



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security

SECU • NUMBER 027 • 2nd SESSION • 41st PARLIAMENT

EVIDENCE

Tuesday, June 3, 2014

—
Chair

Mr. Daryl Kramp

Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security

Tuesday, June 3, 2014

•(1530)

[English]

The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings, CPC)): Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to meeting 27 of the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security.

Today we are following up on our study on social financing. We have two hours of evaluations. During the first hour we have two witnesses with us. From the Department of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, we have Shawn Tupper, the assistant deputy minister of the emergency management and program branch. Welcome, sir. We also have with us Bobby Matheson, the director general of the national crime prevention centre.

Let me apologize before you start, gentlemen. As you are well aware, June can be unique on the Hill. We have votes, and the bells will ring at 3:47. At that time we will suspend; we will go to vote—very quickly, we hope—and be back here to finish the first hour.

That is the schedule we have before us. I understand that both of our witnesses will not be presenting, so we will go to the questions right off the bat. That will be very helpful, as I think we're all aware of the topic. We will start with questions from the government side.

Ms. James, you have the floor.

Ms. Roxanne James (Scarborough Centre, CPC): Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you to our officials for coming back and giving us some more information.

Many of the witnesses we heard from at our last committee meetings were talking more about the social finance of this particular study, but we need to take a step back and also see what worked well with our current NCPC funding strategy and the parameters of that program.

I'm wondering if you can speak for a moment about some of the funding the government has done that has been hugely successful, where we have seen results, and how those results were measured to determine the success of these particular funding projects.

Mr. Shawn Tupper (Assistant Deputy Minister, Emergency Management and Program Branch, Department of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness): We are in the midst of preparing a fairly extensive package for you based on the questions you posed the last time I was here. We're trying to look at some of the programs that deal with alternative suspensions, the stop now and plan community-based program for children 6 to 11 who have been at risk of coming into contact with the law. We're preparing for you some information around multi-systemic therapies, which we've had

particular success with in dealing with youth between the ages of 12 and 17.

All these programs that I'm listing here—and we'll be able to give you a much broader overview as well—are demonstrating very positive results. That includes examples under our program that deal with multi-systemic therapy, wherein we're seeing 92% of youth who have been out of the home placed back in the home and able to stay in the home after three months of intake into the program. We'll be able to pull together for you a range of programs that have shown great success, and for which we'll give you the results on how we are having an impact on youth in this country.

Ms. Roxanne James: To touch base a little more on the multi-systemic therapies that you just talked about, you said there's been 92% success with youth who have been out of the home but been able to go back to the home and still be there after three months. What happens after six months or a year? Are these projects monitored for a long period of time so we can see their real success?

Is there any indication that just because someone has gone back home that they're not going to commit a crime in the future? This is really related to crime prevention, so I'm trying to figure out how we measure success of that particular program as it relates to crime prevention a year from now, two years from now, and down the road.

•(1535)

Mr. Shawn Tupper: These are five-year projects. So over the course of these investments, we are able to track individuals for the duration of the program. We are unable to monitor them beyond the five-year funding. That is the way the program is designed. Five years of tracking and gathering data is a fairly informative process for us.

The evidence is very clear. If youth at risk are able to remain in the home environment, remain in a family environment, with the support of parents and siblings, and able to live in a stable capacity, it has a very clear impact on their ability to avoid coming into contact with the law. So we are seeing good clear evidence that being in a stable home environment is a positive element in preventing crime.

Ms. Roxanne James: It's good to know that there are some successes, but I know there are also some that are not so successful. In your compilation of all the program funding, have you been able to isolate it to certain programs that were less successful?

I've done a number of announcements in and around my area in Scarborough, but I've heard stories of some of the funding programs, for example, getting some of the participants to perform puppet shows and such, and I think that when people hear about crime prevention, they're not thinking about children participating in these types of activities.

I'm just wondering if you have an idea of what programs were less successful compared with the multi-systemic therapies that you just talked about.

Mr. Shawn Tupper: We are pulling together that information. I don't have the unsuccessful programs with me today.

Suffice it to say, as I described to you in my last appearance, we basically categorize our investments in three ways: proven programs, promising programs, and new programs. If you're a promising or a proven program, those investments generally produce very positive results for us. But clearly the design of this program is intended to do a little bit of experimentation—the new programs. It is a minor part of our investments, but we accept, in terms of that design, that it is worth the experiment to see if something works. If it doesn't work, we stop funding. But we do learn from it in the sense of understanding why it didn't work, and we might either make adjustments to those projects to see if we can recast them, or we just stop altogether, assuming or concluding that it is not a worthwhile investment in terms of its impact on crime reduction.

Ms. Roxanne James: Thank you.

Just recently we had someone here from CoSA, Circles of Support and Accountability.

Mr. Shawn Tupper: Yes.

Ms. Roxanne James: He came with some very interesting percentages or figures on the rate of success with individuals who have left prison. The program that they offer, through some of our funding through the government.... It was recognized that they have not had to seek outside investors for the past five years, thanks to the government funding, but they were also open to some of our ideas on social finance and thought perhaps that could fit.

One of the areas of social finance is pay for performance. Based on the statistics that gentleman from Circles of Support provided, I would certainly think that there would be outside investors that would be interested in participating based on the rate of success.

Do you think that type of program to reduce recidivism amongst the prison population once they've been released would benefit from taking a look at social finance?

Mr. Shawn Tupper: Yes. That's the simple answer.

I'm aware of his presentation to you, and I am aware of his statistics. I don't know the sources of all of his statistics.

We are in the midst of working with CoSA in terms of doing an evaluation of the program that we have been funding, and that evaluation is expected to conclude in the fall. It is from there that we would be able to show what the results are after the five years of funding they received from us. Presumably, if his data holds true through our evaluation, that would be exactly the kind of program that could be promoted to partners in the community, where some sort of social finance arrangement may be possible.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Ms. James.

Now we have Madam Doré Lefebvre.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Rosane Doré Lefebvre (Alfred-Pellan, NDP): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

My thanks to Mr. Matheson and Mr. Tupper for joining us today. We greatly appreciate it.

