, I imagine there's a varying level of detail.

The question I had about this, whether we like it or not, concerns Driver Inc., meaning truck drivers who are often poorly trained, are exploited and work gruelling hours. In many cases, they do not comply with the number of driving hours set out in the legislation. This is a very public and high-profile issue in Quebec. I don't know what the situation is in Canada, but it's still a concern because of the many accidents that have occurred.

You have rail and air expertise, and maybe some marine expertise. When there is a crossover between rail and road, to what extent do you have the expertise to get to the bottom of it? Do you have help, for example, from other experts who specialize in the area to do your work?

Yoan Marier: You're right: We don't have a mandate to conduct investigations into road transportation.

Our mandate to investigate road transportation comes up periodically over the years.

We have a mandate to investigate when rail transportation is involved. In this case, the accident involved a train and a truck. As a result, we were given a mandate to conduct an investigation.

Of course, the rail aspect will always be the focus of our investigation, because that's our mandate. However, there can still be a road component when a truck is involved.

A few years ago, there was a collision between a bus and a train in Ottawa. We conducted an investigation and made recommenda-

tions concerning bus transportation, precisely because we felt that the issues overlapped.

Xavier Barsalou-Duval: Are you going to examine the road aspect enough? I'm asking since the focus of your investigations is, first and foremost, rail. That's where your expertise lies. Whether we like it or not, we suspect that the company involved in this accident was also involved in other serious accidents, one of which, I believe, led to some deaths.

Since the company is already known to us, we wonder whether the Transportation Safety Board of Canada will also look at the road component. Whether we like it or not, what's happening on the roads right now is dire.

Yoan Marier: I don't want to speculate on the investigation's scope, because investigations are managed by the directors of investigation for each mode. At the bureau, we stay at arm's length when it comes to conducting investigations. However, I take your points, and I will pass them on to the appropriate people in our office.

Xavier Barsalou-Duval: Okay.

I know I have very little time left, Mr. Chair. I would like to add the rest of my time to my next turn. Can I do that?

[*English*]

The Chair: Sure.

We'll go to Mr. Gill now.

Harb Gill: Thank you, Chair.

Thank you, sir, for attending.

We have seen some recurring issues that you've identified: fatigue, airport runway incursions, commercial fishing vessels, vessel stability and rail grade crossing collisions, which is an issue that you've identified and that we identified decades ago. The collisions keep happening.

When the same contributing factors appear across multiple investigations year after year, what does that tell you about implementation or the oversight gaps?

Yoan Marier: When we conduct an investigation, our goal is to identify what happened and, more importantly, why it happened. From this, we can identify the safety deficiencies, which is what went wrong, and make recommendations to improve transportation safety.

Most recommendations that we issue are targeted at Transport Canada, the Department of Transport. We can issue recommendations to other entities but, in practice, most are addressed to Transport Canada. We follow up with the department every year to make sure that action is being taken.

All of the assessments of our recommendations are made public. It is our way to keep the pressure on and make sure that the change is happening and that these deficiencies are fixed.

Harb Gill: Is the compliance voluntary? Are there any consequences if they don't comply? For instance, rail grade crossing collisions, which take many lives every year, have been ongoing. It's been over 20 years since your department made those recommendations. Why is this still happening? Who is dropping the ball?

● (1700)

Yoan Marier: We don't have the power to force change. We can only identify the issues and then make recommendations for them to improve. After that, the implementation of recommendations depends on who the recommendation target is. As I mentioned, most recommendations we issue are targeted at Transport Canada, and we follow up with them every year.

Harb Gill: Would it be worth our while to give you those legislative changes so that you can enforce and demand accountability?

Yoan Marier: Right now, our mandate to do the investigations ensures that we are independent. Being independent is essential to our mandate because it allows us to look at the big picture, look at the work of the regulator and look at the work of all the other entities in an independent manner. This is why we are sometimes able to be critical of the implementation of some safety measures when they're not going at the speed that we wish. I would say that right now, our mandate is adequate for our purposes, which is to conduct independent investigations and then make recommendations.

Harb Gill: However, you have many recommendations still sitting on the shelves that have not been implemented. There are 81 recommendations that have not been implemented since 1990. Why? Why have they not been executed or implemented and finished?

