



HOUSE OF COMMONS  
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES  
CANADA

44th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

---

# Standing Committee on the Status of Women

EVIDENCE

**NUMBER 010**

Friday, March 25, 2022

---

Chair: Mrs. Karen Vecchio





## Standing Committee on the Status of Women

Friday, March 25, 2022

• (1300)

[English]

**The Chair (Mrs. Karen Vecchio (Elgin—Middlesex—London, CPC)):** Good afternoon, everyone. Welcome to meeting number 10 of the Standing Committee on the Status of Women. I will call this meeting to order.

Pursuant to Standing Order 108(2) and the motion adopted on Tuesday, February 4, the committee will resume its study on intimate partner and domestic violence in Canada.

[Translation]

Given the ongoing pandemic situation and in light of the recommendations from public health authorities, as well as the directive of the Board of Internal Economy on October 19, 2021, to remain healthy and safe, all those attending the meeting in person must not have symptoms. Everyone must maintain two metres of physical distancing and must wear a non-medical mask when moving around the room. It's strongly recommended that masks be worn at all times, including when seated. Everyone must maintain proper hand hygiene by using the hand sanitizer provided at the room entrance.

[English]

For those participating virtually, I would like to outline a few rules to follow. You may speak in the official language of your choice. Interpretation services are available for this meeting. You have the choice, at the bottom of your screen, of floor, English or French. If interpretation is lost, please inform me immediately. We will ensure that interpretation is properly restored before resuming the proceedings.

Before speaking, please wait until I recognize you by name. If you are on the video conference, please click on the microphone icon to unmute yourself. For those in the room, your mike will be controlled as normal by the proceedings and verification officer. All comments should be addressed through the chair. When you're speaking, please speak slowly and clearly—not like your chair—and when you're not speaking, your mike should be on mute.

Before we welcome our witnesses, I would like to provide this trigger warning. We will be discussing experiences related to violence and assault. This may be triggering to viewers with similar experiences. If you find yourself distressed or you need help, please advise the clerk.

I now want to welcome our guests for our first panel. We have, from Interval House of Ottawa, Keri Lewis, the executive director—thanks for joining us, Keri—and from Luke's Place Support

and Resource Centre for Women and Children, Pamela Cross, the legal director.

Each of you will have five minutes for your opening remarks. When you start seeing me wave my hand, please start wrapping it up. That would be fantastic.

I'll now pass the floor over to Keri for five minutes.

Keri, please begin.

**Ms. Keri Lewis (Executive Director, Interval House of Ottawa):** Thank you.

Ending violence against women and gender-based violence requires communication and collaboration among governments, ministries, the justice system, businesses, social services, and survivors. It requires that every policy in government, and across sectors, is considered from an intersectional feminist lens. Every leader, every service provider, and every interaction where power exists must consider these questions: Who is being served? Who is being harmed? Who is being left behind by this policy?

When we begin to ask these questions, we see that the magnitude of the changes required to prevent and respond appropriately to violence against women is immense. While we strive to create the conditions to achieve systemic change that will prevent violence against women, it is important to narrow in on critical factors that can make an immediate and positive change to improve safety for survivors of violence. Basic quality-of-life barriers still exist to survivors, which prevent them from successfully exiting an abusive situation. Access to a living income and access to safe housing are the two barriers that we see on a day-to-day basis.

Today I will focus on housing. Interval House of Ottawa and all other violence against women shelters in Ottawa have been operating at maximum capacity for decades. Demand for safe shelter has increased, and people in our community have nowhere to go when they make the difficult decision to leave the abuse. The result is that when families are finally able to access space, we are seeing an intensity of abuse that is much greater than ever before.

On the surface, it may appear that more shelter beds are needed. I would argue that this is not the case, at least not if we choose to take a long-term approach. It is, instead, an issue of a lack of deeply affordable housing.

In January 2020, the City of Ottawa declared a housing and homelessness state of emergency. To date, the wait-list for subsidized housing has grown to 13,000 households, and it can take families up to 10 years to secure a home with the city. This crisis is having a devastating impact on women and families across Ottawa, especially those who are survivors of violence. Not only are shelter capacities being reached, but a lack of affordable housing is a significant barrier for survivors to leave abusive relationships.

What's more, a bottleneck effect is created in shelters, because women and their families struggle to leave the shelter while rent continues to rise to unaffordable margins. The impact is that families remain in shelter far beyond what is needed to support immediate safety concerns, and people experiencing violence in their homes cannot access safe shelter in a timely manner.

We also cannot ignore that COVID-19 has significantly exacerbated the issue of violence against women. Widespread lockdowns and stay-at-home orders, while necessary from a public health perspective, trap women and their families at home with their abusers. This creates difficult and debilitating conditions that can lead to dangerous situations with tragic outcomes.

Global data collected from the UN in 2021 shows that 45% of women reported that they or a woman they know has experienced a form of violence since the pandemic started. With the increasing intensity and frequency of violence against women during COVID-19, it has become its own pandemic, coined “the shadow pandemic”. Now, more than ever, women are feeling unsafe at home, with little to no option of escape due to barriers like a lack of shelter space and affordable housing.

It has been encouraging to see and experience support from all levels of government over the past couple of years to assist shelters like IHO to continue operating, and even expand services during the COVID pandemic. As life begins to return to a new normal, it is critical that we lay a foundation to support women who have faced the greatest impact from the pandemic and are experiencing violence at an accelerated rate. The first step to safety is having a safe place to move to. Without that, taking the next steps to rebuilding a life after violence is impossible.

All Canadians, but particularly survivors of violence, need access to safe and deeply affordable housing. Housing is a right that many are being denied. This is not an issue that can wait. Families cannot thrive without safe housing.

I call on this government, and all governments, to prioritize increasing the housing stock at an accelerated pace. With adequate investments and partnering with new providers, such as shelters like Interval House, we can provide healthier, safer futures for survivors of violence and their dependants.

• (1305)

**The Chair:** Thank you so much, Keri, for your opening statement.

I'm now going to pass the floor over to Pamela.

Pamela, you have five minutes.

**Ms. Pamela Cross (Legal Director, Luke's Place Support and Resource Centre for Women and Children):** Thank you. Good afternoon.

I'm very happy to be with you to speak on this important topic. I'm the legal director at Luke's Place in Durham Region, Ontario. We provide direct services to women who have left abusive relationships and are engaged with the family law process. We also work at the provincial and national levels conducting research, developing resources, providing training and engaging in systemic advocacy.

We welcome the work of the status of women committee to study intimate partner violence—or IPV as I'll call it—in Canada, which will, we hope, lead to ongoing government initiatives to both respond to that violence with appropriate services and develop strategies to reduce and, ultimately, end violence within families in this country.

I encourage you, if you haven't had time to do it already, to read the joint submission from Luke's Place and NAWL, the National Association of Women and the Law, to see all of our recommendations to the committee.

In my remarks this afternoon, I'll raise several key themes.

First, any measures to address and end the violence that happens within families must apply an intersectional and gendered analysis. While people of all genders can be victims or perpetrators of IPV, research clearly shows that those who identify as women are disproportionately affected, especially in situations of coercive control or homicide. When attempts to address IPV do not reflect this gendered reality, they're not helpful and, in some cases, they actually cause further harm.

Second, potential measures need to take into account the voices of survivors, as well as of advocates and community-based experts who have decades of subject matter experience and expertise.

Third, when new laws or policies are under consideration, time must be given for proper consultation with all those who will potentially be affected—victims, survivors, service providers, legal system actors and so on—so that as many perspectives as possible can be included. There also needs to be consideration of what we've come to call “unintended negative consequences”. Acting too quickly can result in a law or policy that leads to further harm for those it is intended to protect.

Fourth, when looking at ways to address and end IPV, there needs to be a commitment by all levels of government to work together. For example, increased cohesion and consistency in family laws and their enforcement across all jurisdictions would be of great assistance to survivors of IPV.

Fifth, as important as education for all those who respond to situations of IPV continues to be, it's now time to build accountability systems to ensure that what has been learned is being applied. Ways of ensuring that all members of the judiciary have education on IPV are critical if legal responses are to improve.

Sixth, increased access to justice for survivors is essential. This includes, but is not limited to, access to effective legal representation regardless of the survivor's ability to pay, expansion across the country of programs such as Ontario's family court support workers program, and a big rethink of criminal law responses, including present approaches to bail, mandatory charging and vigorous prosecution policies.

Finally, the introduction of Clare's Law, the use of electronic monitoring systems, and the criminalization of coercive control in cases of IPV, among many other ideas, are all interesting possible public policy directions, but they warrant a cautious approach. There are cons as well as pros to every one of these ideas. We need a cautious approach that is coupled with careful consideration and extensive consultation.

I encourage the committee to consider the recommendations contained in Women's Shelters Canada's "A Report to Guide the Implementation of a National Action Plan on Violence Against Women and Gender-Based Violence" for further and more detailed suggestions.

Thank you very much for your time this afternoon. I welcome any questions or comments you may have.

• (1310)

**The Chair:** Thank you so much, Pamela, for your opening statement.

We'll now be doing our first round of questions. We provide each member with six minutes for questions and answers.

We'll be starting off with Dominique Vien. You have six minutes.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Dominique Vien (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis, CPC):** Thank you, Madam Chair.

