



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

45th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

Standing Committee on the Status of Women

EVIDENCE

NUMBER 018

Wednesday, December 3, 2025

Chair: Marilyn Gladu



Standing Committee on the Status of Women

Wednesday, December 3, 2025

• (1630)

[*English*]

The Chair (Marilyn Gladu (Sarnia—Lambton—Bkejwanong, CPC)): I call this meeting to order.

Welcome to meeting number 18 of the House of Commons Standing Committee on the Status of Women.

Today's meeting is taking place in a hybrid format, pursuant to the Standing Orders. Members are attending in person in the room and remotely using the Zoom application.

I have a few comments for the benefit of our witnesses and members. Please wait until I recognize you by name before speaking. Since everybody is in the room, if you want to speak, raise your hand. I'll remind you that all comments should be addressed through the chair. Thank you for your co-operation.

Pursuant to Standing Order 108(2) and the motion adopted by the committee on Monday, September 15, 2025, the committee will resume its study of the anti-feminist ideology.

Before we welcome our witnesses, I would like to provide a trigger warning. We'll be discussing themes and experiences related to anti-feminist ideology. This may be triggering to viewers with similar experiences. If any participants feel distressed or need help, please advise the clerk. For all witnesses and all members of Parliament, it's important to recognize that these are difficult discussions, so let's try to be compassionate in our conversations.

Now I'd like to welcome our witnesses.

[*Translation*]

We welcome Marie-Eve Carignan, a full professor with the communications department at the Université de Sherbrooke and the co-holder of the UNESCO chair in the prevention of violent radicalization and extremism.

[*English*]

We also have Dr. Liza Lorenzetti, who is an associate professor in the faculty of social work at the University of Calgary.

[*Translation*]

We will begin with the opening remarks.

Ms. Carignan, you have the floor for five minutes.

Marie-Eve Carignan (Full Professor, UNESCO Chair in the Prevention of Violent Radicalization and Extremism, Université de Sherbrooke, as an individual): Thank you, Madam Chair.

I thank the members of the committee for inviting me today.

I would like to speak briefly about our work at the UNESCO chair in the prevention of violent radicalization and extremism in relation to antifeminism, talk about the role of the media and present some recommendations that I could suggest for the committee's work.

The UNESCO-PREV chair focuses on antifeminism, which is a counter-movement opposing the feminist movement and largely associated with the manosphere. The manosphere includes various antifeminist communities, such as men's rights activists, pickup artists, men going their own way and incels, to name but a few.

The chair is interested in these groups for several reasons. First, communities in the manosphere promote narratives that are sometimes very hateful and violent, and can lead to rape, suicide, murder, increased intolerance, a deterioration of togetherness and acts of terrorism.

Some of our research activities allow us to work specifically on the topic of antifeminism. In recent years, the chair has set up an online monitoring system. We have a dozen research assistants who work each week on monitoring different communities and the links between influencers and the various narratives that are spread with a view to preventing them, informing our partners, working on prevention and conducting applied action research on these issues.

We are also working to better understand the various international initiatives to prevent hate speech, including against LGBTQ+ communities, as there is a link between anti-LGBTQ+ rhetoric and antifeminist rhetoric.

The chair is also called upon to give many lectures and training sessions to associations, unions and organizations that share their concerns with us on various topics, including the rise of antifeminism. We try to equip them so that they can better deal with these phenomena.

My colleague David Morin told you last Monday that we had presented a study in which we suggested to respondents the statement that feminism is a strategy to allow women to control society. We observed particularly strong agreement among young anglophone men. These results are confirmed by several other studies. In addition, just this week, Sidaction published the results of a study conducted in France that shows that young men are highly influenced by the manosphere and the online discourse of influencers.

I'd like to highlight another element that emerged from that study. While we see that the number of respondents who agree with the statement is fairly stable, we note that the number of those who are hesitant is rising. In fact, the number of people who are hesitant about the statement that feminism is a strategy for control has risen from 6.7% to 11% among our respondents. These results are part of a general trend of mistrust toward official institutions and hesitation in the face of this misinformation narrative, which shows the need to prevent a potential shift toward misinformation among the public.

Digital social networks are particularly important for disseminating these narratives and giving visibility to influencers who argue for highly performative and extremist concepts of masculinity and promote regressive and sexist ideas. Digital social networks create communities that reinforce antifeminist beliefs and perceptions, that can share ideas and narratives, share ways of acting and thus reinforce their beliefs.

We know that young people are widely exposed to these influencers. NETendances reported that 60% of young people often follow at least one influencer online. The extreme ideas that used to be part of marginal communities are now being conveyed on mainstream platforms and are becoming part of a dominant trend.

Given these narratives, traditional media also have a truly important role to play, as they can shed light on these social problems and inform the public, society, policy-makers and parents about the problem.

However, they must do so in the right way, in particular by giving visibility to experts who are interested in the subject and by being very cautious in promoting influencers who want to gain visibility and credibility in traditional media, while avoiding highlighting narratives that risk becoming widely accepted and part of a dominant trend. They must also find the right words, as we are seeing a whole evolution in journalistic discourse on, for example, how to talk about family tragedies that we now refer to as femicides, since these are murders that target women because they are women.

So there is a lot to consider, which leads me to propose the following recommendations.

First, traditional media must be better funded so they can cover these issues more effectively, but journalists must also be trained so they can report on these issues more effectively.

Next, online hate speech must be regulated, young people must be protected from the negative effects of digital social networks, and prevention is needed, particularly through psychological inoculation and prebunking.

We can discuss it again, but these narratives need to be anticipated in advance so that we can better address them. The concept of gender equality should also be included, and teachers should be given the tools they need to help them manage this narrative.

Finally, I believe that it is really important to fund research to monitor online activity, as our team does, and analyze the narrative within these ecosystems.

Thank you very much.

• (1635)

The Chair: Thank you.

[English]

Now we will go to Dr. Lorenzetti.

You have the floor for five minutes.

Liza Lorenzetti (Associate Professor, Faculty of Social Work, University of Calgary, As an Individual): Thank you so much for inviting me.

I am a settler of Italian heritage born on the lands of the Kanien'kehá:ka—Mohawk—people. For 30 years, I have lived on the traditional territories of the Blackfoot and Treaty 7 nations, and I acknowledge the original caretakers of this land.

I am honoured to present on Anishinabe territory, whose kind man initiative, rooted in the seven grandfather teachings, is an inspiring example of men's violence prevention engagement and a blueprint that we can all learn from. The heart of my work is grounded in confronting the ongoing legacies of colonialism, patriarchy and racialized systems that shape the social issues we face today. I am here with the support of my community.

Anti-feminist ideology is not new. A defining moment of my life was as a McGill student on December 6, 1989, when 14 women were separated from men and murdered at École Polytechnique, Université de Montréal, because there was, as there still is, a societal permission to resent women, propel men's victimhood despite rising rates of domestic and sexual violence against women and girls, and a cult-like approval for male authoritarianism.

I was among those who reclaimed the campus, despite threats of harm. However, like many settlers, I was ignorant of the thousands of missing and murdered indigenous women and girls and two-spirit people, who receive no justice, no media attention and no acknowledgement that their lives matter. These experiences have marked my understanding of how misogyny and colonialism are weaponized.

Anti-feminism has always included racist, homophobic, transphobic and colonial ideologies and rigid theocratic interpretations of gender roles. Today, this is amplified to our youth through economic insecurity, the climate crisis, political polarization and the digital world, where misogyny generates enormous profits. Young people, particularly young men who feel disconnected, unrepresented or anxious about the future, are targeted.

As a university educator and mentor, I witness gen Z's anxiety and feelings of hopelessness through my students. Their depth is reflected in the words of my 17-year-old, who told me that young people turn to screens because the real world is terrifying. This fear is underscored in Galway and Field's Canadian study on youth and climate anxiety, where 73% viewed the future as "frightening" and nearly half agreed that "humanity is doomed".

With increasing youth unemployment, now at almost 15%, a recent Ipsos study shows that 80% of Canadian youth view home ownership as only for the rich. As older adults, we must ask ourselves what we are doing to create spaces of hope, compassion, equity, relational accountability and opportunity, particularly for marginalized youth.

Across 35 years of social work supporting women and children impacted by intimate partner violence, war, systemic racism and economic deprivation, I have seen first-hand that anti-feminist ideology is deeply woven into structures that withhold economic well-being, impose gender tropes, police gender diversity and sanction violence. Namely, the most pervasive and least-addressed form, as I've said, is against indigenous women and girls and two-spirit people. Lack of progress on the 231 calls for justice is impacting not only indigenous youth but also non-indigenous youth, and we have some recommendations on that.

My primary prevention research focuses on community-based, culturally resonant, peer-led groups that integrate well-being as a violence-prevention approach in programs with men, women and families. This intersectional research, co-led with ethnocultural communities, is rooted in community strengths.

In 2020, we launched the transforming masculinities international community of practice, now across 11 regions. It amplifies the need for holistic community-based solutions with cultural grounding; the benefits of youth engagement through nurturing fatherhood and role modelling; and the necessity to address systemic issues, not just individual behaviours.

The question of what's happening with gen Z men was explored last summer through a small-scale survey in Alberta, mostly with Alberta men, co-conducted with social work student Charles Panabaker, with some notable findings: 54% receive messages about gender primarily online, but less than 10% feel that influencers are their main resources; 80% report having positive role models, but only 25% have someone they can talk to about their struggles; only 42%—and this is important—support gender equality and only 46% believe in creating safe spaces for women; and 83% say that gender issues are too politicized.

• (1640)

These findings suggest a greater need for connection, belonging, representation and accountability, which can increase the vulnera-

bility to the digital misogyny, extremist narratives and anti-female ideology that are in the manosphere, which is amplified by influencers who, in fact, profit in the capitalist system from fear and polarization.