Yoan Marier: There can be many reasons. As I mentioned earlier, of these 81 recommendations, there are 44 in air, 23 in marine and 14 in rail. Some are very recent. For instance, in marine, we have three recommendations that are less than a year old. Of course, for these recommendations, they are too recent for change to have been put in place.

It is true that some recommendations are very old. We have six recommendations in air that are more than 20 years old, for example. For these recommendations, oftentimes the issue is that our assessment of the risks and of the way to resolve the safety deficiency is different from the assessment of the Department of Transport. We have different perspectives on the issue and how to fix it. In some cases, we're also waiting for regulatory amendments. As we all know, the regulatory amendment process can take time. In some cases, we have been waiting year after year for these regulatory changes to be implemented.

Harb Gill: Would it be fair for me to say that the folks who should be accountable to Canadians are not being accountable and not being responsible in implementing the recommendations that you have put forth?

Yoan Marier: As I mentioned, all of our recommendations and assessments are made public, so this is our way to identify the risks and to keep pressure on the regulators and the stakeholders to make sure that change is happening.

Harb Gill: It appears the pressure's not working.

The Chair: We'll go to Mr. Gasparro, please.

Vince Gasparro: Thank you, Chair.

Thank you both for coming, and thank you for your service.

Maybe we can just take a quick step back. Can you provide a brief overview of the investigative process, please?

Yoan Marier: The first step is the occurrence report.

There is an occurrence. An occurrence can be an accident or an incident. Under the regulations, there is a list of accidents and incidents that have to be reported to us. Operators are obligated to report that to us. There is an occurrence report that we receive. Based on that information, the investigating team, which is usually an investigator and his or her manager, decides whether to deploy to the accident site.

Once they deploy, they will assess the occurrence and decide which type of investigation to conduct. As I mentioned earlier, it can be a class 2 for a very complex investigation, all the way to a class 5, which would basically just be collection of data for statistical purposes. They will assess this and, based on the classification, the investigation will start.

The first step is the field phase. They will collect information about the wreckage. They will interview witnesses. They will discuss with manufacturers.

Then there is the analysis phase, which is basically to identify not what happened but why it happened. In that case, this would be, for example, doing further analysis in the laboratory and having follow-up discussions with the manufacturers to identify why the accident happened.

Then a report will be produced. This report is then submitted to the board. The board is me and four other board members. We take a look at the report, and this leads to a confidential draft report.

The confidential draft report is submitted to what we call "designated reviewers". Designated reviewers are persons who may be directly affected by the board's findings. They get a copy of the confidential draft report and provide comments on the report. Once we get the comments back, we take them into consideration. We make modifications to the report if required.

Then there is a final board review, and the report is published with any applicable recommendations.

● (1705)

Vince Gasparro: Thank you for that.

You mentioned "occurrence", "accident" and "incident". Is there a difference between the three? Can you just quickly...

Yoan Marier: "Occurrence" is the general term for both accidents and incidents.

An accident would be, for example, the occurrence in Toronto where the aircraft flipped upside down on landing. That would be an accident—a major one.

An incident would be an engine failure, such as an aircraft's having an engine failure and having to do an emergency landing at an airport, but with no damage, no injuries or any of that—just engine failure and an emergency landing. That would be an incident.

Vince Gasparro: How do you then work with your stakeholders to encourage the adoption of your recommendations?

Yoan Marier: When we issue the recommendation, if the recommendation is issued to a minister, the minister has 90 days to respond to explain what they will do to address the recommendation. When we get the initial response, we assess it and give it a rating that can go from “unsatisfactory” all the way to “fully satisfactory”. Then, on an ongoing basis, we ask for follow-up information about the status of the recommendation. If required, we will modify our rating. For instance, we may have an initial assessment showing that the intent is satisfactory, but a few years later, the department decides not to move ahead with the changes. That would affect the rating, and we could downgrade the rating.

We are also very engaged with stakeholders, industry associations and all of that. We routinely travel to industry conferences to make sure that we spread our message, that we talk to people and that we also get the pulse of what is happening in the field, what people are seeing in the field.

Vince Gasparro: You mentioned during your previous exchange with one of my colleagues the fact that the Transportation Safety Board is independent and at arm's length from the government. Can you talk about why that's important, please?

The Chair: I'm afraid that you haven't left time for a response.

The time is up, but maybe you can get back to us in writing for that.

We'll now go back to Mr. Barsalou-Duval for two and a half minutes, please.