I'm always somewhat stunned when witnesses tell us how violence against women in particular is so pronounced and impactful. We have such a high level of awareness right now that it boggles my mind.

I want to thank both our witnesses for joining us once again to talk about what they're seeing and experiencing on the ground.

Ms. Lewis, you spoke about the barriers that keep women trapped and that prevent them from being able to stand on their own two feet and leave a toxic situation. In particular, you said how difficult it was for them to find decent and affordable housing.

Does your organization provide temporary housing or another solution right now to help these women?

When they're facing a crisis, they head to a shelter. However, are you able to take them in and house them in temporary housing, given the housing crisis in Ottawa?

• (1315)

[*English*]

**Ms. Keri Lewis:** Interval House of Ottawa is a crisis shelter. We provide crisis shelter for people experiencing violence. At the moment, we do not have alternative interim or second-stage housing available in our city. There is really nothing like that.

What is happening is that women are staying with us sometimes for up to a year. I've been in this field for about 20 years now, and when I first started, the average length of stay in a crisis shelter was eight to 10 weeks. That average has now increased to about four and a half months or five months. There are just no options beyond that. People must wait until they can obtain affordable housing in order to leave the shelter.

However, we as an organization are exploring the possibility of developing additional second-stage housing units in our city to provide that in-between phase when folks leave the emergency shelter and need somewhere to reside temporarily until permanent housing can become available.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Dominique Vien:** Thank you for that information, Ms. Lewis.

These women must sometimes live with you for up to a year. Do they often have children with them?

[*English*]

**Ms. Keri Lewis:** Yes.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Dominique Vien:** You said that the government must provide enough money to build social housing. We know that this can't be done overnight.

How much social housing should be built? How much money would you need quickly?

In this situation, what does the word "quickly" mean to you, Ms. Lewis?

[*English*]

**Ms. Keri Lewis:** Honestly speaking, "quickly" means five or 10 years ago. In terms of the number of women we turned away, between April 1, 2021, and December 31, 2021, we turned away 500 women and their families who were seeking emergency shelter with us.

The numbers are—

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Dominique Vien:** What happened to these women?

[*English*]

**Ms. Keri Lewis:** Many of them had to stay in their abusive situations until a space could be available. Some were placed in temporary places, like motels within the city of Ottawa. Some of them may have been lucky enough to find space in another shelter locally or outside of the city.

The options are very limited and none of them are ideal. The length of time that people are forced to stay in emergency shelters or temporary accommodations creates instability that is really difficult to recover from, especially for kids. If you can imagine, when children move from one area of the city to another to reside in a shelter, for example, they may have to change schools, and then if they are then transferred somewhere else after that, they might have to change schools again.

The lack of housing is creating instability for families on such a large scale that it makes it very difficult for families to move on from the trauma they've experienced.

**The Chair:** You have 10 seconds.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Dominique Vien:** Thank you, Ms. Lewis.

[*English*]

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

We'll now move over to Anita Vandenberg.

Anita, you have six minutes.

**Ms. Anita Vandenberg (Ottawa West—Nepean, Lib.):** Thank you very much.

It's good to see you again, Ms. Lewis. I know that in your previous role we worked together on making sure that we built a new women's shelter, Nelson House, in my riding.

That's actually the nature of my first question. We know that when women are fleeing intimate partner violence, they often do have children, as you mentioned, but some of them also have disabilities. With Nelson House, we were able to create modular housing that could be expanded to accommodate different numbers of members of the family, for different numbers of children, giving the mother a little bit of privacy but also accessibility for somebody in a wheelchair or with other physical accessibility needs.

Can you talk to me about the double challenge for people who might be fleeing a situation at home who have large families with multiple children, or for people who have disabilities?

• (1320)

**Ms. Keri Lewis:** Thank you for that question.

I'll start with accessibility. Shelters are grassroots movements. They started 30 to 40 years ago. Often it was groups of women who came together in communities and found houses that were older and affordable, and that often were not chosen with accessibility in mind. They were chosen with cost and sustainability in mind. Many

shelters are still in those older homes or just in the process of trying to upgrade. Trying to build shelters or convert shelters to make them more accessible is tricky.

I think we've been in a process for a number of years where we've been trying to build purpose-built shelters that meet those accessibility needs. In terms of accessibility, I think we have a long way to go as a sector to be able to create full accessibility for everyone who needs our services. That does mean that it makes it harder for folks who have those accessibility needs.

In terms of larger families, it's a similar story. All the shelters are not necessarily purpose-built. It does make it harder for larger families with five or six kids to find a place that can accommodate them all. It's not easy for moms to be in a space, often one bedroom or sometimes two, with five, six, seven or eight children. It's certainly a challenge.

It makes it all the more important for us to find ways to make that pathway to safe, affordable and permanent housing easier and faster for the folks we serve.

**Ms. Anita Vandenberg:** I'd like to go back to something you said that I personally found very shocking, especially given that you're talking about Ottawa, my city—that 500 women were turned away. That isn't acceptable. I think we all want to see very quick action to make sure this changes.

Obviously, you talked about housing, and you talked about things that might be a little bit longer-term in terms of being able to construct. What do you see that we could do in the short term? What are immediate things that could be done? You said something about second-stage housing. Could our rapid housing initiative, for instance, be able to help in this regard?

**Ms. Keri Lewis:** If we're looking for a solution this week or next week, I think the only viable solution, really, is more funding for temporary spaces—hotel rooms, motel rooms, and converting motels, not into long-term housing but at least in a way in which emergency services could be supported. If we're talking medium term, there is funding available through CMHC for organizations like Interval House and other shelters, but it takes a long time to build a new building.

In terms of what supports could be put in place, it would be to make those funding pots a little bit more accessible for smaller and medium-sized organizations like Interval House. We're small potatoes. We're not a huge housing developer. Sometimes the structure of funding programs is meant for larger developers. A small organization takes on a lot of risk to access those pots of money. For organizations like ours to be able to respond to the problem and be part of a solution and to take on these projects where we can build second-stage housing or additional shelter spaces, it would just be to create processes that are not as risky for us.

**Ms. Anita Vandenberg:** That is very helpful.

Ms. Cross, do you have any advice in terms of short-term, medium-term and long-term priorities?

**Ms. Pamela Cross:** We're looking at the legal side of things, and that's the perspective I bring to this conversation. We certainly have some short-term possible wins. The recent changes to the Divorce Act were followed in Ontario by changes to the Children's Law Reform Act. It would be great to see similar changes made across the country so that courts would have a standardized approach to how they are considering parenting arrangements when the family has had a history of violence.

We need to start a discussion soon about what we're going to do about coercively controlling behaviour. I see that as something for both the short and medium term. We can start the conversation right away, but I hope it is enough of a conversation that any outcome of it would be in the medium term rather than the long term.

In the longer term, on the law side, I would really like to see us look at a completely different way of addressing intimate partner abuse. The present criminal and family systems really perpetuate systems that keep that violence happening.

I have lots more to say about it, but the chair is telling me it's time to stop, so maybe I can get another question about that.

• (1325)

**The Chair:** Absolutely. Thank you so much, Pam.

I'm now going to move it over to Andréanne.

Andréanne, you have six minutes .

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Andréanne Larouche (Shefford, BQ):** Thank you, Madam Chair.

I want to thank our two witnesses from the first panel for joining us today.

Ms. Lewis and Ms. Cross, your presentations will help us reflect on the issue of intimate partner violence.

Ms. Cross, according to your organization's website, coercive control is a key issue to consider when it comes to domestic violence. Many women describe non-physical violence in intimate relationships as worse than physical violence because people have trouble understanding how serious it is. The article also notes that Canada may follow the lead of some countries and criminalize coercive behaviour.

Do you think that Canada should criminalize coercive control?

Can you tell us about the experience of other countries that have enacted legislation on this issue?

[*English*]

**Ms. Pamela Cross:** Our position at Luke's Place is that we need to do a lot more work before we know whether criminalizing coercive control is the right way to go.

Your first comments are really important. Coercive control is a hidden kind of abuse within families. It often doesn't include any physical violence at all. Understandably, when the typical person who doesn't work in this area thinks about domestic violence or intimate partner violence, they think about the slap, the kick, the hit, the push down the stairs. Often coercive control disappears. People

think of it as the back-and-forth, the natural arguments that people in a relationship have with one another, and coercive control is anything but that.

Keri will have seen lots of this at her shelter and I'm sure would have stories similar to the ones I'm going to share with you.

In a relationship of coercive control, the woman loses her sense of self, her sense of agency. She has very little autonomy, because the abuser has created an atmosphere of such fear that she knows she needs to do what he expects of her or there will be dire consequences. Often the children are brought into that coercive control as weapons, unwittingly, of course. They have no idea about the role they're playing, but the abuser may threaten the woman: "I'll take the kids if you leave me" or "I'll do this to the children if you don't do what I want." There are threats to harm pets, financial control and social isolation. The list is long, and I'm sure many of you are familiar with it.

The issue of what we do about coercive control is very challenging. Women have said—and I've had clients who have said to me—"Why isn't there a law against that? I call the police and they say there is nothing they can do because he didn't hit me. He didn't kidnap me. He didn't confine me to the home." They have a very strong point. On the other hand, to criminalize coercive control means that women potentially could find themselves in situations—women who are victims—of being improperly charged with that because of manipulation by the abusive spouse.