The Chair: Thank you.

I'm sorry to interrupt, but that's the end of your time.

The rest I'm sure you will be able to get in with questions. If not, if there's anything you want to send to the clerk, we'd be happy to hear from you.

We will start our first round of questions with Madame Vien for six minutes.

[*Translation*]

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

I'd like to thank our witnesses for making themselves available today.

Ms. Carignan, I think you speak French. Thank you for your very good presentation.

Ms. Lorenzetti, thank you as well for being here.

We're also looking for solutions. You have obviously offered various recommendations.

What specifically can the Government of Canada do to prevent masculinism or antifeminism?

Marie-Eve Carignan: I think the government can do many things. What I tried to highlight, first of all, is that action is needed with respect to digital social networks. I think there's a need to look at how online hate speech can be better regulated, since much of this narrative conveys hateful and, in some cases, violent ideas. There is a need to better regulate violent and hateful online discourse in all its forms.

Prevention is also needed. The government could undertake public communication campaigns and support research in order to better understand the types of messages and narratives that precede the emergence of hateful or violent narratives. Strategies such as inoculation and prebunking must therefore be developed to prevent this narrative.

Dominique Vien: You mentioned prebunking earlier. Can you explain what that is, in 30 seconds or less?

Marie-Eve Carignan: Okay.

Basically, it's about educating people so that they know what kind of misinformation or violent messages they may be exposed to, so that they're already on their guard when they see these messages. They will be less likely to believe them if they know that these messages could be shown to them and that they are problematic.

Dominique Vien: I'm a former journalist by training, in my real life.

If I remember correctly, you mentioned in your first recommendation that journalists should be better trained.

Is that correct?

Marie-Eve Carignan: The first step would be to fund the media, because I believe they have a role to play in this respect. They can discuss these issues in terms of social challenges.

It would also be a matter of finding ways to train the media and think about how to talk about it in the right way, without perhaps giving visibility to certain actors who want to have that media visibility and—

• (1645)

Dominique Vien: Okay.

Do you think that it was a good idea to invite people promoting that message to the show *Tout le monde en parle*?

Marie-Eve Carignan: That's a very good question. We've been asked that many times.

I think that the issue of alpha males and the manosphere should have been discussed. However, I believe that maybe a better balance should have been struck. There was also a lot of social pressure to invite a male researcher.

At the UNESCO chair, we looked at the number of followers of the influencer who was invited on *Tout le monde en parle*. We found that the number of his followers had increased considerably after he appeared on the show.

It's important to be very careful about the visibility given to these people, who will soften their discourse in traditional media, but who will have a much less controlled narrative on their platform.

Dominique Vien: Do you think the media should be funded to take on this responsibility? Aren't they capable of learning this for themselves?

Marie-Eve Carignan: Right now, I think they need funding to be able to further reflect on these problems and address some of them in greater depth. So that requires resources.

Dominique Vien: Ms. Carignan, we've been told that teachers were overwhelmed by events. I assume parents are also overwhelmed. These young people often tend to isolate themselves, so there's less control. It's also hard to communicate with our teens.

What advice or insights can you offer us on this?

Marie-Eve Carignan: Many teachers have contacted us at the chair to ask us to provide training on the subject. I visited a college last spring, and several teachers told me that men had made very harsh comments in their class. For example, one man told a female teacher that he didn't know why he was listening to her, because she

was just a woman. He said that he didn't know why he was listening to her. That's one example of a comment that was reported to me at the college.

There's clearly a problem, in that teachers don't know how to address these topics. This creates tensions between groups of men and women in the classroom. Indeed, I think that something must be done to work with teachers and parents, and try to support them, to see how they can identify these narratives or adherence to them among young people.

Dominique Vien: I dared to mention a national crisis, and Ms. Clermont-Dion told me that she somewhat agreed with me.

Are we just seeing the tip of the iceberg of what is happening right now?

Personally, I'm very alarmed by what I'm hearing in some narratives. I find it terrible.

Marie-Eve Carignan: We must be alarmed, that's for sure. We must be concerned about the situation, because we see that there have been terrorist attacks linked to these movements in the manosphere. These are concrete acts of violence. These narratives seem to be more influential than we think.

Regardless, in the training sessions and lectures I've given, I've been surprised by the number of teachers who told me that they were exposed to this rhetoric in their daily work. I think we should be very concerned by that.

Dominique Vien: Would you say that we're facing a national crisis, given the rise in violence against women?

Marie-Eve Carignan: I believe there's a high risk.

I'm an expert in risk and crisis communication, and in that field, the goal is to prevent crises. I think that, right now, there's an opportunity to prevent a more serious crisis. We really must prevent this crisis.

Dominique Vien: I don't want to run out of time. That's why I ask my questions quickly.

It seems to me that I read that there are women who support this kind of—

Marie-Eve Carignan: Absolutely.

Dominique Vien: That, too, is quite disturbing.

Marie-Eve Carignan: I currently have a student who's working on female leaders or female influencers who share these antifeminist narratives. They share all kinds of content that's sometimes also related to other violent ideologies. We're seeing that there are women who share these views.

Dominique Vien: Are there groups or circles of women who organize and support these narratives?

The Chair: You have 20 seconds left.

Marie-Eve Carignan: Yes, absolutely. There are communities of women who share this content and give each other visibility. It's the negative impact of digital social networks, because they can share it among themselves and give each other visibility.

At the chair, we see it in our studies on online monitoring. These networks create and share content. One influencer gives a lot of visibility to another, and this helps create ecosystems.

Dominique Vien: So there are women who really, truly, in real life, support these guys who use that type of narrative.

Marie-Eve Carignan: Absolutely. Take just an influencer like Andrew Tate, for example. He's followed by a lot of men, but also by women.

The Chair: Thank you.

Ms. Ménard, you have the floor for six minutes.

Marie-Gabrielle Ménard (Hochelaga—Rosemont-East, Lib.): Thank you, Madam Chair.

Thank you, Ms. Carignan and Ms. Lorenzetti, for being with us.

I want to dig a little deeper into this. The study before us stems from a motion I moved. This summer, I had a conversation with a high school teacher who confided in me with dismay that she had had more than one conversation with students in their first and second years of high school. These 13- and 14-year-old girls told her that they didn't see the point in continuing their education since they were going to be expected to raise their children. The teacher asked them why they felt that way and if it was an identity project. The girls replied in unison that it would be easier.

Are we starting to get the picture?

This committee has obviously discussed the impact that this antifeminist trend has had on young men. We've talked about LGBTQ+ groups, who are also suffering the consequences.

What effect is the rise of this movement having on young women, Ms. Carignan?

• (1650)

Marie-Eve Carignan: It can do several things.

In particular, there are studies that say it will trivialize violence against women. Women may be more likely to minimize the violence they experience, whether it be sexual violence, verbal abuse or hate speech.

There's also a step backwards. These networks promote a misunderstanding of feminism. Women will also think that feminism is a bad thing and that it contributes to the dysfunction of society, which leads to a misunderstanding of social issues.

Marie-Gabrielle Ménard: Ms. Lorenzetti, you mentioned that cyber-space is sometimes, rightly or wrongly, seen as a space outside real life, 3-D life.

Is it the government's role to continue to support community organizations that create real spaces where there's a possibility for counter-narratives or counter-experience to what's experienced online?

Liza Lorenzetti: Thank you very much, I'll respond in English because it will be a bit easier for me.

[English]

I believe we need to have protections online. The harms protection act, the bill that was brought forward, still needs to be finalized and put through. We need protections. We need policies.

At the same time, what alternatives are we providing for youth? Everyone is busy. Everyone is making money. Parents are up to here with it. At the same time, young people are spending more and more time online. I think it's nine hours in the teen group. You've read that, I'm sure, in the stats. What alternatives are we providing?

I think there should be leadership from the government to say there are opportunities here, that there's positivity out here, that there's community here and that there are things they can do, build and be part of outside of the online environment. It's not that we're going to take them off-line. That's not going to happen, but at the same time, what are the positive alternatives we're offering?

[Translation]

Marie-Gabrielle Ménard: Thank you very much.

Ms. Carignan, I'll raise a completely different topic. You also seem to be interested in the media.

When we see politicians with significant influence and a large platform openly insult female journalists, belittling and degrading them—we've seen politicians use the hashtag “men going their own way”—what impact does that have on our society?

Marie-Eve Carignan: All these types of narrative relayed in mainstream media normalize narratives that should not be normalized. Sometimes, it makes acceptable narratives that are not. This phenomenon is seen on various topics.

We work on various forms of extremism and have taken an interest in the narrative surrounding the great replacement. We have noticed that, by constantly talking about immigration in traditional media as if it were a strategy to replace white people, this narrative, which was previously marginal and considered a conspiracy theory, has now been normalized as a societal debate.

The same is true for antifeminist narrative. When people are allowed to openly insult women and female journalists in traditional media, it makes it much more acceptable, or at least creates the perception of social normalization.

Marie-Gabrielle Ménard: Ms. Lorenzetti, would you have anything to add in a few seconds?

[English]

Liza Lorenzetti: I think we see role models. We're the role models for compassionate leadership. We see authoritarian role models. We see strong men role models. If it can work for people who empower, and they gain more power, why can't it work for me? That's the question people are asking themselves.

Young people are seeing what's happening. We can talk all day long, but what are we modelling for young people? What are we giving them as alternatives? That's important to consider.

[*Translation*]

Marie-Gabrielle Ménard: Really? That's great.

We talked about digital social networks and oversight.

Ms. Carignan, are you thinking of a legislative framework or do you have something else in mind?

Marie-Eve Carignan: I think a legislative framework needs to be put in place. We really need to take action on hate speech and violent rhetoric online. We really need to regulate it, because it puts young women, young people in general, and the entire population at risk. I also believe that we need to reassess the responsibility of platforms.

