



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

45th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

Standing Committee on the Status of Women

EVIDENCE

NUMBER 028

Tuesday, March 10, 2026

Chair: Marilyn Gladu



Standing Committee on the Status of Women

Tuesday, March 10, 2026

• (1145)

[English]

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

Welcome to meeting number 28 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.

I see that everyone is here in the room.

Please wait until I recognize you before speaking. If you wish to speak, raise your hand. Comments should be addressed through the chair, and the clerk and I will manage the speaking order as best we can. Thank you for your patience and understanding.

Pursuant to the order adopted by the House on Wednesday, January 28, 2026, the committee is commencing its clause-by-clause consideration of Bill C-225, an act to amend the Criminal Code.

We have officials from the Department of Justice here today to answer any questions you may have during the clause-by-clause consideration. I'd like to welcome, from the criminal law policy section, Nathalie Levman, senior counsel, and Alyssa McLeod, counsel. Welcome.

Now I would like to provide members of the committee with a few comments on how the committee will proceed with clause-by-clause consideration of Bill C-225.

As the term indicates, this is an examination of all the clauses in the order in which they appear in the bill. I will call each clause successively. Each clause is subject to debate and a vote. If there are amendments to the clause in question, I will recognize the member proposing the amendment, who may explain it in less than three minutes, as we agreed. The amendment will then be open for debate. When no further members wish to intervene, the amendment will be voted on. Amendments will be considered in the order in which they appear in the package that each member received from the clerk.

In addition to having to be properly drafted in a legal sense, amendments must also be procedurally admissible. The chair might be called upon to rule amendments inadmissible if they go beyond the principles or scope of the bill, both of which were adopted by the House when it agreed to the bill at second reading, or if they offend the financial prerogative of the Crown.

During debate on an amendment, members are permitted to move subamendments. Only one subamendment will be considered at a time, and a subamendment cannot be amended. All amendments and subamendments must be submitted to the clerk in writing.

Once every clause has been voted on, the committee will vote on the title and the bill itself. An order to reprint the bill will be required if amendments are adopted, so that the House has a proper copy for use at report stage.

Thanks, everyone, for your attention. I will endeavour to go slowly so we can all follow along and everyone has a productive clause-by-clause consideration of the bill.

(On clause 1)

The Chair: Let's begin with clause 1.

In clause 1, there are two amendments that are proposed: NDP-1 and LIB-1. These two amendments can't both be accepted, because they're in conflict, so we'll have to pick one, the other or neither.

Mr. Caputo, go ahead.

Frank Caputo (Kamloops—Thompson—Nicola, CPC): Thank you, Chair, for recognizing me.

Can I have the indulgence of the committee for a moment, as the bill's sponsor, to let people know how I envision things going today?

I will be asking the officials to comment on the difference between LIB-1 and NDP-1. "Incompatible" might not be the appropriate word, but they say essentially the same thing with slightly different wording. I believe one is possessive and one isn't.

Before we begin, thank you all for being here and for the support. I know that victims' families across the country are watching. It's great to have everybody at the table here.

How I hoped today would unfold is according to amendments that I have worked on with the government. Those amendments have been circulated. We have two amendments from the NDP. I have indicated to the government that we as Conservatives will be supporting their amendments. Obviously, we welcome the officials who are here and thank them for their work, and they will have something to say if we have questions.

Given the amendments that we have agreed to, certain clauses in the bill will no longer be necessary. In other words, they would conflict with the amendments that we have drafted. We will have to address that in clauses 3 to 6 and clauses 8 and 9. That's not to say that we are voting down a portion of the bill. It's just that, in agreeing to the amendments, we have essentially rendered those clauses obsolete. They're no longer necessary. I hope I've explained that clearly.

With that, I'll ask the analysts to weigh in on what I've just said. Could they please tell us about the differences between NDP-1 and LIB-1? I have told the government I would support it, but I think we should hear the differences.

• (1150)

The Chair: Before we go to the representatives from the justice department, I think it's only fair, since Ms. Gazan has moved NDP-1, that she could say a few words about it.

Leah Gazan (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Thank you so much. I am excited to be here. I really do miss the committee. I loved this committee.

I will speak about the difference between the Liberal amendment and my amendment. They're very much the same. One is possessive; one is not. Instead of saying "partner and the death is caused", I have "partner and their death is caused". That is the change we've made in NDP-1.