Mr. Chair, I think it is extremely important to receive witnesses to discuss various issues of the country's public safety. As we have mentioned a number of times on this side of the table, we could spend our valuable work time on more meaningful studies rather than on continuing to deal with social finance.

If I may, I will give notice of a motion. Let me read it before I ask my questions. Here is what the motion proposes:

That the Committee undertake a study on access to healthcare in federal penitentiaries, while accounting for recent cuts to nursing in Correctional Service Canada institutions and the resulting effects on their staff, and that the Committee report its findings to the House of Commons.

I therefore table this notice of motion.

Gentlemen, you have just talked about CoSA, and I find that extremely interesting. I actually wanted to ask questions about that. You said that it would be worthwhile to present it to promoters or private investors. I believe that was your last comment.

However, witnesses told us to think about the fact that some areas of public safety should not be open to private investors. Some gave as examples the homeless and seniors, and others talked about the reintegration of offenders into society. CoSA specializes in support groups for very high-risk offenders, sex offenders.

Why are we being told, on the one hand, that there should not be private investments in the case of high-risk offenders and, on the other hand, as you argue, that this is a great idea that should be proposed to private investors?

What are you basing this statement on?

● (1540)

[*English*]

Mr. Shawn Tupper: I think that by and large the concept of social financing is not a black and white equation. I think the ability for us to find partners in the community who leverage resources there that aren't necessarily financial, but could be in-kind contributions from partners, means that it isn't about the government walking away from its obligation to pursue good policy with respect to offender reintegration into the community. It's about expanding the range of partners whom we work with in the community.

And so it's about our ability to find partners who may be willing to finance a project. For instance, with high-risk offenders, we are working with the John Howard Society to look at potential employment programs for those offenders who otherwise find it difficult to find employment. The society is able to make arrangements in the city, for instance, working with the city in the context of social housing where these offenders could be doing maintenance and care, or where the society is running a small enterprise and the individual offenders are earning income. They're supervised by John Howard and there's a benefit to the city, because through a contractual arrangement they are able to get services into social housing, and so there's a positive cycle there.

It isn't about replacing government. It's about expanding the partnerships and the relationships and leveraging other resources into successful outcomes for offender reintegration into the community.

[Translation]

Ms. Rosane Doré Lefebvre: Has your budget been cut over the past few years?

[English]

Mr. Shawn Tupper: The NCPC budget is currently in the range of \$41 million. As a result of the deficit reduction action plan, it was reduced by about \$1 million. In my department the difficulty is that between the first nation policing program and the crime prevention program, those are the largest components of our budget. So it was very difficult to avoid completely leaving those programs untouched.

But in the case of NCPC, it's currently funded at about \$41 million per year, which since the DRAP exercise is about \$1 million less than what it was. So it has not been reduced in any significant way.

[Translation]

Ms. Rosane Doré Lefebvre: Mr. Matheson, has your centre suffered budget cuts?

Mr. Bobby Matheson (Director General, National Crime Prevention Centre, Department of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness): As Mr. Tupper said, our budget has been cut by \$2 million.

Ms. Rosane Doré Lefebvre: In your view, do those cuts affect your services at all?

[English]

Mr. Shawn Tupper: Over the last four years, in fact, as a result of the reformulation of this program in 2008—we basically had to restructure ourselves and get our footing again—we were actually lapsing money.

Right now, the amount of money we're putting out the door is the highest we've ever done in making effective investments in crime prevention programming.

• (1545)

[Translation]

Ms. Rosane Doré Lefebvre: I can't remember whether I asked this question last time. You can refresh my memory on the issue.

You talked about looking at whether CoSA could benefit from private investments or from social finance. Can you think of other

public safety areas that could use social finance? Conversely, are there areas that should avoid social finance entirely, in your view?

[English]

Mr. Shawn Tupper: I appreciate your point, and I think there clearly are areas where government must remain involved. I do think high-risk offenders would be one area and mental health would be another, particularly when you're dealing with offenders. It isn't to say that we can't find different kinds of arrangements to work with our community partners, but clearly those are areas where government needs to remain involved.

As I said at our last meeting, we are not seeing any removal of funding or any change in our programming that suggests the government is removing itself from those program areas.

I think there are other areas, where we're dealing with less-risky offenders whose integration back into the community could easily be highlighted by a strong community partnership, where the communities are making a significant investment and where we're more or less doing monitoring and oversight.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr. Tupper.

Thank you, Madam Doré Lefebvre.

Now to Mr. Norlock, please.

Mr. Rick Norlock (Northumberland—Quinte West, CPC): Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

Through you to the witnesses, thank you making your second appearance on this very important topic. I'll tell you why I think it's important.

Over the weekend, I had occasion to attend the 10th anniversary of the ReStore, which is part of Habitat for Humanity. I think I mentioned in this committee before, how 12 difficult-to-employ young persons were included in one of the Habitat builds because of a government investment, in partnership with some money from another government department—and not through Public Safety, I must say. As a result of that investment, it was confirmed that approximately 10 of the 12 are now fully employed in the construction industry.

Would you not agree that is a perfect example of how some government money going to a non-profit agency can not only benefit the community but also give homes to three families, which I believe all had children? I go along with your first statement that a proper domicile to a loving and caring family is the first beneficiary, but the real beneficiary is society, in that 10 people who may have been on the unemployment or the hard-to-employ list are now not only employed but are also paying taxes.

Can you relate any possible similarities to other types of government investment you're aware of, while they may not be directly involved—I'm thinking of training issues and those types of things where we partner with non-government agencies—but that get a good result with a small amount of government investment?

Mr. Shawn Tupper: Habitat is the perfect example. The federal government launched a national partnership with Habitat for Humanity last spring, and while my department does not produce all the funding that goes into that partnership, it is through the horizontal partnerships we have established, across departments that we are able to effect those kinds of results.