The mandatory charging policies in this country have led to just those kinds of outcomes. Policies that were intended to protect women have ended up being used against them, so when we think about coercive control, we say let's have a national discussion about this. Let's talk to survivors, victims, frontline workers, police officers, Crown attorneys, family law lawyers, judges, and Children's Aid Society representatives. Let's have a full conversation so that we can hear many perspectives before we jump to thinking that a particular outcome is the right one.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Andréanne Larouche:** Ms. Cross, I understand what you're saying. You spoke not only about the importance of criminalizing these acts, but you also pointed out that other measures could be considered.

For example, the justice minister in Quebec City this morning made an announcement about the specialized court for sexual and spousal abuse, which would help provide more support for victims. You also referred to electronic monitoring. As we know, the electronic bracelet is being discussed. It's part of the Quebec report entitled "Rebuilding trust." All parties looked at the issue for this non-partisan report.

You referred to cautious approaches. Can you share the pros and cons of electronic monitoring?

Can you also talk about the specialized court and the importance of Ottawa following Quebec's lead in this area?

• (1330)

[English]

**Ms. Pamela Cross:** Electronic monitoring is really interesting. It certainly offers some obvious benefits. We don't want jails filled to the brim with people who haven't yet been found guilty, and that bail period is often when women are at the greatest risk of a sudden escalation in violence by a former partner.

On the other hand, electronic monitoring isn't going to work everywhere in this country until we have a proper telephone system, a proper Internet system. I work in communities in northern Ontario where an electronic bracelet on the abuser would be of absolutely no protection to the woman, because there isn't the technological infrastructure in place to let it work. These things that offer some hope are part of what needs to be a mosaic response. We really need to look at the whole country.

Too often I think we look at urban areas and areas in the south of the country, and we don't look adequately at whether those particular measures would work in remote and rural parts of Canada.

[Translation]

**Ms. Andr anne Larouche:** Thank you, Ms. Cross.

My colleague will be speaking in the next round, Madam Chair.

[English]

**The Chair:** Wonderful. Thank you so much.

We're now going to pass it over to Leah.

Leah, you have six minutes.

**Ms. Leah Gazan (Winnipeg Centre, NDP):** Thank you to both witnesses for being here today.

My first questions are for Keri Lewis.

You spoke about the importance of housing. I would agree with you. I think we've seen some investment in housing that is grossly inadequate, certainly in places like my riding of Winnipeg Centre, where we've gone through decades of no funding and are experiencing a very serious housing crisis. One of the other areas where there have been huge gaps is not just in housing but in access to low-barrier housing where women and diverse-gendered people can go, where they're at. We still lack those kinds of shelters and even temporary housing in our city.

Can you speak to the importance of having low-barrier shelters and low-barrier housing?

**Ms. Keri Lewis:** Yes, thank you.

I think it's important, when we approach housing policy, that we consider the housing needs of all, so it's not a one-size-fits-all solution. We definitely see a need for low-barrier, supportive housing. We see the need in our cities. I can speak mostly to Ottawa. There are some folks who come to a shelter and they really just need the temporary protection of being in a shelter where there's 24-hour support and security, and then they're ready to move into independent housing.

We also see other families who come to us, and their needs are so complex and so challenging. There may be mental health concerns, substance use, or just really complex legal situations and safety concerns that require years of support. It's important when we think about the types of housing we're building that we consider the needs of all.

**Ms. Leah Gazan:** The other thing you mentioned was the correlation between poverty and violence in terms of being able to leave violence.

In fact, I introduced a bill, Bill C-223, in response to this, in addition to current and future government supports and services, including affordable housing with rent geared to income and other kinds of supports.

Do you think a guaranteed livable basic income, based on regional differences and not requiring citizenship, would be a game-changer for helping women and diverse-gendered individuals to leave violence or have a choice to leave violence?

**Ms. Keri Lewis:** Absolutely. There are many barriers, but as I mentioned in my first comments, lack of deeply affordable housing and lack of a livable income are two of the main barriers that we see. Anyone can experience violence, but for folks who have access to resources and who have high-paying jobs, there are more options available to them and maybe an easier pathway to leaving abuse in some regard.

The folks we serve in shelter are varied, but the majority have low incomes, which reduces the choices they make. Anything we can do to provide people with a livable income and deeply affordable housing, truly affordable housing, will allow them an easier path to heal from the abuse they've experienced.

• (1335)

**Ms. Leah Gazan:** Building on what you're talking about, deeply affordable housing, I know there have been a lot of housing investments into so-called "affordable housing". I would argue that it is not affordable housing, which is one of the reasons I think it's important to push for housing with rent geared to income. That is "affordable", if it's geared to your income.

I'm sure you've seen some of the housing programs coming out. Do you think there is enough focus and funding happening right now to fund deeply affordable housing with the new housing strategies coming out, including the rapid housing strategy?

**Ms. Keri Lewis:** I haven't seen the results of the programs that are available right now. These things take time. I do know that some of the projects I am aware of that are labelled "affordable housing" are definitely not affordable for the people we are serving.



I do think that there's a lot of promise in the relatively new pot of funding that's been announced to support shelter spaces and second-stage housing. I think that's a really great idea. I think there are some ways to improve that pot of funding to allow, as I said earlier, services like Interval House of Ottawa and other shelters to become part of that solution. We have the experience. We know the barriers people are facing. We know the types of programs and services that people need that can be attached to housing.

I think there's been some good progress made, but when we're thinking about funding for rapid housing or for getting these projects done quickly, just think about who should be delivering those services and gear that funding to the right folks. Some of those folks are smaller organizations that can't manage the same level of risk that larger developers can.

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

We're now going to move it over to our second round: five minutes to the Conservatives and the Liberals, and two and a half minutes to the NDP and the Bloc.

We're going to start our first five minutes off with Michelle Ferreri.

Michelle, you have the floor.

**Ms. Michelle Ferreri (Peterborough—Kawartha, CPC):** Thank you so much, Chair.

Thank you to two phenomenal witnesses.

Every time I do this committee, I say that six minutes are definitely not enough to deeply dive into a lot of what we are talking about.

I'm going to start with you, Ms. Lewis. It's great work that you do. Thank you. What a heartbreaking stat you've shared, that 500 women were turned away. That made me sick, to be honest with you. I think that's one of the big things we have to look at in terms of policy. If we're telling people that, when they finally have the courage to ask for help or to flee, there's nowhere for them to go, what is the incentive to leave? I think that's a really big issue we need to investigate.

To your point, I really want to hone in on housing, because I think you're absolutely right; it's the baseline for how we help.

Ironically, I had a meeting this morning with some local builders in my riding about supply and demand, definitely not on the affordable housing end of things. They wouldn't be your clients per se, but they touched on a point I found extremely interesting in that, if they can open up supply and demand and get more housing up, they're opening up the opportunity for these more affordable units for your transitional homes, especially for women fleeing.

I'm curious to know what your thoughts are on that and if you would be supportive of a policy that would remove red tape from the federal level that leads down to the municipal level on speeding up planning applications so that we can get more houses built and focus on this so that we can open up supply and, in consequence, lower rent prices.

• (1340)

**Ms. Keri Lewis:** I think housing policies are a really important thing. In some cases, I think it is important to speed up planning processes.

I will just speak about Interval House of Ottawa. We are currently exploring the possibility of building a 10-unit second-stage housing development. To be competitive enough in the application process, we need to be far enough along in the actual pre-development phase to have boots on the ground or shovel in the ground and be ready to go. It's tricky because the municipal processes are complex and take months.

From a policy perspective, what would be helpful for agencies like ours would be some kind of priority or expedited pathway for social services that are trying to build that deeply affordable housing that is the true need in our community. I don't know that it would be helpful to have that on a broader scale for projects that are not for that deeply affordable housing, because they're definitely not meeting the need we're seeing in our community.

I'm not talking about just the clients we serve and shelter, but most people in the city of Ottawa, generally speaking. Even if you're middle-income and earning \$70,000, \$80,000 or \$90,000 a year, you cannot afford the rents in the city and most certainly cannot afford to buy a house.

I think we need to be prioritizing and creating smoother, quicker pathways solely for those deeply affordable housing projects and less so for the market rent or even what's deemed below-market rent, because those are not feasible options for most people in our community.

**Ms. Michelle Ferreri:** Yes. The average house price right now is \$868,000. I can't even fathom it if I were a young person. Yes, there's a lot to unpack there in terms of helping.

Really quickly, have you ever thought about a business model that would be open to your agency? I know the YWCA out in Vancouver actually has a business model where they're profiting. They've built it to try to help subsidize themselves, to be a little more self-sufficient.

Have you ever looked into a model like that, or would you be open to something like that?

**Ms. Keri Lewis:** Yes, I think it's like a mixed model of housing, where you have some market rent units, some below-market rent and some deeply affordable rent all in the same building. I think those are great models, but probably beyond the scale of what we could manage as a smaller organization. I think those models are really creative and can do a lot of good to create self-sustaining housing for a variety of folks.

**The Chair:** You have 30 seconds.

**Ms. Michelle Ferreri:** Okay. I'll be super quick.

Pamela, I just want to touch on the fact that I love your comment about the mosaic. It's critical.