[*Translation*]

Xavier Barsalou-Duval: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

If I remember correctly, there was a train accident on November 14, 2024, in Longueuil. The Transportation Safety Board of Canada went to the site. One of the conclusions you reached was that the wear and tear on the tracks of the secondary line, or on tracks that are not the main line, if I'm not mistaken, was really quite advanced. I think the tracks were over 100 years old.

Do you know if this is widespread across Canada?

That was the first part of my question. The second part is this: Do you know if the tracks at the site have been repaired since then?

Yoan Marier: To answer the first part of your question, in marshalling yards, fairly old tracks are relatively common. The situation in Longueuil is not unique across Canada.

As for the second part of your question, I would have to check whether changes have been made. I don't have detailed information on that incident with me today.

Xavier Barsalou-Duval: I understand that when you raise a problem, like what we saw in Longueuil in 2024, even if you prepare a report, the railway companies are not required to make the recommended changes.

Is that correct?

Yoan Marier: In this specific case, there was no recommendation in the document we published. The document was a deployment summary with our findings at the site. It was a fairly factual document. There was no real analysis. There was no recommendation. We simply recorded the observations we made at the site.

● (1710)

Xavier Barsalou-Duval: Okay. I'm still surprised, because I feel that when tracks are very worn out, it's just common sense to replace them. I feel that it would have been easy to make a recommendation. Maybe that didn't happen because of the investigation's level of detail.

Yoan Marier: Yes, we deployed to the site and then drafted a document about our findings there. It was made public and is available on our website. However, no detailed investigation was conducted.

Xavier Barsalou-Duval: On December 29, there was also a train accident on the Côte-Nord, in the Schefferville area. We saw some pretty crazy images on social media. I see that this accident and the one involving trucks in the Kamouraska area, which I mentioned earlier, were classified as class 4, or minor accidents. You can go all the way to class 6, but I think a class 4 accident is relatively minor. If not, please correct me.

Do you not do more research because of a lack of resources?

Yoan Marier: An accident that—

[*English*]

The Chair: Give a brief answer, if you can, please.

[*Translation*]

Yoan Marier: A class 4 accident is not necessarily a minor accident. It's just that we assessed that the opportunities to advance transportation safety were more limited. Therefore, we somewhat limit the scope of the investigation.

[*English*]

The Chair: Thank you.

We'll have enough time, after Mr. Johns and Ms. Rochefort, for two final four-minute interventions from Conservatives and Liberals.

Mr. Johns, welcome back. The floor is yours for five minutes, please.

Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Thank you, Mr. Chair. It's good to be back at “the mighty OGGO”, as you call it.

I'm really grateful for the work you do at the Transportation Safety Board.

We've had a number of incidents on the west coast. I want to highlight those that are effecting marine spills, especially with cargo shipping units. We had the *Hanjin Seattle* spill just a few years ago, in 2016, off the coast of Ucluelet, and the *Zim Kingston*, as you know, near Victoria. Each time, first nations, local governments, provincial governments, ENGOs and NGOs do the cleanup. There's a jurisdictional quagmire. We don't have an "oil response" type of system set up to respond.

The Transportation Safety Board released a report around the *Zim Kingston*. I don't know why they didn't around *Hanjin Seattle*—maybe I'm incorrect, but I can't find it. It cited, "The occurrence involving the *ZIM Kingston* demonstrated some of the challenges involved in responding to a marine emergency in Canadian waters. It also raised questions about the availability and capability of Canadian resources".

In fact, it cited that Canada's preparedness for other types of marine emergencies, such as those involving hazardous and noxious substances, is a huge concern, as well as that Canada doesn't have a plan on how to respond to those occurrences involving the hazardous and noxious substances. The overall finding was that, if Canada is not prepared to respond to marine emergencies in Canadian waters, there's a risk that these emergencies won't be managed in a timely and effective manner, and this will endanger vessels, their crew, the environment, and the health and safety of Canadians. I would add to that the economy, because we rely on the blue economy on the west coast, and these threats are significant to our food security and our way of life.

Is it frustrating when you make these recommendations and you see no changes? Are you seeing an increase in marine debris spills on the west coast, given that we've seen, obviously, more dangerous weather from climate change and, of course, increased traffic at the port of Vancouver? Could you give some insight on that?

Yoan Marier: Regarding the first part of your question, we didn't issue recommendations as part of the *Zim Kingston* investigation. We issued what we call a "board concern", which is a way for us to flag a safety deficiency when we have limited information to assess the risk in a certain situation.