Through that partnership with Habitat, our goal is to have offenders hired on to every build site that Habitat runs across the country and to see them integrated into their ReStore stores as employees. That's a really great example of how, with very little funding from the federal government, we're having a big impact on the positive possibilities for offenders to reintegrate into the community.

Our best example, I think, of costs for money is a small enterprise that was started in British Columbia a couple of years ago. It's a project for recycling asphalt shingles off homes. It's a new technology that is green. Apparently we've never been able to recycle asphalt shingles before. Now, we're using new green technology to do that, which is taking tons of waste out of the waste sites around British Columbia. But most importantly, for an investment of \$2,375 per individual, we have been able to facilitate full-time employment that produces living wages for 40 women offenders in B.C.

It's a great example, and let me tell you, we spend a lot more than \$2,375 per capita on individuals, but that small investment—one that came out of ESDC, which supplied the money—has had a very positive impact on those 40 women.

• (1550)

Mr. Rick Norlock: Sometimes it's not about public safety investments. It could be other parts of government investing, getting a positive result with possible offenders, etc.

I just—

The Chair: Excuse me, Mr. Norlock, the bells are now on.

I know we're into a good line of questioning and I certainly appreciate the input from our guests. Of course, we have bells and, unfortunately, we're not in control of our own time destiny. We hope to be able to get back here shortly to continue. Should we, of course, run over our hour of allotted time, we have other witnesses to hear from. We hope to be back here in time.

We will suspend and hopefully get back in time to continue on.

We are suspended.

• (1550)

_____ (Pause) _____

• (1635)

The Chair: Colleagues, we will resume our study on social finance.

For the second hour, we have with us, as an individual, Dr. Gregory Jenion, professor in the criminology department or Kwantlen Polytechnic University.

Welcome, sir. We're pleased to have you here at this committee.

You'll have up to 10 minutes to make a statement, should you wish. At that point we'll open up the floor to questions.

Dr. Gregory Jenion (Professor, Faculty, Criminology Department, Kwantlen Polytechnic University, As an Individual): Thank you very much.

The Chair: You have the floor, sir.

Dr. Gregory Jenion: I have prepared a statement, so maybe I'll read that first.

The Chair: That would be fine.

Dr. Gregory Jenion: Excellent.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, thank you for giving me the opportunity to address you today.

I understand this committee is looking at how social finance can be related to crime prevention in Canada. I will begin by providing some background information on the larger context of sustainable crime prevention efforts and practices.

The United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, in its compendium on the standards and norms in crime prevention, states the following:

There is clear evidence that well-planned crime prevention strategies not only prevent crime and victimization, but also promote community safety and contribute to the sustainable development of countries. Effective, responsible crime prevention enhances the quality of life of all citizens.

Many countries look to this compendium as being foundational to their own national strategy. As this committee knows, Canada is a signatory to the guidelines for the prevention of crime.

In 2007 Public Safety Canada's publication, *A Blueprint for Effective Crime Prevention*, stated this:

There is no single approach to crime prevention. A wide array of interventions is needed to maximize effectiveness. Accordingly, the NCPC adopts the position reflected in the United Nations Guidelines for the Prevention of Crime...

The UN guidelines go on to state this.

Cooperation/partnerships should be an integral part of effective crime prevention, given the wide-ranging nature of the causes of crime and the skills and responsibilities required to address them. This includes partnerships working across ministries and between authorities, community organizations, non-governmental organizations, the business sector and private citizens.

However, these guidelines are short on "how to's". For example, there is no information on how wide collaboration with the community in the form of partnerships would be carried out or maintained, or how to conduct initial diagnostic analysis to identify and frame community concerns.

Researchers have drawn attention to the many obstacles involved. As Professor Hastings has stated, the first difficulty involves the lack of agreement regarding the causes of crime and the targets of prevention; the second difficulty involves the level of confidence people have in the solutions proposed for crime problems; and the third difficulty arises from differences in emphasis on the importance of the community.

Lack of such detail encourages a search for where these guidelines are currently being played out. The British experience is often heralded as a successful model. The tenants of the British experience with crime prevention can be found in numerous reports that span several decades, including the Cornish, the Gladstone, and the Morgan reports.

The Morgan report, in particular, “explored ways in which inter-agency crime prevention could be made normal business” and under what administrative arrangements. The key recommendations of that report were that crime prevention would be the responsibility of local area authorities and that this would be made a statutory responsibility.

The pinnacle of the British experience was the Crime and Disorder Act, and this is when the Morgan recommendations were finally realized. This statutory authority moved crime prevention past the natural threats inherent to such an endeavour by providing an obligatory and accountability structure foundational to the sustainability of the effort. Crime prevention moved beyond lip service and the good faith intentions of individuals to a more secure sustainable platform.

Canada is without similar legislation.

The Horner report is a good place to review substantive report recommendations in the Canadian context that are akin to the Morgan report in the British context. Although emphasis on statutory responsibility is limited, most of the foundational pillars from which the national strategy is derived can be found in the report’s recommendations. It should be noted that not all of the report’s recommendations have come to fruition.

One of the recommendations was directly related to funding, and I quote,

The Committee recommends that a share of the monies forfeited as proceeds of crime be allocated to crime prevention activities and that the federal government allocate 1% a year of the current federal budget for police, courts, and corrections to crime prevention over a five year period. At the end of five years, Canada should spend 5% of the current federal criminal justice budget on crime prevention.

● (1640)

It is clear that the Horner report originally envisioned a much larger financial contribution to national crime prevention than what is currently being spent and allocated in this area. Therefore, it was not surprising when I reviewed prior testimony by Mr. Shawn Tupper before this committee when he stated this: “Governments do not have the level of financial resources required to fund these programs in a long-term, sustainable way.”

With a limited time remaining, and having this broader crime prevention context in mind, I would like to summarize by saying that whether we’re talking about social innovation through social finance or some other progressive partnership program, in the absence of a statutory framework that encompasses obligation, accountability, and transparency, along with a substantially larger financial commitment by the federal government to municipalities, I would echo other colleagues in the field who state that for the moment it would be naive to assume that progress towards crime prevention is inevitable.