You talked about the pros and the cons. I know it's a bigger conversation, so could you put into writing for the committee what doesn't work versus what does work? I always find it's easier to find a direction to go when we know what couldn't work.

Would you be interested in doing that?

**Ms. Pamela Cross:** I'd be happy to do that.

**Ms. Michelle Ferreri:** Thank you so much.

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

We're now going to move it over to Pam Damoff.

Pam, you have five minutes.

**Ms. Pam Damoff (Oakville North—Burlington, Lib.):** Thank you so much, Madam Chair.

It's absolutely wonderful to be here at the status of women committee today, especially when I saw who the witnesses were. Thank you to both of you for your work.

Pamela Cross, your reputation and the work you've done with people I know is very much appreciated.

You mentioned judicial education in your opening remarks, so I would like to talk about Keira's law. Even though her mother Jennifer had been subjected to domestic violence, which the courts acknowledged, as well as acknowledging that her ex-husband had lied to the court, the courts still allowed little Keira to spend time with him. As a result, a little four-year-old girl who had her life in front of her died in a murder-suicide.

In my area, there was the case of Darian Henderson-Bellman, which I know you're also familiar with. The man who killed her had breached conditions four times. The last time a judge released him to house arrest, he was caught with possession of a loaded firearm and drugs.

There is a private member's bill coming up, Bill C-233, which includes Keira's law and speaks to judicial education for domestic violence and coercive control. Could you speak a little bit about the importance of that and where the gaps are?

• (1345)

**Ms. Pamela Cross:** To be perfectly frank with you, the gaps are huge and they are everywhere.

We have an important constitutional principle in Canada about judicial autonomy and independence. I think that's part of the reason we haven't progressed in terms of judicial education when it comes to social policy issues such as intimate partner violence, sexual violence, and so on, but it's time to find a way to get around that barrier.

When we go to see the dentist, we don't expect them to not have up-to-the-minute training, education and access to information to perform a checkup on our mouth. It's the same thing when we go to the hospital. We expect the professionals we're turning to to know what they need to know to do the job, yet when it comes to cases that involve intimate partner violence, women who turn to family

court or criminal court are not getting that level of expertise. Sometimes they're not getting that level of expertise from their lawyer, because there is almost no education about intimate partner violence in law schools.

Therefore, yes, we need to educate judges, not to make them biased but to make them understand that this is a phenomenon that happens in a significant number of families in Canada. We need lawyers to have access to ongoing professional development opportunities that are mandatory, frankly. We need to include it in law school curriculum so it's something that anyone who says they're going to be a lawyer has at least a base level of education and awareness about.

Then, as I said in my comments, we need to take that a step further. I've done a lot of training and education, and I will be frank with you. I have no idea whether the people sitting in the room are listening to me, or making a grocery list, or thinking about what they're going to do when they get home or, nowadays, playing Wordle. There is no way for me to know whether anything I've said has sunk in. In addition to education and training, we have to build accountability systems so that when that individual goes back to their workplace, their regular performance reviews include an examination of whether they've been applying what they should have learned in the training session they were at.

Until every actor in both the criminal and family legal systems has a fulsome understanding of the reality of violence in families, the prevalence of it, the fact that it doesn't end at separation, the fact that there are many fathers like Keira's father who use the child, weaponize the child, to get back at their partner, we are going to continue to see shelters that are turning away 500 women and children a year and we are going to continue to see women and children being killed in this country.

It seems obvious, I think, probably to all of us in this meeting this afternoon, so let's go out of here and say we have to find a way to make sure that the professionals understand what they're talking about.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** That's almost perfect timing, because I have only 15 seconds left.

That bill will be coming to this committee, so I look forward to the debate and hopefully the support for it when it comes here.

Thank you very much, Chair.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much, Pam, for those really important questions.

Maxime, congratulations and welcome to our committee today. You have the floor for two and a half minutes.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Maxime Blanchette-Joncas (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ):** Thank you, Madam Chair.

I want to start by acknowledging my colleagues here today. It's a privilege to replace my colleague on the Standing Committee on the Status of Women. It's also a privilege to address the very sensitive and important issues being discussed today.

Ms. Cross, you spoke eloquently about the important concept of coercive control in domestic violence. I want to address the criminalization of coercive control, which we consider a very important tool. It should be combined with a range of tools, including training for justice officials and prevention efforts aimed at the general public.

Do you believe that these measures would help provide support and that we could possibly criminalize coercive control?

Could they also mitigate the potential negative impact of criminalization?

[English]

**Ms. Pamela Cross:** I'm going to answer your question in a slightly different way and say that without those additional elements, any criminalization of coercive control would not work. We still need to do a little more thinking to make sure we have everything in place before we move to thinking that criminalization is the way to go. Therefore, a sort of half-yes is my response to your question.

That has certainly been the experience in jurisdictions that have criminalized coercive control. In the places where a huge amount of money was dedicated to the kinds of programs, accountability and training that you've talked about, criminalization has worked better than in those jurisdictions where those measures were not in place and where funding wasn't available.

It's also the case that it has been the most successful in jurisdictions where there has been a high level of consultation with survivors and with those who work with survivors.

• (1350)

[Translation]

**Mr. Maxime Blanchette-Joncas:** Thank you, Ms. Cross.

Do you have any comments on Quebec's establishment of a specialized court for sexual and domestic abuse?

[English]

**Ms. Pamela Cross:** Something like that tribunal, again, is an important piece of this mosaic or quilt approach that we need to meaningfully address violence that happens within families. Specialization is critical. As the comments I made earlier indicate, the professionals who are generally in front of criminal courts and family courts are generalists. They don't know enough about this, so specialization is really important.

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

We're now going to pass it over to Leah.

Leah, you have two and a half minutes.

**Ms. Leah Gazan:** Thank you so much, and thank you to the witnesses today.

My question is for Pamela Cross.

I know that you chaired the justice and legal systems working group. One of the recommendations from the working group was “[i]mproved immigration pathways that protect vulnerable immigrants, especially women, from precarious living conditions, exploitation, and abuse” by ensuring status for all.

Something that I'm a big supporter of is immigration status for all, and prioritizing permanent residence for survivors of GBV in Canada. Can you expand on the impact of status for all in addressing gender-based violence?

**Ms. Pamela Cross:** When a woman comes to Canada and doesn't have stable status in the country, it places her in ongoing jeopardy. If she's in a relationship where her partner is abusing her, or even entering a relationship where she will be abused, she's in this holding pattern. Until her status here is determined or until she knows that she can stay, she has difficulty with things like employment. She may have difficulty with housing. If there are children, they are going to feel that they are not in a stable situation.

Whether she's coming here to flee an abusive relationship in her country of origin, or whether she's here and the abusive relationship is also here, stabilizing her legal status in Canada is important. It's sort of like housing, in the way that Keri talked about so eloquently earlier. Without some of these foundational pieces of stability, women are living in situations that expose them to more abuse and make it much more difficult for them to move past that trauma.

**Ms. Leah Gazan:** Building on that, we know that women are most often responsible for unpaid care work, meaning looking after children, parents, and family members, which is another important argument for a guaranteed livable basic income.

Do you think a guaranteed livable basic income, in addition to current and future programs and support, including housing with rent geared to income, would assist women to flee from violence?

**Ms. Pamela Cross:** Absolutely.

**The Chair:** With the permission of the committee, I am wondering if the chair can ask a few questions.

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Chair:** Thank you. We have a couple of minutes left, so rather than trying to go the entire round...

Thank you so much to both of you for being here today. It's really important that we have these discussions.

I would like to start with Pamela, if you don't mind.

One thing we talked about is intergenerational trauma. For me, it's about where we nip it in the bud, and I'll focus on youth. What are some of the things you have seen that may be great, whether it be education or programs, and that may help with trying to get away from having violence against women? What types of programs do you think are necessary for our youth when it comes to this type of behaviour?

**Ms. Pamela Cross:** I agree with you, absolutely. We need to nip this in the bud. We need to be raising children who, from very early in their lives, understand that conflict resolution doesn't have to mean that one person wins and another person loses. Happy relationships are where two people have a relatively equal balance of power.

I don't know why we're not talking about this from day care and up. It seems to be a forbidden topic, as though talking about it is going to make it happen. In fact, talking about is going to stop it from happening.

It's great to get kids into programming once the fact that their family has violence in it comes to the surface, but let's do this. Let's bring in the experts. Let's bring in counsellors from shelters, counsellors from sexual assault centres, and others, to talk with children as young as three and four about what a happy, healthy relationship looks like, and to give them the skills they need to engage in that kind of relationship themselves.

• (1355)

**The Chair:** Carrying on with that, Keri, I'd love to hear your comments as well. This will be my last question.

Keri, can you expand on your thoughts on that when it comes to education and trying to prevent this right from the very beginning?

**Ms. Keri Lewis:** I would agree with everything that Pamela said.

It goes back to this idea of how, in order to prevent violence and to respond to violence appropriately, we need all systems understanding the dynamics of violence and abuse. I think there has been some progress made in terms of the school curriculum. There are small sections on unhealthy relationships, but as Pamela said, that starts later on, in grades 7, 8, 9 and 10.

I think we could be having conversations with younger kids in preschools and giving them those skills to talk about their feelings: giving them the words they need to describe anger and what to do with that anger and what some of the options are, and teaching them about the concepts of power and privilege in relationships. These are all things that kids can understand. I have four kids myself, and we've been talking about these things since they were young. They get it. They're so smart. They should be here talking to you.