In the case of the *Zim Kingston*, that's what we did. You're absolutely right that these are the issues we flagged, which is why, a few years later, we decided to launch what we call a class 1 safety issues investigation.

A safety issues investigation is basically a study that we conduct on emergency preparedness for Canada. We launched it this summer; it's already well advanced. Our goal is to interact with port authorities, first nations, operators and regulators to identify what can be improved in terms of Canada's preparedness for marine emergencies, shipboard fires and all that. We're looking at all of these issues.

In the case of the *Zim Kingston*, there was a fire on board. The accident highlighted these risks, which is why we are currently looking deeper into it.

• (1715)

Gord Johns: I appreciate that, and I appreciate that you're checking on the pulse of things on the ground, because this is a big

issue on the west coast. We have the longest coastline in the world, and we hope that Transport Canada responds.

There have been multiple incidents in Tofino harbour. It often happens in rural communities that you have float planes colliding with marine vessels. We had Nuu-chah-nulth asking for action on this. We've had multiple meetings. We have not seen any changes despite multiple incidents in which people have died and some people have been injured.

You're independent, so when you see incidents such as these, and you come back to the same scene in small communities but don't see action, at what point do you say to government, "We need action and we're not getting it?" How can you get that message through to Transport Canada?

Yoan Marier: The traffic around the Tofino harbour and the Vancouver harbour—there is a lot of traffic in that area as well—is something we are aware of. It is a subject that routinely comes up when we talk with stakeholders. When we go to the west coast, we speak with people on the ground.

Gord Johns: We can't even get a meeting with Transport Canada.

Yoan Marier: It is a subject that a lot of people in the industry are talking to us about. When it comes up, we will, of course, flag it through our investigations and identify the potential risks and, eventually, what can potentially be done to fix it. It is something we're aware of.

The Chair: Thank you, gentlemen.

Ms. Rochefort, please go ahead.

[Translation]

Pauline Rochefort: Good afternoon.

[English]

I have a quick question about the International Civil Aviation Organization, to which I understand Canada is a signatory. Do they ever provide any comments about the work you do in Canada?

Yoan Marier: To clarify your question, is it whether the ICAO has provided—

Pauline Rochefort: Do they ever comment on the quality of your work or the lack of coverage on certain issues?

Yoan Marier: Canada went through an audit from the international civil aviation authority just a few years ago. As part of that audit, there were a number of items identified by ICAO for the state to address. The TSB was a small part of the audit, but we were still in it. From the TSB's point of view, there were really only a few items we had to address. We ended up with a very high score, which means that, for the most part, we meet our international obligations when it comes to conducting air investigations.

Pauline Rochefort: Are there many countries that are signatories to this agreement around the world?

Yoan Marier: The vast majority of them are.

Pauline Rochefort: It speaks well to the Transportation Safety Board and your work when they provide an audit that is very strong.

Yoan Marier: We felt the TSB had good results in the audit. There were a few items, but we addressed them quite easily.

Pauline Rochefort: I must say I was impressed with your online strategic plan. I went to look at it, and I was captured by the opening paragraph, which says, "The phone rings in the middle of the night. There's been an accident, and somewhere in Canada, employees of the Transportation Safety Board of Canada (TSB) get to work." It goes on to say that you try to answer three questions, as you said: "What happened? Why? What needs to be done to prevent it from happening again?" Then it says, "Canadians everywhere can be assured that our organization is strong enough and flexible enough to meet the challenges of the future."

Overall, I understand that this is a five-year plan in its last year. Will you be renewing your strategic plan?

Yoan Marier: Yes. We're working on that right now. We should be able to make it public in the next few weeks. We are actively working on having a new strategic plan that will identify new issues we can work on to continue improving.

Pauline Rochefort: We look forward to that.

Just to follow up on a question from my colleague, in your work, have there ever been any instances where you've been held back from carrying out your mandate in any way?

Yoan Marier: The vast majority of the time, we have no problems. Are you referring mostly to fieldwork and how things are working in the field when we interact as we do an investigation?

• (1720)

Pauline Rochefort: It is broader than that. Some would say government intervention, in other words.

Yoan Marier: No, not at all.

Pauline Rochefort: Not at all....

Yoan Marier: We are independent. I've been chair for a year and a half, and I can say that we have absolutely never had any sort of political pressure. We were always able to fulfill our mandate without interference.