I would be happy to take any of your questions.

The Chair: Fine. Thank you very much, Professor Jenion.

Now over here we will start with Mr. Payne, please.

Mr. LaVar Payne (Medicine Hat, CPC): Thank you, Chair.

Thank you for coming, Dr. Jenion.

My question is through you, Chair, to the witness.

I was looking at your comment regarding governments not having the level of financial resources. However, I notice in your statement that you didn’t finish the actual quote, and if you don’t mind I’ll just read that into the record here:

Governments do not have the level of financial resources required to fund these programs in a long-term sustainable way. Leveraging new partnerships that can sustain successful projects once government time-limited funding ends is key to ensuring the public safety needs of the communities we serve. Our aim is to implement effective and efficient social innovation programs that can become sustainable.

It’s interesting. We’ve actually heard from a number of organizations that have talked about these new innovations, bond programs and so on. It’s interesting that there are people who can actually think outside the box.

To me, there’s innovation here. There are opportunities for organizations. We’ve heard a number of our colleagues bringing forward some of these innovations. If we think about Habitat for Humanity and the homes they build, one of my colleagues specifically talked about that in a project in his riding. I would like him to restate that at some point in time here.

I don’t know how much time I have, Mr. Chair.

● (1645)

The Chair: You have plenty of time.

Mr. LaVar Payne: I guess one of my questions is what you think about innovation. Are you prepared to look at that? Is it way beyond what you think we should be doing?

Obviously the federal government has some opportunities. I think that would be a great opportunity for us, as a government, to look at some sort of pilot project to work with other organizations to see what we can do in terms of these activities. We’ve heard organizations that have been quite successful in that, including the John Howard Society.

Dr. Gregory Jenion: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

If I could address the question, I have actually reviewed a report that was delivered to you called “Social Impact Bonds: Overview and Considerations”. I believe it was mentioned earlier in your meetings. Of course, it was a very sombre kind of look at the social bonds. Many times in there you read words like, “there is an element of risk”, “they are unproven”, “the results aren’t fully known.”

I don’t think these things are something that should be disregarded in any way or not pursued, but to think that they would be in some way the key to sustainability of the overall crime prevention effort, to me, is not real.

The other thing that concerns me is looking at things like the chart on figure 1 for the social impact bonds. It’s a report that you have. Point number 6 says, “Evaluation advisor monitors ongoing progress of the preventative program...”. Well, who are the monitors? Who are the overseers, and what type of commitment to transparency and disclosure do they have? I think that would be very important if things like this were to go forward.

Mr. LaVar Payne: I think there certainly are opportunities for organizations, and we did hear from a number of presenters. Deloitte was one of them and they did suggest a whole key of questions that needed to be looked at and figured out ahead of time. You can't go in without some plan on this whole issue.

The other important thing to recognize is that governments can't do everything themselves. We don't have all the answers. There are other people outside who have other experience. They can bring some great ideas to government and if we sit back and say, "No, I'm sorry, that doesn't fit".... I think we need to be able to look at them and we need to be able to try them out.

We just talked about CoSA. They were here just a couple of weeks ago, and they talked about what they had done with outside investors, and in this case it was funding from NCP. Mr. Tupper talked about the potential of that. It could be one of these organizations that could potentially be providing funding and there could be some other community organization that would be prepared to help in that.

I think if you establish a set of conditions and rules around this whole process—obviously there has to be an audit and there has to be some way to measure the performance—there's an opportunity to look at these things rather than just to say, no, it's not possible. So in my view, that certainly is a real opportunity to do some sort of pilot project. I think we'd be remiss if we didn't even look at that opportunity.

• (1650)

The Chair: Fine. That's good, then. Thank you.

Now, Mr. Garrison.

Mr. Randall Garrison (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, NDP): Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

Thanks to Professor Jenion for being here today. I know that you have both academic and practical experience working with the City of Surrey on their crime prevention strategies. In your opening statement, you commented on the need for a substantially larger financial commitment to municipalities.

Would you like to expand on that idea?

Dr. Gregory Jenion: Mr. Chair, if I may?

The Chair: Yes, please.

Dr. Gregory Jenion: I saw first-hand municipalities struggling with crime prevention and where to get their money. Most of the protective service budget for the City of Surrey goes towards police and fire services. In my dissertation, I look beyond what works to an examination of various strategies at the municipal level. While I was interviewing some of the bureaucrats and managers for the City of Surrey, I pointed out that they noticed a tremendous cut in federal funding just for the police contract services they had in the last 20 or 30 years.

But independent of all that, there was no money within those fire-police budgets at the municipal level for even a crime prevention manager. When I first started writing about the Surrey crime reduction experience and the policies that they came up with, they were fortunate enough to hire somebody named Lance Talbot, whom

they later lost to BC Transit, in part because the salary was a lot higher.

So funding is an incredibly important issue at the municipal level.

Mr. Randall Garrison: Would you say it's at the municipal level where we get the best bang for the buck out of crime prevention? Is that your conclusion?

Dr. Gregory Jenion: Well, I don't think those are my words. I think that if we look at the United Nations compendium, it's clear that they have stated—and Canada has signed onto this—that crime prevention is best undertaken by local area governments, and that would be the municipalities.

I think that not only does the UN report say that, but if we go back to the Horner report, it also clearly states that municipalities need to be a central part of crime prevention in Canada.

Mr. Randall Garrison: In your opening statement, you talked about the lack of a legislative framework that would deal with questions of obligation, accountability, and transparency for these "innovative projects." It's a concern that we have tried to raise here.

Can you say a little bit more about what the concerns are with accountability and transparency?

Dr. Gregory Jenion: Sure. I think the first thing is just dissemination of information.

The very first stop for the United Kingdom outside of the Cornish report that I call a key milestone is the Gladstone report, which is basically a fairly dry report. It's a methodological contribution, but that report in the British setting stated clearly that in order to not continue to spin our wheels or to repeat the mistakes of the past, we had to take an evidence-based approach, and that in doing so, the next step was to disseminate our findings widely.