After the COVID-19 pandemic and the storming of the Capitol, we saw platforms implement certain moderation measures that we felt were important, but which have since been completely abandoned. We're seeing platforms shirking their responsibility for hateful content and misinformation online.

I also believe that we need to develop global strategies on how to hold platforms more accountable for the content they publish.

• (1655)

Marie-Gabrielle Ménard: Have you seen any international champions?

Is there an interesting model that we should consider with respect to oversight?

Marie-Eve Carignan: The models in Australia and the United Kingdom are interesting. The European Union model can also be studied. We must also consider how some countries can work together or jointly to put pressure on the major platforms.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

Ms. Larouche, you have the floor for six minutes.

Andréanne Larouche (Shefford, BQ): Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

Witnesses, thank you very much for being with us today. Your testimonies confirm with numbers and facts just how significant the problem is.

Ms. Carignan, as a graduate in applied political studies from the Université de Sherbrooke—it's my alma mater—I'm very interested in your work. However, I find the situation extremely concerning.

I will ask questions that complement those that have already been asked.

First, your colleague Mr. Morin talked about the battle of the sexes.

On the show *Tout le monde en parle*, we saw influencers, but we also saw “trad wives”, which caused quite a stir.

In that moment, we saw a clear demonstration of the phenomenon, complementary to what you said, of women who support

these antifeminist, masculinist movements. And it was right to show that.

Can you tell us more about the alpha male movement?

Marie-Eve Carignan: In fact, the “trad wives” who appeared on *Tout le monde en parle*, for example, weren't really online influencers who had a very negative impact. They were instead conservative women.

I think the term is confusing. I know my colleague Nadine Vincent is currently working on defining the term. She wonders if we shouldn't call them “trad women” instead. There's a whole ideology behind those who are truly influencers and “trad wives”, because they convey more traditional values and the idea that feminism can be a problem.

I think the women invited to the show were mostly women who chose to stay at home, a choice as legitimate as working outside the home, and the same goes for men. The problem is when influencers with extremist views seek to break into public discourse to attract people to their platform. In my opinion, that's when it becomes more problematic, but that wasn't the case with these women.

Andréanne Larouche: We see that people are mixing everything up and using this to associate it with this movement. That's what came out of the comments.

As for traditional media, we saw the announcement for CBC/Radio-Canada in the last budget. However, traditional media is more than that. It also includes community and private media.

Given that we're not fighting hard enough to get money from the web giants of this world, who aren't paying pay their fair share, how important do you think media diversity is?

Marie-Eve Carignan: Media diversity is extremely important. Right now, there are communities that have almost no local information. When a crisis occurs in the community, and it has to react or protect itself, it needs local information. Often, when a community faces a crisis, the first information they receive is from the local radio station or the local newspaper.

We really need to fund all aspects of news media to make communities more resilient. It's extremely important.

Andréanne Larouche: In Sherbrooke, Cogeco and TVA stepped up to denounce the fact that they hadn't been given the funds to do their job properly. We see the importance of having media that do their job of properly explaining these phenomena by reporting facts, not misinformation.

You see a lot of that.

Is that right?

Marie-Eve Carignan: That's right. In fact, there are fewer and fewer resources in the media, especially community media, which sometimes have only one reporter.

What I mean is that they can't do investigative work, address substantive issues by finding the right experts, and explain the issues clearly to the public. The way issues are addressed and the choice of words is really important. To do this, it takes resources and funding for traditional media.

This is very concerning. Many people continue to get their information from social media platforms, which spread misinformation. How can we fight that when there are platforms that no longer convey information?

The Centre d'études sur les médias has released the results of the Digital News Report, which shows that a significant portion of Canadians continues to get their news from social media platforms, particularly Facebook and Instagram. Even though these platforms are no longer distributing news from the media, people continue to go there to get their news.

So, what do they have online? They have influencers, including antifeminist influencers who spread information. A part of the population confuses what's available as online content with professional information.

● (1700)

Andréanne Larouche: We also see cyber-violence on social media. In fact, Léa Clermont-Dion's documentary, entitled *Je vous salue salope* prompted the two documentarians—her and Guylaine Maroist—to come to the Hill two years ago to ask the federal government to intervene to regulate cyber-violence and what can be said online.

I know your colleague David Morin had worked on the former Bill C-63.

Why would it be important to have a law?

With respect to online hate, there has been recent talk of removing the religious exception from the Criminal Code so people can't get away with it. There's sometimes a link between religion and certain narratives on the return of the very traditional man.

Why are these two aspects important?

Marie-Eve Carignan: It's important because hate speech online can then lead to violent acts. Such speech infringes on other rights and freedoms enshrined in the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. Human rights and freedoms must therefore be protected.

To do so, this speech must be regulated, much like the media is, because it must not defame or infringe on other rights. Allowing content that infringes on human rights to remain online is very problematic. Online hate speech must be strictly regulated. There is also violent speech, which can lead to actions outside of social media. I believe we need to think about how to regulate that kind of content.

Misinformation is complex to regulate, since the truth can change our knowledge. However, there's no doubt that it's very easy to regulate hateful and violent content, content that targets young

people, particularly online cyber-pornography. There's content that is easier to regulate and that we should regulate without hesitation.

The Chair: Thank you.

[*English*]

Now we're going to the second round of questions.

We'll start with Ms. Roberts for five minutes.

Anna Roberts (King—Vaughan, CPC): Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

Thank you both for being here. This is an important study from which we can all learn.

I'm going to ask my first question of Dr. Lorenzetti.

Anti-feminist movements openly advocate for traditional gender roles and for keeping women in unpaid, undervalued caregiving roles and financial dependence. Given that 80.6% of Canadians cite food as their main financial pressure, 28% use savings and are going into debt and over 25% experience food insecurity, would you say that current economic realities are reinforcing women's dependence in ways these movements seek to exploit?

Liza Lorenzetti: The movements are definitely exploiting the anxiety, that's for sure—that feeling of “Where's my future?” and the idea I talked about earlier of humanity being doomed. They're asking, “What should I do?”

Talking with some of my young students is interesting, because for me, the tradwife movement is naturally looked upon as an anti-feminist movement. It's anti-feminist, hateful, etc. Some of the young women say to me, “Yes, but we're overwhelmed. We're exhausted. We're not sure where to put our energies. This gives us one option.” It's an option for women.

I think the economic crisis that's deeply impacting young people is part of the solution. It can't be separated from the solution, because the more options women have, the less they might be likely to engage in a relationship that's not going to give them a voice.

Anna Roberts: I want to make it clear. My late husband always said to me that beside every successful man, there's a woman. I remember that after losing five children, he brought me a book to the hospital. He said to me, “I want you to always read this to our children, male or female.” The book was *Love You Forever* by a very famous author who I'm sure everybody knows—Robert Munsch. That was a book I used to read to my children—both my son and my daughter—to educate them that, regardless of whether you're male or female, respect for both genders is critical. If you don't respect yourself, then you can't respect anyone else.

In past sessions, we've had women here who came from different cultures that have different beliefs, and they are dominated by men. From your experience in shelters and social work, how do economic pressures and gender norms intersect to make women more vulnerable to abuse?

• (1705)

Liza Lorenzetti: They absolutely do. The choices are limited. When women don't have access to economic well-being, choices are limited. For me, it's not about enforcing one way or another how women live their relationships—I also love that book—but about the constraints that women feel in having to make choices they're not comfortable with. I don't come here advocating for a certain way of life for women, girls and two-spirit people—or men. It's about opening spaces where there can be choices. As long as you have systemic violence and economic violence in the sense of deprivation, which I think is a form of violence as well, you're not going to have those choices.

We need to take into consideration how deepened that is for communities that are already marginalized—migrant communities, communities with people working two or three jobs or communities that are now being called outsiders or being cast aside. That's really important to think about when we think about roles for women.

Anna Roberts: In the last 30 seconds I have, I want to thank you for your comments. I was in a male-dominated profession previous to coming to Ottawa, and I have to tell you that I think my male colleagues in caucus are afraid of me. I don't know why, but they're very respectful, and I can feel comfortable around them. I think, from a mother's point of view, a lot of it is about the need to educate our male children—and our females—that everyone should be treated with respect.

The Chair: Very good.

Now we'll go to Mr. Chen for five minutes.

Shaun Chen (Scarborough North, Lib.): Thank you very much.

Thank you to both of the witnesses.

Dr. Lorenzetti, you said in your testimony that “misogyny generates enormous profits”. Could you elaborate on that and tell us more?

Liza Lorenzetti: I think there's a lot of research out there. That's not my area of research, but I have been online and seen the products that are being sold. Young men's insecurities are being weaponized in ways that make them willing to spend money. As a woman in her fifties, I've seen that. That has been a reality for women for a very long time.

How much money can you spend? There's the looksmaxxing movement. How are you going to get a date? How are you going to be somebody women want? There's an association among looksmaxxing, the sale of men's well-being through whatever it is—sometimes protein powders or a variety of other things men need to engage in, like fitness routines—and deprecating women. That's where the problem is. Fitness routines and well-being are not bad things. We all need those, but there's a connection between that and dominating. The domination is where the problem is.

That's why some men, especially young men, might go to these websites. They want self-improvement. They're looking for purpose or they want to get fit. Little by little, you see that they're in this so-called manosphere, where there are highly problematic ideologies associated with their well-being. In order to have well-being, they need to dominate, and this is where the problem is.

I'm able to provide some of that research, if you're interested, later on.

Shaun Chen: In terms of efforts to tackle anti-feminist ideology, whether they are community-based or federal, you spoke earlier about the impacts on migrant communities. Are these efforts enough to address the unique challenges and oppressions faced by BIPOC women or gender-diverse women?