Being here, I also want to emphasize and be very clear that I, along with the NDP, know that we do need legislation that protects women and gender-diverse people from violence, because we know that, on average, a woman or girl is killed every 48 hours.

We also know, since experts tell us, that it's not simply a law enforcement issue. We need to stop the violence before it happens. This means ensuring that indigenous women, all women, girls and gender-diverse people have the resources they need to protect themselves, including deeply affordable housing and basic income supports to ensure they can leave violent relationships. I say that because it seems that we are now taking more carceral approaches, which aren't necessarily supported by frontline advocates of this issue.

We also know, since experts shared this with the committee members during the study of this issue, that punitive and carceral approaches disproportionately impact indigenous people and could in fact endanger women and gender-diverse people experiencing intimate partner violence and have the opposite impact. That's why the NDP submitted amendments to this bill that specify that new penalties would not apply to those who are the ones experiencing violence and abuse as a consequence.

Again, I know that this is supported by the status of women committee, which has a history of doing wonderful work and working collaboratively.

I'll leave it at that, but that is, in essence, the difference.

The Chair: I'll go to the justice department and then to Ms. Lattanzio.

Nathalie Levman (Senior Counsel, Criminal Law Policy Section, Department of Justice): Thank you very much, Chair.

First I'll comment on the English version, and then on the French.

The committee members who have just spoken are absolutely right. The difference is between the possessive pronoun "their" and the definite article "the". Just to take the committee through it, starting at line seven of Bill C-225, it has, in English:

murder is first degree murder when the victim is that person's intimate partner.

The NDP motion would add "and their death is caused by that person", whereas the Liberal motion would add "and the death is caused by that person".

Grammatically speaking, the NDP's version requires the reader to do a little extra work to figure out whose death "their" is referring to, because it's preceded by both "victim" and "that person". The phrase "the death" is a little more clear and succinct: It can only mean the death of the victim. I would say that is the grammatical difference between the two versions in English.

There are a few more differences in the French. They are substantively the same. I'm not going to go into a long description of the differences, since I am anglophone, but I can reassure the committee that we have spoken to francophone legislative drafters about the difference. Mostly, the difference is that the NDP version is a little wordier and therefore a little less precise. However, as both committee members have said, both amendments do achieve the same objective.

I hope that helps the committee.

The Chair: Thank you.

Ms. Lattanzio, go ahead.

Patricia Lattanzio (Saint-Léonard—Saint-Michel, Lib.): Thank you, Madam Chair.

First of all, I'd like to thank the NDP for putting forward this amendment. It is clear that we're all aligned in the shared objective of ensuring that women who kill their abusers are not treated as having committed first-degree murder. The amendment, as stated by a few of you, is very similar to the government's, but I do want to make the following remark.

In my view, the government's approach is better aligned with the provisions of Bill C-16 and with other coordinating amendments that will be proposed to ensure that we tackle the issue as soon as possible, whether Bill C-225 or Bill C-16 comes into force first. For that reason, I will be voting against the amendment, for technical reasons. However, I want to be crystal clear on this: I am in agreement with the intentions behind it, and I believe the government's amendment will achieve that objective.

Thank you.

• (1155)

The Chair: Is there any further discussion on NDP-1?

(Amendment negated [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: We will go to LIB-1.

Is there any discussion on LIB-1?

Ms. Lattanzio, go ahead.

Patricia Lattanzio: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Colleagues, I'm introducing an amendment in the provision of Bill C-225 that would automatically classify the killing of an intimate partner as first-degree murder. This amendment would require courts to look at whether there was a pattern of coercive or controlling behaviour that made the victim fear for their safety.

Please excuse my voice this morning; this bill matters to me too much to not make it to the committee this morning.

This matters because intimate partner violence is too often a pattern of threats, intimidation and control over time; it's not just one incident. The amendment ensures that the law focuses on the person or persons who are trying to carry out that abuse. It also helps to protect victims. In some cases, women kill their abusive partners after years of violence and control. This amendment helps ensure that they are not automatically treated as having committed first-degree murder, by allowing courts to consider the full context of the abuse. That is the amendment being put forward.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

The Chair: Thank you.

Are there any further comments on LIB-1?

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

The Chair: We now go to NDP-2.