I think first and foremost, when we talk about accountability, we talk about dissemination of that information with transparency. Outside of that, I think it's also important to note that the Crime and Disorder Act places a statutory responsibility and obligation on people. It actually states by law what they have to do. It's not creating another level of bureaucracy to oversee crime prevention efforts. It's instead telling those who are responsible what they must do under the law.

Mr. Randall Garrison: In the discussion we've had, I think we often run together non-profits, charitable organizations, and for-profit corporations. In the discussions we've had examples from all of these. Would you see that different concerns or different levels of accountability would be needed for these three categories or can they all be treated the same in these projects?

Dr. Gregory Jenion: When I worked with the City of Surrey and sat on that board, I also had the opportunity to interview non-profit organizations, charities. Some faith-based ministries were very nervous about government involvement in their activity. Their activity is very important, in my mind, given the fact that they carry out all sorts of relationship types of programs, drug and alcohol recovery programs, all of which are relatively unknown to the general or broader sector of society, but I think that it is substantial. They're resistant, however, to having too much government interference in their programs, so I think that obviously there would have to be some differences in areas like that.

Maybe I could go back to the performance indicator comment that was made earlier. I think that we don't want to just be governed by performance indicators because sometimes there are dangers and pitfalls in those as well, and that's why accountability has to go beyond just the performance measure. I think that down south our neighbours right now are struggling in their veterans kind of affairs scandal that they've had with how performance indicators have pushed some to massage those numbers, I think, in the form of wait lists down to the south. So I think we want to be cautious of that if we merely state that performance indicators are what we mean by accountable.

• (1655)

The Chair: Another minute.

Mr. Randall Garrison: In the reference you made to the Horner report, which is a House of Commons committee report from 1993 for those who hadn't figured that out, it talks about a much higher level of spending, and we have that contrasted with the current bureaucracy saying that we can't afford to do that kind of spending. I guess my impression from that Horner report was that it's an investment rather than spending, that if the government put more money into crime prevention, it would actually save money in the long run. Is that the tenor of the Horner report?

Dr. Gregory Jenion: Yes, I would say that's correct. I think that it is the spirit of the report. It moves things beyond just lip service or a window dressing, and it's toward sustainability. It's hard to disagree with the word "prevention". Prevention is a wonderful word; everybody wants to prevent crime. I don't think you could find people from anywhere who would not want to prevent crime from happening, but the issue is, how do we sustain that effort? Unless it's of a massive undertaking, I don't think we can assume that we'll have success.

The Chair: Fine, thank you very much. Time is up.

Now Mr. Maguire, please, for five minutes.

Mr. Larry Maguire (Brandon—Souris, CPC): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thank you, Mr. Jenion, for your presentation. It leads me to a few questions in regard to the whole area that you've looked at in the criminology department at Kwantlen Polytechnic University, for sure.

Can you just give us an update perhaps on some of the studies and documents that you've put forward in this area? I was looking for some of those and I couldn't find too much in regard to published areas around social finance tools in crime prevention. I was just curious, can you share some of your academic writings with us?

Dr. Gregory Jenion: Sure, I'd love to.

I think what I could start with is my dissertation, which specifically examined not only the global context of crime prevention efforts but domestic efforts as well, right down to the municipal crime reduction plan that the City of Surrey has done.

My senior supervisor was Dr. Paul Brantingham, the founder of environmental criminology, and my external supervisor was Mr. Marcus Felson, the founder of routine activities theory and opportunities theory. Outside of that, I continue to teach crime prevention at Kwantlen Polytechnic University and I'm approaching my 10th year doing that. I have numerous publications talking about the crime rate in the *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*, as well as some other journals that are in my bio on the web page that you can read.

Even more importantly, I've been involved in interviewing offenders, both in incarceration settings with Burnaby youth custody services centre, project 6116, which is the national young offender study on auto theft, and a project within the Forensic Psychiatric Centre under the direction of Dr. Simon Verdun-Jones. So that would be some of my experience.

Mr. Larry Maguire: I'm looking more for the social finance tools, some of those areas that we could look at. First of all, you mentioned the British model. Could you compare that to the New York model? Do you think there is any success in that New York model?

• (1700)

Dr. Gregory Jenion: I would have to go back and take a look at that to make an accurate comparison now.

Mr. Larry Maguire: As well, in your opinion, if governments were to move toward a more self-sustaining program funded by the private sector through the social finance models, what types of accountability mechanisms would be required to make those successful?

Dr. Gregory Jenion: For sure there would have to be independent oversight outside the private partnership. In terms of accountability, it should go beyond, as I stated earlier, performance indicators alone.

Mr. Larry Maguire: What types of measures would you use for targets with regard to these types of initiatives? How would you judge them?

Dr. Gregory Jenion: I'll say that the one measure I wouldn't use is the crime rate. One of the things that I hear quite often is that Canada's crime rate is going down, and all of that. To be clear on that, it's the reported rate of crime. We know that.

We also know that something else is going down. In 2004, 34% of Canadians reported crime to police, according to the GSS, the general social survey victimization cycle component. In 2009 that number had dropped to 31% of Canadians reporting crime. How low does that number have to go before we question even the official reported rates of crime that are out there?

Mr. Larry Maguire: Would a better way to monitor the crimes that we have based on recidivism rates? Can you comment on that?

Dr. Gregory Jenion: That could be a measure, yes.

Mr. Larry Maguire: If you were looking at that and looking at some of the social programs that are out there today, whether it's social impact bonds or other programs, what sort of involvement would you have from intermediaries in that whole process?

Dr. Gregory Jenion: I'd have to spend a little bit more time thinking about that in depth.

Mr. Larry Maguire: Do you think they would have a role in monitoring the ongoing programming at all?

Dr. Gregory Jenion: Yes.

Mr. Larry Maguire: On the processes of implementation of the social finance models, if you were looking at how to proceed with that, how would you go about setting up that up? We talked about a number of mechanisms for social financing to reduce crime rates. What would be the preferred route to go, in your mind?