Liza Lorenzetti: That's a really good question.

A lot of the work we're doing in the community is connecting and training peer role models and men leaders. We're working with seven or eight ethnocultural communities who are then working with their daughters, sons and community leaders on healthy and nurturing masculinities. All of those things are happening. They're also discussing their challenges as migrants and their challenges with systemic racism. They're getting together in their own languages and through their own cultural practices to find community and solidarity. At the same time, what are we doing at a systemic level to address that?

I've read the 231 calls for justice, and we have anti-racism strategies. We can't do this work in a silo. I've worked in women's work for a long time, and I've found it quite siloing. I've thought to myself that other strategies and plans need to get involved in what we're doing. As much as we are trying to expand this community-based, culturally resonant work with men, in particular around fatherhood and role modelling, at the same time, there need to be policies that give people hope, and they have to be based on equity, decolonization and anti-racism.

• (1710)

Shaun Chen: Speaking of decolonization and equity, I'll turn to Dr. Carignan.

Can you explain the risk of downplaying or undermining diversity, equity and inclusion initiatives? What impact does that have?

Marie-Eve Carignan: What do you mean? Do you mean if I...?

Shaun Chen: Based on your research on misinformation and on the societal impacts of misinformation, when EDI is undermined or downplayed, what happens next?

[*Translation*]

Marie-Eve Carignan: In our research on disinformation and misinformation, we see that many influencers play on feelings of insecurity and vulnerability factors, such as anxiety, isolation, marginalization and feelings of exclusion.

Many influencers, whether they are spreading antifeminist ideologies or other extreme ideologies or conspiracy theories, capitalize on feelings of insecurity and vulnerability among populations, whatever they may be, such as marginalization and exclusion. These people are more susceptible to such narratives because they're seeking meaning, social belonging and answers to their questions. Their insecurity is exploited to draw them into a narrative of mistrust toward public institutions, traditional media, science—

The Chair: Thank you.

Ms. Larouche, you have the floor for two and a half minutes.

Andréanne Larouche: Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

I will continue quickly. Time is flying by, and there's still so much to say.

Ms. Carignan, we've talked about the presence of influencers on *Tout le monde en parle*. However, what about Simon Coutu's documentary *Alphas*, which also caused quite a stir?

Has there been a noticeable trend in the number of followers of the influencers featured in that documentary?

Marie-Eve Carignan: It's the same thing, since the documentary highlighted influencers and showed links to their social media pages. Of course, that put the spotlight on those influencers. That's the whole problem.

We need to find the right balance in how we address these social issues. They're extremely important, and we need to address them. However, we must do that without giving a platform to people who want to promote such narratives to the general public and who want to make ideas that should not be normalized acceptable or commonplace.

I think that's where the line is sometimes very thin. The subject of the documentary *Alphas* was very relevant and it needed to be addressed, just like Ms. Clermont-Dion's documentaries, for example. However, there's a difference between a documentary highlighting experts and people who are affected, and a documentary highlighting influencers who are looking for an audience.

I believe that's where we need to reflect on the role of the media and journalistic practices. It is very clear when we compare these two styles of documentaries. Journalists are important, but we need to find the right way to deal with the subject.

I think it's a good example.

Andréanne Larouche: I, too, have been interested in the subject of this study for some time. I've also had similar thoughts.

We see links between what we're discussing and anti-LGBTQ+ rhetoric. For example, I visited a high school class and spoke with a teacher. She had wanted to talk about diversity issues with her students, and the community flag had been torn down when she returned from break. She told me that now, in school, you can no longer be open about being gay or lesbian, or about being part of the diversity community. We're seeing a return of young men trying to control women and saying that women may not continue their studies. I've seen the same things.

We're seeing white supremacist rhetoric, anti-LGBTQ+ rhetoric and anti-woman rhetoric. How does this radicalization of ideas ultimately contribute to the antifeminist movement?

• (1715)

Marie-Eve Carignan: We can see that all these influencers are echoing each other, so—

[English]

The Chair: I'm sorry, but that's your time, Madame Larouche.

Madame Carignan, if you want to respond and send your answer to the clerk, that would be fine.

We're going now to Ms. Cody for five minutes.

Connie Cody (Cambridge, CPC): Thank you for coming.

Everything goes really fast, so I'll start with questions.

Madame Carignan, you stated that there's a misunderstanding of feminism. In the absence of an official definition in Canada of “anti-feminism”, in your view, does this not contribute to the confusion and frustration that could lead to anger and violence?

Marie-Eve Carignan: Do you mean because there's no definition of “anti-feminism”?

Connie Cody: That's correct. The experts have not been able to agree on a definition. Since there's a lot of confusion around the definition, could that contribute to a lot of the confusion and frustration that lead to anger and violence?

[Translation]

Marie-Eve Carignan: Certainly, having a definition of phenomena can help to deal with them more effectively. This is the case with other phenomena, such as terrorism or radicalization, which are of interest to the UNESCO chair.

When discussing these issues in the political or media sphere, we must face a degree of complexity and difficulty, because there's no consensus on how to define them. This sometimes leads to debate about whether or not we're actually dealing with these phenomena.

Having a clear definition of antifeminism could help to better define the problem and deal with it more effectively. It's a complex issue.

[English]

Connie Cody: In our study, we are required to come up with some recommendations based on witness testimony. However, without datasets and definitions, how do we measure whether interventions reduce anti-feminist attitudes or create more resistance?

[Translation]

Marie-Eve Carignan: The UNESCO chair has set up a project called PREV-IMPACT Canada. I suggest you take a look at it. It has allowed us to show how indicators can be put in place upstream of prevention projects to see how effective they are when deployed.

Although these are prevention initiatives, which are more difficult to measure, there are all kinds of indicators that allow us to see their effect and demonstrate that prevention is effective and extremely important.

[*English*]

Connie Cody: I'll move on to a question for Dr. Lorenzetti.

From your perspective, how should fairness be applied when sex-based rights and gender identity rights conflict, particularly in relation to concerns about risk and women's safety in public spaces?

Liza Lorenzetti: That issue is in discussion right now. I'm from Alberta. Definitely, I've seen quite a bit. In fact, in my view, some harmful legislation has been put in place, which I find problematic.

The overarching thing I see here is the divisiveness in the politic—the divisiveness in the politic of win-lose instead of having a conversation that looks after everyone and addresses the harms that are being done. I think there are ways of doing that. What's happening is that the polarization we see in our political forums is the polarization we see, say, at a university. It's the same thing, and our young people are accepting that. They're on either one side or another, instead of looking after one another.

There are some wonderful approaches that can be found in community that centre on a holistic approach instead of a win-lose one. I think it's up to us as adults and leaders to help uncover approaches that are not win-lose and that don't leave marginalized communities in particular feeling like nobody cares about them.

Connie Cody: As violence towards women is increasing and there's a lot of fear and discomfort, we also have a lot of cultural expectations in our country. How should we ensure that women raising these safety concerns in their private or public spaces are not being mis-characterized or dismissed and that their concerns are actually heard?

Liza Lorenzetti: I'm a woman who's concerned about safety as well. I think many of us are. At the same time, if we're talking specifically about trans communities, two-spirit communities and gender nonconforming, there is much more violence against those communities than even women are going through. As to the extent of violence against members of those communities, especially youth, it's quite high. I think that—

Connie Cody: I want to redirect us to women's safety in public spaces, because that's where the concerns are being heard.

I get a lot of letters from those in my community. They're very concerned about universal change rooms and the lack of requirements as to who can enter. Situations have been brought to my attention.

When it comes to the conflict between sex-based rights and gender identity rights, which will prevail in that situation?

Liza Lorenzetti: I'm not going to give a win-lose answer. What I will say is that it's not members of the trans community who are creating the lack of safety for women. If we look at the data, it's not those communities that are perpetuating violence. That needs to be quite clear.

• (1720)

The Chair: Thank you.

Now we're going to Ms. Nathan for five minutes.

Juanita Nathan (Pickering—Brooklin, Lib.): Thank you, Chair.

Thank you to you both for being here and answering our questions.

My question is for Ms. Carignan.

From a communications perspective, what responsibility should political leaders bear in preventing the spread of narratives that undermine women's rights? Can you talk a bit about political leaders, maybe more so in terms of hate speech and defending it as freedom of speech?

[*Translation*]

Marie-Eve Carignan: Thank you for the question.

Ms. Ménard said earlier that politicians sometimes make somewhat crude comments about women. I believe that one of the roles of politicians is to set an example. Indeed, if we adopt or trivialize violent or hateful speech toward gender minorities, women or ethnic groups, we also trivialize a societal issue. Politicians must use respectful language and must not trivialize violence and aggression.

Politicians must also denounce hateful and violent content because, obviously, they themselves are exposed to it. Several of my colleagues have worked on cyber-bullying against elected officials, an extremely worrying phenomenon. We can see that this type of harassment is also gendered. We must denounce the fact that there is highly gendered content directed at politicians on social media.

This content is also directed at scientists. Unfortunately, I receive comments that are very different from those received by my male colleagues. We must therefore denounce this to make society aware that institutions do not accept this kind of discourse.

[*English*]

Juanita Nathan: It should be allowed. Okay.

We have political leaders going around speaking with young people. In their speeches, there's more of an anti-DEI type of narrative.

Can you talk a bit about how that would shape a young person's beliefs and, going forward, how this may affect society? We see it a lot in the U.S., and we are getting to see it here more now as well.

[*Translation*]

Marie-Eve Carignan: The narratives adopted by politicians become examples to follow, particularly on social media. In our studies and online monitoring, we see that unapologetic speeches that marginalize certain communities and are adopted by political figures, whether Canadian or from another country, are then taken up by leaders who endorse them. They use political arguments to show that they're right and to spread even more hate speech.