Ms. Gazan had combined her statements when she spoke about the first one.

Is there any further discussion on NDP-2?

Ms. Lattanzio, you have the floor.

Patricia Lattanzio: Thank you, Madam Chair.

I understand the intention behind the amendment. The goal is to make sure that victims who kill their abusive partners are not unfairly caught by the proposed first-degree murder provision yet again. This is the objective. I think everyone around this table knows this and shares this point of view.

However, I believe the concern has already been addressed by the amendment we just adopted, LIB-1. I am also concerned that this amendment would be broader than intended and could apply in situations the bill is meant to capture. For example, someone who has controlled and abused their partner and then murdered them might try to rely on the exception by arguing that they themselves experienced coercive control from a previous partner.

In other words, the coercive control aspect needs to be aimed at abusers and not at the victims of abuse. For those reasons, and because the concern was already expressed and addressed in a more targeted way by the amendment we just dealt with, LIB-1, we will not be supporting the amendment.

Thank you.

The Chair: That was very well said.

Is there any further discussion on NDP-2?

(Amendment negated [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: Those are all the amendments to clause 1.

(Clause 1 as amended agreed to)

The Chair: Now we go to amendment LIB-2, which contains a new clause, clause 1.1.

Does anybody want to speak to LIB-2?

Ms. Nathan, go ahead.

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

I'm moving this amendment, which seeks to require a court to consider a life sentence for manslaughter when an intimate partner is killed in the context of ongoing coercive or controlling abuse. This amendment complements LIB-1 by ensuring that even when a case does not meet the legal threshold for murder, the law still treats killings linked to a pattern of abuse with the seriousness they deserve.

• (1200)

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Caputo, go ahead.

Frank Caputo: Thank you.

I appreciate this. This wasn't in the original bill, but I think it really does fit with the intent. For those unaware, I was a parole officer before I went to law school, and I can tell you that the last time a life sentence was given for manslaughter was in 1972. It almost never happens, but if there is to be a life sentence for manslaughter in any context, it should be within the ambit of intimate partner violence, so I appreciate the government bringing it forward.

I don't have a vote, which I was just reminded about, even though I keep raising my hand, so I do encourage the committee to adopt this.

Thank you.

The Chair: Is there any further comment on LIB-2?

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

(On clause 2)

The Chair: Clause 2 contains amendment LIB-3.

Would anybody like to speak to LIB-3?

Ms. Lattanzio, you have the floor.

Patricia Lattanzio: Thank you once again, Madam Chair.

I move LIB-3, which would replace the bill's five proposed intimate partner offences with one broader offence covering violence against an intimate partner. It would treat existing offences such as assault, sexual assault, uttering threats and forcible confinement as intimate partner offences when committed against a partner, and it would increase the maximum penalties in those cases.

Thank you.

The Chair: Excellent.

Is there further discussion on LIB-3?

Go ahead, Mr. Caputo.

Frank Caputo: Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

Thank you, Ms. Lattanzio.

Just to be clear, this is essentially a change in form, not a change in substance. What we are doing is the exact same thing; it's just written differently. I am one person, but the Department of Justice has many lawyers, and they've said this is how we should do it.

I would encourage the committee to vote in favour, and then, as a result, clauses 3 through 6 would no longer need to carry, because it's encapsulated here. I hope that's clear.

The Chair: Is there further discussion on LIB-3?

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

(Clause 2 as amended agreed to)

(On clauses 3 to 6)

The Chair: There have been no amendments submitted for clauses 3 to 6. Can I have unanimous consent to group those together?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chair: Okay, good.

Ms. Khalid, go ahead.

Iqra Khalid: Thank you.

I have a quick question. With respect to the amendments that have already been passed, do they have an impact on any of these clauses?

The Chair: I would ask the Department of Justice, because they're more qualified than I am to answer that.

Nathalie Levman: Thank you, Chair.

The amendment the committee just adopted in respect of clause 2 effectively renders clauses 3 to 6 redundant, or obsolete, as the sponsor has called them. They create very specific intimate partner violence offences. They're specific to particular offences of a general application. All of those offences of a general application would be included as included offences in the IPV-specific offence the committee has just voted in favour of. They are contraindicated, if you will, but, I would stress, in the same spirit as the amendment the committee has just adopted.