Dr. Gregory Jenion: To establish and be clear on whose responsibility the program was, and who could be held accountable for that program, and how widely the results and dissemination of information about that program could be distributed....

Mr. Larry Maguire: Would the key elements to its success be in that whole information process regarding how to implement the social finance model to start with, and how to implement it?

Dr. Gregory Jenion: I'm not sure. I would have to say that given my background, I have a very situational approach to addressing crime issues and social ills. We cannot assume that every context is the same. I would not apply a recipe-type of approach to the various urban and rural areas around Canada.

Mr. Larry Maguire: So you would see differences across different parts of Canada.

I wonder what contractual arrangements would be needed to provide a successful social finance model and what set of rules are the contractual arrangements based on. What would you see put in place there for some kind of cohesiveness around it?

Dr. Gregory Jenion: I'd have to give that some more thought, sir.

Mr. Larry Maguire: One of the witnesses at committee described the grant and contribution process as essentially 100% loss with the hope of an outcome. So I wonder if you could compare that to a social impact bond model where there is sustainable investment and an expectation of an outcome from a societal perspective. From the taxpayers' perspective, would you not agree that it's best to expect tax dollars to create outcomes and actually prevent crime?

Dr. Gregory Jenion: On page 6 of the report that has been distributed to you, the author says this:

Given that no SIBs have yet reached the payout stage, it is not yet possible to assess whether these potential benefits will materialize.

I'm not sure if we know yet that these programs are either beneficial—that they actually have the desired outcome—and/or if they'll be sustainable.

● (1705)

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr. Maguire.

Mr. Easter.

Hon. Wayne Easter (Malpeque, Lib.): Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thanks to the witness for appearing.

Somewhere in your remarks, and I'll come back to the topic at hand in a moment, you talked about the lack of agreement on the causes of crime, which I maintain is probably one of the most important issues that we're failing to address.

What work has been done in that area?

Larry and I both come from the farm sector. We certainly know full-well that if you've got a problem, no matter what it is, you're not going to fix it unless you know the cause of it. If we could get at the causes of these issues, we'd probably be doing a lot more than trying to deal with them after the fact.

Do you have anything to express in that area?

Dr. Gregory Jenion: The motto of Mayor Dianne Watts' campaign for crime reduction was to get at the root causes of crime. That was the heart of it. It's one thing to say it, it's another thing to actually understand what that actually means, and in what context and everything else. A lot of it depends on very recent research—new things that we're learning all the time.

Dr. Andrea Curman, in 2012, published her dissertation out of Simon Fraser University, "Crime and Place: A Longitudinal Examination of Street Segment Patterns in Vancouver, BC.", which showed that high amounts of crime happen only on a very few streets.

It's not even known yet whether those streets actually constitute a neighbourhood. That one piece of information could fundamentally transform what we think in regard to crime, both in theory and practice. That just came out two years ago. Her work is being published with Dr. Martin Andresen at Simon Fraser University, who is one of the most prolific young publishers today.

As for other causes, I may just remind everybody that the United Nations compendium does not talk only about social developmental crime prevention but also about situational crime prevention. There is a whole body of research and literature around situational crime prevention that often gets lost on the wider public, and is only in the domain of police, courts, and corrections.

Hon. Wayne Easter: It's certainly an area that does need a lot more work. I thank you for your response.

In your remarks as well, you seem to emphasize that we need a statutory framework dealing with crime prevention or whether it's social finance. From my own point of view, I guess I'm asking you specifically, what do you mean in that regard?

My concern with social finance is this. I think it certainly has some potential, but my concern is that if there's a great dependency on social finance, it's going to mean a patchwork quilt of programming across the country.

There will be some areas where investors are willing to invest, and there will be other areas, maybe in the north or some of the smaller provinces, where there will not be that willingness to invest. There could be a mix of programs: the crime prevention programs that are funded federally; the policing, federal, provincial, and municipal; and social finance.

What are your thoughts?

Dr. Gregory Jenion: In terms of the statutory legislation that creates some sense of responsibility, obligation, and transparency, I think it's crucial. I think of all things that moved the United Kingdom, or Britain, if you will, out of their repetitive or stalled crime prevention setting was the Crime and Disorder Act.

There are three specific sections of the Crime and Disorder Act to me that are transformative to the effort.

The first one is section 17, which requires all local area authorities to maintain community safety issues in all areas of their policy—but not to the neglect of their other responsibilities.

Section 5 places a duty on those local area authorities, along with police, health, and other probation committees, to work together to tackle the problems of crime, to put aside jurisdictional issues or maybe silos and other things, and to force them in some ways, according to the law, to work together.

In section 6, partnerships are mandated to produce and publish strategies for these problems. These have to be based on an audit of crime that is done regularly within their community.

To me, the statutory authority is really everything. It also assumes that there would be a financial contribution of substantial degree toward that effort.

• (1710)

Hon. Wayne Easter: Is that the Crime and Disorder Act in England or...? I wonder, Mr. Chair, could our researchers obtain a copy of that for us to preview, if they could?

Are you saying, then, in terms of the statutory framework that the federal government should take some leadership and provide that overall framework? Or is it a cooperative venture? How would you suggest that take place?

Dr. Gregory Jenion: In Britain, Tony Blair took up that effort and made it part of the national strategy. So, yes, I think it would be at the national level.

The Chair: Very briefly, Mr. Easter.

Hon. Wayne Easter: There's just one point I wanted to make, Mr. Chair.

You mentioned in passing that you had interviewed offenders. I really think that's a great way to really get some basic opinions on how people ended up offending, and get at the root causes, so to speak, of crime. What did you learn from that experience that could be helpful to us?

Dr. Gregory Jenion: Well, I learned a couple of things. One, the age crime curve was drilled into my mind, and that is, that most people who are offenders commit crimes when they're young and they never go on to commit another one.

Hon. Wayne Easter: Thank you.

The Chair: Okay, fine. Thank you, Mr. Easter. You've gone past your time.