Pauline Rochefort: I have a final question, then, with respect to the act.

The act dates back to 1994: the Canadian Transportation Accident Investigation and Safety Board Act. In your strategic plan, you said that you had plans to provide comments with respect to the need to update the act. In general, what are some of your thoughts and what are your plans moving forward on that?

Yoan Marier: We have identified a few areas in our act that could benefit from modernization. As you mentioned, the act is quite old. It was updated a long time ago. We have flagged these potential improvements to our act with our minister's office for consideration. We feel that some things can be improved to provide

better tools for investigators and to give legal protection for board members. These are examples of things we are looking at.

Pauline Rochefort: For me, it was new to discover the Transportation Safety Board. I'm delighted by their work and to learn more about it. Thank you very much.

The Chair: Thank you.

We'll go to Mrs. Block for four minutes and then Ms. Khalid for four.

Kelly Block: Thank you very much, Chair. I'll be following up on some of the questions previously asked.

In 2023, there was a draft report leaked from the International Civil Aviation Organization that found multiple lapses in Transport Canada's aviation safety policies. In the audit, as you mentioned, the Transportation Safety Board scored an 83%.

However, on aircraft operations, Canada scored just 23% and 67% in personnel training and licensing. What do these numbers say about the state of Transport Canada and the well-being of Canadians when we are provided shockingly terrifying figures like that?

Yoan Marier: For our part, we took part in the part of the audit that was about the TSB. We were not involved in the other parts of the audit. I'm not aware of how things unfolded when the ICAO inspectors went to Transport Canada. I can't really comment on that.

I know for certain that Transport Canada has a number of action items they are following up on to try to fix the issues that were identified as part of this audit.

Kelly Block: Thank you.

Among the findings they found to be unsatisfactory was that Transport Canada does not properly monitor aviation companies' fatigue management systems, which are rules that dictate pilots' required rest periods. Have you raised this as an issue as the Transportation Safety Board?

Yoan Marier: Fatigue has been an issue on our watch list for a long time. We have a number of recommendations related to fatigue. It is a multimodal issue, which means that it's not only for air. It's also for marine and rail. It's definitely been on our radar for a while, still is and probably will be for the near future.

Kelly Block: Other issues they found were that Transport Canada allows holders of foreign private pilot licences to convert them to Canadian permits without verifying the licence with the foreign authority.

Also, Transport Canada has no formal way of ensuring air traffic control or Nav Canada continually assesses the shortage of staff and the capacity to handle aircraft. As well, pilots and mechanics can obtain medical clearance from foreign doctors, who are not subject to Canadian assessments.

Have you found issues similar to the ones that ICAO found, and has the government taken any action on them?

Yvan Marier: Off the top of my head, I don't recall investigations in which these issues were raised.

Kelly Block: Thank you.

The Chair: We'll go to Ms. Khalid, please.

Iqra Khalid: Thank you very much, Chair.

Thank you to the witnesses for being here today.

I'll start by asking about quality and efficiency. Are you, as an organization, leveraging new technologies such as artificial intelligence in how you operate, specifically with respect to quality and delivery of service and efficiency?

• (1725)

Yvan Marier: Finding efficiencies is definitely something that we're working hard on at the moment. With specific regard to AI, we are currently in the evaluation phase. We are looking at opportunities to use AI.

Right now, in the short term, we're looking at targeted uses. Translation is an example. Using it to produce report summaries can also be a potential option. As for other uses, it would probably be sometime down the road when we're able to use it more extensively.

The processes we have internally are already.... It's a well-oiled machine. We have a very good methodology that we use to conduct our investigations. It works well, so we just need to continue providing our investigators with the tools they need to do their jobs.

Recently, we created a new safety analysis tool, which is a tool that our investigators can use to analyze an occurrence in order to identify the findings of that occurrence. It's a new tool that makes the analysis more solid and makes the data about occurrences easily accessible in one place. It's an example of modernization that we did recently. We're continually looking for opportunities to do things better.

Iqra Khalid: I appreciate that. I'd love to learn a little more about how that safety analysis tool impacts your bottom line.

Budget 2025 requires you to reduce your spending by \$4.4 million, if I'm correct. How do you plan on reducing those costs in terms of your operations?

I want to know more about how tools like the safety analysis tool impact your bottom line.