These narratives are really being repeated online. It's very clear in our ecosystem that what is happening in other countries is being replicated here and used as an argument to justify violent and hateful content, and disinformation online.

We really need to be concerned about what's being done elsewhere that has an impact on us.

[*English*]

Juanita Nathan: I want to speak a bit about criminalizing hate speech. Bill C-9 is going through Parliament right now. It's needed, and that's why the bill is there, but can you talk about it in the context of youth and how they may be negatively affected by this? They are being shaped by listening to all this on social platforms, and I think they are going to be negatively affected, but I want to hear your opinion on that.

[*Translation*]

Marie-Eve Carignan: Earlier, I mentioned a study conducted by Sidaction in France in November. This study shows that young people under the age of 18 are widely exposed to online influencers who adopt antifeminist views. They follow many of them, and they're very clearly affected by these narratives.

Our data also shows that young people are heavy users of digital social networks. In addition, several studies in Canada show that young people follow online influencers and that influencers target young people.

There are therefore communities of influencers that target young people and subject them to cyber-bullying. They can lead them to commit violent crimes, commit violent acts against animals, self-harm or, sometimes, commit suicide. There are movements targeting young people online. One example is the 764 network, which really targets young people. If we don't take action against hateful and violent content online, we're putting our youth at risk. We're seeing an increase in the activities of these groups. There have been arrests recently, particularly in Halifax.

There's definitely content that targets young people. That's why violent and hateful content online is a concern for society as a whole, but especially for young people, who are vulnerable and don't always have the critical thinking skills or resources to know how to respond to threats. These groups have a very good understanding of how to threaten, intimidate and scare young people into taking action and committing acts of violence against themselves or their loved ones.

• (1725)

[*English*]

The Chair: Thank you so much.

That concludes our first panel. I want to thank our witnesses for your contributions today. I understand that one of you is testifying at another committee in about five minutes.

I'm going to suspend while we get our second panel ready.

• (1725)

(Pause)

• (1725)

The Chair: We're back for our second panel.

Could I get everyone to come back to the table? Thank you so much.

Let's get to our witnesses for the second panel.

We have Dr. Michael Kehler, research chair for masculinities studies in education at the Werklund School of Education of the University of Calgary. Welcome to you, sir.

From the Be the Peace Institute, we also have Sue Bookchin, executive director, by video conference.

This is a reminder to address your remarks through the chair and wait until I call you by name.

Each of you will have five minutes for your opening remarks. I will be ever so helpful. When you have one minute left, you get the yellow card. When you have 30 seconds left, you get the red card, and then I will ever so gently say, "That's your time".

We'll start with you, Dr. Kehler, for five minutes.

Michael Kehler (Research Chair, Masculinities Studies in Education, Werklund School of Education, University of Calgary, As an Individual): Thank you to the committee for this invitation to provide testimony and respond to anti-feminist ideology.

I'm honoured to speak with you about a topic that has deeply impacted my life and motivated my research, namely the intersection of masculinities and anti-feminist ideology. I speak to you today as a masculinities scholar whose research has spanned 25 years. At the same time, I speak to you as a father, a son and a brother who has experienced first-hand the devastating effect of gender pressures that impact boys and men in our gendered relationships.

My dad died when I was six years old. My mother raised four boys. When I was 18, my older brother was in second year at Queen's University in commerce. He took his life at age 20. My dad took his life too. I've witnessed masculinity and the damaging impact that narrow, restrictive versions of masculinity can have and are having at this critical point as we consider anti-feminist ideology.

My research centres on masculinities, on power and on the gendered interaction of youth, teachers and the curriculum we teach, both in schools and in our faculties of education. In short, my research focuses on boys, men and issues that include but are not limited to homophobia, gender-based violence, allyship, mental health, teacher education and men as change agents. The research I've conducted examines the socio-cultural context within which boys and men "do" boy—the ways boys and men perform and express masculinities not because of their biology but because of their choice.

In 2018, the American Psychological Association updated its guidelines to reflect a growing body of research showing that masculinity is not biologically fixed but socially constructed, meaning boys and men are shaped by the environments and pressures around them. It's not simply boys being boys.

Boys and men navigate and negotiate power arrangements within and among men, determining which forms of masculinity are heralded, valorized and validated and which attitudes and behaviours about being men are discounted, marginalized and ostracized.

Men and boys are compelled to be among "the boys". They want to be accepted, and men and boys are driven by the fear of being perceived as less than a man. This is about men's insecurities and their inability to navigate restrictive versions of masculinity.

Anti-feminist ideology is not new. What is new are the levels at which and the spaces and places in which we increasingly witness anti-feminist views being expressed openly, publicly and indeed with a degree of entitlement not seen in quite some time. There is an upsurge in boys and men whose views, attitudes and beliefs about being men are taking hold and spreading in our classrooms, on playgrounds, in locker rooms, in sports arenas and, yes, on the Internet and in the manosphere.

The recent Netflix show *Adolescence* offers a snapshot of the intersecting issues we witness when we consider anti-feminist ideology. The manosphere, a series of online spaces that promote and distribute anti-feminist beliefs and attitudes, is yet another digital space where anti-feminist ideology goes unchecked, driven by far right-leaning politics claiming that men and boys need to take back power and assert dominance and control.

We need to disrupt, challenge and interrogate these pressures to endorse, conform to and perform dominant masculinity. In doing so, we also need to acknowledge that men and boys have agency to be unlike the rest of the boys.

The "manfluencers" of the Internet are promoting hate, dominance and violence that suggest men reclaim and reassert dominant narrative masculinity. Far right, anti-feminist messaging that suggests men are being left behind because of women and because of minorities further widens an ideological gap between the sexes and blames women and gender equality as the source of all evil.

What we need to be mindful of in this crucial conversation about anti-feminist ideology is the damaging and damaged ways hate and discrimination are being seeded within and among boys and men. We need to be aware of the power of these attitudes and behaviours among men and boys that attempt to reclaim what appears to be entitled male privilege.

Thank you.

• (1730)

The Chair: Thank you very much.

Now we'll go to Ms. Bookchin for five minutes.

Sue Bookchin (Executive Director, Be the Peace Institute): Hi, and thank you so very much.

The organization I'm executive director of is a non-profit based in rural Nova Scotia wholly committed to ending gender-based violence and dismantling the systemic and social forces that keep it in place.

I'd like to speak about the convergence of some of the forces that I think are making young people particularly vulnerable in these polarizing times: sexualized violence and exploitation; the availability of online pornography; extremist ideologies that are highly misogynistic and linked inextricably to gender-based violence and mass casualties; and the online sphere as the primary vehicle for these dynamics. A gendered lens is needed because girls and gender-diverse youth are most at risk of harm, and the harm is not exclusively but primarily being committed by males who are being conditioned into a normalization of misogynistic violence.

In its final report, the Mass Casualty Commission in Nova Scotia talked about a strong connection between stereotypical views of masculinity and perceived threats to masculinity, and gender-based violence and mass violence committed by males. Misogyny is a common trait among perpetrators of mass violence, among other causative factors. Anti-feminist and extremist views appear in their writings, manifestos or online activity, and the hallmarks of the incel movement, which people have talked about, include the overt hatred of women and the belief that they don't deserve respect, security or equality. It's founded on male supremacy, and the UN identifies misogyny as a gateway to other forms of extremism.

The manosphere—people have talked about this as well in online spaces—is a vehicle for grooming young men into these ideologies. We hear about an epidemic of loneliness and isolation, particularly for boys, and as gender roles shift toward greater equality and representation of women, boys and young men are searching for their place. This can propel them into online spaces looking for a sense of community and belonging, where they find social media influencers like Andrew Tate and his extreme misogynistic, hypermasculine views; hateful speech; sexual violence and exploitation; and far right ideologies. He has millions of followers, primarily young men and boys. From a recent CSIS news release, it is increasingly true that children and youth are being pulled into violence motivated by extreme ideologies and world views, and this is accelerated by technology and online platforms.

In White Ribbon's recent report "Boys are at Risk", they found that 75% to 95% of educators and youth professionals have seen radical ideologies expressed by boys and men. They are concerned about harmful online content that is targeting young boys, and they've witnessed misogynistic behaviours in the classroom.

In Nova Scotia, the auditor general put out a report about violence in Nova Scotia schools and found an increase of 60% over the past seven years, which has severe and lasting consequences. It did not have a gender lens as far as I could see, but violence in the form of bullying, cyber-bullying and discriminatory behaviour is influencing a dramatic increase in absenteeism and school avoidance across Canada. Again, this compounds isolation and anxiety, and young people may turn to online spaces and gaming for a sense of community, where the algorithms pull them deeply into these kinds of extremist ideologies.

In the book *The Anxious Generation*, author Jonathan Haidt talks about how the mental health of adolescents has plunged, primarily through the arrival of phone-based childhoods. Rates of depression, anxiety, self-harm and suicide have risen sharply in the last decade in this era of smart phones, social media and big tech, which are influencing the social and neurological development of our children.

Online pornography is not being talked about much. It is hijacking children's brains. What used to be called hard core is now normalized. It's inherently misogynistic and shockingly violent toward females, and males and females are learning to accept the normalized misbehaviour. It changes their brains. It wires together sexual activity and violence and grooms young people to be desensitized to sexualized violence. On these sites, predators also lurk. This has been called a public health emergency.

• (1735)

The pornography industry is a multi-billion dollar industry. In a pediatric grand round that was hosted by the IWK hospital, I was horrified at the alarming statistics about child-on-child sexualized violence. The addiction of teens—

• (1740)

The Chair: Thank you. I'm sorry, but that's your five minutes. We'll get to the content, I'm sure, in the questions.

Otherwise, if either of you have things you would have liked to say that you didn't get time to say, please feel free to send those bits of information to the clerk.