[Translation]

Mr. Rousseau, you have the floor.

[English]

Five minutes.

Mr. Jean Rousseau (Compton—Stanstead, NDP): Thank you very much.

[Translation]

Mr. Jenion, thank you for joining us today.

I am assuming you can hear the simultaneous interpretation, correct?

[English]

Dr. Gregory Jenion: I can hear you.

[Translation]

Mr. Jean Rousseau: Mr. Jenion, what is the danger facing crime prevention programs that are funded and sponsored by the private sector, especially in terms of the tools and parameters that might be used to assess them?

[English]

Dr. Gregory Jenion: Thank you for the question. A complete reliance only on performance indicators....

[Translation]

Mr. Jean Rousseau: Could you elaborate on the impact, the crime rate and other things of that kind?

[English]

Dr. Gregory Jenion: I think the best way to answer that is to understand that the crime rate may not measure what we think it measures. Specifically, I can recall, and I do have it with me, an article in *The Delta*, a local newspaper in Surrey, that records a Staff Sergeant Garry Beggs stating that prostitution within Newton rose in one fell swoop rose by over 300%, and that it was not an indication that the Mounties were not doing their job. And he's correct: it wasn't. It's because they had shifted and changed their patrol patterns and some of the focus and emphasis they were putting their efforts into.

Given the dropping number crimes that Canadians report, I do not think that the crime rate would be a great measure to use of successful performance.

• (1715)

[Translation]

Mr. Jean Rousseau: I would like to continue along the same lines.

What could the danger be for small communities and remote regions in particular? Sometimes, social finance from the private sector is not always possible for some types of crimes. What is the danger facing those communities?

[English]

Dr. Gregory Jenion: That money that could have gone to them would not; it would be going to these other ventures.

May I add one more statement?

Mr. Jean Rousseau: Yes.

Dr. Gregory Jenion: Although the United Nations compendium supports the social development programs, and rightly so, we also want to be cautious that we don't merely engage in social programs for crime reduction purposes alone, and that good governance and an enlightened society should contribute to those things, independent of whether they have a reduction of crime.

[Translation]

Mr. Jean Rousseau: How much time do I still have, Mr. Chair?

[English]

The Chair: You have one minute.

[Translation]

Mr. Jean Rousseau: At the end of the presentation, you said:

...whether we are talking about social innovation through social finance or some other progressive partnership program—in the absence of a statutory framework that encompasses obligation, accountability and transparency—along with a substantially larger financial commitment by the federal government to municipalities...

Can you elaborate on that, please?

[English]

Dr. Gregory Jenion: Regarding the municipalities specifically?

[Translation]

Mr. Jean Rousseau: Yes, more specifically.

[English]

Dr. Gregory Jenion: In my dissertation I talked about natural threats inherent to the crime prevention endeavour, and I called those “tertiary drift”, based on what we call the PST model, the primary, secondary, tertiary model, being applied to crime prevention. The other one I called “social development creep”.

What I said is that if we can't somehow handle those natural threats inherent to crime prevention efforts, we would eventually go back to the traditional and very reactionary way of doing things: the police, courts, corrections way of doing things, partly because they're involved in the day-to-day operations of the system and so naturally it drifts back to them. Alternatively, the other point was that slowly we would start advancing social programs only in the name of crime reduction or crime prevention. That would be quite wrong to do as well, not the least of which is it would criminalize certain marginal populations.

[Translation]

Mr. Jean Rousseau: Thank you very much.

[English]

The Chair: Thank you very much.

Now Mr. Norlock, please.

Mr. Rick Norlock: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair, and through you to the witness, thank you for attending.

I read with interest and listened to you when you quoted some of the United Nations.... I agree with most of the statements here, in particular that there is no single approach to crime prevention.

I think the evidence that this committee has heard and the statements made by the parliamentary secretary are just that, that in this committee,s exploratory enterprise looking at social financing, perhaps we need to look at it as a way to diversify our crime prevention portfolio, if you will.

I was particularly interested in the second part that talks about cooperation and partnerships, that these should be an integral part of effective crime prevention. That's what almost every witness here has admitted, saying that social financing, including but not limited to social impact bonds, is being embarked upon by other countries and entities. That's in line with Einstein's statement that you can't continue to do the same thing, and that if you do, it's the definition of insanity. Right?

So we want to do things differently to get better outcomes, and to invest those very valuable tax dollars that people expect.... So would you not agree that its appropriate for the government the explore the avenue of social financing as part, but not the whole, of its crime prevention strategy?

Dr. Gregory Jenion: I think I'll stick to what I said earlier, that of course I'm supportive of any venture that would reduce harm to Canadians. But if it's a stand-alone venture apart from a larger strategic framework, I don't think the word “sustainability” should be attached to it. But I think that if something can be shown to work, we need to support that. I'm not sure in this case that the recent literature, at least what has been provided to this committee, states that it does in fact have the impact or outcome they want.

● (1720)

Mr. Rick Norlock: So you're saying that the government should not enter into any kind of experiment with regard to crime prevention, that we should wait until somebody else shows us a better way and then we should adopt that?

Dr. Gregory Jenion: No. I think that—

Mr. Rick Norlock: Succinctly, what are you saying, sir?

Dr. Gregory Jenion: Succinctly, I expect that ad hoc solutions, or things where you're just putting out brush fires around crime and social ills, will ultimately go into the annals of history without a broader strategic framework in place....

Mr. Rick Norlock: So you disagree and don't think that the federal government's crime prevention strategies are good strategies. I don't want to say this in absolute terms, however, because there's no absolute.

Dr. Gregory Jenion: I'm saying we don't know.

Mr. Rick Norlock: How would we know, succinctly, sir?

Dr. Gregory Jenion: As the evidence starts to come in.

Mr. Rick Norlock: Okay. If we bring in a program that says we want to reduce.... I need to hone this down to where people at home can understand it and not get into esoterics. Let's say that we have a problem in a village or a town, where there is a lot of vandalism. A group in the community, let's call it the United Way, says, "We would like to work with"—and people think it's youth and there's evidence to indicate that it is—"our young people in our community to prevent this vandalism and we're going to bring in programs, but we need some funding for them."