The Chair: Your advice to the committee would be to vote against clauses 3 to 6 because they're not needed. Is that correct?

Nathalie Levman: That's correct. If you were to adopt them, there might be some inconsistencies and ambiguities in the law.

The Chair: Very good.

(Clauses 3 to 6 negated)

(On clause 7)

The Chair: We go to clause 7. Does anyone wish to speak to CPC-1?

Mr. Caputo, what a surprise.

• (1205)

Frank Caputo: Thank you. I appreciate that, Madam Chair.

For those who don't know, section 490 of the Criminal Code is quite possibly the biggest time-waster for police officers in British Columbia. I think everybody on this committee will get a high-five from every police officer in British Columbia for this. It may mean absolutely nothing to those on the committee, but take my word for it that we are saving countless hours of police work by changing it from 90 days to 180 days. I urge the government to make it one year, as was my original intent.

I thank the government for working with me on this. People don't know how big this is. It is huge.

Thank you.

The Chair: Are there further comments on CPC-1?

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

(Clause 7 as amended agreed to)

(On clause 8)

The Chair: I don't see an amendment to clause 8.

Mr. Caputo, you have the floor.

Frank Caputo: Thank you, Madam Chair, for allowing me to intervene.

I believe that clauses 8 and 9 will no longer be required and are obsolete or redundant, given the amendments that are proposed here.

As sponsor, I would urge the committee to adopt clause 8.1 and the remainder of the amendments in lieu of that.

Thank you.

The Chair: Are there any further comments on clause 8?

(Clause 8 negated)

The Chair: Now let's talk about the new and improved clause 8.1, which is amendment CPC-1.1.

Go ahead, Mr. Caputo.

Frank Caputo: Thank you, Madam Chair.

This is also the product of discussions with the Department of Justice. People think that none of us get along and that we don't talk about these things. This clause is actually a reflection of the fact that there was a lot of work behind the scenes. For the public watching at home—which is probably my mother and Kelly Favreau—they can rest assured that this was something we looked at.

This would put somebody in a reverse onus when they are on what is called a recognizance, commonly called a peace bond. This is changing up the element of bail to be consistent with other provisions.

Thank you.

The Chair: Are there further comments on new clause 8.1 and CPC-1.1?

Go ahead, Ms. Khalid.

Iqra Khalid: I'm a little bit lost, actually. I don't know exactly where we are in the bill.

The Chair: We are discussing clause 8.1, which is the clause that will come into effect if we accept CPC-1.1.

Mr. Caputo has just outlined why CPC-1.1 is a good thing, and I think he also said that if CPC-1.1 passes and we get this new clause 8.1, we don't need clauses 8 and 9.

With that, we'll have a vote on CPC-1.1.

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

The Chair: Now let's go to clause 9, which we said we wouldn't need.

(Clause 9 negated)

The Chair: We now move to LIB-4, which contains a new clause, clause 10.

Ms. Lattanzio, go ahead.

Patricia Lattanzio: Thank you, Madam Chair.

I move LIB-4, which follows the new broad intimate partner violence offence proposed in LIB-3 and clause 2. It clarifies that if a relationship element is not proven, the court can still convict a person of the underlying offence, such as assault, sexual assault or uttering threats, if the evidence supports it.

• (1210)

The Chair: Is there any further comment on LIB-4?

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

The Chair: We have new clause 11, which is LIB-5. Would someone like to speak to LIB-5?

Ms. Nathan, go ahead.

Juanita Nathan: Thank you, Madam Chair.

I move this amendment to follow the new intimate partner manslaughter provision created in clause 1.1. It means that when a court imposes a life sentence for intimate partner manslaughter, the

parole ineligibility period would be the same as for second-degree murder, which is from 10 to 25 years.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Nathan.

It has come to my attention that LIB-5 references proposed section 745.52 of the Criminal Code, which would actually be created by a later Liberal amendment, LIB-12.

I would ask for the permission of the committee to stand the discussion on LIB-5 until after we get to LIB-12, because that's the one that would create the section that LIB-5 proposes to amend.

(Amendment allowed to stand)

The Chair: Let's move along to LIB-6, which proposes new clause 12.

Would somebody like to speak to LIB-6?

Ms. Nathan, go ahead.

Juanita Nathan: Thank you.