Kids are amazing. I think it is really important that we turn some of our attention to that prevention work and getting kids at younger ages to understand these issues and concepts.

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

Thanks to both of you for taking the time to answer my questions as well. On behalf of the status of women committee, I'd like to thank both of you for coming here and giving your testimony today. We wish you all the best.

If there is any additional information or documentation that you can send our way that would benefit us... Perhaps you may see a program that is really beneficial, and you'll say, "Hey, I think the people at the status of women committee need to see this." If you can send anything, that would be wonderful.

We're going to suspend the committee for a couple of minutes and get started once again at two o'clock with the second panel.

Once again, Keri and Pamela, thank you so much for being part of this important study.

• (1355)

(Pause)

• (1405)

**The Chair:** We are back with our second panel.

I would like to welcome our guests today on our second panel for our important study on intimate partner violence.

From the Moose Hide Campaign, we have David Stevenson, who is the chief executive officer, and Paul Lacerte, who is still trying to get on, who is co-founder and national ambassador. From WoodGreen Community Services, we have Yordanka Petrova, who is senior manager of the homeward bound program.

I would like to welcome you.

For the opening statements, you each get five minutes. When you see me start swirling my arm in the air, if you could start winding up, that would be wonderful.

I'm going to pass the floor over to David Stevenson.

David, you have five minutes for your opening statement.

**Mr. David Stevenson (Chief Executive Officer, Moose Hide Campaign):** Thank you. I'm not sure if Paul will join us, but if he does, you'll hear from him as well.

My name is David Stevenson. I'm calling in from the Lekwungen-speaking people's territory here on Vancouver Island. It's an honour to be here.

*Sekoh* to everybody and thanks for inviting us to say a few words. I'm the CEO of the Moose Hide Campaign, which is a campaign that started along the Highway of Tears in 2011. Paul, who will join us in a minute, and his daughter Raven were hunting along that highway. It's their traditional territory. Their ancestors have hunted there for thousands of years, and when they got a moose, as they have done every year, they were inspired to take the hide of that moose and tan it, and cut it up and offer it to friends and relatives in their community who would agree, if they wore the hide, to promise not to do violence against any women and children in their community, and to honour, respect and protect all women in their lives and in their networks.

This was, of course, prior to the real awareness of the MMIWG issues that Canada has been plagued with. It was before the #MeToo movement and really before the TRC and reconciliation got going.

I'd like to point out that this was a moment that Canada needs to stop and think about. Here is an indigenous father transitioning his knowledge and wisdom, and his traditions and his language, to his daughter, and that was the exact moment that the residential school systems were designed to disrupt and to eradicate, that moment of transition of culture from one generation to the next.

That moment is also a moment when we see the power of culture and the power of the use of our collective ability to come together in cultures and design cultures and keep cultures alive and create new cultures, and that's what the campaign is about. It's very much about a focus on using an indigenous medicine, as we like to say, for the benefit of all Canadians and specifically for a very deep and troubling social and spiritual illness that Canadians suffer from. That's the illness of the confusion that violence is somehow a way to achieve some kind of goal.

Men are brought up in a culture in Canada, and many places in the world, where it is not obvious that you do not physically harm women and children. As a matter of fact, many men are brought up to think that this is one of the tools in their tool belt of how to move forward in life and how to achieve whatever it is they're looking to achieve.

The Moose Hide Campaign started at that moment as a call to action for all Canadians to stand together and draw a line in the sand. There was a time in Canada when drinking and driving was kind of okay. It wasn't great but it was okay. We didn't worry about it too much and there was a big grey zone there, and if you got pulled over you might get sent home or something like that. Then Canada decided no, that's offside.

That's not something we're going to achieve through the current tools of government. There are no laws or policies that somebody is going to write that all of a sudden will end violence against women and children in this country. What there is is the moral leadership.

So we ask for that in our engagement with government and all Canadians. Those are not necessarily the tools of government, but it's the leadership of government to say that this is an issue that is a priority to us. It's an issue that we want to focus on and take a stand against, visibly. We believe this is an issue, like all burdensome psychological issues, that can't be left in the dark. We hope that this campaign shines a light into that darkness and that we create the social connectivity and the social expectation that we conduct ourselves and that men hold themselves and each other accountable for a standard of interaction that they would like to see with their own daughters and their own mothers and their own sisters and themselves.

It's the result of a lot of confusion and a lot of yet-to-be-developed expectations, so we were glad to hear folks talking about youth. We have our Moose Hide Campaign Day, which is a virtual celebration. It will be on May 12 this year. We invite each and every one of you, and all of your networks, to join that event. We have about 250,000 people signed up. Close to 200,000 of them are in the K-to-12 system and we invite them to come and watch the day. We have the Governor General saying some words and Murray Sinclair saying some words.

What we're trying to do is set this issue above other issues. It's not just another issue among issues. It's not just a good idea that we work together to end violence against women and children. Violence against women and children is completely preventable. There's an experience and a set of values that we need to walk and talk.

• (1410)

We hold this day as a day of ceremony. We invite men and boys to fast with us for the day, so we get beyond this "It's a good idea" and "Yes, I feel this is the right thing to do" to "Oh, I actually have to deepen my personal experience and my personal commitment to take a stand." We believe this is a muscle that has atrophied, if it ever existed, and it's a muscle we can collectively build together.

It's not everything. It's not going to solve all problems, but it's enough to say we collectively stand together on this issue. It's not simply a virtual signal, and it's not a badge of honour. It's a badge of our collective inability to provide a safe country for all Canadians.

That's the work of the campaign, and I'm happy to talk about any other aspects of it that you would be interested in.

Thank you.

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

We're now going to move to Yordanka, for five minutes.

**Mrs. Yordanka Petrova (Senior Manager, Homeward Bound Program, WoodGreen Community Services):** Thank you, Chair.

My name is Yordanka Petrova, and I am the senior manager of the WoodGreen Community Services homeward bound program.

Good afternoon, everyone, and thank you to the House of Commons Standing Committee on the Status of Women for this invitation to address your study.

WoodGreen Community Services is one of Toronto's largest social service agencies, serving 37,000 people each year, across 40 locations.

As a leader in social innovation, we appreciate the focus of your study. Intimate partner and domestic violence is a social problem with structural roots, such as gender inequality, fear of retribution and accepting the emotional, psychological and physical abuse by the partner due to normalization of male superiority by our society.

Pathways to gaining economic independence through advancing women's education are often complicated by issues such as lack of affordable housing, low child care availability and affordability, and the need to access loans in order to pay for a post-secondary education, which automatically leads to incurring debt.

Intimate partner and domestic violence experienced by women and girls is attributed to a wide range of financial and social structural barriers. Thus, efforts need to be coordinated and focused on bridging the gaps between the siloed systems.

The WoodGreen Community Services homeward bound program is a program model that eliminates barriers preventing women from leaving unsafe environments. It was launched in 2004, and it is the first of its kind in Canada. The homeward bound program provides homeless or inadequately housed single mothers, approximately 80% of whom have experienced violence, access to four years of transitional housing, child care, mental health and family counselling, post-secondary education, and sustainable employment with the help of our industry council.

Coming from a variety of backgrounds and experiences, the women we help are united in the hope for a better future. They work hard to pave their path to sustainable employment, permanent housing and a positive, violence-free future for themselves and their children.

Included in our materials is a reference to an external study that details the impact of the homeward bound program in numbers, one of which is social return on investment: for every dollar invested in homeward bound, approximately six dollars are created in social and economic value. Also, 94% of the program graduates are safely housed upon completion. The employment rate shifts from 6% on entry to 87% within five years after graduation.

WoodGreen shares this model through affiliate partnerships with Peterborough, Halton Region, and Brantford. We have also worked with the Ontario Federation of Indigenous Friendship Centres to share learning and adapt with indigenous cultural considerations. WoodGreen Community Services supports policy, partnership and initiatives that will strive to empower vulnerable women and address intimate partner and domestic violence in Canada.

Based on our extensive experience with traumatized women and children, we would like to put forward some recommendations: core and operating funding to support longer-term programs with wraparound supports, focused on addressing the systemic financial and social structural barriers experienced by women and girls fleeing domestic violence; financial support for longer-term affordable and independent housing opportunities available to women and girls fleeing domestic violence versus temporary solutions, often through the shelter system; procedural improvements in the family court system when going through divorce, child custody, access, child/spousal support, with stress on proper resourcing of more effective legal representation to avoid retraumatization and further abuse; as a preventative measure, more focus on the perpetrators versus those on the violence receiving end, and support for research, recommendations and evidence-based approaches regarding educational and intervention practices.

Thank you so much for your attention and for this opportunity to address you today.

• (1415)

**The Chair:** Thank you both for your opening statements.

We're going to start our first round of questions. Each party will receive six minutes.

We're going to start off with Michelle Ferreri. You have the floor.

**Ms. Michelle Ferreri:** Thank you so much.

Thank you to both of our witnesses today for being here. I really appreciate your time on a Friday. I think you need to send us those lovely little pins, so we can wear them in Parliament on May 12.

I want to quickly ask you, Yordanka, to clarify where in Peterborough you're helping. That's actually my riding.