We'll start our first round of questions with Madame Vien for six minutes.

[*Translation*]

Dominique Vien: I'd like to thank both witnesses very much for being with us.

Mr. Kehler, antifeminism has been around for quite some time.

How is it that antifeminism has gained such momentum over the past 10 or 15 years?

As the Quebec expression goes, "the bread has risen". This brand of antifeminism has taken shape among boys and young men.

Can this be explained solely by greater access to the Internet and the proliferation of platforms?

Are there other explanations for this phenomenon?

[*English*]

Michael Kehler: I'm waiting for the interpretation.

Am I mistaken? I'm sorry.

The Chair: I'll suspend briefly while we fix the interpretation.

• (1740)

(Pause)

• (1740)

[*Translation*]

The Chair: We'll resume the meeting.

[*English*]

Dominique Vien: Is there interpretation? Okay, that's good.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Kehler, I'll be brief since everyone has heard my questions.

Antifeminism has been around for quite some time. As the Quebec expression goes, "the bread has risen". It has risen. How is this possible?

Is this solely attributable to the proliferation of platforms, the fact that digital technology is more dynamic, or greater access to the Internet?

In your opinion, are there other underlying reasons that would explain this enthusiasm for antifeminism and masculinist narratives?

[*English*]

Michael Kehler: That's a good question.

What we need to acknowledge is that, in many ways, we've become complicit in anti-feminism. We've allowed for this uprising. We've allowed for different spaces, locker rooms...and misogyny. Again, we've seen misogyny. We've seen bullying. We've seen anti-feminist ideologies in many spaces for a long time. What we are seeing is an uprising among the far right, who are reclaiming the masculine perspective.

I'm not saying it has ever gone away. I think it's just been simmering underneath what one might argue is the more woke environment in which we now operate. At the same time, many boys and men feel they need to speak up and speak out. We have allowed this to happen because we haven't had clear policies. We haven't explicitly spoken to masculinities in education, for example.

• (1745)

[Translation]

Dominique Vien: Mr. Kehler, would you have any data to share with us regarding public opinion on these issues?

Are there any data on this?

Do people really think this exists, or is it not something they're concerned about?

Has the level of public awareness about these issues been measured?

[English]

Michael Kehler: I can certainly follow up with percentages and numbers. I know that when I think internationally about my colleagues in Australia and the U.K. and about those here in Canada, the rise within education specifically and the anti-feminist ideology that is perpetuated within schools....

I'm currently doing a national study with teachers across Canada, male-identifying teachers. I was, in fact, in Manitoba last week, where the teachers have said that boys make homophobic remarks or sexist remarks against girls. I also have a daughter who is a physical health education teacher, and she talks about how some of the boys will speak back to her until she tells them that's disrespectful and puts them in their place for disregarding her as a woman.

Indeed, I can follow up with statistics.

[Translation]

Dominique Vien: I find this very interesting, and I hope you'll send us the data you have on this.

Would you say that there's a lack of significant and positive male role models in the school setting? Within the school system, there aren't many men who serve as positive figures. It may be limited to the father and maybe the grandfather.

Should we be making greater efforts to ensure that young people have more positive male figures in their lives, precisely to prevent them from turning to the narratives found online?

[English]

Michael Kehler: I appreciate what you're saying. I would be very cautious about saying simply that more male role models will solve the problem. We've seen this attempted here in Ontario in the past. One of the governments tried to encourage having more male

teachers and tried to provide a financial incentive. This, I do not believe...and the research would bear out. It is not strictly the gender of teachers that influence our youth. It is the pedagogical practices of teachers.

However they identify, we need to be very cautious about saying that we simply need more male teachers as male role models. I think that disregards the agency that children have in the classroom. They do not look across and strictly see a female or a male—or however the teachers identify. They are engaged by teachers and teachers' practices in classrooms.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

Next we'll go to Ms. Khalid for six minutes.

Iqra Khalid (Mississauga—Erin Mills, Lib.): Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

I'll be honest with you. Over the number of meetings we've had for this study, I've been a little perplexed. What I see again and again, in more of an unconscious bias type of way, is witnesses and experts coming forward and finding excuses rather than accountability, saying that maybe it's social media, maybe it's indoctrination or maybe it's the incel movement, the MGTOW movement. It's this or it's that. Where's the accountability?

Dr. Kehler, do you think that women, who have been suffering violence for generations—ever since the dawn of time, I would say—get the same leverage, the same ability, to be victims? Instead, are we saying that all of a sudden, now that this movement has come along and we're so woke in many senses, our boys and men are actually the victims; they're the ones being indoctrinated?

Can you comment on that, please? Tell me how we can help solve this.

• (1750)

Michael Kehler: That was a beautifully loaded question. I'll try to respond.

I think what we need to do—and I tried to say it in my opening comments—is acknowledge that boys and men have power and control. They have agency to change their attitudes and behaviours. They are responsible for their actions, and we need to be very careful about allowing them to just be boys. In many ways, what we need to do is lean into these conversations with boys. If that's uncomfortable, then it's uncomfortable, and they need to embrace that and understand how uncomfortable it is for others.

I hope I'm responding to your question. I think that as educators, as teachers and as parents, we have a responsibility to demonstrate what respect looks like. We have a responsibility to show fairness in the classroom.

I was in a classroom just recently when a youth described to me an incident of bullying that occurred in a locker room, where another child was pummelled with balls and homophobic remarks were cast at him. After that talk, the child who was in the same room sought me out and said, “Michael, I was the child who had the ball thrown at him. I was the one who was ostracized.” He expressed to me his appreciation for my acknowledgement of the kind of bullying that occurs in our schools and in locker rooms.

What I'm saying to you is that this child, for me, embraced and acknowledged. He named himself in that context. What I've seen and know from being a high school English teacher—I used to be one—a researcher and a parent is the ability we have to engage youth so they take on responsibility for their actions and own what they do.

Iqra Khalid: Dr. Kehler, I have three brothers. I'm the only daughter in my family, and I also have three nephews. Common sense is that you don't hurt somebody. In my family, that's how it goes. I've had wrestling matches with my brothers with no issues. We go about it that way because we don't consider gender to be a differentiator within my family.

I appreciate that common-sense approach within the classroom, within how we operate as a society, but when we create, as we have over the past 100 years, an old boys' club...and now over the decades we've seen the #MeToo movement, the Epstein files, MGTOW and incels. I don't think this is something that was created now. I think it's just now coming to light, to say it exists.

What do you think, as a society and as a government, we can do to combat the old boys' club mentality to make sure there's equality of opportunity for everybody?

Michael Kehler: I agree with you.

I think we need to be very intentional and purposeful in how we challenge masculinities and how we take up masculinities in our schools. The absence of conversations around different forms of masculinities in and of itself and the invisibility in schools.... For example—and I've mentioned this to the Ontario provincial government—in education there's the lack of attention to the body image issues that adolescents, boys in particular, confront.

With the lack of awareness, the lack of conversations and the lack of support for teachers and educators to take up these issues, this is an area the government needs to pay particular attention to. It's not simply about throwing money at it. It's also—

• (1755)

The Chair: Thank you. I'm sorry. That's your time on this question.

We'll go now to Madame Larouche for six minutes.

[*Translation*]

Andréanne Larouche: Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

Thank you very much to the two witnesses for being with us today to participate in this study. We realize that we're really dealing with elements that are at the very root of violence.

I would like to delve a little deeper into the subject with you, Ms. Bookchin.

What community initiatives have proven effective in preventing misogyny and antifeminism?

[*English*]

Sue Bookchin: I'm not sure I would use the term “efficient”. This is a complex and wicked problem, and many community organizations and partnerships are trying to find ways to tackle it.

Recently in Nova Scotia, a new curriculum came out that will be for the primary grades to grade 12, and there is more initiative in universities about violence prevention and healthy relationships.

It will take time not only to bring that to all grade levels in developmentally appropriate ways, but also to train teachers in ways to make them feel comfortable with the material. This kind of work often gets delegated to a teacher who has time in their schedule, as opposed to people who are specially trained to engage youth in some of these very sensitive conversations.

There's also an initiative here called GuysWork. It is a way for boys to be engaged together during school time to talk about questions around masculinity and the things that can often be normalized. That seems to have some promise.

I think it's a generational change. Some of the forces coming at our young people from so many different directions are addictive in nature. The algorithms do that online.

There is also a program called Caring Dads, which is working with men who have children on how to be better fathers.

There are a lot of initiatives. I find that we don't have a lot of longitudinal studies. If we had a program in schools from the primary grades to grade 6, let's say, how are we following those children over the course of their adolescence to see if it makes a difference for them?

We try a lot of different things, but I don't think we have a lot of good data and long-term research about what works.

[*Translation*]

Andréanne Larouche: That's pretty much what the UNESCO chair representative told us too. They could collect data and conduct studies.

She recommended investing in those data and doing more research. We're starting to see some potential solutions, but there's still more to explore.

What should the federal government prioritize in order to combat antifeminism and misogyny online?

Should it be funding research?

Should it be regulating what is said online?

[English]

Sue Bookchin: Like many people who have spoken about the need for legislation and regulation, I think it's essential to look at those possibilities and to legislate definitions of and accountabilities for hate speech. Big tech companies are getting away with pretty much no accountability for the harms being caused to young people. That area needs to be followed.

The initiatives that often happen through community-based organizations—often in the women's sector and the gender-based violence sector, but also in some men's programs—get a small pot of funding for a year to three years. Then the funding ends, so there's a gap and no ability to do longitudinal work.

The whole sector dealing with young people needs to be funded in a much more sustainable and robust way. I think we also need a lot more supports in schools, because this is a very complex and vulnerable time for all youth, not just the youth we think of as more vulnerable. All youth are vulnerable to these forces. Teachers, assistants and administrators often talk about how they don't have the necessary supports to deal with some things that are coming up in schools and don't have the skills to deal with them.