James Clarkin: I'll just give a clarification. We're reducing by \$1.4 million by 2028-29.

Yvan Marier: As James mentioned earlier, we are looking at various ways that we can gain some efficiencies in how to streamline our work. We want to improve our timelines for report publication, because some reports, as you know, can take a lot of time to be published, so we have to remove bottlenecks. We also have to find ways to streamline the work by providing our people with additional tools. Obviously, the budget reductions we are faced with are another opportunity for us to work hard on finding those efficiencies for our people.

Iqra Khalid: Do I still have time?

The Chair: You have about 15 seconds.

Iqra Khalid: I'm good.

Thank you so much for being here.

The Chair: Mrs. Block finished early, so we have about one minute left. We'll go to Mr. Barsalou-Duval, seeing as he's been such a good guest with us today.

Go ahead for one minute, sir.

[*Translation*]

Xavier Barsalou-Duval: I thank the committee for its generosity.

I would like to come back to the issue of ICAO, the International Civil Aviation Organization. Airport firefighters seem quite concerned about the staff shortage at airports. The shortage seems to be preventing them from responding in the event of a fire on a plane.

Is that one of the things the Transportation Safety Board of Canada also monitors? Is that a concern for you?

Yvan Marier: You're talking about—

Xavier Barsalou-Duval: I'm talking about the fact that ICAO staffing standards are not being met when it comes to Canadian transportation standards.

Yvan Marier: That's not a problem that has emerged in our investigations so far. Therefore, I can't really comment on that.

Xavier Barsalou-Duval: Okay.

[*English*]

The Chair: Gentlemen, thank you again for being with us.

For colleagues around the table and anyone watching from home, I recommend that you take a look at the Transportation Safety Board website's watch list. It's very interesting and frightening at the same time. I highly encourage you to look at it. It addresses a lot of what Mr. Marier and Mr. Clarkin brought up today. It gives a lot more detail on some of the issues we are facing that are not being taken care of right now, and it follows up on some of the things our Bloc members are bringing up.

Thank you again for being with us. I hope we won't have to wait so many years to have you back with us.

Colleagues, very quickly, we have the upcoming schedule to finish the month. We have the supplementary estimates on Thursday. It's all supplementary estimates all the time with the PBO.

On the 12th, when we are back, we have one hour with the PSPC officials right now.

We'll speak to Minister Lightbound and the President of the Treasury Board about other dates. Right now, the Treasury Board is on the 26th.

On the 10th and the 12th, we have a bit of open time because of the changing around of schedules. We said we would do two meetings of two hours each regarding the CER. I'd suggest that we start filling in some of the blanks around that, working around the priority of the availability of the ministers, because we want to get them.

Therefore, maybe by Friday at noon, because we'll do four sessions of one hour for the CER, if you get witnesses to the clerk....

• (1730)

The Clerk of the Committee (Marc-Olivier Girard): The deadline....

The Chair: Yes. It's on Friday at noon. I thought I mentioned Friday at noon. I apologize if I didn't.

Kelly Block: It's this Friday for March 10.

The Chair: That's for the CER, yes. We have two for that. The President of the Treasury Board also agreed to do a separate one for that, but the priority is the estimates.

We might still have an open spot on March 12, but we'll see about the availability of the ministers. If we have an open spot, we can bring in the PCO on the supplementary estimates. We haven't had them in for a bit.

Another department that is within our orbit and we haven't heard from in a while is Defence Construction. They don't have anything

in the supplementary estimates, but they could come in on a briefing and an update for us.

If it's okay, I suggest that we prioritize the ministers and the CER. If we have an open spot—we may know by Thursday—we can talk about whether we want to slot in the defence construction agency or the PCO.

Iqra Khalid: I'm sorry. Pardon my ignorance. I know I missed a couple of meetings, but why do we need four meetings? Is that what you said?

The Chair: No, we'll do four one-hour meetings.

Iqra Khalid: It's two meetings. Okay. Which motion was that part of?

The Chair: That was agreed upon by the committee the last time the President of the Treasury Board was here.

Iqra Khalid: Okay. I must have missed it.

Kelly Block: I think he mentioned the minister.

The Chair: There was a stand-alone motion for the minister and the Treasury Board, and then it came up to do two meetings on the CER. It's in the blues.

If there's nothing else, again, thanks for being with us, and I hope it's not so many years before I have you back here.

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>