**Mrs. Yordanka Petrova:** It's in partnership with Peterborough Housing Corporation.

**Ms. Michelle Ferreri:** Okay. Perfect.

**Mrs. Yordanka Petrova:** Yes. They have a building. I'm not familiar with the address in particular, but it's part of their housing fund.

**Ms. Michelle Ferreri:** Fantastic. Thanks for clarifying that. I'll come back to you in just a second.

I want to go to David, if I can.

I find what you're doing really interesting. You point out that it's not virtue signalling. One of my favourite quotes by Mr. Rogers is this: "anything that is mentionable can be more manageable." When we start to talk about it, education equals awareness equals change.

I'm curious, though, about what the next steps are. I like that you're starting this dialogue and this conversation. If you could clarify it again, what age group are you starting with? You declared it was particularly men and boys. Is that correct?

**Mr. David Stevenson:** Yes. There's definitely a focus on men and boys. We invite every Canadian from all along the gender continuum to participate in all aspects of the campaign, as well as all cultures. It is an indigenous-focused innovation for the benefit of all Canadians.

We have a team—well, two people—working on K to 12. We also have quite an active ground game right now in post-secondary institutions.

**Ms. Michelle Ferreri:** Fantastic.

**Mr. David Stevenson:** We see this as a systems change. We work with large institutions. As a matter of fact, Indigenous Services Canada has just seconded an individual to our team, who will then go across departments and agencies to try to bring the message out to folks to join.

On the day, we have some capacity building. It's a day when we'll have the event and some capacity building and live interactive workshops, so people can use it as a professional development opportunity.

**Ms. Michelle Ferreri:** Thank you for that.

I think what's interesting.... I'm curious to know how you integrate this, if you have people with lived experience. I like what you said at the beginning, that in some families it is the normal base. I like how you used the drinking and driving example. In some areas, especially more rural or cut-off areas in our country, perhaps it is the social norm. That's how you deal with it.

I'm curious where you're directing men. Sometimes, when we open up these conversations, they can open up a wound. They might say, "Wow, I'm actually one of these people contributing to this. I didn't realize how damaging my behaviour is. I was just doing what I was taught." Where are you directing them? What resources do you have to help them go on a journey to correct it and unlearn that behaviour?

• (1420)

**Mr. David Stevenson:** It's a great question.

I think you might have asked...or I'm going to answer a question that you may or may not have asked and then directly answer that one. We have a Wise Aunties Council, made up of women, most of whom have experienced some very significant.... They have a lot of depth, if you will, of experience in this field. They will guide and make sure we're staying....

We are very consciously saying that this is an issue where men need to show up and support, and not jump in front of a parade. We have to be very cautious to make sure we're supporting a larger conversation across Canada.

As for men's resources, what we do is specifically try to work with larger organizations if we can. We put our effort into that. We ask that organization, for instance the federal government, what supports they as an institution have in place, before we start this journey of asking them to raise this and show executive profile—

**Ms. Michelle Ferreri:** I'm so sorry. I hate cutting people off, but we're always in this rush.

**Mr. David Stevenson:** That's fine.

**Ms. Michelle Ferreri:** What I'm trying to get at is, what are the support systems? I love that you recognize that you need to have them in place before you open up the conversation.

What's working? What programs do you find are working when they get to this moment of "Wow, I need help"?

**Mr. David Stevenson:** Unfortunately, there are not a lot of them. There are very specific ones. There are ones like Warriors Against Violence in Vancouver and the Change of Seasons programs in Vancouver, which are often for adjudicated folks, but there is not a cadre of programs and services at the ready.

We find guys who will go, "Oh, this is something I need to think about more." There's a lot of capacity, I think, for people to just get to that first step. Once they're there, there are a lot of supports in communities. I find men will hold each other and support each other in these conversations.

**Ms. Michelle Ferreri:** Yes, navigating the system is often the hardest part. From where we sit at a federal level, your work is extremely important, because you have to get to that point. You don't

know what you don't know, and I think your campaign is critical to getting to that point.

I guess what I'm looking to hammer out from you, if I could, is the kind of program you think could be in place to help these men. What does that look like for you?

**Mr. David Stevenson:** Again, I'll go back to our work in indigenous communities. I don't do this through the campaign itself, but I used to work in this field, very specific programs that are designed for and root for indigenous men and boys. They seem to be very culturally based, locally based, rooted programs, services and initiatives to bring them back to their culture and bring them back to an inner sense of agency and purpose. That's really critical.

Then we found just straight-up counselling, just men being able to turn the dial a bit and go, "Wait a second, there are other behaviours I can do? These emotions can go in different directions?" Those kinds of basic understandings are really important.

I would say, going back to—

**The Chair:** Excuse me, sir. I'm going to have to cut you off, because the fact is that we do have to go to another round.

I want to welcome Mr. Lacerte to our panel. He is here with Moose Hide as well, and he's just been able to join us.

I don't know if you received your headset or not. Did you receive that, by any chance?

**Mr. Paul Lacerte (Co-Founder and National Ambassador, Moose Hide Campaign):** Yes, I received it, but I don't have a way to connect it to my system, unfortunately.

Will this sound work okay for you folks?

**The Chair:** We will do our best, and if there are any problems, I'll let you know. I just wanted to check in on that.

What we're going to do now is switch it over to Emmanuella Lambropoulos.

Emmanuella, you have six minutes.

**Ms. Emmanuella Lambropoulos (Saint-Laurent, Lib.):** Thank you, Madam Chair.

I'd like to thank all of our witnesses for being with us today to answer some of our questions on this really important topic.

I'm going to begin with Ms. Petrova.

You spoke a lot about the existing financial and social barriers that block women from escaping violence in their homes. You also mentioned a couple of recommendations that you want our government to really look into, and this is the perfect place to be able to do that, because we're after recommendations.

I'm going to give you an opportunity to elaborate a little bit more on the four you named, whether it's addressing the systemic financial barriers.... Could you be a little more specific as to how we can do that?

At the end, you mentioned focusing on the perpetrator rather than the victim, so you could go into a bit more detail on that as well.

• (1425)

**Mrs. Yordanka Petrova:** Sure. Thank you for the question.

Really, I'm here to present the homeward bound program as a really good example of a model that addresses both social and financial structural barriers. I think previous witnesses recognized that it's never a one-faceted problem when it comes to partner violence. Women and girls who flee those violent situations face multiple issues. If in the community there are no tools they can turn to and feel they can trust so that they can actually flee the violence and feel safe, they won't leave the relationship or the environment they're currently in.

In general, if you are a woman who is experiencing abuse and you would like to move on with your life, often it's not just emotional abuse. It's also economic and sometimes physical abuse. Women experience different types of abuse. If they're economically dependent, the first thing they need to consider when moving out of the relationship is finding affordable housing.

Previous witnesses talked about the difficulty of locating affordable housing nowadays. That's why in the program we try to tackle those issues. One of the recommendations, if I can explore and expand on it a little bit more, is core funding for those comprehensive model programs that address not just providing immediate shelter to flee the abusive and violent situation but also providing opportunities so that this person can actually tackle the barriers and improve their education, have more permanent housing for themselves, particularly when there are children involved, and have employment opportunities, not just survival jobs but opportunities that will provide them with economic self-sufficiency.

Really, that's the recommendation. It's to look holistically at the situation. These women usually face not just one barrier. It's not a one-silo type of problem.

**Ms. Emmanuella Lambropoulos:** I have another question. I'm not sure if you'll be able to answer it. If you can, let me know.

We heard on the previous panel that many women are often turned away when they do seek help. When they get to a shelter, there's not enough space available. This can be very dangerous for these women. They're already taking a huge risk in leaving. Depending on the situation, it could be a very dangerous one. It could be a matter of life or death. Oftentimes they're turned away with nowhere to go.

This also has a lot to do with coercive control. There are a lot of things that cannot necessarily be proven when things do happen. When it's not physical abuse and there are no bruises on the body, or there's no way of proving the abuse, oftentimes it's very difficult for a woman to actually go and seek help with the police or with anybody.

Do you have any thoughts on that? Do you have any recommendations on how we can make it so that women are empowered in a way where they're believed and they're actually given tools that don't work against them, in the end?

**Mrs. Yordanka Petrova:** Absolutely. It's a very difficult and complicated situation. On one side, they are fleeing a controlled environment. One problem is that shelters do not have sufficient space in terms of really giving a safe environment for all women who need it. That's one side. On the other, the setting in the shelter system is limited space, shared space, with almost controlled curfews and so on.

We're talking about women who have experienced a lot of trauma and who just need space to recover and regroup from those experiences. That's actually why many of them return to the relationship, because they do have shelter, but they don't have the economic supports. They don't have any sort of idea as to what they do next or where they go next or where they turn.

I'm not sure if there's really a very fast type of resolution. That's why there's the second recommendation. Longer-term, affordable, independent housing for those women and girls who experience domestic violence would be a first step as a resolution. Then it would be providing them with the necessary supports in place to either progress their education and complete post-secondary education or have linkages to the labour market or employers so that they can secure the employment to be financially independent.

• (1430)

**The Chair:** That's excellent. Thank you so much.

We're now going to turn it over to Maxime.

You have the floor for six minutes.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Maxime Blanchette-Joncas:** Thank you, Madam Chair.

I want to start by thanking the witnesses here this afternoon.