I would like to move this amendment to create an appeal right for individuals convicted of intimate partner manslaughter under clause 1.1. It means that if a court imposes a life sentence with a parole ineligibility period longer than the minimum of 10 years, the person could appeal that portion of the sentence.

This simply mirrors the existing appeal rights for second-degree murder and ensures consistency in the law.

The Chair: Is there any further discussion on LIB-6?

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

The Chair: We now go to new clause 13, which is proposed in LIB-7.

Go ahead, Ms. Nathan.

Juanita Nathan: Thank you, Madam Chair.

I would like to move this amendment to give the Crown the right to appeal the parole ineligibility period for a life sentence imposed for intimate partner manslaughter. It means that if a court imposes a life sentence with parole ineligibility for less than 25 years, the Crown could appeal that portion of the sentence.

This mirrors the existing appeal right for second-degree murder and helps ensure consistency in the justice system.

The Chair: Very good. Is there any further discussion on LIB-7?

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

The Chair: We now go to new clause 14, which is contained in LIB-8.

Is there someone to speak to LIB-8?

Go ahead, Ms. Khalid.

Iqra Khalid: Thank you, Madam Chair.

I'm moving this amendment because we just adopted a new broad intimate partner violence offence in LIB-3. The new offence that we adopted already applies higher maximum penalties to IPV offences, whether they are first or repeat offences. I don't think this provision is necessary anymore, because there is overlap.

To that effect, this amendment would repeal subsection 718.3(8) of the Criminal Code, which currently increases the maximum penalty for repeat IPV offenders. It's to make sure that what we have approved before is consistent with what we are approving now.

The Chair: That's excellent. I think that cleans it up nicely.

Is there any further discussion on LIB-8?

Mr. Caputo.

Frank Caputo: I just wanted to comment on Ms. Khalid's mastery of section 718.3. I'm deeply impressed.

The Chair: Very good.

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

The Chair: We go to new clause 15, which is contained in LIB-9.

Is there someone to speak to LIB-9?

Ms. Khalid.

Iqra Khalid: That's great. I have a lot of paperwork here, Madam Chair.

I'm moving LIB-9, which again follows the broad intimate partner violence offence that was proposed in LIB-3. It would require the indictment or information to state which underlying offence, such as assault or criminal harassment, etc., was proven, ensuring clarity in the court's record.

I think it would be really good for us to understand exactly who is being indicted and charged, and with what, so that there's a continuing record of people who are repeat offenders.

• (1215)

The Chair: Is there any further discussion on LIB-9?

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

The Chair: Now we move to new clause 16, which is contained in LIB-10.

Go ahead, Ms. Ménard.

[*Translation*]

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

The intent behind this addition is to require sentencing courts to impose specific periods of parole ineligibility in cases where a person is sentenced to life imprisonment. This amendment would require courts that impose a life sentence on a person convicted of manslaughter of an intimate partner, as defined in section 1.1, to also impose a parole ineligibility period of between 10 and 25 years.

[*English*]

The Chair: Is there any further discussion of LIB-10?

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

The Chair: Now we go to new clause 17, which is contained in LIB-11.

Go ahead, Ms. Khalid.

Iqra Khalid: Thank you, Chair.

I'm moving this amendment as a consequential change following the new intimate partner manslaughter offence in clause 1.1.

This sets out that if a 16-year-old or a 17-year-old receives a life sentence for this offence, the parole ineligibility period would be seven years, which is the same rule that applies to second-degree murder for young offenders as well. It's just to be consistent. In simple terms, it recognizes the seriousness of the offence while keeping sentencing rules consistent for young people as well.

The Chair: That's very clear.

Is there any further discussion on LIB-11?

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

The Chair: Now we go to new clause 18 and LIB-12.

Ms. Lattanzio.

Patricia Lattanzio: Thank you, Madam Chair.

I move LIB-12 to set clear parole eligibility periods for life sentences in cases of intimate partner manslaughter.

Under this amendment, adult offenders would be ineligible for parole for 10 to 25 years, and youth offenders under 16 would be ineligible for five to seven years.

The Chair: Is there further discussion on LIB-12?

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

The Chair: Now we have dealt with LIB-12, which has introduced the section of the Criminal Code that we wanted to amend with LIB-5.

Is there unanimous consent to return to LIB-5, which we stood earlier?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chair: Very good.