• (1800)

[Translation]

Andréanne Larouche: You are interested in the issue, and you talked about some models that exist here in Canada.

Have you looked at models abroad? That could have given you some ideas.

[English]

Sue Bookchin: I have heard of and seen some models. I haven't followed them robustly, so I couldn't point to a particular place in the world. I know that Australia is doing quite a bit of work.

The U.K. has instituted some legislation. I'm not sure how that is working. One of the suggestions was that all new technological devices should have an opt-in feature for accessing pornography, as opposed to having it readily available to children on any device, as well as ways of enforcing age limits on things that can be harmful for youth.

The Chair: Very good.

Now we'll go into our second round of questioning. We'll begin with Ms. Cody for five minutes.

Connie Cody: Thank you, Chair.

I'd like to direct my questions to Dr. Kehler. Thank you for coming today.

I'm hearing through this study that viewpoints are being influenced by social media and narratives. You also mentioned today that boys are shaped by the environment around them. Has any research been completed on whether DEI messaging or the generalization of framing men and boys as a whole as harmful and toxic might be pushing some toward anti-feminist views and influencers?

Michael Kehler: I cannot state specifically any studies on that at this moment. However, you used the term "toxic". I will say that research abounds on the disuse of the term "toxic", which essentializes all boys and all men as problematic. In doing so, it lays the rest

with the individual...as something that's inwardly grown and outwardly expressed. You'll notice in any work I've done that I find that language problematic because it feeds into men and boys being naturally violent and naturally aggressive.

Connie Cody: We know that many men find their only community and refuge in faith-based settings—places where they can talk, be vulnerable and get support—but we also see rising public fears that government is moving toward policing or restricting certain religious expression. How do we avoid creating deterrence on the very spaces where men feel safe and comfortable in seeking help?

Michael Kehler: I think that is a challenge.

There's a tension there in how we support a diversity of masculinities, whether they're faith-based or not, and I agree with you that we need to be very cognizant that there are spaces where boys and men need to be able to be vulnerable, to be open and to be unsure of themselves, as opposed to being judged and devalued for that.

I agree with you, and I don't have an answer to how we allow for our faith-based spaces. However, I think we need to find ways to support diverse masculinities.

Connie Cody: Thank you.

I'd like to direct my next question to Ms. Bookchin. How are you today?

Given concerns raised by women in agencies like the Canada Border Services Agency about internal complaint processes, do you believe that government should apply the same scrutiny to its own systems that it does to social attitudes?

Sue Bookchin: Absolutely.

• (1805)

Connie Cody: That was quick. Thank you.

I'll go on to the next question.

Sue Bookchin: Also, because people mention what happens in politics and in the House of Commons or legislatures, I think it has to be said that those are workplaces. If they are supposed to be healthy workplaces, we must address the misogynistic kinds of comments that come at women and figure out how we can address the kind of cyber-vitriol, hate and gendered language that's used and particularly directed at female elected officials. I think it needs to happen everywhere in government as well.

Connie Cody: In the absence of an expert agreed-upon definition, anti-feminism is described as systems or attitudes that harm women. Would you agree that unresolved workplace harassment inside these federally regulated agencies should fall under that description or definition?

Sue Bookchin: I think they certainly could. A lot of it is about harassment and gendered harassment. Adding that particular gendered lens, a gender-based intersectional analysis, is needed in those kinds of situations. I would also say that the way in which many institutions and systems use non-disclosure agreements inappropriately to silence women who are being harassed and violated is another huge issue we should address.

Connie Cody: What safeguards do you believe should be mandated within federal enforcement agencies to prevent supervisors from using pregnancy, medical leave or caregiving responsibilities as grounds for sidelining or penalizing employees?

Sue Bookchin: We thought we had that handled, but apparently not.

Connie Cody: Okay.

I think there is no more time left.

The Chair: That's it for you.

Now we're on to Madame Ménard for five minutes.

[*Translation*]

Marie-Gabrielle Ménard: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Mr. Kehler, your testimony really touched me. I found you generous and courageous for sharing these things with us. You could have kept them to yourself. I think that, in itself, is an indication that it's possible to be vulnerable in society. We could even gain from it.

It's been possible to bring people together to fight against racism as a form of hate.

Is it possible to engage young men in this fight against antifeminism as a form of hate?

[*English*]

Michael Kehler: The short answer is yes. We can see that with, for example, men rallying around Movember and the White Ribbon campaign. We can see that there are organizations engaging boys and men. What we do not have here in Canada—and feel free to correct me if I'm wrong—is a comprehensive strategic framework across Canada for engaging boys and men. We have nothing cohesive and coherent. It does seem to me that this is what we need across our country to say we are serious about engaging boys and men.

I would echo what was mentioned earlier: funding for engaging boys and men has gone up and down. I have admittedly been a recipient of some of this funding; however, it's not an ongoing part of a national focus.

The answer is definitely. I think we need to create opportunities, and we need to allow boys and men to see the strength and courage in our vulnerabilities and not feel that they will be threatened.

[*Translation*]

Marie-Gabrielle Ménard: Let's dream a little; we're still allowed.

We're part of a confederation, and it's not always easy to rally all the provinces and territories around a common project. Often, what we hear first is what sets them apart.

What can we imagine on a national level? Let's dare to dream.

[*English*]

Michael Kehler: I appreciate that.

I moved to Alberta eight years ago from Ontario. I have learned even more so in those eight years to project my voice, to speak up on behalf of youth. There is a province in which diverse masculinities and diverse gender identities are constantly under attack. Across our country, I think we can imagine the possibilities for validating a diversity of masculinities and being cognizant that there is not just one way of being a boy or a man. There are many ways we can express ourselves with respect and with regard for others.

• (1810)

[*Translation*]

Marie-Gabrielle Ménard: Thank you very much, Mr. Kehler.

Ms. Bookchin, during this study, we heard testimony from other people across the country. We were told that the rise of antifeminist ideology threatened democracy and gender equality. Women are therefore more likely to be victims of violence.

Do you think that we should also add under this umbrella the fact that the health of young Canadians is being compromised?

[*English*]

Sue Bookchin: The research certainly highlights that youth are struggling. Their mental health is struggling. The rates of anxiety, depression and self-harm are at a level we've never seen before.

This is hurting youth. We need to be very mindful of how whatever we do affects them. We tend to focus on the risk factors for youth, and there are many. We need to have a more public health and population health focus on the protective factors for helping young people stay strong, resilient and healthy.

[*Translation*]

Marie-Gabrielle Ménard: Ms. Bookchin, do you think this means that we should also be concerned about this phenomenon, this rise in ideology?

Should we consider this a problem in terms of national security and health?

[English]

Sue Bookchin: Yes, it definitely is a health and safety issue, and not just for the individuals involved. As we have seen in mass casualties, it spills out into the health and safety of whole communities. These things are public health emergencies that we need to treat in that way, and gather all of our public health and mental health forces to wrap services, supports and prevention modalities around young people. In particular, when we think about young people in adverse childhood experiences, those are indicators, potentially, of violent behaviour or victimization later in life, and that's when we should be acting.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

[Translation]

Ms. Larouche, you have the floor for two and a half minutes.

Andréanne Larouche: Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

Mr. Kehler, I too was very moved by your testimony. You had the opportunity to express how important this issue is. We must address this issue and identify the causes of this rise in antifeminism so it doesn't turn into a war of the sexes, both for the women who are victims and for men. It is essential that it be seen this way.

Unfortunately, we see that our last meeting for this study will take place next week. After listening to the testimonies today, I think it would be appropriate to extend this study. I think we could reach common ground.

For my last round of questions, Madam Chair, I'd like to propose a motion. We can, of course, discuss, exchange ideas and find a way together to simply continue this study. We realize that when we go in-depth with witnesses, we think of other witnesses we'd like to call on to address other issues.

My motion reads as follows:

That the committee add three additional meetings to the ongoing study on antifeminism, in order to allow for the hearing of additional witnesses and the further examination of the issues raised;

That these meetings be scheduled at the next available opportunity in the committee's calendar; and

That the Clerk take the necessary steps to invite witnesses and organize the sessions.

[English]

The Chair: We are on the topic of anti-feminism, so the motion is in order.

Is there discussion on the motion?

Go ahead, Ms. Khalid.

Iqra Khalid: Thank you, Chair.

I just have a quick question. I don't want to prolong debate on this at all. I'm just wondering what the witness submissions will look like if we're extending the dates.

The Chair: Just for the information of the committee, we have two panels on Monday, and a number of witnesses who were called but weren't available are still on the list. If we extend by three additional meetings, we will not get to drafting instructions on the gender-based violence report or the anti-feminism report until we re-

turn in the new year. Of course, there are a number of other motions for discussion that we plan to talk about next Wednesday.

Go ahead, Madame Vien.

• (1815)

[Translation]

Dominique Vien: Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

My colleagues and I greatly appreciate the study we are currently conducting. I think it's pretty obvious that we're very committed.

However, many other studies and many other motions are pending.

We have trouble seeing, Madam Chair, how we could fit these next two or three meetings into a schedule that is already very tight.

We were also expecting two ministers to appear, but they never showed up. We need to move forward with our work. For these reasons, unfortunately, we would disagree with this motion.

Given the testimony we've heard and the briefs that will be sent to us, it seems to us that we should have a good overview in order to write a coherent and interesting report.

We understand why the motion has been tabled. However, given the deadline and the time allotted to this committee, I don't think we have time to extend this study.

[English]

The Chair: Go ahead, Madame Ménard.

[Translation]

Marie-Gabrielle Ménard: I thank my colleague for the suggestion. I find this study fascinating, and the subject truly alarms me. The more I learn about it, the more I realize that we need to continue digging deeper into this issue. This topic has ramifications across all the studies that seem to be of interest to this committee.