My first question is for Mr. Stevenson and Mr. Lacerte. Mr. Stevenson, thank you for your opening remarks.

According to the Quebec national institute of public health, "indigenous women face a higher risk of experiencing domestic violence and face more serious forms of violence than non-indigenous women." In addition, indigenous women are "over-represented as victims of homicide at the hands of a dating partner."

Mr. Stevenson and Mr. Lacerte, why is violence against indigenous women more common and more serious than violence against non-indigenous women?



[English]

**Mr. David Stevenson:** I'll offer it to you, Paul, if you'd like to say something.

**Mr. Paul Lacerte:** Greetings. My sincere apologies for arriving late due to technical barriers with my system here. There was no disrespect intended to the committee. My apologies, and thank you to the staff for their support.

I would say, first, as the father of four visibly indigenous women and as a first nations man who grew up right along the Highway of Tears—the Highway of Tears runs right through our Carrier First Nation's territory—the statement and the statistics that you cite are the lived experience of indigenous women in this country. For those of us with visibly indigenous women in our families, we know that those statistics apply not just to indigenous women who are vulnerable or who have high-risk lifestyles.

The question that you raise, the “why”, has some deep roots at an institutional level in this country. The presence of systemic racism and statutory racism has affected and specifically displaced indigenous women and disrupted the matriarchal systems that we had in place. That persists today in every system. As you know, for example, in the month of January, the percentage of incarcerated women in Canada who were indigenous exceeded 50% for the first time. So we have indicators showing that we are going in the wrong direction in terms of how incredibly marginalized, unsafe and unsupported indigenous women are in relation to other women, and certainly in relation to Canadians writ large.

These challenges that result in our women being murdered, being abducted and going missing are intergenerational. They are systemic. They are statutory and regulatory. One of my late recommendations here regarding systemic barriers inside our policing systems, including within the RCMP, is for indigenous women to be seen through a lens of respect and equality and not to be seen through this narrative that they are less than and/or often intoxicated and/or not to be trusted and not to be taken at their word, as the previous speaker mentioned.

Part of our theory of change in those broad contexts is simple. It's to increase ceremony in whatever way makes sense for those systems, and to call forward—

• (1435)

[Translation]

**Mr. Maxime Blanchette-Joncas:** Mr. Lacerte, I must interrupt you in order to ask more questions. Please feel free to submit briefs if you want to provide additional information.

Access to resources is a very important issue. The evidence shows a significant lack of resources to assist indigenous women across the country. This issue was exacerbated during the pandemic.

Can you talk about the barriers that indigenous women who are victims of intimate partner violence and domestic violence face when trying to access different types of assistance and support services?

[English]

**Mr. Paul Lacerte:** Yes, absolutely. I think the first is the nature of our communities. For indigenous women who are living in first nations, on-reserve communities, as you've heard, services are already stretched, and there is an incredible absence of most of the services that are available to folks in urban communities. Therefore, there is either an absolute absence or an extreme limit in terms of residential services and protective services for indigenous women living on reserve.

Leaving is a really challenging prospect for a lot of indigenous women who are in vulnerable positions in their home community because it means leaving their extended families. Extended family is a core value and something that is a very high priority for indigenous women. It means leaving their home and often leaving their kids, leaving access to elders and so on. Those are some unique challenges, yes.

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

We're now going to move over for the next six minutes to Leah Gazan.

Leah, you have six minutes.

**Ms. Leah Gazan:** Thank you so much, Chair.

My first question is for Paul Lacerte.

You spoke a little bit about the impact of colonial policies, in terms of the impact they've had on violence against women, girls and, I would say, gender-diverse individuals. Most notably, the Indian Act really usurped the traditional roles of women as matriarchs but also impacted the understanding of the traditional roles of men, who were to be the protectors of women, distorting that sacred role and responsibility. It is something that I think the Moose Hide Campaign is trying to champion, to get back.

I would also argue that, as you've mentioned, part of the issue when you're talking about indigenous women is the normalized violence and hypersexualization of indigenous women and girls, and a kind of romanticized understanding of indigenous women as portrayed through the media. Certainly Disney does so in its portrayal of Pocahontas and her wonderful romance with John Smith, not noting that she was a 13-year-old girl who was married off to an old, dirty guy.

One only has to think about October and Halloween—where we see things like costumes that are called “the sexy squaw”—to really understand how vile and deeply rooted that normalization of hypersexualization and violence is.

How is the Moose Hide Campaign helping to address that?

**Mr. Paul Lacerte:** That's an incredibly complex question.

I would point to two things. One is our effort in the decolonization and re-culturalization space as a lens through which we engage community and design strategy. One really good example of a practice that was displaced is the coming-of-age ceremony. Part of what we're supporting at a community level—and Mr. Stevenson may have spoken to this as part of our kindergarten to grade 12 process—are those early opportunities for intervention in the adolescent window, where young folks along the gender continuum, and male and female, are hardwired for reprogramming, and to understand the effects for themselves of early childhood trauma.

We're in an environment where unhealed early childhood trauma is really prevailing in our communities. Applying this cultural lens and a ceremonial lens, a good example for that very broad question is to support the practice of coming-of-age ceremonies. The code of conduct you have as a man and your accountability to the men in the community, that integrative community capacity building, is really accelerated when we bring those kinds of practices back into place.

There is no panacea in this space. This is about culture change, and it's about shifting our generational thinking so that the devastating effects of these attitudes and perceptions of indigenous women that have been accelerated by Hollywood but also by the prevailing attitudes inside Canadian institutions, the judiciary, the police system etc.—

• (1440)

**Ms. Leah Gazan:** Because we have limited time, I would just say that this kind of behaviour by men is even demonstrated within our institutions, including the House of Commons.

You talked about culture change. Would you say that the reclamation of culture, in terms of men's traditional roles and responsibilities, is helping shift the narrative around violence, particularly with young indigenous men?

I think about my community, where young indigenous men are holding circles and holding each other to account to say that they want to end misogyny. They want to take back their sacred role and responsibility.

Do you think that reclamation of culture is actually the best strategy to mitigate against the violence crisis?

**Mr. Paul Lacerte:** The answer is absolutely yes, and not just in indigenous communities. I think the reciprocity in the reconciliation space is allowing us to export simple practices, like men sitting in a circle with each other creating the safety to be able to talk through the healing and to support each other through peer support and peer accountability. Culture is absolutely paramount in indigenous communities, and I think it creates a level of encouragement in non-indigenous communities.

That's important for me because there's a spiritual component inside indigenous culture. The scourge of sexualized violence against children in this country and the unhealed trauma that adults are carrying as a result of having suffered sexualized violence causes spiritual trauma. So many people in our own communities have that as part of our story.

Culture helps, I think, with the healing we need so that our behaviour changes. The way culture supports and enables that is that there is a spiritual component. We have some spiritual healing to do if we're going to reach for our higher selves.

**The Chair:** Wonderful. Thank you so much.

We're now going to go into our second round.

Shelby Kramp-Neuman, you have the floor for five minutes.

**Mrs. Shelby Kramp-Neuman (Hastings—Lennox and Addington, CPC):** Thank you, Madam Chair.

Can everyone hear me okay?

**The Chair:** I hear you fine. If there are problems, we will let you know for sure.

**Mrs. Shelby Kramp-Neuman:** Fantastic.

First of all, thank you very much to all of you for coming forward and sharing some of your stories.

I'd like to initially address Mr. Stevenson. I would certainly applaud you. You made some comments with regard to moral leadership. I can't speak of that enough—

• (1445)

**The Chair:** Shelby, I have to interrupt you.

Could you move your microphone a little bit down? It is very muffled right now, so it may be too close.

Let's try that again.

**Mrs. Shelby Kramp-Neuman:** Okay. I'll just continue talking to Mr. Stevenson.

Mr. Stevenson, I was just applauding you for your comments. You spoke of the moral leadership—

**The Chair:** Shelby, I'm sorry about this. We're having a problem with translation. It may be something like the Internet service.

**The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Alexie Labelle):** Mrs. Kramp-Neuman, could you just pull away your microphone? It's flexible, so don't be afraid.

**Mrs. Shelby Kramp-Neuman:** To respect the witnesses' time, I'd be happy to pass my time to someone who has better service, whether it's Michelle or Dominique, if they wish.

**Ms. Michelle Ferreri:** I'm happy to take it, if need be.

**The Chair:** We'll just switch right over to Michelle.

Thank you very much, Shelby. I'm sorry about that.

Michelle, you have three minutes and 53 seconds left.

**Ms. Michelle Ferreri:** Thank you so much. I know my colleague would ask fantastic questions, so I'll try to channel my inner Shelby through these questions.

You guys have been wonderful. I'm learning lots, to be honest with you.

I'm going to turn it back over to Yordanka.

I'd love to hear you expand on the homeward bound program. I am a big ambassador of it here in my riding of Peterborough—Kawartha. I've seen the life changes it has made for women.

I'm wondering if you could speak about why you think it works and whether you'd love to see it as a national standard program offered from a federal level.

**Mrs. Yordanka Petrova:** Thank you so much for the fantastic opportunity.

I am always passionate to talk about the homeward bound program. I've been with the program since 2008. I've witnessed amazing transformations of women who have gone through the program. As I said, the majority of them came from the shelter system. Upon leaving the program, we have their graduation, which is a very formal event with a talk from valedictorians.