Is there any further discussion on LIB-5?

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

The Chair: On we go to new clause 19, which is contained in LIB-13.

Go ahead, Ms. Khalid.

Iqra Khalid: Thank you, Madam Chair.

I'm moving this amendment to ensure that the time spent in custody before sentencing is properly credited towards the parole ineligibility period for life sentences in cases of intimate partner manslaughter under clause 1.1.

In simple terms, we're talking about aligning the rules with those that already apply to second-degree murder, ensuring consistency in the justice system and reflecting the seriousness of these crimes. It's about bringing all the rules together into consistency.

The Chair: Very good.

Is there any further discussion on LIB-13?

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

The Chair: Now we go to new clause 20, which is contained in LIB-14.

Go ahead, Ms. Khalid.

• (1220)

Iqra Khalid: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Again, this amendment is about clarification. It's to clarify that the intimate partner manslaughter amendment would apply with respect to an offence committed on the 30th day after the bill receives royal assent, meaning that its application would be prospective.

The Chair: Very good.

Is there any further discussion on LIB-14?

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

The Chair: Now there is amendment CPC-2.

Mr. Caputo, you have the floor.

Frank Caputo: Thank you.

It's the exact same rationale as outlined by Ms. Khalid on the last amendment.

The Chair: Is there any further discussion on CPC-2?

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

The Chair: Now we go to LIB-15, where we have new clause 21.

Madame Ménard, go ahead.

[*Translation*]

Marie-Gabrielle Ménard: Thank you, Madam Chair.

This amendment coordinates the amendments on intimate partner murder in Bill C-225 with similar amendments proposed in Bill C-16, the protecting victims act. The proposed clause 21 clarifies which amendments will prevail if the relevant provisions of both bills come into force. That means this amendment is being proposed for clarification purposes.

[*English*]

The Chair: Very good.

Is there any further discussion on LIB-15?

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

The Chair: We go now to new clause 22, which is in LIB-16.

Madame Ménard, the floor is yours.

[*Translation*]

Marie-Gabrielle Ménard: Madam Chair, the logic is exactly the same as for the amendment I just talked about. This amendment is being proposed for coordination and clarification purposes in the event that one of the two bills passes before the other.

[*English*]

The Chair: Excellent.

Is there any further discussion on LIB-16?

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

The Chair: On we go to new clause 23, which is contained in LIB-17.

Go ahead, Madame Ménard.

[*Translation*]

Marie-Gabrielle Ménard: LIB-17 aligns the Bill C-225 provisions concerning the new specific offence related to intimate partner violence with those of Bill C-16, the protecting victims act, to ensure a consistent approach to intimate partner violence in the Criminal Code.

[*English*]

The Chair: Excellent.

Is there further discussion on LIB-17?

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

The Chair: Next is CPC-3.

Is there someone to speak to that?

Let me guess: It's Mr. Caputo.

Frank Caputo: Thank you, Madam Chair.

It's the same rationale as was just outlined. I believe this was a catch that was determined after.... It was determined throughout the amendment process but a little bit later in the day that this was a transitional provision and coordinating amendment.

The Chair: Is there any further discussion on CPC-3?

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

The Chair: LIB-18 contains new clause 24.

Ms. Nathan, please go ahead.

Juanita Nathan: Thank you, Madam Chair.

I move this amendment to ensure that the reforms in Bill C-225 come into force 30 days after royal assent. Providing a period of 30 days after the bill is enacted for coming into force allows those responsible for administering the criminal justice system time to prepare for the implementation.

The Chair: Thank you. That is clear.

Is there any further discussion on LIB-18?

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

The Chair: Shall the title of the bill carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chair: Shall the bill as amended carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chair: Shall the chair report the bill as amended to the House?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chair: Shall the committee order a reprint of the bill as amended for the use of the House at report stage?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chair: Very good.

That is our fine work for today. Thank you all for your co-operation.

I think this is going to benefit women in Canada, keep them safer and ensure that we address issues of coercive control, intimate partner violence and all the things that we have been recommending. Thank you for that.

On Thursday, we will continue with our draft consideration of the Criminal Code report.

Is it the committee's pleasure to adjourn the meeting?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chair: It is so adjourned.

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

SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

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

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

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

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

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

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

PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

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

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

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

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

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