Then, someone in the community, let's say the local Tim Hortons owner, says, "I'd like to contribute to this, so here is the money for you to develop the program." A year or a year and a half later, whatever the time span, their social contract shows, and everyone in the village sees, that the instances of vandalism have gone down to the measurable result that the contract agreed to. You're saying that really isn't a good measure.

Dr. Gregory Jenion: No, I'm not saying that. I'm saying that—

The Chair: Sorry. Just finish, please.

Dr. Gregory Jenion: I think that we should look at anything that contributes to the reduction of crime in Canada, especially to the reduction of harm to Canadians from those crimes. Ventures like this should be looked at. I am saying that these need to be contained within a broader strategic framework that is clear about accountability and transparency.

The Chair: Fine, thank you very much.

Mr. Garrison, please.

Mr. Randall Garrison: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

Staying with that, for a moment, I think we're on to a good point here. What you're saying is that we have an unproven product before us. You're not opposed to looking at that, but you think that putting all our eggs in that basket might lead us in a wrong direction. Would that be the direction we're heading in here?

Dr. Gregory Jenion: We'd stick with the report that you have before you that is a very sober and an interesting look at social impact bonds. I think it states clearly that we have yet to fully see the results.

Mr. Randall Garrison: Are there other things in your experience, both academic and applied, that we already know work and might be a better place to put resources?

Dr. Gregory Jenion: It depends on the problem in the local context and what they're facing. Sometimes, certain types of social development or wraparound programs work quite effectively. In the City of Surrey's case, some of that's being done with young kids to prevent them from joining gangs.

In other situations, it could be that a situational or an opportunity reduction measure would be the more appropriate response. What I'm trying to say is that it is very contextually specific to the problem.

Mr. Randall Garrison: If we were looking at a particular problem, like gangs in Surrey, you would say there are several tools that might be available. You'd have to understand the specific problem. Then you could choose one of those tools. I guess I'm sensing some doubt that you would be willing to choose an unproven one at that point.

Dr. Gregory Jenion: Were another available, that's correct.

• (1725)

The Chair: Excuse me, Mr. Garrison. I'd like to ask for clarification.

Mr. Jenion, you've mentioned the report again. Were you still referring to the Morgan report?

Dr. Gregory Jenion: The Morgan report? Yes.

The Chair: That's good. I just wanted clarification for our analysts. Thank you very much.

Please carry on, Mr. Garrison.

Mr. Randall Garrison: Please carry on after that interruption.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Chair: My apologies, sir. We were just getting some clarification for the analyst.

Mr. Randall Garrison: One of the claims that I think you're referring to was in Elizabeth Lower-Basch's paper on the social impact bonds. She says two things that I think are interesting.

One is that there will almost always be a higher cost, because you have to create a new bureaucracy or a new entity to run the social investment approach. The other thing that I think she at least implies is that there is always some draw on government resources in establishing programs such as this.

I wonder whether you have any comment on those two points that I drew from her report.

Dr. Gregory Jenion: I think I may not. I'd have to think about it.

Mr. Randall Garrison: Okay.

You had a question before from Mr. Easter that you didn't really address. Maybe you can't address it, but one of the concerns we've had is that if you go to social investment, private decisions decide where resources are allocated. My question is not whether that would happen, but how it would affect your overall approach as a society to crime reduction, if you end up with these private agendas affecting decisions about where you invest money.

Dr. Gregory Jenion: I would go back to earlier comments by a member, who said that it's a kind of piecemeal approach.

Mr. Randall Garrison: And so what you're advocating—I know a little bit about your work—is that we need a broad commitment to crime reduction and that we require crime reduction to be built into the other activities in the justice field. Is that where the British example comes in?

Dr. Gregory Jenion: I think it needs to go beyond a preamble to certain types of criminal justice legislation that already exist. It has to outline and actually put an obligation upon certain key people in authority to do certain things.

Mr. Randall Garrison: The example you gave from Britain required that people build it into their plans, required that they work with other agencies—those specific kinds of requirements for the existing agencies that deal with crime prevention and justice.

Dr. Gregory Jenion: —and to make those fully transparent to the public and to publish them on a regular annual basis. Their publication would also include not only the reported rate of crime but also annual, ongoing victimization survey data and the like.

If I may swerve just for a moment, in the Commercial Drive-Grandview district of Vancouver, they started to do a local community survey. What they were astounded by was just how many other concerns members of the community had concerning criminal justice issues and social ills. Lots of these were not the ones that would show up in the official reported stats.

Obviously we want to fully understand what the community members think, not only in terms of criminal incident reduction but also in terms of reduction of fears that they may have, whether well-based or not, and also whether there are other nuisance-related offences that bother them.

The Chair: That's great. Thank you very much.

You have 15 or 20 seconds, Mrs. James, and that will be it, if you wish.

Ms. Roxanne James: Thank you. Sure.

You mentioned that you had prepared a dissertation on crime prevention. Did it actually include the study of social finance? I'm

wondering because you mentioned as well that you had read the literature that was provided to this committee and that it didn't seem very positive. I've been in every single committee meeting since we started this study, and I think all witnesses but one have been very positive. In fact, with the two witnesses who were here in the first hour, we talked about the organization CoSA. They said that social finance would be applicable to that group.

I'm just wondering what literature you received and whether you were only given some literature.

• (1730)

Dr. Gregory Jenion: My dissertation did not contain any reference to the social impact bonds.

The Chair: Fine. Thank you very much.

Mr. Jenion, thank you very much for appearing before the committee. I don't know whether it has been an enjoyable or interesting time, but most certainly it has been an opportunity to have an experience.

Thank you very kindly for your comments today.

The meeting is adjourned.

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

SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

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 Parliament of Canada Web Site at the following address: <http://www.parl.gc.ca>

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

PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

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.

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 du Parlement du Canada à l'adresse suivante : <http://www.parl.gc.ca>