It's just giving me goosebumps. That's what keeps me motivated.

For the homeward bound program, we are fortunate at Wood-Green to have so many services in one place, with housing and employment supports, in addition to child care centres. The agency has six, and one is particularly for the homeward bound participants.

**Ms. Michelle Ferreri:** What I think is so great about it is the fact that it actually staggers it and has this ladder and time to educate the women so that they make a sustainable income and so they can afford rent or be a homeowner. It's not just for transition.

I don't know if you want to talk about that in terms of the education aspect.

**Mrs. Yordanka Petrova:** Exactly.

Both education and employment are really the goals of the program. We sponsor two-year college diplomas, so they gain their education with one of the community colleges in Toronto.

It's not just random programs; they are programs connected to the labour market. The strength of the program is in having those relationships with corporate partners. We have quite a few on our list. They secure internships and support for the employment.

We're not talking about survival jobs. We're talking about employment that leads to careers, and—

**Ms. Michelle Ferreri:** I just want to jump in because I think it's important to have it on the record.

You're saying that even in skilled trades, attracting those women and helping that gender disparity.... We have such a shortage in skilled trades. This program really checks all of those boxes.

I'm sorry, but I get so excited about it, too. Keep going.

**Mrs. Yordanka Petrova:** Thank you.

Absolutely. It's kind of like we work backwards. We explore the labour market opportunities. All of the programs we sponsor are consulted by our industry council partners, the employers that will be providing the internships and employment.

As I said, we work with mostly corporate partners, so there are lots of opportunities for them to grow. Based on a study—which will be attached to our notes that we'll be sending—8% of those

who are housed within five years can afford to buy a home, which I think is fantastic. I think it's incredible.

I didn't talk about this, but we also work closely with builders to provide affordable housing opportunities upon leaving the program. We've had two opportunities. There were 10 units three years ago, and we were able to secure 35 units within a huge building with mixed rental arrangements for exiting participants. The number of calls we were getting when we were—

• (1450)

**The Chair:** I do have to interrupt you. I'm so sorry. We're just getting tight on time and everybody has lots of questions for you.

I'm going to pass this over to Jenna Sudds.

Jenna, you have the floor for five minutes.

**Mrs. Jenna Sudds (Kanata—Carleton, Lib.):** Thank you.

Perhaps I'll give you an opportunity, Yordanka.

As you were speaking, I noted that you commented that for every dollar spent, there are six dollars in economic return. I know you cited some other data as well. Some of it flew by me quickly.

I'd love for you to explain that and some of these other metrics that measure the success.

**Mrs. Yordanka Petrova:** Thanks for providing this opportunity.

I'll just quickly give some numbers. Of the participants who enter the program, 46% come from the shelter system, and 94% are stably housed upon exit. I mentioned that 8% of them are homeowners.

Sixty-four per cent had either grade 12 or lower education, and 100% of them obtain post-secondary education, college education, upon exit. When they came to the program, 94% weren't employed, and 88% were employed upon leaving the program. Ninety per cent of them were on Ontario Works with an income of \$1,100 or \$600-something dollars. The average wage upon exit is \$43,000.

The benefits of the program are not just housing stability, increased education and better employment opportunities, but also the indirect benefits for their children. They experience observing their moms working hard towards their education. Being involved in mentorship programs and having positive role models.... There are multiple levels, not just the immediate.

It's a lengthy program; we recognize this. That's why it's so successful. It provides the time for women to regroup and work on any issues while gaining education and experience through internships and employment.

**Mrs. Jenna Sudds:** Did I miss the number of women you're helping annually?

**Mrs. Yordanka Petrova:** We have close to 100 units available for families, two- and three-bedroom units. Because it's ongoing, I can say that we've helped over 300 families and some 500 children through the course of our homeward bound program. Because it's a long-term program, it's not like they stay for a couple of months. We don't have high numbers, and that's what is often not so attractive in terms of support for the program.

**Mrs. Jenna Sudds:** There might not be large numbers, but it obviously has a big impact. It's greatly appreciated.

I have one more question, and I'd like to go back to David and Paul.

One of the items I've noted, and I don't think you've had a chance to elaborate on it yet, is around the Moose Hide learning journey for children and youth, the program geared for school-aged children. Can you enlighten us on what that program looks like and its benefits?

**Mr. David Stevenson:** I'm happy to do so. Thanks for the question.

You're right. We do have a learning journey program for youth. It's in different stages for different ages. From kindergarten to grade 12, there are about three or four levels, depending on what age you're at.

What we do is engage a lot of peer support as well as mentorship, and we also use famous TikTokers, etc., to get the message out about getting involved and taking a stand. We really encourage creativity in the space. We have art competitions and video competitions, and they're a very playful aspect of this, as well as an opportunity to engage in conversations.

We have online workshops. We actually go out to teachers and have these hour-long online workshops with various folks, which they can do in school, and then we lead that up to our Moose Hide Campaign Day.

On Moose Hide Campaign Day itself, there will be a specific youth plenary. Again, the Governor General is going to say a few words, and there are going to be some famous TikTokers involved. It's basically to encourage discussion about this, discussion about how to be respectful and kind in this space.

Of course, it depends on which age you're talking about. You talk quite differently with a high schooler than you do with early years. We have two indigenous first nations teachers who design and work with this. I wouldn't call it a "curriculum", because there's a specific thing about curriculum, but it's definitely a learning journey, and it's meant to ladder the youngsters along.

● (1455)

**The Chair:** That's awesome. Thank you so much.

We're now going to move it over to Andréanne for two and half minutes.

[Translation]

**Ms. Andréanne Larouche:** Thank you, Madam Chair.

I want to thank the second panel, Mr. Stevenson, Mr. Lacerte and Ms. Petrova, for their presentations.

My questions are for all three witnesses.

I want to delve a little deeper. Several witnesses who spoke to the committee as part of this study proposed ways to resolve some of the domestic violence issues, or at least to improve the situation. Suggestions included improving access to support resources, increasing funding for resources and doing more prevention. These are just some of the tools.

In Quebec, for example, a specialized court was established to address sexual and domestic abuse. This relates to the issue of raising public awareness.

Do you think that we should take action in this area?

There's also talk of introducing tracking bracelets for abusers.

What do you think about these legislative solutions that could go hand in hand with public awareness measures?

Could the federal government implement measures that are similar to the measures in Quebec, but that would apply to the whole country?

[English]

**Mrs. Yordanka Petrova:** Absolutely, education is extremely important with respect to starting with young children. We've found a very essential component that provides opportunities for the children of the women who are in the program for positive role modelling and education, through mentorship programs with students from the University of Toronto, and so on.

I'm absolutely in support of educational opportunities starting at a very young age for those children coming from families where they've witnessed or experienced domestic violence.

**The Chair:** Paul, you have 10 seconds.

**Mr. Paul Lacerte:** I would just say that women's services have been underfunded. We would never want to infringe on dedicated resources for women's services.

Investing in supports for men and healing, including investing in the Moose Hide Campaign, is absolutely critical if we're going to effect the generational change that we're trying to bring forward.

**The Chair:** Wonderful. Thank you so much.

For our final round of questions, we're going to pass the floor over to Leah Gazan.

Leah, you have two and a half minutes.

**Ms. Leah Gazan:** Thank you so much.

My final questions are for Yordanka Petrova.

Prior to starting a political career, I had the opportunity to teach for a long time in the faculty of education at the University of Winnipeg, in the education access program. One thing that was great about that program was that it was a holistic program. Students received mental health supports, scholarships, bursaries and tutoring if necessary. Many were non-sequential learners, and it allowed individuals who needed other supports to access education with the ability to be successful.

I often found that those students were better than my main campus students. That's now in the Hansard, but this is a true story. They were my best students. They produced the best work.

When we're looking at funding educational programs through federal transfers, would you say that we need to change things, not just to look at the academic parts about the student but the whole student?

• (1500)

**Mrs. Yordanka Petrova:** That's it exactly. I would agree with you that our participants are often complimented by faculty and different staff at colleges. They are very dedicated and extremely organized, because they've learned through their life experience to juggle multiple responsibilities.

When we talk about who is a good fit in terms of being supported with their education, we should be looking at their holistic situation and not just base it on financial need. We should also look at other resources that they might need and what they might be facing as a barrier. Support would be absolutely necessary.

**Ms. Leah Gazan:** I have 20 seconds.

At the foundation, would you say that housing and a livable income are critical pieces in that?

**Mrs. Yordanka Petrova:** It's livable income, sustainable wage, housing, access to affordable child care, and therapy and counselling—many of them are dealing with PTSD and trauma experiences—so it's a variety of things. It's a package of services that these women need. It's never a single-faceted issue.

**The Chair:** I would really like to thank all of you today.

Thank you so much to Paul, David and Yordanka. You guys have been great today, so thank you. On behalf of the committee, if there's any other documentation or anything you would like to send our way, please feel free to do so.

I'm going to remind everybody that on Tuesday, we'll have Simon Lapierre, Sakeenah Homes, Women's Centre for Social Justice, Ogjiita Pimatiswin Kinamatawin, and the YWCA of Peterborough Haliburton.

Everybody, thank you so much.

Today's meeting is adjourned.

---





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

---

### SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

---

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

---

### PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

---

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

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

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

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

---

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