I completely agree with my colleague Ms. Vien's thinking, namely that there's a lot of work ahead of us. That said, I believe that this study remains important. I feel that it helps us better understand other matters.

I support the motion that my colleague Ms. Larouche has just put forward. I am also very aware that we have a lot of work ahead of us. We are ambitious in this committee, and I think that's one of our strengths. However, I feel that sometimes we open something up only to discover how little we actually know about it.

This study doesn't have many precedents. Based on what has been studied in recent parliaments, I think we're opening a new chapter. In that sense, I'm in favour of extending this study while the subject is still fresh in our minds. We're in the midst of something. It seems to me that four meetings is too short a time to continue to explore this topic in depth.

[English]

The Chair: Go ahead, Madame Larouche.

[Translation]

Andréanne Larouche: The problem is that I can't propose an amendment to my motion. I'm sensitive to what the Conservatives are saying, but I realize that I can't propose an amendment asking whether we can compromise by adding only two meetings.

[English]

The Chair: Go ahead, Ms. Cody.

Connie Cody: I really appreciate the motion, and I understand that in every conversation we could probably spend a year on every single topic. I've listened to a lot of the witnesses, and the information is amazing. It's full, and I think it's very complete. The witnesses we've heard from have basically shared a lot of the same information. I think if we spend more time on this rather than some other issues of concern to the people we represent, we might be missing other opportunities to move forward.

With witnesses, we could talk forever and a day on this. I think we need to move forward and get to the recommendations and the end of the study so we can actually start making some changes and move in a more positive manner. We should also look at all the other issues and present our other motions so we can expedite all the issues instead of spending so much time on one.

The Chair: Go ahead, Madame Ménard.

[Translation]

Marie-Gabrielle Ménard: I'm very sensitive to what has been said by my colleagues from the Conservative Party.

In this spirit of collaboration, I'm taking the risk of proposing an amendment to the motion.

I will present it in two parts.

I propose reducing the number of additional meetings to two.

Why not keep the schedule as it is and dive into the draft report, which is the stage that was planned in the schedule? This would prevent us from delaying the work already in progress. We could complete these two proposed meetings after what was already planned for next Wednesday.

• (1820)

[English]

The Chair: Just to clarify, the amendment that Madame Ménard is moving is to go to two meetings and to strike the part that says, "at the next available opportunity in the committee's calendar". We'll discuss that in our committee business next Wednesday.

Go ahead, Madame Vien.

[Translation]

Dominique Vien: Can we speak on Ms. Ménard's amendment, Madam Chair?

Okay, thank you.

Personally, I'm having difficulty understanding how we're going to add two new meetings without affecting the schedule as it currently stands.

I don't know how you think we'll do that.

Marie-Gabrielle Ménard: No, it's the opposite.

Dominique Vien: It's the opposite of what?

[English]

The Chair: It would be next year when we come back and restart. We would be adding those two meetings at that point in time, and whatever other things we decide we're studying next year.

Go ahead, Madame Larouche.

[Translation]

Andréanne Larouche: In fact, I just thought of an advantage with respect to the schedule. We'll have a subcommittee meeting next week to discuss upcoming studies. We know that this one will be coming to an end. However, we would be studying two reports when we return in January, when we could be studying one report at a time. I think we can definitely provide instructions for the report on section 810.

After the holidays, we could hold a meeting with witnesses to conduct a parallel study. Then, we could hold another meeting depending on our schedule.

We could establish a schedule to continue the study on section 810. We could also finish the current study to avoid having to study two reports at the same time. If we give two instructions for the report on Wednesday, we will be studying two reports at the same time when we return from the holidays.

At the very least, we could finish one study and review the report from another study that has already been completed. We could alternate between the two studies, so to speak. I don't see how we could study two reports at the same time when we return. This would allow us to study one report at a time, namely, the one on section 810, while completing the work on another study.

Then, we could finish the report on the study on antifeminism and perhaps even start another study that would be adopted at next week's subcommittee meeting.

[English]

The Chair: Just to be—

[Translation]

Andréanne Larouche: We could even invite the two ministers we're expecting because we were told they are supposed to come. This could be an opportunity to conclude this study with the ministers. We can finish the study on section 810 with the ministers and receive the last witnesses for the study on antifeminism.

We will complete everything and move on to a new study.

[English]

The Chair: Yes. Both ministers have indicated that they will be available to come early in the new year.

Do I understand correctly, Madame Larouche, that you agree with the amendment of Madame Ménard to go to two additional meetings and stick with our existing calendar? Of course, we wouldn't be drafting instructions on the anti-feminism report, because that would be after the two meetings in the new year.

Is that correct? Very good.

Go ahead, Madame Vien.

[*Translation*]

Dominique Vien: We're losing track. We're adding meetings and welcoming ministers.

We had invited the ministers. We're told that they won't be coming as soon as we thought and that this hasn't changed, but we didn't agree to receive them in February because we wanted to conclude this study.

[*English*]

The Chair: The ministers have indicated that they will come in the new year—the last week of January or the first week of February.

[*Translation*]

Dominique Vien: Madam Chair, I've done several studies here. The information is starting to repeat itself. This isn't the fault of the witnesses; it's the nature of a committee.

Can Ms. Larouche tell us exactly what additional information she wants that we haven't had so far?

[*English*]

The Chair: Go ahead, Madame Larouche.

[*Translation*]

Andréanne Larouche: We've had four meetings to explore the causes of such a deep-rooted problem, which causes hatred and the rise of hatred. Some aspects relate to legislation, particularly the legislation on online hate. Today, thanks to a teacher, we've just opened a door on the issue of traditional media. No one had mentioned it to us before. Is this an avenue work exploring?

We're talking about funding, but why? It's about funding organizations that help men. We have the beginnings of some solutions. It's true that adding three meetings is ambitious. We can agree on two. That doesn't change our invitation to the ministers. We'll set the schedule. I think that at this point, there are still some things to work out, just as there are with the ministers regarding section 810.

To conduct a thorough study, we can afford to gather a bit more information. I would still urge us to keep the invitation to the ministers a priority, because it's for the study on section 810. If they're willing to appear quickly in February, we'll reschedule a meeting with witnesses to complete the study on antifeminism.

• (1825)

[*English*]

The Chair: The suggestion is that we go with the amendment of Madame Ménard, and we can figure out the schedule in the next year.

Go ahead, Ms. Cody.

Connie Cody: I have a suggestion for the amendment. I believe Madame Ménard mentioned the continuation of this meeting after some other items. Is that correct?

The Chair: Yes, the suggestion is that we try to fit the ministers in as soon as possible in the new year so we can finish that off, and then we would have two additional meetings on anti-feminism.

Connie Cody: That would be afterwards; we're not going to do it beforehand. Could we also look at other motions to bring forward so they're no longer postponed?

The Chair: Yes, we'll have a discussion next Wednesday on all the other motions, and we'll figure out what order they will go in. We'll have that discussion next week or next Wednesday.

Madam Nathan, did you have something to say? No. Okay.

We'll call the question. All in favour of the amendment of Madame Ménard?

Connie Cody: Can you read the amendment specifically, please?

The Chair: The amendment is that we have two additional meetings on anti-feminism, and we are striking the part of Madame Larouche's motion that says “at the next available opportunity” so that we will be able to do other things first and decide our calendar together next Wednesday.

Connie Cody: Does it specify that it's after the ministers appear?

Iqra Khalid: We're voting now. You called the question.

The Chair: I've called the question.

Connie Cody: My question was whether the motion included that, and you said yes.

The Chair: The motion doesn't specifically include that, although the discussion is here.

Iqra Khalid: It's the chair's prerogative to schedule as she may.

The Chair: If you wanted to make a subamendment, it had to be made before we started voting on the question.

Are all in favour of the amendment?

(Amendment agreed to [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

[*Translation*]

Dominique Vien: We will agree later.

[*English*]

The Chair: Are all in favour of the motion as amended?

(Motion as amended agreed to [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: Very good. That's passed.

I apologize to the witnesses for the interruption of our committee business.

Go ahead, Madame Vien.

[*Translation*]

Dominique Vien: Excuse me, but this is going fast.

We said that we agreed to move forward, but we had one condition, which was to add a meeting with the ministers. That's what was expected. That's what we had agreed on.

[*English*]

The Chair: Procedurally, you're not able to do that. When an amendment has been made, you can make a subamendment. If you don't make a subamendment, when you begin to vote on the amendment, you cannot then—

[*Translation*]

Dominique Vien: Madam Chair, we wanted to propose a subamendment. That's exactly what Ms. Cody said, and everyone understood it.

Ms. Ménard, you understood it too.

Everyone understood that we wanted to propose a subamendment so the ministers—

Marie-Gabrielle Ménard: It was a question. It wasn't phrased like that at all.

[*English*]

The Chair: I didn't hear anyone say they wanted to make a subamendment. I'm sorry.

With that, I want to thank our witnesses.

Go ahead, Madame Larouche.

[*Translation*]

Andréanne Larouche: We will have the meeting on committee business, and we will prioritize the appearance by the ministers.

I want the priority to be finishing the study on section 810 with the appearance of the ministers. Next week, when we discuss committee business and set our schedule, we'll need to note somewhere that this is a priority, even ahead of these two studies. Otherwise, we will intervene in another way.

[*English*]

The Chair: I think everyone is in agreement with the order. We'll make sure that it's recorded when we have our discussions about the order of committee business next Wednesday.

Out of respect for the witnesses and their time, I very much want to thank them for coming.

Obviously, we didn't get much time to ask questions. If there's something you wanted to tell the committee, please send it to the clerk. We'd be happy to have all of your input. Thank you again for your time.

With that, I'll adjourn the meeting.

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>